A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE

INCLUDING THE APOCRYPHA

29-9126

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

presented by

DR. H. E. DANA

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

CH5
G66
c.2

A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE

INCLUDING THE APOCRYPHA

A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE
INCLUDING THE APOCRYPHA

A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE

INCLUDING THE APOCRYPHA

EDITED BY

CHARLES GORE

HENRY LEIGHTON GOUDGE

ALFRED GUILLAUME

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

NEW YORK MCMXXIX

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

COPYRIGHT, 1928,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

All rights reserved, including the right
of reproduction in whole or in
part in any form.

Second Printing

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

220.7
G666

PREFACE

THIS Commentary is written by Anglican scholars who, while holding their faith, are determined in approaching the books to give their critical faculty, instructed by all the means within their power, its full and rightful freedom. It is hardly necessary to say that they have not found the results of legitimate criticism to conflict with the Catholic faith, though, believing, as they do, that criticism is a progressive science, and in the main a new science, their conclusions do very often differ widely from those which have been traditional. It will perhaps hardly be doubted that a Commentary on the whole Bible, written from this particular point of view, has been for many years both wanted and lacking; so that we need not apologize for endeavouring to supply the need. But it should be added that on no portion of the books was a new Commentary more obviously required than on the Apocrypha. It is not easy to exaggerate the importance of the books comprised under this ambiguous title in supplying the mental background necessary for understanding the New Testament.

Two further general explanations seem to be necessary. 1. The Bible should be read from the point of view from which it was written; and there can be no doubt that from end to end the original writers wrote, and later editors, where such there were, edited and adapted the original documents for the purpose of edification, not of pure science. Thus, though the historical and archæological importance of the books is immense, it is the spiritual use of them which is their proper use, and it is principally to this spiritual use of the Bible that we intend our Commentary to minister. We shall have fallen quite short of our aim if it does not lead all those who study it onwards from 'reading, marking, and learning' to 'inwardly digesting' the Holy Scriptures; and in particular if it is not of service to the ministers of religion in that 'daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures' to which they are pledged, and by which alone they can hope to wax riper and stronger in their ministry. But it must be confessed that, especially in parts of the Old Testament, it will be found that the critical and archæological aspects of the books are the most prominent in this Commentary. In the present condition of biblical criticism this is inevitable. A commentator on any book must explain his view of the book, his reasons for so regarding it, and his relation to current criticism. His readers would demand this of him. Hence the large place inevitably held by critical discussions.

It must be remembered, however, that sound criticism involves appreciation. There is a great deal of modern biblical criticism which is inspired by a spirit so obviously hostile to the Christian faith as to leave no room for real appreciation of the books. But it is not this sort of criticism which readers will find in this Commentary.

2. The contributors to this volume are almost all united in their general point of view, but this is not held to preclude considerable differences of opinion on particular points. Each contributor is alone responsible for the opinions which he expresses; but where considerable differences appear, attention is directed by cross references from one opinion to another. Where, however, as in the case of Kings and Chronicles, or of the Synoptic Gospels, we have two or more parallel accounts of the same events, it has not been thought necessary constantly to insert cross references. It is assumed that the student will read the different accounts side by side. Sometimes also the editors have added a footnote, either supplying a judgement different from that expressed in the text, for comparison with it, or supplementing the information there supplied. No attempt, however, has been made to provide a full compendium of theology; we have only sought to give what is needed for the understanding of the books.

It should be observed that *all the footnotes throughout the Commentary are by the editors.* Where the Old Testament or New Testament editor and the final

N12886

editor have both had a hand in the footnote, or it expresses the judgement of both, it is signed 'ED.' Where only one has been concerned in it, it is signed by initials.

Some further details should be noted.

(1) The name 'Jehovah' has been retained throughout, and not altered into 'Jahveh' or 'Yahweh,' first because the old word has been hallowed by centuries of use in English, and secondly because the new forms are only hypothetical constructions which many scholars (including the Old Testament editor of this Commentary) believe to be artificial and not the name by which the God of the Hebrews was actually invoked.

(2) As we have written with the 'ordinary reader,' or elementary student always in view, we have not assumed that he will have access to complete libraries. But we have assumed that he will possess the Revised Version, with full references and some maps. We recommend the S.P.C.K. Bible Atlas (price 1s.). Like all English Bible Atlases, it contains some site identifications which are inaccurate or doubtful; but the Commentary will generally correct errors of this kind. Those who desire more exact information should consult the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and especially Driver's *Samuel* and Burney's *Judges*, to which frequent reference is made in the commentaries.

(3) As knowledge of the original language of the Bible is not taken for granted in those who use this Commentary, where Hebrew or Greek words must be cited, they are transliterated.

(4) To save space, certain well-known works of reference are referred to by initials. A list of such abbreviations follows this Preface.

(5) The paging of the book is in three parts—Old Testament—Apocrypha—New Testament. This is to make it easier at some future date to publish the parts separately, but there is no present intention of doing so. The references therefore are given thus: OT, 533*a*, Apoc., 17*b*, NT, 27*a*—the *a* and *b* indicating the left-hand and right-hand columns of each page.

The order of books in this Commentary follows that of the English Bible, with two exceptions: St. Mark's Gospel is given precedence over the others, and the Epistle to Philemon is attached to Colossians. The reasons for these two exceptions will be sufficiently obvious.

Probably none of the editors, when they embarked on this work, had any idea how much labour and difficulty it would involve, and now that they are sending the Commentary out on its career, they can only do so with the modest hope that it will be found—not perfect, but useful.

They are bound to express their gratitude to all their contributors, especially to those who sent in their contributions speedily and have had to wait a long time before seeing them published, and to those who cut down their contributions, or submitted to such cutting down, to the required limit—a matter in which we must confess that strict impartiality has not been observed. With so large a team of contributors, absolute uniformity in technical details of scholarly method is neither possible nor, in view of the variety of subject matter, always desirable; but the editors have done as much as was feasible in this respect. We also owe a great debt to the Rev. Dr. C. Harris, to whose vision and initiative the inception of the Commentary, and the overcoming of various difficulties that arose during its preparation, were largely due; and to the Rev. Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke, the secretary of the S.P.C.K., for the labour he has bestowed upon the book, and to the printers for the skill with which they have dealt with the material submitted to them. Not least do they desire to express their gratitude for the work of Arthur James Mason and Andrew Ewbank Burn, who passed away while the volume was still in preparation.

May the good Lord prosper our undertaking!

C. G.
H. L. G.
A. G.

July, 1928.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

EDITORS

GENERAL EDITOR

GORE, CHARLES, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford.

NEW TESTAMENT

GOUDGE, HENRY LEIGHTON, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCRYPHA

GUILLAUME, ALFRED, M.A., Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Languages in the University of Durham.

CONTRIBUTORS

BARNES, WILLIAM EMERY, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.
Ezekiel.

BARTLETT, DAVID DANIEL, M.A., Lecturer at St. David's College, Lampeter.
Numbers.

BATTERSBY HARFORD, JOHN, B.D., formerly Principal of Ripon College.
Deuteronomy.

BENECKÉ, P. V. M., M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
The Political Background of the New Testament.

BEVAN, EDWYN, F.B.A., D.LITT., Lecturer on Hellenistic History and Literature at King's College, London.
Environment of Israel from Maccabees to our Lord.

BICKNELL, EDWARD JOHN, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in King's College, University of London.
The Function of Literary and Historical Criticism. Introduction to the Wisdom Literature.
The Acts of the Apostles.

BINNS, LEONARD ELLIOTT, D.D.
Isaiah 1–39. Hosea. Micah. Daniel. Text and Versions (Old Testament).

BROWN, SYDNEY LAURENCE, D.D.
Exodus. Joel.

BURKITT, FRANCIS CRAWFORD, D.D., F.B.A., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.
The Prophets of Israel.

BURN, ANDREW EWBANK, D.D., Dean of Salisbury, 1920–27.
Pastoral Epistles (with H. L. Goudge).

CLARKE, WILLIAM KEMP LOWTHER, D.D., formerly Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.
The Gentile Background of Early Christianity. The Chronology of the New Testament.

COLEMAN, NOEL DOLBEN, M.A., Lecturer in Hellenistic Greek in the University of Durham.
Judith. Additions to Daniel.

COOKE, GEORGE ALBERT, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. Jonah.

CRAFER, THOMAS WILFRID, D.D., Professor of Theology at Queen's College, London.
Colossians and Philemon. The Apocalypse.

DIMONT, CHARLES TUNNACLIFF, D.D., Principal of Salisbury Theological College. James.

DU BUISSON, JAMES JOHN CLEMENT, M.A., Dean of St. Asaph, formerly Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden.
Philippians.

ERITH, LIONEL EDWARD PATRICK, M.A., Warden of St. Peter's College, Kingston, Jamaica.
Introduction to the Criticism of the Pentateuch. Genesis. The History of Israel. Joshua. Judges.

GAVIN, FRANK, PH.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the General Theological Seminary, New York.
Sacraments in the New Testament.

GAYFORD, SYDNEY CHARLES, M.A., formerly Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon College.
Leviticus. Hebrews.

GORE, CHARLES, D.D.
The Bible in the Church. St. Luke. The Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Virgin Birth of our Lord.

GOUDGE, HENRY LEIGHTON, D.D.
St. Matthew (with P. P. Levertoff). The Theology of St. Paul. The Pastoral Epistles (with A. E. Burn).

GRAHAM, ERIC, M.A., formerly Dean of Oriel College, Oxford.
Ephesians.

GUILLAUME, ALFRED, M.A.
I. and II. Kings. I. and II. Chronicles. Job. Isaiah 40–66. Obadiah.

HARRIS, CHARLES, D.D., formerly Theological Lecturer at St. David's College, Lampeter.
Appended Note on the Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament. The Wisdom of Solomon. Additional Note on the Fourth Gospel. The New Testament and the Catholic Creeds.

HODGSON, LEONARD, M.A., Professor of Apologetics in the General Theological Seminary, New York.
The Knowledge of Christ Incarnate.

HOSKYNS, SIR EDWYN CLEMENT, M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
The Johannine Epistles.

HOW, JOHN CHARLES HALLAND, M.A., formerly Hebrew Lecturer at Trinity College, Cambridge.
Ezra-Nehemiah. Esther. Haggai. Zechariah. Malachi. I. and II. Esdras. Additions to Esther.

HUNKIN, JOSEPH WELLINGTON, B.D., formerly Dean of Caius College, Cambridge.
I. and II. Maccabees.

JAMES, EDWIN OLIVER, PH.D.
A Comparative Study of the Old Testament.

JONES, MAURICE, D.D., Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter.
I. and II. Thessalonians.

JOYCE, GILBERT CUNNINGHAM, D.D., formerly Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter.
New Testament Prophecy and Apocalyptic.

KNOX, WILFRED LAWRENCE, M.A.
Galatians.

LEARÖYD, W. H. A., B.A., Lecturer in Hebrew, St. John's College, Durham.
Ruth.

LEVERTOFF, PAUL PHILIP, M.LITT., formerly Professor of Old Testament and Rabbinics at the Delitzsch College, Leipzig.
St. Matthew (with H. L. Goudge).

LITTLE, THOMAS WRIGHT, M.A.
II. Peter. Jude.

LOCK, WALTER, D.D., formerly Lady Margaret Professor in the University of Oxford.
St. John.

MARGOLIOUTH, DAVID SAMUEL, D.LITT., F.B.A., Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford.
Canticles.

MARSH, FRED SHIPLEY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, Cambridge.
Sacrifice and Priesthood in the Old Testament.

MASON, ARTHUR JAMES, D.D., formerly Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.
I. Peter.

MCNEILL, ALAN HUGH, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. Psalms.

MORRIS, ALFRED EDWIN, M.A., Professor of Hebrew at St. David's College, Lampeter.
Proverbs.

MOZLEY, JOHN KENNETH, D.D., formerly Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and Principal of Leeds Clergy School.
I. and II. Corinthians.

NARBOROUGH, FREDERICK DUDLEY VAUGHAN, M.A., formerly Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford.
The Synoptic Problem.

OESTERLEY, WILLIAM OSCAR EMIL, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, King's College, University of London.
II. (IV.) Esdras. Ecclesiasticus. The Religious Background of the New Testament in Jewish Thought.

PHYTHIAN-ADAMS, WILLIAM JOHN, D.S.O., M.C., M.A.
The Geography of the Holy Land.

PICKERING, BERNARD MILNER, M.A.
Jeremiah.

RATCLIFF, EDWARD CRADDOCK, M.A., Vice-Principal of Westcott House, Cambridge.
Amos.

ROPER, ROBERT KILLBY, B.A., St. John's College, Durham.
Lamentations.

SEDGWICK, SIDNEY NEWMAN, M.A.
Ecclesiastes.

SELWYN, EDWARD GORDON, D.D., formerly Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Warden of Radley College.
The Evidence of the Resurrection.

SIMPSON, WILLIAM JOHN SPARROW, D.D.
The Constitution of the Church in the New Testament.

STENNING, JOHN FREDERICK, C.B., C.B.E., M.A., Warden of Wadham College, Oxford; University Lecturer in Aramaic.
I. and II. Samuel.

STONE, DARWELL, D.D., Principal of Pusey House, Oxford.
The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament.

THACKERAY, H. ST. JOHN, D.D.
Tobit. Baruch. The Epistle of Jeremy.

TURNER, CUTHBERT HAMILTON, F.B.A., D.LITT., LL.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford.
St. Mark. Textual Criticism of the New Testament.

USHER, PHILIP CHARLES ALEXANDER, M.A.
Sacred Sites of the Gospels.

WADE, GEORGE WOOSUNG, D.D., Senior Tutor of St. David's College, Lampeter.
Introduction to the Historical Books of the Old Testament. Nahum. Habakkuk. Zephaniah.

WILLIAMS, NORMAN POWELL, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.
Romans.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Old Testament : Gen, Ex, Lev, Nu, Dt, Jos, Jg, Ru, 1 S, 2 S, 1 K, 2 K, 1 Ch, 2 Ch, Ezr, Neh, Est, Ps, Pr, Ec, Ca, Is, Jer, Lam, Ezek, Dan, Hos, Jl, Am, Ob, Jon, Mic, Nah, Hab, Zeph, Hag, Zech, Mal.

Apocrypha : 1 Esd, 2 Esd, Tob, Ad Est, Wisd, Ecclus, Bar, Sus, Bel, Man, 1 Mac, 2 Mac.

New Testament : Mt, Mk, Lk, Jn, Ac, Rom, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Gal, Eph, Phil, Col, 1 Th, 2 Th, 1 Tim, 2 Tim, Tit, Phm, Jas, 1 P, 2 P, 1 Jn, 2 Jn, 3 Jn, Rev.

a, *b*, etc.	the first, second, etc., part of the verse; also for the right and left columns on the page: see Preface.
‖ (‖s)	parallel(s).
†	signifies that all the passages containing a given word are cited.
ad loc.	on the passage.
Alt. Test. Stud.	*Alttestamentliche Studien.*
A.T.R.	*American Theological Revi w.*
AV	Authorized Version.
C.A.H.	*Cambridge Ancient History.*
C.B.	*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.*
Cent. B.	*Century Bible.*
cf.	compare.
C.G.T.	*Cambridge Greek Testament.*
Charles	R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.*
Cooke, *N.S.I.*	G. A. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions.*
ctr.	contrast.
D.A.C.	*Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.*
Deissmann, *B.S.*	A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies.*
Dr.	S. R. Driver.
E.B. or *E. Bi.*	*Encyclopædia Biblica.*
E.G.T.	*Expositor's Greek Testament.*
En	Book of Enoch.
E.R.E.	*Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.*
E.T.	*Expository Times.*
Eus., *H.E.*	Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiæ* (*History of the Church*).
EV(V)	English Version(s).
Ex. B., or *Exp. B.*	*Expositor's Bible.*
Gen R., etc.	Genesis (etc.), Rabba.
Harnack, *Mission*	A. von Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity.*
H.D.B.	Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*
Herod.	Herodotus.
H.K.	*Handkommentar.*
ib. (*ibid.*)	in the same place.
I.C.C.	*International Critical Commentary.*
J.B.L.	*Journal of Biblical Literature.*
J.E.	*Jewish Encyclopædia.*
Jos., *Ant.*	Josephus, *Antiquities.*
Jos., *B.J.* or *Wars*	Josephus, *Jewish Wars.*
J.Q.R.	*Jewish Quarterly Review.*
J.R.A.S.	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*
J.T.S.	*Journal of Theological Studies.*

K.E.H.	*Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch.*
K.H.C.	*Kurzer Handcommentar.*
l.c.	passage quoted.
L.O.T.	S. R. Driver, *Literature of the Old Testament.*
L.S.	Liddell and Scott's *Greek Lexicon.*
Luc.	Lucian's Recension of the Septuagint.
LXX	The Septuagint.
Midr.	Midrash.
M.M., *Vocab.* (or *Vocab.* alone)	Milligan and Moulton, *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament.*
MT	Massoretic Text (of the Hebrew Bible).
n.	note.
OL...	Old Latin Version.
op. cit. (*o.c.*)	work quoted.
PBV.	Prayer Book Version (of the Psalms).
Peake('s *Co.*)	A. S. Peake, *Commentary on the Bible.*
P.E.F.Q.S.	*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement.*
P.L.	Migne's *Patrologia Latina.*
P.S.B.A.	*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology.*
R.B.	*Revue Biblique.*
Rel. Sem. (*R.S.*)	W. R. Smith, *Religion and Worship of the Semites.*
Robinson, *B.R.*	Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, second edition, 1856.
RV(m), or RM	Revised Version (margin).
S.D.B.	*Standard Bible Dictionary.*
Sinai and Palestine	A. P. Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, 1864.
Smith, G. A., *H.G.*	G. Adam Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land.*
Smith, W. R., *O.T.J.C.* ...	W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.*
sp.	specially.
s.v.	*sub voce* (in references to Dictionaries); under the word.
T.A.	Tell-el-Amarna Tablets.
Theology	*Theology*: a Monthly Journal of Historical Christianity.
u.s.	*ut supra*, as above.
v.	*vide*, see.
v.i.	*vide infra*, see below.
v.l.	*varia lectio*, different reading; sometimes *vera lectio*, true reading.
v.n.	see note.
West. C. or *W.C.*	*Westminster Commentary.*
W.H.	Westcott and Hort, *Greek New Testament.*

Other abbreviations, such as J, E, P, Q, etc., are explained when they first occur.

The Commentary is on the Revised Version. Corrections of the Revised Version, when they are more than tentative suggestions, are printed in italics.

Clarendon type is used for the words commented on, and for summaries of sections.

References to pages of the Commentary not further defined are to the same part (i.e. OT, Apoc., or NT) as that in which they occur.

PART I
THE OLD TESTAMENT

CONTENTS

Subject.	*Author.*	*Page.*
The Bible in the Church	C. Gore	1
The Function of Literary and Historical Criticism ...	E. J. Bicknell	18
Introduction to the Criticism of the Pentateuch ...	L. E. P. Erith	22
Genesis	L. E. P. Erith	36
Exodus	S. L. Brown	64
Leviticus	S. C. Gayford	99
Numbers	D. D. Bartlett	121
Deuteronomy	J. Battersby Harford ...	146
Introduction to the Historical Books	G. W. Wade	169
The History of Israel	L. E. P. Erith	174
Advice to the Ordinary Reader of the Historical Books	The Editors	187
Joshua	L. E. P. Erith	189
Judges	L. E. P. Erith	198
Ruth	W. H. A. Learoyd ...	213
I. and II. Samuel	J. F. Stenning	215
I. and II. Kings	A. Guillaume	248
I. and II. Chronicles	A. Guillaume	274
Ezra—Nehemiah	J. C. H. How	281
Esther	J. C. H. How	303
Introduction to the Wisdom Literature	E. J. Bicknell	307
Job	A. Guillaume	311
The Psalms	A. H. McNeile	341
The Proverbs	A. E. Morris	376
Ecclesiastes, or The Preacher	S. N. Sedgwick ...	400
The Song of Solomon (Canticles)	D. S. Margoliouth ...	411
The Prophets of Israel	F. C. Burkitt	419
Isaiah (I.-XXXIX.)	L. E. Binns	432
Isaiah (XL.-LXVI.)	A. Guillaume	457
Jeremiah	B. M. Pickering ...	486
The Lamentations of Jeremiah	R. K. Roper	514
Ezekiel	W. Emery Barnes ...	520
Daniel	L. E. Binns	544
Hosea	L. E. Binns	556
Joel	S. L. Brown	564
Amos	E. C. Ratcliff	569
Obadiah	A. Guillaume	579
Jonah	G. A. Cooke	580
Micah	L. E. Binns	583
Nahum	G. W. Wade	589
Habakkuk	G. W. Wade	593
Zephaniah	G. W. Wade	598
Haggai	J. C. H. How	602
Zechariah	J. C. H. How	607
Malachi	J. C. H. How	626
The Geography of the Holy Land	W. J. Phythian Adams ...	634
Text and Versions	L. E. Binns	647
Sacrifice and Priesthood in the Old Testament ...	F. S. Marsh	652
A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Light of Recent Anthropological and Archæological Research	E. O. James	659
The Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament ...	Darwell Stone	688
Appended Note	C. Harris	696

A NEW COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE INCLUDING THE APOCRYPHA

THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH

By Charles Gore

In seeking to arrive at conclusions as to the place of the Bible in the Church, and as to the relation of the authority of the Church to the Canon of Scripture, the best course we can pursue is to begin historically—that is, with the Old Testament, and with the enquiry how the canon of Holy Scripture came into being and into recognition among the Jews.

(1) 'The Old Testament in the Jewish Church.'—(The phrase is the title of the famous volume of Lectures by W. Robertson Smith, 1881.) Israel appears in the period before the Captivity as the people of the Covenant, and not yet as the people of the Book. The Covenant was dated in one sense from Abraham, but in a fuller sense from Moses. Israel was by that divinely inspired leader welded into a nation which was also a church, in covenant with their Redeemer-God Jehovah, whom subsequently they were taught by the prophets to regard not only as *their* God to the exclusion of all others, but as the only God worthy of the name—the creator and ruler of all that is. (The question whether Moses at Sinai had all 'the twelve tribes' with him, or whether some were already in Canaan, need not be discussed here. At any rate the consolidation was completed later.) And of the will of their God they were to be informed by His own word spoken through prophets or priests, of whom the first and greatest was Moses himself. He first appears as giving to Israel directions, instructions and decisions in particular cases of dispute ('Toroth,' see Ex 18 [13-27]), such as could become the basis of a general 'law' (Torah) governing the whole life of the holy people, and believed to be divine—'the law of Jehovah' or 'the law of Moses.'

The practice of writing in one form or another was very much more ancient than the epoch of Moses, and Moses may well have committed to writing some collection of instructions coming from Jehovah. But the documents and the subsequent history, when carefully studied, make it evident to almost all our students that nothing like the collection of laws presented to us in the Pentateuch as a whole can have come from Moses. What is presented to us in the Pentateuch is a collection of codes coming from different sources and dating from different periods down to or beyond the Captivity.

Under the monarchy, the chief instruments for the delivery of the law were priests and prophets. Doubtless at all the chief shrines of worship, and especially at Jerusalem, a *cultus* or law of approach to God became formulated under the authority of the local priests, and the directions of the priests were moral as well as ceremonial. (Dt 17 [8-12], 33 [10]; Mal 2 [7]. For complaints that they had misdirected the people, see Hos 4 [6-9]; Mal 2 [8-9]; Zeph 3 [4]; Ezek 22 [26].) But it is chiefly of the prophets that we are led to think as the organs of the 'word of the Lord.' However, we must observe that the 'true prophets,' before the Return—those, that is, whom alone later ages regarded as deserving the name—were exceptional persons. They themselves always speak of 'the prophets' in general, as of the priests, as corrupt misleaders of the people. 'The prophets prophesy falsely and the priests bear rule by their means, and the people love to have it so' (Jer 5 [31]; cf. Mic 3 [5-11]; Is 28 [7], 29 [10]; Jer 23 [16-40], etc.). These true prophets were both carriers of the moral tradition which came from Moses as its source, or more truly from God through Moses, and were also organs of God's continuous disclosure of His will. As to the 'word of Jehovah' delivered by the prophets we should notice (1) that it concerned solely the moral, social and political life of the people, and left the ritual cultus, which they generally spoke of with disparagement, aside. This is certainly true in general of all the 'prophets' down to Jeremiah; (2) that

no finality had been arrived at in the delivery of 'the word of the Lord.' When Hosea (1 4) denounced the blood-thirsty massacres of Jehu, he was announcing something as a divine word which would have been strange to the author of the narrative in the Book of Kings. When Ezekiel again asserts the individuality of moral responsibility, he is asserting a principle hitherto hardly recognized. The 'word of the Lord' is a living voice—a message still being spoken—which had been in part already codified and recorded in writing, but which did not get its authority from a book.

But a great change occurred which was completed during the Captivity. For the Jews who returned to Jerusalem the threatened breach between prophet and priest, or (more truly) between the law and the cultus, had been quite healed. The instruments of this reconciliation are to be found specially in the Book of Deuteronomy, and in Ezekiel. In Deuteronomy the cultus appears as a part of the general social law of the 'chosen people,' and the whole is permeated with the prophetic spirit. It is ethical through and through. Again in Ezekiel's forecast of the redeemed Israel the cultus assumes a central place in the whole social life, while the whole is animated by the spirit of the prophets. The same synthesis appears in the later portions of Isaiah. The redeemed Israel thus represented the victory of the true prophets. As we read the Old Testament generally we perceive how their spirit had penetrated the whole literature of Israel. On the other hand, the victory was followed by an eclipse. The succession of prophets ceased. Prophecy was discredited (Zech 13 1-6). Henceforth there were no prophets more (1 Mac 4 46, 9 27; Ps 74 9). And the future lay, eventually, not so much with the priests as with the scribes or lawyers. Israel under Ezra (Neh 8 13-9 3, 432 or 397 B.C.) became 'the people of the book,' the book being 'the Law of Moses'—probably the complete Pentateuch, in which previous attempts at codification were revised and summarized. This was the 'book of the Law,' every copy of which Antiochus sought to destroy (1 Mac 1 56-57). This was the first definite step in the formation of the Canon of the Old Testament. By this time there is substituted for inspired prophets an inspired book. But the nature of the inspiration is not altered. What justifies a belief in the inspiration of the compilers of the Pentateuch, and later of the other books of the Old Testament in various degrees, is that the same spirit which inspired the prophets now permeates the whole literature. But inasmuch as the existence of a written law brought with it as a matter of course a constant need of interpretation, in view of constantly arising questions as to its meaning, so we find rising into religious power, in the place of the prophets, and finally more influential than the priests, the *Sopherim*—scribes or lawyers—the authorized interpreters and guardians of the written law (1 Ch 2 55). Meanwhile the former prophets were not forgotten. Their writings were collected and edited, so that next to the Law ranked the Prophets—the iii major (the Book of Daniel not reckoned with them, apparently because it did not yet exist as we know it), and the xii minor. This second stage in the formation of the Canon is presupposed in Ecclesiasticus (written originally about 190–180 B.C. by Ben Sira the scribe, see its *preface*), and Daniel is represented (Dan 9 2) as learning about the prophecy of Jeremiah 'in the books,' or as we should say 'the Bible,' the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings being included among the prophets. Sira's grandson (Ecclus, *preface*) already recognizes a third class of sacred writings ('the rest of the books'), the extent of which was not yet defined; but before Our Lord's time the Psalms, the Proverbs, the Book of Job, and the Lamentations, as well as the later histories, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and Ruth (if that was not reckoned with the Book of Judges), were all included in this third class; while the three books of Ecclesiastes, Esther and the Song of Songs remained more or less in dispute till the Councils of the Rabbis at Jamnia (A.D. 90 and 118), when probably they were finally included in the completed Canon, the Song of Songs apparently being so accepted because mystically interpreted of the love of Jehovah to Israel, His people. These disputed books, we notice, are not referred to anywhere in the New Testament.

The Bible in Greek, called the Septuagint (LXX) from a legend about its origin, consisted of translations of the Hebrew books made at Alexandria at different dates beginning from the middle of the 3rd century B.C. Originating thus before the Jewish canon was finally fixed, it had admitted a number of books—those we call the 'Apocrypha' or Deutero-canonical—some of them translations from the Hebrew or Aramaic, and some of them originally Greek, as well as additions to books finally recognized as

canonical without these additions (Esther and Daniel). Of the effect of this on the Christian Canon we shall have to take notice later. But though 'the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach' (Ecclesiasticus) and 1 Maccabees, both originally Hebrew books, were highly thought of, the acceptance into the Canon of any of the apocrypha received no countenance from the Jewish authorities—not even from Philo, though he wrote at Alexandria. The sacred scriptures—the books that 'defiled the hands'—where those only which were included in the three divisions of the Canon, of which the Law was the most sacred portion. Moreover, with the fixing of the Canon went the fixing of the text of the books. It is obvious that the Septuagint, especially in its versions of Samuel and Jeremiah, was made from texts sometimes widely different from those Hebrew MSS. which have survived. But the method of interpretation of the Scriptures followed by the rabbis and scribes had come to be strictly verbal and, as we should think, unintelligent. In particular, it was regarded as necessary to find in the Scriptures a sanction for every detail in their tradition. To do this it was necessary that every word and even letter of the sacred text should be fixed, and texts which differed from those regarded as the most authoritative were diligently destroyed. Thus not only was the Canon, fixed about the end of the 1st century of our era, a definitely closed Canon, but the text became a scrupulously fixed text, which allowed no variations (see W. R. Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, 72-3).

This brief sketch of the origin of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture makes it evident that the Scriptures were the sacred books of a nation which became a church, and were not intended to stand by themselves. Even when Moses was supposed to have written the whole Pentateuch, the 'word of God' was not to be limited to the law then given or to the age of Moses. God was to speak through the whole succession of the prophets—'in many parts and in many manners.' And when prophecy failed after the Return and Israel had become 'the people of the book,' still the scribes claimed the authority to interpret it—'to bind' and 'to loose,' and claimed for their tradition an authority even equal to the text (W. R. Smith, 58, 60). The book was the book of the nation-church, the people of God, and could not be received or interpreted except within the chosen people, and in submission to its authoritative interpreters. [For the above see Ryle's *Canon of the Old Testament* (Macmillan), Robertson Smith's *O.T.J.C.* (Black), Driver's article 'Law' in *H.D.B.*, and Sanday, *Inspiration* (Longmans), Lect. ii.] So matters stood when our Lord was educated in the Scriptures and began His mission.

(2) **The Mind of the Lord in Regard to the Old Testament.**—Plainly three things are to be acknowledged: (*a*) That our Lord did not regard the Old Testament as final, but claimed to advance upon it and to supersede it; (*b*) that He protested against the tradition of the scribes as distorting and concealing the real word of God; (*c*) that none the less He accepted the Old Testament in its three divisions, as conveying really the word of God to Israel, and would have His disciples regard it, even in its details, as something to be fulfilled and not abolished. For the establishment of (*a*) we refer to Mt 5 [21] ff. (where He plainly revises even the sixth, seventh, and third of the most sacred Ten Words), Mk 7 [18-19] (where He makes all meats clean), Mk 10 [2] ff. (where He supersedes the Mosaic law of divorce by reference to a prior principle), and Mt 11 [13]; Lk 16 [16] (where the plain implication is that the Law and the prophets had a preparatory function, now fulfilled); cf. also Mk 2 [22] and Lk 9 [54-56]. (The words 'ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of' may not belong to the original text, but they truly represent our Lord's meaning. He repudiates the appeal to the characteristic spirit of the Old Testament, where God is habitually invoked to take manifest, present, vengeance on the adversary.) See finally Lk 10 [23-24]; Mt 12 [6-8]. For (*b*) we should refer to Mk 7 [1-23]; Mt 9 [13], 12 [1-24], 23 [16-26], and Lk 11 [46-52], 12 [1]. In all these passages the authorities in the Jewish Church, who represent the tradition are accused of moral blindness, of spiritual tyranny, of obscuring instead of interpreting the word of God. What is claimed by our Lord may be expressed by saying that, demanding an interpretation of the details and minutiæ of the Law in the ethical spirit of the prophets and in view of its moral purpose, and finding the opposite in the tradition of the scribes, He claims to repudiate it. For (*c*) we should refer to a whole class of passages where our Lord recognizes that 'the scripture cannot be broken' (Mk 9 [11-13], 12 [26], 14 [49]; Lk 16 [17], 18 [31], 20 [17, 37], 22 [37], 24 [25, 44, 45]). The evangelists Matthew and John are more concerned than are Mark and Luke to point out detailed fulfilments of prophecy, but as regards the principle of

fulfilment the words of our Lord in Matthew are hardly stronger than those of Luke. In Matthew our Lord definitely recognizes the authority of the scribes in interpreting the Law and demands obedience to it (23 3), but this is deeply modified in 15 6-14, 16 12, 23 16 ff. He Himself, however, is represented as restoring within His Church' (the New Israel) the same authority which had proved so liable to abuse (16 19, 18 18).

Now, if we bear in mind that the differences between the records of the different evangelists make it impossible to suppose that in all cases we have got the *ipsissima verba* of the Lord, there is no great difficulty in reconciling (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*). We are certainly bound to admit both that our Lord's whole teaching was based upon the assumption that in the Jewish scriptures, as codified in His day and under the headings of the Law, the Prophets, and the 'Writings,' was to be found a real 'word of God' which could not fail of fulfilment. We notice that He plainly treats the Psalms and Daniel as authoritative Scripture. If we take the different elements of the Old Testament scriptures—the moral law, the doctrine of God, the proclamation of the great (Messianic) hope, the apocalyptic vision—plainly He assumes them to be of divine authority. The same finally is seen to be true of the ceremonial Law of sacrifice (see NT, 293). Plainly also, on the other hand, He regards this revelation as incomplete and claims to supersede it—not to destroy, but so to fulfil as to supersede it, these scriptures having henceforth their chief function in pointing forward to what had now actually arrived. It is to be noticed that all the passages in the New Testament outside the Gospels which define the function of 'The (Old Testament) Scriptures' convey this general sense, and this general sense only (see below, p. 8).

But the Jews of our Lord's day interpreted 'inspiration' as the equivalent of divine dictation, and thus attributed verbal authority and infallibility to the Scriptures, and interpreted them with a perverted literalism which to-day seems to us absurd (see Sanday, chap. ii), and the Church has often done the like, and pressed upon its members the infallibility of the book in all respects. Protestantism has appeared to be even more insistent in this sense than Catholicism and if it is not generally so to-day, yet 'fundamentalism' is still very strong and vocal both in America and in England. Its chief argument is that our Lord in His teaching enjoined upon us this strict claim. But this is surely not a fair representation. Our Lord recognized the Word of God in the Old Testament Scriptures, and He recognized in the Church of the Old Covenant an interpretative authority; but, on the other hand, of the actual conclusions of this Church authority, as presented to Him by the contemporary holders of it, He was deeply critical. He declared them to be perilously wrong. Whereas they put the Law above the prophets, He insisted on interpreting the Law in the spirit of the prophets. He repudiated their minute legalism. Above all, He openly claimed to fulfil and so to supersede both Law and prophets. The scribes plainly regarded His teaching with the strongest aversion. It cannot, of course, be suggested that Jesus showed any signs of anticipating the historical science or critical methods of the future. He talks the language of His time about the Old Testament incidents and the authorship of the books, as He talked about God making the sun to rise. To be intelligible He could not have talked any other language. With regard to all the accepted 'knowledge' of His time, we cannot but suppose that our Lord took it for granted, but He cannot be said to have *taught* it. He can reasonably be said to have *taught* nothing but those truths about God and about man, and about the Kingdom and the New Israel, which were to constitute His Gospel. We can perhaps express the truth by saying that only those things did He 'know' with that infallible 'knowledge' which He so solemnly claims (Mt 11 27). When we come to particulars, it seems to the present writer that our Lord's references to events in the Old Testament record, e.g. His references to the Flood and to Lot's wife, cannot be pressed as requiring of us a belief that these stories are historical descriptions of actual occurrences. For experience shows us that God does judge both nations and individuals by physical catastrophes following on moral delinquencies. And these ancient stories stand as the symbols of this fact, still available for us, just as we constantly draw warnings and encouragements from the incidents of *Pilgrim's Progress*. [Incidentally it is to be observed that there is grave reason to suppose (see NT, 159*b*) that Mt 12 40 is a somewhat misleading gloss and not a word of Christ.] There is only one instance in which our Lord appears to insist upon particular words as uttered by a particular person, and that is in His argument about

Ps 110 (Mk 12 35). There His argument seems to depend upon the authorship of the psalm by David himself. To us David's authorship seems utterly improbable. It is obviously a psalm written not *by* a King, but *about* a King. But when I look at the three passages which (with appreciable variations) describe the conversation, it really appears that our Lord is not *teaching* at all. He is not, as would appear on the surface, teaching that the Christ would *not* be David's son. He is simply reminding the scribes who used glibly to give this account of Christ, that they must (on their own principles) acknowledge Him to be something more. Similarly on another occasion, when He reminded the Jews that it could not be regarded as blasphemy for anyone bearing any sort of divine commission to call himself son of God, for the Psalm even called judges 'gods' (Jn 10 34), He cannot be supposed to be thereby giving positive teaching as to the sense in which He claimed to be the Son of God without contradicting the whole purpose of the 4th Gospel. It was part of our Lord's mission to teach men 'of themselves to judge what is right' (Lk 12 57), and this means that they should not be satisfied to use from moment to moment the most effective controversial argument, but should, before they consented to use it, think about its bearing upon their accepted principles as a whole. That is a warning men need to-day as much as ever. It is the legitimate kind of *argumentum ad hominem*.

On the whole, then, if we make a review of the implications of our Lord's teaching about, or reference to, the Old Testament, remembering especially in the case of the 4th Gospel that we cannot rely on having His actual words, we are led to some such conclusions as these: (1) That He laid great stress on the Old Testament scriptures as conveying the authoritative message of God to Israel, and as destined in all their great anticipations to find fulfilment. (2) That He would have us regard the Old Testament as in all respects imperfect and destined to be superseded; that its fulfilment was to be found in Himself, the Christ, and that henceforth its chief function would be that of pointing forward to Him. (3) That, while He showed no signs of anticipating any future science or criticism, He did show marked dissatisfaction with the scribal method of interpretation and presumably would be dissatisfied with the like methods wherever pursued. He interprets the books in the spirit of the prophets—that is, in the light of the spiritual purpose of God. (4) That while He Himself shows no disposition to leave His disciples tied by written documents, but preferred the living voice, and renewed for His apostles the same sort of authority which had been exercised by the scribes in interpreting the word of God, yet He plainly did not identify such authority with infallibility, but taught us where necessary to appeal against it to the reason and conscience of men.

(3) The Old Testament in the Christian Church.—The authority of the Old Testament as being 'the Scriptures,' containing the Word of God in the earlier stages of its delivery and pointing forward to Christ, was accepted by the Apostles from their Lord, and from the Apostles passed, unquestioned, into the Catholic Church. The mass of the Jews did not accept Jesus for Christ or the Christian interpretation of their Scriptures as true. For this reason a large part of the intellectual activity of the first Christians was devoted to showing the Jews to be wrong and the Christians to be right. But in view of the hostility of the Jews we may be astonished at the readiness with which the mainly Gentile Churches adopted the Jewish Scriptures as their own, and the Jewish nation as their own forefathers in religion. This no doubt was partly due to the fact that of the first Gentiles who accepted Jesus as Lord a large number had been already in some sort adherents of the synagogue (God-fearers); but in still larger part it was due to the authority of St. Paul, who, while he depreciated the Law as only a temporary discipline, would allow no one to doubt that the principles of the Old Covenant, both moral and theological, were the foundations of the New, and were the oracles of God Himself. Even the so-called Epistle of Barnabas—a very primitive document—though vehemently anti-Jewish and affirming that the ordinances of the Law had never been intended to be accepted or practised literally, but only spiritually or mystically, and that the Jews had been all along the subjects of a deception of Satan, still held to the Jewish Scriptures as containing the true religion under a veil. It was left to Marcion in the 2nd century boldly to seek to tear Christianity out of its Jewish soil and to reject the whole Old Testament, as well as a great part of the New, out of the Christian Bible. (For a fair account of Marcion see Kidd's *History of the Church*, 1, 213 ff.) Marcion had learned from Syrian Gnostics their fatal determination to disrupt this

closely knit universe by ascribing it to different powers or gods. He believed in a lower God who had created the physical world out of a formless matter, in itself evil, and to this lower God he ascribed the Mosaic Law and the Old Testament generally, and also a baser element in the New. This God was barely just, and He was to be finally manifested in the Jewish Messiah still to come. But he believed also in a supreme and wholly good God who had been manifested suddenly and only in Jesus, whose material birth he denied, lest He should be contaminated by contact with the lower creation. These doctrines sound to us somewhat absurd in detail, but Marcion anticipated the modern repugnance alike to the savagery of the Old Testament and to the element of severe justice which remains even in the New. Like so many moderns he wanted a God in whom he should find mercy without judgement, love without severity; and from this point of view, while he mutilated the Gospel of St. Luke and the ten Epistles of St. Paul which he retained, he wholly rejected the Old Testament. It is noticeable that he succeeded in founding a powerful and widespread schismatic church, and that it lived on for some centuries. It is noticeable also that he had no glimpse of the principle of gradualness or evolution in God's creative method, or in His educative purpose for men. One great distinction of the Greek Fathers is their insistence that what we find in the Old Testament is the record of a gradual education by which God disciplined and trained a barbarous tribe and led them up towards 'the high philosophy': that accordingly we are to see in the different stages of moral enlightenment presented to us in the Old Testament and in the New the inspiration not of different Gods, but of the One God who deals with men according to their capacity at each stage, and who tolerates for the time much that He intends hereafter to condemn and to remove: and that the very fact that we can now repudiate so much in the moral standards of the Old Testament is the evidence of the success which has attended the divine method. You must judge the worth of it by its final attainment. (See quotations from the Fathers in *Lux Mundi*, 240 ff.; also xxii f., a quotation from St. Chrysostom to the effect that the institutions of the Old Testament cultus, 'the sacrifices, the purifications, the observances, the new moons, the ark and the Temple itself had their origin from Gentile grossness,' and that God should be said to have tolerated rather than enjoined these things.) Such is the best *apologia* of the Fathers for the retention of the Old Testament. But heresies have been seldom condemned in the Church without the reaction against them running to extremes. And the vindication of the Old Testament which became common in the Church was, as we shall see, not as satisfactory in its principles or method as this would imply. However, all that we are concerned with at the moment is the fact that from its first origin Christianity knew itself to be rooted in the Hebrew religion, and in its Scriptures, and that no attempt to uproot it or to repudiate those Scriptures had a chance of success.

(4) **The Fixing of the Canon of the Old Testament in the Christian Church.**—The Church took over the Old Testament Canon from the Jews almost without criticism. As we have seen, there remained a doubt as to the reception of certain Hebrew books till the end of the 1st century, but the Church took them over with the rest, though some hesitation was shown about the Book of Esther (Sanday, *op. cit.*, 214). What, however, proved of more importance was the vast difference there was between the contents of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek Bible (the LXX). Hardly any Christians—even their learned men—knew Hebrew. Their Old Testament was thus the Greek Bible, and some of the books which the Hebrews had never thought of including in their Canon, especially Ecclesiasticus—so called apparently because of its familiar use in the Church as a manual of morality—were specially popular. Thus from the first there is a broad distinction between the Canon as recognized by the learned, which is the Jewish Canon—the 'ecclesiastical' or 'apocryphal' books being relegated to a lower level—and the Bible of the people, which in Greek and in the old Latin contained all the books without discrimination. [The books of Ezra and Nehemiah, we should notice, were not translated into Greek till the Jew Theodotion did it in the 2nd century. Previously their place was taken in the Greek Bible by 1 Esd, and perhaps it did not contain Ecclesiastes or Canticles. See Burkitt in *Legacy of Israel*, 84, 89.] The scholar Jerome, who had been instructed by a Jewish rabbi, and who was the author of the revised Latin version, made a vigorous effort to deepen and mark the distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books. Later scholars in the West maintained his

distinction. Even as late as the beginning of the 16th century, when the great Cardinal Ximines published his Complutensian Polyglot Bible, he retained Jerome's distinction, and spoke of the *Apocrypha* as books 'without the Canon, which the Church receives rather for the edification of the people than for the establishment of ecclesiastical doctrines.' But with the Church generally the influence of St. Augustine, who, on the whole, supported the larger popular Bible, prevailed; and while the Anglican Church in 1571 in the Articles of Religion (vi) followed the tradition of the scholars in drawing the distinction between canonical and apocryphal or ecclesiastical books, the Roman Church at Trent (1546) officially abolished it for the first time in its list of the Old Testament Scriptures, and made the acceptance of 'the entire books with all their parts as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church and in the Old Latin Vulgate edition (i.e. Jerome's Bible with the apocryphal books added) as sacred and canonical,' an article of faith obligatory under anathema. In the East the decisions of the Quinisext Council (A.D. 692) were confused or contradictory, nor has the question of the Canon ever been cleared up by a conciliar decision; but the recent *Greek Orthodox Catechism* published by authority in England (1926) maintains the smaller Canon, and mentions the other books as 'deutero-canonical' or 'good for reading.' (On the whole subject see Westcott's *The Bible in the Church*.)

It must be acknowledged, however, that though the Anglican Canon of the Old Testament is fully justified by tradition, yet the traditional language in which the distinction between canonical and 'apocryphal' books is expressed is not pleasing to the Christian of to-day, who reads his Old Testament in a modern spirit. He will ask in what sense you can rely on Ecclesiastes or Judges to 'establish any doctrine,' and not upon Ecclesiasticus or Wisdom; he will want to know whether, if you are seeking to gain an historical view of the providential dealing of God with Israel, the story of the Maccabees is not as important and as truly inspired as the record of Chronicles, 'Hierom's' words do in truth suggest the 'establishing' of the doctrine of the Trinity from certain texts in Genesis, and the doctrine of everlasting punishment from Ec 11 [3]. As a matter of fact no modern history of the beginnings of Christian doctrine could ignore the deep influence of the book of Wisdom and of other 'apocrypha'—the apocalyptic books of most of which our fathers knew nothing, but which are well represented in 2 Esdras. We do well to adhere to the distinction between the books which were contained in the Jewish Canon, which was taken over by the Christian Church bodily and without criticism, and the books which were not. But we should wish no longer to be responsible for the language in which Jerome formulated the meaning of the distinction. We ask to be allowed to recognize the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as an enlightenment or force which is at its maximum in the great prophets or in some of the psalms, or in the opening of Genesis, or elsewhere in the historical books, and is just discernible at its minimum in Esther (see 4 [14]), or in Ecclesiastes or in the Song of Songs (by a special interpretation), but is not limited to the books of the Hebrew Canon.

A word should be added on the history and meaning of the term 'apocryphal.' It is a translation of the Hebrew term for 'hidden.' The 'hidden books' might mean worn-out copies of the Law hidden respectfully in the cupboards of the synagogue, or it might express books containing hidden mysteries not, or not yet, to be revealed to the world (Dan 12 [4, 9]; 2 Esd 14 [44-47]). In any case it meant books not to be used for public reading in the assembly of the faithful. This is the fundamental meaning of 'apocrypha' as the word was used among the Jews, and was borrowed by the Christian Church. But the books which contained or professed to contain mysteries for the initiated were very commonly more or less heretical, like the hidden books of the Essenes (Josephus, *B.J.*, ii, 8, 7), and 'the apocrypha' gained in that way a bad sense which by no means applied to all the 'outside' or uncanonical books. This vague meaning of the word continued in the Christian Church, and the meaning became still less clearly defined owing to the popularity of such non-canonical scriptures as Wisdom or Ecclesiasticus or Maccabees, which, in fact, *were* read in the churches; the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach being even called 'the Church book' from its public use, especially in the instruction of catechumens. All that can truly be said is that 'the Apocrypha' in the narrower sense means 'the books not in the Hebrew Canon,' with the implication that, as a whole, they belong to a lower grade ('Deutero-canonical'), while 'apocryphal books' in its larger sense carries

with it a suspicion of heresy or theosophy (see 'Apocrypha' in *H.D.B.*).

The idea that the books of the Hebrew Canon were fixed at twenty-two, including Ruth with Judges and Lamentations with Jeremiah, to correspond with the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, is found in Origen and Athanasius, but it is said not to appear in Jewish tradition (Ryle, *Canon*, 227), which reckoned twenty-four.

It is worth noticing that Tertullian, *de Cultu*, 13, wished to see the Book of Enoch, which, following St. Jude, he believes to be a genuine work of the patriarch, admitted into the Canon of the Old Testament, but the proposal never appears to have been considered.

(5) In what Sense the Inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures was accepted in the Church.—When the Christian Church started on its career it had no 'holy scriptures' except the Old Testament, and as the Christian writings were gradually canonized, that meant their being admitted into a status already more or less defined. We do well, therefore, to see in what sense the early Church admitted the inspiration of these older scriptures, for that practically determined its sense for the New Testament also. The modern student then finds with satisfaction that all the passages in the New Testament which speak of the scriptures generally, and in a measure define their function and their inspiration, are such as a modern, open-minded scholar, who is also a believer in Jesus Christ as 'the Word of God made flesh,' can accept without scruple. I am referring to the following: Rom 1 [2]; Heb 1 [1]; Ac 10 [43]; 1 P 1 [10] ff.; 2 P 1 [20-21]; Heb 9 [8]; Rom 15 [4]; 1 Cor 10 [11]; 2 Tim 3 [15-17]. In these passages he will welcome (1) the emphasis upon the prophets as the principal instruments of the divine self-revelation, through whom chiefly it was that Israel became 'the sacred school of the knowledge of God and of the spiritual life for all mankind' (Athanasius). It is the chief spiritual advantage that we gain from the modern critical estimate of the Old Testament that it has restored to the prophets their proper primacy. But he will recognize that the spirit of the prophets was finally so far victorious in Israel that it remodelled the whole intellectual heritage of the people, purging and inspiring with deep truth their folklore, their legends, their historical tradition or written records, their 'wisdom,' their poetry, and especially their cultus—making this last a real treasure house of spiritual meaning. (2) He will welcome the recognition in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the self-disclosure of God to Israel was given 'in many parts and in many manners,' and that even in the details of the ceremonial law a permanent meaning can be found. The prophetic writings—including in greater or lesser measure all the books—have something more in them than the 'private interpretation' of the individual (author or reader) can give them. There is a movement and mind of the Spirit of God through their whole fabric. (3) Again he will rejoice to recognize the abundant wealth of moral example, encouragement and warning which the Old Testament contains, and that the 'word of God' which it conveys to us was intended much more for moral than for intellectual enlightenment. But at the same time (4) it is of the essence of the Old Testament in all its departments to be imperfect, as St. Augustine says: 'We wrong the New Testament, if we put the Old on the same level with it.' Alike in its teaching and its law of worship it represents an incomplete and, therefore, defective moral and spiritual enlightenment. Moreover, it knows itself to be imperfect. It eagerly, and with full assurance, expects a Kingdom of God not yet apparent, in which all nations are to participate, a divinely anointed King not yet come, an abundant effusion of the Spirit not yet given, a new Covenant into which God has not yet entered with His people, and a final Day of the Lord. In the person of the latest prophet of the Old Covenant, John the Baptist, it confesses its unworthiness and its incompetence in the presence of Him who was to come. (5) Finally, in all its elements the forecast of the Old Testament found its fulfilment in Jesus the Christ. In Him the promised Kingdom had actually come. In Him was really found the King, the Son of God, the fulfiller of All Righteousness, the great Redeemer, the all-sufficient sacrifice, the vessel and fountain of the Holy Spirit, the restorer of the true Israel and the light of the Gentiles, and in His person at the end of the world God is to come into His own, as judge and restorer, in His whole universe. All this wide-sweeping interpretation of the Scriptures of the Old Covenant in the New is valid for us as for the first Christians, and we need not fear that anything worthy of the name of criticism will invalidate it in any part. But when we pass from this general interpretation to the interpretation of particular proof

texts, we find something different. We occasionally find in St. Paul's earlier epistles collocations of texts quite dissociated from their original contexts and combined to prove some position, which in our judgement is indeed wholly 'provable,' but not by these texts. Thus (to quote some examples) the gloomy pictures of the hostile world drawn by psalmists and by the prophet Isaiah, which St. Paul combines in Rom 3 [10-18], do not really prove his thesis that *all* Jews and Gentiles are under sin. How about the righteous remnant? Again, how can the sayings of the prophet Hosea to Israel (Rom 9 [25-26]) prove the vocation of the Gentiles? How can the passage from the Law (Rom 10 [5-8]) be quoted against the Law? How can the author of Heb 1 [10] quote the Psalm concerning God as referring to the Son without assuming what he is proving? Can we justify St. Matthew's proof texts in his narrative of the nativity? These instances might be multiplied.

It has to be noticed, however, that the instances quoted from St. Paul and those still to be quoted occur in the epistles in which he is occupied with controversy against the Judaizers. They do not occur either in the epistles to the Thessalonians or in the epistles of the Captivity; and St. Matthew and Hebrews are in their first application specially addressed to Jews. In such a connexion Jewish methods, which formed the basis of the writers' own minds, naturally prevailed. For this way of using the Scriptures was the method of the contemporary scribes or rabbis of the Jewish schools. They treated each text as a divine oracle which could be separated from its context and manipulated in combination with other like fragments to prove some point at issue. St. Paul and St. Matthew learned the method from their Jewish teachers in Palestine, and the author of the Hebrews in Alexandria, though they used it with more moderation than their teachers. It was the method of their race and time. But we have learned to see that it is valueless to prove anything, and it would be inexcusable in us to use it. Again, it is assumed by St. Peter and St. Paul, as reported in Ac 2 [25] ff., 13 [33] ff., that the author of Ps 16 is King David, and that inasmuch as the psalmist expresses the assurance that God will not leave his soul in death nor suffer His holy servant to see corruption, whereas David did in fact die and see corruption, so he must be speaking of someone not himself—foreseeing in fact the resurrection of the Messiah who is Jesus. But this is not an argument which, using the best light we have as to the original meaning of the psalm, we can assent to. This and other psalms do convey an intimation of immortal life with God. But the precise form of argument which St. Luke records, as used by the two apostles independently, would not for us be justified. What, again, are we to say about St. Paul's occasional use of allegorical interpretations? The method of allegorical interpretation was common to Jews and to pagan men of letters. Philo at Alexandria used it without restraint in interpreting the Old Testament. And it was current also in the schools of Palestine. And there is a sense in which it is permanently valid which perhaps requires a fuller examination than it has received of recent years. Thus when the Epistle to the Hebrews (9 [8]) asserts that in the elaborated sacrificial law of Israel we can discern a purpose of the Holy Spirit which looked beyond those temporary and local enactments, we can agree. Anyone who has studied the details of the Temple ritual may well feel convinced of it. But when St. Paul (Gal 3 [16]), argues from the singular word 'seed' that the reference is to the single person of Christ, or (Gal 4 [21] ff.) that the instruction to Abraham to eject Hagar ought to convince the Judaizers that they are to cast out the Law given on Sinai, we feel that the argument is far from valid. Thus we are bound as rational men to recognize that the inspiration of the Apostles did not lift them out of the intellectual conditions and methods of their time or their training, but that they identified themselves with these methods in a manner and with a directness which cannot justly be attributed to our Lord. We must draw the same conclusion, even more strongly, about the method of the Fathers in arguing from the Old Testament. If we read Irenæus' 'proof texts' of the verity of the Christian faith drawn from the Old Testament (J. A. Robinson, *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching*), we see at once the invalidity, as proof texts, of many of them. For us the conviction that in Jesus we see the fulfilment of a divine purpose, which in the Old Testament is both apparent and unfulfilled, may well be as assured as it was for Irenæus. What differs is the method of argument and the kind of proof which carries conviction. Especially under the dominant influence of Origen the method of spiritual or allegorical interpretation of Old Testament incidents and laws ran to extra-

vagant lengths, and there are famous books by ancient spiritual masters, such as St. Gregory the Great's *Morals on the Book of Job*, or St. Bernard's *Homilies on the Canticles*, which remain for us as most valuable guides in the spiritual life, but which appear to us to have very little real connexion with the texts upon which they profess to be commenting. Thus we heave a sigh of relief when we discover that the great St. Thomas lays it quite decisively down, basing himself on St. Augustine, that no argument on behalf of the faith is to be based on any allegorical interpretation of Scripture. And he adds that we lose nothing scriptural thereby 'because nothing necessary to faith is contained under the spiritual (allegorical) sense of Scripture, which Scripture does not somewhere deliver manifestly through the literal sense' (*Summa Theol.*, p. 1, q. 1, art. 10, ad 1[um]; cf. Addis and Arnold's *Cath. Dic.* and *Cath. Encycl.*, v, p. 696, art, 'Exegesis'). Thus we are not to prove the perpetual virginity of Mary from Ezek 44 [2] or the obligation of the eucharistic sacrifice from 1 S 20 [29]. (For a somewhat different view of the Mystical Sense see below, p. 688 ff. And on the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament and the Fathers, McNeile, *Old Testament in the Christian Church.*)

The science of the exegesis of ancient texts is progressive like every other science, and we are bound to be faithful to the best lights of our own day. And we are free to be so faithful. The Church, we observe, has never attempted to impose any definition of the meaning of inspiration upon its members, except the general proposition of the Creed that the Holy Spirit spake by the prophets. The great scholar Origen declared that it was part of 'the ecclesiastical tradition' that Scripture has a double sense, the plain and the hidden, and he claimed that there is much in the books of the Old Testament which cannot be true literally or historically, and much which in its literal sense is not for edification, which must be interpreted only according to its 'spiritual,' i.e. allegorical, meaning. But the widespreading influence of Origen, and of those who looked up to him as a master, never provoked the Church to any authoritative repudiation of his doctrine. Again in opposing the fanatical claim of the Montanists the Church authorities commonly rejected the idea, derived from Philo, that the inspiration of the Spirit was so commanding as altogether to supersede the natural intellect of the prophet through whom He spoke. But no attempt was made to define the extent of the human element in the inspired utterance. As was indicated above (p. 6*a*), there is a good deal in the Fathers which favours a liberal interpretation of the meaning of inspiration and does not make it identical with verbal or historical infallibility. Even in the Gospels St. Chrysostom recognizes discrepancies. It is enough, he says, that they show the independence of the witnesses, and touch only minor matters, and not the chief points of the faith in Christ (*in Matt.*, i 2). Many of the Fathers were in love with the principle of development in the spiritual education of mankind. They knew that man was not created perfect, but only in a fit state to advance towards perfection. They did not interpret as history the early stories of Genesis, but regarded them (with Gregory of Nyssa) as 'ideas' or 'doctrines in the form of a story' (see ref. in *Lux Mundi*, xx ff. and 262 f.). And though as the philosophical atmosphere of the Græco-Roman Empire passed away cruder ideas prevailed, the Church never laid its formal ban upon these earlier ideas. In the Roman Church it was still open to Newman to contend that the sphere of divine inspiration was not to be found in the region of science or historical fact, but only of 'faith and morals.' It was not till 1893 that the Pope's Encyclical on the study of Holy Scripture strove to bind the Roman Church to the strictest view of inspiration as involving the infallible dictation of the Holy Spirit in respect of all its affirmations on every subject-matter. But whether or no this Encyclical is, for Roman Catholics, irreformable, it is not of authority for others. Mercifully we have been preserved from any definition of inspiration. It is true that in the Church of England deacons have been required solemnly to answer in the affirmative the question whether they unfeignedly believe all the canonical scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments; but in the Revision of the Prayer Book, while the question remains unchanged, there is added to it an explanatory clause, so that it runs: 'Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical scriptures . . . as given of God to convey to us in many parts and divers manners the revelation of himself which is fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ?' Indeed Anglican bishops generally for fifty years past have been freely ordaining men who made no concealment that it was in this sense they interpreted the question, and were prepared to answer 'I do believe.'

This action on the part of one Communion may be of value for others.

(6) The Formation of the New Testament Canon.—A word must first be said about the terms New and Old *Testaments*, and about the term *canon*. (1) As soon as mankind began to learn the use of writing in any form, it was natural that every solemn covenant between contracting parties should be accompanied by a document. So the solemn covenant of Jehovah with Israel had its attesting document—'the book of the Covenant' (Ex 24 [7]), and the term was applied to the 'Law of Moses' in its more developed forms (2 K 23 [2]; 1 Mac 1 [57]; Ecclus 24 [23]). As was natural the Christians in the light of the New Covenant called the earlier Covenant 'Old,' and in 2 Cor 3 [14] we find 'the Old Covenant' used apparently as a name for the book. Thus, when there was a New Testament Canon added to the Old, the canonized books were called by the Christians in Greek 'the Old' and 'the New Covenant' (*diatheké* translating *berith*). Unfortunately in the old Latin versions the word *diatheké* was translated by *testamentum*. When Jerome came to make his new translation of the books of the Jewish Canon, he rightly translated *berith* by *fœdus* or *pactum*. But *testamentum* remained in the 'apocryphal' books which Jerome did not translate, and he suffered it to remain in the revised New Testament. Hence the collection of the books of the New Covenant were called in Latin *Novum Testamentum*. Tertullian had striven to introduce the word 'instrumenta' (authoritative documents) instead of *Testamenta* as a name for the Bible Old and New. He would have had it called 'the divine documents.' But the older title was too strong for him (see an interesting note in Harnack's *Origin of the New Testament*, App. V). But surely it would have been a great gain if we had spoken of 'the Old' and 'the New Covenants,' rather than 'the Old and New Testaments'; for the latter word suggests a legacy from one who is gone, and the former an established and permanent relationship with one who is alive. (2) The word 'canon' was in familiar use in Greek when the Church came out into the world to describe any authoritative standard; such as the 'canons' of grammar or astrology. The Alexandrian grammarians spoke of the Classics as 'the canon' or standard of good Greek. And the term passed from describing the instrument which measures to that which corresponds to the measure. So St. Paul speaks of the authoritative *rule* (canon) of Christian living supplied by the cross of Christ (Gal 6 [16]), and he speaks also of the *province* (canon) of work *ruled out* or allotted to him and other messengers of the Gospel (2 Cor 10 [13-16]). So later we get *the rule of faith* (*canon* or *regula*) used to express both the standard by which doctrine is to be judged and the creed or statement which corresponds to that standard, and the rules of worship and discipline are also called *canons*. So it was natural that Origen should speak of the books distinguished by the Church as inspired and authoritative, as being 'canonized' or 'canonical,' i.e. included in the authoritative list. 'No one,' he writes, 'should use for the proof of doctrine books not included among the *canonized* Scriptures,' (*in Matt.*, § 28). It was natural again that Athanasius should go a step further and call the whole body of books so sanctioned by Church authority 'the Canon.' In this sense the word found general acceptance (see Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, App. A, and the word *canon* in Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary*).

When the Church of Christ, the New Israel, started on its career, it had no sacred Scriptures except those of the old Israel. Our Lord had written nothing, nor given the Twelve any commandment to write. He committed His Gospel to an organized group of men whom He had trained to receive this trust, and whom He promised to inspire by His Spirit rightly to recall His teaching and to understand its meaning (Jn 14 [26], 15 [26], 16 [13])—not to any book. The Apostolic Church, therefore, used the Old Testament Scriptures with a profound reverence as forecasting the Christ who was Jesus. They scrutinized it diligently for anticipations of what had now actually occurred. But they recognized that these Scriptures had been superseded. Their value to them lay in their imperfection. Their types had been fulfilled, the law had passed into the Gospel, the Christ who was to come had come, the old things had become new. So from the first, there was added to 'the Scriptures' 'the Lord,' or the words of the Lord or 'the Gospel.' This constituted 'the tradition' of teaching and practice, moral and sacramental, which the Apostles and evangelists and teachers delivered to the first converts, first Jewish and then Gentile. This is 'the tradition' of the first Jerusalem Church which St. Paul speaks of himself as having 'received' after his conversion, and as 'handing on' to the churches of his formation. This

authoritative oral message lies behind all the books of the New Testament, no one of which was written to give the first instruction to converts. All of them presuppose this tradition or 'form of teaching to which' St. Paul says that all converts 'were delivered' (Rom 6 [17]), and, when he said this, he was writing to the Church of Rome, of which only a few of the members could have been taught by himself. It is something he can assume to be general. We can get a fair idea from the books of the New Testament what it could be assumed that all converts would know already—that is, we can discover the contents of the tradition. There was first of all the record of 'the things said and done by the Lord,' of His sufferings and death, His resurrection and ascension, and of the assurance of His 'coming.' It was to this primarily that the Apostles were to be witnesses (Ac 1 [21-22]). We have very good reason to believe that in the second Gospel we have a written record of the instruction of this kind given by Peter to the churches of his foundation, made by John Mark, his companion and interpreter; St. Paul tells us incidentally how his converts were instructed in the tradition of our Lord's institution of the Eucharist, and of His death and resurrection and appearances (1 Cor 11 [23], 15 [1-3, 11]). He also from time to time quotes as of final authority words of our Lord; and careful examination of his letters shows that he could assume in his converts a general acquaintance with Christ's teaching and character (see esp. Diessmann's *Paul*, 2nd ed., 195 ff.). St. Luke also assumes that Theophilus will have been taught the Gospel story (Lk 1 [4]). Again, it is constantly assumed that the members of the different churches will know the moral law for Christians (1 Th 4 [1]; 1 Jn 2 [7]), and it is chiefly this that St. Jude appears to mean by 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints.' It is assumed, again, that the name of the Father, the name of the Son, the Lord Jesus, and the name of the Holy Ghost were familiar names (Mt 28 [19]; Mk 1 [1]; 2 Cor 13 [14]; 1 Jn 2 [20] ff.; Jude [20]), and the idea of atonement by Christ's death and of regeneration by His Spirit familiar ideas, and that instruction had been given about the sacraments (Rom 6 [3]; 1 Cor 11 [23]; Heb 6 [1-2]), and about 'the last things,' and about the authority of Scripture and the authority of the Apostles. The tradition which the New Testament books take for granted comprises all these things, and they appear to be undisputed; or, to speak more truly, where explicitly or implicitly any part of this tradition was disputed or rejected, the tradition is appealed to as of unquestionable authority. 'As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth any Gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema' (Gal 1 [9]), 'Whether it be I or they (the Twelve), so we preach, and so ye believed' (1 Cor 15 [11]), 'Ye hold fast the traditions, even as I delivered them unto you' (1 Cor 11 [2]). 'We exhort you . . . that, as ye received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, even as ye do walk—that ye abound more and more' (1 Th 4 [1]); 'If any man teacheth a different doctrine, he is puffed up, knowing nothing' (1 Tim 6 [3]); 'Hold the pattern of sound words which thou hast heard from me' (2 Tim 1 [13]). 'Let that abide in you which ye heard from the beginning'; 'Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God' (1 Jn 2 [24]; 2 Jn [9]). 'To contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints' (Jude [3]). 'Remember how thou has received and didst hear; and keep it' (Rev 3 [3]). This kind of *conservative* note, implying that 'the churches' were one organized society, pledged to a specific doctrine, moral, theological, sacramental, disciplinary, accepted as the word of God, runs through the New Testament books, and you cannot get behind it. And from the first it rests on the assumption that the Apostles were the authorized and trustworthy interpreters of Christ, though they were only His ministers, and that their Gospel was His Gospel. It is not our present object to justify this assumption or to justify the inclusion in the original tradition of this or that article of faith or practice. Our present object is simply to secure the recognition that back behind the written books of the New Testament, as far as we can obtain evidence from the first beginnings of the Gospel, the Church rested upon 'the teaching of the Apostles' received as the word of the Lord or the word of God: and this 'tradition' was in full force prior to any written books, which all bear witness to it. This tradition itself, like all traditions, came in time to be written down. The confession of faith required of those to be baptized came to be written down in the baptismal creeds of the Church; and the *Didaché* is the writing down of the instruction, chiefly moral instruction, given to Catechumens, together with such as was necessary for the conduct of church affairs, in some group

of churches, as it would seem in an outlying district, untouched by the influence of St. Paul or St. John. But doubtless there were many, like Papias, who carried out of the 1st century into the 2nd their preference, over any written books, of the unwritten teachings of the Apostles as those had been able to hand it on who were their younger associates. 'I did not think that I could get so much profit from the contents of written books as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice.'

However, our written Scriptures of the New Testament began very early to come into being. St. Luke (1 [3]) already knows of 'many' who have taken in hand to write down the record of the eye-witnesses of the Lord's life on earth. He himself uses a written record, now lost, of our Lord's teaching, with accompanying incidents, which is commonly known as Q (from *Quelle*, the source), and which was probably the collection of St. Matthew. He uses also St. Mark's Gospel, which consisted in the main of the teaching of St. Peter. He himself, moreover, as St. Paul's companion, has good opportunities in Palestine of collecting information from eye-witnesses. In the first Gospel we have the record, based on St. Matthew and incorporating St. Mark, which emanates from Palestine. The 4th Gospel, written at Ephesus at the end of the 1st century, showing acquaintance with St. Mark and St. Luke, in various ways supplements, corrects, and greatly enriches the tradition, claiming an authority to do so which could only belong to an acknowledged eye-witness and, one would suppose, to an Apostle. Early in the 2nd century these four books were collected, and constituted 'the fourfold Gospel,' held in great reverence, and read in the churches. Their unquestioned acceptance belongs to the earliest memories of Irenæus, and Tatian (A.D. 170) formed them into a combined narrative (the *Diatessaron* or *Four in One*). But besides the Gospels there was another collection. St. Paul has made almost a new departure in literature in the form of letters not to individuals, but to whole societies—the churches of Thessalonica, Galatia, Corinth, Rome, Colossæ, Ephesus and other Asian cities, and Philippi—meant for public reading and meant also in some cases to be passed about from one church to another. There were also letters of his to individuals —Philemon, Timothy, and Titus. 'The Apostle' was thus added to 'the Gospel.' A collection of St. Paul's Epistles is implied already in 2 P 3 [16]. Clement and Ignatius bear witness to the process in Rome and Ephesus. The pilgrim Abercius, during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, has 'Paul' for his companion—that is, he carries epistles of his with him. The martyrs of Scilli in Numidia have in their case, besides 'our books' (i.e. the Scriptures), 'the epistles of Paul, the righteous man.' Letters from other Apostles—Peter, John, James, Jude—were also treasured. But at the same time other writings were being read in some churches—a Gospel according to the Egyptians and one according to the Hebrews, and Acts of Paul, as well as our Acts of the Apostles, an apocalypse of Peter as well as our apocalypse of John, an Epistle of Barnabas, as well as genuine books by men who in some sense claimed inspiration—the Epistle of Clement and the Shepherd of Hermas. And the Gnostic sects were publishing documents sometimes professing to contain a superior and hitherto secret tradition from the Apostles. Clearly it was necessary for the Church to distinguish what should be or should not be read in church, what books it recognized as apostolic, and what it did not. Tertullian reveals to us a considerable activity of Church Councils in this sense (*de Pudic.*, 10, *de Bapt.*, 17). But what, so to speak, forced the hand of the Church of the 2nd century and compelled it to act, was especially two movements. Marcion, whose motives have been already described, published (about A.D. 140) for his newly founded churches a distinct Canon, consisting of St. Luke's Gospel, greatly mutilated, and ten Epistles of St. Paul, also more or less expurgated. His own *Antitheses* or contradictions of the Old and the New Testaments was added. Marcion's movement was powerful enough to compel the Church not only to reassert its relation to the Old Testament, but also to form its own Canon of the New Testament. The other movement was Montanism. The Phrygian Montanus, with his prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla, was not only opposed to the tradition of the Church by his revival of the (properly pagan, but also Philonic) idea of divine inspiration as an ecstasy in which the prophet lost the use of his reason, nor only by his ascetic innovations, but also in maintaining that a new era of the Spirit had dawned which might supersede in some ways even the inspiration of the Apostles. The utterances of the new prophets were written down, and were to be read as being the word of God. Tertullian in the West, after he became a Montanist, would have added to the

New Testament the productions of 'the newest prophecy.' The danger was obvious that the religion of the Apostles might be merged and swamped in the new enthusiasm. The same danger was apparent in the mass of more or less Gnostic literature which was everywhere ministering to superstition. The Church was driven back upon its original principle of the finality of Christ, and of the religion of Christ as proclaimed by the Apostles. The Apostles only had plenary inspiration. So Tertullian (not yet Montanist) and Clement of Alexandria had proclaimed. Thus the Scriptures of the Church, which constitute her standard, must be apostolic and only apostolic. Only such must be read in the churches. Here, then, was another powerful motive at work for the fixing of a New Testament Canon. Here was a standard which would exclude not only spurious works, but such as the Shepherd of Hermas and the Epistle of Clement.

The writings of the latter part of the 2nd century show us this process of forming a Canon at work, and from the end of the century there comes from the Church of Rome the first evidence of a formulated Canon in the anonymous fragment discovered by Muratori. The writer of this document refers to a Canon, apparently as having ecclesiastical authority, which comprised the four Gospels, the Acts, the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, two of St. John, St. Jude, and the Apocalypse of John, side by side with an Apocalypse of Peter, 'which some would not have read in Church.' The Shepherd of Hermas may be read indeed, but not read in Church. We have not the whole of the document, and there may have been some other items. Hesitation, however, was felt in the West at this date about accepting the Epistle to the Hebrews. After this we have very little information about the Western Canon, till under the influence of Jerome and Augustine and of the 3rd Council of Carthage (397), it was fixed in the form familiar to us. In the East Origen (185–253) gives a list of books corresponding to ours, though he takes note of doubts about 2 Peter and 2 and 3 John. Eusebius (324) notes, as disputed by some, James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John. The Apocalypse he treats as accepted, but liable to rejection, apparently, if not by St. John. The Council of Laodicea (?) (*c.* 363) and Gregory of Nazianzus give the full list, except the Apocalypse: this, however, Athanasius (367) includes, and his authority tended to carry the day. The Quinisext Council in 692 made the full list authoritative in the East. It is noticeable that no one of the doctrinal councils reckoned as ecumenical touched the matter of the Canon of Scripture till it was dealt with at Trent. We may say it was treated as a matter of discipline, rather than of doctrine. On critical principles, it appears that the Church should have omitted 2 Peter—that is to say there appears to be little doubt that this is a pseudonymous writing. Otherwise all the books can be accepted by a reasonable criticism as apostolic, that is, as written by Apostles or companions of Apostles; and there is no book not included in the Canon which can be so accepted. There is no doubt that apostolicity was the main criterion, though it was interpreted to include the works of immediate disciples of Apostles, such as Mark or Luke. Being read in Church did not save the Shepherd of Hermas or the Epistle of Clement. The only plain utterance to the contrary is the remark of Jerome that 'it does not matter who is the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as in any case it is the work of a Church writer, and is daily read out in the churches' (*Ep. ad Dardanum*, P.L., xxiii, 1103). It is, however, fairly obvious that apostolic authorship was not the *only* criterion actually present. The hesitation of the East in accepting the Apocalypse, and the hesitation of the West in accepting the Hebrews, was not merely due to doubts about the authorship of St. John and St. Paul respectively. The Apocalypse appeared to teach millenarianism, which was held to be a Jewish or Montanist dotage. The Hebrews, in spite of all arguments to the contrary, seemed to teach the impossibility of repentance and absolution in the case of deliberate apostasy. The final admission of each of these books to the Canon may be truly said to have been accompanied by an understanding that they were not to be interpreted literally, but according to the general sense of Scripture. We may conclude this section by recording Sandy's verdict on the New Testament Canon. After giving an account of the literature which was contending for recognition in the early centuries, he adds: 'It is certainly a wonderful feat on the part of the early Church to have by degrees sifted out this mass of literature; and still more wonderful that it should not have discarded . . . . one single work which after generations have found cause to look back upon with any regret. . . . There is not one which at this moment

we should say possessed a real claim to be invested with the authority of the Canon.'

[The above account of the formation of the Canon can be filled out by reference to Westcott's *Canon of the New Testament*, Harnack's *Origin of the New Testament*—an enlightening book which, however, greatly exaggerates the *suddenness* of the appearance of the Canon—Sandy's *Inspiration*, vi, vii, and *H.D.B.*, art. 'New Testament Canon.' Nothing has been said in this article on the Canon of the Syriac-speaking Church which, owing to its separation from the Greek-speaking East, retained for centuries a smaller Canon, excluding 2 and 3 John, 2 Peter, and Jude, as well as Apocalypse; cf. Sanday, 10 f., and Goodspeed's *Formation of New Testament* (Chicago).]

(7) The Sense Attached to the Inspiration of the New Testament Books.—The only book in the New Testament which *claims* divine inspiration for its whole contents is the Apocalypse. St. Luke's preface, which applies to *Acts* as well as *Gospel*, makes no claim except that of the careful historian, well informed as to the exact facts. We should judge, moreover, that he cannot have regarded his predecessor St. Mark's record, which he uses, as divinely certificated at all points, or he could not have used it with such freedom. We should suppose that he simply believed in its trustworthiness, on the grounds explained later in the famous passage of Papias. The writer of the 4th Gospel again plainly not only supplements, but at points corrects, the earlier Evangelists, Mark and Luke; where he did not correct them, we should suppose that he regards their narrative as true and sufficient. That the Gospels and Acts do provide us with wholly reliable history was from the first taken for granted by the Church, and any views to the contrary, such as were exhibited by some Ebionites or Gnostics, shocked the common conscience, and were stamped as heresy. We notice that Origen is careful to explain that his idea of the Old Testament—viz. that many things are recorded which cannot have actually happened, in order to direct our minds to a hidden or spiritual meaning—does not apply to the Gospel narrative. The works of Christ there recorded may have a hidden meaning, like the raising of Lazarus, but first of all they actually occurred (see Gore, *Epistles of St. John*, 38 f., 236 f.). No doubt also, from the first, the Church, which believed all its members to be really inspired, believed the Apostles and prophets to be so in the highest degree, and doubtless this belief passed from the men to their writings, though St. Paul would not at all points give his warrant for this. Nevertheless, the canonization of the books, as we see it taking place from the end of the 2nd century, did make a great difference. Clement of Alexandria seems to be the first person to call the New Testament books 'divinely inspired.' This meant that they were formally co-ordinated with the Old Testament books, and at once all the exaggerated notions attaching to inspiration, which the Church had received from the Jewish schools, passed to them also. They are to be regarded, Origen tells us, as infallible: when the writers record what they could not have known by natural means of information, the Holy Spirit must have supplied it; there can have been no lapses of memory: where variations of statement occur in seemingly parallel passages, they must refer to different occasions (Sandy, 37). We are glad to notice that he implies that others in his day would not have spoken so. Later we treasure St. Chrysostom's admission of minor contradictions in the Gospels already referred to (p. 10*b*). Tertullian also points out that St. Paul does not always appear to be writing under inspiration, and St. Jerome refers to those who drew a similar distinction within the books (Sanday, 42 f.). Chiefly must we be thankful that the Church made no attempt to frame any obligatory definition of inspiration, in spite of the habit both in East and West of identifying it with absolute inerrancy. In our day real believers in Christ are probably not the least tempted to doubt the reality of the inspiration of the New Testament writers or the authority which that inspiration imparts; but the plain fact that the Evangelists differ among themselves in detail would prevent their ever acquiescing in this identification. The fixing of the Canon, however, made a great difference in the Church. Harnack exaggerates the difference as Sanday points out, but it cannot be denied. Before it was fixed there was no certain line between different books read by Christians with respect, or publicly read out in Church. Now a sharp line was drawn, even if the fanaticism which here or there would have proscribed all reading except that of 'the Scriptures' did not prevail. Moreover, it put a severe restraint on the ecclesiastical tradition. That the faith as preached by the Apostles was the rule of faith for all subsequent generations would

have been always admitted. But an unwritten tradition is always expanding or changing. Now the conservative restraint on tradition, at least in respect of doctrine, was made much more precise and effective. Whatever doctrinal question was raised, the supreme court of reference was henceforth what a bishop at a Council in Carthage (A.D. 256) called 'the holy and adorable words of the Scriptures,' and this brings us to our last point.

(8) The Authority of 'Tradition' and the Authority of Scripture.—From the first the Church had held fast to the apostolic tradition. Its function was to maintain the tradition: *Nihil innovandum nisi quod traditum.* When the Gnostics had suggested secret traditions of higher value for select souls, the Church had appealed to the open tradition of each of the apostolic sees handed on from bishop to bishop as sufficient and alone authentic. And with the consent of these traditions they confronted the Gnostics. Tertullian summarized the argument in an epigram: 'Is it possible that so many churches of such importance can have hit by an accident of error upon an identical creed (*in unam fidem erraverint*)?' Councils assembled in order to bear witness to the tradition. The ecumenical councils were important, because there all the Churches of Christendom were present by representation, to condemn the false teaching which none of them recognized, and to approve and guard the common tradition, 'So the Catholic Church believes.' This is the idea which is developed in the little book—the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lerins—which became in the West the classical work on the doctrinal authority of the Church. What the faithful son of the Church is to ask for, is the faith which has been held in the great Church, 'everywhere, always, and by all'—'everywhere' by contrast to what can only show local prevalence; 'always' by contrast to what is novel; 'by all' in contrast to what is merely the opinion of an individual, however great. In matters of discipline or practice the Church had a free hand to decree what might seem best, from time to time, under the circumstances. In matters of doctrine it had a much more restricted duty. So Athanasius (*de Synod.*, 5) notes the difference between the formula used at Nicæa in settling the Paschal controversy —a matter of practice—and that used in the doctrinal decision against Arius. 'With reference to Easter such and such things "were determined" (*edoxe*, and at such a date), for at that time it was determined that all should obey a certain rule: but with reference to the faith they wrote not "such and such things were determined," but "thus the Catholic Church believes." And they added immediately the statement of their faith, to show that their judgement was not new, but apostolic, and that what they wrote was not any judgement of theirs, but was what the Apostles taught' (see for fuller quotations Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, iii). When the Canon of the New Testament was formulated no new principle was introduced. But henceforth it was understood that the reference to tradition did not suffice. It was taken for granted that the apostolic doctrine had been expressed once for all in the books now canonized, and that the final reference was to the books. So it was laid down peremptorily by Origen, by Athanasius, by the Fathers generally without any hesitation. The great obstacle to the acceptance of the test word *Homoousios* at Nicæa was that the word was not in Scripture; and the obstacle was only overcome by the evidence that no other word would really exclude the Arian idea of a demi-god, and that the Church had the duty of guarding and protecting what was really the faith of Scripture, even, if necessary, by a new word. But during the years of controversy following Nicæa almost all the argument is conducted on the field of Scripture with little reference to the Council. In his Catechetical lectures St. Cyril of Jerusalem says to his catechumens: 'Do not believe me simply, unless you receive the proof of what I say from Holy Scripture'; 'Keep that faith only which the Church is now giving to you, and which is certificated out of the Holy Scripture.' We stand astonished at the particularity with which St. Chrysostom insists on his flock having their family Bibles (not necessarily all the books), and studying them for themselves. Nor does he stand alone in this. Writer after writer insists that the purity of the faith can only be maintained by constant familiarity on the part of the members of the Church generally with the Scriptures. There are two or three passages in the Fathers where tradition is aligned with Scripture as an independent source, but in each case it is made unmistakably evident that the independent authority of tradition concerns matters of discipline and practice, not matters of faith (see G. L. Prestige, *Tradition*, in *Theol.*, July, 1926, and *Roman Catholic Claims*, iv). The Fathers certainly affirm that nothing can be orthodox which is not scriptural.

From this point of view the relation of the teaching Church to the Scriptures is easy to establish. The Church with its tradition comes first. It was there before the Scriptures were written. All the books of the New Testament presuppose it, and no one of them is intended to give the first teaching to the Catechumen. To use Athanasius' expression, it remains the function of the Church to give to the disciple his 'point of view' (*scopos*). Without this traditional instruction as to the Threefold Name, the Incarnation, the Mission of the Spirit, the Church, the Sacraments, the moral duties, the Last Things (all of which the New Testament presupposes), an individual left to himself to find his own way about in the books would be fairly sure to come to grief. But when he has received his point of view and his creed from the Church, he is to build himself up in fuller assurance and knowledge in the books; and this familiarity with the books on the part of both teacher and taught is to keep the tradition itself from corruption and one-sidedness.

The question suggests itself, but does not appear to have been raised in ancient times, What proof can be offered that all that the Apostles or their immediate disciples regarded as belonging to the tradition appears in their occasional writings? Why should there not have been an unwritten tradition also and equally apostolic? To this question there is perhaps no answer. It seems to have been taken for granted that the providence which presided over the coming of the Gospel secured the 'all-sufficiency' of the Scriptures on which the Fathers frequently insist. At any rate, it is noticeable that there is, in fact, nothing of importance—nothing which concerns the faith of the ordinary Christian—which can be shown to have been always in the tradition and which is not also implied in the New Testament (on the last point see Gore, *Reconstruction of Belief*, Part iii, 900).

The above—which indisputably represents the unanimous mind of the Fathers—is a very conservative position. It gives a very restricted meaning to the authority of the Church. The time came when the authoritarian spirit of the Roman Church chafed against such a restriction. In fact, it found itself committed to mediæval doctrines which had not much support in antiquity, and none in Scripture. So the Council of Trent sanctioned the idea of tradition as an independent fount of doctrine besides Scripture. And whereas the idea of tradition suggests researches into the past and the verifying and correcting of the present by the past, this restraint also upon the authority of the living voice came to be viewed with jealousy or openly repudiated. The present living voice of the Church is enough; and the Church has been given in the successor of St. Peter a centre and seat of final authority. Thus we find recent Roman authorities on history (Franzelin and Batiflol) refusing any longer to accept Vincent of Lerins' rule, because the facts of history make it impossible to maintain (what still remains the official claim) that the present teaching of the Roman Church is covered by the appeal to antiquity—by the *quod semper* and the *quod ubique*. Thus the idea of the authority of the Church has been centralized, freed from limitations, and rendered peremptory and absolute in the Latin tradition.

In the providential purpose of God it seems to be given to the Anglican Church in the Western world to stand for the ancient rule of faith. The ancient Church wished to be the faithful depository of the whole Gospel, and to protect it when necessary; but it had no desire to formulate dogmas or to increase the *credenda*; it might even have anticipated the passionate aspiration of Erasmus: 'Let the essentials of the faith be limited to the fewest articles.' Anglicans may well regard themselves as the trustees of the ancient liberty. There is a faith without which the Church cannot live, and which is older even than the New Testament. It is that which the Sacraments make effective and the Creeds embody, and the Councils sought to protect. It is the Church's business to teach that faith. We have no cause to fear that science or historical criticism can dissolve its foundations. But we have grave cause to fear that ecclesiastical authority may forget its limitations and become burdensome upon sensitive consciences, and intolerable to the open-minded scholar. So a high value attaches to the limitation which the Fathers admitted. 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith' is no more than the ancient rule. And it should be remembered that though 'pious opinions' which are not 'articles of the faith' are not to be despised, those who teach in the Church's name must not insist upon them or burden the conscience of men with them, as if they were. (For the bearing of this rule of faith on the idea

of the development of doctrine or of the Church see *Reconstruction of Belief*, Part iii, cap. vii.)

As a last word let it be said that to-day the labour of scholars on the Bible is being chiefly devoted to critical questions. It will be found to be so in much of the work contributed to this Commentary. This is inevitable, because our critical science is in great part a new science, and the foundations of exegesis have to be relaid. But when all that criticism can do has been well and truly done, and when the historical background of Scripture has been redrawn, the real purpose for which the holy books have been given to us has not yet been served. They were given to us to convey to us the word of God in all the stages of its delivery, to be the guide of life through this bewildering world, and to keep us in the light of God. If they are to serve their purpose 'the Scriptures must be read in the same spirit in which they were written.'

THE FUNCTION OF LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM

By E. J. Bicknell

Criticism is the art of judging. All judgement involves comparison and discrimination. Even the simplest statement depends upon a previous act of criticism. All thought implies a process of selection and judgement. We say or hold that this is right or wrong, and that this is true or false, as a result of an act of criticism. In common speech no doubt criticism is often used in the sense of an unfavourable judgement. A critic is one who finds out faults and points out the weak spots. Hence the results of criticism are held to be negative and destructive. The critic is one who spoils our enjoyment or undermines our beliefs. But this is not the true use of the term. All genuine appreciation of truth or beauty, all real conviction, can only be won through discrimination and testing. The uncritical mind is at the mercy of passing impressions and shifting moods. It does not know why it believes or enjoys. It can give no reason for its affirmations or its denials. It mistakes prejudices for convictions, and temper for conscience. In short, it fails to be rational, and, as such, falls short of the standard of humanity. Only by criticism can belief be kept true and morality uncorrupted. In other words, right criticism is constructive and energizing. It makes possible the highest kind of life. By purging and stabilizing the processes of thought and emotion, it vindicates and preserves the supreme values. Of course, the power of judging may be misused or perverted. It cannot by itself supply the material for a full or abundant life. It can only deal with what it finds. But it cannot be simply suppressed or ignored without great danger to the whole man. As Plato said, 'The unexamined life is impossible for a human being.' The nemesis that awaits the stifling of criticism is mental and moral stagnation.

Though all criticism is in its essential functions one, there are plainly many types of criticism. They vary in accordance with the subject-matter with which they deal and the practical aim that they seek to accomplish. This article is concerned with two kinds, literary and historical criticism. The two, though closely connected, can be distinguished and require separate treatment.

Literary criticism investigates the date and authorship of a writing, the circumstances under which it was composed, the scope and purpose and nature of the work. It asks such questions as whether it is the production of one author or more than one; whether it is based on or embodies earlier writings: and if so, what is their date and character, and have they been altered by the editor? This kind of criticism is sometimes known as 'higher' criticism, not from any claim to superiority on the part of those who exercise it, but in contrast to 'lower' or 'textual' criticism which only aims at ascertaining the actual words that the author wrote. It is higher because it builds upon and assumes the work of the lower criticism. At the same time it is clearly more complex and embraces a wider field.

In relation to modern books such literary criticism is rarely needed. Since the invention of printing the author and date of a work are indicated on the title page. In the case of more than one edition, the date and place of the original edition is also usually shown. Only in unusual instances, such as anonymous writings,

or books that claim to be based on the discovery of some old or original document, is such criticism called into play. But this is a comparatively recent state of affairs. In old days all copies had to be made by hand. They were fewer in number and more easily damaged. The name of the author might be lost, or the manuscript assigned to someone else. Further, the canons of literary honesty were different from our own. There was no law of copyright. Forgery of all kinds was at some periods less strongly condemned and always less readily detected. There was every temptation to claim the support of a great name for some political or religious theory. The age as a whole was uncritical. It was difficult in the extreme to trace the antecedents of a manuscript. Small wonder if many writings came into circulation under names which were not those of their true authors, and the mistake was not detected.

Further, strange as it may seem to us, partly owing to the entire absence of copyright, partly to the want of any device to correspond to our use of inverted commas, it was the regular custom in all parts of the world to insert large quotations from earlier writings without any acknowledgement. Ancient books possessed nothing in the shape of footnotes or references to authorities. Nor was it thought necessary to quote exactly. A later writer was free to alter or adapt the work of an earlier just as he felt disposed. A large number of books, not only in the times of the Old and New Testament but as much in mediæval days, were compiled on this paste and scissors system. It is said that in Arabia this custom survives to-day and involves no moral blame.

Under these conditions it is obvious that literary criticism has before it an exacting and necessary task. It must scrutinize carefully all claims to authorship. It will be on the watch for traces of the use of earlier sources. In some cases its methods have been vindicated by the discovery of the actual sources of a book after their employment has been detected by criticism. In other cases the original documents have come down to us, and the manner in which later compilers have incorporated them into their own works can be traced from the start. Thus in the Old Testament the late book of Chronicles is based in part on the books of Samuel and Kings. A comparison of the writings shows at once how the chronicler took over whole passages and freely adapted them to suit the ideas and customs of a later time. The historic sense did not yet exist, and authors always tended to read back into earlier ages the ideas and habits of their own age. Thus mediæval painters depicted scenes from the Bible in which men and women wore mediæval costume, and the scenery was that of Europe.

Historical criticism works in the closest connexion with literary criticism, and starts from the results attained by it. When the probable date and authorship of a work, its character and the sources that it embodies, have been ascertained, the historical critic asks the further question, What is its value as evidence for history? How far does it give a true account of events as they actually occurred? What light does it shed on the ideas and customs of the time which it describes, or of the period in which it was composed? If it is contemporary with the events recorded, how far is its account accurate and based on trustworthy information; how far is it biassed or one-sided? If it dates from a later age than the events recorded, is it based on reliable traditions and records? How far have primitive records been coloured by later prejudices or modified by more recent developments? Every effort must be made to distinguish between genuine old accounts and the ideas that they contain and the accretions of later ages. In short, historical criticism aims at discovering the value of writings as evidence for history in the sense not only of what actually did occur in the region of fact, but of the ideas current at particular times. For example, the Book of Chronicles is very bad evidence for the truth of what happened in the reign of David, but it is excellent evidence for the opinions held in priestly circles at the beginning of the 3rd century B.C., when the book was composed. It is plain that a small amount of evidence contemporary, or nearly contemporary, with the events may be worth far more than many later narratives or traditions. The acceptance of a tradition by later ages over a wide field is not of itself a guarantee of its truth. If relics of documents attesting a different view and belonging to earlier times can be disentangled from later chronicles, they outweigh as evidence later traditions however widely prevalent. Thus scholars agree that the conception of the conquest of Canaan, which dominates our present books of the Old Testament, is historically of little worth. It represents that conquest as immediate, complete, and achieved by a united Israel. But fragments of early records survive, embodied in the later narratives,

which represent it as piecemeal, partial, and achieved by individual tribes. Many arguments go to show that this is correct. The later tradition can be explained as coloured by patriotic and religious motives, and as reflecting the later experience of the unity of the nation. Later conditions have been read back into primitive times. What ought to have been has been substituted for what actually occurred. As a rule the writers of the Old Testament were more concerned to be edifying than to be accurate recorders. They were preachers before they were historians.

It is plain that the books of the Bible cannot claim exemption from criticism, literary and historical. Christianity, unlike certain other religions, is bound up with history. That is one source of its strength. But the price has to be paid. Historical facts can only be proved by historical evidence. Historical evidence can only be obtained by a scientific criticism of the records. Why, then, is such criticism often regarded as the enemy of the Christian faith? If our sacred books are indeed inspired by God, will not they emerge victorious from the test? Do we not claim that Christianity is to be believed because it is true and for no other reason? All truth comes from God, and in its measure reveals God.

In the abstract, few Christians would wish to deny these propositions. The common idea that criticism is the enemy of religion is due partly to a mistaken conviction that the truth of Christianity is bound up with certain beliefs about the date and authorship of the books of the Bible, which were long unchallenged and accepted by generations of Christians; partly also to a forgetfulness of the limitations of criticism, and to the claim by certain critics to make pronouncements about matters which lie outside their authority.

When critics adduce arguments to prove that this or that book must be later than it has been usual to suppose, or cannot be assigned to its traditional author, they are perfectly within their rights. The arguments must be considered by the light of reason, and if, in the opinion of those most competent to judge, they prove their point, then the verdict must be accepted. This is not to say that any and every assertion by a body of critics is then and there to be accepted as infallible. There is bad criticism as well as good. Many minds are led astray by the desire for novelty. Further, the science of criticism is inductive. Its conclusions cannot be proved in the same manner as the propositions of Euclid. On a very large number of points certainty is unobtainable. At least for a long time to come differences of opinion will have to be tolerated. No one would dispute that many of the verdicts of earlier criticism have had to be revised in the light of closer study and wider evidence It is also true that critics may suffer from the disease of hypercriticism. They imagine differences where none exist. They demand from their documents an accuracy and consistency which is not to be found in ordinary human records. They get out of touch with ordinary experience. But the fact remains that there are considerable results which may be taken as assured. There are many positions that are not likely to be shaken by later research, and that have approved themselves to practically all scholars. These we are bound to accept, even if we suspend our judgement on many other points on which unanimity has not yet been attained. In any case, it is important to remember that the antidote to wild and reckless criticism is not the refusal to criticize, but a sober and patient criticism. Arguments can only be met by arguments. Truth will in the long run prevail.

Even so, many of the accepted results of criticism have given a shock to traditional Christian faith. No scholar of any reputation to-day holds that the Pentateuch, as it stands, was written by Moses. Yet this was the opinion of the Jewish Church in the time of Christ, and was universally held by Christians down to recent times. Nevertheless, in the light of new knowledge we must revise our ideas. We are coming to see that inspiration is not given either to individuals, or to the Church as a whole, in order to save them the trouble of finding out what they can learn by the exercise of their natural powers. The Holy Spirit does not give formulated information about facts of history or details of authorship in order to dispense us from using our reason. There are no grounds for supposing that the Christian Church was ever promised the power of making infallible decisions about questions of the date and authorship of its sacred books without using the ordinary means of discovering the truth about them. In short, particular views about the origin of the Bible, considered as a literature, are no essential part of the Catholic faith. Only those views are impossible to Christians which destroy the moral and spiritual

value of its teaching. As a matter of fact, nothing has done more to make possible a reverent and reasonable appreciation of the spiritual value of the Old Testament than criticism. The discovery of the probable order and history of its contents has brought to the front the idea of gradual and progressive revelation. Much of its teaching, which from the earliest days of the Church had been a stumbling-block to the Christian conscience, can now be explained as belonging to an early stage in the development of Israel, and as being corrected by later passages within the Old Testament itself. As a result of criticism we can believe the Bible to contain the Word of God, as on the older view we could not have done. And this is the reward of allowing criticism free scope in its own sphere.

When we pass on to historical criticism, the question becomes more complicated and more serious. It is one thing to admit that the books of both the Old and New Testament were compiled according to the methods and on the literary principles current in those days, and not according to the modern law of copyright; it is another to face the full consequences of this admission. We must allow that no criticism can destroy the Bible. At most it can show that certain teaching which we had supposed to have been given in one age and by one person, was as a matter of fact given in another age and by another person. But Christianity claims to be a religion not only of mere ideas, however exalted, but to be grounded on a historical basis. It witnesses to certain events of history and interprets them as revealing the mind and purpose of God. It is the religion not of a book but of a Person, and of a historical Person. If, as a result of literary criticism, it could be demonstrated that the New Testament afforded no satisfactory evidence that Jesus of Nazareth ever existed, or that He rose from the dead, the grounds for belief in Christianity, at least in its traditional form, would be seriously weakened.

In reply we must not attempt to withdraw the books, even of the New Testament, from historical criticism. We believe that they will stand it, and indeed have stood it, so that the result of criticism has been to establish the main Christian beliefs on a firmer basis. But we must recognize the limitations of pure historical criticism. Strictly speaking, no historical event can ever be proved to have occurred. It is always possible to explain away the evidence, and to adduce reasons for maintaining that the alleged witnesses were mistaken. In other words, when the critic is weighing and sifting his data, mental presuppositions derived from elsewhere inevitably come in and influence his judgement. In dealing with ordinary events we all have approximately the same presuppositions and the personal element can be allowed for. But in dealing with more complicated historical questions, especially such as involve religious or political or other strong emotions, it is not easy to eliminate or even to be conscious of personal bias. Other considerations come in which are not, strictly speaking, historical at all. If, for instance, a historian holds such a theory of the universe that he believes that anything of the nature of a miracle cannot happen, even though strong evidence for the occurrence of a miracle be produced, he is bound to set it on one side or explain it away. But he will do this not on strict historical grounds, but on grounds which are properly philosophical. In refuting him it would be necessary to go behind his historical arguments and challenge his theory of the world. In short, when we come to judgements about the historical worth of, say, the Gospels, our decision will depend on other than merely historical criticism. That by itself is unable to give the final verdict. Its judgements are most important, but within certain limits they will always be disputable.

This need not alarm us. For, say, the historical existence of Jesus the evidence is so overwhelming that only the biassed critic can doubt it. For the fact that the first Christians all believed that He rose from the dead, the evidence is equally good. If on other questions the verdict of historical criticism is more doubtful, we are content to await the issue in faith. 'Time tries arguments as well as men.' The mistakes of one school or age are corrected by another. Truth will in the long run win. But it can only win when criticism is allowed to exercise its function without fear or favour. On the other hand, true judgement always demands sympathy. The critic who knows something of the power of religion in his own life will be preserved from many errors and misunderstandings. Behind the Bible there stands the continuous life of the people of God, the Jewish and Christian Church, and much in that life can only be truly understood by one who has shared it.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH

By L. E. P. Erith

(1) **Meaning and History of Criticism.**—The Pentateuch is the comprehensive name given to the first five books of the Old Testament, Genesis to Deuteronomy, traditionally called 'the Books of Moses,' a tradition retained in the titles in our English Bibles, e.g. 'The First Book of Moses, commonly called Genesis,' etc. These titles, however, are not original, but have been added to the books from the Greek version, the Septuagint. The Hebrew titles are simply the opening words of each book, 'In the beginning' (Genesis), 'These are the names' (Exodus), 'And He called' (Leviticus), 'In the wilderness' (Numbers), 'These are the words' (Deuteronomy); and no author's name is attached to them. The Jewish tradition that Moses wrote them is not supported by the contents of the books themselves, for they show no signs of Mosaic authorship, but, on the contrary, contain clear evidence that they could not have been written by Moses, or, in fact, by any one author. The Pentateuch contains, for example, duplicate narratives of the same events, often with contradictions in matters of fact, and narratives which are characterized by marked differences in literary style and by widely divergent ideas of God. On the assumption of unity of authorship, especially if Moses be regarded as the author, the literary and theological difficulties raised by the Pentateuch become insuperable.

The tradition of Mosaic authorship probably arose from the ascription of the Jewish Law to Moses. Since Moses was the first leader to give Israel a legislation, subsequent legal codes, which, in the course of Hebrew history, were drawn up on the basis of the Mosaic legislation to meet changed conditions as the nation of Israel grew and developed, came to be ascribed also to Moses; and as the Pentateuch embodies these codes of law, which we shall have to consider later on, it would be in accordance with Jewish ideas to attribute to Moses also the authorship of these five books. But, however it may have arisen, the tradition of Mosaic authorship cannot be maintained in face of the difficulties it involves. Hence arises the need of literary criticism, for it is the function of the critic to examine the books carefully and scientifically to discover what evidence they offer as to their origin and composition, and to enquire whether such evidence explains the difficulties and solves the problems they present. We will therefore try to show the methods employed in documentary or literary criticism, and to illustrate the results which follow from their application, so that readers may be able to examine the Pentateuch critically for themselves, or, in other words, to practise the Higher Criticism, a term which is used to distinguish the criticism of documents from the criticism of the text, which is known as textual or lower criticism. The term higher criticism has provoked quite unreasonable prejudice and hostility in some quarters, and critics are accused with complete injustice of 'cutting up the Bible' in order to force facts to fit a preconceived subjective and destructive theory, whereas nothing could be further from the truth. Instead of inventing theory and then manipulating facts to fit it critics have only gradually and step by step built up the theory on inferences from the facts, namely the phenomena observable by every careful reader of the Pentateuch. Documentary criticism thus forms a constructive science, not of merely academic interest, but of the highest religious importance, since it helps the thoughtful reader of the Old Testament to realize the progress of Divine Revelation.

The evidence on which the present documentary hypothesis of the composition of the Pentateuch is based, and the methods by which the different literary and theological characteristics are distinguished and co-ordinated, will perhaps be most readily understood by tracing the history of critical research and development. This will also serve to correct the misrepresentation, frequently repeated, that the higher criticism of the Old Testament was invented in Germany by Dr. Wellhausen during the latter half of the 19th century; while, in fact, it is the outcome of long and patient study and research by various scholars during the past 250 years, who, working for the most part independently, have reached substantially the same conclusions.

The science of documentary criticism began with the observation of duplicate and divergent records, and with the attempt to explain them. How the need for such explanation produces a theory of criticism is usefully illustrated by T. H. Robinson in *The People and the Book*, 153. He tells of a group of Sunday School teachers who had met to discuss the lesson for the next Sunday. It was the story of Joseph and his brothers (Gen 37), and as they studied it with a view to teaching it they found difficulties in reconciling the contradictions it contains. In one place Joseph is said to have been sold to Ishmaelites, and in another to have been carried off by Midianites; while in one part of the story Reuben tries to rescue him by suggesting that he should be put in a pit, in other verses it is Judah who saves his life by proposing to sell him to the Ishmaelites. 'The case seemed hopeless until the leader of the group suggested that possibly two stories were intertwined here. At once a line of solution was offered, and in half an hour, with nothing but the English AV before them, they had disentangled two narratives, each of which was in itself practically complete. . . . These young people would probably have been much surprised if they had been told that they were doing "higher criticism," yet that is exactly what they were doing.'

Now this method of meeting the difficulties in the Joseph story, which we shall consider in fuller detail below, is precisely the method which, when applied to the whole of the Pentateuch, has enabled scholars to analyze the five books and to distinguish with reasonable accuracy the documentary sources which have been combined in their composition. We need not deal here with the attempts of the Jewish Rabbis in the Middle Ages and later to account for isolated passages, such as the account of Moses' death, which could not have been written by himself, but may pass to the first attempt at scientific documentary criticism, which was made by a French Roman Catholic priest, Richard Simon, who in 1678 published a *Critical History of the Old Testament.* Simon pointed out the presence of duplicate narratives of the same events in Genesis, e.g. of Creation and the Flood, and he showed, moreover, that in these instances of duplication each account exhibited differences of literary style, one being curt, the other copious. He thus inferred that Genesis was a compilation and not the work of one author. Simon dealt only with Genesis, but by demonstrating that narratives by different writers in that book may be distinguished by diversities of literary style he established the correct method of criticism, which later scholars were able to develop and to apply to the whole of the Pentateuch. The next impetus toward critical investigation of the sources of Genesis came from a French Roman Catholic physician, Jean Astruc, who in 1753 wrote a book in defence of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Astruc held that the Pentateuch was compiled by Moses from various sources, and that the two main narratives which he combined in Genesis and Ex 1-6 may be distinguished by the writers' use of different Divine names. One writer uses the name *Elohim* (God), the other *Jehovah* (Hebrew Yahweh or Jahveh). Astruc was the first to draw attention to the consistent variation of the names of God in Genesis, and thus, working independently of Simon and using a different criterion for distinguishing documents, he arrived at substantially the same conclusion. It should, however, be emphasized that modern criticism, though recognizing the validity of the variation in the Divine names which Astruc demonstrated, as a clue to the separation of sources, does not regard it as one of the principal criteria which distinguish the narratives of the different writers. Still, Astruc's work strengthened the case for the composite origin of the Pentateuch and led to further investigation. In Germany, Eichhorn published in 1780 a theory of the composition of Genesis, in which, though working independently of both, he reached the same conclusions as Simon and Astruc, and distinguished two principal documents differing from each other in literary style and in the use of the Divine names. Thus by the end of the 18th century criticism had advanced to the stage of recognizing a combination of two main documentary sources in Genesis and the early chapters of Exodus. The next step was taken by a Scotchman, Alexander Geddes, who in 1792 published a critical edition of the Pentateuch and Joshua, in which he enunciated what became known as the 'fragmentary hypothesis.' Geddes extended the field of critical enquiry to the whole of the five books, and suggested that they were composed of fragmentary sources comprising more than two main documents. This hypothesis was introduced into Germany by Vater in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch* in 1802, and stimulated further research, and from that time

onward most of the critical work on the Old Testament by which the present position has been reached was done in Germany; but the way had been pointed out in France and Scotland.

We need not follow the course of subsequent developments in detail. Fuller consideration of the literary style showed that the variation in the Divine names was no longer a safe criterion for the two-documentary theory after Gen 20, where another document appears which uses *Elohim*, but differs completely in style from the account of Creation in Gen 1-2^4, and the narratives akin to it where *Elohim* is also used. Further, it was made clear that Deuteronomy, which possesses a distinctive style and contains an independent legislation, was the work of a separate writer. The German scholar Ewald led criticism a step further by demonstrating the unity of plan on which the separate documents have been combined, and he attempted to determine their relative ages, though later research considerably modified his chronological arrangement. When Hupfeld in 1853 analyzed the two sources in Genesis which both use *Elohim*, and showed that they differ markedly in style and thought, while the document which uses *Jehovah* is distinct from both, the existence of three separate sources in the Pentateuch, apart from Deuteronomy, was definitely established. The sources which use *Elohim* became known as P and E. P is the writer of the Creation narrative in Gen 1-2^{4a} and of the subsequent kindred passages, which are easily distinguished by his marked individuality of style. The writer of E, which first appears at Gen 20, though using the name *Elohim*, has no affinity with P either in thought or expression. The writer who uses *Jehovah* is known as J, and the Deuteronomist as D. It was also observed that these sources extend beyond the Pentateuch into Joshua, and consequently the first six books of the Old Testament are frequently designated the Hexateuch.

It remained then to determine the relative dates of these sources. Ewald, who pointed out the unity of plan by showing that P supplied the framework into which narratives from the other sources had been fitted, supposed for that reason that P was the earliest in date, and this view was for some time accepted until the legal codes were more fully examined. It was then seen that each of the sources contained a body of laws. The whole of the laws in Leviticus and most of those in Exodus and Numbers belong to P, while a shorter legislation in Exodus is found in JE (see below), and Deuteronomy has its own code of law. It then became evident that the development observable in these laws was in conflict with the dates assigned to the documents on literary grounds alone, and it was found necessary to supplement literary by historical criticism in order to decide their chronological order. 'To determine when the different documents contained in the Hexateuch were written is an *historical* investigation rather than a literary one. . . . The laws and institutions of a people are landmarks in its development; and the historical student examines them in order to trace the growth of ideas which exercise influence on the community. A similar process is necessary in following the course of Israel's development, both religious and political. Accordingly criticism proceeded to enter on a wider field, and, instead of occupying itself exclusively with words and phrases, paid attention to the laws and institutions of the chosen people' (Chapman, *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, 34).

It had been generally agreed that Deuteronomy was the book of the law on which Josiah based his reformation, 621 B.C. (2 K 22, 23), and literary criticism had shown that the historical records from Exodus onwards had been revised and edited in accordance with the Deuteronomic point of view. It had therefore been assumed that the Deuteronomic revision was the final arrangement of the Pentateuch, or Hexateuch, and that Deuteronomy was the latest of the documents. The great influence of Ewald kept his theory of the priority of P in possession for some time, and though different opinions were expressed by some few scholars they were not seriously considered until Reuss in 1833 propounded in his lectures what has since been generally accepted as the true explanation of the chronological relation of the sources to one another. A consideration of the laws in comparison with the history of Israel showed that the developed legislation of P was not known or observed before the Exile, and that the laws of D were not recognized till after the reformation of Josiah. Among the laws observed in Israel before this reformation were those of the Covenant preserved in certain JE passages in Exodus. Historical and literary criticism were now combined, and further literary examination showed that while D contains clear reflections of the JE Covenant laws it shows no trace of the influence of P.

Meanwhile Vatke in 1835 pointed out the importance of Ezekiel's legislative programme, for Ezekiel shows a knowledge of D, but not of P, the legislation of P being a developed and completed codification of the laws for the restored exiles summarized in Ezek 40-48. Reuss hesitated to publish his conclusions in face of the popular theory, but his work was carried on by his pupils, one of whom, Graf, in 1866, published his important thesis maintaining that the teaching of the prophets was prior to the Levitical legislation, P, which was not completed till after the fall of the kingdom of Judah, and that the Pentateuch was not put forth in its present form till after the Exile, during the reformation of Ezra. The Grafian hypothesis with all that it involved was at first regarded with suspicion by those who may be termed the 'orthodox' critics of the time till it was powerfully reinforced by the writings of two great scholars, Kuenen in Holland and Wellhausen in Germany. In the Introduction to his *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* Wellhausen recounts his own experience in terms which suggestively express the religious importance of the critical hypothesis. He says that he was attracted to the study of the Old Testament by the stories of Saul and David, Ahab and Elijah, and by the discourses of the prophets, and that he considered he tolerably understood the historical and prophetic books, though he felt that he was 'beginning with the roof instead of the foundation; for I had no thorough acquaintance with the Law, of which I was accustomed to be told that it was the basis and postulate of the whole literature. At last I took courage and made my way through Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and even through Knobel's Commentary to these books. But it was in vain that I looked for the light which was to be shed from this source on the historical and prophetical books. On the contrary, my enjoyment of the latter was marred by the Law; it did not bring them any nearer me, but intruded itself uneasily, like a ghost that makes a noise indeed but is not visible and really effects nothing. Even where there were points of contact between it and them, differences also made themselves felt, and I found it impossible to give a candid decision in favour of the priority of the Law. Dimly I began to perceive that throughout there was between them all the difference that separates two wholly distinct worlds. Yet, so far from attaining clear conceptions, I only fell into deeper confusion, which was worse confounded by the explanations of Ewald.' He then learned of Graf's hypothesis, which placed the Law later than the Prophets, and this suggested at once a solution of his difficulties. The significance of Wellhausen's work lies not in the originality of the thesis he maintains, to which he lays no claim, but in the fact that in solving his own difficulties he showed others how to interpret the progressive religious development in the Old Testament, and he worked out the critical theory afresh so thoroughly and presented it in such a clear and intelligible form that he carried conviction to scholars in all countries, and since the publication of the famous *Prolegomena* there has been a growing consensus of opinion in favour of the critical hypothesis he restated. It is worth while, however, to point out again that this hypothesis of the combination of four documents in the Pentateuch and of the priority of the Prophets to the Law was not the work of any one man. We have seen the gradual development of literary criticism as the result of conclusions reached by various scholars working on different lines and in different countries; and the position established by historical criticism was reached in the same way, by various scholars working independently, as Wellhausen points out. 'The hypothesis usually associated with Graf's name is really not his, but that of his teacher Eduard Reuss. It would be still more correct to call it after Leopold George and Wilhelm Vatke, who, independent alike of Reuss and of each other, were the first to give it literary currency. All three, again, are disciples of Martin Lebrecht de Wette, the epoch-making pioneer of historical criticism in this field. He indeed did not himself succeed in reaching a sure position, but he was the first clearly to perceive and point out how disconnected are the alleged starting-point of Israel's history and that history itself.' The critical hypothesis was explained lucidly and fully for English readers by Robertson Smith in *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*; while a full critical introduction to the Old Testament with detailed analyses showing the extent of the various documents in the Pentateuch was written by Driver, *Literature of the Old Testament*, still the standard English book of reference on this subject.

(2) **The Documentary Sources.**—We may now briefly summarize the results reached by the application to the Pentateuch of literary and historical criticism

on which is based the 'documentary hypothesis' generally accepted to-day. The Pentateuch is a compilation formed by the combination of four documents designated J, E, D, P. Of these documents P, or the priestly source which forms the framework and contains the priestly legislation, is the latest and was not completed till the time of the Exile. It may be dated approximately *c.* 450 B.C. This is not to say, however, that the legal and ceremonial principles underlying the legislation of P were the product of the Exile. It is clear from Ezekiel's programme that religious thought had been moving in this direction previously. What criticism does establish is that the legislation of P was not codified and put forth in its present form till the reformation of Ezra. Included in P is the body of laws contained in Lev 17-26 which bears clear marks, both in vocabulary and style, of distinct authorship though akin to P and showing a remarkably close literary resemblance to the writings of Ezekiel. This code lays great stress on holiness, and is therefore known as the Holiness Code or H. It is later than Deuteronomy but earlier than P, and its close similarity to the teaching and language of Ezekiel seems to show that it is the product of a school of thought which that prophet represented; but, whatever its origin, it was taken over entire by the compilers of the priestly code, and so for legal purposes may be regarded as P.

D (Deuteronomy) contains a code of laws (12-26), based on the teaching of the prophets of the 8th century, especially Hosea and Isaiah. This code was promulgated during the reign of Josiah and was made the standard by which that king carried out his reformation. Its promulgation may be dated therefore *c.* 621, and it remained the law of Israel until the priestly legislation was put in force by Ezra. The relation between these two codes will be explained below.

The remaining sources, J and E, furnish most of the narrative portion of the early history. These two sources are closely related and form two parallel histories embodying traditions which reach back to patriarchal times. The compiler has interwoven extracts from each, occasionally so closely that it is not always possible to separate them, and the critic must sometimes be content to mark a passage simply JE. There can, however, be no doubt that J and E are two distinct sources. This is clear from the presence of duplicate narratives of which neither can be assigned to P, whose style is unmistakable; and closer investigation of such narratives, which we will consider in fuller detail later on, shows that each source exhibits characteristics of its own, both literary and theological. The religious standpoint of E belongs to the period immediately preceding the prophets Amos and Hosea, and it may thus be dated *c.* 800-750 B.C. J, which reflects the cruder religious ideas of an earlier period, may be regarded as having been written not later than *c.* 850 B.C. Both these sources, however, contain traditions which go back to much earlier times, and they carry on their records of the history beyond the period covered by the Pentateuch up to the time when they were put in writing. Thus, e.g., we find that J is a valuable historical authority for the period of the Judges. In a later section we shall see reason to believe that J was written in the Southern Kingdom, and represents the traditions of past history as they were preserved and handed down in the tribe of Judah; while E records the history from the standpoint of a member of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. This accounts for the differences in detail observable when both sources narrate the same story. 'Thus, as the result of the work of more than two centuries of Biblical scholarship, we have to-day, instead of one, four parallel historical narratives in the Old, as well as in the New Testament. A modern history of the Hebrew people rests therefore not on one but four corner-stones. . . . Above all, the critical historian is able to avail himself of the testimony of witnesses who lived many centuries before the completion of the books in which their writings are now embodied. When the analysis has disclosed the different narratives, they can be studied in their original literary simplicity and unity, free from the abrupt transitions and seeming inconsistencies which characterize them in their present form. Only when the older is distinguished from the later, is it possible intelligently and constructively to trace the marvellous unfolding of Israel's faith and of that noble moral and religious sense which made the Hebrews a race of prophets' (C. F. Kent, *Growth and Contents of the Old Testament*, 30).

(3) **Eastern Historians' Methods as Seen in the Books of Chronicles.**—Before passing on to consider the characteristics of these sources it may be well to explain the Eastern method of writing history, which makes it possible to distinguish the different sources used by the compiler. This explanation is necessary in view of

the frequent needless difficulties which arise through readers of the Old Testament assuming that it was written according to the literary conventions observed by modern Western historians. The modern Western historian, after reading up his sources, conveys in his own words the information he has derived from them. The Eastern writer, on the contrary, incorporates extracts from his sources verbatim, only amending them here and there in conformity with his particular standpoint, or, as in the Old Testament, in accordance with the religious principle he wishes to inculcate, adding only as much original writing as is necessary to fit the sources together into a more or less coherent narrative. This method may be fully illustrated from the writings of Arabic historians, as A. A. Bevan has shown (*Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 12-19). Fortunately we have in our Old Testament an example of the Hebrew historian's method, where both the compilation and one of the original sources may be compared, namely the books of Chronicles, which incorporate verbatim large sections from Samuel and Kings. If the reader will compare the story of the death of Saul in 1 Ch 10 with 1 S 31 he will see that the Chronicler has incorporated the chapter from Samuel, and has added two verses of his own at the end to point the moral of Saul's defeat and death. Then, going on to 1 Ch 11 he will see further that here the Chronicler has selected extracts from 2 S 5 $^{1\text{-}10}$ and 23 $^{8\text{-}39}$, while he has also used another source in the later verses. And so the reader may continue, by means of the references in the RVm, comparing Chronicles with the corresponding passages in Samuel and Kings. It does not come within our scope to dwell more fully here on the relation of these books to one another, but it is relevant to our purpose to consider two further passages which illustrate two characteristics of the Hebrew histories important to bear in mind, namely the differences in theological standpoint observable in sources of different date, and the writers' anachronistic tendency to represent the more developed national institutions and religious ideas of their own age as belonging to the earlier period with which they are dealing. This is specially characteristic of P in the Pentateuch. When we compare 2 S 8 with 1 Ch 18 we find that the Chronicler has copied the chapter from Samuel practically word for word, but with one significant alteration in the last verse. 2 S 8 ^{18} ends with the words 'and David's sons were priests'; but Chronicles is a later compilation by a member of the school of P who wrote in a time when a definite hierarchy was established, the Aaronic priesthood, strictly limited to 'the sons of Aaron.' Consequently the Chronicler has altered the statement of the earlier history to 'and the sons of David were chief about the king.' This is an example both of anachronism and of difference in theological standpoint. Again, 2 S 24, the account of David's census of Israel, reproduced with some characteristic alterations in 1 Ch 21, opens with the statement: 'And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them, saying, Go, number Israel and Judah.' In the Chronicler's version this is altered to 'And Satan stood up against Israel, and moved David to number Israel,' an alteration due to the Chronicler's higher conception of God, which has led him to correct the crude theology of the earlier writing. A full discussion of the relation between Chronicles and Samuel and Kings in its bearing on Pentateuchal criticism will be found in Chapman (267-273), where it is demonstrated that most of the alterations in and additions to the narratives of Samuel and Kings made by the Chronicler are due to the influence of the priestly legislation, which was clearly unknown to the earlier writers, since the compiler of Kings, who was interested in the Temple and its worship, would hardly have ignored entirely the priestly code had it been in existence. A comparison of Kings and Chronicles therefore strengthens the inference that P belongs to a period later than the fall of the Jewish kingdom. Enough will now have been said here to show that Chronicles provides an excellent illustration of the Hebrew method of compiling history by the incorporation of documentary sources, a method which was followed in the compilation of the Pentateuch; and although we possess no independent version of the sources used in the Pentateuch, yet they are marked by such distinctive characteristics of literary style and theological standpoint that it is possible to distinguish them for the most part with reasonable certainty, and we will now proceed to consider more fully the criteria which enable us to recognize the four documents J, E, D, P.

(4) **The Document P.**—We may conveniently take the documents in the order of their occurrence in the Pentateuch and so examine P first, which, though the latest in date, possesses the most strongly

marked peculiarities of style and diction, and so is the most easily recognizable; and in order that the reader may be able to judge the nature of this document for himself we will append here Driver's list of all the passages in the Pentateuch which belong to P, namely:

Gen 1-2^{4a}, 5$^{1-28, 30-32}$, 6$^{9-22}$, 7$^{6, 11, 13-16a, 17a, 18-21, 24}$, 8$^{1-2a, 3b-5, 13a, 14-19}$, 9$^{1-17, 28-29}$, 10$^{1-7, 20, 22, 23, 31, 32}$, 11$^{10-26, 27, 31, 32}$, 12^{4b-5}, 13$^{6, 11b-12a}$, 16$^{1a, 3, 15, 16}$, 17, 19^{29}, 21$^{1b, 2b-5}$, 23, 25$^{7-11a, 12-17, 19, 20, 26b}$, 26$^{34, 35}$, 27$^{46-28^9}$, 29$^{24, 28b, 29}$, 31^{18b}, 33^{18a}, 34$^{1-2a, 4, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 20-24, 27-29}$, 35$^{9-13, 15, 22b-29}$, 36, 37^{1-2a}, 41^{46}, 46$^{6-27}$, 47$^{5-6a, 7-11, 27b, 28}$, 48$^{3-7}$, 49$^{1a, 28b-33}$, 50$^{12, 13}$.

Ex 1$^{1-5, 7, 13, 14}$, 2^{23b-25}, 6$^{2-7}$ $^{13, 19, 20a, 21b, 22}$, 8$^{5-7, 15b-19}$, 9$^{8-12}$, 11$^{9, 10}$, 12$^{1-20, 28, 37a, 40, 41, 43-51}$, 13$^{1, 2, 20}$, 14$^{1-4, 8, 9, 15-18, 21a, 21c-23, 26, 27a, 28a, 29}$, 16$^{1-3, 6-24, 31-36}$, 17^{1a}, 19^{1-2a}, 24^{15-18a}, 25-31^{18a}, 34$^{29-35}$, 35-40.

Leviticus, all, including H, 17-26.

Nu 1$^{1-10^{28}}$, 13$^{1-17a, 21, 25, 26a}$ (to 'Paran'), 32^{2a}, 14$^{1, 2, 5, 7, 10, 26-30, 34-38}$, 15, 16$^{1a, 2b-7a}$ $^{(7b-11}$, later addition), $^{16, 17, 18-24, 27a, 32b, 35}$ $^{(36-40}$, later), $^{41-50}$, 17-20^{1a} (to 'month'), 2, 3b-4, 6-13, 22-29, 21^{4a} (to 'Hor'), $^{10, 11}$, 22^{1}, 25$^{6-18}$, 26-31, 32, $^{18, 19, 28-32}$, 33-36.

If these passages be read it will be seen that P forms a practically complete record, giving only very brief accounts of the patriarchal history, but affording a full and detailed treatment to the religious institutions and the ceremonial law of Israel. When this record is considered as a whole it is found to contain many characteristic words and expressions which occur nowhere else in the Old Testament, while its general style has no affinity with any other Old Testament writings except Ezekiel. A general impression of the literary style of P may be gained at once by a detailed consideration of Gen 1-2^{4a}, a passage which contains many of this writer's characteristic words and expressions. On reading this account of Creation we notice a repetition of fixed phrases, e.g. *Let there be ... and there was—and God saw that it was good—And there was evening and there was morning—after its (their) kind—herb yielding seed and tree bearing fruit—Be fruitful and multiply.* We note also a circumstantiality and redundancy of expression, the same thing being repeated in almost the same words. Consider, e.g., $^{24-28}$: 'And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after its kind, *cattle and creeping thing*, and *beast of the earth after its kind*, and *the cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the ground after its kind*: and God saw that it was good. And God said, *Let us make man in our image*, after our likeness: and let them *have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle*, and over all the earth, and *over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth*. And God created *man in his own image; in the image of God created he him*; male and female created he them. And God blessed them and said unto them, 'Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and *have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that creepeth upon the earth*' (not 'moveth' as RV). With the passage quoted above cf. $^{2 1, 2}$, and note the repetition of *finished* and *his work which he had made*. On reading the other P passages in the Pentateuch we find the same distinctive style throughout, and several words and phrases which appear in this short account of Creation are frequently repeated elsewhere, e.g. *after their kind*, in Gen 6^{20}, 7^{14}. If the reader will look at these verses he will see at once that they are the work of the writer of Gen 1; cf. also Lev. 11$^{14-16, 19, 22, 29}$, etc. *To be fruitful and multiply*: cf. Gen 8^{17}, 9$^{1, 7}$, 17^{20}, 28^{3}, 35^{11}, 47^{27}, 48^{4}; Ex 1^{7}; Lev 26^{9}—*for food*: cf. Gen 6^{21}, 9^{3}; Ex 16^{15}; Lev 11^{39} (Heb.)—*These are the generations of*: cf. Gen 5^{1}, 6^{9}, 10^{1}, 11^{10}, and frequently. Some few other words and phrases characteristic of P are *this selfsame day* (Gen 7^{13}, 17$^{23, 26}$; Ex 12$^{17, 41, 51}$; Lev 23$^{14, 21, 28, 29, 30}$); *after their families* (Gen 8^{19}, 10$^{5, 20, 31}$, 36^{40}; Ex 6$^{17, 25}$; Nu 1, many times, also in 3, 4, and 26, etc.); *throughout your (their) generations* (Gen 17$^{7, 9, 12}$; Ex 12$^{14, 17, 42}$, 16$^{32, 33}$, and frequently); *congregation*, for the nation of Israel: Ex 12$^{3, 6, 19, 47}$, 16$^{1, 2, 9, 10, 22}$, and frequently in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; so *princes or rulers of the congregation*. In addition P uses certain words in a sense peculiar to himself which readers of the Hebrew readily recognize, e.g. the words for *tribe, half, judgements, kinsfolk, make a covenant*, etc. The above are only a few examples of the distinctive vocabulary of P. A more detailed list will be found in Chapman (206-227); but a better idea of the literary style of P can be gained by reading it for oneself rather than by consulting tabulated lists.

Apart from his distinctive style the writer of P exhibits also a distinct theological standpoint. His conception of God is strictly monotheistic and transcendental. In this document God is not portrayed as coming into direct contact with the world or mankind. Creation is accomplished by His Divine fiat—'Let

there be,' a conception very different from the anthropomorphic idea of God expressed in Gen 2 and 3. Moreover, we see in this document an attempt to trace a development in the Divine Revelation by the names of God. Up till Gen 17 P uses *Elohim*, but in the first verse of that chapter a new name is revealed, *El Shaddai*, RV 'God Almighty'; and not till the time of Moses is the name *Jehovah* revealed (Ex $6^{2,3}$). 'And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am *Jehovah*: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as *El Shaddai*, but by my name *Jehovah* I was not known to them.' This alone should make it clear that the many passages in Genesis from 2 onwards where the name Jehovah (obscured in RV by 'the *Lord*,' though the Hebrew is precisely the same as 'Jehovah' in Ex 6^{3}) is constantly used must belong to a different writer than the author of the statement that God was not known to the patriarchs by His Name Jehovah. Moreover, a comparison of Ex $6^{2,3}$ with 3^{13-15}, which contains another account of the revelation to Moses of the name Jehovah, shows the existence of a third document distinct both from P and from that of the writer who has used Jehovah consistently in the earlier narratives. Further evidence of the developed theological standpoint of P is to be found in the fact that his record nowhere represents the patriarchs as offering sacrifices. He gives no description of a sacrifice until he has described the construction of the Tabernacle and the institution of the priesthood properly qualified to offer it. The first sacrifice recorded in P is that offered by Aaron and his sons (Lev 8). In his view sacrifice could not be offered except by the priests and in the proper place according to the regulations of his code of law, which will be considered later in its relation to the other legal codes in the Pentateuch.

(5) **The Document J Compared with P.**—We come now to the document J which begins in Gen 2^{4b} with the second account of Creation. A few of the longer extracts from this source will be enough to enable the reader to appreciate how widely different is its literary style from that of P. To J may be assigned Gen 2^{4-25}, 3, 4, 18, 19, 24, 26^{1-33}, 27^{1-45}, 38, 39, 43, 44. Let us now compare the account of Creation in Gen 2^{4b-25} with that of P in 1. We notice at once a threefold difference—in style, in presentation of facts, and in theology. In place of the formal, circumstantial and redundant record of P we have a story instinct with living human interest. This writer illustrates the creation of mankind by showing us a man in a garden, and tells a simple story with an easy fluency in marked contrast to the precise, formal phrases and repetition of P. Cf., e.g., $1^{11,12}$ with 2^{9}—'And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil'; or $1^{24,26}$ with 2^{19}—'And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto the man to see what he would call them: and whatsoever the man called every living creature, that was the name thereof.' The facts are also presented differently. In P the world is at first a waste of waters and the dry land gradually appears. In J the earth is at first too dry for vegetation to grow on it, and is watered by a mist. Again, in P the narrative is designed to lead up to the creation of man last, and man and woman are created together. In J man is created first and is lonely, and afterwards God makes the woman, out of the man's rib. The theological standpoint of J is much more crude and primitive than that of P. J uses a different word for creating—'The Lord God *formed* man.' It is the word used of a potter moulding his clay. His conception of God is boldly anthropomorphic, as in all his narratives, e.g. God *breathes* into man's nostrils, *plants* the garden, *brings* the animals to the man, *fashions* the woman out of the man's rib, and in 3 He *walks* in the garden, etc. The two narratives of Creation, therefore, in Gen 1 and 2 furnish clear and striking evidence of composite authorship.

We may pass to another combination of P and J, where the two accounts are not preserved side by side, but are interwoven, namely the story of the Deluge in Gen $6\text{-}9^{17}$. When we read these chapters as a whole we notice clear evidence of two distinct literary styles with differences in representation of facts and in theological standpoint; and closer examination enables us to analyze them as follows: To P belong 6^{9-22}, $7^{6,11,13-16a}$ (to 'commanded him'), $17a,18-21,24$, $8^{1,2a}$ (to 'stopped'), $3b$ (from 'and after') ^{3,13a} (to 'off the earth'), $^{14-19}$, 9^{1-17}. In these passages from P, which form a practically complete story of the Deluge and the subsequent covenant with Noah, the reader will readily recognize abundant marks of this writer's style. The remainder of these chapters belongs to J,

except 7^{7-9}, which is an addition by the compiler, designed to harmonize the two accounts by correcting J's distinction (7^{2}), between the numbers of clean and unclean creatures in favour of P's estimate that all alike were taken into the ark in pairs ($6^{19,20}$, $7^{13,14}$). The difference in the time of the duration of the Flood in the two accounts should be noted. According to P it lasted one year and eleven days (7^{11}, 8^{14}); compare also the stages described in 7^{24}, 8^{3-5}. According to J it lasted for sixty-one days ($7^{12,17}$, 8^{6-12}). The crude anthropomorphism of J is again very marked in these chapters, e.g. 6^{1-8}, 8^{21}, whereas P maintains his high conception of a transcendent God, and gives no account of Noah's sacrifice.

(6) **The Document J as Compared with E.**—These two sources form, as we have said, parallel histories, and do not differ from one another by such clearly marked divergencies of style and standpoint as enable us to distinguish them both from P. They cover very largely the same ground, and preserve records of the personal lives of the patriarchs and of early tribal history; but as narratives from both sources describing the same events have been incorporated into the Pentateuch, and as these duplicate narratives exhibit differences of detail in their presentation of facts, we are enabled by comparing them carefully to separate the two accounts, as in the Joseph stories, and so to discover certain individual characteristics by which it is possible for the most part to determine which passages belong to each. Before Ex 3 the consistent use of *Elohim* for God in passages which are clearly not P is a fairly safe criterion for distinguishing E from J. The record of Ex 3, preserving a tradition of the revelation of the name Jehovah to Moses, apart from that of P in 6, shows the existence of a third document distinct both from P and from J. We may compare the two accounts of the patriarchal deception of Abimelech king of Gerar and the subsequent treaty which gave its name to Beersheba. In Gen 20 and 21^{22-23} there is a record, somewhat similar to Gen 12^{10-20}, describing Abraham's sojourn in the south of Palestine in the territory of a king of Gerar named Abimelech, who, being deceived by Abraham's story that Sarah is his sister, marries her himself, but is warned by God in a dream that she is Abraham's wife. Abraham, when reproved by Abimelech, confesses the deception but excuses himself on the ground of personal nervousness, and pleads, moreover, that Sarah is his half-sister, whereupon Abimelech behaves with great generosity to Abraham and Sarah. The narrative is interrupted at the end of 20 by a story of Hagar and Ishmael, and is resumed at 21^{22-32a} which tells of a treaty between Abraham and Abimelech and Phicol, 'the captain of his host,' which gave its name to Beersheba. Turning now to 26^{1-33} we find another account of a matrimonial deception practised on Abimelech king of Gerar, substantially the same as in 20, but with differences in detail. Here Isaac pretends that Rebekah is his sister till Abimelech discovers the truth for himself by observing their intimacy. Isaac, like Abraham in 20, pleads that he went in fear of his life through his wife's beauty, and subsequently makes a treaty with Abimelech and Phicol at Beersheba, the origin of the place-name again being noted. On comparing these two accounts we can have very little doubt that both record the same tradition. The variations in detail are no more than might be expected in different versions of a story handed down through many generations from the distant days of the patriarchs. As Dr. Sayce has pointed out: 'Doubtless, history repeats itself; disputes about the possession of wells in a desert land can frequently recur, and it is possible that two kings of the same name may have followed one another on the throne of Gerar. But what does not seem very possible is that each of these kings should have had a "chief captain of his host" called by the strange non-Semitic name of Phicol; that each of them should have taken the wife of the patriarch, believing her to be his sister; or that Beersheba should twice have received the same name from the oaths sworn over it' (*Early History of the Hebrews*, 64).

Assuming then that 20^{1-17} with 21^{22-32} and 26^{1-33} are separate accounts of the same event, can we find in these narratives any characteristics which will enable us to distinguish the two writers? There is no great difference in literary style, but we notice that 26 belongs to J. The name *Jehovah* is used throughout, and God is represented as appearing directly to Isaac. In 20 and 21^{22-32}, however, we find that, except in 20^{18}, which is an addition by the compiler, the writer uses *Elohim* (God), and that his conception of God is less anthropomorphic than that of J. In 20 God appears to Abimelech not directly but in a dream (^{3}), and this method of Divine communication is emphasized in ^{6}. We may then assign this record to the writer who states in Ex 3

that the revelation of the name Jehovah was made to Moses, i.e. E.

Further clear evidence of the existence of a cognate source combined with J is furnished by the Joseph stories (Gen 37 and 39-45). Careful examination of these chapters reveals contradictions and inconsistencies which are only explicable on the assumption that two separate narratives have been used by the compiler. Take, e.g., the record in 37 of Joseph's treatment by his brothers. After [21] there are clearly two versions of the story. In one version *Judah* seeks to save Joseph's life by the suggestion of selling him to a caravan of *Ishmaelites* who happen to be passing, and this is done, the sequel being found in 39 [1], where an Egyptian buys Joseph from the Ishmaelites for a household slave. In the other version *Reuben* tries to save Joseph by proposing to put him into a pit, intending to rescue him afterwards. Joseph is consequently consigned to the pit, but Reuben's beneficent intentions are frustrated by *Midianite* merchants, who, passing by while the brothers are at their meal, or more likely indulging in a siesta after it, draw Joseph out of the pit and, unknown to his brothers, carry him away with them into Egypt where they sell him to an Egyptian officer called Potiphar. When Reuben goes to rescue Joseph he finds the pit empty and cannot explain Joseph's disappearance. We may now attempt an analysis of 37 on the basis of variations in statements of fact. [1, 2a] are clearly P. [25-4, 12-18, 21, 25b] (after 'to eat bread')-[27-28b] (after 'out of the pit,' 'pieces of silver'), [31-35] may be assigned to J, the Judæan narrative. In [21] 'Reuben' seems to be certainly a copyist's error for 'Judah' (*v.n.*). The remaining verses will then belong to E, and E's narrative is resumed at 40 [1] and continued down to 42 [37], except for 42 [27, 28] (J). The analysis in the early part of 37 can only be tentative, but that given above is based on the coherence of the verses assigned to J, and on the prominence of dreams, a characteristic of E, in the verses assigned to that document. After [18] the analysis is practically certain, and the facts as recorded in the two versions will perhaps become clearer if we set them out separately from [18] onwards. J's story is then seen to run as follows:

'. . . And they saw him afar off, and before he came near unto them, they conspired against him to slay him. And [Judah] heard it, and delivered him out of their hand; and said, Let us not take his life. And they lifted up their eyes and looked, and, behold, a travelling company of Ishmaelites came from Gilead, with their camels bearing spicery and balm and myrrh, going to carry it down to Egypt. And Judah said unto his brethren, What profit is it if we slay our brother and conceal his blood? Come, and let us sell him to the Ishmaelites, and let not our hand be upon him; for he is our brother, our flesh. And his brethren hearkened unto him, and sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites for twenty pieces of silver. And they took Joseph's coat,' etc.

E's story, from [19], is:

'. . . And they said one to another, Behold, this dreamer cometh. Come now therefore, and let us slay him, and cast him into one of the pits, and we will say, An evil beast hath devoured him: and we shall see what will became of his dreams. And Reuben said unto them, Shed no blood; cast him into this pit that is in the wilderness, but lay no hand upon him: that he might deliver him out of their hand, to restore him to his father. And it came to pass, when Joseph was come unto his brethren, that they stript Joseph of his coat, the coat of many colours that was on him; and they took him, and cast him into the pit: and the pit was empty, there was no water in it. And they sat down to eat bread. And there passed by Midianites, merchantmen; and they drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit, and they brought Joseph into Egypt. And Reuben returned unto the pit; and, behold, Joseph was not in the pit; and he rent his clothes. And he returned unto his brethren, and said, The child is not; and I, whither shall I go? And the Midianites sold him into Egypt unto Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, the captain of the guard.'

In the sequel, which tells of Joseph's life in Egypt, the same variations are observable. According to J (39) Joseph is bought from the Ishmaelites by a private Egyptian, for the statement in 39 [1]—'Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, the captain of the guard'—copied from E, (37 [36]), is a harmonistic addition by the compiler. This Egyptian takes Joseph into his household and makes him his head slave, a position which Joseph holds till the fury of a woman scorned consigns him to prison on an unjust charge. According to E the Midianites sell Joseph to Potiphar, an Egyptian officer (37 [36]), whose duties included the governorship of the prison (40 [4]). The compiler has put together the story of Joseph's career in Egypt by incorporating long extracts from J and E alternately, occasionally inserting

a short passage from one into the other. These stories also exhibit variations in matters of fact, which will be dealt with in the Commentary. It will be sufficient here to append an analysis so that the reader may be able to separate the two records and note the variations for himself. In 39-48 the passages which come from J are 39, 42[27, 28, 38], 43, 44, 46[28-47[4, 12-27a] (to 'land of Goshen'), [29-31]. To E belong 40-42[26, 29-37], 45-46[5], 48[1-2, 8-22].

Closer examination of the E passages now reveals some characteristics of this writer. Apart from his use of *Elohim*, his higher theological standpoint and tendency to dwell on dreams and visions already noticed, we find that he uses uncommon words and grammatical forms, which are not apparent, however, in an English version, though noticeable enough in the Hebrew. Again, E calls the natives of Palestine *Amorites*, whereas J prefers *Canaanites*. In E the Hebrew sacred mountain is called *Horeb*, in J *Sinai*. E prefers to speak of *Jacob*, J of *Israel*, as the father of the twelve tribes. The interest of the writer of E centres in the northern kingdom of Israel. He gives special prominence to the Ephraimite sanctuaries, Bethel and Shechem, and provides a more detailed account of Joseph, the ancestor of the powerful tribe of Ephraim. In his Joseph stories he tends to exalt the character of Reuben, the father of a northern tribe. From these indications it is inferred that E represents the traditions of Israel's early history as they were handed down and written up in the northern kingdom. J, on the other hand, seems to emanate from the kingdom of Judah. This writer is specially interested in Hebron, the Judæan sanctuary, and he makes Judah the leader in the Joseph stories. The unpleasant narrative of Gen 38 would have special significance for Judah as explaining the origin of some of the clans related to that tribe. In the same way J explains the origin of other southern races which lived on the borders of Judæa—the sons of Keturah, Ishmael, Esau (Edom).

Enough will now have been said to enable the reader to inform himself of the presence of distinct documentary sources in the Pentateuch, and to apply the methods of critical analysis as a means of solving the problems raised by variations in detail in descriptions of the same events. For example, the difficulties in the story of the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Nu 16-18) will be found to disappear when the narrative is analyzed into its component parts. The P passages in these chapters have been already indicated; the rest are JE, and the reader can work out an analysis with the aid of the Commentary, as also in the composite story of the spies (Nu 13, 14) and of Balaam (Nu 22-24).

(7) **The Relative Dates of the Sources Determined by Comparing their Legal Codes with One Another and with the History of Israel.**—It remains now to investigate the relation of these sources to one another and to arrange them in chronological order, and this may be done by comparing the legal codes which they contain, first with one another and then with the stages in religious development observable in the history of Israel. Criticism will thus help us to gain a clearer view of the progress of Divine Revelation than is possible from the traditional theory of Mosaic authorship. In comparing the legal codes contained in the documents JE, D, and P, it is well to start with Deuteronomy.

The Book of Deuteronomy contains a legal code (12-26), preceded by an historical retrospect and followed by some concluding exhortations (27-31), two poems (32, 33), and a brief account of the death of Moses (34). In 4 the writer says that an earlier Covenant legislation was given at Horeb, which Moses was bidden to supplement by further statutes and judgements (4[13, 14], 5[30, 31]), while in 29[1] the Deuteronomic law is regarded as supplementing the earlier Covenant. 'These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb.' It is thus clear that the writer of Dt 29, while ascribing the origin of the legal code to Moses, regarded it as supplementary to the earlier Covenant legislation of JE contained in Ex 20-23 and 34. It is also obvious that D was considered by the writer to be the final Mosaic legislation, given in the plain of Moab by Moses just before his death. This at once raises the problem of accounting for the Levitical or priestly law contained in Ex 25-31, 35-40; Lev, Nu 1-10, 15, 18, 19, 27-36, which, according to the arrangement of the Pentateuch and to the traditional belief in Mosaic authorship, was given before D, and yet reveals a much more highly developed system of law and religion, which the writer of D entirely ignores, for the legislation which D is intended to supplement is that of JE, and there is no room for the priestly code

between them. It then becomes necessary to investigate the relation of these three codes to one another by literary and historical criticism. We will therefore examine them first by themselves and then in relation to the history of Israel.

The Covenant legislation to which D refers is contained now in the short groups of laws in Ex 20[22]-23[19] and in 34. In Ex 34 we find the earliest of Israel's written laws—namely, the primitive decalogue embodied in [14-28]. These early brief enactments, which are all religious, have clearly been amplified by the Judæan writer, but we may try tentatively to recover the original ten commandments. That these verses are intended to comprise a decalogue is shown by the statement with which the passage ends ([28]): 'And he wrote upon the tablets the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.' This original decalogue then probably ran as follows:

(1) Thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God ([14]).
(2) Thou shalt make thee no molten gods ([17]).
(3) The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep ([18]).
(4) All that openeth the womb is mine; and all thy cattle that is male, the firstlings of ox and sheep ([19]).
(5) Six days thou shalt work, but on seventh day thou shalt rest: in plowing time and in harvest thou shalt rest ([21]).
(6) Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, even of the firstfruits of wheat harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end ([22]).
(7) Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread ([25a]).
(8) The sacrifice of the feast of the passover shall not be left unto morning ([25b]).
(9) The first of the firstfruits of thy ground thou shalt bring unto the house of the Lord thy God ([26a]).
(10) Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk ([26b]).

Turning now to E's report of the Covenant law (Ex 20[22]-23[19]) we find that other religious as well as social laws have been added, but the whole of this early decalogue is included (cf. 20[23], 23 [12-19]). We thus find a duplicate version of an original decalogue. The ten commandments of Ex 20[1-17], repeated with slight alterations in Dt 5[6-21], are apparently a later addition; but that is not a matter for discussion here—see the Commentary *ad loc.*

Now when we compare D with JE on the one hand and with P on the other we find that whereas it clearly reflects both the historical narratives and the legal enactments of JE, it shows no knowledge whatever of P. The review of past history in Dt 1-11 naturally covers much of the same ground as the records of JE and P in Exodus and Numbers, and we find that D frequently incorporates extracts verbatim from these books, but always from JE and never from P. This is specially noticeable in 1[19-46], the reminder of Israel's behaviour at the report of the spies. This is based on Nu 13, 14, where JE and P are interwoven. Yet D uniformly follows the JE narrative, and never once quotes from P. This should be verified by the reader. Again, in the mention of the rebellion against Moses, Dt 11[6] speaks only of Dathan and Abiram, though in Nu 16 Korah is joined with them, but Korah belongs to the P account, Dathan and Abiram to JE. This indicates with sufficient clearness that the narrative of P was not in existence when D was written. The same is true in reference to the legal codes. The enactments of the Covenant legislation are frequently repeated and expanded or modified in D, but the law of P is ignored entirely. We find, e.g., the injunction 'Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk' (Ex 23[19], 34[26]), incorporated verbatim in the food rules in Dt 14[21]. The law of slavery (Ex 21[2-6]) is quoted in Dt 15[12-18], but is developed in an humanitarian direction. In both legislations the Hebrew slave is to be freed at the end of six years, but D adds: 'Thou shalt not let him go empty: thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy threshing-floor, and out of thy winepress: as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee thou shalt give unto him. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt.' The Covenant law, which allows the master to retain the wife of the slave, if married during his servitude, and the children, is abrogated in D. There is also a significant omission in D. While it records from Exodus the ceremony of boring the slave's ear to a doorpost if he voluntarily remains, it omits the injunction 'then his master shall bring him unto God,' because D allows only one central sanctuary. The slavery law of D is thus clearly a development of JE. Then turning to P we find that the priestly code expressly forbids the possession of Hebrew slaves at all; only foreigners may be enslaved (Lev 25[39-45]), a law which could only have come into existence at a stage

of development later than D. So one might go on pointing out the presence of the Covenant laws in D, but further illustrations are unnecessary, and we may pass to the important Deuteronomic law of the central sanctuary. In Ex 20[24] the existence of many local altars is clearly implied. 'An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen: in every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee.' But Dt 12 rigidly limits the offering of sacrifice to the central sanctuary ([1-11]). Only animals for food may be slaughtered at home ([20, 21]). In P, however, the law of the one sanctuary is never mentioned. It is everywhere taken for granted as having been in existence from the beginning, an assumption which shows that when P was codified the Deuteronomic law was generally observed and had become a matter of course. Further evidence of the later date of P is furnished by the development of the priesthood. In D all members of the tribe of Levi are priests (18[1-5]), and D makes provision for the dispossessed priests of the country sanctuaries abolished at the reformation, which legalized only the one sanctuary at Jerusalem, for Dt 18[6-8] enjoins that these priests may, if they wish, exercise their ministry in Jerusalem, and shall be accorded equal status and emoluments with the Jerusalem priests. 2 K 23[9] gives the result. 'Nevertheless the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, but they did eat unleavened bread among their brethren.' Then in Ezek 44[9-15] we see that a distinction is drawn between these country priests, now called Levites only, and the Zadokite priesthood at Jerusalem. The dispossessed priests of the local sanctuaries are relegated to a lower position. They are not allowed 'to execute the office of a priest,' but are given various menial duties to perform in the Temple and the ritual. 'But the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from me, they shall come near to me to minister unto me; and they shall stand before me to offer unto me the fat and the blood, saith the Lord God: they shall enter into my sanctuary, and they shall come near to my table, to minister unto me, and they shall keep my charge' (Ezek 44[15, 16]). Ezekiel is the first to draw a distinction between non-priestly and priestly Levites, a distinction unknown in D or in any pre-exilic writings, but developed in P into the three orders of High Priest, Aaronic priests and Levites, a threefold order which is everywhere assumed after the time of Ezra. A full and detailed comparison of the three legislations, into which we need not go further here, will be found in Chapman (*op. cit.*, 110-172), who adduces abundant evidence to prove that their order is undoubtedly JE, D, and P.

A further comparison of these three codes with the course of Israel's history indicates the stages in national and religious development to which D and P belong. In the early history until the time of the prophets Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah we find that the only legislation observed is that of the Covenant in JE. The law of D itself clearly shows that until its promulgation sacrifice was offered at many local sanctuaries, and the history proves that worship and sacrifice at local altars was a normal feature of Israel's religion until the reformation of Josiah in 621 B.C. In view of the constant references to this form of worship without a hint of its illegality, save in the Deuteronomic revision of the history, one need only mention the lament of Elijah over the destruction of the local altars by Jezebel's heathen priests (1 K 19[14]) to prove that this great religious leader was unaware of any such legislation as D. But the corruption of the worship of Jehovah at the local sanctuaries by the introduction of degrading practices borrowed from the cult of Baal and Ashtart led the prophets Amos and Hosea to denounce it strongly. Amos (2[7, 8]) and Hosea (4) very clearly point out the demoralizing influence of the popular worship on the national character; while Isaiah in the reign of Hezekiah did actually carry out some measure of reform (2 K 18[3, 4]); but the reforming movement was checked by the death of Hezekiah, and under his evil successor, Manasseh, religion sank to its lowest level. The teaching of the prophets, however, was not allowed entirely to lapse into oblivion, and it seems likely that during Manasseh's reign a new moral and religious code was drawn up and placed securely in the Temple ready for promulgation when occasion should offer, based on the Covenant legislation, but conceived in the spirit of the great prophets Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. It was this code which guided the reformation of Josiah, and which may safely be identified with the legal portion of Deuteronomy, namely, 12-26.

Further, the conception of the priestly

office in the history shows that D's restriction of the priesthood to members of the tribe of Levi was unknown before the reformation of Josiah, though a tendency in that direction is observable. Sacrifice was constantly offered by other than Levites, e.g. by Gideon in the Judges period, by Samuel, an Ephraimite, by David and by Solomon. The story of Micah in Jg 17 shows that although a Levite was preferred as a priest, yet it was not held illegal for Micah's sons to fill the priestly office. The offering of sacrifice did not require a priest. The priests' special function in the days of the early monarchy seems rather to have been the giving of oracles in answer to those who came 'to enquire of the Lord.' Both Saul and David employed priests for this purpose (1 S 14[18], 23[6-12], 30[7, 8]). One other criterion which bears upon the date of the promulgation of D is to be found in the development of the ideas of God in Israel. D teaches Monotheism, a conception unknown in the days of Jephthah, David or Elisha. In Jg 11[24] we find Jephthah in his argument with the leaders of Moab stating quite freely his belief in national deities. For him the existence of Chemosh, the god of Moab, is as real as that of Jehovah, the God of Israel. David, when driven out of Israel's territory, complains that he has been forced to 'go and serve other gods' (1 S 26[19]); while Naaman's request that he may take back to Syria some of the soil of Israel on which to worship Israel's God (2 K 5[17-19]) is granted by Elisha who seems, so far as we can judge, to acquiesce in his conception of national deities. Monotheism does not appear to have been fully apprehended in Israel till it was taught by Amos. We see, then, that history provides converging lines of evidence which point to the reformation of Josiah as the date of the promulgation of D.

Further examination of the history shows just as plainly that the priestly code was not put forth till after the Exile, not, in fact, till it was promulgated by Ezra who brought it with him from Babylon. The next great leader after the Deuteronomic reformation was Jeremiah; and his prophecies reflect throughout both the language and thought of D—'this covenant' (cf. 11[1-5]). Jeremiah's attitude toward the law of slavery shows that he recognized the Deuteronomic legislation, but that P was not yet in force. In 34[8-22] he severely reproves those who, having first obeyed Zedekiah's ruling for the release of Hebrew slaves, afterwards broke their engagement and took back their slaves. His reproof is based on Dt 15, though Lev 25[39-45] would have been much more to his purpose had it existed at the time. The same Deuteronomic law of slavery is presupposed in Neh 5[1-8]. The fact that Nehemiah here uses only moral persuasion to induce the rich usurers in Jerusalem to free their Hebrew slaves is plain proof that the law of P forbidding the enslavement of Hebrews was not yet in force, for Nehemiah was not the man to argue when he had the law behind him. That Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem and subsequent reformation came after Nehemiah is now generally agreed. But apart from this, the prophet Ezekiel provides convincing proof that the priestly legislation was not promulgated till after the Exile. Ezekiel was the prophet of the early days of the Exile, and he drew up a legislative programme (40-48) for the reconstitution of a future Jewish state. This programme presupposes D and foreshadows P, while it proves that P was not yet codified, otherwise there would have been no need and no room for Ezekiel's programme. We have already drawn attention to Ezekiel's separation of the Levites into the Zadokite priesthood and the non-priestly Levites, an advance on D, which is carried a stage further by P into the threefold ministry. A further illustration of the stages in development between D, Ezekiel, and P is found in their attitude toward the monarchy. D assumes the rule of a Jewish king; Ezek 45[9-17] contemplates the rule of a *prince* subject to priestly authority. P has no room for a king or prince, but makes the High Priest the head of the state. Consequently after Ezra we find the Jewish state under the rule of the High Priests till the successful resistance of the house of Hasmon to the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes led to the revival of the monarchy in the short-lived Hasmonæan dynasty.

Now, passing on to the early post-exilic prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, we find still no knowledge of P as a code of law. Both Haggai and Zechariah contemplate the rule of a prince, and Zechariah reflects Ezekiel's teaching of the joint rule of priest and prince, 3[6-9] and 6[13]—'He shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and there shall be a priest beside his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.' (RV in this passage is misleading.) Malachi, who has much to say of the priesthood, does not recognize even

the distinction made by Ezekiel, still less the threefold order of P, but regards all Levites as priests (2^4, 3^3). The evidence is thus clear that the priestly legislation was not promulgated till Ezra came from Babylon, 'to teach in Israel statutes and judgements,' bringing 'the book of the law of Moses,' which he read to the people (Neh 8), with the result that the Feast of Tabernacles (Booths) was forthwith celebrated according to the regulations of P.

It will now have become evident that each of the legislations, JE, D, and P, belong to important stages in the religious and national development of Israel. On the basis of the law given by Moses the faithful nucleus of the Exodus tribes were able to build up a code which helped to keep alive in Israel the true Covenant teaching, emphasizing the high standard of moral righteousness required by God from His people. When the Covenant religion was in danger of becoming merged in the pagan licentiousness of the materialistic nature-cults through worship at the local sanctuaries, the prophets were inspired to bring about a reformation based on the centralization of worship at the Temple in Jerusalem; and when the captivity made necessary a further legislation for the reorganization of the Jewish state after the return of the exiles, the priestly code aimed at the high ideal of reconstituting the Jewish nation as a Church, 'the congregation of Israel,' whose government should be a Theocracy with Jehovah Himself as their King, and with the whole of national life ordered in accordance with the Divine Law, in which the highest duty of man is conceived to be obedience to the Will of God as taught by His faithful priests. Criticism thus helps us to understand the progress of Divine Revelation by making clear the successive stages by which God led His people onwards and upwards to that higher knowledge finally revealed when 'in the fulness of time' He sent forth His Son, to whose coming all the law and the prophets had pointed.

It has not been possible to give more than an outline sketch of this very important subject. We have been compelled to omit any discussion of the bearing of recent archæological research on the critical hypothesis or of the attempts of Dahse to discredit the methods employed in separating the documents, but these points are adequately treated by D. C. Simpson (*op. cit.*); and no discussion has been attempted here of the late date theory of D advocated attractively by Dr. Kennett, or the arguments in favour of an earlier date than 621 put forward by Dr. Welch. For these, see Commentary. Our aim has been to enable the average reader, if he will be at the trouble to turn up references, to understand the need of literary and historical criticism of the Pentateuch, to follow the lines along which criticism proceeds, to practise the methods by which it is applied, and to appreciate the constructive religious value of the conclusions which it reaches. Those who wish to pursue the study further will find, apart from the standard works of Robertson Smith (*Old Testament in the Jewish Church*) and Driver (*Literature of the Old Testament*), a full and useful presentation of the evidence in A. T. Chapman's *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, and a popular though less detailed discussion in D. C. Simpson's *Pentateuchal Criticism*.

GENESIS

By L. E. P. Erith.

The Book of Genesis forms an introduction to the historical books of the Bible, Genesis–2 Kings; the Books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah being a separate and, in part, parallel history. The English title Genesis comes from the Vulgate through the LXX and refers to the creation of the world. The Hebrew title is simply the opening words of the Book, 'In the beginning.' Genesis is the Book of beginnings; the compiler is concerned to explain the origin of mankind in general and of Israel in particular, and the greater part of the Book is occupied with the lives of the patriarchal ancestors of the Hebrew tribes, ending with the death of Joseph. It is thus a more complete unit than any other of the historical books, and is designed upon a careful plan in which the writer has made use of Babylonian myth and cosmogony and early Hebrew folklore, legend and tradition, but has used them as vehicles to convey moral and religious truth. His object is to trace the beginning of the working out of God's 'eternal purpose,' which He realized 'in

Christ Jesus our Lord' (Eph 3 [11]), to explain the meaning of the creation of mankind and the choice of one people whose ancestors were guided by God to found a nation which might become the Divine instrument for the salvation of mankind, as expressed in the repeated promise to Abraham, 'In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.'

(1) **Composition and Contents.**—An explanation of the 'documentary hypothesis' with a description of the sources J, E and P used by the compiler of Genesis has been given in the *Introduction to the Criticism of the Pentateuch*, to which the reader should refer, especially sections 4, 5 and 6, where the characteristics of the separate documents are illustrated in some detail. Here we need only point out the method followed by the compiler of this Book in his use of older records. The document P, giving merely a bare skeleton outline of the patriarchal history, provided a framework into which the author has fitted extracts from the two earlier parallel records J and E, which preserve early tribal traditions of the lives of the patriarchs as they were handed down in the kingdoms of Judah and Israel respectively. The greater part of Genesis consists therefore of the narratives of J and E, while the patriarchal history is articulated according to the chronological scheme of P.

Although the writer has thus combined three separate and distinct sources, he has, nevertheless, written his history with a definite unity of design, his object being gradually to concentrate his readers' interest upon the ancestors of Israel. Consequently, after describing the creation of man and the distribution of various races of mankind in the world, he passes to the call of Abraham and his entry into Palestine, and from this point traces the origin of Israel, as distinct from related races, in the stories of four generations of patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. 'The attention of the reader is fixed upon Israel, which is gradually disengaged from the nations and tribes related to it: at each stage in the history, a brief general account of the collateral branches having been given, they are dismissed, and the narrative is limited more and more to the immediate line of Israel's ancestors.' (Driver, *Genesis*, ii).

The Book falls naturally into four main divisions of practically equal length, and each of them, except the last, concludes with a genealogy of related peoples, viz.:

(1) The Story of Mankind, 1-11 [26], ending with the genealogy of the Semites, sons of Shem, the parent stock of Israel (11 [10-26]).

(2) The Story of Abraham, 11 [27]-25 [18], ending with the generations of Ishmael, i.e. Bedouin tribes akin to Israel (25 [12-18]).

(3) The Stories of Isaac and Jacob, principally of Jacob (25 [19]-36), ending with the generations of Esau, 'the same is Edom,' a closely related people (36).

(4) The Story of Joseph (37-50).

The writer has thus confined his record to the lives of the individual ancestors of the tribes of Israel, and so concludes with the death of Joseph in Egypt, a point where the narrative may conveniently be resumed in the form of tribal and national history, as it is, in the Book of Exodus.

(2) **Historical Value.**—From the point of view of history Genesis may be divided into two sections:

(*a*) 1-11 [26], which deal with primitive mankind, the prehistoric period.

(*b*) 11 [27]-50, which record the beginning of the history of Israel in the lives of its patriarchal ancestors, the historic period.

The records of the prehistoric period are based very largely on Babylonian tradition. They express the current Hebrew ideas on the creation of man and human origins; the facts of human nature, its limitations, habits and institutions; and the distribution of mankind on the earth. Here, approaching the study of the Old Testament on the right lines, we should not expect, and we do not find, in the sphere of geology and ethnology, accuracy of facts as established by modern scientific research. As will be shown in the next section, the Old Testament is not a treatise on physical science or a textbook on the history of mankind. It is a record of Divine Revelation in which we expect to find, and we do find, *religious* truth. All attempts to harmonize these earlier chapters of Genesis with the scientific knowledge of to-day start from a false premiss, depend upon a forced and artificial interpretation, and satisfy no serious enquirer. 'We are forced therefore to the conclusion that, though, as may be safely assumed, the writers to whom we owe the first eleven chapters of Genesis, report faithfully what was currently believed among the Hebrews respecting the early history of mankind, at the same time making their narratives the vehicle of many moral and spiritual lessons, yet there was much that they did not know, and could not take cognizance of: these chapters, consequently, we are

obliged to conclude, incomparable as they are in other respects, contain no account of the *real* beginnings either of the earth itself, or of man and human civilization upon it' (Driver, xlii). We know, e.g., that the beginnings of the world and of mankind reach back to a remote antiquity immeasurably earlier than that indicated in the carefully dated records of Genesis (see on 5, 7^{11}, 11^{10-26}), that the order of creation described in Gen 1 is not in accordance with geological fact, that different languages are due to diversities of race and are the result, not the cause, of the distribution of mankind on the earth as stated in Gen 11^{1-9}. These points, together with the cosmogony of these early chapters and the traditions which they embody, may conveniently be considered in fuller detail in the notes on the text. The reader who feels any difficulty about the discrepancy between Genesis and science should refer to Driver's Commentary, where the whole question is discussed fully.

Passing to (*b*), which comprises the main part of the Book, we have the story of the patriarchs; and with the introduction of Abraham we touch real history and are able to compare the narratives of Genesis with Babylonian and Egyptian records. For a general review of the points of contact between the patriarchal stories and external records, see *History of Israel* (1). The identification of 'Amraphel king of Shinar,' i.e. Babylon (14^{1}), with Hammurabi, the sixth king of the first Babylonian dynasty, who reigned *c.* 2123-2081 B.C., gives us an approximate date for Abraham's migration from Babylon and sojourn in Canaan; and, moreover, the personal names, Abraham and Abram, are found in Babylonian records of the first dynasty. Thutmosi III, the great Egyptian conqueror of Palestine, has left an inscription on the temple walls of Karnak telling of his subjection of Jacob-el among other conquered peoples (*c.* 1479 B.C.). The name read as Joseph-el in Thutmosi's list is too doubtful to be cited as evidence. Mineptah (*c.* 1222) records a defeat of 'Israel' in Palestine. We have thus external evidence for three of the patriarchal names; and apart from this there is also, as is shown on pp. 175 ff. evidence of the movements of bodies of Semites during the period covered by the patriarchal traditions in Genesis. Semite settlers had migrated from Canaan to Babylon and founded the first Babylonian dynasty there; others, the Hyksos, had successfully invaded Egypt; while the Tell-el-Amarna tablets describe a further movement of Habiru (=Hebrews) into Canaan *c.* 1411-1358 B.C., and this, as we shall see, is probably reflected in the story of Jacob's return with his 'sons' from Paddan-Aram. Extra-Biblical records thus give us certain fixed dates, and the light they throw on the stories of Genesis enables us to see that while the Hebrew traditions have telescoped the history of centuries into the lives of four generations of patriarchs they have, nevertheless, preserved a substantially correct sequence of events. The occurrence of the names of Abraham in Babylonian, and of Jacob and Israel in Egyptian, records, shows that there is no reason to doubt the existence of the patriarchs as historic personages; but there are clear indications, latent also in the text of Genesis, as is pointed out below, that tribal history is often personified and pictured as the movements of individual patriarchs, as in 13, 19^{30-38}, 25^{19-34}.

We must admit therefore that the records of Genesis are to a large extent legendary in character, which is only natural, since they go back to remote antiquity and were handed down orally through many generations before they were written; but the testimony of external sources shows that the Hebrew legends, like all others, rest on an ultimate basis of fact. The Higher Criticism also testifies to the foundation of history upon which the patriarchal narratives have been built up; for we have in J and E (see *Pentateuch*, 6) two parallel documents recording the same traditions, differing in detail, but in substantial agreement on the main course of events. As these two documents preserve traditions handed down and written independently, one in the southern, the other in the northern, kingdom, their agreement in general outline furnishes trustworthy evidence of the basis of historical truth upon which the traditions rest, though transmitted in the form of legend. Moreover, the legendary character of the patriarchal stories has preserved for us something more than the bare, though historically more accurate, records of Babylon and Egypt can give, for 'while legend is not history, it has in some respects a value greater than history. For it reveals the soul of a people, its instinctive selection of the types of character which represent its moral aspirations, its conception of its own place and mission in the world' (Skinner, *Genesis*, iv). As authorities for the scientific reconstruction of ancient Eastern history these stories of Genesis

cannot claim to rank with Babylonian and Egyptian records, which are documents contemporary with the events they narrate, whereas the Hebrew traditions, written centuries later than the times of the patriarchs, acquired, as we have seen, a legendary form in the long course of oral transmission. Moreover, they were written with a definitely didactic purpose, and were designed to record the early development of a people conscious of its unique religious position. 'It is obvious that the central idea of the patriarchal tradition is the conviction in the mind of Israel that as a nation it originated in a great religious movement, that the Divine call which summoned Abraham from his home and kindred, and made him a stranger and sojourner on the earth, imported a new era in God's dealings with mankind and gave Israel its mission in the world' (Skinner, xxvi). Consequently the writers of these stories narrate the origin and ancestry of Israel from a religious and moral rather than from a secular standpoint, and although, as we have seen, they preserve a generally trustworthy outline of Israel's early development, their principal value for us lies in the fact that they enable us to trace the growing religious consciousness of a people who knew that far back in the distant past God had chosen their ancestors to found a nation through whom He would reveal Himself to the world.

(3) **Religious Value.**—It is a common fallacy, which has caused much needless difficulty and fruitless discussion, to suppose that the religious value of Genesis depends upon its scientific and historical accuracy. This confusion of thought is due to a mistaken theory of inspiration which maintains that every word of Scripture, every statement contained in the Bible, is divinely inspired and is therefore to be accepted as literal truth. Such a theory is, as Driver has shown, 'one for which there is no foundation either in the Bible itself or in the formularies of our Church,' and is one which can only be maintained either by obstinately ignoring the established facts of science and history or by imposing a forced and artificial interpretation upon the narratives of Genesis to try to reconcile them with scientific facts by extracting from them a meaning which they do not contain. Such a method of exegesis defeats the purpose it is intended to serve, for no amount of special pleading will satisfy the serious enquirer who finds the stories of Genesis at variance with the knowledge obtained by modern scientific research; and to try to force the plain meaning of Scripture to fit a preconceived theory of inspiration is simply to perpetuate the mistaken idea of a conflict between religion and science. If, instead of trying to manipulate the words of Scripture to fit an arbitrary theory to which the Bible itself gives no support, we examine the Scriptures carefully and deduce a theory from the evidence they themselves furnish, we find that their religious value is independent of scientific or historical accuracy. The writers are inspired to reveal the religious truth necessary for man's eternal salvation. Scientific and historical accuracy is not necessary for salvation, and does not call for a Divine revelation, since it is within the scope of ordinary human knowledge. Man, in the course of his natural intellectual development, gradually acquires for himself an increasing knowledge of the truths of science and history, and it would be unreasonable to expect the writers of Genesis to be in advance of their age in the sphere of scientific knowledge. The essential inspiration of the Book of Genesis is in no way impaired by the fact that the writer has used the beliefs of his time on the origin of the world and mankind as the medium by which to convey the religious truth which he was inspired to teach. He did not always correct the Babylonian cosmogony from which current Hebrew ideas of natural origins were derived, but he did correct the crude, non-moral, polytheistic myths of the Babylonian Creation Epic for the men of his time in a statement of the Divine purpose in Creation which is true for all time.

The various aspects of religious truth revealed in Genesis will be pointed out in the notes. Here it must be sufficient to say that the writers were inspired to teach the truth of the Divine purpose in Creation, and to show how from the beginning God has guided and led man to a gradually increasing knowledge of Himself. The Book opens with the sublime truth of the omnipotence of God by whose will the world and all creatures have come into being and exist, who has made man in His own image, capable of choosing between right and wrong, and under a moral obligation to obey the Divine law. It shows us that sin consists in conscious disobedience to God's commands, that God, the Almighty, requires obedience and punishes sin, but also shows mercy and rewards righteousness. The documentary analysis helps us to understand the progressive character of Divine Revelation. The later,

more developed theology of P shows us a transcendent, holy God; while the earlier records of J and E give us a simple and graphic picture of God's love and care for man, and illustrate the Divine guidance of human life by homely stories of a God who deigns to reveal His Will to men by coming down and talking with them.

I.-II. 4*a*. *The Record of Creation by P.*—This description of Creation by the priestly writer differs in literary style, in presentation of facts and in theological standpoint from the story in 2^{4b-25}, in which the Jehovist tells of the origin of the world and of man. For the clearly marked characteristics of P in this narrative see *Pentateuch* (4). P's story of Creation, written approximately four centuries later than J's, and almost certainly during the Exile, is that of a theologian who wrote very carefully to correct popular mistaken ideas learned in Babylon; and this explains both the similarities and the differences between the Hebrew and Babylonian theories of Creation. The relation between the two accounts may be readily seen by comparing the narrative of P with the Babylonian Creation Epic.

P's account is very carefully articulated to show that the universe came into being in six successive stages in definite order by the supreme will of one Almighty God, expressed in the Divine fiat **Let there be.** First (1^{1-5}), out of a chaos of darkness and waters light was created. The second stage (1^{6-8}), was the division of the waters by the creation of a **firmament,** i.e. the sky, which the Hebrews, like the Babylonians, regarded as a solid vault confining the upper waters (cf. Job 37^{18}—'the sky which is strong as a molten mirror'). It was thought that the rain was supplied from these upper waters when 'the windows of heaven were opened' (7^{11}: cf. Ps 104^{13}), and that above them Jehovah sat enthroned (Ps 104^{3}; Am 9^{6}). The third stage (1^{9-13}) was the creation of the earth by the gathering together of the lower waters **unto one place,** so that the dry land appeared. The waters were now confined within certain limits around and below the earth (cf. Ps 104^{6-9}, which is not a description of the Deluge, but of the primeval chaos of waters and their dispersion). The Hebrews shared the primitive idea that the earth was flat and circular, surrounded by seas on which the solid firmament of the heavens rested, supported by pillars (cf. Job 26^{11}; Am 9^{6}); while the springs and rivers were supplied by the waters which came up from under the earth. When the earth appeared vegetable life was created upon it. The fourth stage (1^{14-19}) marks a further order by the creation of luminaries for the division of time, day and night, seasons and years. In Hebrew, as in Babylonian thought, the sun was considered to move across the solid arch of the firmament (cf. Ps 19^{4-6}). At the fifth stage (1^{20-23}) animal life was created in the waters and the air. The sixth stage (1^{24-31}) describes the creation of animal life on the earth leading up to the making of man **in the image of God.** P's account ends (2^{1-4a}) with a very solemn statement of the sanctity of the Sabbath (see below), as the day on which God **rested from all his work which he had made.** The anthropomorphism,* remarkable in P, is due to the writer's desire to emphasize the sacred duty of Sabbath observance by representing the Sabbath as an integral part of Creation. To gain a fuller view of Hebrew cosmogony the reader should refer now to Ps 104; Job 26, 38, 39, and carefully compare these and kindred passages with P's account here.

Turning now to the Babylonian Creation Epic we find a story closely similar in its cosmological ideas, but bearing no comparison to the Hebrew narrative in religious outlook. This Epic is contained in a series of clay tablets discovered in the ruins of Asshurbanipal's library at Nineveh in 1873, which contained copies of several older documents; and the Creation Epic is regarded by Dr. Sayce as dating from the 22nd or 23rd century B.C. The tablets are not complete, but are sufficient to give a clear view of Babylonian cosmogony. They describe the creation of an ordered universe as the outcome of the victory of Marduk, the supreme god of Babylon, over Tiamat, the deity of chaos and darkness. The following extracts are quoted from Driver, 28:

'When above the heaven was not yet named,
And the land beneath yet bare no name,
And the primeval Apsu (the abyss) their begetter,
And chaos, Tiamat, the mother of them both—
Their waters were mingled together,
And no field was formed, no marsh was to be seen;
When of the gods still none had been produced,
No name had yet been named, no destiny yet fixed;
Then were created the gods in the midst of heaven.'

* Contrast Jn 5^{17}. The ideas of activity and repose upon the achievement of activity represent successive stages in human experience. The like successiveness is attributed to God in ordinary human thought about Him. But deeper thinking suggests the simultaneity of divine states.—ED.

Then follows a description of the various gods and their war with Tiamat under Marduk their champion. Tiamat, conceived as an enormous monster, is vanquished by Marduk, who divides her body, setting up one half to form a firmament restraining the waters above it.

'He cleft her like a flat fish into two parts,
The one half of her he set up, and made a covering for the heaven,
Set a bar before it, stationed a guard,
Commanded them not to let its waters issue forth.

. . . . . .

'He made the stations for the great gods,
As stars resembling them he fixed the signs of the zodiac,
He ordained the year, defined divisions,
Twelve months with stars, three each, he appointed.

. . . . . .

'He caused the moon-god to shine forth, entrusted to him the night;
Appointed him as a night body to determine the days.'

The tablets so far discovered do not contain an account of the creation of plant life, but it may be safely inferred that this was recorded in the missing parts from the fact that in the concluding hymn, addressed to Marduk, he is styled 'bestower of planting' and 'creator of grains and plants, who caused the green herb to spring up.'

A comparison of these two accounts shows at once how closely the writer of P has followed the cosmogony of Babylon on its material side. The outline of the course of Creation is practically the same in both accounts. There is the same primeval chaos of waters and darkness, designated in Hebrew *tehom*, an etymological equivalent of the Babylonian Tiamat. In both the creation of light is the first act, though in the Babylonian account light is personified in the coming of Marduk, the god of light. Then follows the division of waters by the creation of a firmament; while the formation of the dry land and the appearance of plant life were probably described in the parts now missing of the fifth tablet. Then we find the creation of the luminaries for the division of time, and finally the creation of man. There can thus be little doubt that the writer of P based his account on cosmological ideas current in Babylon; and in their close material resemblances both accounts are at variance with the conclusions established by modern scientific research. For example, we notice at once that light is created and day divided from night ($^{3-5}$), before the creation of the luminaries ($^{14-18}$); and, moreover, plant life appears before the sun ($^{11, 12}$), a manifest impossibility. The general conception of the world—flat earth surmounted by the solid vault of heaven—is obviously unscientific. While Genesis represents the world as being created in six days, geology shows its immense antiquity, and the slow and gradual development of the various forms of life. That the six days allotted to the successive stages of Creation are meant to be regarded as ordinary days in a week seems to be indicated by the writer's clear reference to the sanctity of the weekly Sabbath as the seventh day, which God hallowed by His rest. If, however, it be contended that 'day' in this chapter means 'geological period,' then the difficulty arises that the order in which life on the earth, and the heavenly bodies, are said to have been created does not agree with the facts either of geology or astronomy. This attempt to harmonize Genesis with science by a forced interpretation of **day** as 'period' is thoroughly examined by Driver (19-26), who points out that whereas in Genesis plant life appears two 'periods' before animal life, 'geology shows that they appear simultaneously—even if animal life does not appear first.' Similarly the creation of the sun, moon and stars after the earth cannot be brought into harmony with astronomy. 'The formation of the heavenly bodies after the earth is inconsistent with the entire conception of the solar system as revealed by science.'

Thus both the Babylonian and the Hebrew outlines of Creation are alike unscientific, but in theological conception we see that the two accounts differ fundamentally, for here the writer of Genesis is inspired to reveal religious truth. To reveal scientific truth, which human intelligence is capable of discovering for itself, is no part of Divine inspiration. It was not necessary to alter the physical outline of Babylonian cosmogony, since it could well serve to convey the revelation necessary to correct Babylonian theology. Consequently, we find in the story of P no trace of polytheism, of the crude, heathen ideas of a conflict of deities; and when we consider the religious form into which P has cast the Babylonian legend we realize that his purpose is to teach a pure, transcendent monotheism. There can be no conflict, since God is supreme, existing externally, who has called all things into being by the power of His Will, including the heavenly bodies, sun, moon and stars, which were long regarded as being themselves deities, but are now shown to be God's creatures equally with the earth and the seas. As Ryle has said so well, 'The saints and prophets of Israel stripped

the old legend of its pagan deformities. Its shape and outline survived, but its spirit was changed' (*Early Narratives of Genesis*, 12).

We may now briefly summarize the main religious ideas expressed in this very important passage. It shows that a Divine purpose lies behind the complex order of Creation. The supreme Will of the one only God dominates and guides the whole range of nature and of life which He made in the beginning **very good.** The world did not come into existence by itself, or by blind chance. The course of Creation was so ordered as to lead up to the making of man **in the image of God.** A deep religious truth underlies the distinction that whereas the various forms of plant and animal life were created **after their kind,** man is made in the Divine likeness. There is a relationship between God and man which no other creature shares.

1. 2. **waste and void**—Hebrew *tohu wabohu*. This expression occurs also in Is 34 [11] and Jer 4 [23], which seems to show that the writer is using a fixed and familiar term to denote primeval chaos. That is to say, that in this chapter he is setting out to re-interpret long-established ideas. **The spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.** On the analogy of the Hebrew conception of the 'spirit' of man as the active principle of life we must interpret the Spirit of God here as the Divine energizing power which is the source of all life. **Moved** should be translated as in RVm, **was brooding upon.** The word occurs elsewhere only in Dt 32 [11], where it is used of an eagle 'hovering' over its young. The metaphor is possibly taken from the ancient belief that the ordered creation emerged from a world egg, a belief which the Hebrew writer 'has transformed into a beautiful and suggestive figure' (Driver).

26. This very important verse makes a distinction between the rest of creation and man, and explains the difference between man and the animals. Man is not made 'after his kind,' but **in the image of God.** The likeness to God indicates man's higher, as distinct from his animal, nature. Man is distinguished by the gifts of reason and conscience; he is to be governed by reason, not by instinct, and is conscious of moral standards, able to understand God's law and to recognize the duty of obedience. The writer thus reveals the spiritual potentiality of man, which was fully realized in the Incarnation. The plural pronouns—**let us . . . our image . . . our likeness**—present a difficulty. It is most unlikely that they reflect any trace of primitive polytheism in view of the consistently lofty monotheistic conception which pervades the whole narrative. It is possible that the writer thought of God as taking counsel with the heavenly host (cf. 1 K 22 [19-22]; Is 6 [8]); but it is probable that the plural of majesty is used here, which would be quite in accord with the solemn deliberation which precedes the creation of man.

II. 1-3. *The Sabbath.*—In these verses describing God's cessation from work on the seventh day the writer departs from the Babylonian Epic in order to give a Divine sanction for the observance of the Sabbath; and for this purpose he has represented the various works of Creation as occupying six days. The Hebrew verb translated **rested** is *shabath*. In origin the Sabbath goes back probably to the early moon cultus of the Semites in Babylon. For a long time the Hebrew fixed holy days were 'new moons and Sabbaths' (cf. 2 K 4 [23]; Am 8 [5]); the Sabbath being fixed by the moon's changes every seventh day, 11 [27-32] *v.n.* With the teaching of monotheism and the fuller revelation given through the prophets it became necessary to provide a religious reason for Sabbath observance in accordance with the higher knowledge of God. For two such reasons cf. Ex 20 [11] with 23 [12] and Dt 5 [15]. In the exilic period during which P's narrative was written observance of the Sabbath was rigidly enforced, as we see by the severe penalty ordered in the priestly code for its infringement (Ex 31 [14]; Nu 15 [32-36]; and cf. Jer 17 [19-27]; Ezek 20; Neh 13 [15-22]).

4*b*-25. *J's Narrative of Creation.*—Here the Divine name **Jehovah** first appears, obscured in RV by the rendering LORD. For the literary and theological characteristics of this passage as distinct from P's Creation record, see p. 29*a*. It will be sufficient here to point out that while P gives a theoretical and impersonal record, J tells an arresting human story. His interest centres in humanity. The animal and plant creation are very briefly mentioned, and only in their relation to man. Nothing is said of an original chaos of waters, but the creation of earth and heaven is assumed, and the earth is described as too dry for fertility, watered only by a mist, water being afterwards supplied by rivers. Man is formed before plants and animals. This writer, whose narrative is approximately 400 years earlier than P's, shows, as we might

expect, a cruder theology, characterized by striking anthropomorphisms, e.g. God forms man out of dust, plants a garden, brings the animals to the man, fashions a woman out of the man's rib, walks in the garden, etc. All this is in striking contrast to the lofty transcendental conception of P.

This story, though akin to legends current in Babylon, is by no means so closely related to any external source as the record of P. It shows affinity with, but not dependence upon, the legends of other peoples. One of the very early Babylonian legends of Creation tells of the formation of man before plants and animals, and is regarded by Sayce as the 'earliest starting-point yet known to us of that form of the story of Creation which we find in Gen 2.' The idea of Eden is common to more than one primitive race, e.g. stories are found in India and Persia telling of supernatural gifts, especially immortality, conferred by the fruit of sacred trees. The Hebrew story, however, is unique in its moral teaching: see note at end of 3. Speculation as to the site of Eden is futile, as may be seen by the discussion in the standard Commentaries of Driver and Skinner of the many localities suggested. All that can be said is that the narrative contains reminiscences of the country between the Euphrates and Tigris, and any fertile spot in Mesopotamia may have furnished the basis of the story of the garden.

4*b*. J's narrative begins in the middle of the verse. There should be a full-stop after **created** to mark the end of P's record, and no full-stop at the end of the verse, since the sentence is continued in 5. Translate: *In the day that Jehovah God made earth and heaven, no plant of the field was yet in the earth*, etc. Here, as elsewhere, LORD = Jehovah, which shows that this passage cannot be the work of the writer who states in Ex 6 3 that God was not known to the patriarchs by His Name Jehovah.

8. **in Eden**—here clearly a geographical district is intended; the garden is planted **in the east**, i.e., from the point of view of a writer in Palestine, Babylonia, the home of the earliest civilization known to the Hebrews, from which the various races of mankind were supposed to have been dispersed: see p. 48*a*. In this passage, therefore, Eden is probably to be explained by the Sumerian *edinu* = 'plain' or 'prairie,' denoting a fertile district between the Euphrates and Tigris. In Hebrew *eden* = 'luxury' or 'delight,' and the more usual term 'garden of Eden' would thus come in Hebrew thought to mean 'garden of delight,' from a natural association of ideas between the garden and the blessedness of man's original innocence. LXX renders 'garden' by *paradeisos*, a Persian word = 'park,' and from LXX the term 'Paradise,' to describe the state of the blessed, has passed into Christian theology.

9. On the significance of these two trees in relation to Babylonian ideas see note at end of 3.

10-14 would seem to refer to the system of canals by which Babylon was irrigated. Of these rivers **Pishon** and **Gihon** are unknown. **Hiddekel** is the Tigris. **Havilah,** mentioned again (10 7, 29, 25 18), is probably a district of Arabia. **Bdellium** is a medicinal gum produced in Arabia, obviously well known to the Hebrews, since the word is used in Nu 11 7 to describe the appearance of manna. **Onyx stone**—the meaning of the Hebrew *shoham*, which clearly indicates a gem of high value (cf. Job 28 16), is doubtful. Ex 28 9, 12 shows that these stones could be engraven; onyx is merely a guess.

16-17 are of great religious importance. The Divine command reveals a moral consciousness that man is not free to follow his natural impulses. The first injunction laid on man imposes restraint.

23. English, in **woman,** aptly reproduces here the assonance of the Hebrew *ish* and *isshah*. The Vulgate attempt to do so results in the rendering *haec vocabitur virago*!

25. A deep moral truth underlies the simple Hebrew statement. Innocence knows no shame, which comes from consciousness of sin, and shame led to man's conviction of disobedience and to the Divine punishment.

III. *The Fall of Man* (*J*).—This chapter is undoubtedly based upon Babylonian attempts to account for human mortality. The writer discusses the origin of death and uses the Babylonian legend as a vehicle by which to convey religious truth on the subject of temptation, sin and punishment. In the Babylonian story we read of a wonderful tree in 'the fields of the blessed,' a parallel to the garden of Eden, whose fruit conferred the gift of immortality; but before man could eat of this fruit it was devoured by the serpent, which thus gained the boon of immortality intended for man. For the wide-spread primitive belief in the immortality of the serpent, due to the periodic shedding of its skin, see Fraser (*Folklore in the O.T.*, i, 49 ff.). In the Babylonian story the tree of life alone is mentioned; for the significance of the

introduction of the tree of knowledge into the Hebrew narrative, see below, and cf. Oesterley (*Immortality and the Unseen World*, 193-197).

1-5. The serpent was regarded by all primitive peoples with superstitious dread as possessing supernatural powers, a regard which may be readily understood from its distinctive habits, its deadly nature and its power of fascination. 'The serpent had moreover in antiquity the reputation of wisdom (Mt 10^{16}), especially in a bad sense: it was insidious, malevolent, subtil.' And so it appears here as the representative of the power of *temptation*; it puts forth with great artfulness suggestions which, when embraced and carried into action, give rise to sinful desires and sinful acts. The serpent is not, however, in the narrative identified with the Evil One. The Old Testament does not mention the being whom we call Satan till the period of the exile; and even then he is not the "tempter" of the New Testament: it was only later, when it had become usual to connect the power of evil with a person, that those who looked back upon this narrative saw in the serpent the Evil One' (Driver, 44). It seems clear, however, that there is in the writer's mind some conception of a power of evil definitely opposed to God, and the ideas connected with the serpent would naturally lead him to choose it as a fitting representative of an active power of evil seducing man from his allegiance to God.

7-8 express graphically the voice of conscience. Loss of innocence by disobedience brings a sense of shame (see 2^{25}), and of guilt—they must hide from the Presence of Jehovah whose command they have transgressed. In $^{9-32}$ the writer explains from a religious standpoint the origins of conscience, i.e. the voice of God speaking in man's soul, which convicts him of sin; of the peculiar gait of the serpent, used to symbolize the truth that the curse of God falls upon all evil, and that evil must be beaten down to the ground; of the enmity between the serpent and man, which pictures the moral conflict between good and evil in which man's spiritual nature is potentially the victor; of the pain of childbirth and the burden of work, used to illustrate the suffering and the trouble due to sin; of bodily death, which is the result of the corruption of human nature by evil.*

* It is worth noticing that the Fathers recognized that man was created mortal. But they held that, if he had remained in supernatural fellowship with God, he might have been raised above his natural destiny.—Ed.

24. The **Cherubim**, which appear here for the first time as guardians of Eden, are possibly a reminiscence of Babylonian mythology: cf. Ezekiel's description (1^{5-28}, 9^{3}, 10^{1-20}, 11^{22}), as the living creatures which bear Jehovah on His throne. The same idea is present in the symbolic figures of Cherubim on the Ark ($2\ S\ 6^{2}$ = $1\ Ch\ 13^{6}$; Ex 25^{18-22}, 37^{7-9}; Nu 7^{89}), whose outstretched wings form a throne for the glory of Jehovah from which His voice is heard. In Ps 18^{11} = $2\ S\ 22^{11}$ the Cherubim are pictured as the storm-wind or thunder-cloud upon which Jehovah rode. They were clearly regarded in Hebrew thought as beings attendant on Jehovah, and are probably a personification of the storm-cloud and the lightning under figures borrowed from Babylonian art.

The religious importance of J's narrative of Eden and the Fall will be readily recognized when compared with the Babylonian attempt to account for human mortality outlined above. In the Babylonian story, which is entirely non-moral, there is only one tree, the tree of life, and man's failure to obtain the boon of immortality is regarded simply as a misfortune due to the greater agility of the serpent in securing the fruit for itself. The introduction of a second tree, the tree of knowledge, into the Hebrew narrative, is intended to convey the religious and moral truth of human free-will, that man is free to choose between right and wrong, good and evil, that through yielding to temptation to disobey the law of God man fell from his state of original innocence and received the punishment of death—'the wages of sin is death.' The story is the story of mankind pictured as one man and his wife in a garden, showing that man possesses a moral nature, a spiritual understanding. 'It is the awakening conscience of the human race, the awakening sense of right and wrong, the operation of which is thus right out brought before us' (Driver, 56). There is the further religious truth that 'sin is lawlessness' (1 Jn 3^{4}), and, as such, involves punishment. The best commentary on the Divine sentence passed on Adam's disobedience is contained in St. Paul's words (Gal 6^{7}). But the story contains also the hope that man may recover from the Fall.

15 is usually termed the *protevangelium*, and rightly so, for it looks forward to the fulness of the 'good news' that the Incarnation brought, when the Son of Man broke the power of evil (cf. Rom 8^{3}).

IV. *The Beginnings of Human History and Civilization* (*J*).—This chapter deals with the origins of pastoral and agricultural life (1-2); of sacrificial offerings (3-5); of the strife between the pastoral nomads and the settled agriculturists (6-10); of the nomad life of the Kenites and their immunity from the law of blood-revenge (10-15); of city, and nomad pastoral life (16-20); of music and metal-work (21-22); of the blood-feud (23-24), and of ordered worship (26).

1-15. The story of Cain and Abel has been held to serve the double purpose of indicating the result of inherited tendency to sin in the loosing of unrestrained passions,* and of assigning an origin to the constant strife and conflict between the two types of early peoples in Western Asia, the pastoral nomad tribes and the settled tillers of the soil. The name **Cain**, Hebrew *qayin* = 'lance' or 'spear,' is suggestive. It is the same name as Kenites, descendants of Cain, a wandering tribe connected with Israel, of which one branch were smiths (cf. Tubal-Cain, 22), and into which Moses married (Ex 2 16-22; Jg 1 16). In 1 S 15 6 we find the Kenites exempted from the vengeance taken by Saul upon Amalek. It is possible that the protection of Cain reflects the feeling of mysterious awe which in primitive times surrounded the craft of the smith—smiths are still a distinct caste in Arabia. As the secret of working in iron was jealously guarded, and as smiths were few and necessary for the community, they would be protected from the operation of the law of blood-revenge.

It seems clear that the story of the rejection of Cain's offering is intended to show that God will only accept sacrifice made with clean hands and a pure heart. It was Cain's evil character which made his offering unpleasing to God, a character of envy and hatred, which expressed itself in the murder of his brother.

7 in RV is meaningless, but in the Hebrew it assigns a reason for the rejection of Cain's sacrifice. '**If thou doest well**, i.e. hast a right and sincere purpose, it will show itself in thy countenance, "shall there not be lifting up?" viz. of thy countenance, it will not be downcast and sullen, but bright and open: **and if thou doest not well**, hast sinister, envious thoughts, **sin** is then near at hand, couching like some wild animal **at the door, and unto thee is its desire**, it is eager to spring upon and overpower thee: **but thou shouldest rule over it**, conquer the rising temptation before it is too strong for thee, and subdue it . . . it teaches a profound psychological truth, the danger, viz. of harbouring a sullen and unreasoning discontent: it is a temper which is only too likely to lead to fatal consequences, and which, therefore, as soon as it begins to show itself, should at all costs be checked' (Driver, 65).

16-24 describe the progress of mankind in the line of Cain, and the beginnings of civilization. The line of Cain's descendants here should be compared with P's genealogy in 5, where Enoch, Methuselah (=Methushael) and Lamech are described as descendants of Seth. These two parallel genealogies show that the names are mere reminiscences of the heroes of a far distant past to whom J has ascribed the origins of various arts.

16. The **land of Nod** means land of 'wandering' in reference to nomadic life.

17. The question of Cain's wife should raise no difficulty when we understand the method of the writer. He clearly assumes that the earth is peopled, otherwise there would be no point in Cain's fear of being slain, and no need to protect him. For the sake of graphic narration the history of mankind is illustrated by the development of one family.

23-24, as RV indicates, are in verse, and are probably quoted from an ancient song of victory in a blood-feud.

25-26 are a fragment of J's genealogy of the family of Seth, introduced to show that in this family the beginnings of formal worship took shape.

For a detailed discussion of the many points of interest raised by this chapter reference should be made to the Commentaries of Driver and Skinner.

V. *P's Genealogy of the Line of Seth.*—This is inserted by the compiler to cover the period from Adam to the Flood. P's style will at once be recognized, e.g. by comparing 1-3 with the language of 1. According to P's formal system of chronology ten generations, or 1,656 years, intervened between Creation and the Flood. The abnormal longevity attributed to these early ancestors of Israel finds parallels in the literature of other primitive peoples. 'It need hardly be said that longevity, such as is here described, is physiologically incompatible with the structure of the human body' (Driver). Possibly the explanation lies in the fact that as the names of only a few ancestors survived from the past the writer's desire to preserve a connected narrative has led him unduly to lengthen their days so as to cover long periods of time.

* It seems to us doubtful whether the conception of inherited sinfulness is to be found here.—Ed.

The Enoch story (5[21-24]) is probably to be explained from the close Babylonian parallel in the legend of Enmeduranki, the seventh of the antediluvian Babylonian kings, as Enoch is said to be the seventh from Adam. Enmeduranki was called up by the sun-god, who taught him supernatural secrets. Enoch, whose age of 365 years is much less than that of any other of the early patriarchs, seems clearly to be associated with the number of days in the solar year. In the Hebrew account, however, it is clearly inferred that Enoch's translation was due to his righteousness. Later Jewish theology taught that Enoch learned Divine secrets from his intercourse with God—hence the apocalyptic 'Book of Enoch,' and the statement in Ecclus 44[16] that he was 'an example of knowledge to all generations.'

VI.-IX. 17. *The Flood Narratives.*—Here the compiler has combined the two sources J and E into one complete narrative. After a general introduction from J (6[1-8]) he has used P as his framework into which he has fitted extracts from J. The J passages are 6[1-8], 7[1-5, 7, 10, 12, 17, 22, 23], 8[3] (to 'continually'), [6-12, 13] (from 'and Noah removed') ([20-22]). The rest is P, except for 7[8-9], which is an addition by the compiler intended to harmonize the two accounts. If the whole narrative is read carefully the duplications due to the combination of sources will be clearly seen. There are two main differences between P and J. In P all the animals are taken into the ark in pairs, and no distinction is made between clean and unclean. In J Noah is bidden to take seven pairs of clean animals and only one pair of unclean. The editorial note in 7[8-9] is evidently meant to correct this in favour of P's estimate. In P the flood lasts 1 year and 11 days (7[11] and 8[14]), whereas J's estimate is 61 days, comparing 7[12] with 8[8-12], where three periods of seven days seem clearly indicated. The literary and theological characteristics of the two sources become strikingly evident upon examination: see *Pentateuch* (5).

That this story of a universal deluge covering the whole earth so as to submerge the highest mountains cannot be historical hardly needs demonstration. To collect pairs of animals from all quarters of the globe into one place would be a manifest impossibility, even could an ark have been built capable of containing them. The Hebrew story seems to belong to a general tradition of deluges of which accounts survive in many countries, e.g. Greece, Australia, Polynesia, Thibet, India and America, and is closely parallel to the Babylonian Flood narrative as told in the epic of Gilgamesh. There we read of the visit of Gilgamesh to his ancestor Ut-napishtim across 'the waters of death' to enquire how he had obtained from Bel the boon of immortality. Ut-napishtim tells of his escape at the time of the great flood; and his description of the flood, as the following passages quoted from Driver will show, is clearly the source from which the Hebrew story is derived. The epic of Gilgamesh is as follows:

'O man of Shurippak, son of Ubaratutu:
Frame a house, build a ship;
Forsake thy possessions, seek to save life;
Abandon thy goods, and cause thy soul to live:
Bring up into the midst of the ship the seed of life of every sort.

. . . . . .

'With all that I possessed I laded it:
With all the silver that I possessed I laded it;
With all the gold that I possessed I laded it;
With the seed of life of every kind that I possessed I laded it.
I took on board all my family and my servants;
Cattle of the field, beasts of the field, craftsmen also, all of them did I take on board.

. . . . . .

'Six days and nights
Raged wind, deluge and storm upon the earth.
When the seventh day arrived the storm and deluge ceased,
Which had fought like a host of men;
The sea was calm, hurricane and deluge ceased.
I beheld the land and cried aloud:
For the whole of mankind were turned to clay;
Hedged fields had become marshes.
I opened a window, and the light fell upon my face.

. . . . . .

'When the seventh day arrived,
I brought forth a *dove*, and let it go:
The dove went to and fro;
As there was no resting-place it turned back.
I brought forth a swallow and let it go:
The swallow went to and fro;
As there was no resting-place it turned back.
I brought forth a raven and let it go:
The raven went, and saw the decrease of the waters;
It ate, it waded, it croaked (?), it turned not back.
Then I sent forth (everything) towards the four winds (of heaven):
I offered sacrifice:
I prepared an offering on the summit of the mountain.
I set Adagur-vases, seven by seven,
Underneath them I cast down reeds, cedar-wood and incense.
The gods smelt the savour,
The gods smelt the goodly savour;
The gods gathered like flies over the sacrificer.'

The very close resemblance between these two accounts leaves no room for doubt that the Hebrew story depends upon the Babylonian; but here, as in the Creation narratives, the Hebrew writers have made the non-moral and mythological legends of Babylon the basis of religious and moral teaching. The Hebrew

story ' marks an epoch in the early history of mankind. A judicial motive is assigned for it: it becomes a judgement upon corrupt and degenerate mankind. It thus exemplifies a great principle by which God deals with both nations and individuals (cf. Mt 24 [37-39]) ' (Driver, 107).

The ultimate origin of the legend is probably to be found in some disastrous flood in Babylon caused by an overflow of the Euphrates in which the city of Shuripak was destroyed, and from which only a few managed to escape by means of a ship. This disaster became magnified in the long course of oral transmission into a universal deluge in which all mankind, except one family, perished. The legend thus formed a valuable medium through which to convey the religious truth of Divine punishment on a degenerate people which the Hebrew writers wished to inculcate.

VI. **1-4** are remarkable as preserving the only piece of unrevised mythology in the Old Testament: an isolated fragment of great antiquity which the compiler considered suitable for an introduction to the Flood story, as explaining the general wickedness of mankind, though it belonged originally to a legend which told of a prehistoric race of giants.*

2. sons of God should be rendered here *sons of gods*, LXX 'angels.' Elsewhere, e.g. Job 1 [6]; Ps 29 [1]; the expression means semi-divine beings. This verse explains St. Paul's injunction (1 Cor 11 [10]), that women must worship with heads covered ' because of the angels.'

3 cannot be translated literally so as to give any certain meaning, as RV shows. The text has probably been mutilated past restoration; but it seems intended to convey Jehovah's decree that the offspring of these unions shall not become immortal, but that their years shall be numbered. The idea is well expressed in Moffatt's free rendering—' Human creatures are but flesh; my spirit is not to be immortal in them; they shall not live more than a hundred and twenty years.'

4. Nephilim, of which the etymology is unknown, are mentioned again in Nu 13 [33], which suggests an origin for an abnormally tall race of men in Canaan in Joshua's time (cf. 2 P 2 [4]; Jude [6]).

5-7 (J) should be carefully compared with [9-13] (P). This duplicate description of universal evil is instructive as illustrating the difference between the two writers, e.g. [6], the Divine *repentance* finds no counterpart in the more developed theology of P. Notice also that J's distinction (7 [2]) between clean and unclean animals is avoided by P, since this distinction was a product of the Levitical legislation, and P never mentions Levitical institutions till the time of Moses, to whom he attributes their origin.

VII. **11.** Noah's age, added to the years of the antediluvian patriarchs, gives 1,656 years as the length of time from the Creation to the Flood.

VIII. **4. Ararat** is in N.E. Armenia, and was probably the highest mountain within Hebrew knowledge at the time when this story was written.

20-22. Noah's sacrifice (J) is suppressed by P, who gives no account of sacrifice till proper provision has been made for it, and a priesthood appointed to offer it (Lev 8). This is closely parallel to the description of the sacrifice offered by Ut-napishtim in the Babylonian legend—' The gods smelt the goodly savour ': see above.

IX. **1-17** contain P's narrative of God's blessing of Noah, and the Divine covenant with the promise to all mankind. The blessing ([1-3]) recalls 1 [22, 26-28], but adds two important limitations ([3-6]). The blood of slain animals is not to be eaten as food, for the blood is the ' soul ' (*nephesh*), i.e. the vital principle which was regarded as sacred, and was to be offered only to God (cf. 1 S 14 [32-34]; Ac 15 [20]). Further ([5-6]), the shedding of human blood is strictly forbidden, and death is decreed as the punishment for murder. The covenant ([8-17]), of which the rainbow is made the symbol, is parallel to the Divine promise in J (8 [21-22]), and is made unconditionally, an expression of the everlasting mercy of God.

18-X. 32. *The Descendants of Noah.*—In this section the compiler has interwoven extracts from J and P to show how the earth was repeopled after the Flood by the families of Noah's three sons (10 [32]). The J passages are 9 [18-27], 10 [8-19, 21, 24-30]. The rest is P. J's story of Noah as a vine-grower proceeds on similar lines to 4, in which he has explained the origin of various institutions and inventions. Here J attributes to Noah the beginning of the cultivation of the vine and its result. Consequently we have the curse on Canaan, the offspring of Ham, and the blessing of Shem and Japheth. This curse and blessing, as RV indicates, is in verse, preserving an old tradition. Canaan is cursed though Ham was the offender, because at the time of writing the corrupt

* Lenormant found a spiritual motive for its presence here in that it stamped as purely evil and the source of evil the whole idea of intercourse between semi-divine beings and women.—ED.

influence of the Canaanites and their nature-cults on the life and religion of Israel was recognized in the circles among which this history was written.

In 10 the compiler attempts to show how the various nations came into being after the Flood by ascribing their origin to the families of the three sons of Noah. To the descendants of Shem, known generically as Semites (properly 'Shemites'), belong the *Hebrews* (21)—**all the children of Eber** (cf. 11 14-16). '*Eber*,' of which the first letter is a strongly aspirated guttural, is the name from which 'Hebrews' is derived, and means 'the other side,' thus denoting those who came from 'the other side' of the Euphrates, i.e. from Haran, whence Abraham passed down into Canaan. The compiler is thus giving a general sketch of all nations before passing on to the direct ancestry of Israel in the family of Abraham. **Mizraim** (6) is the Hebrew name for Egypt. **Shinar** (10) is one of the Hebrew names for Babylon. **Aram** (22-23) is elsewhere in EVV rendered Syria, and the Aramæans are called Syrians, though the Hebrew is always *Aram* and *Arammi*.

XI. 1-9. *The Tower of Babel.*—J's explanation of the origin of different languages, which he regards as the cause of the dispersion of mankind from Babylon, Hebrew *Babel*, which, by a popular but incorrect etymology, is here derived from the Hebrew *balal* = 'to confound' (9). Properly, *Bab-il* is Babylonian = 'gate of God.' According to the Biblical chronology the date of the Flood was 2501 B.C., and clearly this legend is a continuation of J's account of the rise of the various nations from the descendants of Noah; whereas inscriptions exist, written in three distinct languages, at a very much earlier date. Moreover, we know that differences of language are the result, not the cause, of the diversity of races. It would be natural, however, for the Hebrews to regard Babylon, the great cosmopolitan city of the ancient world, as the centre from which the different races of mankind were originally dispersed; while the lofty temple towers of Babylon, which were said to reach to heaven, would naturally give rise to the legend. 'The narrative thus contains simply the answer which Hebrew folk-lore gave to the question which differences of language directly suggested' (Driver). At the same time it is intended to convey a religious lesson, showing the Divine purpose in the division of mankind into different races, and the Divine power in checking undue presumption.

10-26. The compiler here bridges over a further period by incorporating P's genealogy of the descendants of Shem, which is now limited to the direct ancestry of Abraham in nine generations. According to P's chronology the length of time from the Flood to the birth of Abraham was 290 years.

27-32. *The Migration of Terah and his Family from Ur in Babylon to Haran.*—If the identification of Amraphel in 14^1 with Hammurabi, the sixth king of the first Babylonian dynasty, is correct, then we may assign a religious motive to this migration (see p. 175*a*). Previous to Hammurabi's reign, as the names of his two predecessors show, Abil-Sin and Sin-muballit, the worship of Sin, the moon-god, was the official religion of Babylon. Hammurabi, however, established the worship of Shamash, the sun-god; and this apparently drove the adherents of the old religion to make a pilgrimage from Ur, the southern centre of the worship of Sin, to Haran, the northern sanctuary of the moon-god: see map. Moreover, there is evidence to show that in Babylon Yahu, = Hebrew Yahweh (Jehovah), was equated with Sin. Further, the two forms of the name Abram and Abraham are found in Babylon, and seem to have originated in the attributes of Sin, meaning 'loving (or merciful) father' or 'the father is loving.' Also, the name *Sarratu* (= Sarah) was the title of the goddess consort of Sin, and *Malkatu* (= Milcah) was a title of the goddess Istar. When we add to this the name of Israel's sacred mountain, Sinai, it would seem clear that the earliest form of Hebrew religion and worship of Jehovah was connected with the moon cult. The call of Abraham and his further migration into Canaan then marks another stage in Hebrew religious development. See further, Burney (*Judges*, 243-253). The remainder of this body of pilgrims, who stayed in Haran, became the nation known as the Aramæans or Syrians, closely akin to Israel, whose territory, gradually extending southwards, brought the two nations into almost constant conflict during the period of the Israelite monarchy.

XII. and XIII. *The Call of Abraham and his Migrations.*—The narrative is mainly J. P appears only in 12^{4b-5}, 13^6. The call of Abraham may be regarded as the starting-point of Israel's unique religious position as the people chosen by God to communicate to mankind the knowledge of salvation (12^3). Hitherto, as Jos 24^2 records, the Hebrews had 'served other gods'; and though the

migration from Ur to Haran was, as we have seen, probably inspired by religious motives, the religion was that of the moon-god. When Abraham left his home and his kindred in Haran he did so as an act of faith in the true God, who, as he realized, was guiding him to a new land to found a nation through whom God would reveal Himself to all men. 'The ethical and spiritual idea of God which is at the foundation of the religion of Israel could only enter the world through a personal organ of Divine revelation; and nothing forbids us to see in Abraham the first of that long series of prophets through whom God has communicated to mankind a saving knowledge of Himself. The keynote of Abraham's piety is *faith* in the unseen. . . . He moves before us on the page of Scripture as the man through whom faith, the living principle of true religion, first became a force in human affairs.' (Skinner, 27). 12 describes the migrations of the two families of Abraham and Lot, and 13 tells of their amicable separation. Lot leaves Canaan to Abraham and becomes subsequently (19 30-38) the ancestor of the nations Moab and Ammon. It is clear that, although we need not doubt the existence of both patriarchs, tribal movements underlie the personal history of the two leaders.

XII. 2-3 contains the first of the Divine promises made to Abraham. The reader will find it instructive to refer to and compare all the promises made to the patriarchs in Genesis, viz. in J and E (12 7, 13 14-17, 15 5, 18-21, 18 18, 22 15-18, 25 23, 26 2-5, 27 27-29, 28 13-15, 46 3-4, 49 10); in P, 17 2, 6-8, 28 3-4, 35 11-12. Here, the first promise made to Abraham points forward to the Catholic Church. The meaning of 3b, **in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed**, is ambiguous. The Hebrew voice, as in, 18 18 and 28 14, may be either reflexive or passive; but in the cognate passages (22 18 and 26 4) the verb is undoubtedly reflexive. Whether the meaning should therefore be in all passages reflexive, viz. 'bless themselves by thee,' i.e. desire blessings similar to those divinely conferred on Abraham and his seed, as many scholars hold, or whether the passive should be retained here is not of material importance, since, in any case, the significance of the promise is clear, viz. that through Abraham and his seed all mankind shall be brought to seek and to find salvation in the true God (cf. Is 2 2-3).

6. **Shechem**, the first patriarchal settlement, was a well-known sanctuary in later times. **The oak of Moreh** should be translated 'the oracle-giving turpentine tree' or 'the turpentine tree of the soothsayer' (cf. Jg 9 37). This sacred tree at Shechem is mentioned again (35 4 and Jos 24 26 *v.n.*), where it is said to be 'in the sanctuary.' Tree-worship was common among the Semites.

10-20 describes Abraham's further migration to Egypt in time of famine, and contains the first of three versions of a matrimonial deception practised by patriarchs on a foreign king, cf. 20 (E), where Abimelech, King of Gerar, is said to have been deceived by Abraham, and 26 6-11 (J), which records Isaac's deception of the same king. This is clearly a piece of ancient and popular Hebrew folklore, and is probably introduced here to account for Abraham's dismissal from Egypt. This brief narrative is possibly a dim recollection and personification of the Hyksos rule in Egypt and their subsequent expulsion (see p. 175*b*).

XIII. narrates the separation of Abraham and Lot in terms which suggest that tribal expansion made it necessary. Lot chose for a settlement the fertile district at the southern end of the Jordan valley. **plain of Jordan** (10) should be 'circle,' Hebrew *kikkar*. It does not include the whole of the Jordan valley, but the most fertile part of it, in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea. Abraham now made his settlement in the south of Canaan at Hebron, another sanctuary with sacred turpentine trees (18), cf. 14 13, 24, 18 1, 23 17-19, etc., where, according to patriarchal custom, he built an altar to Jehovah. Mamre is probably the older name of Hebron, derived from a well-known native sheikh (14 13, 24). **Perizzite** (7) is probably not a proper name, but means simply the native villagers or peasantry; Hebrew *perazi* = 'hamlet-dwellers.'

XIV., recording the punitive expedition of Chedorlaomer and his allies against five rebellious vassal kings of the Jordan valley, is of considerable historical importance, since it enables us to place Abraham against the background of real history. The chapter stands alone, and cannot be assigned to any of the Pentateuchal sources. It seems to have preserved an isolated fragment of an historical occurrence which took place during the lifetime of Abraham. Of the four kings mentioned in 1, **Amraphel king of Shinar** is generally identified with Hammurabi, the great ruler of Babylon, *c.* 2123-2081 B.C., and although some few scholars still question the identification it

may be regarded as reasonably certain. **Arioch king of Ellasar** may now be safely identified from his inscriptions with Eriaku, King of Larsa, midway between Babylon and the Persian Gulf, a contemporary of Hammurabi. Of **Chedorlaomer king of Elam** it can only be said that Elam was at the time a powerful country whose rule extended to Canaan, and that Chedorlaomer is a proper name of correct Elamite formation compounded with the name of the deity Lagomer. Nothing is known of **Tidal king of Goiim.** Goiim is the usual Hebrew word for **nations,** and may mean, as Sayce suggests, the 'hordes' of northern peoples, or it should possibly be read as Gutim, a people living in the E. of what is now Kurdistan. The identification of two contemporary kings out of four gives us, however, a date for Abraham, which we may estimate at approximately the reign of Hammurabi, and also suggests that, although we must not press details too far, the record as a whole rests upon an historical foundation, viz. a punitive expedition undertaken during the time of Abraham's settlement in Canaan by powerful overlords against rebellious Canaanite vassals. On this basis of fact the Hebrew writer has founded a story intended to exalt both the military prowess of Abraham and the early religious importance of Jerusalem; but there is nothing inherently improbable in the suggestion that Abraham, as the head of a tribe, whose wide expansion is clearly indicated in the preceding chapter, should be strong enough to rescue Lot and his family.

2. Nothing further is known of these petty vassal kings.

3. The vale of Siddim is mentioned only in this narrative, where the writer identifies it with the Dead Sea, called the Salt Sea also in Nu 34 [3]; Dt 3 [17]; Jos 3 [16], etc. The Dead Sea is nearly 25 per cent. salt. There was obviously a tradition that in these early times the present Dead Sea was dry land.

5-7, describing the circuitous route taken by Chedorlaomer and his allies, suggest that this punitive expedition was made the occasion for a wholesale subjugation of the neighbouring peoples whose names, as given in [5-6], denote prehistoric races of giant stature. After advancing southwards from the E. of Jordan the four kings turned back to Kadesh, 50 miles S. of Beer-sheba (see map), subduing the Amalekites and Amorites, and then advancing N.E. to the valley of the Dead Sea.

7. En-Mishpat = 'spring of (divine) judgement,' a sacred spring, as its name Kadesh = 'holy' or 'sacred' indicates.

13. The way in which **Abram the Hebrew** is introduced here shows that this record had originally no connexion with the preceding chapters.

14-17. The story of Abraham's rescue of Lot is told in hyperbolical language with a view to enhancing the glory of his success. The number of his **trained men,** 318, is the numerical value of the Hebrew letters of Eliezer his steward (15 [2]), and the record of his slaughter of the four kings ([17]) can hardly be authentic.

18-20. Melchizedek.—Here Melchizedek is described as priest-king of Salem, an archaic name for Jerusalem. In primitive times the king acted as priest for his nation or tribe, e.g. both David and Solomon performed priestly duties, and cf. Ps 110. Melchizedek means probably 'Zedek is my king,' Zedek being the name of a deity (cf. Jos 10 [1], Adoni-Zedek = 'Zedek is my lord'); but it would be natural for Hebrews to interpret it as Heb 7 [2], 'king of righteousness' (Hebrew *zedek* = 'righteousness'). Melchizedek was a priest of El Elyon, by which title the highest of Canaanite deities is implied; though subsequently Elyon was used as a title of Jehovah (Nu 24 [16]; Ps 18 [13], etc.). It cannot be supposed that Melchizedek was a priest of the true God at this period. Abraham's religious instinct prompted him to make the customary offering of tithes at the sanctuary of the god of Salem. For centuries later the Hebrews, though owning strict allegiance to Jehovah their God, recognized territorial deities (see on Jg 11 [24]). To the Jews Melchizedek, as the first-mentioned king and priest of Jerusalem, became the type of the ideal priest-king (see Ps 110). Heb 7 illustrates the interpretation which later Jewish mysticism placed upon the person and office of Melchizedek.

22. Abraham swears by El-Elyon that he will receive none of the booty for himself. **I lift up mine hand** describes the gesture used in taking an oath. The insertion of 'the LORD' is probably due to the attempt of the compiler, or a later editor, to identify El-Elyon with Jehovah: it is omitted in LXX and Syriac.

XV. is probably a combination of J and E, though no certain analysis can be offered. The ch. contains the promise of an heir to Abraham ([1-6]), and a further promise, emphasized by a solemn covenant, of the possession of the land of Canaan ([7-21]). Abraham's natural anxiety as to the fulfilment of God's

previous promises is expressed in the complaint that he has no son, and that his possessions will not continue in his seed, but will pass out of his family to his steward. In answer to this he receives the Divine assurance that a son shall be born to him, and that his descendants shall be as numerous as the stars. Abraham's faith is shown by his implicit trust in the certain fulfilment of God's promise against all appearances to the contrary (1-6).

2. go childless should be rendered 'go hence,' RVm.

2b is meaningless, the Hebrew text being evidently badly mutilated. The name Eliezer is clear, and the general sense may be inferred from 3, which seems to belong to a parallel account.

7-21. The promise of the ultimate possession of Canaan is now made binding by a solemn covenant into which Jehovah deigns to enter with His faithful servant. For the covenant ritual cf. Jer 34 18-20, where the divided victims symbolize the fate which will befall either party who violates a covenant. Here, since God Himself makes the covenant, the division must include the idea of sharing the divided victims as a symbol of sharing the obligation to observe the covenant.

11 predicts the constant effort and vigilance which Israel must sustain in order to inherit the promise. This is amplified in the following verses which foreshadow a time of tribulation before the Divine promise is fulfilled.

13. The 400 years, which is a clear reference to the oppression in Egypt, agrees practically with P's estimate of 430 years (Ex 12 40).

17. The smoking oven and flaming torch, corresponding to the pillars of cloud and fire of the Exodus, represent the presence of Jehovah. For fire as symbolic of the Divine presence cf. Ex 3 1-6, 19 18, 24 17, etc. **Furnace** means the portable stove or oven still used in the East.

18 describes the extent of the ideal kingdom to which Israel aspired, but which it reached only in the zenith of Solomon's glory (1 K 4 21).

XVI. *The Birth of Ishmael.*—Here the compiler has inserted into P's bare statement of fact the fuller story of J. To P belong 1a, 3, 15, 16, which form a complete record. The rest is J's story, which explains the origin of the Bedouin tribes related to Israel as descendants of Ishmael (10-12), cf. P's genealogy, 25 12-18. The parallel narrative of E is contained in 21 8-21. This chapter continues the story of Abraham's anxiety about an heir, but we note that no lack of faith in the previous promise is here attributed to the patriarch himself. It is Sarah who has given up hope of bearing a son, and who, in accordance with the custom of the East, gives her maid to Abraham in order to obtain a son by proxy.

4. Hagar's attitude expresses the characteristic Eastern contempt for her barren mistress.

7. The angel of the Lord is a term used to give concrete expression to an abstract conception, and denotes the message of Jehovah Himself expressed as a manifestation of His Presence (13): Jg 6 11-24 *v.n.*

10-12 describe the future Ishmaelite tribes, their character and locality. For 10 cf. 25 12-18.

12 gives the character of the Bedouin. **A wild ass among men** should be rendered 'a wild ass of a man,' i.e. one who will live the free life of the open country, at constant feud with his neighbours. **In the presence of** should be 'to the east of' as RVm. The home of the Ishmaelite tribes was on the S.E. of Israel, approximately the locality to which Hagar is represented as fleeing (14): cf. 21 21.

14. J gives the origin of the sacred well, Beer-lahai-roi, mentioned again 24 62, 25 11: for meaning see RVm.

XVII. contains P's record of the institution of circumcision as a sign of the covenant between Jehovah and Abraham to ratify the Divine promise of a son by Sarah and of the possession of Canaan. This is parallel to the account of the covenant ritual in JE (15), but marks a development, in that here P makes the rite of circumcision a permanent condition of the Divine covenant with the seed of Abraham.

1. God Almighty = Heb. *El Shaddai.* P gives three stages in the revelation of the Divine Name. First, *Elohim*, as in 1 and onwards, now *El Shaddai*, and finally, *Jehovah* (Ex 6 2-3). Many etymologies have been suggested for the meaning of Shaddai, but no Hebrew derivation is satisfactory; and it is probably to be explained from a Babylonian title of divinity in which the deity is addressed as *ilu shadu'a* = 'god my mountain' (cf. Ps 18 2, 31 2, 3, etc.).

5. Abram is usually regarded as a contraction of Hebrew 'Abiram' (cf. Nu 16 1, etc.) = 'the father is exalted,' while **Abraham** is here derived by assonance from Hebrew *ab hamon* = 'father of a multitude.' The derivation is, however, forced and artificial; and we get a simple explanation from the occurrence of both forms of the

name in Babylonian, where the exact Babylonian equivalents of *-ram* and *-raham* are merely variants of the participle of the verb *ramu* = Hebrew *raham*, 'to love.' The two forms of the name are therefore interchangeable, and mean 'the father is loving' or 'the loving father.'

10-14. Circumcision was by no means peculiar to the Hebrews. It was practised generally by their neighbours and in Egypt (cf. Jos 5^{9}; Jer 9^{26}); the Philistines, being an exception, were regarded with special contempt. It was originally performed at the age of puberty, among the Arabs at 13, the age of Ishmael, as a preliminary to marriage, and marked admission to the manhood of the nation. This is the idea underlying the earliest mention of circumcision in the Old Testament, viz. Ex 4^{24-26} (J). In later Judaism it became a rite of the highest importance and of most binding obligation, denoting the privileged religious position of the Jew; hence the controversies in the early Christian Church (cf. Ac 15, etc.). There is no law of circumcision in Israel's early legal codes: it belongs to the late legislation of P. When circumcision in Israel lost its civil and political significance and became a purely religious rite signifying admission into the Jewish Church, it was natural for it to be performed in infancy (^{12}), in order that the child might be dedicated to God and brought under the Divine protection as soon as possible; and this is probably the ultimate origin of infant baptism in the Christian Church. See further *s.v.* 'Circumcision' in *E.R.E.*

15. The change of name from Sarai to Sarah appears to have no etymological significance. Sarai was probably an archaic form.

16-21. P derives the name Isaac (Hebrew 'he laughs') from Abraham's incredulous laughter. J, who rates Abraham's faith more highly, attributes the laughter to Sarah in the parallel narrative (18^{12}); while E ascribes Sarah's laughter not to incredulity, but to joy (21^{6}).

XVIII. and XIX. with the exception of 19^{29} (P) are a continuous extract from J's narrative of angelic visitors to Abraham and to Lot. The story is a good example of J's style, and is marked by his characteristic anthropomorphisms. Jehovah Himself is represented as one of the visitors, who comes down to investigate the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah, and discusses with Abraham the fate of the guilty cities.

XVIII. **1-15** contains J's version of the further promise by name of a son to Abraham and Sarah, a parallel to P in 17^{15-19}, but here the name Isaac is derived from the laughter of Sarah: see above. J's statement (^{1}), that **Jehovah appeared unto him in the turpentine trees of Mamre,** is intended to indicate a theophany which the writer goes on to describe under the graphic concrete figure of three supernatural visitors, one of whom is plainly intended to represent Jehovah (see ^{22}, where **the men turned from hence, but** Jehovah remained and talked with Abraham and then **went his way** [^{33}], and in 19^{1} **the two angels came to Sodom**). Abraham's reception of his angelic visitors, who are regarded as representing Jehovah in manifestation, is closely parallel to the similar experiences of Gideon and Manoah (Jg 6^{17-23}, 13^{15-23}).

16-23. In this passage, which records the Divine sentence on Sodom and Abraham's intercession on behalf of the righteous in the doomed city, we find an instructive illustration of belief in the justice of God and in the value of intercessory prayer. Abraham's remonstrance ($^{23-25}$) reveals a high sense of justice, and clearly implies the conviction of the writer that worshippers of Jehovah must be able to feel implicit trust and confidence in the Divine justice and righteousness; and the success of Abraham's insistent prayer that Sodom may be spared for only ten righteous men reveals God's mercy as well as His justice.

XIX. **1-28.** There is no sufficient reason to doubt the probability that this story rests upon a basis of fact. The fate of Herculaneum and Pompeii affords a striking parallel; and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah may well have been due to an earthquake which caused an eruption of petroleum and bitumen. Hebrew religious instinct would naturally regard such a disaster as a direct Divine judgement.

1-10. The story of the unnatural lust of the men of Sodom is closely parallel to the account of the outrage on the Levite and his concubine in Jg 19^{22-30}. Both narratives show the low view held of women in early Israel; the sacred law of hospitality being regarded as of much greater importance than a woman's chastity. This incident is introduced to indicate that God, through His messengers, has 'seen' for Himself the iniquity of Sodom (18^{21}).

1. the two angels, because Jehovah, regarded as one of Abraham's three visitors, had **gone his way** (18^{33}).

30-38. The discreditable origin here assigned to the peoples Moab and Ammon

reflects the coarse humour of Hebrew folklore and the detestation in which Moab and Ammon were held by Israel. The narrative clearly suggests a personification of tribal history.

XX. is the first continuous narrative from the source E. We notice that now God (*Elohim*) is used instead of Jehovah. 'The LORD' in 18 is plainly editorial. The Divine appearance in dreams (3. 6) is characteristic of this source. This record of Abraham's deception of Abimelech on account of Sarah is E's parallel to J's story of Isaac's similar imposition on the same king (26), a further variant of the earlier story in 12 10-20, a popular incident of Hebrew folklore told sometimes of one patriarch, sometimes of another. The fact that Sarah is here represented as a young and attractive woman makes it clear that this record comes from a document distinct from either of those used in the preceding chapters, where she is said to be ninety years old, 17 17 (P), and laughs at the idea of bearing a child, 18 11, 12 (J). The parallel narrative (26 1) gives as the reason for this further patriarchal migration southwards that 'there was a famine in the land.' The site of **Gerar** is uncertain, but it may possibly be identified with the Wadi Gerur, 13 miles S.W. of Kadesh.

12. To marry one's half-sister was a Semite custom, and was allowed in Israel (2 S 13 13), before the Deuteronomic and priestly legislations which forbade it (Dt 27 22; Lev 18 9, 11, 20 17).

XXI. **1-21.** The account of the birth of Isaac and the expulsion of Ishmael is inserted somewhat strangely at this point, and breaks the continuity of E's narrative of Abraham and Abimelech. In 1-7 the compiler has given a composite narrative of the birth of Isaac from the three sources: J—1a, 2a; E—6-7; P—1b, 2b-5. P represents Abraham as circumcising Isaac at the age of eight days in accordance with the much later law which he has already stated in 17 12. Both statements are anachronisms.

6. The compiler has not preserved E's record of the name Isaac, but has retained his explanation of it as derived from laughter.

8-12 contain E's version of the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael, parallel to 16 (J), though E's record of the birth of Ishmael has been omitted: see notes on 16.

21. the wilderness of Paran is south of Palestine, the territory inhabited by the Ishmaelite tribes.

23-24 continues the narrative of Abraham and Abimelech and describes the treaty of Beer-sheba and the patriarchal settlement in that locality. In J (26 26-33) the treaty is made with Isaac; but it can hardly be doubted that both sources record the same event (see p. 55*a*).

31. Beer-sheba is 28 miles S.W. of Hebron, the earlier patriarchal settlement. The name means 'well of seven,' and seven wells are still to be seen there, four of which are in use. The Hebrew etymology, which derives the name from the oaths taken there by the parties to the treaty, goes back to the derivation of the Heb. verb 'to swear,' the root meaning being 'to pledge oneself by seven,' seven being a sacred number, possibly dating back to the time of moon-worship, and connected with the Sabbath. **33.** Beer-sheba was a famous sanctuary in later days (cf. Am 5 5, 8 14), and, like Shechem and Hebron, had its sacred tree which Abraham is here said to have planted. The mention of the Philistines in 32-34 is due to the compiler under the influence of J who represents Abimelech as a Philistine king (26), an obvious anachronism omitted by E.

XXII. **1-19.** The projected sacrifice of Isaac is a continuation of E's history, though 15-18 are probably editorial. The story marks a development in Israel's religious thought, and may be regarded as a prophetic midrash of the 8th century B.C. intended to teach that Israel's God does not require human sacrifice. The writer treats the incident as the supreme trial of Abraham's faith in order to show that God demands implicit obedience—the entire surrender of the will. When this is yielded a human sacrifice becomes unnecessary. The story sanctions the customary substitution of an animal instead of a human offering, the animal being the redemption price paid for the life of the son (cf. Ex 13 13, 34 20). At the time of Abraham human sacrifice was customary and frequent among his Canaanite neighbours, and the early legislation of Ex 22 29, which states without modification that first-born sons are to be given to God, seems clearly to imply a stage in Israel's thought which regarded such sacrifices as a religious duty; and they were occasionally offered under the monarchy (cf. 2 K 16 3, 21 6, 23 10, etc., though the Deuteronomic legislation expressly forbade it (Dt 12 31, 18 10, etc.). The teaching of Micah (6 6-8) furnishes an instructive comment on this story, and Jg 11 31 *v.n.*

2. The **land of Moriah** is an unknown locality. Later Jewish tradition identi-

fied it with the Temple hill at Jerusalem (14) (2 Ch 3 1).

14. **Jehovah-jireh** may be rendered 'in the mount of the Lord provision shall be made.' The writer evidently connects a current proverbial saying about the Temple hill at Jerusalem with the provision of a ram in place of the offering of Isaac.

20-24. J's genealogy of the descendants of Nahor, Abraham's brother, is intended to introduce Bethuel in preparation for the story of Isaac's marriage to Rebekah which follows in 24, J's narrative being interrupted by the insertion of P's record of the death of Sarah (23). As far as the **sons of Nahor** can be identified they appear to represent tribes on the E. and N.E. of Palestine. **Aram** is the Hebrew name for Syria—the Syrians being the principal nation which extended from Haran, with their subsequent capital at Damascus. **Maacah** is the name of a tribe on the E. of Jordan mentioned in Jos 13 11, 13; 2 S 10 6, etc.

XXIII. P's narrative of the death and burial of Sarah, and Abraham's purchase of the field of Machpelah as a burial ground (cf. 25 9, 49 29-32, 50 13). The unusual detail of P in this story is perhaps due, as Skinner suggests, to the wish to defend Israel's right to this sacred patriarchal burial ground against the later encroachment of Edom in the neighbourhood of Hebron. **Children of Heth** = Hittites would appear to be P's general designation of the original inhabitants of Palestine, corresponding to the 'Canaanites' of J and 'Amorites' of E, a recollection of the earlier period when the powerful Hittite Empire held sway in Palestine: Jos 1 4 *v.n.* and p. 176*b*.

XXIV. is a continuation of J's narrative from 22 20-34, 23 having been interposed by the compiler possibly in view of the statement in 67 which presupposes Sarah's death. This narrative, which is an excellent example of J's clear and easy style, should be interpreted as a personification of a further tribal movement from the original Semitic settlement in Haran, by which the numbers of the Hebrews in Palestine became largely increased, with the result pictured in the story of Jacob and Esau: see below.

XXV. 1-18 is a combination of J and P in which the compiler completes the history of Abraham and states the relationship to Israel of various kindred tribes before proceeding to the history of Isaac.

1-6 continue J's narrative from the preceding chapter, and tell of Abraham's marriage to Keturah after the death of Sarah. The 'sons' of Keturah are various tribes with whom the Hebrews admitted kinship—this is clear from the mention of Midian (2), a people who lived in the region of Sinai on the S.E. of Palestine (cf. Ex 2 15, 3 1, etc., and Jg 6-8). Of the other tribes mentioned practically nothing is known. At 7 the compiler breaks off from J and inserts P's account of the death and burial of Abraham (7-11).

12-17 contain P's genealogy of the descendants of Ishmael, 'twelve princes according to their nations,' in agreement with 17 20. **Nebaioth** is mentioned again in 28 9, 36 3 in connexion with Esau's wife. **Kedar** was a well-known pastoral tribe (Is 21 16, etc.; Jer 2 10; Ps 120 5).

18. (J) describes again the locality of the Ishmaelite tribes: see on 16 12.

19-34. Having now dismissed the collateral branches of the Palestinian Semites the compiler proceeds to concentrate attention on the direct ancestry of the tribes of Israel by explaining the preferring of Jacob over Esau.

19, 20 are P, the rest being J's description of the supplanting of Esau by his younger brother, continued in 27. It is perfectly clear that this narrative contains the explanation by which Hebrew folklore accounted for the ascendancy of the younger branch of Semite settlers in Canaan over the older, viz. Edom. The popular theory is expressed in poetic form (23), as the oracular response to Rebekah's enquiry. Jacob is a personification of the nation and character of Israel, and the fact that he is represented as his mother Rebekah's favourite, while Isaac shows a partiality for Esau, indicates that the more recent tribal accretion, figured by Rebekah and her marriage with Isaac, underlies the story of Jacob's supplanting of Esau. The legend, however, probably goes further back than this, and embodies a recollection of the time before Abraham's migration, when, as the Cappadocian tablets prove, Semite settlers were already established in Canaan. It is this earlier Semite race which is represented by Esau = Edom (see p. 175*a*).

The religious value of the story, as Driver has shown, lies in the spiritual lessons which may be deduced from the types of character exhibited by Esau and Jacob. If Esau appears to be frank, open and generous, he nevertheless exhibits a shallow character, incapable of appreciating the true value of the inheritance which he barters for the immediate

gratification of his appetite, 'governed by the impulses and desires of the moment.' His lack of spiritual insight is rightly described in Heb 12[16] as 'profane.' How far this is a true picture of Edomite character we have no means of ascertaining. In Jacob we find reflected both the good and bad traits in the national character of Israel. Jacob is selfish, scheming, and clutches at every advantage; but he looks beyond the immediate moment; he has ambition and perseverance; his character is thus a deeper one (in both a good and a bad sense) than Esau's; it contains sound and genuine elements, which, when purified from merely personal and selfish aims, are capable of consecration to the service of God, and of being made subservient to carrying out His purposes' (Driver, 249).

23 shows that the story is to be interpreted as a personification of national history.

25. **red**, Hebrew *admoni*, is doubtless a play on the name Edom: see below. **hairy**, Hebrew *se'ar*, appears to be a play on Seir, the locality inhabited by Edom (36[8]).

26. The name **Jacob** is derived from *'aqeb* = 'heel.' The verb *'aqab* = 'to follow at the heel of,' so 'to circumvent' or 'overreach'; and the subsequent history tells, with evident approval, how Jacob overreached both his brother and his uncle.

30. Again there is a play on the word **red**, *adom*, from which Edom is derived. Hebrew etymology found in the name Edom a perpetual memorial of the greed of one of Israel's bitterest enemies (cf. Am 1[11], Ps 137[7]).

XXVI. 1-33 is J's parallel to E's story of Abraham's deception of Abimelech (20, 21[22-34]: see above). There is practically nothing in this legend of Isaac which has not also been told of Abraham, except the obvious anachronism which makes Abimelech a Philistine king. The note in [1]—'beside the first famine that was in the days of Abraham'—is an editorial insertion in view of 12[10].

34-35 are added from P, giving the names of Esau's Canaanite wives, whom P calls Hittites: see on 23.

XXVII. 1-45. J's story, telling how Jacob, at the instigation of Rebekah, deceived his father Isaac and defrauded his brother by securing for himself the first-born son's blessing, is designed like 25[27-34] to explain the ascendancy of Israel over Edom. The fact that the writer seems unduly to favour Jacob, the perpetrator of deceit and fraud, is to a large extent due to his strong national prejudice against Edom—Jacob being merely a personification of Israel. The writer of J points no morals, but his subsequent record of Jacob's life shows that unrighteousness brings its own punishment. In the following chapters we find that Jacob derived no benefit from his dishonest self-seeking. His wrongfully acquired possessions brought him no happiness. As soon as he returned to Canaan rich and prosperous his punishment began, and lasted till he ended his days an exile in Egypt with the lament, 'few and evil have been the days of the years of my life' (47[9]). The contrast between the two blessings ([27-29] and [39-40]) is obscured in RV text; the margin is right. The antithesis of the Hebrew may best be indicated by translating [39]—'Lo, far from the fatness of the earth must be thy dwelling, and from the dew of heaven above; but by thy sword shalt thou live,' etc.

46-XXVIII. 9 continue P's narrative from 26[34-35], telling of the grief of mind of Isaac and Rebekah because Esau had taken wives of 'the daughters of Heth.' Rebekah, anxious lest her favourite son should follow his brother's bad matrimonial example, asks Isaac to take steps to prevent it. Isaac accordingly sends Jacob to the ancestral home at Paddan-Aram, to his grandfather Bethuel, bidding him choose a wife there among the daughters of Laban, Rebekah's brother. Esau, learning that his father disapproves of Canaanite women, dutifully seeks a third wife among the daughters of Ishmael. It is obvious that this narrative has no connexion with the preceding story of J which represents Isaac on his death-bed, and Jacob as fleeing to Haran before the just fury of his defrauded brother. Here in P the circumstances are totally different. There is no suggestion that Isaac is in failing health (cf. 31[18], 35[27-29]), and no hint of any family discord, except on the subject of 'the daughters of Heth.'

XXVIII. 10-22. A combination of J and E describing Jacob's vision at Beth-el on his flight from Beer-sheba. [10, 13-16, 19] are J. The rest is E. This story is designed to give the authority of a patriarchal origin to the famous sanctuary at Beth-el, just as the origin of Shechem is ascribed to Abraham (12[6-7]). The important sanctuary at Beth-el was one of the two centres of worship provided by Jeroboam for the Northern Kingdom (1 K 12[29-33]). Its popularity is evident from the references in Am 3[14], 4[4-5], 5[5], 7[7-13], etc. It was natural for Hebrew tradition to find the sanction for

worship and for payment of tithes at this popular sanctuary in its consecration by Jacob.

12 and 13 furnish an instructive contrast in the methods of Divine revelation as narrated by E and J. In E God appears to Jacob in a dream (12)—this writer's characteristic description of the means by which God communicates with man; in J Jehovah 'stood beside him' (RVm) (13).

18. A standing stone pillar, *mazzebah*, was a prominent feature of Canaanite worship at the local 'high places,' and was supposed to be the abode of the deity (cf.22). These stone pillars were taken over by the Hebrews to represent the presence of Jehovah, and were regarded as legitimate adjuncts of Israelite sanctuaries until the Deuteronomic legislation abolished them (Dt 16 22; Hos 10 1-2). Here E ascribes to Jacob the setting up and consecration, by anointing, of the sacred pillar in the ancient sanctuary of Beth-el. 'For us the religious value of the narrative lies not in what is said about the sacred stone, but in the truths which find expression . . . in 12-17, that heaven and earth are not spiritually parted from one another, that God's protecting Presence accompanies His worshippers, and that He is ever at their side, even when they are away from their accustomed place of worship, or are otherwise tempted by circumstances not to realize the fact' (Driver, 268).

19. Beth-el='house of God' was the sanctuary as distinct from the city Luz (cf. Jos 16 2); but in course of time the name of the sanctuary became commonly used for the city also.

20. Jacob's vow, which seems presumptuously to impose conditions on the Almighty, is typical of the stage of religion reached by Israel in its earlier days (cf. Nu 21 2; Jg 11 30, etc.).

22. For the payment of tithes at Beth-el cf. Am 4 4.

XXIX.-XXXI. **Jacob and Laban.**—These chapters, recounting the story of Jacob's sojourn in the employ of his uncle at Haran, reveal distinctly unedifying traits in the characters of both men. It is a story of deceit and fraud on both sides. Laban first deals dishonestly by Jacob, and gains both a husband for his ill-favoured daughter and a further seven years' service from Jacob. After his fourteen years of service Jacob overreaches Laban by a skilful trick, and acquires for himself the best of his uncle's sheep and goats, a piece of sharp practice which leads to a coolness on the part of Laban and his sons, and results in Jacob's return to Canaan. The narrative is mainly J and E, with only three verses from P. To J belong 29 2-14, 31-35, 30 4, 7-16, 24-43, 31 1, 3, 46-50. The rest is E, except for 29 24, 29, 31 18, which are P.

XXIX. 1-30. Jacob's arrival at Haran, his contract with Laban and his marriages. Jacob's contract for seven years' service takes the place of the customary purchase price paid to the bride's father. Jacob now finds himself outwitted by the substitution of Leah for Rachel, a deception rendered possible by the Eastern veil (cf. 24 64-67).

27. For the week's wedding festivities cf. Jg 14 12. After the week was completed Jacob was married to Rachel on agreeing to serve another seven years for her.

31-XXX. 24. Here the compiler has combined the explanations of the origin of the tribes of Israel given by J and E. Both writers personify the tribes as 'sons' of Jacob, and are concerned to explain the meaning of their names, mainly by assonance with familiar terms: see RVm. *ad loc.* The 'sons' form three tribal groups, viz. the Leah tribes, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun; the Rachel tribes, Joseph and, subsequently, Benjamin (35 18); the handmaid tribes, Dan, Naphtali, Gad and Asher. The description of these last four tribes as sons of handmaids represents 'a tradition which can hardly mean anything else than that these tribes were regarded in later times as holding an inferior position in the Israelite confederacy, perhaps because they were not purely Israelite by race' (Burney, *Judges*, cvi). It is also significant that three of these handmaid tribes bear the names of Canaanite deities (30 5-13). Dan was a title of the sun-god, Gad was the god of good fortune—30 11, Leah said 'by (i.e. with the help of) Gad,' though another reading is 'Gad comes.' Asher is closely connected with Ashera, the consort of the local Baal, giver of fertility, i.e. to an Eastern woman, the highest form of happiness (30 13). With 30 3 cf. 16 2: Rachel adopts the same plan as Sarah for obtaining children by proxy. The expression **that she may bear upon my knees** denotes the ceremony of adoption by which Rachel will recognize Bilhah's children as her own.

XXX. 14. **Mandrakes** belong to the potato family, and bear fruit resembling plums in appearance. They are still regarded in the East as an aphrodisiac.

25-43. This narrative from J describes the ruse by which Jacob overreached Laban and secured for himself

great wealth in sheep and goats at his uncle's expense. It is a shepherd's story, and, as the expedient employed by Jacob was well known, probably had its origin in some actual occurrence. At the end of his fourteen years of service Jacob approaches Laban with the suggestion of returning to Canaan. Laban, unwilling to lose the services of a profitable helper (27-30), invites Jacob to stay on his own terms. Jacob accordingly proposes a scheme of payment which leads his crafty and avaricious uncle to believe that he can still secure his services cheaply; for he asks only to be allowed to keep for himself the black sheep and the parti-coloured goats. The point of this is that normally Syrian sheep are white and the goats black. In good flocks there would be only a few black sheep and 'ringstraked,' i.e. streaked, goats. Laban immediately closes with these agreeably modest demands, and, in order still further to decrease Jacob's wages, straightway removes all the sheep and goats of abnormal colour to prevent any further interbreeding, and so to reduce to a minimum the number of animals likely to be born of the right colour for Jacob. Jacob, however, was a skilful shepherd, and, acting on a sound physiological principle, prepared parti-coloured rods and placed them in the watering troughs where the ewes and rams came together, so that the ewes had these parti-coloured objects before them at the time of conception, and consequently gave birth to similarly coloured lambs. Moreover, Jacob adopted this device only with the best and strongest of the flock, so that in course of time he acquired considerable wealth (43).

XXXI. The success of Jacob's ruse caused such strained relations between him and his uncle's family that he decided to leave without notice. His speech to his wives (5-13) protesting that his wealth had been acquired by the help of God, reflects the writer's belief in the Divine protection of the father of the tribes of Israel. Jacob's wives fully agreed that their father had behaved badly towards them, and supported their husband in his intention to leave. Laban's absence from home at the time of sheep-shearing afforded the opportunity, and Jacob and his family took all their possessions, among which Rachel included her father's teraphim, and hastened towards Canaan. Laban on hearing the news went after them and overtook them in Gilead where, after some contention, a treaty was made at Mizpah and ratified by a sacrifice. The narrative, which is mainly E, is intended to explain the later territorial limits of the Syrian kingdom formed by the expansion of the early Semite settlement at Haran: see below.

4-13. Jacob's declaration that the increase of the spotted and streaked animals allowed him as wages by Laban was due to the direct interposition of God in his favour is at variance with J's description of the artifice he employed (30 25-43). This narrative from E must not therefore be taken to imply that the writer suggests that God approved of the trick by which Jacob enriched himself at Laban's expense, of which E makes no mention. This is one of many instances where documentary analysis removes a difficulty. According to J, Jacob gained his riches by his own successful ruse; according to E God prospered him by protecting him from the avarice of Laban. For 13 cf. 28 18-19.

18. The statement that Jacob is about to return to Isaac his father reads somewhat strangely after the narrative of 27, where Isaac is pictured as being on his death-bed 20 years earlier (cf. 41), and giving his sons his final blessing. Here again the documentary analysis provides the explanation—this verse is from P, who preserves another tradition of the life of Isaac (see on 27 46-28 9), and records his death at the age of 180 (35 28), after Jacob's return.

19. teraphim is a plural of eminence, like *Elohim*, and does not imply more than one image. Teraphim, here mentioned for the first time, appear to have been the household gods of the Semites, possibly connected with ancestor worship, but more probably simply symbolizing the belief that the home was under the protection of the tribal or national deity. It was the desire to retain the protection of the god of her fathers which prompted Rachel to steal the teraphim, and Laban's anxiety to recover it was due to a similar religious motive. Teraphim were consulted as oracles (Ezek 21 21; Zech 10 2). They were objects of worship in Israel till a comparatively late period (Jg 17 5, 18 14-18; 1 S 19 13-16; Hos 3 4). From 1 S 19 we gather that the image of the teraphim resembled a human form in shape and size, Laban's was probably smaller, judging by the device employed by Rachel in concealing it (34).

23. the mountain of Gilead should be translated 'the hill country of Gilead.' The writer is clearly influenced by the later boundary between Israel and Syria in Gilead, the district on the E. of Jordan: see map, and cf. 1 K 22 3. This story

explains the division of the territories of the two peoples, Hebrews and Aramæans (Syrians), beyond Jordan under the figure of a boundary treaty in which Jacob and Laban represent the two nations (47, 52). This explains the Aramaic and the Hebrew names for Gilead in 47; see RVm.

42 and **53. the Fear of Isaac** denotes God whom Isaac feared and worshipped.

53. The Hebrew verb for **judge** is plural, and RVm **gods** is right. Jacob and Laban each swore by the God of his fathers, and the plural verb expresses the early belief in tribal or territorial deities (cf. Jos 24 2).

XXXII. and XXXIII. *Jacob's Return to Canaan, his Meeting with Esau, and his Settlement at Shechem.*—This narrative is extracted from J with the exception of four verses: 32 1, 2; 33 19 are E; 32 18 is P. Under the figure of Jacob, his family and his flocks, we may see a further migration of Semites from the early settlement at Haran. Jacob's dread of a hostile meeting with Esau, his preparation to guard against attack, and his propitiatory presents must be interpreted as the natural apprehension felt by a new body of immigrants doubtful of the reception which the older settlers may accord them. We may reasonably regard the personal narrative of the meeting and reconciliation between Jacob and Esau in 33 as a diplomatic victory gained by the newcomers, Israel, over the Edomites who had set out with the intention of repelling the invaders. After a peaceful meeting on the E. of Jordan the Edomites (=Esau) retire to their own country, Seir, and the Israelites settle in central Canaan at Shechem.

XXXII. **2. Mahanaim** became afterwards an important centre on the E. of Jordan. Its exact site is uncertain, but it must have been near the N. bank of the Jabbok (22). It was the capital of Israel for a time after the death of Saul (2 S 2 8, 9), and was one of the twelve centres of taxation under Solomon (1 K 4 14). The word is dual in form='two camps,' and is here derived from the 'host' or 'camp' of angels—'This is God's host' (Hebrew *mahaneh*).

3-5. This seems clearly to imply that Esau is here a personification of Edom, representing the older branch of Semite settlers in Canaan, to whom the chieftain of the newcomers sends a conciliatory message.

6. Esau's march northwards with 400 men indicates that the Edomites were prepared to resist the advance of Israel.

7-8. Jacob's plan of dividing his followers into two companies so that, if attacked, one at least might escape, was a precaution that would naturally occur to any capable leader.

9-12. Jacob's prayer, in its humility and entire dependence upon, and faith in, the Divine protection, is a model of Old Testament devotion. The absence of any expression of penitence is remarkable, but may be explained if the writer thought of Jacob not as an individual, but as representing Israel.

13-21. The manner in which Jacob arranged that the hostile intention of Esau should be gradually mollified by successive relays of gifts again denotes a wise and able leader.

22-32. *Jacob's Wrestling at the Jabbok.*—In this record of Jacob's encounter with a mysterious Divine antagonist we have what is probably a primitive legend of Hebrew folklore rewritten and modified in accordance with J's belief that Jehovah Himself wrestled with Jacob—a characteristically crude anthropomorphism (cf. Ex 4 24). The original narrative goes back to an earlier stage of religious thought in which the deity who met Jacob and resisted his passage was regarded as a local god, possibly, as Frazer suggests, the river-spirit of the Jabbok (*Folklore in the O.T.*, i, 136). It was a primitive animistic belief that rivers resented being crossed, and that the river-spirit opposed and tried to drown those who would ford it. Hebrew folklore told how Jacob, the father of the tribes, successfully overcame the spirit of the Jabbok who attempted to prevent his advance into Canaan. The legend, when J incorporated it into his history, was emended to refer to Jacob's successful struggle with Jehovah in explanation of the names Israel and Peniel. A further advance in religious thought is found in Hosea's reference to this incident (12 4), where it is said that Jacob 'had power over the angel, and prevailed,' a tendency to spiritualize the story, which Driver has carried on in his admirable exposition of its religious significance. 'The struggle at Peniel is the turning-point in Jacob's life. . . . The story of his wrestling shows how the higher elements in his nature gained the ascendancy over the lower elements. It is a critical moment in his life. He is on the point of re-entering the land which he left 20 years before; he is about to meet his brother, whom he had wronged and deceived; memories of the past crowd upon him; his conscience smites him, and he is "greatly afraid." But God is his real antagonist, not Esau; it is God whom his sins have offended, and who here comes to contest His right. These thoughts and

fears are, as it were, materialized in his dream. He struggles with his mysterious antagonist; and he struggles with such persistence and effect that his antagonist cannot overcome him, until by a Divine touch He paralyzes his natural strength. . . . The moment marks a great spiritual change in Jacob's character. He feels his carnal weapons become lamed and useless; they fail him in his contest with God; as the result of his struggle his natural self is left behind, he rises from it an altered man. A new truth is vividly brought home to him—the valuelessness before God of the weapons in which he has hitherto trusted. The lameness which he carries away with him, is, as it were, a palpable memento of the fact' (Driver, 296).

26. The request **Let me go, for the day breaketh** reveals to Jacob that he is wrestling not with flesh and blood, but with a supernatural being. It was, and still is, widely believed that spirits must disappear at dawn. Jacob's request for a blessing follows naturally upon his recognition of the deity.

28. Israel means properly 'God strives' or 'perseveres,' possibly an ancient war-cry to express confidence of victory, which the Hebrews assumed as the name of their united tribes. Here, by a transformation of meaning grammatically impossible, it is assigned to Jacob to commemorate his successful struggle with God. In 35^{10} P records the change of name without any explanation.

29. For the anxious desire to obtain the name of a deity and the refusal to give it, cf. Jg 13^{17-18}. Among ancient peoples the name was invested with a mystic significance as part of the personality of its bearer. To know a man's name was regarded as obtaining a certain power over him, and in the same way it was believed that the use of the name of a deity for invocation acted as a spell and compelled a favourable response to prayer. The record of God's refusal to disclose the name here and in Judges reflects this early belief in Israel.

30. This incident suggested an origin for the name Peniel, though, as Driver points out, the name may well have been due to some physical formation of a rock resembling a face.

XXXIII. The meeting between the brothers, as indicated above, must be interpreted as a personification of tribal history. Jacob, the leader of the new body of immigrants, managed by skilful diplomacy to avoid an armed conflict with Edom, who had set out to oppose this migration. The two peoples, Israel and Edom, were closely related and their leaders might well be described as brothers: see above on 25^{19-34}. The meeting took place somewhere on the E. of Jordan, and Edom was eventually persuaded by fair speeches and lavish gifts to allow Israel to settle in that neighbourhood at a reasonably safe distance from Edomite territory.

17. The site of Succoth is uncertain; it belonged to Gad on the E. of Jordan (Jos 13^{27}). Jacob subsequently moved to the early patriarchal home at Shechem.

19, like 23, shows the importance attached by the Hebrews to the possession of burial grounds. The purchase of the 'parcel of ground' by Jacob is recorded here because it was subsequently the grave of Joseph (Jos 24^{32}; Ac $7^{15,16}$).

XXXIV. *The Taking of Shechem.*—The compiler has here combined the narratives of J and P which preserve separate traditions of the capture of Shechem. To J belong $^{2b, 3, 5, 7, 11, 12, 19, 25a}$ (to 'brethren'), $^{26, 30, 31}$. The rest is P. On comparing the two accounts we see that whereas P narrates tribal history, representing Hamor the chieftain as desiring an alliance between his own people and Israel to be ratified by the marriage of his son Shechem with Dinah ($^{8, 9}$), J, as usual, personifies the tribal history and tells only of the outrage on Dinah and the personal vengeance exacted by Simeon and Levi. According to P all the males in the city were circumcised and all were slain by the sons of Jacob. According to J only Hamor and his son were circumcised, and they alone were slain by Simeon and Levi, who rescued their sister Dinah. The taking of Shechem by the Hebrews is attested by the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, one of which, a letter from Aradhiba, governor of Jerusalem, mentions that the Habiru (Hebrews) have taken Shechem (see p. 175*b*). The story of the outrage on Dinah may also be a reminiscence of an actual event, on which J has based his narrative. Probably Shechem was taken by the two tribes, Simeon and Levi, who were afterwards driven out by successful reprisals on the part of the natives, of which a hint is contained in ^{30}. This would account for the fact that these two tribes were afterwards homeless, and attached themselves to Judah, and that in the Judges period Shechem was again in the possession of the 'children of Hamor': see on Jg 9. That some obscurity exists in the Hebrew traditions of the taking of Shechem must be admitted, for in 48^{22} (E) Jacob is represented as saying that he took

Shechem 'with my sword and with my bow.'

XXXV. is a combination of fragments from J, E and P, which the compiler seems to have put together hastily in order to complete his narrative of Jacob's return to Canaan before passing on to the history of Joseph. $^{1-8}$ are E; $^{9-13, 15, 22b-29}$ are P. The rest is J.

1-8 contain the sequel to E's version of the taking of Shechem which has not been preserved, though reference is made to it in 48^{22}. Possibly E recorded the recapture of the city by the natives, and this would account for Jacob's retirement to Beth-el. Now that Jacob and his company have returned to Jehovah's land the patriarch orders them to put away the foreign gods of Haran—i.e. 'strange gods' of RV in ^{2}—and prepare to devote themselves by a solemn purification to the service of Jehovah. The images of the foreign gods were buried under the sacred turpentine tree at Shechem (cf. Jos 24, a passage which, in conjunction with this, points, as Skinner suggests, 'to the memory of a great national renunciation of idolatry at Shechem in the early history of Israel').

5 is very possibly a point of contact with external history, for the Tell-el-Amarna tablets testify to the 'great terror' which the Hebrew invasion caused in Canaan.

8. Cf. 24^{59}. The death and burial of Deborah is probably recorded here to provide an explanation for the name of the turpentine tree at Beth-el, i.e. of 'weeping,' *bacuth*; cf. Jg 2^{5}, where Beth-el is called 'Bochim' = 'weepers.'

9-13. P's record of the change of Jacob's name to Israel with a repetition of the Divine promise given to Abraham.

14 is J's parallel to 28^{18} (E), recording the patriarchal origin of the sacred pillar at Beth-el.

16-20 record the birth of Benjamin, Jacob's youngest son, and the death and burial of Rachel at Ephrath, i.e. Bethlehem, and here again a patriarchal origin is assigned to the sacred pillar. For ^{22} cf. 49^{4}.

22*b*-29 continue P's story of Jacob. The extract is fittingly inserted here to round off this portion of the history with P's list of Jacob's sons after the birth of the youngest. P follows another tradition which knows nothing of the dispute between Jacob and Esau. Esau is represented as still living with his father Isaac at Hebron, whither Jacob returns after his sojourn in Haran, and on Isaac's death his two sons bury him with no trace of any enmity between them. The divergence between this and the preceding stories is explained by the documentary hypothesis.

XXXVI. *P's Genealogy of the Descendants of Esau and the Rulers of Edom.*—According to P, who follows throughout the story of Jacob a tradition distinct from J and E, Esau did not migrate to Seir till after Jacob's return to Hebron and his father's death ($^{6-8}$). These verses are in striking contrast to 32 and 33 (J). Here P's narrative echoes the story of Abraham and Lot—Jacob and Esau separate because there is no room for the two of them with all their cattle at Hebron, so Esau goes to Seir and becomes the ancestor of the Edomites.

7. Cf. 13^{6}. The separation is entirely amicable.

31 implies that the narrative was written after the founding of the Hebrew monarchy. It also points to the earlier political development of Edom, the older body of Semite settlers in Canaan.

XXXVII. introduces the concluding section of the book, which except for 38 and 49 is occupied entirely with the history of Joseph—'at once the most artistic and the most fascinating of OT biographies' (Skinner). J and E preserve the story as it was handed down in Judah and Ephraim, and the compiler has combined the two traditions with occasional notes from P. Apart from $^{1, 2a}$ (P), 37 is a combination of J and E. To J belong $^{2b-4, 12-18, 21, 25b}$ (from 'and they lifted up')–$^{27, 28b}$ (from 'and sold'), $^{31-35}$. The rest is E. The differences between the two traditions become at once apparent on reading the chapter. In J Judah suggests a way for disposing of Joseph without killing him by selling him to *Ishmaelites*, who carry him to Egypt (39^{1}). In E Reuben intercedes for his life, and devises a plan for his subsequent rescue by putting him in a dry cistern, from which, however, unbeknown to his brothers, he is taken by *Midianites*, who afterwards sell him to Potiphar in Egypt: see further p. 31*a*.

3. **coat of many colours.** Not 'a multicoloured garment, but, literally, 'a tunic reaching to palms and soles,' i.e. a long robe with sleeves, whereas the ordinary tunic was sleeveless and reached only to the knees. Joseph's tunic was one of distinction (cf. $2\ S\ 13^{18}$), and was well calculated to arouse the jealousy of his brothers.

17. **Dothan** is 15 miles N. of Shechem.

20. **pits** were cisterns used for storing water, and were often dangerous both to men and cattle (cf. Ex $21^{33, 34}$). Reuben,

anxious to save Joseph, persuades his brothers to put him alive into a cistern which he probably knew was empty (22-24). In 21 (J) 'Reuben' seems to be clearly an error for 'Judah,' probably due to a copyist whose eye wandered to 'Reuben' in the next verse.

36. **captain of the guard**: lit. 'chief of the butchers,' not 'executioners' as RVm. "'The royal butchers must, it seems, have come in some way to form the royal bodyguard' (Driver).

XXXVIII., crude and indelicate though it may seem to our Western sense of literary decorum, would be understood by the Hebrews only in the sense that the writer intended, viz. as an explanation of certain semi-foreign tribal accretions in Judah. The great tribe of Judah included some loosely related Canaanite clans, and this chapter gives a graphic personification of their origin. It is also intended to inculcate the duty of marriage with a deceased brother's widow in order to perpetuate the family (cf. Dt 25 5-10; Mt 22 23-28).

XXXIX. continues J's story of Joseph from 37 36. Joseph was sold by the Ishmaelites as a household slave to an Egyptian who afterwards raised him to a position of trust. By resisting the immoral overtures of his master's wife he incurred her hatred, and was thrown into prison on a false charge of attempted adultery. In prison he was also promoted to a place of trust as chief warder. Both J and E concur in the statement that Joseph commenced his career in Egypt in prison, but whereas E follows a tradition which tells of Joseph's duties there in virtue of his master Potiphar's position as captain of the guard, J embodies a story which forms a striking parallel to one related of two Egyptian brothers in a papyrus dating from the reign of Seti II, *c.* 1209-1205 B.C., where the younger brother is said to have been similarly tempted by his sister-in-law, who also accused him of adultery in revenge for her thwarted lust. In 1 the words 'Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, the captain of the guard' seem to be plainly an editorial insertion intended to harmonize this with E's account. 6 is one of many indications which show that the writers of these stories had an intimate knowledge of Egyptian life and customs. Foreigners were not allowed to come in contact with Egyptians' food (cf. 43 32).

XL.-XLII. The compiler continues the story of Joseph from E's record with only two brief extracts from J, viz. 42 27-28. 38, and one from P, 41 46. The immediate sequel to E's history of Joseph's entry into Egypt has been omitted in favour of J's story recorded in 39, and E's narrative is resumed at a point subsequent to Joseph's commencement of his duties as a prison official. As a member of Potiphar's household Joseph was given charge of two important prisoners, Pharaoh's chief butler and baker, whose dreams he interpreted, thereby laying the foundation of his future rise to eminence, for though the chief butler forgot him at the time, he soon recalled his skill when Pharaoh sought to learn the meaning of his dream of the fat and lean kine. Joseph's interpretation, and his wise suggestion for making provision against the coming famine, led Pharaoh to appoint him food-controller in Egypt with plenary powers. As a result of Joseph's foresight Egypt became the granary of Western Asia during a time of famine, and among others who came to buy corn were Joseph's brothers. 42 is a dramatic story of the sons of Jacob failing to recognize in the haughty Egyptian official, whom they so anxiously strove to placate, their younger brother whom a few years previously they had hated to the point of murder, and of whose present greatness they were the unconscious instruments (cf. 45 5-8, 50 20). That there is nothing inherently improbable in this record of Joseph's rise to power in Egypt is abundantly clear from Egyptian history. Among the Tell-el-Amarna tablets are two letters addressed to a high official of Akhnaton, bearing the Semitic name of Dudu; while on the tomb of one Baba, *c.* 1500 B.C., is found the following significant inscription: 'I collected corn as a friend of the harvest god. I was watchful in time of sowing; and when a famine arose and lasted many years I distributed corn to the city.' 40 3—'into the prison, the place where Joseph was bound'—is probably an editorial note intended to harmonize the two traditions of J and E by suggesting that Potiphar was governor of the prison into which Joseph had been cast on the accusation of his master's wife.

XLI. 43. **bow the knee** is a purely conjectural rendering of the obscure word *abrekh*, the meaning of which is unknown.

XLIII. and XLIV. The compiler here returns to the narrative of J in recounting the second expedition of Jacob's sons into Egypt to buy corn. With great difficulty the patriarch is at last persuaded to allow Benjamin to accompany them, and only then on Judah's promise to become surety

for bringing him safely back. The brothers meet Joseph with fear and trembling on account of the money formerly returned in their sacks, but this time they are received kindly and invited to dine with Joseph, who, however, subjects them to one more trial by directing that his divining cup be placed in Benjamin's sack before they are dismissed with a further supply of corn. They have barely started on their homeward journey when they are overtaken and brought back into Joseph's presence charged with the theft of his cup. Joseph decrees that Benjamin, in whose sack the cup is found, shall be retained in bondage, whereupon Judah makes an eloquent plea to be allowed to take Benjamin's place, since the loss of his youngest son will break their father's heart. We notice in 43 [32], 44 [5] (which refers to the practice of hydromancy), further evidence of the writer's knowledge of Egyptian customs.

XLV. The narrative is now resumed from E in recording the effect of the preceding incident. Joseph, no longer able to restrain his feelings, tells his astonished brothers who he is, and reminds them how they sold him into Egypt. His deep sense of religion and of Divine guidance appears in the way he calms their not unnatural trepidation by showing them that their evil intentions had been overruled by God for His own providential purpose ([5-8]; cf. 50 [20]). Joseph's invitation to his father to come down to Egypt is confirmed by Pharaoh, and the brothers are sent back with generous gifts to the patriarch, who is completely overcome on hearing that his favourite son is still alive.

XLVI.-XLVII. **12.** Here J, E and P are combined in the record of the settlement of Jacob and his family in Egypt. 46 [28]-47 [4, 6b, 12] are J; 46 [1-5] are E. The rest is P. E records a further vision and Divine promise to Jacob at Beer-sheba on his way to Egypt (46 [2-4]). P gives a characteristic list of the members of Jacob's family who accompanied him to Egypt ([8-27]). They were allotted a district to themselves, viz. Goshen in the Nile Delta, 'for every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians' ([34]). Pharaoh, however, was willing to employ them as keepers of the royal cattle (47 [6]). Jacob's address to Pharaoh ([9]) reflects his feelings on the ultimate futility of all the wealth he had striven so hard to acquire.

XLVII. **11. the land of Rameses** is an anachronistic term here. This portion of the Delta was the scene of extensive building operations by Rameses II, after whom it was named at the time when P wrote.

13-27 (J). This section, recording the progress of the famine, is entirely occupied with Joseph's policy in acquiring gradually all the land for Pharaoh. The Egyptians pledge first their cattle, and then themselves and their lands for food, with the result that all the land, except that of the priests, becomes subject to a tax of one-fifth of its value, whereby the royal revenues are largely augmented.

28-XLVIII. describe the closing scenes of Jacob's life compiled from all three sources. 47 [29-31] are J; 47 [28], 48 [3-7] are P. The rest is E. Jacob asks Joseph to bury him with his fathers in Canaan (47 [29-31]). P's parallel in 49 [29-32] is more definite, and names the field of Machpelah where Abraham and Isaac were buried. 48, which recounts Jacob's adoption and blessing of Joseph's two sons as his own, is intended to explain the division of Joseph into two tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh, and the pre-eminence of Ephraim, here represented as receiving the chief blessing though the younger son. The blessing is recorded by E, and at the time when E was written Ephraim had become the powerful central tribe, whose rise to power is here ascribed to the deliberate intention of the patriarch Jacob in preferring Ephraim before Manasseh in spite of Joseph's protest.

XLVIII. **22. one portion above thy brethren**: see RVm. The Hebrew is evidently intended by a play on the word *shechem* (='shoulder' or 'mountain slope') to refer to Shechem, the centre of Ephraim's later territory in Canaan. Here Jacob claims to have taken Shechem, but see on 34.

XLIX. **1-27** is a poem—'one of the oldest pieces of Hebrew poetry which we possess' (Skinner). It is attributed to Jacob on his death-bed, and records his judgement on his sons with an estimate of their characters. That tribal characteristics are here personified can scarcely be doubted, and the poem should be compared carefully with Dt 33 and Jg 5, which also describe the characters of the various tribes; but this poem, though included in J's narrative, goes back to an earlier age than the other two, for here **Levi** is still a purely secular tribe, described together with **Simeon** as violent and bloodthirsty, whereas in Dt 33 Levi has become the priestly tribe giving judgement and law to Israel and offering sacrifices for the people; while in Jg 5 Levi is not mentioned either for praise or blame, an omission which accords with its assumption of priestly functions. The order in which

the tribes are mentioned here indicates their relative importance in early Hebrew tradition, e.g. **Reuben,** represented as Jacob's first-born, must have been at one time a more powerful tribe than its later position would suggest.

4 assigns two reasons for the decline of Reuben. For the instability of purpose characteristic of this tribe cf. Jg 5 [15-16].

5-7. Simeon and Levi are specially mentioned in the J sections of 34 as taking the lead in the treacherous capture of Shechem. The two tribes seem to have been closely allied in the early stages of Israel's development.

5. For **brethren** Burney, following Ball, reads 'hyenas,' a change involving no alteration of the Hebrew consonants, and aptly expressing the idea of bloodthirsty cruelty. On the probable course of Levi's development into the priestly tribe: Jg 17 [7] *v.n.*

8-12. Judah appears to have been always a large and powerful tribe.

10 presents considerable difficulty. It seems clearly to reflect the pride of the writer in the Davidic monarchy; but the poem belongs to a much earlier period. It is probable therefore that this passage is a later addition due to prophetic Messianism. The insertion presupposes a royal house of David destined to reign until the Messiah comes. The words **until Shiloh come** can hardly be explained: see RVm. Shiloh occurs in the Talmud as a personal name of the Messiah, but there is no evidence that it was ever used previously in this sense. Possibly we should slightly emend the text and read with LXX and other ancient versions 'till he that is his shall come,' i.e. till the Messiah, destined to be of the tribe of Judah, shall come. For a full discussion of the passage see Driver and Skinner.

14, 15. Issachar is compared to a beast of burden forced to labour, a simile explained in [15b]. **and became a servant under taskwork** should be 'was for the forced service of a labourer.' The Hebrew *mas* = 'forced labour.' Jg 1 [27-36] show that many tribes only gradually gained supremacy over the Canaanites; and this description of Issachar refers to an early period of the Hebrew settlement when this tribe was in subjection to the Canaanites.

17. For an example of the insidious methods of warfare and conquest adopted by **Dan** cf. Jg 18.

20. For the meaningless **out of Asher,** etc. of RV read 'As for Asher his food shall be rich,' etc.

24. The last clause of this verse has clearly suffered some mutilation, and it is impossible to recover its meaning: see RVm.

27. For the warlike character of the tribe of **Benjamin** cf. Jg 3 [12-30], 20.

29-33 are P's account of Jacob's last words, charging his sons to bury him at Machpelah.

L. *The Burial of Jacob and the Death of Joseph.*—[1-11, 14] are J; [12, 13] are P. The rest is E. The fact that Jacob's body was embalmed may have been due to Joseph's wish to conform to the customs of Egypt, and also in order to preserve it for burial in Canaan. Embalming in Egypt expressed the belief that the soul might return to take possession of its body, and the body must therefore be preserved. In accordance with Jacob's wishes he was duly buried in the sepulchre of his fathers at Machpelah.

14-21 reveal the high moral and religious character of Joseph. Now that 'their father was dead,' and the restraint of parental authority removed, the brothers, judging Joseph by themselves, fear that he will exact a terrible vengeance for their former outrage. Joseph, on the contrary, reiterates his belief that their intentions were overruled by God for His own beneficent purposes (cf. 45 [5-8]), and freely forgives them. On this passage see a suggestive sermon by F. W. Robertson.

25. Joseph's command to be buried in Canaan was afterwards obeyed (Jos 24 [32]).

Bibliography

The two standard Commentaries are Driver's in the *Westminster,* and Skinner's in the *I.C.C.,* series. For smaller books *C.B.* is useful, and A. Maclaren, and F. W. Robertson, *Notes on Genesis,* are still of great spiritual value.

EXODUS

By S. L. Brown

This book, which takes its English title from the LXX through the Vulgate, continues the story of the Israelites from the death of Joseph in Egypt, and ends with the erection of the tabernacle or dwelling in the wilderness of Sinai on the first day of the second year of the Exodus. The subject-matter of the first half of the book is familiar to all readers of the Old Testament. From their earliest childhood they have known and loved the story of Moses, his birth and infancy, his flight into Midian, his call to deliver his fellow-countrymen from oppression, the plagues, the Passover, and the adventures encountered on the way to the holy mount. If to some the second half is tedious reading, to others it has much of interest to say. For the story of the tabernacle is something more than a mere catalogue of materials or a mere directory of ceremonial observances; it bears witness to that longing for the visible Presence of God which was only fulfilled in the Incarnation, and it teaches us that beauty in worship is acceptable to God, because as the outward expression of the heart's devotion it calls out the spirit of self-sacrifice and service.

It is clear that Exodus is built upon the same lines as Genesis and of the same materials, J, E and P; but the larger number of parallel narratives, the greater bulk of later editorial matter, and the more frequent occurrence of displacements in the text make an exact analysis more difficult. This means that none of the documents from which extracts have been taken is contemporary, or even nearly so, with the events which it sets out to relate. If the earlier narratives are based on traditions current in the 9th and 8th centuries B.C., they will be some 400 and 500 years later than the time of Moses; and if large sections are the work of post-exilic writers, much of the book will be at least 200 years later still. It follows from this, therefore, that Exodus is not history in the sense that the record of the reign of David or the Acts of the Apostles is history, or as history is understood to-day. Instead of records which are literally exact, we shall expect to find stories expanded in the course of oral transmission, divergent, and sometimes contradictory, accounts of the same event, narratives acquiring a more miraculous character during the centuries which have elapsed between their occurrence and their committal to writing, and showing the influence of customs, laws, and institutions which really only began to prevail in later days. But when all those deductions which intellectual honesty demands have been made, it cannot seriously be doubted that all three sources have historic ground beneath them, and that in their broad outlines the narratives of J and E at least (P is less reliable) are historically true. Thus it is safe to assume that some, if not all, of the tribes of Israel settled in Egypt and were in course of time subjected to forced labour; that, at a time when Egypt was overwhelmed by a series of calamities, Moses delivered his people from slavery and led them across the Red Sea beyond the reach of their oppressors; that he brought them through a wilderness to a sacred mountain, where he was the medium of a revelation which marked a new departure in the national religion; that he gave decisions on civil and ceremonial matters which formed the basis of all subsequent legislation, and that therefore Israel owed to him under God its existence as a nation. If the view taken in this commentary be correct, the Book of Exodus is the record of an ancient tradition substantially true, but idealized by prophets and priests, and rightly interpreted by both as revealing a providential purpose of Jehovah for Israel.

The book falls naturally into two parts: (*a*) Israel in Egypt—the story of the Great Deliverance (1-15 ^{21}); (*b*) Israel in the wilderness—the establishment of the theocracy on Mount Sinai (15 ^{22} to end). In (*a*) the climax is the Song of Moses; in (*b*) the descent of Jehovah to take up His abode in the tabernacle.

Bibliography

Driver (*C.B.*); Bennett (*Cent. B.*); McNeile (*West. C.*); D. C. Simpson, *Pentateuchal Criticism*; and articles in *H.D.B.* and *E.B.*

I.-XV. 21. Israel in Egypt.

I. Increase and Oppression of the Hebrews.—From JE and P (see below). This chapter describes the condition of 'the sons of Israel' in Egypt before Moses came. They had 'increased abundantly' (lit. swarmed) since the descendants of Jacob settled there, and it was feared that they might become a source of danger to

the state. So when there arose a new Pharaoh, who 'had not known Joseph,' steps were taken to crush them. One device was to break their spirit by forced labour. The other was to reduce their numbers by destroying their male children at birth. When the midwives to whom this task was entrusted disobeyed the king's command, orders were given that all their boy babies should be drowned in the Nile.

1-5, 7 (P) is a genealogy, bridging the gap between the history of a family (Genesis) and the history of a people (Exodus). Seventy is the traditional number (Dt 10 [22]) of the family whence the increase was derived, but its constituents vary in the different accounts (cf. the list in Nu 26 and Gen 46). Both here and in Genesis LXX makes the total seventy-five, the number given by St. Stephen in Ac 7 [14]. Between [5] and [7] a verse is introduced from J, probably for the purpose of leading up to the statement in [8].

With the exception of [13, 14] (P), the rest of the chapter is a compilation from J and E.

8-12 (J) imply that the Hebrews were more numerous than would naturally be gathered from [15-20] (E).

8. The **new king** is generally identified with Rameses II, of the nineteenth dynasty (*c.* 1300-1234 B.C.). Those who take this view date the Exodus *c.* 1225 B.C., during the reign of Mineptah. J. W. Jack (*The Date of the Exodus in the Light of External Evidence*) takes the view that Thutmosi III was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and that the Exodus took place during the reign of Amenhotep II, *c.* 1445 B.C.

9. Translate with RVm: 'too many and too mighty for us.'

10. Substitute 'craftily' for **wisely**, and (changing one letter) read, with LXX, 'when any war befalleth us.' It has been computed that the foreign element in this reign amounted to at least a third of the population of Egypt. As a subject population they would always be ready to take advantage of those invasions of the north-east frontier to which the country was peculiarly liable.

11. Translate 'gangmasters.' Forced labour was used for many of the great buildings of antiquity: Aristotle mentions the Egyptian pyramids as an example, and Solomon introduced it into Judah (1 K 5 [13], 9 [15]). Pithom is known to have been built by Rameses II. It lies about sixty miles north-east of Cairo. Petrie places Raamses ten miles west of Pithom.

12. The measure did not have the desired effect: the more the Hebrews were oppressed, the more they increased, so that the Egyptians 'felt a loathing for,' or 'had an uneasy dread of,' them.

13-14 (P) is parallel to [11-12] and follows [7]. The black mud of the Nile was used both for bricks and for mortar. Service in the field meant the construction of canals and dams for the purposes of irrigation and the actual watering of the land by means of long poles with their heavy buckets.

15-22. From E we read of two more measures to restrict the increase, both ineffectual. The Hebrew midwives were commanded to slay all male children as they were born. If the male population really numbered 600,000 (12 [37]), many more than two midwives would have been required. Either E did not think of the Hebrews as being very numerous, or these were the only two names that tradition has remembered. It is recorded of Shiphrah and Puah that they 'feared God,' and disobeyed the king's inhuman command, and that as a reward God made them houses, i.e. gave them families to perpetuate their names.

22. As a last resort, Pharaoh commands all the Egyptians to throw every male infant of the Hebrews into the Nile. After **born** add (with LXX) 'to the Hebrews.' This measure, like the last, seems to imply a small community living near the river.

II. The Preparation of Moses.

1-10 (E). His Birth, Deliverance, and Education.—This passage shows how Pharaoh's brutal command became the means of bringing Israel's future deliverer to the Egyptian court and preparing him for his mission.

E is apparently ignorant of the names of the father, mother, and sister of Moses: or it may be that the names have been mentioned previously in a part of the document which has not been included by the editor. The parents' names appear for the first time in 6 [20] (P). [1-2] suggests that Moses was the first child of the marriage, while in [4] he has a sister old enough to take care of him, and in 7 [7] (P) he has a brother three years older than himself. It must, therefore, be supposed that Aaron and Miriam were children of Amram by a former marriage. In favour of this it may be noticed that Miriam is referred to as 'Aaron's sister' (15 [20]), and that the two conspire against Moses (Nu 12 [1]). **goodly**, i.e. comely; cf. Ac 7 [20]; Heb 11 [23]. In Hebrews (after LXX) the hiding of the infant is ascribed to both parents, and the motive given is

faith in his future. When concealment was no longer possible, the babe was placed in a chest made of papyrus stems and caulked with bitumen and pitch, and committed to the reeds on the edge of the river. Rameses II is said to have had fifty-nine daughters. The one who found Moses and adopted him is called Thermuthis by Josephus, and by Eusebius, Merris.

6. Translate, 'behold a boy weeping.' When the child was weaned, his mother brought him to the princess, and he 'became a son to her.' Driver remarks that the common opinion, based on Ac 7 [22], that Moses was 'instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,' has no support in the Old Testament itself, but it is surely a reasonable inference from [10]. It is difficult to see how one who was brought up in the establishment of an Egyptian princess and adopted as her own child could fail to acquire much of the learning for which Egypt was then famous. If we take this view, we must, however, be prepared to admit that besides 'moral duties and good manners, reading, writing, composition and arithmetic,' Moses would be introduced to less desirable subjects, such as 'mythology, astrology, magic and superstitious practices in medicine.' The derivation and meaning of the name 'Moses' are uncertain. The Hebrew *Mōshēh* resembles in sound *māshāh*, which means 'to draw out'; hence RV and note in the margin, but it is not likely that Pharaoh's daughter would give her adopted son a Hebrew name. It is therefore more probable that it represents the Egyptian word *mosi*, 'born,' which occurs as the second part of a god-bearing name; e.g. Thutmosi ('Thoth is born').

The story in E above has a very close parallel in that of Sargon, King of Accad (3800 B.C.), which is found on an inscription of the 8th century. It relates how his mother, a poor woman, gave birth to him in secret, placed him in a basket of reeds, closing the lid with pitch, and abandoned him to the river, and how he was found and rescued by Akki, a drawer of water, who adopted him and brought him up as his own son. Compare the stories of Romulus, suckled by a she-wolf, and Cyrus, exposed to die and brought up as a herdsman's son.

11-22 (J). **Moses Flies to Midian and Marries.**—When Moses was grown up (according to Ac 7 [23] he was forty years old), an incident occurred which compelled him to leave Egypt. Seeing one of his own people being ill-treated by an Egyptian (perhaps one of the gang-masters of 3 [7]) he intervened and slew the Egyptian. The next day, attempting to reconcile two Hebrews who were quarrelling, he found that the act of homicide was known and fled to the desert. Here he met the seven daughters of the priest of Midian, and chivalrously came forward to help them to water their father's flock. Taking up his abode with the priest, he married Zipporah, one of the seven, by whom he had a son, Gershom.

In this passage Moses is seen to be brave and patriotic (Heb 11 [24-26]), with a strong sense of justice and of sympathy with the oppressed, but he needs to be cured of his impetuosity: hence his removal into another environment. Midian was in the south or south-east of the 'Sinaitic' peninsula. From Gen 25 [1-6] (J) we learn that the Midianites were distant blood-relations of the Hebrews. From Ex 18 [10-12] it seems probable that they were worshippers of Jehovah. In later times they came to be regarded as Israel's bitterest enemies (Jg 6, 7; Nu 25, 31). Tradition has handed down three names for the high priest of Midian: **Reuel** ('the friend of God'), Jethro (3 [1], E), and Hobab (Jg 4 [11], J). 'Reuel' here, however, may be dismissed as a gloss inserted by someone who misunderstood Nu 10 [29]. Among the Bedawin of this district the duty of tending the flocks is still performed by young unmarried women. The shepherds, wishing to have the first turn at the well, drove the daughters of the high priest away, but, like a true hero, Moses is more than a match for many opponents. This interference on the part of the shepherds was apparently a frequent occurrence, for Hobab asks why his daughters have returned so soon. '**An Egyptian delivered us . . . and actually drew water for us.**' The dress and speech of Moses would suggest that he was an Egyptian. 'Actually drew' expresses surprise at the kindness of the man in drawing water for *women*. Moses 'agreed to dwell' with Hobab, and married one of his daughters (**Zipporah** = 'a bird').

22 gives the popular explanation of the name **Gershom: for he said, I have been a sojourner** (Hebrew *gēr*) **in a foreign land.**

23-VI. 1. **The Call and Commission of Moses: First Account** (JE, with preface from P).

II. 23*a* (J). **The Death of Rameses II.**—This sentence seems to be inserted here in order to explain how it became possible

for Moses to return to Egypt (cf. 2 15 with 4 19). Since Gershom is still quite young in 4 20-25 (J), Moses cannot have remained long in Midian. The word 'many' should therefore be regarded as a gloss in the interests of P's theory that Moses was eighty years old when he went in unto Pharaoh (7 7).

23b-25 (P). God Hears the Cry of the Israelites.—These verses follow 1 14 (P). The rest of this section (3 1-6 1) is a series of excerpts from J and E. In 3, E is used in the main, with shorter passages from J (2-4a, 5, 7-8, 16-18); in 4-6 1, J is chiefly drawn upon (4 17-18, 20b-21, 27-28 and 5 1-2, 4 are E).

III. 1-10. The Vision of the Burning Bush.—Moses, having led Jethro's sheep behind (i.e. to the west of) the wilderness to Mount Horeb, sees a thorn-bush (LXX a 'bramble') which appears to burn without being consumed. Here it is revealed to him that God is about to deliver the children of Israel from the Egyptians and to lead them into Canaan, and that he himself is to be the instrument of God's purposes.

The holy mountain is called **Horeb** by E (see 17 6, 33 6) and D. In J and P it is always **Sinai.** The two names are generally regarded as practically interchangeable, the only distinction being that Horeb covers the wider district in which Sinai is located. 'Both denote the mountain of the law-giving, and there is apparently no place where "Horeb" occurs in which "Mount Sinai" or "the wilderness of Sinai" could not have been used' (Driver). Those who regard Horeb as=Sinai identify the mountain with either Jebel Musa or Jebel Serbal in the Sinaitic peninsula. It has, however, been contended by Sayce and others that Sinai was not in the Sinaitic peninsula at all, but on the east side of the Gulf of Akaba; while McNeile seeks to prove that Sinai and Horeb are totally different places, the one being near Kadesh on the west border of Edom, and the other on the east of the Gulf. The evidence is conflicting, and it is difficult to decide between the rival theories. For the various arguments see Driver (*C.B.*) and McNeile (*West. Comm.*).

Horeb is not called **the mountain of God** because God appeared to Moses there, or because the Law was to be given from it, but because it was already a sacred place. It is quite in accordance with Semitic ideas that a lofty mountain should be regarded as the abode of Deity, and the name Sinai is most probably derived from Sin, the Babylonian moon-god. **the angel of Jehovah** is Jehovah Himself manifested for a special purpose, usually (though not so here) in human form. P never uses the expression. The fire in the bush is a symbol of the Divine Presence (cf. 13 21, 19 18, 24 17). The custom of removing the sandals on entering a holy place is widespread in the East as a mark of reverence. Cf. 'hid his face' in the next verse (E).

6. 'It is no new God, but the God worshipped by thy father and by thy forefathers, who is speaking to thee.' Remembering the visions and voices vouchsafed to the saints and mystics, some will regard the dialogue between Jehovah and Moses as a record of an actual occurrence; others would say (with Driver) that it 'must be pictured, not as audible externally, but as giving expression—in words which are naturally those of the narrators—to Moses' mental communings with God, through which he was gradually taught that, in spite of the difficulties which he saw before him, he was nevertheless to be His appointed agent for accomplishing Israel's deliverance.' In Mk 12 26 our Lord uses this verse to prove to the Sadducees the truth of the resurrection. God, He argues, calls Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, long after the patriarchs were dead. Therefore those who have died in faith are alive, for God is still their God. 'I am the God of Abraham' implies that Abraham still exists.

8. a land flowing with milk and honey is a frequent description of the Promised Land in the Pentateuch. 'Honey' (Hebrew *debash*) includes not only the honey of bees, but also what the Arabs call *dibs*, i.e. a sweet syrup, used in Palestine to-day as a condiment as we use jam. **the Canaanite** in J is a general term for the native pre-Israelitish people of Canaan (E uses 'Amorites'). The list of the tribes which follows, here and in 17, may be an editorial expansion for the purpose of bringing the sentence into line with later history.

11-IV. 17. The Diffidence of Moses.—As a young man Moses was self-confident and impulsive, but now the magnitude of the task laid upon him makes him cautious and distrustful of his own powers. Accordingly he suggests four reasons why he should not undertake it.

III. 11-12. His first difficulty: he is not the man to deal with Pharaoh or to lead the children of Israel. The answer is that God will be with him (cf. Jos 1 5), as he will discover when he returns with his people to this same mountain. With the diffidence of Moses we may compare the

cases of Gideon (Jg 6 15), Jeroboam (1 K 3 7), and Jeremiah (1 6).

13-22. **His second difficulty**: he does not know the name of the God who has sent him. Moses is told what the Name is. He is to announce his mission to the elders of Israel. They will listen to him and go with him to Pharaoh to ask permission to go into the wilderness to sacrifice to their God. Pharaoh will not consent till God has smitten Egypt with all His wonders. When the people depart, they shall demand jewels and clothes from the Egyptians.

In ancient religions it was necessary to know what the personal name of one's deity was; for only if it were known could it be appealed to for help or its character and nature be understood by the worshipper. It is clear from 13-15 that, according to E, the name *Yahweh* was not known to the Israelites up to this moment when it was first revealed to Moses. The same view is taken in P (6 2. 3). Hence neither document uses *Yahweh* in Genesis, or in Exodus before 3 14 and 6 4 respectively. J, on the other hand, uses *Yahweh* consistently from the very beginning (Gen 2 4): with him it is the primeval name and was first used in invocation in the days of Enosh (Gen 4 26). There is an element of truth in each of these representations. J is probably correct in supposing that Moses did not go to the Israelites in the name of a deity hitherto unknown to them. It is not likely that one with an entirely new name would have been so rapidly accepted. There is also a considerable amount of evidence in Babylonian texts to show that the name 'Yahweh,' in the form *Ya-u*, occurs long before the time of Moses, as a West-Semitic, or Amorite, deity (see Burney's *Judges*, 243 ff., and, for another view, Burkitt in *J.B.L.*, xliv, 353 f.). It cannot, perhaps, be assumed as yet that the Hebrew 'Yahweh' was actually derived from *Ya-u* but, if this is ever proved beyond doubt, it will be little more than an interesting historical fact. The important question for us is not the source from which the Divine Name sprang, but what it came to mean for the children of Israel. 'Whatever the name may have been in its *origin*, it *came to be* the name of the one and only God' (*C.B.*, li). This stage of ethical monotheism was not fully reached till the age of the prophets, but there is every reason to suppose that the name 'Yahweh,' whatever its origin, was invested with an entirely new significance when at Sinai it became the covenant-name of Israel's God. J would agree with E and P that there was a new revelation at the Exodus.

E is the only writer who attempts to explain the name 'Yahweh,' and RV with its three marginal notes reflects the attempts of scholars in the 19th century to explain E. It is clear that E's intention is to connect the Divine Name philologically with the verb 'to be,' whose first person singular imperfect is *ehyeh*. 'God is *ehyeh*, "I will be," when speaking of Himself, and *Yahweh*, "He will be," when spoken of by others' (*H.D.B.*, ii, 199). *Ehyeh* means not 'I am,' but either 'I will be' or 'I am wont to be,' and, whichever rendering be chosen, the reference is not to abstract, inactive Being, but to God manifesting Himself in action. Thus 'He is wont to be what He is wont to be' would mean that He is always revealing Himself anew in the history of the nation, and 'He will be what He will be' suggests that, though He is absolutely self-determined, His character will be gradually unfolded in His dealings with the chosen people. 'I will be what I will be' is, on the whole, the better rendering (see McNeile, 18 f., 21 ff., and Driver, 40). Owing to an exaggerated sense of reverence, based on passages like Ex 20 7 and Lev 24 16, the Divine Name fell out of use among the Jews, and, whenever they saw YHWH (or JHVH) written or printed, they read the word *Adōnay* (Lord) instead. Consequently the correct pronunciation was lost, but the contraction *Yah* (Ex 15 2, 17 16), and the form *yāhū*, which occurs in many proper names in the Old Testament, together with Theodoret's statement that the Samaritans pronounced it *Iabe*, suggested 'Yahweh' as the correct vocalization of the word. Our English 'Jehovah' is formed by a mistaken combination of the vowels of *Adōnay* with the consonants of JHVH.

18. The request of the Israelites is in itself a reasonable one, if their God can only be worshipped at a desert-shrine, but it reads like a ruse for getting out of the country. A three days' journey would not bring them to Sinai, whether that mountain be placed north or south of the Sinaitic peninsula. Dillmann suggests charitably that the request may have been intended merely to test Pharaoh's feelings towards the Israelites, with a view to opening further negotiations if it was favourably considered.

19. Read (with LXX) 'except by a mighty hand,' i.e. unless he is compelled by Jehovah.

IV. 1-9 (J). **His third difficulty**: perhaps

the people will not believe in him. This is met by endowing him with the power of working signs, which will serve as his credentials: (1) his shepherd's staff becomes a serpent, and (2) his hand becomes leprous. He is to repeat these signs before the people, and, if they remain unconvinced, as a last resort (3) he is to turn Nile water into blood.

In J the rod is Moses' ordinary shepherd's crook. In E it is given him by God (17) and called 'God's rod' (20)—a magic instrument which works miracles. In P the rod is in Aaron's hands, and it is changed into a serpent before Pharaoh (7 8-13). The third sign is in E and P the first plague (7 14-25).

10-16 (J). His fourth difficulty: he is not a man of words (cf. Jer 1 6), i.e. fluent of speech, but 'heavy of mouth and heavy of tongue.' This objection is met by the promise that God will teach him what to say; when he still demurs, he is told that his brother Aaron will join him and be his spokesman.

11. God gives man all his faculties; He can, therefore, give Moses eloquence. For **seeing** read perhaps 'lame' (McNeile).

13. 'Send anyone but me'—a polite way of declining the commission. In the next verse Aaron is described as the **Levite.** As Moses also belonged to the tribe of Levi, and it would be superfluous to tell him to what tribe his brother belonged, we must assume that here, as elsewhere, the term denotes not ancestry, but profession, and means 'the priest.' Cf. Jg 17 7, where a young man of the family of Judah is called 'a Levite.'

16. As God inspires Moses, so Moses will inspire Aaron: the latter will be his brother's mouthpiece (cf. 7 1, P). In spite of this passage Philo and Josephus represent Moses as eloquent. St. Stephen's 'mighty in his words and works' (Ac 7 22) may reflect the later Jewish traditions, but it need not be more than a general description of a great prophet (cf. Lk 24 19).

17 (E). This is not the rod of 2-4, with which only one sign was to be performed, but the wonder-working rod of 20b and *passim* in E.

18-31. Moses Returns to Egypt.

18 (E). He asks permission to leave Jethro, in whose service he is, concealing his real purpose under the guise of a temporary leave of absence.

19-20a (J). Moses is now commanded by God to do what he has just obtained his father-in-law's permission to do. The inconsistency is explained by the fact that 18 is taken from one source and 19 from another.

Hitherto only one son has been mentioned (2 22), and 4 24-26 implies that only one son was with Moses in his journey. We should, therefore, read 'his son' and explain the plural as the work of a harmonizer who thought that some notice ought to be taken of 18 2-4 (E).

21-23 is a summary of what Moses is to do when he goes back into Egypt: he is to perform the wonders (portents) which God has put in his hand before Pharaoh, and, when these have failed to move him, he is to threaten him with the death of his firstborn.

The 'portents' of 21 are not the 'signs' of 2-9, which were to be performed before the *people*, but the 'signs' of 17, which were to be performed before *Pharaoh* by means of the magic rod. With 22 cf. Dt 32 6; Is 1 2; Jer 31 9; Hos 11; and Gal 3 26-4 7. For the hardening of Pharaoh's heart see p. 71*b*.

22, 23 are clearly out of place in their present context. Their proper position would seem to be between the ninth plague and the tenth, i.e. before 10 28 or 11 4, where they would form a suitable introduction to J's account of the death of the firstborn. By their removal to this section they serve as a general introduction to the plagues and make the instructions of Moses complete.

24-26 (J). A curious fragment of folklore, the original object of which was to explain the circumcision of male infants as a more humane substitute for the circumcision of young men before marriage. The story continues 20a. On this journey to Egypt Moses fell ill, and Zipporah, interpreting the illness as a punishment for having neglected the rite of circumcision, saved her husband's life by circumcising their son and making his foreskin touch Moses' feet. Gershom's circumcision was thus made to count as his father's. Moses became symbolically 'a blood-bridegroom,' and Jehovah let him alone, i.e. refrained from slaying him. The author of this section seems to know nothing of Gen 17.

27-28 (E), **29-31** (J). Moses meets Aaron at Horeb, and together they deliver their message to the elders of Israel. 27, 28 continue 17, 18; 29-31 follow 14-16 and relate the fulfilment of the commands in 3 16 and 4 2-9. In 30a Aaron appears as the spokesman of Moses in accordance with 15-16 (J). In 30b (**and did the signs**) the subject is Moses, and the signs are those referred to in 1-9. For **when they heard** read (with LXX) 'they rejoiced.'

V. 1-VI. 1. **The Appeal to Pharaoh and its Failure.**—J, except 1, 2, 4 (E).

V. 1-5. Moses and Aaron ask permission to hold a pilgrim-feast in the wilderness: Pharaoh refuses. He regards the pilgrimage as an excuse for a holiday, and charges Moses and Aaron with unsettling their people.

The Hebrew *hag* is a feast accompanied by a pilgrimage for worship at a shrine. Such were the three 'feasts' at which every male was to appear in later times (23 14-17). *Haj* in Arabic=the pilgrimage to Mecca which every pious Moslem seeks to make at least once in his life. 'Who is Jehovah?' is an expression of contempt, not a request for information. **God of the Hebrews** as usual in J (see 3 18); in 1 (E) it is 'God of Israel.'

6-VI. 1. Pharaoh bids the Egyptian 'taskmasters' increase the burdens of the Israelites: they are to find straw for themselves, and yet make the same 'tale' of bricks as before. The 'taskmasters' obey, and, when the tale of bricks is not made up, beat the Israelite foremen. The foremen complain to Pharaoh, but without avail. As they come out from their audience with the king, they meet Moses and Aaron, whom they blame for this aggravation of their people's sufferings. Moses expostulates with God, and is told that something will shortly happen to Pharaoh which will make him not merely willing, but even eager, to get rid of the Israelites.

The **taskmasters** (or 'oppressors') were Egyptians appointed by Pharaoh; the **officers** (or 'foremen') were Israelites appointed by the taskmasters to subordinate positions of authority over their fellow-countrymen.

The process of making bricks is illustrated in Egyptian wall-pictures (Driver, 39). Black mud was carried from the Nile to the moulding place and dried in the sun. Sometimes it was mixed with chopped straw, but more often sand or pebbles or waste stubble were used for binding the mud. Petrie (*H.D.B.*, Art, 'Brick') does not consider that the Israelites suffered any serious hardship in having to do without straw or in having to find stubble for themselves. 'Considering the well-known character of the Hebrews (Nu 11 4, 21 5), we must not take their grievances too seriously. They had at least in Egypt a good and full diet, by their own confession (Nu 11 5), as good as, or better than, that of the Egyptian peasant of the present day.' In *Egypt and Israel* (33) Petrie suggests that straw was demanded, not for mixing in the bricks, but for dipping their hands in, to prevent mud sticking to them, and for coating the mud before it was put into the brick-moulds.

8. **tale** is OE for 'number.'

9. Read (with LXX) 'that they may attend to it, and not attend to lying words.'

14. **task**=prescribed portion or amount.

16. After **beaten** read (with LXX) 'and thou shalt sin against thy people,' i.e. against thy subjects, the Hebrews.

VI. 2-VII. 13 (P). **Second Account of the Call and Commission of Moses.**—The story covers the same ground as 3 1-6 1, but gives a somewhat different account of Moses' call and of the preliminary steps which he took to secure the release of his countrymen; e.g., while in 3 1-6 1 Aaron is the spokesman of Moses with the people, in this section he is his spokesman with Pharaoh, and whereas in 4 31 the people were satisfied with the credentials of Moses, in 6 9 they refuse to listen to him. Another point of difference is that P implies that Egypt, and not Midian, is the scene of Jehovah's revelation of Himself.

God, who had been known to the patriarchs as *El Shaddai*, now reveals Himself to Moses as *Yahweh*, and bids him tell his people that He is about to deliver them from bondage and bring them to the Promised Land. The people, however, refuse to listen. Moses and Aaron are then told to demand the release of the people from Pharaoh. When Moses declares himself to be unequal to the task, Aaron is appointed to be his spokesman with the king. But God will harden Pharaoh's heart and he will not let the people go, until he has been made to feel God's power. When Pharaoh asks for a portent as a proof of their mission, Aaron turns his rod into a 'serpent,' and when this act of magic is imitated by the Egyptian wizards, his rod swallows up theirs. But Pharaoh remains obdurate, and will not let the Israelites go.

VI. 2-9. It is the theory of P (as of E, see 3 14) that the name *Yahweh* was unknown until it was revealed to Moses. Accordingly, we find that, in those sections of Genesis which belong to the Priestly writer, *Elohim* is the Divine Name regularly used. *El Shaddai*, rendered **God Almighty** here and elsewhere, was God's distinctive name used by the patriarchs (Gen 17 1, 28 3, 35 11, 48 3, P). It is probably a very ancient name for God, but its exact meaning is a matter of conjecture. All that we can say for certain is that 'God Almighty' suits the context in many passages in which the name occurs (Driver's *Genesis*, 404 ff.).

Some would read with LXX (changing one letter), 'but my name Yahweh I made not known unto them.' In 4 omit **have.** The reference is to the covenant made with Abraham in Gen 17 1-2, 7-8 (P). **lifted up my hand** = 'sware.' In 9 RVm 'impatience' is better than RV.

10-12. An unconditional release is demanded, not merely, as in J (3 18, 4 23), a temporary absence for a pilgrim-feast. Note also that whereas in 4 10 (J) Moses pleads his inability to persuade the Israelites, here he trembles before the harder task of meeting the king. **of uncircumcised lips** is P's equivalent for J's 'slow (lit. heavy) of tongue' in 4 10. 'Uncircumcised' = closed in, opening with difficulty. The same figure is used in the Old Testament of the heart (i.e. the mind) and the ear.

13-30. The narrative is interrupted at this point by the insertion of a genealogy, the main interest of which is the tribe of Levi and the connexion of Moses and Aaron with it. **fathers' houses** in P = clans. The name of Moses' mother is given as **Jochebed** here and in Nu 26 59. In both cases she is described as Amram's paternal aunt. As a union of this nature was afterwards forbidden (Lev 18 12) we must suppose that an ancient tradition is here preserved. LXX adds 'and Miriam' after Aaron and Moses in 20. The compiler attempts to soften the harshness of the intrusion of his genealogy by means of an introductory verse (13) and a conclusion which summarizes 6 2-12.

VII. 1-12 is the sequel to 6 12. Moses is to be **a god** to Pharaoh, and Aaron is to be the spokesman of Moses with the king. In 4 15, 16 (J) Moses is 'a god' to Aaron, and the latter is his spokesman with the people. 'Signs,' 'portents,' and 'judgements' may refer to the same acts from different points of view, or it may be that 'signs' refer to acts of Moses and Aaron performed as credentials of their mission, that 'portents' describe the less severe plagues, and that 'great judgements' are those which eventually brought about the deliverance of the children of Israel.

8-13. In 4 1-5 (J) this portent is shown to the Israelites. **thy rod** is the one which Aaron always carries in P (7 19, 8 5, 16, 17). The word translated **serpent** is not the word for an ordinary serpent (*nahash*) as in 4 3 (J), but *tannin*, i.e. any large reptile. Used of sea-monsters and dragons, it would seem to mean here a very formidable land-serpent or possibly a young crocodile. The trick which the magicians performed with their secret arts (RVm) is the converse of one which modern Egyptian snake-charmers have been seen to perform: they can hypnotize a snake or a crocodile into the rigidity of a rod and hold it up by the tail. Jewish tradition records the names (Jannes and Jambres) of two of these Egyptian magicians (2 Tim 3 8).

Both E (4 21, 10 20, 27) and P (7 3, 9 12, 11 10, and 14 4, 8) speak of God as **hardening** Pharaoh's heart (cf. also 14 17, P). The moral difficulty is considerably modified when we remember that the Hebrews were in the habit of referring things done by man to the direct operation of God. An instance of this may be seen in 10 1, where what is described in 11 9 as a result of Pharaoh's not heeding Moses and Aaron is here described as a result of Jehovah's hardening the hearts of Pharaoh and his servants; compare the many passages in which Pharaoh himself is said to make his heart 'stubborn.' God is not represented as acting arbitrarily; He hardens Pharaoh and his people in so far as they harden themselves (see *C.B.*, 53, and Peake's *C. ad loc.*); or, to put it in another way, 'if a man hardens his heart, the result will be as inevitable as results in the natural world—so inevitable that it may even be said that Yahweh hardens His heart' (*West. Comm.*, 47).

14-XII. 36. The Ten Plagues.—Pharaoh's obstinacy was great, but in the end he yielded to the pressure of events. The Egyptians were smitten by a succession of plagues similar to those to which the country is still more or less liable. (1) The water of the Nile became the colour of blood and undrinkable. This was followed by (2) swarms of frogs, which entered the houses, and climbed up the bodies, of the Egyptians. Next came (3) a plague of gnats, and (4) another of dog-flies. After these (5) a murrain or cattle-plague and (6) boils and blains on both man and beast. Then (7) a hailstorm destroyed the greater part of the crops, while (8) what was left was devoured by locusts. (9) A sandstorm obscured the light of the sun for three days; and finally (10) an epidemic wrought havoc amongst the Egyptian youth.

The events which preceded the Exodus were so deeply imprinted on the national memory that they are recorded with exceptional fulness and in all three sources. As they were committed to writing four centuries or more after the time of Moses, it is not to be expected that these stories should be 'exact recollections of actual facts.' On the other hand, no one who possesses a sound historical judgement

would be prepared to deny that there is a substantial basis of fact in the traditions which they preserve. It seems highly probable that underlying the story of the plagues there is a series of adverse natural occurrences, which the Israelites under Moses and Aaron ascribed to the action of Jehovah, and by which the Egyptians were so impressed that their reluctance to let the children of Israel depart was overcome; and that as the story passed from mouth to mouth and from generation to generation, it became invested with a miraculous character and gradually assumed its present shape. A wise man who believes that a particular purpose of God was at work in the redemption of Israel will be slow to deny there was anything 'miraculous' in the events as they actually occurred. But, considering the long interval between the date of the events and the date of the written narratives, he will pretend to no certainty in the matter. It is clear, however, that the events made upon the imagination of Israel a profound impression that God had bared His arm, smitten Egypt, and delivered His people. Nor is it without significance that the miracles recorded in the Old Testament are grouped almost entirely round two great crises in the fortunes of Israel—the Deliverance from Egypt and the Reformation of Elijah and Elisha (*H.D.B.*, iii, 393).

For a detailed analysis of the sources, see each section as it comes, but the following general observations may help to explain their various contributions and points of view:

(1) *The Number of the Plagues.*—J, the oldest and most graphic of the three sources, mentions only eight: the Nile turned into blood, the frogs, the dog-flies, the cattle-plague, the hailstorm, the locusts, the darkness, and the death of the first-born. E (used fragmentarily by the editor), as it has come down to us, records only five: the Nile turned into blood, the hailstorm, the locusts, the darkness, and the death of the firstborn. P, the latest source, also contributes five: the Nile turned into blood (heightened to include all the waters of Egypt), the frogs (extended to every stream and pool in Egypt), the gnats, the boils and blains on both man and beast, and the death of the firstborn. It seems highly probable that J's eight is the original number, P's gnats being a duplicate of J's dog-flies, and P's boils and blains a variant of J's murrain.

(2) *Presentation of the Plagues.*—Apart from differences of style and phraseology (for which see larger commentaries), there are striking differences in the way in which the plagues are described as having been brought about, corresponding to the three sources from which the narrative is compiled. Thus in J the plagues are in themselves natural events, invested with a supernatural character by their severity and by the fact that they happen at a time fixed by God and announced by Moses. In the fragments of E which have been preserved the miraculous character of the plagues is heightened by describing Moses as bringing them about by stretching out his magic rod (in 10 [21], his hand). In P, however, it is Aaron's rod which works the wonders, the Egyptian magicians compete with Aaron, and generally the miraculous element is intensified. Another difference is that while J pictures the Israelites as living apart in the land of Goshen, E assumes that they are living in Egypt in close contact with their Egyptian 'neighbours.'

14-25. The First Plague: Water Turned into Blood.—To J belong [14, 15a] '. . . to meet him,' [16-18] (omit 'with the rod that is in mine hand'), [20c, 21a, b, 23-25]. This is a fairly complete narrative. Jehovah instructs Moses to meet Pharaoh on his usual morning visit to the Nile, and tell him that He, Jehovah, will smite the waters of the river and turn them into blood: the fish will die and the water will become unfit to drink. The waters are turned into blood, the fish die, and the water becomes undrinkable. Pharaoh remains stubborn, and the Egyptians have to get water by digging. This plague is an intensification of what happens every year in Egypt. 'When the Nile first begins to rise, towards the end of June, the red marl brought from the mountains of Abyssinia stains it to a dark colour, which glistens like blood in the light of the setting sun' (Sayce). The intensification is in the circumstances under which the plague is brought about and in the consequences which followed, namely the destruction of the fish (a staple food in ancient Egypt) and the undrinkableness of the water. For what reason Pharaoh went to the river in the morning (cf. 2 [5], 8 [20])—whether to bathe, to worship the Nile-god, or to see how far the river had risen—is not stated. In [16] we have the formal demand which is made of Pharaoh in J: cf. 4 [23], 8 [1, 20], 9 [1, 13], 10 [3]. The editor makes but little use of E. In [15b] Moses is bidden to take the rod given to him by Jehovah in 4 [17, 20b] (E) ['which was turned to a serpent' is a harmonizing insertion, since the miracle

referred to in 4^{3} (J) is not described in E] in his hand. In 20^{b} he (i.e. Moses) lifts up the rod and smites the waters. In 17 'with the rod that is in mine hand' is probably from E, 'thine' being changed to 'mine,' but its insertion spoils the sense.

19, 20*a* (as far as 'commanded'), 21*c* belong to P, and, like the verses from J, are complete in themselves: Jehovah instructs Moses that Aaron shall stretch his rod over all the waters of Egypt (the Nile and its arms; the canals used for irrigation and all the reservoirs) and turn them into blood. Moses and Aaron carry out their instructions, and all the water in Egypt (including that contained in vessels of wood and stone) is turned into blood. The magicians, however, do the same with their 'secret arts,' and Pharaoh's heart is hardened. Where the water on which the magicians exercised their magic came from is not stated.

VIII. 1-15. **The Second Plague: Swarms of Frogs.**—According to J ($1^{-4,\ 8-15a}$) Moses is instructed by Jehovah to threaten Pharaoh with a plague of frogs from the Nile (J's account of the arrival of the frogs is omitted in favour of P's). At Pharaoh's urgent request, and his promise that he will let the people go, Moses intercedes with Jehovah, and the frogs die. 'But when Pharaoh saw that the respite had come he made his heart stubborn.' In P's account ($5-7,\ 15b$), Jehovah through Moses bids Aaron stretch out his rod over all the waters of Egypt and bring up frogs. The magicians do the same, and Pharaoh 'hearkened not unto them, as the Lord had spoken.'

'Each year,' says Sayce, 'the inundation brings with it myriads of frogs, which swarm along the banks of the rivers and canals.' Here the frogs come at a signal from Aaron's rod, enter the houses, climb up on the people and into their earthenware stores and the bowls in which they knead their dough. In 3 read with LXX 'the houses of thy servants and of thy people.'

9-10. The meaning seems to be that Pharaoh is politely invited to name the time when the plague shall cease, in order that he may be convinced that it was sent by Jehovah. For **brought upon** in 12 read 'appointed for,' i.e. as a sign.

16-19 (P). **The Third Plague: A Swarm of Gnats.**—At Jehovah's bidding through Moses, Aaron's rod turns all the dust of Egypt into gnats (or, as we should say, mosquitoes: so Driver after LXX). The magicians attempt to do likewise, but are unsuccessful, and admit that this is 'the finger of God.' Pharaoh's heart, however, remains 'hardened.'

Mosquitoes are a familiar plague in Egypt, but they arise out of the water and the rice-fields, and not from dust. It may be that they are described as made out of dust owing to the fact that a swarm of gnats often looks like a dust-cloud. For the wide extent of the plague cf. 7^{19}, 8^{5} (P).

20-32. (J) **The Fourth Plague: Swarms of Flies—Pharaoh's First Concession.**—Jehovah instructs Moses to threaten Pharaoh with a plague of flies. The Israelites in Goshen will, however, be immune from the plague. Jehovah sends the flies. But when Pharaoh promises to let the Israelites go into the wilderness to sacrifice to Jehovah, Moses intercedes with Jehovah and the plague ceases. Pharaoh again 'makes his heart heavy,' i.e. stubborn, and breaks his promise.

Characteristic of J are the direct action of Jehovah (no mention of the rod of Moses [E] or that of Aaron [P]); the three days' journey into the desert (3^{18}, 5^{3}); the intercession of Moses; the removal of the plague and Pharaoh's broken promise. Note also that Israel lives apart in Goshen, and that this district is not visited by the plague.

The word translated **swarms of flies** occurs only elsewhere in allusions to this plague (Pss 78 and 105). Its etymology is uncertain. Driver, following LXX, thinks that the reference is probably to the dog-fly, described by Philo who lived in Egypt as a 'stinging and treacherous beast.' Goshen has been identified with a district east of the Delta, some forty miles north-east of Cairo, and containing excellent arable land and pasture.

23. RV is preferable to RVm, but it involves the change of one letter (so apparently LXX, Vulgate).

24. The sentence is wrongly divided. Add 'and' (LXX, etc.) after **land of Egypt**; and translate 'and into his servants' houses, and into all the land of Egypt; and the land was ruined'—by the irritation and diseases brought by the flies.

At first Pharaoh is only willing to allow the Israelites to hold their festival in Egypt (or Goshen), where they would remain under his control; but Moses points out that, if the Israelites were to sacrifice animals which the Egyptians held to be sacred (e.g. cows, sheep, goats), they would wound the religious susceptibilities of their neighbours, and be in danger of their lives. Pharaoh, seeing, or pretend-

ing to see, the force of the argument, gives the permission required, but stipulates that the Israelites are not to go very far away.

IX. 1-7 (J). **The Fifth Plague: Murrain on Cattle.**—Jehovah instructs Moses to threaten Pharaoh with a cattle-plague. All the cattle of Egypt die, but not one of the Israelitish cattle in Goshen. Pharaoh's heart, however, is still stubborn.

As camels were not used in ancient Egypt, either they are an anachronism here or the reference is to camels belonging to traders from the desert. The word 'all' in **all the cattle** seems inconsistent with the existence of cattle in $^{19\text{-}21}$ (cf. also 11^{5}, 12^{29}, 13^{15}), but perhaps it = 'all kinds of cattle,' or it may be a rhetorical expression for a very large number. On this occasion Pharaoh does not ask for a removal of the plague, the reason being that he could not expect Moses to restore the cattle to life.

8-12 (P). **The Sixth Plague: Boils on Man and Beast.**—This may be P's version of J's murrain. At Jehovah's bidding Moses and Aaron take two handfuls of soot from a kiln, and Moses tosses it towards heaven, whereupon it falls in fine dust and becomes boils on both men and cattle. The magicians, unable to imitate the plague, are themselves infected by it. Jehovah hardens Pharaoh's heart.

Though skin-diseases are common in Egypt, there are not sufficient data for deciding which disease is here intended. 'Boil' = an inflamed spot; 'blains' probably = pustules.

13-35 (JE). **The Seventh Plague: Hail.** J: $^{13,\ 17\text{-}21,\ 23c\text{-}30,\ 33\text{-}34}$. This account is complete in itself. The rest is probably E except $^{14\text{-}16}$, which is an addition, and ^{35c}, which is P's concluding formula, added by the compiler to round off the sentence (cf. $7^{13,\ 22}$, $8^{15,\ 19}$, 9^{12}). At Jehovah's bidding Moses demands the release of the Israelites, and threatens Pharaoh with a severe hailstorm. The Egyptians are advised to bring in their cattle and slaves from the field. At Jehovah's bidding Moses stretches out his rod (E) and Jehovah sends thunder, lightning, and hail. All the men and beasts left in the fields are smitten, and every herb and tree. The land of Goshen (J) alone was immune. Pharaoh promises to let the Israelites go, and Moses intercedes for him, although he knows that the king will break his promise. (E's note on the damage done to the crops.) When Moses intercedes, the storm subsides and Pharaoh makes his heart stubborn (E: 'Pharaoh's heart waxed strong');

14-16 interrupts the narrative in order to explain why, when all these plagues have made so little impression on Pharaoh, Jehovah is sending more. Read in ^{14a} (changing one letter) 'all these my plagues upon thee and upon thy servants.' **made thee to stand** = kept thee alive, instead of destroying thee at once. St. Paul in Rom 9^{17}, disregarding the LXX, uses the word in its late Hebrew sense and translates 'raised thee up,' i.e. as an actor on the stage of history.

27. Pharaoh is not penitent in the Christian sense of the word. The most we can say of him is that he feels that he has gone a little too far in defying a foreign deity.

30. Omit **God** with LXX.

31-32 (E). **flax** was grown extensively in Egypt: linen was not only worn by the priests and men of rank, but also used for the wrappings of mummies. **spelt** resembles wheat, and bread made of it has been found in Egyptian tombs. **bolled** (= podded for seed) suggests a stage of growth which is farther advanced than the Hebrew warrants. Translate 'was in bud.' The storm must have occurred at the end of January or the beginning of February, when the barley was ripe and the flax in bud. The **wheat** and the spelt escape destruction, because 'they are (usually) late' in coming up, i.e. a month later than flax or barley.

X. 1-20 (JE). **The Eighth Plague: a Swarm of Locusts.**—J: $^{1a,\ 3\text{-}11,\ 13b,\ 14b\text{-}15a,\ 15c\text{-}19}$. The rest is E except $^{1b,\ 2}$, which like $9^{14\text{-}16}$ is a didactic addition. At J's bidding Moses threatens Pharaoh with a plague of locusts if he will not let the Israelites go. Pharaoh's ministers induce the king to recall Moses and to offer to let the *men* go, without their families, flocks and herds. When Moses refuses the offer, he is driven out from the presence of the king. According to E ($^{12,\ 13a,\ 14a}$), Moses stretches out his rod and brings over all the land locusts, which eat up all the vegetation left by the hailstorm. According to J, an east wind (sirocco) brings the locusts along with it. The land is covered with them, and every green thing is devoured. Pharaoh sends for Moses, confesses his sin, and persuades Moses to intercede for him. Whereupon Jehovah sends a west wind which drives the locusts away. E: but Jehovah makes Pharaoh's heart strong, and he will not let the people go.

The story opens in the usual way: 'And Jehovah said unto Moses, Go in unto Pharaoh,' but instead of the words 'and say unto him, Thus saith Jehovah,' etc., there follows a didactic addition ($^{1b,\ 2}$)

explaining why Jehovah hardened Pharaoh's heart. Translate 'how I have made a toy of thee.' 'And Aaron' should be omitted at the beginning of [3], probably also in [8] and [13]; for in [1] and [6] Moses alone goes in and out from Pharaoh.

7. **snare** = fowling instrument. The reference is probably to the trigger of a trap for catching birds.

10 is sarcastic, and means 'I will not let you go at all.' RVm is correct: 'in wanting to leave Egypt you have an evil purpose in view.'

15. **darkened** = hidden from sight.

16. Pharaoh's confession of sin is deeper than in 9 [27]: he asks for pardon, and for the fourth time begs for the removal of the plague.

This description of a plague of locusts is borne out by the testimony of travellers. They are brought by one wind and carried away by another. They cover the face of the earth, and nothing escapes their voracity from the leaves of the trees to the herbage on the ground. See Driver's *Joel and Amos* (*C.B.*). So terrible was the plague in the eyes of Pharaoh's court that the king was induced to make a fresh concession, viz. that the *men* should be allowed to go (cf. 23 [17]). The retention of their families and possessions would, of course, secure their return to Egypt.

21-29 (JE). The Ninth Plague: Darkness.—E: [21-23, 27]; J: [24-26, 28-29]. At Jehovah's bidding Moses stretches out his hand and brings thick darkness in all the land of Egypt for three days. No one has light except the Israelites. Pharaoh sends for Moses, and offers to let the people go without their flocks and herds. Moses refuses on the ground that until they reach their destination they will not know how many animals will be required for sacrifice. Jehovah hardens Pharaoh's heart, and Moses is sent away with the warning that, if he ever approaches Pharaoh again, he will die.

The *Khamsin* often raises such a storm of dust and sand as to darken the light of the sun and cause distress to man and beast. While the storm lasts people are compelled to remain indoors. The hot sand and dust are such as 'can be felt,' and the wind usually blows for three days. Pharaoh's concession is greater than the last one ([8-11]): only their flocks and herds must be left as security. 'Not a hoof shall be left behind,' says Moses; moreover, Pharaoh must himself contribute animals in order to propitiate Israel's God.

XI. 1-8 (JE). The Last Plague: Death of Egyptian Firstborn.—In 10 [29] Moses agrees never to enter Pharaoh's presence again, but here ([4-8]) he goes once more to Pharaoh's court to deliver his message about the death of the firstborn. The inconsistency is removed when we understand that 11 [4] is the immediate sequel of 10 [29], the story having been interrupted by the insertion of [1-3] from E.

1-3 is the sequel of 10 [27] (E). Jehovah reveals a final plague to Moses, as a result of which Pharaoh will not only let the people go altogether (without keeping back flocks and herds), but will even thrust them out. In anticipation of this the Israelites are to demand of their neighbours jewels of silver and gold (add 'and raiment' with LXX: cf. 3 [21-22], 12 [35, 36]). The Egyptians lend more readily because the man Moses has a great reputation among them on account of his wonder-working powers.

4-8 should be read after 10 [29]. After saying that he will see Pharaoh's face no more, Moses declares that at midnight all the firstborn of the Egyptians will die, and Pharaoh's ministers will humbly beg the Israelites to depart. Moses then leaves Pharaoh's presence in hot anger (on account of the threat in 10 [28]).

9-10 is P's conclusion of the account of the portents hitherto done before Pharaoh. The reference in [10] is to 7 [8-13] (P) and to P's plagues.

XII. The Passover.—The origin and meaning of the most distinctive festival of the Jewish religion are explained in Ex 12 and Dt 16 [1-8]. According to these passages, the feast was instituted on the eve of the Exodus. Its main purpose was to distinguish the houses of the Israelites from those of the Egyptians, that Jehovah might 'pass over' the former when He smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, and it was to be observed for all time as an annual memorial of the Great Deliverance. But it is doubtful whether this is the real explanation of its *origin*. It must be remembered that even the earliest account of the Passover in the Pentateuch dates from a time when the feast was a long-established institution, and that none of the accounts necessarily tells us more than the *traditional* origin of the feast or the *traditional* explanation of its meaning. Signs are not wanting to indicate that its origin was pre-Mosaic. Thus the Israelites in Egypt repeatedly ask Pharaoh's permission to hold a pilgrim-feast in the wilderness (3 [18], 5 [1], 7 [16], 8 [27], 10 [9]), and in 12 [21] '*the* Passover' is mentioned as a feast already well known. If, then, as is now commonly held, the Passover was an ancient Semitic feast, re-

tained by the worshippers of Jehovah, its original significance should be sought in the details of its ceremonial and in the customs of other Semitic races rather than in the explanations given by the religious reflection of a later age. Its two outstanding features, the application of the blood to the houses and the eating of the victim's flesh at a common meal, seem to indicate that the Passover was originally a sacrifice of propitiation and communion, offered every year in the spring in order to renew the family's sense of communion with the Deity and protect their tents (later, their houses) from pestilence during the coming year.

There are two other institutions which a later age has connected with the Exodus: (*a*) the dedication to Jehovah of the firstborn of men and the firstlings of animals; and (*b*) the Feast of Unleavened Cakes. (*a*) is clearly an ancient practice. As among other races, the firstlings of animals were sacrificed as a token of thankfulness for past fruitfulness and with the idea of sanctifying all future births. The firstborn of man was held sacred for similar reasons, and the ceremony of redemption points back to a time before the dawn of Israel's religious history when it was a common practice to sacrifice young children. When the actual origin of the dedication of the firstborn was forgotten, an explanation was found in the thought that it commemorated Jehovah's destruction of the firstborn of the Egyptians. (*b*) is post-Mosaic in origin and belongs to a time when the Israelites were settled on the land. It was an agricultural festival, connected with the beginning of the barley-harvest. As it occurred at the time of the year at which the Exodus took place, memories of that event became attached to it, and in particular the unleavened cakes eaten at the feast were interpreted as commemorating the afflictions in Egypt and the deliverance which followed.

But, as Driver remarks, 'the significance of an institution does not depend necessarily upon what it was in its origin; it may depend equally upon what it *came to be*, and upon the ideas of which, as years went on, it came gradually to be regarded as the expression' (*C.B.*, 412). What the Passover came to be was 'a solemn memorial of a great national deliverance, and of the birth of national independence,' and the same may be said of the Feast of Unleavened Cakes and of the custom of dedicating the firstborn to Jehovah, while all three reminded men of the covenant between Jehovah and Israel, and 'kept alive their sense of the continuance of His favour towards them.'

The significance of the Passover is not exhausted in the Jewish rite. To the Christian the Paschal lamb is a type of Christ, and the Paschal meal foreshadows the Eucharist (1 Cor 5 [7], 10 [17]). The firstborn of all creation, the Lamb of God without blemish, was offered once for all upon the Cross. In the Eucharist we plead this sacrifice, we realize our unity with each other, we renew our communion with God, and the atoning virtue of the blood of the Lamb is applied for the salvation of all who by faith partake of the sacred feast.

XII. 1-13. **P's Regulations for the Passover.**—It is to be held in the first month, i.e. our March-April, known in J, E, and D as Abib and in later post-exilic times as Nisan. P, however, always uses numbers, thereby avoiding heathenish names. Before the Exile the Hebrew year began in the autumn (23 [16]), but after the Return the Babylonian custom of beginning the year in the spring was adopted, and P dates the change from the institution of the Passover in Egypt. The victim is to be a lamb (or a kid) without blemish, a male of a year old. It is to be selected on the tenth day of the month and kept (i.e. taken care of) till the fourteenth, when at the appointed hour each householder shall kill his own lamb. The hour is described as 'between the two evenings.' This may mean either the time between sunset and the appearance of the stars, or that between 3 p.m., when the heat of the sun begins to decrease, and the setting of the sun, which usually occurs about 5 p.m. The latter is the traditional explanation. The blood of the victim is to be applied to the doorposts and lintel of the house in which it is eaten, in order to consecrate the house and protect its inhabitants (cf. the Bedawin, who are said to sprinkle the blood of a goat on the doors when a new house is dedicated). As the Passover is essentially a domestic institution, each lamb is to be eaten by members of one family or at most by two families living close together. It may not be eaten raw (lest the blood should be eaten) or boiled (lest some of the fat should be eaten), but roasted (on a spit) entire—head, legs, and inwards. It is to be eaten with unleavened cakes, i.e. round biscuits which could be baked quickly (Gen 19 [3]), and with bitter herbs (such as wild lettuce or endive) as a condiment. Nothing is to be left over till the morning, lest the sacred food should be profaned, and the people must eat 'in trepidation,'

with robes fastened up round the waist, sandals on their feet and staves in their hands, as though ready for a journey. These regulations are addressed to 'the congregation of Israel,' i.e. to the post-exilic nation as an organized religious community or, as we should say, a Church; and the feast itself is described as 'a *pesaḥ* unto Jehovah,' which is explained (from the cognate verb *pāsaḥ*) as a 'passing-over' (sparing) of the Israelites when Jehovah executed His judgements. Our English word 'Passover' preserves the intended play on words.

14-20. P's Regulations for the Feast of Unleavened Cakes.—This festival, originally intended to celebrate the beginning of harvest, was distinct from the Passover, though it followed it immediately (Lev 23 [5, 6]), but, as it occurred at the time of the year when the Exodus took place, memories of that event became attached to it. Leaven (a piece of sour dough reserved from the previous day's baking) was prohibited in all sacrifices (except Lev 7 [13], 23 [17]), either because unleavened bread had the sanction of antiquity, or because leaven, being produced by fermentation, was regarded as tainted by corruption. In the New Testament, except in the parable of the Leaven, it has a bad sense (cf. Mk 8 [15]; 1 Cor 5 [6-8]; Gal 5 [9]). For seven days no leaven is to be eaten on pain of excommunication ([15]). On the first and seventh days there is to be a 'holy convocation,' called together by silver trumpets (Nu 10 [2]), and no work is to be done on those days, except that which the preparation of food renders necessary. Even the sojourner or resident alien must submit to the rule about leaven.

21-27. J's Regulations for the Passover.—These are expanded in [1-13] by P, who does not, however, mention the hyssop, the basin, or the prohibition against leaving the leaven till the morning. The elders of Israel are to 'draw out' from the folds as many lambs (or kids) as they will need for the feast, and, when they have 'killed the Passover,' they are to apply some of the blood to the lintel and doorposts, in order that 'the destroyer' (i.e. the destroying angel) may not enter the house. **hyssop** is probably a species of wild marjoram, which grows in clefts of the rocks or in the chinks of walls, a wisp of which would be well adapted for sprinkling.

25-27*a* is in the style of Deuteronomy. It lays down how in future years the memory of the Great Deliverance is to be kept alive, viz. by instruction of the children whenever the Passover is celebrated—an injunction which is still faithfully observed by the Jews.

28 is P's conclusion to [1-13].

29-42 (JEP). The Tenth Plague and the Departure from Egypt.—J: [29-34, 37-39]; E: [35-36]; P: [40-42].

29 records the execution of the threat in 11 [4] (J). The tenth plague, like the other nine, is connected with the natural conditions of the country, epidemics being common in the spring and often accompanied by great loss of life, but in course of time it was invested with a supernatural character, and a plague which was the immediate occasion of the Exodus and perhaps particularly fatal to children became, under the influence of the Israelitish custom of dedicating the firstborn, one which spared the firstborn of Israel and destroyed all the firstborn of Egypt. Pharaoh and his people urge Moses and Aaron and the children of Israel to go away and serve Jehovah as they have requested. The haste with which they depart is held to account for the origin of the Feast of Unleavened Cakes: the people had no time for leavening the dough, so took their kneading-bowls wrapped up in their mantles. In [35-36] (E) the Israelites carry out the instructions in 3 [21] f. Before the events narrated in [29-34] they had borrowed ornaments and clothes to wear at the feast.

The first stage of the journey was from Rameses to Succoth (*Thukke*=Pithom), a distance of about ten miles towards the east. The number of men able to march (600,000) implies, when women and children are included, a total of about 2,000,000. This is inconsistent both with the extent of Goshen and with the possibility of maintenance in the desert. The tradition of later centuries must have greatly exaggerated the figures. With the Israelites went 'a great mixed multitude,' such as Egyptians who had married Israelites and prisoners of war glad to escape from hard labour. The length of Israel's sojourn in Egypt is given as 430 years (cf. 400 in Gen 15 [13]), but whether this is even approximately correct is more than we can say, as we have no data for fixing precisely the interval between Jacob's migration and the Exodus.

42. RVm is better than RV: it is 'a night of vigil unto Jehovah.'

43-51. P's Regulations for the Passover (*continued*).—No alien, temporary settler (RV 'sojourner') or (foreign) servant may eat of it, but a slave and a sojourner (i.e. a protected foreigner: RV 'stranger') may partake after being circumcised.

The unity of the company keeping the feast is further emphasized by the rules that one lamb is to be eaten in one house, that no part of the flesh is to be carried outside the house, and that no bone of the Paschal lamb is to be broken (cf. Jn 19 36).

51 repeats 41, and is probably inserted here to close the account of the departure from Egypt.

XIII. **1-2. P's Law of the Sanctity of the Firstborn.**—Here the principle is stated in its general form: the firstborn in Israel, whether of men or of cattle, are sacred to Jehovah.

3-10. J's Regulations about Unleavened Cakes.—No leavened bread is to be eaten on the day of the Exodus, which occurs in the month Abib (the old Canaanite name: cf. P in 12 2). The passage then describes how the feast is to be kept when the Israelites have entered Canaan. Unleavened cakes are to be eaten for seven days, with a pilgrim-feast on the seventh day. In P (12 14-20) the pilgrimage is on the first day, and there is a 'holy convocation' on the first and the seventh days. The children are to be instructed as to the meaning of the festival (cf. 12 26), and its observance, like a tattooing or branding on the hand and a badge worn on the forehead in primitive religions, is to remind Israel of its duty to Jehovah, who brought it out of Egypt.

11-16. J's Law of the Sanctity of the Firstborn.—Firstborn males, both of man and beast, belong to Jehovah. As the ass cannot be eaten in sacrifice, because it is unclean, it must be redeemed by a lamb or a kid. The children are to be taught the meaning of the observance, and the custom is to act, like a ceremonial mark or badge, as a reminder of what Jehovah has done for His people. **memorial** in 9 = **frontlets** (perhaps 'headbands') here. Though the reference here and in 9 is purely figurative, it gave rise to the later custom of wearing phylacteries, cases containing small scrolls, on which were written Ex 13 1-10, 11-16; Dt 6 4, 9, 11 13-21, and bound to the forehead and left arm.

17-22. From Succoth to Etham (17-19, E; 20, P; 21-22, J).—The exact line of march cannot now be traced. It is clear, however, that the Israelites did not follow the Mediterranean coast. The reason given for this is the presence of the Philistines; but this is an anachronism, as in Gen 21 34 and 26 1, for the Philistines had not yet settled in Canaan. It is more probable that they wished to avoid the Egyptian forts and garrisons which would be a serious obstacle to a multitude wishing to escape across the isthmus of Suez. Instead of going by the direct route, they were led round 'in the direction of the wilderness,' west of the Red Sea, 'to the Red Sea' itself, or probably to a shallow extension of it which in those days reached as far north as Lake Timsah. Etham is described as 'on the edge of the wilderness.' There is no certain identification of the site, but the name is thought by some scholars to be a survival of *Khetem*, a line of fortresses guarding the east frontier of Egypt. For 'armed' in 18 read 'in battle array,' i.e. in an orderly manner.

20 is P's formula for marking the various stages of the journey: cf. 17 1, 19 2.

21-22. J describes how Jehovah guided the Israelites in a pillar of cloud by day and in a pillar of fire by night. Cloud and fire are symbols of the divine presence, but the treatment of the cloud varies considerably in the different sources. In J the pillar goes in front of the Israelites continuously in order to show them the way; in E (33 7-11) it comes down from time to time (no appearance of fire mentioned), and stands at the door of the Tent of Meeting; in P (40 34-36) the cloud (not a pillar) covers the Tent of Meeting as soon as it is set up, and remains there (with fire in it by night), and it gives the signal for moving the camp by rising above the Tent (Nu 9 17-23). Symbolical of the guiding or protecting presence of God, the cloud and the fire may have had some natural basis (e.g. the custom of carrying a brazier filled with burning wood at the head of an army or caravan on the march, or the figure may have been suggested by the sight of a volcano in eruption), but we cannot now say what is the relation of this beautiful tradition to the actual fact, natural or supernatural.

XIV. **The Crossing of the Red Sea** (1-4, P; 5-7, J; 8-9, P; 10a, b, J; 10c, E; 11-14, J; 15a, E; 15b, P; 16a, E; 16b-18, P; 19a, E; 19b, J; 20a, E; 20b, J; 21a, P; 21b, J; 21c-23, P; 24-25, J; 26-27a, P; 27b, J; 28-29, P; 30-31, J).—This is a composite narrative and somewhat complicated, but the two principal strands, J and P, agree with each other and with the song in the next chapter in the main fact, namely that the children of Israel crossed in safety, while the Egyptian army perished in the waters. According to P, Moses lifts up his hand (in E his rod) and the waters divide, forming a road with a wall of water on either side. When the signal is repeated, the waters come back upon the Egyptians. In J, on the other hand,

Jehovah works through natural causes: a strong east wind drives along (not 'back' as RV) the waters all night, so that a part of the bottom is laid bare; in the morning the sea returns to its wonted flow (RVm) and the pursuing Egyptians are drowned in it. If, as is probable, the sea went up as far as Lake Timsah, and there were shallow places south of that lake, it is conceivable that a south-east wind might drive the shallow waters to the north-west, while an ebb-tide might at the same time be drawing the main body of the sea in a southerly direction, thus leaving a track across which the children of Israel could march.

1-4 is the sequel of 13 [20] (P). The Israelites are told to turn and encamp on the west side of the sea, i.e. of the Gulf of Suez, or rather the ancient extension of it, in order that Pharaoh may be drawn to pursue them and that God may derive glory from his discomfiture. None of the places mentioned has been identified, but the general situation is clear: the Israelites encamped in the wilderness of Egypt, with the sea in front of them, in order that Pharaoh might suppose that they were confused (RV 'entangled'), not knowing which way to turn for escape.

8-9 is the sequel of [1-4]. **with an high hand** = defiantly. In J the Israelites go after obtaining Pharaoh's leave for a temporary absence (12 [31] f.). **all the horses . . . and his army** is a gloss on 'the Egyptians': omit.

5-7 (J). When the Egyptians found that the Israelites had not merely gone on a pilgrimage, but had departed altogether, they changed their mind (Hebrew 'heart') with regard to the permission given in 12 [31] f. and made preparations to follow them. Instead of **captains over** Driver translates 'knights upon'; some superior military officer is intended.

10-14 (J) ([10c], E) is the sequel of [5-7]. When the children of Israel saw that 'Egypt was marching after them,' they were alarmed, and in their alarm declared that they had always been opposed to this plan (cf., however, 4 [31], J). In [13a] translate 'stand firm,' and in [13b] follow RVm.

15-31. The command, **lift thou up thy rod**, plainly belongs to E (see 4 [17], etc.); so also the reference to the angel of God in [19a] and [20a] (translate 'and he came between'), and perhaps the first half of [15], where **Wherefore criest thou unto me?** comes in awkwardly. The reference to the cloud and the darkness in [20] is somewhat obscure, and it is possible that the text may be corrupt. Probably the meaning intended in the original was that the cloud, which had moved from the van to the rear, was dark to the Egyptians, but gave light to the Israelites. According to Jos 24 [7], the Lord put thick darkness between the Israelites and the Egyptians. The mention of **horsemen** in this chapter and in 15 [19] is an anachronism: the Egyptians did not use cavalry at this period. **the morning watch** is the last of the three parts into which the Hebrew night was divided.

24. Ps 77 [17-19] suggests flashes of lightning as the means of the Egyptians' discomfiture. Perhaps that may be the meaning of the expression, **Jehovah looked forth upon the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of cloud.** In [25] read with Sam., LXX, and Syriac 'he bound,' i.e. clogged, 'their chariot wheels,' and continue as RVm.

XV. **1-21. A Song of Triumph.**—This is one of the finest specimens of Hebrew poetry, but it cannot be assigned in its present form to the time of Moses; for the allusions to Jehovah's **holy habitation** and His **sanctuary** in [13, 17] imply a date after the conquest of Canaan and the setting-up of the Ark in Shiloh, if not to the building of Solomon's Temple. On the whole it seems probable that it is an exilic psalm, drawing encouragement from the ancient deliverance of God's people (cf. Ps 68 and Is 43 [16, 17], 48 [21], 51 [9-11], 52 [4-5], 63 [11-14]). Style and vocabulary support this view. Moreover, the poem shows acquaintance not only with J ([4, 8a]), but also with P ([8b, c, 9]). Some, however, would claim the song of Miriam in [21] as a genuine fragment of ancient song. If this is so, we must render 'the horse and his charioteer,' or, omitting the pronoun with LXX, read 'horse and chariot.' So also in [1], if, as some think, this v. too is ancient. [1b-5] hymns the warlike prowess of Jehovah, shown in the drowning of the Egyptians; [6-10] further describes how Jehovah destroyed the enemy, while [11-18] celebrates the incomparable power of Jehovah in guiding Israel, through the conquest of Canaan, to their promised home.

9. Translate: 'My appetite shall be sated with them . . . my hand shall dispossess them.'

19. An addition by the compiler, in the style of P, explaining the significance of the psalm.

20-21 (E) describes how Miriam and the women of Israel celebrated the great deliverance with dance and song. For dancing as an outlet for religious enthusiasm cf. 32 [19]; Jg 21 [21]; 1 S 18 [6]; 2 S 6 [14];

Ps 149 [3], 150 [4]. **Miriam** answered them may mean that she and her women sang in antiphon. This is E's account of a song which in [1](J) is attributed to Moses. Miriam is described as Aaron's sister, because she is more closely associated with Aaron than with Moses (cf. notes on 2 [1]).

22-27. From the Red Sea to Elim (J with additions in [25b, 26]).—Leaving the place where they had crossed the Red Sea, the Israelites march through the desert of Shur along a narrow track which skirts the shore. After a three days' journey (i.e. about forty-five miles) they reach a spring named Marah and find it so bitter as to be undrinkable, but Moses (cf. Elisha, 2 K 2 [19-22]) makes it sweet by casting a certain tree into it. Then they come to an oasis called Elim and described as consisting of twelve springs of water and seventy palm trees.

22. The wilderness of Shur or Etham ran east of the present Suez Canal. As *Shur* = 'a wall' in Hebrew, it has been supposed to refer to a wall built by the Egyptians to protect their east frontier against invaders from Asia; but the fact that the word is poetical and only occurs twice in this sense renders this theory precarious. There is no certain identification of either **Marah** ([23]) or **Elim** ([27]), though it is not impossible, if the traditional Sinai be adopted, that Ayun Musa ('the springs of Moses') and the Wady Gharandel respectively may be the spots to which reference is made.

25*b* is thought to belong to E's explanation of the name **Massah** ('proving'); cf. 17 [7].

26 is an addition in the style of Deuteronomy.

XVI. **The Wilderness of Sin. Manna and Quails** ([1-3, 6-13*a*, 15*b*-26, 31-36] are assigned by Driver to P; [4-5, 13*b*-15*a*, 27-30] to J).—Leaving the oasis of Elim, the Israelites entered the wilderness of Sin. This is sometimes identified with a plain near the coast called El Markha. Here they had their first experience of lack of food, and they soon began to complain of their meagre fare. In answer to their complaint, Jehovah gave them quails in the evening and manna in the morning (P). According to J, Jehovah provided them daily with manna from heaven, and on the sixth day with sufficient manna for two days. Omit [8] as an explanatory gloss, and read [6, 7] after [12].

This chapter is clearly out of place in its present context; for it implies the Sabbatical Law, the Ark, and the Decalogue ([5, 9, 23, 33] f.), none of which was in existence before the giving of the Law, and, according to Nu 11 (J), quails were sent by Jehovah *after* the departure from Sinai because the people had grown weary of eating manna. It seems, therefore, that this section of P belongs originally to a later period in the narrative, perhaps after Nu 10.

Flights of quails are common in this region; they come with the wind (Nu 11 [31]) and fly low. When they alight in the evening, they cover the ground and are easily caught. As they are only mentioned in P here, and that abruptly, with nothing to indicate that the Israelites used them, we must infer that only a fragment of P's account of the quails has survived. The reference may have been left in accidentally by the editor when he transferred this section to its present position.

Manna is described as 'a thin flake,' like the hoar-frost ([14]) in size, or as the small greyish-white seeds of the coriander ([31]). Its appearance was 'as the appearance of bdellium' (a transparent gum, Nu 11 [7, 8]), and its taste like 'wafers mixed with honey' ([31]) or 'cakes baked with oil' (Nu 11 [8]). It fell from heaven with the dew ([4, 13-14], Nu 11 [9]). The reference is, no doubt, to the Arabic *manna*, a sticky juice which drops during the night from the trunks and branches of a species of tamarisk in certain parts of the Sinaitic peninsula and, when boiled and strained, is eaten by the Arabs, like honey, with unleavened bread. When found in the early morning, it is in the form of small white grains and of the consistency of wax, but it melts quickly under the heat of the sun ([21]). It does not appear except in the months of June and July, and then only after a rainy spring. Moreover, it is only produced in small quantities. Here, however, and in Nu 11, its providential character is magnified: it is the staple food of the Israelites for forty years, it falls every day except on the Sabbath, and the supply is exactly sufficient for each man's need. For New Testament allusions see Jn 6 [31] ff.; 1 Cor 10 [3]; 2 Cor 8 [15].

In both P and J the provision of manna is connected with the Sabbath, and both take the opportunity of teaching the duty of its observance. In [23-26] this duty is laid upon the people in consequence of the miracle described in [22], and in [27-30] (cf. [4b, 5]) the observance is regarded as a test of obedience.

In the direction for the preservation of the pot of manna ([31-34]), there is a reference to the Ark or Tent of Meeting,

as often (e.g. 27 21; Nu 16 7, 16 f.). **So Aaron laid it up before the Testimony** (P's usual expression for the Decalogue written on the tables in the Ark; cf. 25 16, 30 36; Nu 17 4, 10). **before Jehovah** in 9 has the same sense as here, and it is probable that in 10 we should read either *miqdāsh* ('sanctuary') or *mishkān* ('tent of meeting') instead of *midbār* ('wilderness'), as it is in this connexion that the glory of Jehovah in the cloud almost always appears.

15. What is it? (Hebrew *mān hū'*). The question is intended as a popular explanation of the name for manna (Hebrew *mān*), the real origin of which is unknown.

16. Omer is only found in this chapter. According to Kennedy, the tenth part of an ephah would be about six and a half pints.

XVII. 1-7. From the Wilderness of Sin to Rephidim; Water from the Rock (1a, b, P; 1c, 2a, b, 4-6, 7b, E; 2c, 3, 7a, c, J).—The children of Israel journeyed by **stages** (RVm; lit. by pluckings up, i.e. of tent-pegs) from the desert of Sin to a place near Horeb called Rephidim. Here again, as at Marah, they suffered from lack of water, and their complaints were renewed. Their wants were supplied by Moses, who struck the rock with his rod (E), and the memory of the event was preserved by giving the names Massah ('Proving') and Meribah ('Strife') to the place where it occurred.

The double question in 2, combined with the two names and two explanations of the same locality in 7, suggests an amalgamation of two narratives—a 'Massah' story from J and a 'Meribah' story from E. In Nu 20 1-13 (J and P) there is another story of the striking of the rock which is almost certainly a variant of E here, but it is represented as taking place at Kadesh, near the borders of the Promised Land. It may be that the story originally belongs to the period when the Israelites were at Kadesh. In any case, it is not unlikely that the events recorded in this chapter and the next belong to a time after the departure from Sinai. There is a Rabbinical legend, to which St. Paul alludes in 1 Cor 10 4, that the rock of Ex 17 followed the children of Israel in their wanderings and supplied them with water.

2, 7. Instead of **tempt** and **tempted** translate 'put to the proof.'

8-16 (E). A Battle with the Amalekites.—If this section is in its right position here, the battle takes place as the Israelites approach Mount Sinai. A nomad tribe whose home was in the south of Palestine, near Kadesh, made a raid upon the Israelites, who were led by Joshua. Moses watched the contest from a hill, and, as long as he held up his rod, his side won. When his strength failed, Aaron and Hur held up his hands (or hand) until sunset, by which time Joshua had 'prostrated (RVm) Amalek and his people without quarter.' Provision was made for the remembrance of the victory: Moses was bidden to write it in a book and impress it upon (**rehearse it in the ears of**) Joshua. He also erected a commemorative altar (cf. Gen 35 7; Jos 22 34; Jg 6 24) and called it 'Jehovah-nissi.'

It is probable that this incident, like that of the water from the rock, stood originally at a later stage of the wanderings. That a predatory tribe should find its way as far south as the district of Horeb is not impossible, but the struggle with Amalek in Nu 14 suggests the neighbourhood of Kadesh rather than that of Sinai. Moreover, Moses is represented as too old and feeble to lead his army in person, and Joshua is introduced without explanation as a general already well known. These arguments point to a date nearer the end than the beginning of the story.

11 and **12** seem to reflect two traditions: according to one, Moses holds up the rod in one hand; according to the other, he holds up both hands—the attitude of prayer. The versions read 'hands' in 11, suggesting that Moses raised one hand with the rod in it and stretched out the other also. Hur (said by Josephus to be the husband of Miriam) is only mentioned once again (24 14 with Aaron).

14. for with RVm.

15. Jehovah-nissi = Jehovah is my banner, i.e. my leader under whom I will fight.

16. Lit. 'a hand on the throne of Jah,' i.e. 'I (Moses) swear, with my hand lifted up to Jehovah's throne.' It is unnecessary to read with many scholars *nēs* ('banner') for *kēs* ('throne'). 'The principle expressed in 14-16 and Dt 25 17-19, and acted upon by Gideon (Jg 6), Saul (1 S 15) and David (1 S 30; 2 S 8), breathes the spirit of the older dispensation' (Driver, lix f.).

XVIII. Jethro's Visit to Moses (E, with editorial additions in 1c-4 and perhaps 7-11, where 'Jehovah' occurs instead of 'God').—Moses is visited by his father-in-law, Jethro, who brings with him Zipporah, Moses' wife, and his two sons, Gershom and Eliezer. He receives Jethro with Oriental courtesy and tells him of

the escape from Egypt and of the people's adventures by the way. Jethro blesses Jehovah for Israel's deliverance, offers sacrifice, and invites Aaron and other notables to join him at the sacrificial feast (1-12). Jethro advises Moses to appoint capable subordinates to assist him in the administration of justice, reserving only for himself the more important cases and the duty of warning the people 'of the statutes and directions' (13-27).

This episode belongs quite clearly to a later point in the narrative, for **the wilderness at the mount of God** (5) where it took place was not reached till 19 1, 2. Probably Dt 1 9-18 is correct in placing it at the end of the Israelites' stay at Horeb. Other indications of a date subsequent to the revelation at Sinai are **to eat bread before God**, i.e. at the sanctuary (12), and **the statutes of God**, given on the mountain (16, 20).

2-4. In 2 22 Moses has only one son, and in 4 20 he takes Zipporah with him to Egypt. In order to solve the difficulty suggested by 5, these verses are inserted: the name of the second son is supplied, and it is stated that Moses had sent his wife back to Midian after his arrival in Egypt.

6. Read (with LXX, Sam. and Syriac) 'and one said unto Moses, Behold thy father-in-law Jethro is come.'

16. statutes were definite rules, stereotyped and permanent, such as those which Moses received on Mount Sinai; 'directions' (not **laws** as RV) were pronouncements delivered from time to time as circumstances required (McNeile).

21. It is difficult to imagine how such an elaborate organization would work. 'If Israel numbered 600,000 the required number of rulers would be 78,600' (McNeile). Perhaps 'thousands,' etc., stand for groups, not numbers. In Nu 11 14-24 Moses appointed only seventy elders to help him.

There are two questions of historical interest connected with this chapter: (1) the influence of Jethro on Moses; (2) the picture of Moses as a legislator. (1) The connexion between Moses and his people with Jethro the Kenite, priest of Midian, and his tribe must have been a very close one. When Moses fled to the desert after slaying the Egyptian he stayed with Jethro, kept his flock and became his son-in-law. When he returned to Horeb at the head of his people, Jethro visited him, and it was he who taught Moses to delegate much of his work as judge to subordinates. When the Israelites were about to leave Sinai, Moses requested his father-in-law to accompany them, but Jethro expressed a wish to return to his own kindred. Moses then urged that his knowledge of the wilderness would be of great service (Nu 10 29-32), and a later reference suggests that he finally consented to go (Jg 1 16: cf. 4 11). From this close association, combined with the facts that before the time of Moses the God of the Israelites was thought to dwell on Mount Sinai, and that He was worshipped by a branch of the Midianites, of whom Jethro was the priest (3 1, 18 1), it has been supposed (*a*) that Moses learnt the name 'Jehovah' from the Midianites when he was living with them, and (*b*) that the sacrificial feast at which Jethro presided (18 12) on the arrival of the Israelites at the mount of God was really their admission to the tribal worship of Jehovah. Against (*a*), however, is the statement of E that Jehovah is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, also the unlikelihood of so rapid an acceptance by the Israelites of a new and foreign deity, while (*b*) is more naturally explained as the action of a chief in his own territory entertaining visitors and seeking to unite the two tribes who worship the same God by vows of friendship and alliance (McNeile, cxiii f.). (2) The mass of legislation, ceremonial, moral, and judicial, now grouped round the name of Moses, belongs to different periods and represents different points of view, but as almost all Old Testament scholars believe that the real history of the nation begins with this great leader, so almost all would agree that it was he who planted the seeds of that spiritual monotheism, ethical morality and social justice which blossomed in a later age. If the Pentateuch is not Mosaic in its final shape, it is Mosaic in inception and germ. In this chapter we see him, like an Arab sheikh, giving decisions on social matters, and 'so creating a primitive nucleus of Hebrew law.' Such decisions, given orally in the settlement of cases brought before him from time to time, would naturally form precedents for future use. Priests and judges would follow them or adapt them to the circumstances of their age. Thus there would gradually grow up an increasing body of ceremonial, civil, and criminal law which, because it was based upon a Mosaic foundation and Mosaic principles, would pass current under the name of the first great lawgiver.

XIX. **The Theophany on Mount Sinai.**—As Sinai was believed to be the abode

of God, it was natural that Moses should go up to it as soon as the Israelites arrived there. Here he received a revelation 'amid the awe-inspiring accompaniments of a theophany.' Whether this chapter is only 'a dramatic picture the details of which are not to be pressed,' or whether an actual thunderstorm is the natural foundation of what is described, we cannot say; but we know from many references in the Old Testament that the Hebrews associated thunder and lightning with Jehovah's presence, and it may be that the storms which played round the mountain inspired Moses with a sense of God's nearness, and that the thunder meant something more to him than a mere symbol of God's voice (Wade, *Old Testament History*, 115 f.).

Incoherence, inconsistency, and want of sequence betray the composite character of this narrative. It is impossible to follow the movements of Moses up and down the mountain or to get a clear idea as to what the people and the priests were to do, when we read the text as it stands. Much ingenuity has been shown in attempts to disentangle the various sources, but no certainty is attainable. The following, based on McNeile and Driver, is put forward as a possible solution:

2a and 1 is P's account of the arrival of the Israelites at Sinai: 'And they took their journey from Rephidim, and came to the wilderness of Sinai, and pitched in the wilderness: in the third month, etc., came they into the wilderness of Sinai.' This is P's itinerary, continued from 17.

If we assign $^{2b, 3a, 10, 11a, 14-17}$, and ^{19} to E, we get the following result: '. . . and there Israel pitched before the mount. And Moses went up to God. And Jehovah said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their garments, and be ready against the third day. And Moses went down from the mount unto the people, and sanctified the people, and they washed their garments. And he said unto the people, Be ready against the third day: come not near a woman. And it came to pass on the third day, when it was morning, that there was thunder and lightnings, and a dense cloud upon the mount, and the voice of a *shōphār* (horn) exceeding loud; and all the people that were in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet God; and they took their stand at the nether part of the mount. And the voice of the *shōphār* (horn) waxed louder and louder: Moses kept speaking and God kept answering him with a voice (i.e. with thunder).' What God said is recorded in 20^{1-21}. According to this account, Moses goes up to the mountain, which is God's abode, and is commanded to sanctify the people in preparation for a theophany on the third day. Moses obeys, and on the third day God comes to the mountain in a thundercloud and with the sound of a mysterious trumpet. The people are brought trembling to the foot of the mountain to meet God, and hear a colloquy between Him and Moses.

If we eliminate $^{3c-6}$ as the contribution of 'a religious thinker of the Deuteronomic school' (Dr. and McN.), $^{7-8}$ as out of place here because it presupposes the Decalogue (McN.), ^{9b} as a misplaced variant of ^{8b}, and $^{23, 24a}$ as a gloss (see McN., xxvi), the remaining fragments will belong to J's version of the theophany, but it is obvious that the verses are not in the right order. The following arrangement gives a tolerably clear account: 'And Jehovah called unto him out of the mountain (^{3b}), and Jehovah said unto Moses, Lo, I am coming unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and may believe thee also for ever (^{9a}). And mount Sinai was altogether a smoke, because Jehovah descended on it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a kiln, and the whole mount quaked greatly (^{18}). And Jehovah came down upon mount Sinai, to the top of the mount: and Jehovah called Moses to the top of the mount; and Moses went up. And Jehovah said unto Moses, Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto Jehovah to gaze, and many of them perish. And let the priests also which come near to Jehovah sanctify themselves, lest Jehovah make a breach in them ($^{20-22}$). And thou shalt come up, thou, and Aaron with thee, and the priests (^{24b}); for the third day Jehovah will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai. And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying: Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death: no hand shall touch him, but he shall surely be stoned, or shot through; whether it be beast or man, it shall not live. When the *yōbhēl* (the ram's horn) soundeth long, they (emphatic = "the priests") may come up the mount ($^{11b-13}$), but let not the people break through to come up unto Jehovah, lest he make a breach in

them. So Moses went down unto the people, and said unto them . . .' What he said has been lost, but it would naturally be the substance of the commands in [21-24]. The sequel in J is 24 [1].

If this be an approximately correct arrangement of the fragments which remain of J, we have a parallel narrative of the theophany which differs in some respects from that of E.

3*c*-6 describes the covenant-relationship between God and the people. One of the most beautiful passages in the Old Testament, it represents a stage of religious belief which was not reached until the prophets of the 8th century (McNeile, cxxii f.).

5. Translate 'a special possession unto me above all peoples' (Dr.). For New Testament references see Tit 2 [14]; 1 P 2 [5, 9]; Rev 1 [6], 5 [10], 20 [6]. The Christian Church is the true people of God.

16. For a supernatural trumpet as one of the signs of God's coming see Mt 24 [31]; 1 Thess 4 [16]; 1 Cor 15 [52]. The 'horn' here and in [19] is not the same as the 'ram's horn' in [13]. The latter is not the heavenly trumpet, but a signal which Moses is to give to the priests when the time comes for them to ascend the mountain.

24*b*. The translation given above represents a change in punctuation, not an emendation of the Hebrew text.

XX. 1-17. **The Decalogue.**—This famous collection of laws, which forms a concise summary of an Israelite's duty towards God and his neighbour, is known as the Decalogue, i.e. the 'Ten Words,' a name derived from Dt 4 [13], 10 [4]. Opinion, however, differs as to how it should be divided: (1) The Greek Church numbers the commandments as the English Church numbers them; (2) the Roman Church joins our first and second commandments into one, and splits our tenth into two, while (3) the Jews take the preface as the first, and make our first two into their second commandment. According to the Church Catechism, the first four deal with religious, the remaining commandments with moral, duties, but, since respect for parents was a religious duty in ancient times, it is legitimate to think of them as two groups of five each.

Literary History of the Ten Words.—Every child who has been taught to repeat them must have noticed that whereas one, six, seven, eight, and nine are terse and simple, consisting in each case of a single sentence, the rest are amplified either by reasons for keeping the commandments or by other additional matter. And when these amplifications are compared with those which are found in Dt 5 [6-21], it is seen that a different reason is given for Sabbath observance, and that there are smaller divergences in two, five, nine, and ten. Hence it has been supposed that all the commandments were originally cast in the same terse form and that various explanatory comments were added from time to time. (This view, now held by almost all Old Testament scholars, is reflected in the English revision of the Book of Common Prayer.) The sources from which the additional matter is thought to be derived will be indicated in the notes below. It will be sufficient here to say that two, three, four, and ten show affinities with J and E, that two, three, four, and five contain Deuteronomic elements, and that four suggests the influence of P. If this supposition be correct, the 'Ten Words,' as we have received them, are the result of a long growth extending over several centuries. This does not, however, detract from their value; for 'a product which has been slowly evolved is not less the work of God than one which has appeared complete and ready-made, and it must be judged not by the earliest but by the latest stage in its growth' (McN.). As the Decalogue stands now, it is 'a monument of priceless worth, and is the basis of all subsequent Christian teaching on our duty towards God and our neighbour.'

In the Book of Common Prayer the Decalogue holds a position of considerable importance. It is to be learnt by heart by every baptized person, together with the Creed and the Lord's Prayer; it is interpreted in a Christian sense in the Church Catechism; it is held up as our standard for self-examination, and it is ordered to be read at the celebration of the Holy Communion. But there are many who feel with Bishop Gore that it is 'questionable whether it should be so constantly and nakedly propounded as the summary of the moral law to Christian people' (see Gore's *Christian Moral Principles*, 1-47, 110-123).*

1-2. The preface states who it is that utters the commandments: it is Jehovah, Israel's God, who has a claim upon their gratitude and obedience.

3. **The First Commandment:** 'There shall not be to thee other gods in front of me.' This 'Word' does not necessarily

* The Ten Commandments were not joined to the Creed and the Lord's Prayer as part of the 'rudimentary instruction' till the 13th cent.—ED.

mean that the existence of other gods must be denied. If it belongs to the age of Moses, the probability is that it forbids the Israelites to acknowledge any other gods in front of Jehovah, their God.*

4-6. **The Second Commandment:** 'Thou shalt not make unto thee a graven image.' **Graven images** were images carved out of wood or stone. The reference is to images of Jehovah, but Deuteronomy extends the prohibition to representations of birds, beasts, and fishes, perhaps also heavenly bodies (cf. Dt 4 16-19), as objects of worship. For **the water under the earth** see Gen 1 6-10.

5. Jehovah, as Israel's Husband (cf. Hosea), will not tolerate the giving to another of the reverence due to Him, whether that other be a god, as in 34 14, or, as here, an image of a god (cf. Dt 4 24, 5 9, 6 15). It is an everlasting law of human society that children suffer by reason of the sins of their fathers. Nothing is more shallow than to deny the reality of either God's exclusive claim or of the social consequences of human sin. It should be borne in mind, however, that the words refer only to the external results of sin, and not to God's anger against innocent sufferers, and that Jeremiah (31 29 f.) and Ezekiel (18 2) taught the complementary truth that every man must suffer for his own sins (McN.).

6 is Deuteronomic: cf. Dt 6 5; Mk 12 30. The Greek Church adheres literally to the second commandment, and uses ikons, i.e. flat pictures of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and the saints. Puritans would prohibit the use of images in church, but the Catholic view (as also the Lutheran) is that this commandment was modified by the Incarnation, and that images (not of the unseen Father but) of the Incarnate Son and His saints are permissible for purposes of instruction and as aids to devotion (*Prayer Book Dictionary*, Art. 'Images').

7. **The Third Commandment:** Thou shalt not take up (upon thy lips) the name of Jehovah thy God for unreality.' A prohibition against irreverence. It applies not only to blasphemy, cursing, and reviling, but also to an idle and frivolous use of the Name. According to Bishop Gore (*Sermon on the Mount*, 209), the Christian application is the duty of truthfulness; God is everywhere, and oaths are unnecessary because everything said ought to be of the nature of an oath in God's presence (Mt 5 33-37). **thy God** is characteristic of Deuteronomy, and the expansion 'for Jehovah will not leave him unpunished . . .' recalls 34 7 (J).

8-11. **The Fourth Commandment:** 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' The word **Sabbath** (possibly Babylonian in origin, because the word *šabattum* and an observance of seventh days are found in Babylon) was connected in thought with the Hebrew *shābath*, which denotes 'cessation from work.' Dt 5 12 has 'observe' for 'remember,' and adds 'as Jehovah thy God commanded thee.'

9-10 is an expansion from a Deuteronomic source, defining how the Sabbath is to be sanctified: no business to be done either by the Israelite himself, or by any member of his household, or by his cattle, or by the sojourner settled in his cities (lit. 'gates'). **manservant** and **maidservant** = male and female slaves. For this verse cf. Dt 12 12-18, 16 11-14. Dt 5 14 inserts 'ox' and 'ass' before 'cattle.'

11, an expansion from the school of P (31 17; Gen 2 3), explains why the Sabbath is to be kept holy. Dt 5 14-15 gives a different reason. Instead of the reference to the week of Creation, Deuteronomy assigns a humanitarian purpose to the institution: 'that thy male and female slave may rest as well as thou. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence with a strong hand and a stretched-out arm. Therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to celebrate the Sabbath day.' This commandment, as it has come down to the Christian Church, contains three principles: (1) that of work ('six days shalt thou labour'), which accounts for the Jewish contempt for idleness; (2) that of abstinence from work on the Sabbath, in order that the day may be set apart for God; and (3) the principle of fellowship—equal regard for slaves, sojourners, and cattle (Gore's *Christian Moral Principles*, 21 f.). There is one principle which underlies both the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, viz. that our time belongs to God: the special consecration of one day in seven teaches us the sacredness of all days. The difference between the two is that the Sabbath is primarily a day of cessation from work, while Sunday is primarily a day of worship.*

* It is possible, however, that *'al panai* may mean 'to my face,' implying, in an age when polytheism was an insistent temptation, defiance of Jehovah. The offender would be consciously forcing Him to behold 'other gods'—an act of studied insolence (cf. Job 1 11). The verse neither proves nor disproves either monolatry or monotheism.—A. G.

* The Sabbath commandment is by St. Paul regarded as abrogated with the rest of the Old Testament ceremonial (cf. Col 2 16).—Ed.

12. **The Fifth Commandment:** 'Honour thy father and thy mother.' For the high respect paid to parents in Israel cf. 21 [15-17]; Dt 21 [18-21]; Mk 7 [10-13]. The promise is a Deuteronomic expansion (cf. Dt 4 [26-40], 5 [33], 6 [2], etc.). After 'mother' Dt 5 [6] inserts 'as Jehovah thy God commanded thee,' and amplifies the second part of the verse. Here the first 'table' ends.

13. **The Sixth Commandment:** 'Thou shalt do no murder.' The penalty for murder is laid down in 21 [12]. For our Lord's interpretation of this command see Mt 5 [21-26]. He applies the prohibition to the words of the lips and the thoughts of the heart, as well as to overt acts of hatred.

14. **The Seventh Commandment:** 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.' The penalty is mentioned in Lev 20 [10]; Dt 22 [22]. Our Lord's interpretation of this commandment, as of the sixth and the third, goes behind the outward act to the inward motive. The deliberate intention to sin is as sinful as the sin actually committed (Mt 5 [27-32]).

15. **The Eighth Commandment:** 'Thou shalt not steal.' Dishonesty was a besetting sin in Israel, constantly denounced by the prophets. Dt 5 [17-19] links the seventh, eighth, and ninth commandments together by the word 'and.' Breaches of these three commandments are joined with false swearing in Hos 4 [2]; Jer 7 [9]. Penalties for stealing are given in 21 [16], 22 [1].

16. **The Ninth Commandment:** 'Thou shalt not testify against thy neighbour a witness of falsehood.' Another besetting sin in the East. The reference is primarily, no doubt, to a court of law, but in 23 [1] 'false witness' refers to giving currency to a groundless report. The penalty is given in Dt 19 [16-21]. Dt 5 [20] has 'unreality' instead of 'falsehood.'

17. **The Tenth Commandment:** 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house.' The commandment is thought to have ended here originally, the rest being a mere amplification. In this case **house** would mean 'household,' and what follows simply enumerates some of the things belonging to it (cf. 23 [12], E). In Dt 5 [21] the wife is placed first, and the house, etc., follow. 'His field' is added to the list of things which shall not be 'desired' (a different verb from the one used in the case of the wife). It has been said that this commandment differs from the other nine in that it deals not with our acts, but with that inner mental state which is the source of all wrongs done to one's neighbour (cf. Rom 7 [7]) From this it is argued that a commandment which suggests so high a standard of morals is out of place in the Decalogue. But it is possible that we may have read into the commandment more than it actually meant at the time when it was given: '"coveting" may emphasize not so much the feelings as the practical steps which might be taken to give effect to them' (*Cent. B.*), and against St. Paul in Rom 7 [7] we can set Mk 10 [19], where the tenth commandment is interpreted as 'Defraud not.'

It has been argued further that the use of the word 'house' rather than 'tent' implies a settled agricultural life in Canaan, and that, therefore, this commandment cannot belong to the Mosaic age. But it is possible that *bayith* ('house') may have been a general term for dwellings, including tents, as in Arabic. A similar objection is brought against the fourth commandment, viz. the incompatibility of cessation from work with the life of nomads mainly occupied with feeding and tending cattle. This is not decisive, as we do not know how much abstinence from work was required in the age of Moses. There is, however, a serious difficulty in the way of accepting the second commandment as original, for images were widely used in the worship of Jehovah, apparently without condemnation, till the time of the 8th-century prophets. For a full discussion of the problem see *C.B.*, 413 ff.; 'the prohibition may have been Mosaic, though it was not acted upon by the bulk of the people.'

18-21 (E). **Effect of the Theophany on the People.**—Alarmed by what they saw (and heard), the people ask that Moses may speak to them instead of God. For **when the people saw it** read (with LXX, Sam., and Vulg.) 'the people were afraid and.' This involves no change in the text itself, but gets rid of the second 'saw,' which is tautologous.

22-XXIII. 33 (E). **The Book of the Covenant.**—The name by which this section is known is derived from 24 [7]. It is the oldest known collection of Hebrew laws, but not so old that we can ascribe the authorship to Moses. No doubt it contains decisions which were made by Moses (18 [16]), but much of its subject-matter is unsuitable for the nomads whom Moses led. The stage of society for which it is designed is one in which the main interests of the people are agricultural. At the same time it is not an advanced stage: the laws of worship are of the simplest possible character, and the principles of civil and criminal justice are in some cases those which are still current among the Arabs (e.g. the *lex talionis*). The code

as a whole will, therefore, be later than the conquest of Canaan and earlier than the later monarchy with its more complex social conditions.

The promulgation of a new code of laws was sometimes ascribed to the command of the nation's god (cf. the laws of Zeus and Apollo). But the closest parallel to Ex 20^{22}-23^{33} is the code of Hammurabi (CH), king of Babylon (*c.* 2123-2081), said to have been delivered to him by Shamash the sun-god. Some of the features which these early Hebrew laws share with CH may be features common to all Semites from prehistoric times; others may be traced to the fact that the ancestors of the Israelites once lived under CH, whether in Ur (P), or in Haran (J), or to Babylonian influence in the land of Canaan before the conquest. Divergences, both in subject-matter and (where there are similarities) in detail, seem to preclude the theory of direct borrowing on the part of the Hebrew legislators. For a concise account of CH, which is on the whole more severe than the Book of the Covenant, see *H.D.B.* (extra vol., 584-612).

24^3 in referring to these laws as 'the words of Jehovah' and 'the judgements' suggests a rough analysis: (*a*) the judgements, i.e. legal precedents with the force of law, contained in 21^2-22^{17}; (*b*) the words of Jehovah, i.e. commands on moral, religious, and social matters, contained in $20^{23\text{-}26}$, 22^{18}-23^{19}, to which is added (*c*) an epilogue, consisting of divine promises conditional on obedience to these laws ($23^{20\text{-}33}$).

(*a*) **The Judgements** (21^2-22^{17}).

XXI. 2-11. **Regulation of Slavery.**—A Hebrew slave must be set free after six years' servitude. If he was married when bought, his wife shall go with him; but if his master has given him a wife, the master keeps both wife and children. If, however, the slave prefers to remain in slavery rather than leave his master and his family, he may become a slave for life by going through a religious ceremony. His ear (the organ of obedience) is to be bored at the door or doorpost of his master's house, in token of his attachment to that house. **bring him unto God** would naturally mean 'bring him to a sanctuary,' but in its present context it must refer to the special sanctity which belonged to the threshold of a home, perhaps because the household gods, or images of Jehovah, were kept near the door. A female slave can only be set free in the event of her master marrying her either to himself or to his son, and then failing to treat her as a wife or a daughter. There is a restriction on her master's power to sell her: she cannot be sold to a foreigner, but only bought back by a kinsman. (CH seems to be more merciful than the Book of the Covenant; for it enacts that when a man's wife and children become slaves through his inability to pay his debts, they shall only remain slaves for *three* years.)

12-17. **Capital Offences.**—The penalty for murder, insult, or injury to a parent, or kidnapping of a fellow-Israelite for the purpose of selling him into slavery, is death. The same penalty attaches to the keeping of a dangerous ox ($^{28\text{-}29}$). A man who has slain another accidentally may take refuge at the altar. (CH ordains that if anyone kidnaps a boy, he shall be put to death. It is less severe in the case of striking a father, the penalty for which is cutting off the hands; but there is no mention of the mother.)

18-27. **Bodily Injuries Caused by Human Beings.**—If one man injures another in a quarrel, and the injured man recover sufficiently to leave his bed, the one who inflicts the injury is let off with compensation for loss of time and the payment of the doctor's bill ($^{18\text{-}19}$). (CH ordains that he shall take an oath [cf. $22^{8,9}$] that he had no intention of hurting the man and then pay the doctor.) Some would translate 'spade' or 'cudgel' instead of 'fist.' Nothing is said as to what would happen if the injured man were to die in his bed, but presumably the 'judgement' of ^{12} would apply. If a pregnant woman intervenes in a quarrel between two men and she be struck by one of them, and a miscarriage, but not death, ensues, the man who struck the blow shall be fined, and he shall 'pay for the miscarriage' (changing one consonant, Hebrew not giving a satisfactory sense). If any mischief happen, i.e. if the woman dies, then it is a case of 'life for life' ($^{22\text{-}23}$). The two verses which follow either belong to $^{18\text{-}19}$ or are added here 'as an abridged summary of the laws of retaliation' (McN.), though not relevant to the case in point. (For the offence in ^{22}, CH orders compensation, if she is a free-woman.) The rough and ready justice of the *lex talionis*, which makes the punishment fit the crime, was, and is, widely prevalent, especially in the earlier stages of civilization. There are several instances in CH (cf. Mt 5^{38}).

No punishment is to be inflicted on a man who has beaten his slave to death, unless he or she dies under the master's hand ($^{20\text{-}21}$). What the punishment was when the slave died under the flogging is

not stated; it was probably left to the discretion of the judge. 'His money' = his property. If a slave loses an eye or a tooth through his or her master's ill-treatment, that slave shall be set free (26-27). Like CH, the Book of the Covenant sets a higher value on the person of a freeman than on that of a slave, but it should be remembered that the restrictions laid down in this code mark a real advance on primitive custom, which gave the master absolute control over his slaves, and are humane in their tendency and intention.

28-36. Bodily Injuries Caused by Animals or Due to Neglect.—If an ox, which is known to be dangerous, kills a freeman or freewoman, the owner forfeits his life, but the extreme penalty may be escaped if the relatives of the deceased are willing to accept monetary compensation. If the victim is a slave, the loss is to be made good by the payment of thirty shekels of silver, the value of the property (Zech 11 12-13; Mt 26 15, 27 9 f.). If it is the first time that the ox has shown himself to be vicious, the ox alone shall suffer (28-32). Similarly in CH there is no remedy against the owner unless the ox is known to be vicious and the owner has been careless, in which case compensation is ordered, half mina for a noble, one-third for a slave. If an ox or an ass fall into a reopened or newly dug pit which has been left uncovered, the owner must purchase the carcase at its value when alive (33-34: cf. Mt 12 11, 15 14). Pits were used as reservoirs and granaries. If an ox kills another ox, the live ox is to be sold, and the price, together with the carcase of the dead ox, is to be divided between the owners. But if the ox is known to be dangerous and its owner has been neglectful, he must buy the carcase with a live ox (35-36).

XXII. 1-6. Theft, Burglary, and Damage by Fire.—If an ox is stolen and killed or sold, the restitution required is fivefold; if a sheep, fourfold (2 S 12 6). But if the animal is found alive in the possession of the thief, he is to restore it and provide another like it. If he has nothing, he is to be sold as compensation for the thing stolen (1, 3b, 4). If a burglar be caught in the act of 'digging through' (Mt 6 19) by night, he may be killed without any guilt being incurred, but not if the deed is done in daylight (2, 3a). In CH the penalty for house-breaking is death. Two slight changes get rid of difficulties and give the following result in 5: 'If a man cause a field or a vineyard to be burnt, and let the burning spread, and it burn in another man's field, of the best of his own field, and of the best of his own vineyard, shall he make restitution.' It is a case of allowing a bonfire of weeds or stubble to spread into a neighbour's field. Whether this is done carelessly or maliciously is not stated, but in either case the man is at fault; hence compensation is to be 'of the best.' In 6 sparks are accidentally blown from a bonfire and catch the thorns in a neighbour's field. In this case no blame is attached to the one who lit the fire, and so compensation for the damage actually done is sufficient.

7-15. Compensation for Breach of Trust.—If a man is given money or goods for safe keeping and it is stolen, the thief, if found, shall pay double. But if the thief cannot be found, the man to whom the property was entrusted must go to a local sanctuary or take an oath that he is innocent. In 9 this principle is extended to all cases of alleged misappropriation of property (7-8). If the property is an animal, and the animal dies or is injured from some unknown cause, the man to whom it was entrusted may clear himself by a solemn oath; but if he is careless enough to let the animal be stolen, he must compensate the owner. In the case of an animal which has been torn by wild beasts, there is no compensation, provided evidence to that effect is produced (10-13). Compurgation by oath, frequently mentioned in CH, is a common practice among the Arabs to-day. If death or injury happen to a borrowed animal, the borrower must make good the loss, unless the owner is with it at the time (14-15). So also CH.

11. shall accept it = shall accept the oath, but this statement is superfluous. Omit **or driven away** (*nishbāh*) as an accidental doubling of 'hurt' (*nishbār*), and understand it as = the dead or injured animal (*West. Comm.* and *Cent. B.*).

15. The meaning seems to be that in fixing the charge for hiring, the risk of accident is taken into account.

16-17. Since an unbetrothed daughter is her father's property, and the loss of her virginity decreases her value, the man who seduces her must pay the father the usual marriage-price (not **dowry**) and marry the girl. If the father refuse to give the girl in marriage, the price (fixed in Dt 22 29 at fifty pieces of silver) must still be paid.

Here the section known as 'The Judgements' ends. The rest of the Book of the Covenant may be conveniently divided (Dr.) into (*a*) regulations relating to religious observances, and (*b*) injunctions of a moral and humanitarian character.

Instead of decisions or rulings for the use of judges in court, we now have to consider regulations and warnings introduced by 'Thou shalt' or 'Thou shalt not.'

(*b*) **The Words of Jehovah: Laws of Public Worship** (20 22-26, 22 20, 28-31, 23 10-19).—Altars are to be of earth, or, if stone is used, it must be unhewn, and no steps are allowed (20 24-26). This regulation reflects an early stage of Hebrew worship; for not only is a multiplicity of altars recognized (cf. Dt 12), but also a crude and simple form of altar (cf. 27 1-8, P). For altar of earth cf. 2 K 5 17. In **burnt offerings** the whole victim was burnt and went up in sweet smoke to God. The **peace offering** was the ordinary sacrifice, in which the worshippers had a share (see Lev 3). These sacrifices might be offered in every place where Jehovah had caused His name to be remembered, i.e. by some manifestation of Himself. Steps are forbidden lest the legs of the worshippers should be seen (cf. 28 42 f., P). Priests are mentioned in 19 22 (J), but this very early code seems to imply that any layman may offer sacrifice. The prohibition of tools may be a survival (unconscious) of the time when the Deity was thought to reside in a natural rock or boulder.

22*b*-23, which prohibits molten images, reads like an editorial addition.

If 23 13 is not an editorial comment (out of place in its present context), it should be read before 23 20. No other god is to be worshipped or even named, and sacrifice to any god save Jehovah is to be punished with the ban. Jehovah is 'a jealous God' (20 5), and he who is disloyal in this way must be 'devoted,' i.e. put to death in honour of Jehovah, like Achan (Jos 6, 7). 22 28 commands reverence for God and those in authority (cf. 1 K 21 13; Ac 23 5; 1 P 2 17).

Firstfruits and the firstborn of men, oxen, and sheep are to be given to God (22 29-30, 23 19*a*). In 29*c* the Hebrew is 'thy fulness and thy trickling' (*C.B.*), and the reference is to the newly threshed corn and the freshly extracted juice of the grape, possibly of the olive also.

29*b*. Cf. 13 13=34 20 and Nu 3. Flesh torn by wild beasts is not to be eaten (31), because to eat such flesh, not properly drained of the blood, would render the eater (ceremonially) unholy.

The land is to be left fallow in the seventh year (23 10-11). These verses only ordain that all land shall lie fallow one year in seven, and not, as in later laws (Lev 25 1-7), that all land shall be fallow in the same year. The reason given here is a humanitarian one, viz. that the poor may eat of the self-sown crop; in Leviticus the motive is religious, viz. that the land may keep a Sabbath to Jehovah. So too with the Sabbath: whereas a religious motive is attached to the fourth Word of the Decalogue (20 11), here it is given a humanitarian purpose (12).

Three annual pilgrim-feasts are to be observed: Unleavened Bread (15), Harvest, and Ingathering (16). At these festivals every male is to appear before God at a sanctuary (17). Later reflection connected all three with the Exodus (the last only in post-Biblical times), but in origin they were purely agricultural. They were a payment of tribute to the Baal, or 'Owner' of the land, for the produce of the soil. The Feast of *Mazzōth*, or Unleavened Cakes, which marked the beginning of the barley harvest (April-May) may have got its name from the fact that men were so busy with the harvest that they had no time for making leavened bread. The Feast of Harvest was held seven weeks later (Dt 16 9), at the end of the wheat harvest, while the Feast of the Ingathering celebrated the completion of the vintage and olive gathering in September. In 34 22 and Dt 16 9 the Feast of Harvest is called 'the Feast of Weeks,' and the Feast of the Ingathering is called in Deuteronomy (16 13-16) and later writers 'the Feast of Booths,' from the booths or huts, made of branches, etc., in which men slept during the fruit harvest (Is 1 8). In 15 all the words after 'keep' should be omitted as the work of a harmonizer (cf. 34 18-20). 17 may be a doublet of 14.

18 contains two regulations with regard to sacrifices: they are not to be offered with leavened bread (12 15), nor may the fat be left unburnt till the next morning.

19*a* is redundant after 22 29, and probably comes from 34 26.

19*b* may be meant to prohibit a practice which is repugnant to one's natural feelings, but as it occurs in a sacrificial context it more probably refers to some heathen custom connected with the offering of a kid. For various suggestions see McNeile, 143 and xiii, and Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, 188.

Miscellaneous Injunctions, Moral and Humanitarian (22 18-19, 21-27, 23 1-9).—Sorcery and bestiality are to be punished with death (22 18-19). The remaining verses are exhortations to kindness and upright conduct. The sojourner (resident foreigner with no legal status), the widow, and the orphan are not to be oppressed or ill-treated (22 21-24, 23 9). Interest is not to be taken on money lent to a poor

Israelite (22 25), and a mantle taken as a pledge is to be returned before sunset, because it is a poor man's only covering by night (26-27). Stress is laid upon veracity and impartiality in the administration of justice (23 1-3, 6-8); and kindness is to be shown, even to an enemy: his ox or his ass must be brought back if it has strayed, or released if lying under a burden (4-5).

23. Translate: 'If thou afflict *him* in any wise, and *he* cry at all unto me.' The reference is to the *ger*, or resident foreigner, of 21. It is almost certain that 21*b*, 22, 24 (also 23 9) are an addition to the original text.

XXIII. **1. Thou shalt not take up** (on thy lips), i.e. give currency to, **a false report: put not thine hand with him that is in the wrong to be a malicious witness.** According to Dr. it is a warning against subverting the innocent by helping to clear the guilty.

2. Text is corrupt: but RVm gives the general sense: he is not to follow the majority for evil purposes or to pervert justice. For **a poor man** many would read (with a change of one letter) 'a great man,' the latter being more suitable to the context and more consonant with the practice of Oriental judges.

4-5 anticipates Mt 5 44; Rom 12 20: cf. Pr 25 21. **5.** RVm is preferable.

6-8 refer to the judges, as 1-3 refer to the witnesses: the poor must be dealt with fairly, the innocent must not be condemned to death, or the wicked acquitted (LXX '*thou* shalt not acquit the wicked'), and no bribes are to be accepted.

(*c*) 20-33. Conclusion of the Book of the Covenant (E, except 23-25*a* and 31*b*-33, which are Deuteronomic expansions).—If Israel is obedient, Jehovah will give it prosperity, health, and long life, slow but sure success in the conquest of Canaan, and extension of territory afterwards. It is a hortatory epilogue such as is found at the end of the codes of H (Lev 26 3-45) and D (Dt 28). While J regards the pillar of cloud as Israel's guide (13 21), E speaks of 'an angel' (LXX 'my angel') who is the visible manifestation of Jehovah (14 19).

25*b*. and he shall bless continues 22. Read with LXX, Vulgate 'I' for 'he.' For **the hornet** cf. Dt 7 20; Jos 24 12; Wisd 12 8. No doubt the tradition has some basis in an actual plague which occurred during the conquest of Canaan.

29-30. The gradual nature of the conquest is true to the older traditions (e.g. Jg 1 19, 21, 27-35), but contrary to later accounts of rapid extermination.

23-25*a* condemns idolatry, and is out of place in a series of promises. The same objection applies also to 31*b*-33.

XXIV. **The Covenant.**—It is evident that this ch. is composite in character. Cf. 19, where we have the same difficulty in following the movements of Moses up and down the mountain. E's narrative, which has proceeded practically without interruption in the last four chs., is here broken into by insertions from J (1-2, 9-11) and P (15*b*-18*a*).

3-8 (E) is obviously the sequel to 20 22-23 33. Moses reports to the people all the 'words of Jehovah.' When they promise obedience, he writes the words in a book, and arranges a covenant between Jehovah and the nation. The covenant is ratified by sacrifice and sealed by blood. Moses builds an altar (20 24) and sets up twelve 'pillars' (obelisks or standing stones), the usual adjuncts of an altar until proscribed by Deuteronomic legislation (Dt 7 5). He then sends **young men** (no official priests as yet) to offer sacrifices (20 24), but he himself **tosses** the blood on the altar and on the people, thus making a blood-bond between Israel and Jehovah (cf. Mk 14 24; 1 Cor 11 25; 1 P 1 2; Heb 9 20). As the rest of this passage refers only to the 'words,' most scholars omit **and all the judgements** in 3.

12-15*a*, 18*b* (E). Moses goes up into the mountain with Joshua to receive the tables of stone, leaving Aaron and Hur in charge of the people, and remains there forty days. Omit 'and the law and the commandment,' which cannot refer to the Decalogue, as a later addition.

15*b*-18*a* is probably P's account of the event described by J and E in 19. Note the cloud which, as often in P, is the sign of Jehovah's presence and enshrouds His glory. In 17 the glory breaks through the cloud and is seen as 'blazing fire' by the people. The sequel to 18*a* ('and Moses . . . went up into the mount') is 25 1, that is to say, he goes up in order to receive instructions for the making of a sanctuary.

1-2, 9-11 (J). Moses is summoned to the mountain with Aaron, Aaron's sons, and seventy elders (1-2). They are to worship afar off (in preparation, perhaps, for the vision in 9-11), Moses alone going to the top of the mountain. Moses and his companions ascend the mountain, see a vision of Jehovah, and ratify the covenant by a sacrificial meal (9-11).

10. The meaning seems to be that they saw God, not directly, but in the dazzling rays of the sun, as they looked up at it through a clear, blue sky.

11 reflects the belief that God could not be seen with impunity. On this c-

casion, however, Jehovah 'put not forth his hand' against the nobles (lit. 'cornermen,' i.e. supports of the community).

XXV.-XXXI. (P). **The Tabernacle or Tent of Meeting.**—That there was a Tent of Meeting to which Moses withdrew with Jehovah, and whither the people resorted when they had occasion to 'seek' Him, is more than probable (see 33 [7-11]), but that it was the costly and elaborate tent described in these chapters and in 35-40 few would now care to maintain. Lack of the necessary materials, skill, and labour in a desert people, and the difficulties of transport, make the account incredible in itself, and it is further contradicted by the fact that the tabernacle is never referred to in Judges and Samuel in connexion with the movements of the Ark, and by the earlier tradition of JE, where it appears as a simple nomad tent, which Moses 'used to take and pitch without the camp' (33 [7-11]). The generally accepted theory is that we owe these chapters to a school of writers after the Exile whose aim was to hold up a religious ideal, viz. that the all-holy God dwells in the midst of His people. Since Solomon had built his magnificent Temple, the idea that God had an earthly habitation had become familiar to every Israelite. And when the nation was in Exile and the Temple in ruins, there grew up an intense longing for the restoration of a visible symbol of the objective presence of God, round which the religious life of Israel might rally. This longing is reflected in Ezekiel and in these chapters of Exodus. Both Ezekiel (40-48) and P draw a picture of the Temple of the future, which follows closely the arrangements of the pre-exilic Temple. The only difference between them is that while Ezekiel projects his picture forward into the Messianic age, P throws his backward to the golden age of Moses. See *H.D.B.* (Art. 'Tabernacle'); *C.B.*, 257-262, 420 ff., and *West. Comm.*, lxiii ff.

XXV. **1-9. Materials for the Sanctuary.**—Jehovah bids Moses appeal to the people for liberal 'contributions' (RV **offerings**) of materials for the sanctuary, its fabric, its furniture, and the vestments of its priests. The requirements are gold, silver, and bronze; stuffs dyed violet, purple-red and crimson, fine linen and goat's hair; skins dyed red and *tahash* skins; acacia wood, oils, spices, and precious stones. These are needed for a sanctuary in which Jehovah may dwell in the midst of His people. This sanctuary is further described as 'the Dwelling' and it is to be built according to a model (not pattern) shown to Moses in the mount. **tabernacle** is from the Vulg. *tabernaculum* = 'a tent,' but 'Dwelling' is a better translation, because it expresses the connexion between *mishkān* and the verb *shākan*, 'to dwell,' in [8] and elsewhere. It occurs about one hundred times in P, sometimes (as here) for the entire fabric of the sanctuary, at other times for the curtains of tapestry which formed 'the Dwelling' proper. The commonest expression for the sanctuary as a whole is 'the Tent of Meeting.'

5. The word translated 'badgers' skins' (AV) and **sealskins** (RV) is of uncertain origin. An Arabic word *tukhas* = 'dolphin,' and it may be that the reference is to marine animals generally, including porpoises, seals, and dugongs. Others would connect the Hebrew *tahash* with an Egyptian word *ths* = 'leather.'

10-22. The Ark.—Before the Dwelling itself is described, we have a description of the Ark, the symbol of Jehovah's Presence and the *raison d'être* for the erection of the Tent. It is a chest of acacia wood ($3\frac{3}{4} \times 2\frac{1}{4} \times 2\frac{1}{4}$ feet), overlaid with gold within and without, with a moulding of rolled gold round the top. Two poles of acacia wood, overlaid with gold, are attached to its feet for convenience in carrying it. Inside the chest are the two tables of stone, called 'the Testimony' (31 [18]). Resting upon the chest is a solid slab of gold, called the *Kappōreth*, and near the ends of this, facing each other and with wings spread out, are two 'cherubs' made of beaten gold. Between the cherubs is the trysting-place where Jehovah communes with Moses. A cubit = about 18 inches. The Hebrew *Kappōreth* means 'a thing by which propitiation is made.' Tindale's **mercy-seat**, suggested by [22] and the ceremony on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16 [14] ff.), was intended to express this idea, but it has no basis in etymology. In the absence of a suitable word, many scholars adopt the Vulgate *propitiatorium* (LXX and Heb 9 [5] = *hilasterion*), and translate 'the propitiatory.' **Cherubs** occur frequently in the Old Testament as bearers of the Deity or as guardians of sacred spots, but we have no certain knowledge about their appearance in this connexion, except that they were winged. If the Ark is the symbol of God's Presence, its furniture calls attention to His stern requirements (the tables of stone) and His loving compassion (the propitiatory).

23-30. The Table of Presence Bread.—From the furniture of the Most Holy Place we pass to that of the Holy Place. The table is of acacia wood ($3 \times 1\frac{1}{2}$ feet and

2½ feet high), overlaid with gold, with a moulding of solid gold round the top. A rail with a golden moulding connects the four legs, and on the legs near the rail (or cross-stays) are four golden rings through which the poles are passed when the table has to be moved. Golden dishes, incense cups, flagons, and chalices 'with which libation is made' are provided for the table, and the Presence Bread must always be found upon it. **Shewbread** like 'mercy-seat' we owe to Luther (through Tindale). The Heb. means lit. 'bread of the face'='Presence Bread' (RVm), i.e. 'bread placed in the presence of Jehovah' (cf. 1 S 21 [6]). The story of David and the shewbread indicates that the custom was older than P. It is no doubt a survival from primitive times, when food was placed before the deity for his consumption. But P has discarded such materialistic motives, and transformed the rite into a Eucharist, at once a feast and a thankoffering for the gift of daily bread (Lev 24 [5-9]).

33-40. The Golden Lampstand.—The lampstand consists of a central stem with three branches on either side, bent upwards and outwards, stem and branches alike ornamented at intervals by the calyx and petals of an almond-blossom in beaten gold. Stem and branches hold seven lamps which the priests are to take down and trim every day and replace each evening (27 [21]). 'Tweezers' are provided for drawing up the wicks, and 'snuff-dishes' for the pieces of wick pulled off by the tweezers—all of pure gold.

37. Translate 'they shall fix on the lamps thereof, to give light in front of it,' the idea being that the lampstand was at the south side of the Holy Place, and that the wicks turned north and lit up the space in front of the lampstand. If the lampstand in Zerubbabel's Temple suggested the lampstand of P, its symbolical meaning will be that of Zech 4: the seven lamps are the eyes of Jehovah which 'run to and fro through the whole earth.' It is not quite clear as to whether the lamps were allowed to go out in the daytime. The later custom was to burn one or three by day and all seven by night. Cf. the modern custom of keeping perpetually burning lamps before holy objects or before the Reserved Sacrament.

XXVI. The Dwelling.—The word is used in its strict sense in this chapter, i.e. of the interior tent, or fabric of curtains, supported on a wooden framework, and divided by a veil into the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies. There are ambiguous statements and gaps in the information, but the general idea is fairly clear. The Dwelling has a framework of 'boards' (or frames: see notes below) overlaid with gold, running round the two sides and the back, the front being left open. Each board stands upright in two bases of solid silver, and the whole framework is held in place by bars overlaid with gold, running (probably) along the top, the middle, and the bottom of the framework ([15-30]). This framework supports ten richly coloured curtains with cherubs worked on them. These, joined together so as to form two sets of five, form the Dwelling proper. Over them is spread a single curtain of goat's hair (made of eleven curtains fastened together). This is the 'Tent over the Dwelling.' For protection against the weather there is a further covering of leather dyed with madder, and over that a waterproof sheet made of *taḥash* skins ([1-14]). The Holy Place is separated from the Holy of Holies by a veil (of the same workmanship as that of the curtain which formed the Dwelling), attached to four pillars overlaid with gold ([31-33]). The entrance to the Dwelling, left open as regards framework, is covered by a screen. This, being further from the Most Holy Place than the veil, is of less elaborate workmanship and has no cherubs woven into it. It is supported by five pillars overlaid with gold ([37-38]). The dimensions of the dwelling are 45 × 15 × 15 feet, the Most Holy Place being a cube of 15 × 15 × 15 feet, and the Holy Place of the same height and width, but double as to its length.

34-35 direct that the Ark and the Propitiatory should be placed in the Holy of Holies, and that the Table of the Presence Bread should stand on the north side of the Holy Place, with the lampstand opposite. 30 [1-5] states that an Altar of Incense also stands in the Holy Place.

1. cunning workman is inadequate. Dr. translates 'designer' or 'pattern-weaver.' His work is more elaborate and skilful than that of the 'embroiderer' (or 'variegator') of [36], or that of the simple 'weaver' of 28 [32], 39 [22, 27].

15. The word translated **boards** is of uncertain meaning. Kennedy, whose article 'Tabernacle' in *H.D.B.* should be read, objects to this translation on the grounds that (1) a solid framework of boards contradicts the idea that the Dwelling is formed by curtains, and that (2) these wooden walls would hide the richly woven curtains from view. He contends, therefore, that the *qĕrāsîm* are open 'frames' which, while supporting the curtains and other coverings, allow

the tapestry to be seen from within the sanctuary. 'Towards the Negeb, southwards' in [18] and 'westward' (lit. 'towards the sea') in [22] betray the hand of one writing in Palestine and not in the desert of Arabia. Negeb is the tract of country south of Judah.

XXVII. **1-19. The Court of the Dwelling.**—As in the case of the Dwelling, the furniture is mentioned first.

1-8. The Altar of Sacrifice.—This is made of acacia wood overlaid with bronze. It is 7½ feet square and 4½ feet high, and at each corner there is a horn of bronze. The vessels of the altar, necessary for the sacrifices, are all of the same material. The altar has a bronze grating, and poles overlaid with bronze by which it may be carried. A hollow wooden box seems to be intended, but how such a box could escape being destroyed by the heat of the sacrificial fires is not explained. In order to escape this difficulty and bring this altar into line with the command in 20 [24], it is commonly assumed that, when not being carried about, the altar-case was filled with earth or stones. The probability is that the writer, in his desire to describe a portable altar, overlooked this practical point.

9-19. The Court.—The Dwelling is surrounded by a rectangular uncovered court, lying east and west like the Tent, 150 feet long, 75 feet broad, and enclosed by white linen curtains 7½ feet high, which hang on bronze pillars with bronze bases. In the middle of the east side there is a space of 20 feet, which is left for the gate, or entrance to the court. This space is covered by a screen, supported on four pillars and of the same materials as the screen of 26 [36].

20-21. Oil for the Lamp.—Oil is to be provided at the people's expense, that the lamp may be always burning through the night. It is the duty of Aaron and his sons to attend to this. As there is no account of this having been done in 35-40, and these verses occur again in Lev 24 [2] f., it is thought that this regulation has been added by a later hand from Leviticus. 'Beaten oil,' the purest, was obtained by pounding the olives in a mortar.

XXVIII. **The Priestly Vestments.**—Having described the Dwelling and its furniture, the writer now deals with the ecclesiastical officers, Aaron and his four sons. The following garments are to be worn by Aaron: (*a*) linen drawers, to prevent unseemly exposure ([42-43]: cf. 20 [26]); (*b*) a tunic of chequer-work, like a cassock in shape, made of fine linen by the ordinary 'weaver' and girt with a richly coloured sash, the work of 'the embroiderer' ([39]); (*c*) a violet robe, woven in one piece and put on (like a chasuble) by being thrown over the head, the hem adorned with a fringe of pomegranates and golden bells ([31-35]); over this, (*d*) a richly woven ephod, 'the work of the designer.' According to the older view this was a kind of waistcoat, supported by two broad straps, worn on the shoulders like braces, and held in position round the body by a band. But the view now commonly held is that it was an apron (or kilt), held up by shoulder-straps attached to a band at the top of the garment, well above the loins. If the garment was an apron, the onyx-stones in 'filigree settings of gold' ([11]) would act as brooches to the upper ends of the shoulder-straps; if a kilt, the straps would be fastened to the band of the garment back and front, and the onyx-stones would be an ornament only ([6-12]). Above (not 'upon') the band of the ephod Aaron wears (*e*) the 'pouch of judgement' (a bag 9 inches square), made of the same richly coloured materials as the ephod and ornamented with twelve precious stones. Golden rings at its four corners were used to fasten the pouch to the shoulder-straps and band of the ephod. The pouch contains the *ūrim* and *tūmmîm*. Much has been written on the derivation and meaning of these words, but all we can say for certain is that they were sacred lots (perhaps stones), used for the purpose of ascertaining the Divine Will; see LXX: cf. 1 S 14 [41] ff. ([13-20]). On Aaron's head is (*f*) a turban of fine white linen ([39]), with a violet band tied round it, and on the band a gold plate, bearing the inscription, 'Holy to Jehovah' ([36-38]). Tunics, sashes, headtires (perhaps brimless caps), and linen drawers are ordered for Aaron's sons, i.e. the ordinary priests ([40-43], omitting [41] as an anticipation of the next chapter).

7. Read (with LXX): 'It shall have two shoulder-straps joined to it; at its two (top) ends shall they be joined to it.'

8. Translate 'the band of its attachment.' In *E.B.* it is suggested that the ephod was a ceremonial survival of the primitive loin-cloth, worn as a Christian bishop used to wear—as the Pope does still—a succintorium over his alb.

17 ff. The stones cannot be identified with any degree of certainty (cf. Rev 21 [19] f.). For the rendering 'breastplate' there is no justification.

26-28 are omitted in LXX: they may be the work of an annotator.

31. The 'violet' of royal and ecclesiastical dignity.

33-35. McN. sees in the pomegranate a possible survival of nature-worship: cf. the resemblance of the lampstand in 25 31 ff. to an almond tree. He suggests also that the bells may have been used originally, like our gargoyles, to scare evil spirits from the sanctuary. Here they were used either to let the people know when Aaron entered or left the Holy Place, or (more likely) to remind God that he was present as the representative of the people (cf. 12, 29).

This description of Aaron's dress, based, no doubt, upon that of the High Priest in the writer's own day, contains much that is suggestive for the Christian reader. Thus vestments are 'holy garments,' made 'for glory and for beauty,' i.e. to enhance the dignity of public worship (2, 40), and skill in making them beautiful and glorious is due to divine inspiration (3: cf. 31 3). We have the priest as the representative of the people, bearing the names of the twelve tribes upon the brooches of his shoulder-straps and upon the stones of the pouch of judgement, bearing them also upon his heart (i.e. in his mind), and entering the Holy Place to bring the remembrance of them before God (12, 29). He is also the representative of God to man, declaring His will by means of the sacred lot (30). The diadem on Aaron's head with its inscription symbolizes the relationship between Israel and God, and suggests that the Church ought to be (and is ideally) in union with its great High Priest (36), while Aaron's responsibility for defective worship on the part of the people and his intervention that they may be accepted before God reminds us of the work of the great Intercessor who makes our worship acceptable before the Throne (38).

XXIX. 1-37. **The Consecration of Aaron and his Sons.**—1-3 sets out the materials required for the service: a bullock and two rams, 'bread of cakes,' 'perforated cakes,' and large round wafers, all unleavened. The ceremony itself is then described: (*a*) Washing the entire bodies (30 19 f.) of the priests (4): cf. Heb 10 22. The daily services after their consecration only required the washing of hands and feet (Jn 13 10). (*b*) The investiture of Aaron with the garments described in 28 and his anointing (5-7). (*c*) The investiture of the ordinary priests (8-9). Omit 'Aaron and his sons' in 9a with LXX. (*d*) The offering of a bullock as a sin offering for 'Aaron and his sons' (10-14). separating them from all that was not holy. (*e*) A ram offered as a burnt offering (15-18), signifying their entire devotion to Jehovah. (*f*) Offering of the second ram as 'a ram of installation' (22). The application of the blood to the ear, hand, and foot (19-20) suggests the duty of listening to Jehovah's commands, performing His sacred offices, and walking in His holy ways. (Omit 21 as a gloss.) The priests are then invested with authority to offer sacrifice. Certain portions of the sacrifices—the fat tail, the fat that covereth the entrails, the appendix of the liver, the two kidneys with their fat, and the right thigh, together with a round cake, a perforated cake, and a wafer—are placed on their palms and waved by Moses, as they lie there, before the altar (22-25) A sacrificial meal, which shows that this is essentially a peace offering, is partaken of by Aaron and his sons in a holy place, i.e. in the court of the Tent (31-34). All these ceremonial acts are to be repeated every day throughout the octave (35), and the case is the same with the ceremonial purification of the altar (36-37). 27-30 do not agree with 22-24, neither do they occur in Lev 8. They are, therefore, to be regarded as a later insertion, or at least as a parenthesis. 33 also reads like an addition: there has been no previous mention of 'the things wherewith atonement was made'; the idea of atonement in connexion with a peace offering is unique in P, and the rule that a foreigner (i.e. one not a priest) shall not partake is superfluous after the statement in 32.

6. Translate 'and put the holy *diadem* upon the turban,' the reference being to the violet band, with the gold plate in front, tied round the white turban.

9. In this chapter, and in 28 41, 32 29, translate 'install' instead of **consecrate**. The literary meaning is 'to fill the hand of.' Except in Ezek 43 26 it is always used of consecration to the priesthood. It suggests the placing on the hands of the candidate some symbol or instrument as a sign that he was henceforth authorized to officiate as priest. Cf. the delivery of the Bible into the hands of a newly ordained priest in the English Ordinal, and the delivery of the chalice and paten in the ancient rites. 29 24 implies that installation included filling the hand of the priest with portions of the sacrifices.

13. Here and in 18, 25, 30 7, 8, 40 27 translate 'consume in sweet smoke' for **burn**: Lev 1 9 *v.n.*

16. Not **sprinkle** but 'toss' or 'throw': cf. 24 6. In 27-28 the translation **heave** and **heave offering** is misleading. Read 'contribute' and 'con-

tribution,' the Hebrew meaning something lifted up or separated from a larger mass for sacred purposes.

36. cleanse the altar means 'free the altar from sin.' Made of materials common and profane, fashioned by human hands, it is regarded as tainted by sin. Cf. the Christian custom of setting apart new churches and their furniture from 'all profane and common use,' and the customary purification of sacred buildings which have been defiled.

37. RVm is the more probable rendering; but better 'Whosoever toucheth the altar shall *become* holy,' i.e. dedicated to Jehovah and therefore liable to be forfeited, a survival of primitive conceptions of holiness. If a thing touches the altar, it is confiscated for the use of the sanctuary; if it is a person, not already consecrated and so authorized to touch it, he is handed over to the Deity to be dealt with.

It should be noted that the account of the carrying out of these instructions is given in Lev 8, and that throughout the above passage the regulations of Lev 1-7 are presupposed.

38-42. The Daily Sacrifice.—This passage interrupts the connexion between [37] and [43], and is premature in its occurrence. As it is found with slight verbal changes in Nu 28 [3-8], where it occurs in a table of public sacrifices required to be offered on various occasions, it is probable that it has been inserted here by a later hand with such alterations as would make it fit into its new position. The reason for the addition is clear: one of the principal duties which the priests had to perform at the altar mentioned in [36] f. was the offering of the daily burnt offering on behalf of the community.

These verses represent the post-exilic use. Before that time it was usual to offer a burnt offering in the morning and only a cereal offering in the evening (2 K 16 [15]), and even in Ezekiel's Temple only a burnt offering in the morning is prescribed, there being no mention of an evening sacrifice (Ezek 46 [13-15]).

40. The cereal offering is the regular accompaniment of the burnt offering in P (Nu 15 [1-12]). About 6½ pints of fine flour are mixed with about 2⅔ pints of beaten oil.

42 is a connecting verse to lead up to [43-46], which is the natural sequence of [37].

43-46. Conclusion of Chs. 25-29.—'And I will meet with the children of Israel there (at the altar of [36] f.); and it (the altar) shall be sanctified by my glory.' The altar will be Jehovah's trysting-place with His people. When the Dwelling and its furniture have been completed and its priests have been installed, tent, altar, and priests will all be hallowed by His Presence, and He will take up His permanent abode as their God in the midst of His people. Thus the object of the Exodus will have been fulfilled.

44. It is worthy of note that the ceremonial acts by which priests and altar are consecrated to holy purposes do not of themselves make consecration. They are only valid because Jehovah appoints and accepts them. It is He who sets apart the sanctuary and its ministers for His service (*Cent. B.*, 235).

XXX. - XXXI. Appendices. — These chapters belong to P, but there are reasons for supposing that they belong to a later and secondary stratum of that school.

XXX. 1-10. The Golden Altar of Incense.—Moses is to make an altar of acacia wood overlaid with gold, 3 feet high and 1½ feet broad and long, with horns and a moulding of gold running round it, and under the moulding on two sides gold rings for the carrying-poles. It is to stand in the Holy Place, with the veil behind it, and Aaron is to burn incense before it every morning and evening —in the morning when he takes the lamps down to trim them, and in the evening when he 'fixes on' the lamps again to light them. This altar is to be used exclusively for burning incense, and only for incense made according to the proper prescription (see [34-37]). Atonement is to be made for it once a year.

When we have just got the impression that the commands concerning the Dwelling are complete and confirmed by the solemn promise at the end of the last chapter that Jehovah will come and make His abode in the Dwelling thus completed, it is disconcerting to read that Moses is now to make an altar of incense. As it is not mentioned in 25 or 26, or in Lev 16 (where the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement, alluded to in [10], is described), or in Ezekiel (but see 1 Mac 1 [21], 4 [49] ff.), and as the altar of burnt offering is so often referred to as '*the* altar,' as if no other existed, we may conclude that the Dwelling, as conceived in the main document of P, contained no such altar. Incense is provided for already in 25 [29], and in Lev 10 and Nu 16 it is offered, not on an altar, but in pans or censers. LXX omits the reference in 37. This altar is not mentioned in the spoil taken by Titus, but it may have existed in the Second Temple.

11-16. Tax for the Maintenance of Public Worship.—In primitive times a

census was regarded as a dangerous thing (2 S 24). Consequently, it is ordered that when a census is taken, half a sacred shekel be paid by every man as a ransom for his life and for a contribution (not 'offering') to Jehovah: the proceeds to be applied to the maintenance of the daily services. In Neh 10 [32] the people agree to pay one-third of a shekel annually. This suggests that our regulation here is later than the original P, the increased amount showing increased devotion to the Temple after Nehemiah's time. In any case, the passage is out of place here, as it implies a completed sanctuary and the census of Nu 1: cf. Mt 17 [24-27].

This tax is not exactly a freewill offering, but it lays down an important Christian principle, viz. that every member of the Church should contribute to the cost of its worship. The principle of [15] seems to be that the value of every human life is the same in the sight of God (McNeile): every man counts for one, and no man for more than one.

17-21. The Bronze Laver.—Moses is to make a bronze laver for washing the hands and feet of Aaron and his sons when they minister in the Dwelling, and place it between the Dwelling and the altar. Cf. the *Lavabo* at the Eucharist.

Like the altar of incense, this does not belong to the original stratum of P; otherwise it would have been mentioned in 27 with the altar of burnt offering. 38 [8] states whence the material for this altar was obtained. In Solomon's Temple there were ten lavers and a 'molten sea' (1 K 7).

22-33. The Anointing Oil.—Moses is to prepare oil by following a certain recipe, and with it anoint the Dwelling, its furniture, and its priests. It must not be used for the toilet, or be mixed by an ordinary layman, on pain of his being cut off from his 'father's kin.'

28 assumes the existence of the altar of incense and the bronze laver, and [30] orders the anointing of Aaron's sons, contrary to the command in 29 [7-9] and references to 'the anointed priest' in Lev 4 [3, 5-16], etc. The passage is, therefore, later than the original P.

'The anointing of the priesthood and the sanctuary finds its counterpart in the anointing of our High Priest . . . and of His Church (2 Cor 1 [21]; 1 Jn 2 [20, 27])' (McNeile).

34-38. The Sacred Incense.—Moses is to make incense out of certain ingredients for use upon the altar of incense. Such incense is not to be made for any other purpose; and anyone who so makes it is to be cut off from his 'father's kin.'

The use of incense in worship is of ancient origin and widespread in its occurrence. We do not know when it was introduced into Palestine, but we know that, when it was fully established in divine worship, it became a beautiful symbol of prayer (Ps 141 [2]; Rev 5 [8], 8 [3, 4]). As [36] connects the passage with the altar of incense (see [6]), these verses too must be later than P.

XXXI. **1-6. Bezalel and Oholiab.**—Two skilled craftsmen are specially chosen and inspired to take the chief part in making the Dwelling, its furniture, and the vestments of its priests. If 30 is later than P, this passage belongs to the same time, since the list of appurtenances includes the altar of incense, the bronze laver, the anointing oil, and the sacred incense. We are grateful, however, for its insertion, for it records the conviction that the source of artistic ability is the Spirit of God ([3]), and suggests ([6]) that those who possess such ability may be endowed with wisdom, i.e. the necessary taste and skill to make their work worthy of its object.

12-17. Sabbath Observance.—Those who break the Sabbath are to be put to death. The Sabbath is a sign between Jehovah and Israel. Jehovah Himself rested on the seventh day. Usually in P Sabbath observance is inculcated from the ceremonial point of view, but here P rises to a greater height. It is a sign between Jehovah and His people throughout successive generations that men, i.e. the world outside (not 'ye' as in RV), may know that it is He who sanctifies Israel. 'The separation of one day in seven is a symbol of the separation of the entire people; it is a sign and a covenant between them and Yahweh who sanctifies them. And the same principle holds good whether the consecrated day be the seventh or the first day of the week' (McNeile).

18 makes the transition between 25-31 and 32-34. **tables of stone** refers us back to 24 [12] (E).

XXXII.-XXXIV. Full of repetitions and other discrepancies (for which see commentaries), this is one of the most complicated passages in the Old Testament. It is obvious that several documents have been used, but it is by no means easy to apportion the verses between J and E and various annotators, or to decide in what order the verses stood in the documents from which they have been taken. The following analysis is based on Driver:

J: 32 [25-34], 33 [1, 3-4, 12-13, 17-23], 34 [5-9, 33 14-16], 34 [1a, 2-5] (except 'like unto the first'), [10-28] (with expansions).

E: 31 18b, 32 1-6 (expanded 7-14), 15-24. 35, 33 5a, c, 6, 7-11, 34 1, 1b, 4 ('like unto the first').

P: 31 18a, 34 29-35.

The Golden Bull.—It is E's narrative of the Golden Bull (or fragments of it) which forms the nucleus of these chapters. In 24 12-15a, 18b, the last excerpt from E, Moses has ascended the mount in order to receive the tables of stone. This would naturally be followed by an account of his having received them, and we probably have a survival of this in 31 18b, 'tables of stone, written with the finger of God.' The story then proceeds: During the long absence of Moses on the mount (24 18b), the people lose heart and persuade Aaron to make them a god to act as their visible leader (cf. Ac 7 40 f.). Aaron makes a golden bull and the people worship it (1-6). When Moses returns to the camp with Joshua and hears what has happened, he breaks the tables of stone, grinds the image to powder, and makes the people drink water in which the powder has been thrown (15-20). A plague follows (35). When Moses reproaches Aaron, the latter makes excuses: first, he blames the people, and then he pretends that he merely threw gold on the fire and a bull came out (21-24). In 7-14, Jehovah Himself tells Moses about the molten bull and announces His intention of destroying the people, but, when Moses intercedes, repents. Inconsistent with its context, and similar in thought and style to Dt 9 12-14, it is an expansion of the original story.

The plural 'gods' in 2, 4, 8 and 23 suggests the influence of 1 K 12 28, where the reference is to two bulls. Here there is only one image, and it is clear that polytheism was not intended, the bull being a symbol of Jehovah (5). The image seems to have been made of wood and overlaid with gold, not of gold entirely, otherwise it could not have been burnt (20). Cf. Ps 106 20 f.; 1 Cor 10 7.

E's Tent of Meeting.—33 7-11 is hidden away in a context with which it seems to have nothing to do, but historically it is one of the most valuable passages in Exodus, for it is a fragment of an early tradition about the Tent of Meeting. Here the sanctuary is not the costly and elaborate structure described by P, but a simple nomad tent which Moses and Joshua could carry and pitch; it is pitched outside the camp, some distance away, not in its centre as in P (Nu 2 17); and its only minister, apart from Moses, is a young man of the tribe of Ephraim, whereas in P Aaron and his sons are the priests and the Tent is protected by a large army of Levites. It is probable that this passage is the conclusion of E's account of the construction of the Tent of Meeting, which has been omitted by the compiler in favour of P. If so, the ornaments mentioned in 5a, c, 6, may have been for use in making or adorning the Tent (cf. in P 25 2-8, 35 22-29).

Jehovah's Presence.—J's narrative begins with an account of a rebellion which seems to have nothing to do with the episode of the Golden Bull. The people have 'broken loose' and become a 'derision' (lit. 'a whispering') among their enemies. (This cannot refer to bull-worship; for to other tribes this would be a normal practice.) In response to an appeal from Moses ('Who is for Jehovah? To me!') the Levites slay 3,000 of the people and are rewarded with the priesthood (32 25-29). Moses intercedes for the people and offers his own life, if such an offering will secure forgiveness. Jehovah yields to the extent of postponing punishment and allowing Moses to lead the people to the Promised Land (30-34, omitting as a gloss 'behold, mine angel shall go before thee'). When the people hear that Jehovah will not go with them, they mourn and leave off wearing their ornaments (33 1-4, omitting 2 as a gloss). Moses asks Jehovah to tell him whom He will send with him, and to reveal His ways of dealing with men, that he may know how to find grace in His sight (12-13). He becomes bolder and asks Jehovah to show him His glory, and is told that this cannot be seen in its fulness, but that he may catch a glimpse of it (17-23). Jehovah then passes by and proclaims the glories of His moral nature (34 6-8). Moses once more intercedes—let Jehovah prove that He is forgiving by going with His people (9)—and receives the promise that Jehovah's 'Presence' will go with them (33 14-16).

XXXII. 29. 'Fill your hand (with sacrifices) that you may be installed into the priesthood; for every man is against his son and against his brother,' i.e. you have shown that spirit, viz. the ignoring of natural relationships (Dt 33 9), which is required in priests.

32. God's **book** is not 'the book of life' in the New Testament sense, but a roll on which the names of the living are said to be written (Ps 69 28; Is 4 3; Mal 3 16; Dan 12 1).

XXXIII. 2. A gloss. Read (with LXX) 'he will drive out.'

17-23. **my goodness** = my goodliness, i.e. my beauty as a visible sign of my

moral perfection (McN.). Moses is to stand where he may see Jehovah as He passes by, but he will see, not His face, but only His hinder parts, a kind of afterglow, a faint suggestion of what the full radiance of His Presence might be (cf. Rom 1 [20]). 34 [6-7] is one of the finest descriptions of the divine character in the Old Testament, the source of the comment on the second commandment (20 [5b, 6]), and often quoted in the later literature.

J's Account of the Covenant.—It is now widely held that 34 [1-5] (omitting references to the first tables in [1] and [4]) and [10-28] are taken from J's version of the Two Tables of Stone and the Covenant between Jehovah and Israel, which originally followed J's accouut of the descent of Jehovah upon Mount Sinai in 19. Its present position would be due to the compiler who, wishing to use both J's and E's versions, made the one the sequel, instead of a variant, of the other.

Moses was to hew two tables of stone and take them up Mount Sinai alone. He obeyed, Jehovah came down in a cloud, 'and he (Moses) stood with Him there, and called upon the name of Jehovah,' i.e. worshipped Him ([1a, 2-5]). Jehovah then announced His intention of making a covenant with Israel on the basis of certain laws, all of which have to do with religious worship:

(1) 'Thou shalt not worship any other god: for Jehovah, whose name (i.e. character) is Jealous, is a jealous God' (cf. 20 [3, 5]). [10b] (after 'covenant')-[13] ('Asherim: for') is probably an expansion of the original text; so also [15-16]. (2) 'Molten gods thou shalt not make thee' (cf. 20 [4, 23]). (3) 'The Feast of Unleavened Cakes shalt thou keep' (cf. 13 [4, 6], 23 [15]). [18b] is an expansion. (4) Firstlings of ox and sheep belong to Jehovah. Firstling of an ass and firstborn of man must be redeemed (cf. 13 [12, 13, 15], 22 [29]). (5) The Sabbath must be kept, however urgent the demands of work on the farm may be (cf. 20 [8], 23 [12]). (6) The Feast of Weeks must be observed, and the Feast of Ingathering at the year's turn (cf. 23 [16]). (7) 'Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before (perhaps read "see the face of") Jehovah God, the God of Israel' (cf. 23 [17]). [24] is an expansion. (8) 'Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread; neither shall the sacrifice of the feast (omit "of the passover") be left all night until the morning' (cf. 23 [18]). (9) 'The first, (namely) the firstfruits of thy ground, thou shalt bring unto the house of Jehovah thy God' (cf. 23 [19]). (10) 'Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk' (cf. 23 [19]). At Jehovah's bidding Moses wrote down these words (the commands of [11-26]), as the conditions upon which Jehovah made His covenant with Israel ([27]: which is J's parallel to 24 [3-8], E). He remained on the mount forty days and nights, without food or drink, and engraved these 'ten words' on two tables of stone ([28]). [10b-16] and [24] are characteristically Deuteronomic additions. The latter is interesting: it meets the objection that the absence of all the males at the central sanctuary at Jerusalem three times a year would render those left behind liable to attack. 'There would be a truce of God, as in the Middle Ages' (*Cent. B.*).

The Veil on the Face of Moses.—We now return to P. When Moses came down from the mount, after receiving the tables of stone (31 [18a]), his face shone with a reflection of the divine glory, so that Aaron and the people were afraid to come near him. Moses, therefore, put a veil on his face, and always wore it, except when he went into the Tent or conveyed Jehovah's message to the people (34 [29-35]). 'Those who abide incessantly in the presence of the Lord are gradually but surely "transformed into the same image from glory to glory"' (McN.). For St. Paul's allegorical interpretation see 2 Cor 3 [7-18].

XXXV-XL. **(P). The Construction of the Sanctuary.**—These chs., which are based on, but by a later hand than, 25-31, describe how the instructions given to Moses are carried out. There are omissions and abridgements, and changes in the order of presenting the contents, but, for the most part, the story of 25-31 is repeated *verbatim* with only the necessary changes of person and tense. To the modern reader nothing is so tedious as a twice-told tale, but the Priestly writer dwells on every detail of the worship he loves so well.

XXXV. 1-3 is a summary of 31 [12-17].

3 makes explicit what is implied in 16 [23]. This preface may be intended as a reminder that the Sabbath may not be broken even for work in the sanctuary.

4-19 = 25 [1-7], an appeal for contributions of materials, together with an invitation to skilled workmen to come forward, and a list of the things to be made.

20-29 describe how the people responded: men, women, and 'rulers' gave willingly and liberally.

XXXV. 30-XXXVI. 1 = 31 [1-11] is the call of Bezalel and Oholiab and other skilled workmen, who soon have to report

that they have received more contributions than they need. It is a happy picture of joyous giving for the service of God (2-7).

XXXVI. 8-38. **The Dwelling.**—This corresponds to 26, except that 12-13. 30, and 33-35 are omitted. A new point is that the pillars of the screen have capitals of gold (38). Cf. 38 19, where the pillars at the door of the outer court are given silver capitals.

XXXVII. **Furniture of the Dwelling.**—This is repeated from 25 10-15. 18-20. 23-29. 31-39, and 30 1-5. The last verse condenses the recipes in 30 22-25. 34-35 into one brief statement.

XXXVIII. 1-20. **The Court and its Furniture.**—Cf. 27 1-8, 30 17 f., and 27 9-19. The reference to the metal 'mirrors of the serving women' (8) may be a later addition, as it seems to imply the erection of the Tent in 40.

21-31. **The Amount of Metal Used.**

XXXIX. 1-31. **The Vestments.**—This corresponds generally to 28, but there are abridgements and variations in the wording. 3, explaining how the gold was treated, and the 'twined linen' of 24, are not in the original instructions. The account of the installation of the priests is given in Lev 8.

32-40. When everything was made, it was brought to Moses for inspection, and he blessed the workers.

XL. **The Erection of the Dwelling.**—Moses is instructed to erect the Tent and the Court, to put the sacred furniture in position, to anoint the Tent and all that belongs to it, to invest the priests and to anoint them (1-15). He obeys. He also begins the daily services, himself acting as priest, Aaron and his sons not having been installed (16-33). The cloud descends to cover the Tent and the glory of Jehovah fills the Dwelling. And so the promise of 29 43-45 is fulfilled. We close the book with the impression on our minds that the Priestly writer wishes us to feel that all the labour and self-sacrifice has been well worth while.

LEVITICUS

By S. C. Gayford

The Name.—The title in the LXX was so called because the book is mainly a manual for the priests to use in their work. In the Hebrew Bible the title is taken from the opening words 'And (the Lord) called.'

Composition.—The book belongs to the group of the Hexateuch, and to one document among the sources of that group, viz. the priestly document P. This document, however, is the product not of a single author, but of a school of writers covering a period from the beginning of the Captivity (597) to the completion of Ezra's legislative work (444), i.e. roughly a century and a half, possibly with scattered additions made later still. The generally accepted theory is that the contents of Leviticus were drawn from several of these writers. These were:

(1) Pg, the ground document of the whole group, a history book, and the same as large portions of Genesis and Exodus. The writer is still employing the form of narrative in Leviticus, which purports to give the story of the delivery of the Law to Moses. This document begins with 8, which will be seen to connect directly with the close of Exodus. It closes with the end of 10.

(2) Apart from this historical section we have three groups of laws: (*a*) those relating to the regular sacrifices (1-7); (*b*) the laws relating to purification and uncleanness (11-15), culminating with the account of the Day of Atonement (16), the climax of the purifying sacrifices; (*c*) a separate code (17-26) known as the Law of Holiness, which is seen by its contents to be of earlier date than the laws of 1-7 or 11-16. Comparison with Ezekiel (40-48) has led to the generally accepted conclusion that this code dates from the early years of the Exile, and is earlier than Ezekiel's vision. The original record (H) of this code was worked over by a priestly writer, who added some features taken from the priestly laws. These three groups of laws originally came from separate writers. Even within some of them there are signs of still further distinctions of authorship: e.g. 6 8-7 contain features inconsistent with 1-6 7, which covers the same ground. These differences of origin and authorship will be found worked out in detail in Chapman's Leviticus (*C.B.*). These various older documents were finally wrought into one whole in their present form by a final reviser who followed the customary literary methods of his day, incorporating extracts *verbatim* without comment or alteration, except for an

occasional word or phrase, especially in linking one source on to another.

Order and Contents.—The compiler and final reviser chose as his framework the historical document, Pg, which underlies the whole Hexateuch. A comparatively small part of the document is included in Leviticus, viz. 8-10 and 16. Between Ex 40 and Lev 8 he inserted the laws of sacrifice (1-7) in order to show the purpose for which the Tabernacle now completed (Ex 40) was to be employed. 8-10 describe the consecration of Aaron and his sons and the regulations for the priesthood. 11-15 describe the laws of purification, etc., to which is added as a natural climax the Day of Atonement (16). 17-26, the Law of Holiness, forms a separate code dealing with religious, civil, and social life. Its contents are too miscellaneous to be set out in detail here. 27 is a supplement dealing with vows and tithes.

The Present Value of Leviticus.—The greater part of this book has often been dismissed as having a merely antiquarian interest for the student of ancient law or comparative religion. But even the laws relating to secular concerns and hygiene have an importance for Christians in general apart from their archæological interest, for they exhibit the great principle of progress in the scheme of divine revelation. Compared with the 'Book of the Law' (Ex 21-23), and the code of Deuteronomy, they show the divine guidance of the chosen race in meeting the difficulties of a more complex social life. But the chief interest of the book to the religious student lies in the regulations for sacrifice, and particularly in the description of the Day of Atonement. We have only to turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews to see how the new religion was linked in the writer's mind with the old, and the forms of thought and practice of the old supplied the atmosphere and the terminology of the new. To take the chief instance. The use of the expression 'the Blood of Christ' has become one of the most sacred and precious of sayings to the devout Christian. But it can only be understood if we first become familiar with the associations which it recalled to the minds of the first Christians to whom it was charged with meaning drawn from their Jewish training. It was the truths derived from the use of the blood of bulls and goats in their sacrifices which made them naturally describe the Sacrifice of Calvary and the Heavenly Temple in terms of the Levitical worship. And in this they had the authority of their Master's example. It was He who first employed the phraseology of the ancient sacrifices: 'My Body,' 'My Blood,' and 'the New Covenant' (or 'Testament,' to use the term more familiar to us). The teaching of St. Paul, although cast in quite a different mould from that of the Levitical cycle of thought, is in line with the best side of its spiritual significance. 'Dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God' summarizes the meaning of the slaughter of the victim and the presentation of its blood on the horns of the altar. And no text could be found for a better commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, with its elaborate comparison between the Day of Atonement and the Sacrifice of Calvary, than the words of the preceding verse applying the same thought to our High Priest: 'The death that he died, he died unto sin once: but the life that he liveth, he liveth unto God.' The same set of terms, 'Body,' 'Blood,' 'Testament,' are incorporated also with the same divine authority in our Eucharistic language. Both food and offering borrow their terminology from Leviticus. The Christian sacred meal is thus linked with the sacrificial aspect of the Lord's death and heavenly life. For the advantages gained by the acceptance of the critical conclusions on Leviticus with their conception of a developing law, see Baron von Hügel's essay in Briggs and von Hügel, *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch* (1906).

Bibliography

Driver and White (*S.B.O.T.*), 1898; Kennedy (*Cent. B.*), 1911; Chapman and Streane (*C.B.*), 1914; articles in *H.D.B.* and *E.B.*; Foster-Kent, *Laws of Israel*, 1907; R. W. Dale, *Jewish Temple and the Christian Church*; Gayford, *Sacrifice and Priesthood*, Part I. **Foreign Books:** Bertholet (Marti's *H.K.*, vol. iii); Eerdmann (*Alt. Test. Stud.*, vol. iv); Baentsch (Nowack, *H.K.*).

I.-VII. Laws relating to the ordinary sacrifices. The section falls into two subsections, both dealing with the four kinds of sacrifice and with the meal offering. The reason for covering the ground twice is that the first section (1-6 ^{7}) is for the layman, 'the children of Israel' (1^{2}, 4^{1}), while the second is a manual for the priest (6$^{9, 25}$), with two additional regulations for the laity (7$^{23, 29}$). The two sets of regulations do not agree in every particular (see note on 1^{7}), and are probably drawn from different sources.

The Sacrifices and Offerings fall into two

main classes: (1) the animal sacrifices, called in Hebrew *zebach* = slaughter (offerings), and in English 'sacrifices'; (2) offerings of field produce, called in Hebrew *minchah* (= gift), RV generally 'meal offering' (e.g. 2 [1]), but sometimes more literally and correctly 'offering' (e.g. 1 S 3 [14]). The two terms—sacrifice (*zebach*) and offering (*minchah*)—covered the whole field of sacrifice (1 S 3 [14]; Ps 40 [6]). The *sacrifices* were of four kinds: the peace offering, the burnt offering, the guilt or trespass offering, and the sin offering. Of these the peace offering was probably the earliest, as it is sometimes called simply 'the offering,' which is probably a survival from the time when it was the only form of animal sacrifice. But the burnt offering was also of very ancient origin, and from the evidence of the Old Testament alone might have been thought of equal antiquity with the peace offering. As soon as the two begin to be distinguished, the burnt offering with its absence of a meal and its consequent emphasis of the gift made to God seems to have the idea of propitiation more strongly developed, being offered especially in times of distress and sense of sin. This is especially the case in 1 Samuel. So in Leviticus it is classed as an atoning sacrifice (1 [4]). About the time of the Exile the guilt offering, which earlier took the form of a money fine, became one of the sacrifices. Last of all, the sin offering came into force after the Exile as the supreme sacrifice of propitiation, 'to make atonement.' Common to all four were the four acts of sacrificial ceremonial: (1) laying on of hands; (2) the slaughtering of the victim; (3) presentation of the blood; (4) the burning of the flesh. In regard to the first two all sacrifices were alike, but in the use to which the blood and the flesh were put each had its own peculiar ceremonial. In the peace offering the sacrificer received a portion of the flesh for a sacred meal to express his fellowship with God. In the burnt offering the entire carcase was burnt upon the altar. This symbolized the entire self-surrender of the offerer to God. In the sin offering the *putting* of the blood upon the horns of the altar emphasized the making of atonement. For the peculiar features of the guilt offering, see notes on 7 [1-7]. For the details of the ceremonial of sacrifice, see Gayford, *Sacrifice and Priesthood*, II and III.

I. The Burnt Offering.

1. out of the tent of meeting, i.e. Moses was outside the tent. This connects immediately with Ex 40 [35]. **tent of meeting**: Ex 27 [21] *v.n.* Within this 'tent of trysting,' the place appointed for the Lord to meet with Moses, the actual place of meeting was more particularly 'above the mercy-seat, between the two cherubim' (Ex 25 [22]; Nu 7 [89]). In the latter case Moses entered the tent to speak with God.

2. an oblation: Hebrew *korban*—a thing brought near, i.e. to God, an offering. Used generally of all kinds of gifts to God (cf. Mk 7 [11]). **cattle . . . herd . . . flock**: in sharp distinction from neighbouring nations the Israelites were allowed to sacrifice only the domestic animals, and of them only such as formed their staple food. In both particulars the close connexion between the offerer and the thing he offered was emphasized. The victim was in a real sense identified with the sacrificer: it was the fruit of his labour, and would have gone to support his life.

3. a burnt offering: lit. one that goes up to heaven in sweet smoke. Another name for it is 'the whole offering,' or whole burnt offering, because the whole of the flesh was burnt on the altar. The victim might be a bullock (1 [3]), sheep, or goat (1 [10]), or pigeons (1 [14]). **without blemish**: expanded in 22 [20-25] (cf. Mal 1 [8, 14]; Heb 9 [14]; 1 P 1 [19]). **at the door of the tent**: in the outer court where the altar of burnt offering stood (Ex 40 [29]). **offer**: lit. bring near: the word is the verb from which *korban* is derived. It is used also of the priest's offering of the 'blood' ([5]) and the body ([13]).

4. lay (or press) his hand upon: the laying on of hands was common to all the animal sacrifices, and was used also in ordination (Nu 27 [18]) and on other occasions. No explanation of its significance in sacrifice is given; it is to be noted that the 'laying on of hands' in Lev 16 [21] is not a part of the sacrifice, as this is, and therefore the explanation there given does not follow here. In the ceremonial act of sacrifice the laying on of hands signified that 'the offerer solemnly identified himself with the victim' (Swete, *H.D.B.*, iii, 85*a*); what the victim did or suffered after this was in symbol the act or the suffering of the offerer himself. **accepted for him . . . to make atonement for him**: the preposition 'for,' in the first instance, is the simple unemphasized *dativus commodi*; the second 'for' means literally 'upon,' i.e. on behalf of. Taken together, the two prepositions illustrate the significance of the laying on of hands. By that act the victim was made to represent the offerer before God; it be-

came a maker of 'acceptance' and 'atonement' on his behalf. **make atonement:** Ex 29 [33] *v.n.* In sacrifice it is always the priest or (as in this passage) the sacrifice that is said to make atonement. The word 'atonement' in AV (retained also in RV) meant 'at-one-ment,' i.e. the reconciliation of two estranged parties. It is disputed whether the primitive and literal sense of the Hebrew was 'to cover' or 'to wipe away.' The latter is perhaps the more probable of the two meanings. But at least as early as the 3rd century B.C. the idea of reconciliation was associated with this word *kipper*, since LXX usually translates it by *exilaskomai*, i.e. 'to make reconciliation.' It is doubtful, however, whether this is anything more than an inference from the original meaning. Although the great sacrifice of atonement was the sin offering, yet the burnt offering is regularly spoken of as a sacrifice 'to make atonement (e.g. 16 [24]). It would appear indeed from 17 [11] that *all* the animal sacrifices had an atoning purpose.

5. he shall kill: the slaughtering was not the work of the priest but of the offerer, assisted possibly, or in some cases represented, by official helpers, the Temple Levites (cf. 2 Ch 35 [11]). The verb here may be impersonal, which is equivalent to the passive voice 'it shall be killed'; but in the peace offering (3 [2]) and the sin offering (4 [29]) it is clear that the act of slaughter was to be performed by the sacrificer, and there is no reason to suppose any difference in the burnt offering. Probably the rule was too well known to need emphasizing. The priest did not, *quâ* priest, kill the victim, but only when he was or represented the sacrificer (e.g. 16 [11, 15]). The symbolism is clear and significant: the offerer lays down his own life in sacrifice (cf. Philo, *De Victimis*, 14). **before the Lord,** i.e. in the court before the **tent of meeting,** in which the Lord tabernacled with His people ([1] *v.n.*). **Aaron's sons, the priests:** in D the words 'priest' and 'Levite' are synonymous; but by the time of P the priesthood was confined to one particular family within that tribe, the family of Aaron. **present the blood:** the priest's part now begins. The first three actions (presentation, laying on of hands, killing) were the work of the sacrificer; the last two, the ceremonial use of the blood and of the carcass, were the priest's part of the sacrifice. The word for *present* is the same as for 'offer' in [3] *v.n.* The *blood* to a Jew was identified with the *life* (see 17 [11] and references there given). It is significant that this life was offered *after* the death of the victim; the 'life-blood' did not cease to live with the victim's death; in the sacrifice the 'blood' denotes *a life that has passed through death*, i.e. a risen life. The expression 'the blood of Jesus,' therefore, from its association with the old sacrifices, denotes His *Risen* Life, i.e. the active, vital, and vivifying force within Him set free by His death. The ideas arising from this conception may fruitfully be applied to Jn 6 [56] and 1 Jn 1 [7]. The blood of Christ is the 'food of immortality' because it is His Risen Life, the vital force in Him, which has conquered fear, pain, sin, and death. The blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin because His Risen Life has passed through the death unto sin and risen again to the Life of Righteousness. **sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar:** the verb should be 'pour' instead of 'sprinkle.' It is unfortunate that RV has followed AV in this mistranslation, which confuses two distinct Hebrew words. In the burnt offering (here), the peace offering (3 [2]), and the guilt offering (7 [2]), all the blood was *poured* (*zaraq*=throw or cast in a volume) against the altar; only in the sin offerings on the Day of Atonement a small quantity was *sprinkled* (*hizzah*) with the finger on the Mercy Seat. This distinction in the technical words for the use of the blood in the sacrifices is lost in the English translation: see further on 16 [14]. **the altar . . . at the door of the tent of meeting,** i.e. the great altar of burnt offering in the forecourt (Ex 40 [29]); for this reason also called 'the altar that is before the Lord' (16 [18]).

6. cut it into its pieces: see [8]. The carcass was divided into joints as if for human consumption; it was the 'bread of the Lord' (21 [6]). So also in [8], 'lay . . . in order' is the term used for laying a table for an ordinary meal; and the 'altar' is the 'Table of the Lord' (Ezek 41 [22]; Mal 1 [7, 12]).

7. The lighting of the fire is inconsistent with 6 [12], and an indication that these passages come from different sources.

9. The burning of the *whole* carcass was peculiar to the burnt offering. The word for 'burn' (*hiqtir*) is again a technical term. It means literally 'to consume in sweet smoke,' and is quite distinct from the ordinary word *saraph*, which means to destroy by fire. *hiqtir* is also used of incense, and the derivative noun is used of the incense itself. The word denotes the way in which the 'bread of the Lord' was used by Him. The flesh offered to Him ascended to heaven in

smoke in the same way as incense and prayer mount up to His throne (Ps 141 [2]). **an offering made by fire:** Hebrew *ishsheh*, a technical term for any offering, the whole or part of which was burnt on the altar (2 [3], 24 [7]). **of a sweet savour:** lit. 'a smell of tranquillizing,' i.e. that gives contentment and peace to the mind. At first the idea was used in a gross and anthropomorphic sense (Gen 8 [21]; 1 S 26 [19], RVm), but later the thought was refined and spiritualized. Ezekiel (20 [41]) uses it figuratively of the people of Israel: offering themselves to God they are a 'sweet odour' to Him. With the evangelical teaching of the Prophets that the sacrifices were pleasing to God not for their own intrinsic value, but for the inward feelings which they expressed, the sacrificial term was used figuratively of the pleasure of God in acts of righteousness (e.g. Ecclus 35 [1-6]), and hence the familiar use in the New Testament (e.g. 2 Cor 2 [14-16]; Eph 5 [2]; Phil 4 [18]).

11 adds to the regulations for the killing, a further instruction as to the *place*. **on the side of the altar northwards:** the side of darkness and evil, moral and physical; used in this semi-figurative sense of the land of exile (Jer 3 [12, 18]; Zech 2 [6]) and of the direction from which invaders came down upon Israel (e.g. Jer 1 [14, 15]). The moral forces of evil came from the North (Is 14 [13]). So if any significance is to be attached to the regulation, this is the most probable. But possibly it was dictated merely by convenience from the situation of the altar in the 2nd Temple. This passage and Jer 3 [12] have been supposed to supply the reason for reading the Gospel in the Eucharist facing northwards.

14. turtle-doves or young pigeons, i.e. as before, restricted to (*a*) articles of ordinary food: (*b*) animals reared by the sacrificer. The poor kept tame doves for food (cf. *H.D.B.*, Dove). The ceremonial is altered here. The killing and the offering of the blood are compressed into one act, and performed by the priest. This was necessary as there was not enough blood to be caught in a bowl and dashed against the altar.

16. The bird is prepared as if for the table. 'Filth' should be 'feathers' (RVm).

II. The Meal Offering.—The Hebrew *minchah* means simply a gift; and it is only as a technical term of sacrifice that this word explains the gift to be of the fruits of the earth. In religious language earlier than P the word was used sometimes of both animal and vegetable offerings, e.g. in Gen 4 [4, 5] it is applied to Abel's offering as well as Cain's. The ingredients of the vegetable offering were the three staple foods produced by cultivation, viz. corn, wine, and oil. The material of sacrifice is limited to food produced by labour in the same way as in the animal sacrifices. The oblation of wine is only incidentally alluded to in Lev. 23 [18, 37], but expressed in *ib.* [13] and Nu 15 [5, 10]: cf. Ex 30 [9]. The corn might be offered in the form of flour ([1-3]), or cakes ([4] ff.), or parched corn ([14-16]). *Oil* was used with bread in daily life, and therefore in the offering to God also. The addition of *frankincense* is peculiar to the offering to God, and it is to be noted that all the incense was placed upon the portion offered to God on the fire ([2]).

2. the memorial thereof: lit. 'that of it which brings to remembrance.'*

3. most holy: the portion not burnt on the altar was consecrated in the highest degree, and therefore could be eaten by the priests only and within the sacred precincts (cf. 6 [16, 17]). No portion of the *minchah* went to the offerer. **made by fire:** the term 'fire offering' is here extended to include offerings a part of which was burnt on the altar.

4. unleavened cakes. Leaven was not altogether forbidden in the offerings. Firstfruits with leaven were offered at Pentecost (23 [17-20]). But probably because of its putrefying action it was forbidden in all meal offerings made to the Lord by fire. So in the New Testament leaven is used of moral corruption (Mt 16 [6]; 1 Cor 5 [8]).

11. honey, which included the juice of fruits, was forbidden perhaps for the same reason as leaven. Another possible reason was because it was a wild uncultivated product, and not the result of human labour. A land of natural fertility was 'a land flowing with milk and honey' (Ex 3 [8]).

12. oblation: *korban*, which included every kind of offering. **firstfruits** were to be offered to God in two ways: (*a*) by being handed over to the priests for their use: a list is given in Nu 18 [12, 13] of the products on which this toll was exacted. These firstfruits did not come up on the altar; (*b*) the *minchah* of firstfruits ([14-16]). This was a fire offering, since a part of it (the *azkarah*) was burnt on the altar, but as it consisted of unground corn, the question of leaven did not arise.

* In 24 [7] the frankincense *is* the memorial (*azkarah*) of the shewbread. Here it is clear that the Heb. 'together with *all* the frankincense thereof' means that the frankincense procures 'remembrance' for the offering.—A. G.

13. salt. For the opposite reason salt as a preservative is to be used with all offerings. Salt was a necessary and invariable article of food at all meals. So the sacred tie of hospitality was established by eating of anyone's salt. Also as a preservative salt was a fitting token of an inviolable bond such as hospitality created. A covenant between man and man was ratified by a common meal, and the salt of the meal was the symbol of the sacredness of the covenant: hence the expression 'a covenant of salt for ever' (Nu 18 [19]; 2 Ch 13 [5]). The covenant here indicated is the covenant between God and His people established by the covenant sacrifice of Ex 24 [4-8]. In every offering the salt was to be a reminder of the sacred inviolability of this 'covenant of thy God' (cf. Ezek 43 [24]; Mk 9 [49] RVm).

14. firstfruits: the word (*bikkurim*) is a different one from [12] (*reshith* = first), but the meaning seems to be the same.

III. The Peace Offerings.—[1] RVm '*or* thank offerings.' In either case the plural may be *intensive* only. Two alternative derivations are given of the word *shelamim*: (1) from root = to pay fully and so reward (thank offering); (2) to be at peace (peace offering). This sacrifice is called pre-eminently '*the* sacrifice,' and the term for sacrifices in general (*zebach*) is often applied to it.

2. sprinkle: the same word (*zaraq*) as of the burnt offering. It should be translated 'pour' or 'dash' to preserve its distinction from the true 'sprinkling': 1 [5] *v.n.*

5. burn it . . . upon the burnt offering, i.e. upon the perpetual daily public burnt offering (6 [12]). So the private offerings were laid upon the nation's offering which perpetually consecrated the altar. The burning of the fat portions only was a point of ceremonial common to the peace and sin and trespass offerings. The 'fat' is often used figuratively to describe the best part of anything: e.g. Nu 18 [12]; Dt 32 [14] (RVm, Hebrew, 'fat'). The expression 'the fat of the land' (Gen 45 [18]) has passed into English. The fat of an animal was regarded as the centre and source of its life, in almost as great a degree as its blood (W. Robertson Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, 379); hence like the blood it was given to God and forbidden as human food ([11, 16, 17]).

7. before the Lord: see on 1 [3, 5].

11. food (bread) of God: 1 [6-9] *v.n.*

17. The double prohibition is repeated in 7 [23-25], and the forbidding of blood is several times enforced (e.g. 17 [10]). In both cases the motive seems to be respect for the sanctity of life. The life comes from God, and is in a peculiar sense set apart for Him, i.e. 'holy.' It should be noted that the common meal in which the sacrificer had his allotted portion is not mentioned in this chapter, and is implied rather than expressly enjoined in 7.

IV.-V. 13. The Sin Offering.—The purpose of the sin offering was in a very special degree 'to make atonement.' 4 treats of the different ceremonial required for different classes of offenders: [1-12] the High Priest; [13-21] the whole congregation in its corporate capacity; [22-26], a ruler; [27-35], a private person. In all cases the *putting* of the blood upon the *horns* of the altar is the distinctive feature of the sin offering. For the priest or the whole congregation the altar is the golden altar of incense in the Holy Place: for the others, the altar of burnt offering in the forecourt. The priest and the congregation as a priestly people (cf. 16 [15] ff.) have access to the Holy Place; therefore it is there the blood is brought for them. The individual layman was not allowed beyond the altar of burnt offering, and therefore the blood of his sin offering was brought to this altar. In each case the offender is restored to his own degree of privilege forfeited by the offence.

IV. 2. unwittingly. It is not quite clear to what extent this word may cover sins of frailty, conscious but unpremeditated: it is contrasted in Nu 15 [30] with sins done 'with a high hand,' i.e. deliberately and defiantly. Failing to bear witness when called upon to do so (5 [1]) could hardly be called a sin of ignorance. Note also that ceremonial quite as much as moral offences were regarded as sins. Any breach of the divine commands, ceremonial or moral, committed in ignorance or knowingly was a sin within the meaning of the Law.

3. the anointed priest is the High Priest only: in his representative character he involves the nation in his sin, just as he stands for them in worship.

4. Being the *offerer* as well as the priest he kills the bullock himself.

6. sprinkle: the word here and in 4 [17] and 5 [9] is the true word for 'sprinkle' (*hizzah*). This is an additional item to the ceremonial as regulated by Ex 29 [12]; Lev 8 [15]. The blood was sprinkled from the finger dipped into it. This is quite distinct from the *pouring* (from a bowl) in the burnt offering, the peace offering, and the trespass or guilt offering; as also from the *putting* of the blood (4 [7]), which was done by dipping the finger in the blood and smearing it on the horns of the altar (see 4 [30, 34]). The Hebrew for 'put' is

a vague general word meaning 'to give' (*nathan*), and perhaps the idea of 'offering' attaches to it. Literally 'he shall give some of the blood.'

7. horns of the altar: these were at the four corners and were regarded as the most sacred part of the altar (cf. Am 3 [14]; 1 K 1 [50]; Jer 17 [1]). The horns were to be of one piece with the altar (Ex 27 [2]) just as the altar was of one piece with the ground (Ex 20 [24, 25]). The 'horn' being also the seat of strength in the ox, the word was used figuratively for strength, and no doubt this idea is implied in the 'horns of the altar.' The blood in the sin offering was applied to a more sacred spot than in the other offerings. **the altar of sweet incense:** called also 'the golden altar' (Ex 39 [38]); for the description of it see Ex 30 [1-10]. It was one of the latest additions to the Temple, and the mention of it belongs to the later parts of the priestly code. **before the Lord** seems to go with 'shall put of the blood': the altar of incense stood before the veil which shut out from sight the Presence above the mercy-seat. **in the Tent of Meeting,** i.e. in the Holy Place, the first of the two chambers inside the tabernacle. **pour:** the word in this case is not *zaraq*, the technical word for the sacrificial pouring on the altar, but the general word *shafak*; the object here is merely the reverent disposal of the blood not required for the sacrifice

8-12. The 'fat' of the sin offering for the priest was burnt as an offering (*hiqtir*, [10]) upon the altar, but the rest of the carcase, the eatable parts as well as the offal, was to be destroyed by fire (*saraph*=to burn up: cf. 13 [52]) outside the camp on the ash-heap. When the offering was not for himself but for another, the priest received his portion of the carcase; but when he made atonement for himself he could not be the guest of God, and the flesh had to be otherwise disposed of, as it was 'most holy' (6 [29]); in order to prevent its profanation by any 'common' use, it was to be 'burnt up in' a clean place.

18. The 'whole congregation' was a 'kingdom of priests,' and therefore its sin offering followed the same ceremonial as that of the priest. It was killed by the elders: the blood was *put* on the horns of the altar of incense; the 'fat' was burnt (*hiqtir*) on the altar ([19]), and the rest of the carcase burnt up (*saraph*, [21]). The priest was included in the congregation, and therefore the offering was for himself, and he might not eat of it.

22. ruler: generally translated 'prince,' especially used to denote the head of a tribe (Nu 1 [16]).

24. where they kill the burnt offering: see 1 [5, 11]. The only difference between the sin offering for a ruler and one for a private person was in the sex of the victim.

31. sweet savour: the words show that the uncleanness of the offender was not transferred to the victim which stood for him. In that case the flesh would have been treated as unclean, and its destiny would have been the destroying fire. The point is of importance in considering the relation between the sacrificer and the victim. The theory that the victim suffered the penalty of death as a guilt-bearer in place of the sinner receives no support from the ceremonial of sacrifice: 1 [4], 10 [17] *v.n.*

35. upon the fire offerings: RVm 'after the manner of.' The Hebrew may bear either meaning. If the first be adopted, see note on 3 [5].

V. **1-13** refers to the sin offering ([6, 7, 9, 12]), and not to the trespass offering (in spite of [6, 7]). Three cases are given for which a sin offering is required.

1. the voice of adjuration: when the judge 'adjures' anyone (by name or in general) to utter what he knows of a crime (e.g. 1 K 8 [31]; Pr 29 [24], and especially Mt 26 [63]). It will be noticed that this is (1) a moral and not merely a ceremonial offence; (2) a real sin, and not merely an unconscious lapse.

2. unclean beast: see 11. **creeping things** should be 'swarming things' (a different word in the Hebrew): 11 [20-43] *v.n.* **it be hidden from him:** and so he has not purified himself.

3. uncleanness of man: as described in 12-15.

5. confess, i.e. before he makes his sin offering: the order is first the confession, then the sin offering.

6. guilt offering (*asham*). But it is expressly stated a few lines later that it is a 'sin offering.' It is to be remembered that before *asham* came to be used technically of a sacrifice, it was applied to any offering presented as a compensation for guilt: so e.g. the Philistines offered five golden mice and five golden tumours as an *asham* to the Lord (1 S 6 [4, 5]). The word seems to have retained this wider meaning after it became the name of a sacrifice (cf. Is 53 [10]). The rendering 'guilt offering' here is misleading, if it is supposed to refer to a sacrifice.

7. A sin offering was generally followed by a burnt offering: 'the worshipper is not allowed to rest content with the

negative removal of past sin, but must proceed to a renewed dedication of life to God' (Gayford, *Sacrifice and Priesthood*, 53, where see refs.).

9. sprinkle (=*hizzah*): the same word as in 4 [6, 17]; this was in place of 'putting' the blood on the horns of the altar. Both this and the offering of flour for a sin offering are exceptional, and do not follow the ordinary ceremonial.

10. according to the ordinance: 1 [14-17].

11. the tenth part of an ephah: rather less than half a peck. **no oil . . . frankincense:** as in the ordinary meal offering (2 [1]).

12. The *Azkarah* (2 [2] *v.n.*) takes the place of putting the blood on the horns of the altar and burning the fat in the proper sin offering (4 [30, 31]).

14-VI. 7. The Guilt Offering: 5 [14-19], for wrongs to God; 6 [1-7], for wrongs to neighbour.

V. **15. trespass . . . in the holy things of the Lord,** i.e. appropriate to himself some 'holy' thing set apart to the Lord. This is of the nature of a theft from God; Achan's sin (Jos 7 [1]) is described as a 'trespass in the devoted thing.' **The shekel of the sanctuary** (see Ex 30 [13]). The valuation of the victim emphasizes the aspect of the *asham* as a fine or compensation: it is peculiar to this sacrifice and the vow (27 [3]).

17-19. The case seems to be the same as those in 4 which required a sin offering. The words do not seem to contemplate the case of a tender conscience fearing it may have sinned, but unable to specify when and how. The **sin offering** proper arose later than the guilt offering, of which it was a development, and this passage is probably from an earlier (? unwritten) code dating from the time when the *asham* covered all offences afterwards divided between it and the sin offering.

VI. **1.** Wrongs done to neighbour are also a 'trespass against the Lord': therefore, as well as the restitution in kind, a guilt offering must be made. Note that these are not unconscious offences.

8-VII. 38. Further Regulations, particularly for the Priests.—Note (1) the whole section, except 7 [22-34], is addressed to the priests (the sons of Aaron), and [28-34] refer mainly to the priests' dues. (2) The order of the sacrifices differs from that of 1-6 [7] in one particular, viz. the peace offering is last instead of third.

VI. **9. this is the law of:** a characteristic phrase of this section. **the burnt offering:** it is clear that the daily public burnt offering (Ex 29 [38-42]) is meant; [9] refers to the evening, and [12] to the morning offering.

10. For service at the altar the priest is to wear his priestly vestments (Ex 28 [40-42]) which he exchanges for his ordinary clothes to remove the ashes without the camp.

11. unto a clean place. Even the ashes are 'holy,' and must be reverently disposed of.

12, 13. The fire kindled miraculously from heaven (9 [24]) was to be kept perpetually alight, and the daily burnt offerings were to be perpetually burning on the fire ([9]). They were called the 'continual burnt offering' (Nu 28 [3, 6]).

15 repeats 2 [2, 3].

16 supplies further particulars. **leaven:** 2 [4, 11] *v.n.*

17. In common with the sin and guilt offerings, the portion of the meal offering which was not burnt on the altar was to be eaten by the priests alone. **holy** = 'dedicated to God.'

18. holiness is conferred by physical contact (cf. [27, 28]). The person thus 'dedicated' would probably have to devote himself to the work of the tabernacle.

19-23. The Priest's Perpetual (=Daily) Offering.—This was a meal offering for the priesthood, probably made in connexion with the perpetual burnt offering for the people ([8-13]). Similarly priesthood and people had their separate sin offerings on the Day of Atonement (16 [3, 5]). The words ([20]) **in the day when he is anointed** have probably crept into the text by mistake: they are inconsistent with the general run of the passage which deals with a *daily* offering.

22. wholly burnt: lit. burnt as a whole offering, i.e. as the whole burnt offering was (see 1 [9]).

23. wholly burnt: as in the sin offering the priest could not be a partaker in the offering when he was himself the offerer (cf. [30]). **24-30. The Sin Offering.**

25. in the place: see 1 [11].

26. priest that offereth it, i.e. on behalf of someone other than himself.

30. any of the blood is brought into the tent of meeting, i.e. into the Holy Place, as in the offering for the priest or for the whole congregation (4 [1-21]), or into the Holy of Holies (16), as in the offerings for priest and for people on the Day of Atonement. In these cases the offering being for himself, either alone or with others, the priest could not partake of the flesh, and it had to be burnt (*saraph*) outside the camp (4 [12]).

VII. **1-7. The Guilt Offering.**

2, the place: see 1 [11]. **sprinkle** = *zaraq*, to toss or pour: 1 [5] *v.n.*; this is the only

point of difference in the ceremonial between the sin and guilt offerings.

5. burn: sacrificially (*hiqtir*): 1 [9] *v.n.*

7. one law, i.e. as regards the disposition of the flesh.

8-10. The Priest's Portions in Other Offerings.—The insertion of these regulations at this place is suggested by [7].

11-21. The Peace Offering.—Three classes are mentioned: the **thanksgiving** ([12]), the **vow** or votive offering, and the **freewill offering** ([16]). The distinction between them is not defined, but taken for granted as well known. The nature of the 'thanksgiving' and of the 'vow' is fairly clear: the freewill offering is more doubtful. The vow and the freewill offering are mentioned together without reference to the 'thanksgiving', in 22 [18, 21, 23]; Nu 15 [3]; Dt 12 [6]. This linking together of the vow and the freewill offering no doubt rests upon the contrast that while the votive offering is in fulfilment of an obligation previously assumed by the making of a vow, the freewill offering is spontaneous. It is sometimes supposed that the freewill offering was a kind of *merci d'avance*, a thankoffering made when some blessing was prayed for. But this is a mere guess, unsupported by evidence, and hardly consistent with Ex 35 [29]; Ps 54 [6]. The only legitimate inference from the evidence is that the freewill offering was not specifically a thanksgiving for a particular blessing, but a general expression of gratitude. So it might take the form of a burnt offering as well as of a peace offering (see 22 [18]; Nu 15 [3]; Ezek 46 [12]).

12, 13. Along with the sacrifice (i.e. the animal victim) unleavened and leavened cakes are to be offered: the unleavened bread alone might be offered on the altar (2 [11]); the leavened was partly for the priest ([14]), and the rest for the sacrificer.

13. 'With cakes of leavened bread in addition to the sacrifice of his peace offerings which are given as a thanksgiving shall he present his offering' (*Polychrome Bible*).

14. heave offering: the word means 'a portion lifted from a larger mass' to be used for a separate purpose. In the sacrifices the 'heave offering' is always a portion assigned to the sacrificing priest. Outside the sacrifices, however, it refers to offerings made directly to God (e.g. Ex 25 [2], margin): [32] *v.n.*

17. burnt=*saraph*, the destructive, non-sacrificial burning.

18. abomination=*piggul*, a technical term for sacrificial flesh which has become unclean through too long keeping (19 [7]). In [21] the word is *shekeṣ*, which is a technical term for ordinary unclean food (see 11 [10-12]). **19.** Again the word is *saraph*.

20. uncleanness: see 11 [24] ff. **cut off from his people**: whether by excommunication or death, and in the latter case, whether inflicted by God or by man, is uncertain.

21. unclean abomination: cf. 11 [10] ff.; 7 [18] *v.n.*

22-27. Fat and blood forbidden as foods.

23. to the children of Israel. As the peace offering was the only sacrifice in which any portion of the flesh fell to the layman, this context is suitable for the insertion of the warnings (see 3 [17]).

25. It would seem that the prohibition referred only to the fat of sacrificial victims which was burnt on the altar: other fat might be eaten. Blood, on the contrary ([26]), is without exception prohibited.

28-34. The share of God and His priest in the peace offering.

29. his oblation unto the Lord, i.e. the portion to be burnt on the altar, and the breast and thigh for the priest.

30. waved for a wave offering. The waving was a forward and return motion representing the offering of the breast to God and His handing it back to the priest for his portion. The symbolism is clear from Nu 8 [10-22]. The Levites were offered by the congregation as a wave offering to the Lord who gave them back to Aaron ([19]) to assist him in his ministrations. There was a difference between the wave breast and the heave thigh: the breast was given to God who handed it back to His priest; the thigh was given directly to the priest. So the priest was the guest of God in the former case and the guest of the sacrificer in the latter, and thus became the mediator between God and man in the common meal.

32. heave offering: [14] *v.n.* Notice that in the earlier code of D the portions were different (Dt 18 [3]: cf. also 1 S 2 [13] ff.).

35-38. Summary.

35. anointing portion: see RVm **portion.** The root of the verb 'to anoint' (*mashaḥ*) is also connected with the meaning 'to measure,' and here the word may mean simply 'measured portion.' If the reference to anointing is intended here (as is probable from [36]), translation should be rather *anointed* (i.e. *consecrated*) *portion.*

36. anointed them: in some passages the High Priest alone is anointed, in others the whole priesthood. See on 8 [12], also list in Chapman's note on this verse.

37. the consecration: *sc.* 'offering';

apart from 6 [20] this must refer to 8, and so forms a link between the Law portion (6 [8-7]) and the historical portion which follows (8-10).

VIII.-X. **Consecration of Aaron and the Priesthood: the Inauguration Sacrifices.**—8 connects directly with the close of Exodus, 1-7 being an insertion. Ex 35-40 describe the making and setting up of the tabernacle, and on this naturally follows the consecration of the priests and the inauguration of the sacrificial worship. 8, describing the consecration of Aaron, follows closely the instructions of Ex 29 [1-37]. The various things required for the consecration ([2]) and the holy garments ([7-9]) are mentioned with the definite article ('*the* garments,' '*the* anointing oil'), with direct reference to the instructions of Ex 29.

VIII. **2. the anointing oil:** see Ex 30 [23-25] and 37 [29].

7-9. For the various garments, especially ephod, breastplate, and Urim and Thummim, Ex 28 *v.n.*

9. the golden plate, the holy crown. The words 'the holy crown' are in apposition to 'the golden plate,' and refer to the same thing (Ex 28 [36-38]). In Ex 29 [6] it is called 'the holy crown' (cf. Ex 39 [30]).

10, 11. For the anointing of the tabernacle and its furniture cf. Ex 29 [36], 30 [26-29], 40 [9-11].

10. sanctify: see on [15].

11. sprinkled=*hizzah*: 4 [6] *v.n.*

12. Cf. Ex 29 [7], 30 [30-32], 40 [13-15], but note that in the last two passages Aaron's sons (the whole priesthood) are to be anointed as well as Aaron himself. This agrees with Lev 7 [36] as against this verse, but 8 [30], 10 [7] also presuppose the anointing of the whole priesthood. **pour:** this is not the word for the sacrificial 'pouring' upon the altar (1 [5]), but another word used for the pouring away of the blood at the base of the altar (8 [15], 9 [9]). In 4 [7], etc., a third word (*shaphak*) is used.

12. sanctify, i.e. set apart as 'holy' to the Lord.

13. headtires, or 'caps': these are different from the 'mitre' (see Ex 28 [40]).

14-30. The consecration sacrifices, consisting of (*a*) a sin offering ([14-17]); (*b*) a burnt offering ([18-21]); (*c*) the ram of consecration ([22-32]), which was a peace offering ([31]). On the combination of sacrifices and the significance of their order (purification, dedication, union) see *Sacrifice and Priesthood*, 52-55.

14. Aaron and his sons are the offerers; they lay their hands on the bullock and slay it. Moses acting the part of the priest presents the blood and burns the fat.

15. purified: the meaning of this word passed through three stages: (1) to sin, (2) to make a sin offering; (3) to cleanse from sin (i.e. chiefly ceremonial uncleanness). This purification is not prescribed in Ex 29 (Ex 29 [36] should be 'free the altar from sin' rather than 'cleanse the altar,' as RV).

15. purified . . . and sanctified . . . to make atonement: better *by making* **atonement.** The making of atonement both negatively purged the altar from previous uncleanness, and also imparted to it a positive sacredness, making it holy to the Lord, 'sanctified' it. For the interconnexion of the three ideas, 'to cleanse,' 'to sanctify,' and 'to make atonement,' see *Sacrifice and Priesthood*, 49 f., 113 f. The triple process was effected by the 'putting' of the blood upon the horns of the altar (cf. 16 [18]), not by the pouring of the rest of the blood at the base of the altar. **the altar:** according to 4 [7] this should be the altar of incense. But the expression 'the altar' simply would denote the altar of burnt offering (cf. [16, 19, 21, 24]). The section 8-10, like 1-3, knows of one altar only, the altar of burnt offering. Both sections are probably earlier than other passages (e.g. 4) which speak of the two altars. **for it:** it would be understood that at the same time atonement was made for the offerers also (cf. 16 [11, 16]).

16. burned, i.e. sacrificial burning on the altar, as the burning in the next verse is the destructive burning (see 1 [9], 9 [10, 11]).

18-21. The Burnt Offering, signifying the dedication and self-devotion of the priest.

19. sprinkled: should be 'tossed' or 'poured' (*zaraq*): 1 [5] *v.n.*

20. the head, and the pieces and the fat: 'the whole ram,' as repeated in [21]: see 1 [8, 12].

22-32. The Peace Offering: the Ram of Consecration.—This sacrifice was of the nature of a peace offering with a common meal ([31]), differing, however, in several respects from the ordinary peace offering, particularly in the use of the blood for consecration.

23. The ear to listen, the hand and foot to carry out the command (cf. 14 [14]): these mark the priest as the servant of God.

24. sprinkled: poured (*zaraq*).

25. Cf. 3 [9, 10]. The fat was the portion of God. The right thigh (7 [32]) and the cakes (*ibid.* [14]) in the ordinary peace offering went to the officiating priest. In this case Aaron and his sons were not yet

fully consecrated, so these portions were also offered by fire on the altar; the wave breast went to Moses who performed *ad hoc* the office of sacrificing priest (29).

27. **put . . . upon the hands of Aaron.** The word for consecrating a priest (lit. 'to fill his hand': cf. 33) is taken from this ceremony in which the priest received the portions which it fell to him to handle in his future ministry—the portions which he was to hand on to God (the fat) and also those which he was allowed to use for himself. In the ordinary peace offering only the breast was waved; the other portions of the priest (the thigh and the cakes) were a 'heave offering' (7 14. 32).

30. Oil and blood, which have been used separately for the previous consecrations (12. 23), are now used together in a third consecration, in which the priestly vesture is included. **sprinkled**=*hizzah*, the true sprinkling, as in 11.

31. **boil the flesh**, i.e. the portion that ordinarily fell to the sacrificer, the role now filled by Aaron and his sons. **at the door of the tent of meeting**: the food was to be eaten in the sacred precincts.

32. **burn**=*saraph*.

33. **go out**: better 'leave,' 'go away from' the door of the tabernacle, at which stood the great altar of burnt offering, which was the place both of their consecration and of their future ministry.

34. The sin offering at least (Ex 29 36), and presumably the other two offerings, were to be repeated on each of the seven days of consecration.

IX. **Sacrifices for inaugurating the Regular Worship.**—These were (1) for the priest, a sin and a burnt offering; (2) for the people, a sin, a burnt, and a peace offering. On the invariable order of these sacrifices and its significance see note on 8 14 ff.

6. **the glory of the Lord**: the bright light which is the token of the manifestation of God (see Ex 24 16 f., 40 35).

7. **and for the people**: LXX 'and for thy house' is probably the better reading.

8. As the sacrificer Aaron killed the victim.

9. **the altar**, i.e. of burnt offering: see note on 8 15.

10. **burnt**=*hiqtir*. 11. **burnt**=*saraph*.

12. **sprinkled**: poured (*zaraq*).

15. **as the first**, i.e. the same ceremonial of the blood and the carcase as in 8 (see 10 16 ff.).

16. **according to the ordinance**, as in 1.

17. **besides the burnt offering**: these words, which presuppose the sacrifices as already in working order (Ex 29 38-42), are probably a later insertion: if original, they regard the lamb (3) as the first 'continual burnt offering.'

18. **sprinkled**: poured (*zaraq*).

19. **the fat of the ox**, etc.: the verb is *delivered* (not, of course, *sprinkled*). The punctuation is somewhat awkward; but the sense is 'they delivered . . . the fat of the ox and the fat tail, etc., of the ram.'

21. Contrary to 7 30-32, the thigh as well as the breast was waved.

23. A ceremonial entrance, being the first since the consecration of Aaron. Now as priests they entered into the immediate presence of God. Then, returning again outside, they brought the Divine Blessing to the people, and the 'glory' (6) followed them and appeared without. From the 'glory' came a flash and consumed the burning carcases on the altar. The altar fire had been already burning seven days. 24 is not inconsistent with this or with the 'burnt' of 13. 17. 20; the burnt offering and the fat of the sin and peace offerings would take many hours to consume in the ordinary way (cf. 6 9); they were already burning, but now the 'fire of heaven consumed them' (lit. 'ate up') in a second. 22 does not imply that the bodies were already burnt up.

X. 1-7. **The offence of Nadab and Abihu.** After the inauguration of the sacrifices according to the Law follows the first breach of this Law and its punishment.

1. **Nadab and Abihu**: they were among the seventy elders to whom the vision of God was vouchsafed (Ex 24 9-11), Aaron's other sons were Eleazar and Ithamar (*ibid.*, 6 23). **censer . . . fire**: this implies that there was no altar of incense (see note on 8 15). **strange fire**: the word for *strange* is used of a *foreigner* (from the national point of view) or an outsider (from the family). Here then it means an alien fire unrecognized by the Law, not kindled from the sacred heaven-sent altar fire (9 24), but ordinary and unconsecrated, as incense not prepared according to the Law was 'strange' incense (Ex 30 9). **before the Lord**, i.e. in the court of the tabernacle (cf. 1 3-5. 11); see 4, 'carry your brethren from before the sanctuary.'

3. **be sanctified**: treated as 'holy,' i.e. separated from among things 'common and profane.' In 22 32 it is the opposite of 'profane' (lit. unloosed, set free, for ordinary secular use). So to 'sanctify' was to confine a thing or person to certain limits, to set apart as sacred.

4. The priests were not allowed to touch

a dead body (21 [10] ff.) when occupied with their duties, as [7] implies was the case with Aaron. This prohibition as well as the anointing in [7] is extended to all the priesthood and not confined to Aaron as in 21 [10]. **from before the sanctuary:** incidentally this confirms the fact noted in [1] that this section does not know of an altar of incense in the Holy Place. The great altar of burnt offering stood before the sanctuary in the outer court. The 'sanctuary' is the name for the whole tabernacle; the inner shrine is called in Hebrew the 'Holy of Holies.'

7. go out: better 'leave not the entrance of the tent' (cf. 8 [33-35]). RV 'go out' would imply that their ministration was entirely performed inside the tabernacle, whereas this places their work at the altar of burnt offering in the outer court. **upon you:** in agreement with Ex 40 [13-15], this supposes that *all* priests were anointed (see note on 8 [12]).

8-11. Wine forbidden during times of ministration.

8. unto Aaron: only here and in Nu 18 does Aaron receive a message directly as if he were a prophet.

9. strong drink, i.e. fermented juice (especially of the date) other than of the grape (=wine). The word (*shekar*) got into Greek (*sikera*) (cf. Lk 1 [15] RVm).

10. the holy and the common=sacred and secular; the latter not necessarily unclean, but belonging to ordinary everyday use.

12-20. Regulations for Eating the Priest's Portions in the Offering.—The priest's portions in the meal, the sin and trespass offerings were 'most holy' (6 [17]), because in them no portion was assigned to the layman; they were therefore to be eaten 'within the sanctuary' ([12, 18]). In the peace offering the sacrificer had a share of the flesh, and as the eating approximated more to that of an ordinary meal, the priest's portion might be eaten anywhere except in an unclean place.

12. The reference is to the particular meal offering of 9 [17], which was the accompaniment of a burnt offering on behalf of the people (cf. the regulations of 6 [14-23].)

14. wave breast, heave thigh: 7 [14-30] *v.n.*

16-20. the goat of the sin offering, i.e. the people's sin offering of 9 [15]. The passage is full of difficulties. If the reason of Aaron's mistake was that the blood was not brought into the sanctuary (i.e. to be put on the horns of the altar of incense), neither was this the case with Aaron's own sin offering (9 [9]); yet there was no question in that case that Aaron was right in not eating the flesh. If, as is intelligible, Aaron should have eaten of the flesh because the offering was not for himself, the question then arises, Why was not the blood brought into the sanctuary as 4 [18] directs; in which case the whole carcase should have been burnt (*ibid.* [21]), and the victim should have been a bullock (*ibid.* [14])? It seems clear that this passage is later than 9 [11], but earlier than 4.

16. burnt=*saraph.*

17. the sin offering, i.e. the animal offered as a sin offering (cf. 6 [25, 30]). This verse should be compared with 6 [26-30]. **he hath given it you:** the verb is impersonal: 'one hath given'='it hath been given.' The impersonal active is often equivalent to a passive (cf. 1 [5], 'he shall kill the bullock' may='it shall be killed'). **to bear the iniquity of the congregation,** i.e. be responsible for it; the phrase is almost technical in the Law (cf. 5 [1, 17]). It is used also of bearing the guilt for the sins of others (Nu 30 [15]; Ezek 4 [4, 5, 6]). In this passage the subject of 'bear' should be 'you' rather than 'it,' since the victim in the sin offering is never said to bear the guilt of the sinner (in contrast with the 'scapegoat,' 16 [22]). RVm 'take away' gives a better meaning and more in accordance with the parallel 'make atonement for'; but the difficulty here is that in all other passages with this meaning the subject of the verb is the offended person (generally God), and the sense is 'to forgive.' This would be inapplicable in the present passage. If we accept the meaning as 'to bear,' and the subject as 'you' (Polychrome Bible 'that you may bear'), the priest represents the people in the people's sin offering and is himself the offerer on their behalf, as well as the priest who makes atonement for them.

17. to make atonement: it cannot be meant that the eating of the carcase was the means of making atonement; this is contrary to 17 [11], and the whole idea of sacrifice is that the blood made the atonement.

18. the sanctuary within: the last word is an adverb, not an adjective, and the reference is not to the inner sanctuary, i.e. the Holy of Holies. The meaning is 'brought within, into the sanctuary,' i.e. the tabernacle.

XI.-XV. Laws Relating to Cleanness and Uncleanness: Uncleanness Imparted by Contact.—On all this section see W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, appendix on Holiness, Uncleanness, and Taboo, 446 ff. 11 [1-23, 40-43] deal with food; [24-39] with contact.

XI. **1. and to Aaron:** one of the duties of the priest was to teach the people the statutes generally (Dt 33 10; Mal 2 7), and the laws of uncleanness in particular (10 10, 11), so Aaron is included in this revelation.

3 ff. The list should be compared with Dt 14 3-21. The grounds of distinction in many cases go back to natural instincts and aversions or early prejudices; some of the 'unclean' animals, e.g. the camel, swine, dog, were objects of reverence in heathen religions.

3. This general rule for distinguishing between clean and unclean animals is probably an afterthought in order to assign a reason for distinctions which really arose from prehistoric prejudices (see *H.D.B.*, article 'Unclean,' 4). The camel was commonly eaten in Arab sacrifices; the swine too was used in heathen sacrificial meals (Is 65 4).

5. coney=rock badger: nothing to do with the rabbit.

10. have not fins and scales: these are forbidden because of their resemblance to the serpent. **abomination**=*shekeṣ*: see 7 18.

13 ff. Birds of prey were regarded as unclean probably from their feeding on carrion. **gier:** Old English for vulture (cf. *Lammergeier*).

20. upon all four: as opposed to standing upright. The expression does not mean that insects were supposed to be fourfooted.

22. locust: the food of John Baptist (Mk 1 6).

34. on which water cometh, i.e. so that the whole is saturated with the water that is unclean: of dry food only that actually touched by the carcase is unclean (cf. 37, 38).

39. die, i.e. a natural death, so that the blood is not drawn from the body (cf. Dt 14 21).

44. The reason given is the same as that which occurs repeatedly in the document H, e.g. 19 2, 20 7, 26, 21 8, and it is quite probable that part at any rate of this chapter belongs to that document.

XII. **Unclean States of the Person.**

2. as in the days of the impurity of her sickness: see 15 19.

4. days of her purifying: cf. Lk 2 22.

5. It was popularly believed that the physical after-effects of childbirth last longer after the birth of a girl than of a boy.

6. This is one of the few passages which invert the usual order of the offerings (sin-burnt; 5 7 *v.n.*).

7. make atonement: this was necessary, although no moral offence had been committed (4 2 *v.n.*).

8. This was the case with the Virgin Mary (Lk 2 24).

XIII.-XIV. **Leprosy.**—The widespread and terrible nature of this scourge may be gauged by its prominence in the Old and New Testaments. Its character and the danger of infection made it necessary to isolate the sufferers, and being cut off from social fellowship they were excluded from worship also. The repulsiveness of the disease naturally led to its being regarded as unclean. The modern idea that leprosy was a symbol of sin is not found in the Bible. (But see 2 Ch 26 19.—A. G.)

XIII. deals with the diagnosis of leprosy in persons (2-46) or clothing (47-59); along with this should go (14 33-53) leprosy in a house. The priest is to diagnose according to the presence or absence of certain symptoms, and pronounce accordingly whether the case is one of true leprosy or not. Medical science, as we understand it, hardly existed then, and as the matter was regarded from its religious aspect, the priest was called in to decide.

2. plague: lit. a stroke, a blow, from God.

11. an old leprosy: either of long-standing the symptoms of which had not before appeared, or apparently healed and breaking out again.

12-17. Distinction between leprosy and a temporary and comparatively harmless skin disease.

30. scall: lit. 'a tearing away,' an irritable scale or scab.

39. a tetter: a harmless skin disease, still common in Syria, and known by the same name (*bahaq*).

40. bald: i.e. at the back of the head (see 41).

45-46. Rules for the leper to observe: they are those of the mourner. He mourns for himself as one dead (Nu 12 12) and cut off from the life of the people. For the loosening of hair and rending of clothes cf. 10 6: covering the upper lip (a sign of being cut off from speech with one's fellows) cf. Ezek 24 17, 22; Mic 3 7; crying 'unclean,' cf. Lam 4 15.

46. Cf. 2 K 7 3, 10; Lk 17 12.

47-59. Leprosy in clothing: probably some kind of vegetable fungus is meant, like a mildew or mould.

51. fretting, i.e. burrowing, spreading.

55. bareness (within and without): the same words in the Hebrew as in 40, 41 for baldness at back of head and the forehead.

XIV. **1-32. Readmission of the Healed Leper.**—The ceremonies are of two kinds: (1) non-sacrificial (1-9), a secular ceremony performed outside the camp; (2) a religious

ceremony at the Tent of Meeting: offering of sacrifices (10-32). The first represents the readmission to civil life and social fellowship; the second to religious life and worship.

1-9. These ceremonies are probably much older than the religious ones of 10-32: they date probably from prehistoric Semitic heathenism, and their original meaning was partly lost.

4. The blood of the bird that is killed is used for cleansing (*a*) the leper himself; (*b*) the living bird which represents him. This second bird is set free to carry the cleansed leprosy right away from the leper himself and from the camp. **Cedar** was traditionally interpreted by the Rabbis as a symbol of incorruption. The cedar and hyssop are mentioned together in 1 K 4 33 as the proudest and humblest of trees. **hyssop**: a sort of marjoram, would hold water like a sponge, and could be used for sprinkling as here (cf. Ex 12 22; Heb 9 19). Ps 51 7 is probably a reference to the sprinkling with hyssop. The hyssop was tied to the stick of cedar wood with scarlet wool (cf. Heb 9 19). The colour **scarlet** is probably chosen as being the colour of 'blood'; so Is 1 18 makes it a symbol of sin itself, bloodshed, the climax of wrongdoing, being taken as typical of sin at its worst.

5. **running**: lit. 'living' (RVm), i.e. water from a spring or river, the opposite of standing water. The bird was not killed over a stream, in which case the blood would have been washed away, but over a vessel filled with spring water. The amount of blood alone would not have been sufficient for the sprinkling.

7. **let go the living bird**: the symbolism is the same as in 16 22, viz. the final dismissal of the uncleanness from contact with the people. For this idea common in other parts of the world see Frazer, *Golden Bough*, iii, 15 f., 101 f.

10. One of the **two he-lambs** was for a guilt offering (12), and the other for a burnt offering (20): a ewe-lamb being prescribed for the sin offering (4 32). **log**: about a pint. The oil was for the anointing.

12. **guilt offering** (*asham*): see 5 15. It is not clear why this should be required. If it was a sacrifice at all (and not an *asham* in the older sense of a fine), it was perhaps to atone for the service which the leper had been compelled to withhold from God. Possibly there was no altar transaction in this offering. The lamb was offered and returned (wave offering): its carcase belonged to the priest, and its blood was 'put' on the leper instead of the altar. This would explain the unique combination of a guilt offering with a wave offering, and also a guilt offering followed by a sin offering (only here and in the Nazirite's offering after defilement: Nu 6 10-12). The word *asham* retains here something of its old sense of a compensation-fine. This was not, however, the case in later times: see *Mishna*, tract *Negaim*.

wave offering: see 7 30. In the ordinary guilt offering the carcase belonged to the officiating priest, but there was no 'waving.' The addition of this ceremony is peculiar to the leper's guilt offering.

13. **where they kill the sin offering and the burnt offering**: 1 11, 4 24, 6 25.

14. The leper was cleansed and hallowed by the blood and then (17) consecrated by the oil (cf. 8 30), and so restored to the fellowship of the priestly nation from which his uncleanness had excluded him (8 23 *v.n.*).

33-53. **Leprosy in a house.** 33-47, at least, would seem to be out of place here and to belong to the previous chapter. The whole section seems to have been inserted here because of the similarity of subject-matter between 48-53 and the rest of the chapter.

XV. **Sexual Issues and their Cleansing.**

2. **an issue out of his flesh**: flesh=the genital organ. The reference is to a chronic issue of blood, or of blood and semen.

3. Driver and White explain the meaning: 'And his uncleanness shall continue as long as he has the discharge; whether the discharge run from his body or whether it be stopped so that no discharge appears, he is in a state of uncleanness.'

19. **issue**, i.e. at the normal menstruation periods: these were widely recognized as sources of uncleanness (see *Rel. of Semites*, 448).

25. **abnormal issues**: cf. the woman with the issue of blood (Mk 5 25). These are regarded as diseased and needing a sacrificial atonement.

XVI. is the climax of the Book of Leviticus, and especially of the first part relating to priesthood and sacrifices. **The Day of Atonement**, known technically as 'the Day,' which is the title of one of the treatises of the *Mishna*, *Yoma* (=the Day).

This chapter as it stands seems to be at cross-purposes with itself in combining two separate topics: (*a*) the conditions under which Aaron might enter the Holy of Holies; (*b*) the ceremonial for a special atonement for tabernacle and people. The simplest and most probable explana-

tion of the combination is the supposition that [1] is an editorial insertion: this is made probable by the repetition in [2] of 'and the Lord said.' If [1] be removed from the text and treated as a marginal gloss, the rest of the chapter runs consistently enough with the theory that its main purpose is to prescribe the regulation of the Day of Atonement. If a statement of the day on which Aaron should appear before the mercy-seat had occurred at the end of [3], all would have been straightforward. Some commentators suppose that this was originally the case, but the date was afterwards withdrawn here when [29] ff. were added. This is a simpler and on the whole more probable explanation of the chapter than the theory that in it an editor has attempted to weld together two distinct sets of regulations, one for the conditions of entry and another for the offerings of the Day of Atonement. The simpler theory does not, however, exclude the possibility that we have here the final codification of rules belonging to different stages of development. See Chapman, *Leviticus*, 163 ff.

With this chapter should be compared the earlier and simpler provisions in Ezek 45 [18-20]. One point common to both, and especially noteworthy, is the way in which the atonement for the sanctuary is interwoven with that for the people. The 'sins' of the congregation polluted their sanctuary as well as themselves. Both therefore need cleansing (Ezek 45 [20]; Lev 16 [16, 19]), and the same application of the blood makes atonement for the sanctuary with its sacred furniture ([16, 18, 19, 20]), and also for priest and people ([6, 11, 17, 30, 33]).

[1] links 16 directly with 10 [1-7]. But the present chapter deals *mainly* with the means of making atonement for sanctuary and people. After [2] there is no further reference to the conditions of safe entry except possibly in [13]. It should be noted also that although the sin of Aaron's sons lay in offering 'strange fire,' they would have to 'draw near before the Lord' (i.e. enter the sanctuary) in order to do this, and their offence would therefore be that of using an uncovenanted means of approach. That incident would therefore form a natural introduction to this chapter, which describes how on one day a covenanted means of approach was ordained.

2. the holy place within the veil. For the veil see Ex 26 [31-33]. What is here called 'the holy place within the veil,' or simply the 'holy place' ([16]) is in Ex 26 [33] 'the most holy place' (lit. 'Holy of Holies'). The outer chamber of the tabernacle (called in Ex 26 [33] and apparently in Lev 6 [30] the 'holy place') is here simply 'the tent of meeting' ([16]) as in Ex 40. **mercy-seat**: see on Ex 25 [17-21]. The word *kapporeth* is closely connected with *kipper* = to make atonement, and signifies 'a means or instrument for making atonement': hence the Greek *hilasterion*, and the Latin *propitiatorium*. This is more probable than the connexion with the meaning 'to cover' (one of the supposed original meanings of the verb *kaphar*), which would make *kapporeth* mean simply 'a covering' or 'lid.' **that he die not.** If [1] is an editorial insertion, these words were understood by the final compiler to refer to Lev 10 [1-5]. The reference, however, is probably wider than this. Various transgressions against the rules of worship were threatened with the death penalty (see 22 [9], 8 [35], 10 [9]; Ex 28 [43]). **I will appear in the cloud**: cf. Ex 25 [22].

3. Herewith: lit. 'with these things.' The reference is especially to the bullock and the ram. The bullock was the proper sin offering for the priest (4 [3]).

3-28. The Ceremonies of the Day of Atonement: described first summarily ([4-10]), then with more detail ([11] ff.). The sacrifices consisted of two sin offerings (one for the priest and one for the people) with their appropriate burnt offerings. With the blood of the two offerings the priest sprinkled the mercy-seat and purged the tabernacle and its sacred furniture. At the same time, and by the same acts, atonement was made also for the sins of priest and people. The atonement then being completed, the sins were laid upon the head of the 'goat for Azazel' in order that he might bear them into the desert and away from the congregation. The sacrifices were then completed by the attendant burnt offerings.

4-10. The Summary Description.—From the fact that the ground is twice covered ([4-10] and [11-22]), it has been argued that these are separate accounts drawn from different sources. But the inference is not necessary; in [11] there is again a summary statement before the detailed description.

4. the holy linen coat . . . breeches . . . girdle . . . mitre: see Ex 28 [39-43]. From the full list of vestments in *ib.* [4] we see that the breastplate, the ephod, and the robe of 'gold and blue and purple and scarlet' were laid aside on this occasion. Thus outwardly and inwardly ([29]) the day was marked as one of penitence and humiliation.

5. two he-goats for a sin offering, both forming part of the same sin offering on the

Day of Atonement, when atonement is made by the blood of the first and the sin is clean removed by the dismissal of the second (22)

6. make=shall make.

7. before the Lord: cf. 1 5. The words indicate both the place and also the act of solemn presentation.

8. Azazel. There is no doubt that this was a personal being, and the same of whom the legend is preserved in the oldest part of the Book of Enoch (6, 7, 9), that he was the leader of the 'sons of God' (Gen 6) who introduced wickedness into the world. Azazel is either a satyr (a goat-demon) or one of the fallen angels (sons of God). He was bound in the desert to rugged rocks. The AV 'scapegoat' (=escape goat) comes through the Greek (=the led-away goat), and the Latin ('caper emissarius') from a mistaken derivation of the Hebrew, making it mean 'the going-away goat.' Azazel is the father of evil, to whom the goat takes the sins which God has forgiven and dismissed. Note that both goats are presented before the Lord, and He determines by the sacred lot which shall be killed in sacrifice and which is sent to Azazel. As both belong to the sin offering (5), so both belong to the Lord.

10. to make atonement for him: the meaning is uncertain, but probably the idea was that the goat was consecrated for its work of sin removing. Cleansing, consecration, and making atonement for a thing or person were united in one act of blood-application (8 15).

11-28. The Full Ceremonial in Detail.

11. The first half of the verse gives a repeated summary of the whole of Aaron's sin offering and its purpose. **for himself and his house**, i.e. the whole priesthood. **kill . . . the bullock . . . which is for himself**: see note on 1 5.

12. a censer: neither here nor in 16 is the altar of incense mentioned. The 'altar before the Lord' is the outside altar of burnt offering (18). The portable censer here used (cf. 10 1; Nu 16 6) is filled not from the altar of incense, but with live coal from the altar of burnt offering, and on this the incense is poured. Thus this part of the chapter at any rate seems to be of earlier date than e.g. 4 7, 18 or Ex 30 1-10. The use of the censer is not in itself decisive against the existence of the altar of incense; but surely if that altar existed the incense would have been taken from it. The silence of 16 makes it conclusive that this passage knows nothing of the altar of incense.

13. the cloud makes a veil between the presence of God and sinful man, who even on this solemn occasion could not 'see God and live' (Ex 33 20). **the testimony**: the name for the two tables of the Law on which the Ten Commandments were written (Ex 31 18). These were God's 'witness' of Himself and His will. They were put into the ark (Ex 25 16). In such paramount honour were they held that not only the ark but even the tabernacle itself was named from them (Ex 25 22, 38 21). Ex 27 21 and Lev 24 3 imply that the sacredness of the ark and even of the mercy-seat was derived from the testimony, which formed as it were the innermost centre of Israel's worship (cf. Ex 30 36). **mercy-seat . . . testimony**: the former the instrument of God's forgiving mercy, the latter the witness of His stern holiness (cf. Ps 85 10), **that he die not**: cf. Ex 28 35.

14, 15. With these vv. Hebrews (especially 9 11-13, 23-26) should be carefully compared.

14. sprinkle=*hizzah*. The 'sprinkling' of the blood was the characteristic feature of the Day of Atonement, and as a significant part of the making of atonement, it was peculiar to the sin offering of this day (4 6, 17, 14 7 *v.n.*). From this it follows that where the 'sprinkling' (*rhantismos*) of the blood is mentioned in the New Testament (Heb 12 24; 1 P 1 2) the reference is not to the sacrifices of the Old Covenant in general, but to this sin offering. The LXX faithfully preserves the distinction of the Hebrew between the 'pouring' (in the burnt, peace, and trespass offerings) and the 'sprinkling' (in the sin offering on the Day of Atonement) (see on 1 5; Heb 9 13, 19, 12 24). **on the east . . . and before**: lit. 'upon the mercy-seat on the east, and in front of the mercy-seat.' If the tabernacle faced eastwards (like Ezekiel's temple, Ezek 47 1) the Holy of Holies would lie at the west end of the building, and so the east surface of the mercy-seat would be its front; the sprinkling was upon the surface of the mercy-seat towards the front part, and in front of the mercy-seat (for the latter cf. the 'sprinkling' of 4 6, 17). *Polychrome Bible* 'on the front of the mercy-seat which faces eastward.'

16. make atonement for the holy place: 8 15 *v.n.* Here the reason for the need of atonement is explained; the altar is polluted by contact with the uncleanness of the people. **all their sins**: cf. 21, 22, 30, 34; not all kinds of sin, including deliberate moral offences, but only the kind of sins for which atonement could

be made by sacrifice (4 [2] *v.n.*). So Heb 9 [7] describes them as 'ignorances.' **tent of meeting**, i.e. the first chamber of the tabernacle in which were the table of shewbread, the seven-branch candlestick, and the golden altar of incense. The 'holy place' is the Holy of Holies (cf. [2, 3, 17, 20, 23, 27]). Nothing is said of the means by which atonement was made for the Tent of Meeting. Ex 30 [10] says that the blood was 'put' on the horns of the altar of incense 'once in the year' to make atonement for it. But this is probably a later addition after the altar of incense was made.

17. no man in the tent of meeting, into which the priests entered daily (Lk 1 [9] ff., [21]; Heb 9 [6]). **atonement for himself**: this shows that the atonement for the tabernacle and for the people was made by the same sprinkling.

18. go out, i.e. from the tabernacle into the court. **the altar that is before the Lord**, i.e. the great altar of burnt offering in the outer court ([12] *v.n.*).

20. The sins for which pardon has been secured by the making of atonement are now to be removed by the scapegoat clean away from the people into a 'no-man's-land' in the wilderness (see note on 14 [7] and cf. Ps 103 [12]; Zech 5 [5-11]). **present**: the technical *hiqrib* shows that this means a formal presenting. This goat had been consecrated ([10]), and is now presented before the Lord. So far from being accursed or identified with the sins which it bears, it is 'holy to the Lord.' Its office of removing sins, like that of making atonement for sins, is a sacred and even a priestly one (cf. note on 10 [17]).

21. The thrice-repeated *all* is very emphatic ([16] *v.n.*). **a man that is in readiness**, or 'appointed' (RVm).

22. solitary: lit. 'cut off,' i.e. either 'uninhabited' or 'from which there is no return.' In either case the complete separation of the sins from the people is implied. Nothing is here said of Azazel or what he did with the goat or the sins. **let go the goat**, lit. 'send' (cf. the releasing of the living bird in 14 [7, 53]). Hence the name 'escape-goat' shortened to the familiar 'scapegoat.' In this shortened form the derivation of the word has been forgotten, and in general parlance 'scapegoat' has come to mean one who is made to bear the punishment for the sins of others—the exact opposite of the original meaning. Careful note should be made of the sense in which the 'scapegoat' bore the sins of the people. The atonement had already been made ([20]) and the sins forgiven before they were laid upon the goat; his only function was to bear them away into the wilderness in order to get rid of them, as a scavenger removes the refuse of a city. The Mishna tract *Yoma* says that the goat was thrown over a precipice, which shows that already by about the 2nd century A.D. the idea of substitutionary punishment had become attached to the ceremonial of the 'scapegoat.'

23, 24. See note on [4]. The penitential work of the day being completed, the High Priest dons his usual vestments (Ex 28 [4]). A sin offering was invariably followed by a burnt offering, reminding the pardoned sinner to rededicate his life to God. **make atonement**: 1 [4] *v.n.*

25. Some dislocation of the order has occurred here: we should expect [25] and [27, 28] to follow [19], and [26] to come after [22].

26. The same cleansing is ordered in [28] for the man who burnt the bodies of the bullock and the other goat. The flesh of the sin offering makes all that it touches 'holy' and therefore in need of washing before being put again to ordinary use (6 [27, 28]). As the two goats form one sin offering, and the second goat was also consecrated, the reason for the need of purification is probably the same as in [28], i.e. contact with a 'holy thing.'

27. burn=*saraph* (cf. 4 [11, 12, 21], 6 [30], 10 [16-18]).

28. [26] *v.n.* **29-31.** Cf. 23 [26-32].

29. seventh month=*Tishri* (September-October). **afflict your souls**: 'mortify yourselves' (*Poly. Bib.*), a technical expression for self-denial and fasting (cf. 23 [27]; Nu 30 [13]; Ps 35 [13]). This is the only regular fast day ordered by the Law.

30. atonement . . . cleanse: note how the two ideas are associated (cf. 8 [15]).

31. sabbath of solemn rest, lit. 'a sabbath of sabbatic observance.' The word 'sabbath' means rest, desisting from work. It is only later that it became the name of any solemn day of rest (as here). The name is not restricted in the Old Testament to the weekly day of rest, although that is its special meaning.

XVII.-XXVI. **The Law of Holiness.**—These chapters contain a separate code of laws known as the Law of Holiness, because of its continual insistence on the demand for holiness (which includes moral purity as well as ceremonial cleanness). From a comparison of its contents with Ezekiel's regulations for the restored Temple (Ezek 40-48) it seems probable that the code with its exhortations and warning (26 [3-46]) was drawn up in the closing years of the monarchy. The author was probably, like Ezekiel himself, both a priest

and a prophet. The work of H was in turn revised and edited by a later compiler who incorporated it in its present position as part of the priestly code in Leviticus (see Chapman, Appendix III).

XVII. **Flesh Food and Sacrifices.**—At first sight the chapter seems to deal with three unrelated practices: (*a*) sacrifices away from the tabernacle ([3] f.); (*b*) sacrifices to heathen deities (?); (*c*) eating of flesh with the blood ([10]). As a matter of fact there is an underlying unity connecting the three. All slaughter and feeding on animals allowed in sacrifice was originally regarded as a sacrificial action. The blood was shed at a 'high place' or on a sacred stone (1 S 14 [33] ff.) in token of offering to Jehovah. But when the code of D abolished the 'high places' and ordered *all* sacrifices to take place at the central sanctuary, at the same time it did away with the sacrificial character of the slaughtering of animals for ordinary food, and allowed this to be done anywhere as a secular action (Dt. 12, esp. [20-27]). But the idea that the blood belonged to God was still preserved in the command that it was to be 'poured out upon the earth,' and not to be eaten. At the same time some safeguard was needed lest the slaughterer should think that the blood, not being offered to the Lord because it was not brought to the sanctuary, might be offered to some demon satyr (like Azazel). Such a safeguard is provided here ([7-9]).

3-4. The conditions contemplated are those of camp life in the desert: otherwise this would repeal the laws of Dt 12 and make the eating of flesh food impossible except to those living close to the tabernacle.

3. ox, lamb, goat, i.e. the animals prescribed for sacrifice.

5. peace offerings: because this was the only class of sacrifice in which the offerer shared in the meal upon the carcase.

6. sprinkle = 'pour' (*zaraq*).

7. he-goats: 'satyrs' (RVm), goat-like demons of the desert (cf. 2 Ch 11 [15]; Is 13 [21]).

10. The prohibition of blood as food is found in 3 [17] and many other passages of varying dates (e.g. Gen 9 [4]; Dt 12 [16]; 1 S 14 [33]).

11. the life of the flesh is in the blood: cf. Gen 9 [4]. *Nefesh* sometimes stands both for *life* and for *soul* in Hebrew: the principle of life which distinguishes man and the animals from the inanimate world. The blood was identified with the life of the body. In Semitic heathen religions blood was drunk in sacrifices and at ordinary times (*Rel. Sem.*, 234). This v. alone explains *why* it was forbidden to the Hebrews. As being 'the life,' the blood may be presented to God only, and when presented on the altar it makes atonement. **I have given . . . reason of the life:** this is the only passage in the laws relating to sacrifice which gives any hint as to the meaning of the ceremonial acts. Elsewhere this seems to be taken for granted as well-known. From this v. we learn (*a*) the ceremonial generally and this act in particular were intended to be symbols of spiritual truths; (*b*) the meaning of the blood 'upon the altar' was that a life was offered to God after it had passed through the experience which we call 'death'; (*c*) it is not the blood when being shed from the body that makes atonement, but the blood when applied to the altar; not a penal death, but the offering to God of a dedicated life. The 'blood' is in effect a 'risen life.' On the bearing of these thoughts upon the 'blood of Jesus' see W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of our Lord*, 290-304; (*d*) the provision of a means of atonement is a gracious gift from God, **I have given it to you . . . by reason of the life:** i.e. because it is the life. In the sacrificial terminology the blood means not simply the life but the life that has died, and yet so far from being destroyed has by that very fact become capable and available to make atonement for sin.

13. pour out the blood, i.e. on the ground, i.e. give it to God (cf. 2 S 23 [16]). **cover it with dust,** i.e. bury it so that it should not cry out against him (cf. Job 16 [18]). **taketh in hunting any beast or fowl:** only the home-trained animals (1 [2, 16, 14], 3 [1]) might be offered in sacrifice, so there was no question in this case of sacrifice.

14. the blood is (*all one*) **with the life . . . the life of all flesh is the blood.** The words show how completely the principle of life was identified with the blood. The Jews seem to have regarded the blood as a kind of living thing which vivified the body.

XVIII. **Forbidden Degrees of Marriage; other Forbidden Intercourses; Molech Worship.**—The ground of this chapter is covered again to a certain extent by 20 [1-20]. There the reference to Molech worship comes first. 20 adds the nature of the penalty for each of the forbidden things. Possibly the two passages sprang from different but closely related codes.

2. I am Jehovah your God: a common and characteristic expression of the Law of Holiness. It occurs twenty-one times in 18-26 and sometimes as here in con-

nexion with warnings against heathen abominations (e.g. 18 [30], 19 [4]).

9. born at home, i.e. as issue of the present wedlock; **abroad**, i.e. either out of wedlock, or by a previous spouse.

16. It is curious that the levirate law, though much older than this code (Gen 38 [8]; Dt 25 [5, 6]), should not be mentioned as an exception to this.

18. take a woman to her sister . . . in her lifetime, i.e. not marry the sister of a living wife; by implication this seems to allow the marriage of deceased wife's sister.

21. Molech: god of the Ammonites (1 K 11 [7]). Allusions to the offering of sons to Molech in sacrifice (probably by slaughtering and then burning the body: cf. Gen 22 [9, 10]) are common (2 K 16 [3], 17 [31], 23 [10]; Jer 7 [31], 19 [5]).

XIX. **Various Laws.**—This ch., with its miscellaneous contents, comes between two chs. (18 and 20) dealing with much the same subject. Many of the laws are taken over from earlier codes.

Parallels are found in the Decalogue and in D; [3-5] covers the ground of the first table of the Decalogue; [9-22] the second table. The order of arrangement, however, differs considerably from that of the Ten Commandments.

2. holy: the fundamental meaning of the word is to be set apart from ordinary (human) life and usage. As applied to God it suggested at first His unique Majesty and unapproachableness; then gradually as men came to know Him as a God of goodness it came to have a moral association and meant His separation from, and hatred of, things evil.

4. idols: lit. 'things of nought' (RVm), a term of derision applied to heathen gods (cf. Is 2 [8], 10 [10]; Jer 2 [28], etc.).

5-8. Cf. 7 [15-18].

9-10. Cf. 23 [22]; Dt 24 [19-21].

15. respect: lit. 'lift up' (one above another), show partiality towards; the poor man's poverty equally with the rich man's power must not be made a ground for unjust partiality.

16. talebearer, i.e. slanderer (cf. Ex 23 [1]). **stand against**, i.e. be an enemy to his life by slandering him in the law court on a capital charge.

17. bear sin because of him, i.e. by being silent in the presence of evil-doing: the idea being that 'silence gives consent.'

18. children of thy people . . . thy neighbour: 'neighbour' is confined to fellow-Jews; the parable of the Good Samaritan extended it to the foreigner and the enemy.

19. The common idea underlying the three instances seems to be that God made the species diverse from one another, and man must not blur the distinctions.

20. betrothed: this is not the ordinary word for betrothal. It means rather 'assigned.' That this is tantamount to marriage amongst freemen is shown by the words '*they* shall not be put to death,' i.e. because she is a slave. The husband would be her master, i.e. a freeman.

21. guilt offering: 7 [1-7] *v.n.* The woman is regarded as the property of her husband (as in the tenth commandment), and so the offence is one for which a guilt offering is demanded. It is probably assumed in the words 'they shall be punished' that there will be also a fine payable to the husband. **a ram**: cf. 5 [15, 16].

23. uncircumcised, i.e. ceremonially unclean, and therefore not to be eaten. The circumcision of the child was its dedication to God. The fruits, when fully matured (i.e. in the fourth year), are in like manner to be dedicated to God.

24. for giving praise unto the Lord: cf. Jg 9 [27] (RVm), where the same word is used of a heathen vintage-festival.

26. eat with the blood: cf. 3 [17], 17 [10]. **enchantments**: divination from omens, e.g. from the liquid in a cup (Gen 44 [5]). **practise augury**: the word is supposed to mean 'to hum,' and to refer to the crooning noise made by diviners.

27. round the corners of your heads, i.e. by cutting the hair. Cutting off and offering the hair was common in heathen religions, as also were cutting and tattooing the flesh [(28)].

28. for the dead, i.e. as an offering to the dead, a relic of ancestor worship (cf. Jer 16 [6]; Dt 14 [1]).

31. them that have familiar spirits . . . wizards: lit. 'the ghosts and the familiar spirits.' The second rather than the first of the two words should be translated 'familiar spirits.' In both cases the idea is of a spirit residing in and manifested through a medium (the enchanter). The first word, *ob*, means the ghost of a dead man; 'necromancer' would be the best translation. The second word means a spirit (not necessarily the ghost of a dead man), specially attached to a particular medium and speaking through him or her.

36. ephah: a dry measure of about a bushel. **hin**: a wet measure of about twelve pints.

XX. **Penalties attaching to Various Offences.**—The laws forbidding the offences have already for the most part been declared. **1. Molech**: see 18 [21].

6. **familiar spirits . . . wizards**: see 19 31.

24. **milk and honey**: cf. Ex 3 8, the food of a nomad people in a land of natural fertility. On 'honey' see 2 11.

25 presupposes the distinctions drawn up in 11. **make your souls abominable by beast**, etc.: the idea is that a man's food becomes part of himself.

27. **that hath a familiar spirit or that is a wizard**: lit. 'when there is in them a ghost or a familiar spirit.' This law is an addition to 19 31.

XXI.-XXII. 16. **Holiness in the Priesthood.**

1. **defile himself for the dead**, i.e. by touching a dead body (cf. Nu 19 11-20; also Lev 10 4, 5).

4. **a chief man**: the Hebrew is corrupt, and possibly the RVm, 'as a husband,' i.e. for his wife, may be meant.

5. 19 27, 28 *v.n.*

6. **offerings made by fire**: 1 9 *v.n.* **the bread of their God**: 1 6-9 *v.n.* (cf. 3 11, 16). The expression is found five times in these two chapters. Cf. also Mal 1 7 and the expressions 'my table,' 'the table of the Lord' (*ibid.* 1 7, 12).

7. **profane**, i.e. of immoral life.

10. **the high priest . . . garments**: cf. 8 2 ff. **hair of his head go loose, rend his clothes**: cf. 10 6. **that is consecrated**: RVm 'whose hand is filled' (8 27 *v.n.*).

12. **go out of the sanctuary**, i.e. either he must live in the sacred precincts as Eli did (1 S 3 2, 3), or, more probably, must not leave the sanctuary during his ministrations. **profane**, i.e. bring in something 'common or unclean.' **crown of the anointing oil**: 'the consecration conferred by the anointing' (*Poly. Bib.*: cf. RVm).

18. **flat nose**: better as RVm 'slit nose'; the word probably means perforated.

22. **He shall eat**, i.e. enjoy the priestly privileges as regards the meal and peace and trespass and sin offerings. **most holy . . . holy**: this distinction is not made elsewhere with regard to the offerings. But 22 speaks of them as 'holy' (2, 3), and 6 17, 29, 7 6 as 'most holy.'

23. **the veil**, i.e. between the Tent of Meeting and the Holy Place. So 'unto the veil' refers to his ministrations in the Tent of Meeting, i.e. at the seven-branch candlestick or the Table of Shew-bread. **the altar**, i.e. of burnt offering, referring to ministrations in the outer court. The expression leads us to infer that the writer knew nothing of the altar of incense. **them**, i.e. the sanctuaries: the Tent, the Holy Place, and the Altar.

XXII. 2. **separate themselves from the holy things**, i.e. do not touch them when unclean, and so pollute them (see 3).

4. **hath an issue**: see 15 2 ff.

11. The slave belonged to the household (the *familia*), and enjoyed a privilege not granted to the visitor or the free servant.

12. The woman ceased to belong to her father's family when she married.

14. **a man**, i.e. a layman; because he has taken of that which belongs to another (i.e. the priest) he is bound to make compensation (see 6 5, also 27 13, 15, 19). **unwittingly**: see note on 4 1.

17-33. **Purity, etc., in the Offerings.**

18. **vows . . . freewill . . . for a burnt offering**; this is the only passage in which the vow or the freewill offering is classed under the burnt offering (see note on 7 11-21). 22. Cf. Mal 1 8 ff.

23. The reason for the distinction is easily seen. The vow once made must be punctiliously fulfilled.

27, 28. Regulations prompted by compassion and sympathy with animals (cf Dt 22 6 f.; Ex 22 30).

30. Cf. 7 15: the repetition here points to a difference of source.

XXIII. **A Calendar of Days and Seasons** (cf. Ex 23 14-17, 34 23; Dt 16 1-17).

2. **holy convocations**, i.e. gatherings of the people summoned for religious purposes.

3. **sabbath of solemn rest**: also in 32 (16 31 *v.n.*: cf. 25 4; Ex 35 2).

5-8. **The Passover** (cf. Ex 12).

5. **the first month**, i.e. the month called Abib (its Canaanitish name), known also in post-exilic times by its Babylonian name 'Nisan.' **passover**: Ex 12 11 *v.n.*

10. **sheaf of the firstfruits**: cf. Ex 23 19, 34 26; Dt 26 2 ff.

11. **wave**: see on 7 30. The wave sheaf was apparently given to the priest. **on the morrow after the sabbath**: Sabbath is used in the ordinary sense, the seventh day of the week, and apparently the week of unleavened bread (i.e. the passover week) is here meant.

13. **ephah . . . hin**: 19 36 *v.n.*

15-21. **The Feast of Weeks.**

20. **priest shall wave them**, i.e. the wave loaves. This would be clearer if 18, 19 were printed within brackets. These two verses form a parenthesis, and it is suggested with some probability that they were inserted afterwards from Nu 28 27-30.

23-25. **Feast of Trumpets.**

23. **a memorial** (*zikkaron*): a reminder to God (cf. Nu 10 10).

26-32. **The Day of Atonement** (cf. 16).

27. **the day of atonement**: it is from this verse that the name of the day is derived. **afflict your souls**: 16 29 *v.n.*

32. at even, from even unto even: the Jewish day began with sunset, so that the eve of a day in our reckoning was part of that day in the Jewish reckoning. A survival of this is seen in the liturgical celebration of eves in the Christian calendar.

33-36. The Feast of Tabernacles (cf. Ex 23 [16]; Dt 16 [13-15]; Nu 29 [12]; Ezr 3 [4]). Ex 23 [16], 34 [22] call it by its earlier name, 'the feast of ingathering.' This, the most popular of festivals, was known by the name of 'the feast' (Jn 7 [2]).

34. tabernacles: booths made of branches of trees ([40-43]).

36. solemn assembly: the word seems always to mean a gathering of people. The translation 'closing festival' (RVm) is less justified. This eighth day was known as 'the great day of the feast' (Jn 7 [37]).

37. a sacrifice, i.e. a peace offering (see p. 101*a*).

39-43 goes back to the Feast of Tabernacles.

43. Cf. Hos 12 [9].

XXIV. 1-9. Arrangements for the Worship in the Tent of Meeting, i.e. the first chamber of the tabernacle.—Note that, as in 16, there is no mention of the altar of incense, the third and latest addition to the furniture of this part of the tabernacle.

1-4. the lamp, i.e. the seven-branch candlestick. [1-3] are a duplicate of Ex 27 [20, 21].

4. continually, i.e. regularly; the words 'from evening to morning' seem to imply that the lamp burnt only by night (cf. 1 S 3 [3]).

5-9. The Shewbread: see Ex 25 [30] (cf. 1 S 21 [6]).

6. the pure table: 'the table of pure gold' (*Poly. Bib.*). **before the Lord:** lit. 'to the presence of the Lord'; hence the name is properly 'Presence-bread' rather than 'shewbread.'

7. frankincense . . . memorial: 2 [2] *v.n.* The incense was burnt probably on the altar of burnt offering. Josephus (*Ant.*, III, x, 7) says it was put in cups placed on the bread.

9. offerings . . . made by fire: the expression is here alone used of an offering not actually burnt on the altar. Apparently the word 'fire offering' has drifted away from its derivation-meaning and is applied figuratively to any offering wholly devoted to God; just as in the New Testament the expression 'an odour of a sweet smell' derived from the sacrificial burning is figuratively applied to our Lord's self-oblation (Eph 5 [2]) and to the gifts sent to St. Paul by his converts (Phil 4 [18]). An alternative suggestion is that 'fire offering' included any offering of which a part (in this case the incense) was burned (Gray, *Sacrifice*, 10).

10-23. An instance of the death penalty for blasphemy: other regulations of punishments are inserted into the account ([17-22]).

11. the Name, i.e. Jehovah (see [16]). The later Jews shrank even from pronouncing the sacred Name, for which they substituted *Adonay* (=Lord) in reading their scriptures aloud (Ex 3 [13-22] *v.n.*).

14. The witnesses are to be the executioners (Ac 7 [58] f.).

18, 19. life for life . . . tooth for tooth. The *lex talionis* (i.e. exacting a penalty like to the offence) appears in the earlier codes: the Book of the Covenant (Ex 21 [23-25] *v.n.*); D (Dt 19 [21]). It should be remembered that it restricted an unlimited vengeance which might exact more than the offence. At the same time it is 'fulfilled' by being set aside in the Gospel (Mt 5 [38] ff.).

XXV. The Sabbatical and Jubile Years.

1-7. The Sabbatical Year.—Cf. Ex 23 [10, 11], where the motive is love of neighbour; here it is more definitely religious: that the land may 'keep a sabbath unto the Lord.'

5. thy undressed vine: lit. 'thy Nazirite'; the untrimmed trailers of the vine are like the unshorn locks of the Nazirite. And as with the Nazirite so with the vine, the untrimmed growth was consecrated to the Lord (Nu 6 [5, 18]).

6. The meaning is that the produce is not to be harvested, but plucked and eaten as wanted.

8-55. The Year of Jubile.—Within this section [20-22] revert to the Sabbatical year. The section deals also with the law of property (land and slaves), particularly in relation to the year of Jubile.

9. on the tenth day of the seventh month: this was also the Day of Atonement (16 [29]), and the beginning of the secular year. Josephus (*Ant.*, I, iii, 3) says: 'Moses appointed that Nisan . . . should be the first month for their festivals [i.e. for the sacred year]; '. . . although he preserved the original order of the months as to selling and buying and other ordinary affairs.' According to this 'original order,' the year began with the seventh month, the sacred month Tishri. The Jubile year, being closely connected with buying and selling, followed the 'original order.'

10. jubile: the Hebrew word means 'a ram's horn'; the year is named from the trumpet proclamation with which it was ushered in.

13. There is no sign in the history of Israel, either before or after the Exile, that this law was ever in operation.

16. **the number of the crops doth he sell**, i.e. it was not the land itself that was to change ownership, but the crop of it for the number of years before the Jubile. [18-22] would naturally come after [7], and [23] after [16].

22. **ninth year**: we should expect *eighth*, and some suspect an error in the text. But in Syria land allowed to grow fallow produces only a small crop in the first year after it is again cultivated; thus it would be the ninth year before a full crop could be expected, and the sixth year's crop would have to last over the sixth, seventh, and eighth years.

24-31. The law that each parcel of land belonged inalienably to a particular family is frequently alluded to, e.g. Ru 4 [3]; 1 K 21 [3]; Jer 32 [7] ff.

24. **redemption**: this was the work of the next of kin, who was called on this account the 'redeemer' (*goel*). This word came to be technically used of one who had the right and the responsibility to take up for another the assertion of a just claim which the other was unable to pursue for himself. So it came to be applied to the 'avenger of blood' who exacted the penalty for murder (Nu 35 [12]; Dt 19 [6]).

27. **the overplus**, i.e. the difference between the original price of the land and the value for the number of years still remaining before the Jubile.

33. **redeem**: to make a satisfactory meaning we must suppose (with the Vulgate) that a 'not' has dropped out from the Hebrew. **and the city of his possession**: 'in the city of their hereditary possession' (*Poly. Bib.*).

35-55. A poor Israelite may either be supported by a loan from his neighbours, repaying capital without interest ([35-38]), or sell himself into slavery: in the latter case he is to receive wages and be set free in the year of Jubile.

37. Cf. Ex 22 [25]; Dt 23 [19].

XXVI. A concluding exhortation with warnings and promises: the codes of the Book of the Covenant and D also end with a similar homily (Ex 23 [20-33]; Dt 28-30). The ch. is remarkable for its close resemblance to expressions of Ezekiel. The opening vv. cover the first four commandments, the duty towards God.

1. **idols**: 19 [4] *v.n.* **pillar**: Ex 23 [24] *v.n.* **figured stone**, i.e. a flat or bas-relief carving on a stone.

9. **establish my covenant**: better 'carry out.' **covenant**: Gen 9 [8] *v.n.*

10. **because of**, i.e. to make room for: cf. RVm 'from before.'

25. **the vengeance of the covenant**: a covenant was ratified by ceremonies significant of the punishment to fall on the party who broke it, e.g. dividing the bodies of animals and walking between the severed parts, thus invoking a similar punishment upon oneself (Gen 15 [10. 18]; Jer 34 [18-20] *v.n.*). **a sword . . . that shall execute the vengeance of the covenant** is perhaps an allusion to this ceremony. **gathered together within your cities**, i.e. for protection.

26. **your staff of bread**: the figure is taken from the traveller's staff to support his footsteps (Ezek 4 [16], 5 [16]; Ps 105 [16]: cf. Is 3 [1]). The figure suggested the verb 'to break' (cf. Is 14 [5]). **ten women**, i.e. each representing a family: one oven will suffice for ten families. **by weight**, i.e. rationed.

30. **high places**: the sacredness of mountain-tops (derived from the idea of their aloofness from the world and nearness to heaven) was a common feeling of Semitic peoples. So the early Hebrews used the hilltops for their worship (1 S 9 [12], 10 [5]). But in many cases these high places were already associated with the heathen worship of the previous owners of the land, and the worship of Israel became corrupted by their idolatry. So a feeling of hostility towards them arose and grew, culminating in their destruction by Josiah (2 K 23 [5] ff.). Even after this some were left (Jer 17 [3]), and it is to these that reference is here made. **sun images**: better 'sun pillars,' in honour of the Phœnician sun god (Baal Hamman), **idols**: the word is not the same as in [1] and 19 [4], but a word found several times in Ezekiel (e.g. 6 [4]) meaning rounded blocks of stone. It is used contemptuously (cf. 'blockheads').

31. **smell the savour**: 1 [9] *v.n.*

39. **in the iniquities of their fathers shall they pine away**: cf. Ex 20 [5].

42. **covenant with Jacob** (Gen 46 [1-4]); **with Isaac** (*ib.* 26 [2-5]). **with Abraham** (*ib.* 15 [13-18]). 44. Cf. Ps 89 [30-34].

46. Formal conclusion to the Law of Holiness (17-26).

XXVII. **Redemption of Vows and Tithes.**—Probably added by the editor who combined H with P. The addition seems to have been suggested by its references to the year of Jubile ([17]) and the idea of redemption, both of which have been treated in 25.

1-8. **Redemption of Persons.**—In the earliest times persons coming under a vow were handed over for the service of

the sanctuary (e.g. Samuel: 1 S 1 [11]), or even offered as a sacrifice (e.g. Jephthah's daughter: Jg 11 [39]). But means were devised to avoid the direct offering either by substitution (as the Levites were substituted for the firstborn: Nu 8 [10-16]) or by a redemption-payment (2 K 12 [4]). [8] implies that the case in consideration is that of a person vowing *himself*.

3. the shekel of the sanctuary: see Ex 30 [13].

9-29. Redemption of Property.

13. add the fifth part: see also [15. 19. 27. 31]; perhaps the addition was regarded as a sort of *asham* for not devoting the thing itself (cf. 5 [16], 6 [5]).

14. sanctify, i.e. make it 'holy to the Lord' by a vow of dedication.

16. sowing of an homer of barley: about eleven bushels, for which it is computed that about three and three-quarters acres of land would be needed.

26. the firstling was already 'holy to the Lord' (Ex 13 [2]), and therefore could not be vowed as if it were a man's own property.

28. devoted thing: this is different from the object of a vow: the 'devoted thing' is separated from other things and put under a *ban* forbidding its use by men. In this case it must, if fit, be given to God (like the spoils of Jericho: Jos 6 [17. 18], 7 [1]), or if evil and therefore unfit for an offering to God, destroyed ([29]) as an accursed thing.

32. the tithe on cattle is not mentioned elsewhere except in 2 Ch 31 [6]. **under the rod,** i.e. of the shepherd (cf. Ps 23 [4]). The rod was used for counting the flock, and so may be regarded as a symbol of possession.

NUMBERS

By D. D. Bartlett

Title.—The title 'Numbers' is strictly applicable only to 1-4 and 26 of 'The Fourth Book of Moses,' for the account of the two censuses which were taken of the children of Israel (in the second and the fortieth years after the Exodus) is restricted to these five chapters. A more appropriate title for the book as a whole would be that employed by the Jews themselves, viz. *In the Wilderness*, for the real interest of the book centres round the varied fortunes of the Israelites during their sojourn in the wilderness of Sinai, in the wilderness of Paran, and in the plains of Moab.

Composition.—The book (like Genesis, Exodus, and Joshua) is a compilation from the three sources J, E, P, the bulk of the narrative being derived from P (1 [1]-10 [28], 15, 17-19, 26-31, 33-36). In 11 f., 22-24 JE appears alone, while in the remaining chapters JE and P are interwoven.

Chronology.—The chronological scheme is on the whole clear. When the book opens the Israelites had already been encamped at Sinai for some eleven months, i.e. from the third month in the first year until the first day of the second month in the second year after the Exodus (Ex 19 [1]; Nu 1 [1]); and exactly a month previous to the date given in Nu 1 [1] the Tabernacle had been set up (Ex 40 [17]). Nu 7, 9 [1-14] thus describe events which occurred before the date with which the book opens (see on 7 [1], 9 [1]). The Israelites leave Sinai on the twentieth day of the second month in the second year (10 [11]), and arrive at Zin (Kadesh) in the first month of the (?) fortieth year (20 [1]). Aaron dies at Hor some four months later (20 [28], 33 [38]), and the book closes at an undefined date between the fifth and the eleventh months of the fortieth year (33 [38]; Dt 1 [3]). An incidental reference to the departure from Rameses is found in 33 [3]. These chronological data are all derived from the late source P, and their value is to be estimated accordingly. It is certainly not very probable that a period of only nineteen days (cf. 1 [1], 10 [11]) would suffice for the taking of the census at Sinai, for the detailed ordering of the Tabernacle and of the camp, and for the communicating of sundry laws. Still less probable is it that within a period of five months (33 [38], 20 [29]; Dt 1 [3]) could be contained all the events related in 21 [4]-36, events which include negotiations and war with the Amorites, the incident of Balaam and Balak, the taking of the second census, the war with Midian, to say nothing of the communicating of numerous laws.

Division.—The book falls roughly into three main divisions: (*a*) Events in the wilderness of Sinai (1 [1]-10 [10], P); (*b*) the march northwards from Sinai and events in the wilderness of Paran and in the South (10 [11]-21 [9], JEP); (*c*) events in the

plains of Moab east of Jordan (21 10-36 13, JEP).

Religious Value.—The various strata of narrative found in Numbers reflect religious beliefs and practices of somewhat unequal value. In JE the conception of the Deity and of His relations with His people is primitive. Jehovah is strictly a national God (Jg 11 24), who leads His worshippers to victory in battle (10 35, 14 9, 21 14). Even in JE, however, there are indications of the growth of a more adequate conception of the nature of Jehovah. It is to Him that the Israelites owe their very existence. They are His chosen people, and through them does He make His name known among the heathen (see on 14 14). Yet it is not to them alone that He vouchsafes His immediate revelation; He has His prophets even in the Gentile world (22-24). In P the thought of the transcendence and holiness of God is more marked. He is ever present in the midst of His people (1 1; cf. 16 22), and in virtue of that presence all His people are holy (16 3). The Divine holiness is indeed so awful that the Ark, the symbol of His presence, must be protected from profanation by a double cordon of sacred Priests and Levites (2-3). The service which He requires must be promptly and duly rendered (9 13, 28-29), and the sacrifice offered to Him must be generous and without blemish (7, 28 19, 31, 31 50 ff.).

It is round the person of Moses, however, that the religious interest really centres. He is throughout the man of God, revealing Jehovah to the Israelites, and pleading for the Israelites before Jehovah. He is the true prophet (16 28), ever jealous for Jehovah's glory (11 29), and ever submissive to His will (12 3). To him is accorded the supreme revelation of God (12 8), with all the responsibilities which that revelation entails. Despite the sin which ultimately excluded him from Canaan (20 12), it was his life and example which were to inspire the prophets of the future (cf. Dt 18 15-18).

I. 1-X. 10. P. **Events in the Wilderness of Sinai.**—In Ex 25-31, 35-40 an account has been given of the erection and furnishing of the Tabernacle, and the appointment and consecration of the Priests; while Leviticus is wholly priestly in character. There follows in Nu 1 1-10 10 a detailed account of the establishment of a fixed camp-order, and of the appointment of the Levites as servants of the Priests.

I. 1-46. **The Numbering of the Twelve Secular Tribes,** exactly a month after the erection of the Tabernacle (Ex 40 17).—The census is taken by Moses and Aaron, assisted by a representative of each tribe, and embraces all males over twenty years. The total given, 603,550 (46, 2 32; Ex 38 26), or in round numbers 600,000 (11 21; Ex 12 37), is highly improbable, if only for the reason that in Jg 5 8 the fighting forces of all Israel are estimated at only 40,000 men.

1. **the tent of meeting.** In P the Tent is represented as situated in the centre of the camp, as a symbol of Jehovah's presence in the midst of His people (1 50, 2 2. 17, 5 3). In JE it is generally represented as situated outside the camp (10 33, 11 26, 12 4; Ex 33 7-11), 14 44 *v.n.*

2. **all the congregation,** i.e. exclusive of the Levites (cf. 47 ff.). **by their families, by their fathers' houses.** Better 'by their clans, by their families' (so also in 18. 20 ff.).

47-54. The Levites were not to be reckoned with the secular tribes, but were to be privileged to serve as guardians of the Tabernacle, encamping immediately around it, and protecting the rest of the congregation from the danger of too close an approach. The brief instructions of 50 ff. are elaborated in 2-4.

50. **the tabernacle of the testimony.** The relationship between the Testimony, the Tabernacle, and the Tent may be thus briefly described. The Testimony (consisting of the two tables of stone given to Moses at Sinai [Ex 31 18, 34 29]) was contained within the Ark (Ex 25 16, 40 20), and the Ark was in turn deposited within the Tabernacle (Ex 26 34, 40 21). The Tabernacle itself was covered by the Tent (Ex 26 7, 40 19), and the Tent was still further protected by coverings of rams' skins and of sealskins (Ex 26 14, 40 19). Thus the titles Tent of Meeting, Tabernacle of the Testimony, Tent of the Testimony, Tabernacle of the Tent of Meeting all refer to the one sacred edifice where Jehovah was believed to dwell.

51. **the stranger,** i.e. any non-Levite (cf. 3 10).

II.-III. **The Position of the Sacred and the Secular Tribes round about the Tent.**—The camp was to lie four-square, each side being composed of one sacred company and three secular tribes. Immediately around the Tabernacle the Priests and the Levites were to encamp: on the east, Moses, Aaron, and his sons (3 38); on the south, the Kohathites (3 29); on the west, the Gershonites (3 23); on the north, the Merarites (3 35). An outer cordon was then to be formed by the twelve secular tribes: on the east, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulon (2 3-9); on the south,

Reuben, Simeon, and Gad (2 10-16); on the west, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin (2 18-24); on the north, Dan, Asher, and Naphtali (2 25-31). When on the march, the camp of Judah was to lead, followed by Reuben (2 9, 16). Then came the Levites with the Tent of Meeting (17), and Ephraim and Dan were to bring up the rear (24, 31). (A different order is given in 10 14-28.) This detailed arrangement of the tribes around the Tabernacle is probably not historical, for in earlier tradition the Tabernacle was represented as situated outside the camp. The conception of such a camp as is here described has probably been derived from Ezekiel's vision of the ideal future (Ezek 40-48).

III. 1. The mention of Moses is clearly redundant. 4. Cf. Lev 10 1-7.

5-13. The Levites.—These were originally a secular tribe (Gen 29 34). Their treacherous conduct towards the Shechemites, however (Gen 34 *v.n.*), brought them an evil name in Israel (Gen 49 5 *v.n.*), and it is probable that at a later date they suffered some disaster at the hands of the Canaanites, and were forced to seek refuge in the territory of other tribes (cf. Jg 17 7, 19 1). But though the Levites thus degenerated as a secular power, they gradually rose to prominence as a sacred caste, and came to be invested with sacred functions (Dt 10 8). This was probably in virtue of their relationship to Moses (Ex 18 14 ff., 33 7-11; Jg 17 7 *v.n.*). Ex 32 25 ff. and Dt 33 8 will then reflect variant traditions as to the precise circumstances which led to their acceptance by Jehovah. Their formal institution as a sacred caste, though recognized in 1 47 ff., 2 17, 33, is not described by P until 3, where they are represented as given to Jehovah and to the Priests in lieu of the firstborn of all Israel (9, 40 ff.). They were not to claim the supreme privilege of the Priesthood, but were to act as servants of the Priests in all the service of the Tent of Meeting.

The Priests.—According to P, Aaron and his sons had been instituted in their office in accordance with a divine command given at Sinai (Ex 28 f., 40 12 ff.), and the Priesthood was their peculiar and inalienable right. Thus, though the Priests and the Levites were genealogically connected, through their descent from a common ancestor Levi (Ex 6 16 ff.), yet as religious castes they were distinct and separate. P's theory of the establishment of the Priests and the Levites as separate castes is in direct conflict with earlier practice, for prior to the Exile the Priesthood was not confined to the family of Aaron (Jg 18 30; 2 S 8 18, 20 26), nor was any distinction made between priestly and non-priestly Levites (1 K 12 31; Dt 18 1 ff.). It was Ezekiel who first made this distinction, and P's representation of the Levites as a non-priestly caste, subordinate to the Priests, is clearly the outcome of reflection upon the priest-prophet's picture of the ideal future (Ezek 44 10-14).

9. **wholly given**, cf. the Nethinim, or 'given ones,' who in post-exilic times were themselves servants of the Levites (Ezr 2 70, 8 20; Neh 7 46 ff.).

10. **the stranger**, i.e. anyone (including Levites) who is not a Priest (1 51 *v.n.*).

11-13. The basis of Jehovah's claim to all the firstborn in Israel is the same in JE as in P, but J differs from P in representing the claim as operative only when the Israelites have entered Canaan (Ex 13 11 ff.).

14-39. Census of Male Levites over a Month Old. Position and Duties of Levites.—For the position of the Levites around the Tent, see above. The Gershonites were to take charge of the curtains and hangings of the Tent (25 f.), the Kohathites of its furniture (31), and the Merarites of the actual framework (36 f.).

25. **the tabernacle**, i.e. the linen curtains mentioned in Ex 26 1 ff. (cf. Nu 4 25). For the other curtains and coverings mentioned, see Ex 26 7 ff., 14, 36, 27 9 ff., 16.

26. **the altar**, i.e. of burnt offering (Ex 27 1 ff., 38 1). **the cords.** In 37 these are assigned to the care of Merari (cf. 4 26, 32).

28. The number given (8,600) is probably an error for 8,300. (The total mentioned in 39 is 22,000, but the numbers given in 22, 28, 34 actually total 22,300.)

31. **the table**, i.e. of shewbread (4 7; Ex 25 23 ff.). **the altars**, i.e. of burnt offering (26) and of incense. Until some time after the Exile, however, an *altar* for the offering of incense seems to have been in fact unknown in Israel (Ex 30 1 *v.n.*). **the screen**, i.e. the veil (4 5) which separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies (cf. Mk 15 38). The ministers mentioned in this verse are not the Kohathites, but the Priests.

36 f. Cf. Ex 26 15 ff., 26 ff., 32 ff., 27 10 ff.

38. The most important side, the front or the east, was to be guarded by the Priests. 39. 28 *v.n.*

40-51. Census of Firstborn Male Israelites over a Month Old, and their Redemption by the Levites.—The lives of 22,000 firstborn Israelites were to be redeemed by the lives of the corresponding number of Levites, and for the additional

273 firstborn Israelites a sum of five shekels apiece was to be paid to the Priests. (Nothing is said of firstborn females or of firstborn males under a month old.)

41. and the cattle of the Levites . . . Read 'and the cattle of the Levites instead of the cattle of all the firstborn among the children of Israel,' i.e. the cattle of the Levites were to be given in lieu of the (redeemable) cattle of the firstborn Israelites. (All firstlings of cattle could not be redeemed, but only the firstlings of unclean cattle: 18 [15]; Lev 27 [27].)

47. five shekels. Approximately 13s. 9d.

IV. Census of Levites between Thirty and Fifty Years, and Fuller Details of their Service.

3. A different age limit is given in 8 [23] ff. (cf. also 1 Ch 23 [24, 27]; 2 Ch 31 [17]; Ezr 3 [8]).

4-20. When the camp set forward, the **Kohathites** were to bear on their shoulders (7 [9]) all the furniture of the Tent, viz. the most holy things ([4]), which had previously been covered by the Priests with various coloured cloths ([5-15]). The Kohathites themselves were not to touch the holy things (nor even to look upon them unveiled), but were to carry them by their staves or on their frames.

6. a cloth all of blue. The sacred Ark alone was covered with cloth of blue, in order, presumably, that it might easily be distinguished from the rest of the furniture.

11. the golden altar, i.e. of incense.

13. the altar, i.e. of burnt-offering.

15. lest they die: cf. the fate of Uzzah (2 S 6 [6] f.).

16. The Kohathites were to serve under Eleazar, who himself had certain articles in his personal charge.

20. lest they die: cf. the fate of the men of Beth-shemesh (1 S 6 [19]).

21-28. The **Gershonites,** at the command of the Priests ([27]), and under the general supervision of Ithamar ([28]), were to carry in their wagons (7 [7]) the curtains and hangings of the Tent (cf. 3 [25] f.).

25. its covering, i.e. the first covering of rams' skins: 1 [50] *v.n.*

29-33. The **Merarites,** also under the supervision of Ithamar, were to carry in their wagons (7 [8]) the woodwork and the necessary fittings of the Tent (cf. 3 [36] f.).

V. 1-4. The Exclusion from the Camp of all Unclean Persons.

2. every leper. In Lev 13 f. minute instructions are given for the detection of leprosy, and for ceremonial cleansing after cure. Instances of the exclusion of lepers are found in 12 [14] f.; 2 K 7 [3] ff., 15 [5]. The present law, in commanding exclusion from the camp in the case of uncleanness through an issue, or through contact with the dead, goes beyond the requirements of Lev 15 and Nu 19 [11] ff. (but cf. Dt 23 [10]).

5-10. Certain Priestly Dues.

5-8. In Lev 6 [1-7] it is commanded that a fraudulent person shall restore to the defrauded person, or to his nearest kinsman, a sum equivalent to six-fifths of the value of the property stolen. The present law provides that in cases where there is no kinsman the payment shall be made to the Priest, as Jehovah's representative.

8. the ram of the atonement. Cf. Lev 6 [6].

9. Read 'And every contribution—even all the holy things—of the children of Israel . . .'

9 f. provide that the portion of any man's offering which is usually appropriated by the Priest is to become the property of the individual Priest concerned (cf. Lev 7 [7-9, 14]), and not of the priestly community in general (cf. Lev 6 [18], 7 [6, 10]).

11-31. The Ordeal of Jealousy. The presence of duplicates in this section (cf. e.g. [16, 18]; [19, 21]; [24, 26]: cf. also the double name given to the offering in [15] and [18]) obscures the real sequence of events, but the procedure was probably as follows. The suspected adulteress was brought by her husband to the Priest, and set by him before the altar of Jehovah. The Priest, bearing in his hand holy and dust-impregnated water ([17]), then recited to her the customary oath, to which she replied, 'Amen, Amen.' The Priest next wrote the words of the curse on parchment and washed them off into the holy water. He then took the meal offering, waved it before Jehovah, and burned a portion of it on the altar. Finally, the woman was made to drink of the water. If no evil befell her (? within a reasonable time) she was declared innocent, but if the potion produced any ill effect, she was pronounced guilty.

This is the only express reference in the Old Testament to the custom of trial by ordeal. It is probable, however, that the custom was more prevalent in Israel than this isolated notice would suggest, for trial by ordeal was favoured* by primitive peoples in almost all countries (Frazer, *Folklore in the Old Testament*, iii, 304). Here it is worthy of note that though the rite as a whole is primitive and savage in origin, the decision is given

* And is still to-day in Sinai (A. Kennett, *Bedouin Justice*, 108).—A. G.

at Jehovah's sanctuary and by Jehovah's Priest, and that it is Jehovah Himself who makes the sinful woman to be 'a curse and an oath' (21).

13. and be kept close . . . Better 'and she be undetected, though she be defiled.' A woman taken in the act was, on the evidence of two witnesses, immediately stoned (Lev 20 10; Dt 19 15). The ordeal was employed only in cases where direct evidence was lacking.

15. her oblation for her. The offering was really provided by the husband, and was intended as a gift to Jehovah and to the Priest. **the tenth part of an ephah.** Approximately 7 pints. Oil and frankincense were the usual accompaniments of meal offerings (Lev 2 1), but were omitted in this case probably because the occasion was a sad one (cf. Lev 5 11).

17. holy water, i.e., probably, running water from a spring. **the dust . . .** Possibly the dust was regarded as holy in virtue of the holiness of the place whence it was taken. Or else it was felt that as dust defiled the holy place, so a charge of unfaithfulness defiled a suspected person.

18. For the loosening of the hair, see Lev. 10 6, 13 45, 21 10. **the water of bitterness.** The phrase may originally have signified water which had been rendered bitter by various poisonous ingredients. In the present instance, however, it is explained (24. 27) that the water itself becomes bitter upon being swallowed, and causes bitterness (or harm) to the sinner. (For sweetness and bitterness produced by the eating of a book, see Ezek 2 8-3 3; Rev 10 9 f.)

21 breaks the sequence between 20 and 22, and is best omitted.

22. and this water. Better 'then this water . . .' The precise effect produced by the water is not explained, but it was probably either dropsy or abortion.

31. the man, i.e. the husband. He is to be free from all blame, even though his suspicions are proved to have been unfounded.

VI. 1-21. The Law of the Nazirite. Nazirites were of two classes, those who took a vow of consecration to Jehovah for a limited period, and those who, like Samson, were Nazirites for life. The present law relates only to the former class. Such temporary Nazirites were to abstain from the use of any product of the vine (3 f.); they were to allow their hair to grow long (5); and they were to avoid contamination by any dead body (6 f.). Should a Nazirite accidentally contract defilement during the period of his vow, the days which he had already fulfilled were to be cancelled, and his consecration was to begin afresh (9-12). When the days of his vow were fulfilled, he was to offer certain specified oblations, and was then to be absolved by the Priest from his special service to Jehovah (13 ff.).

The three restrictions laid upon the Nazirite were all definitely religious in import, the first in particular being intended to preserve undefiled the pure religion of Jehovah. For the culture of the vine and the use of its products were a characteristic of the Canaanites, with whom the children of Israel had been commanded to hold no intercourse. But this command was not easy of accomplishment, for the licentious worship of the Canaanitish Baalim had an almost irresistible fascination for the Israelites. There was thus a danger to pure religion. The crisis produced its champions, and the Nazirites, by their abstinence from wine, with its heathen associations, stood for the primitive purity of the religion of the desert (cf. Am 2 11 f., Nazirites; Jer 35 6-10, Rechabites). After the teaching of the prophets had been assimilated a happy mean was found, and wine used in moderation (Pr 20 1) became both the symbol and the servant of innocent happiness (cf. Ps 4 7; Jn 2 1-11).

In the mind of early peoples the hair was 'a living and important part of the body . . . the special seat of life and strength. . . . All over the world the hair and head of persons under taboo are peculiarly sacred and inviolable' (*Rel. Semites*[3], 324, 483). The wearing of the hair long was thus a sign of intimate relationship with the Deity, and the subsequent offering of the hair upon the altar a sign of the consecration to the Deity of the whole self.

The requirement that the Nazirite should avoid all contact with the dead is clearly a special instance of the general requirement referred to in 5 2. All Jehovah's people were to guard against defilement, but special precautions must be taken by specially consecrated persons such as the Nazirite, the High Priest (Lev 21 10 ff.), and (in a lesser degree) the sons of Aaron (Lev 21 1 ff.).

Direct allusions to the Nazirites are few, but their influence was probably considerable. 6 is best regarded as a regulation by P of an institution which had already been long in existence.

2. or woman. No mention of female Nazirites is found in the Old Testament (but cf. 30 3 ff.).

9. on the seventh day. Cf. 19 11. The hair in this case is shaved off (? and

buried), because defilement was specially liable to cling to it.

10. two turtledoves, i.e. the least costly form of sacrifice (Lev 5 [7], 12 [8], 14 [22]).

12. a he-lamb. Cf. Lev 14 [21].

14. Cf. Lev 1 [10], 3 [6], 4 [32].

15. meal offering . . . drink offerings, i.e. according to the scale in 15 [3] ff.

21. In addition to the sacrifices already mentioned, the Nazirite is to offer such sacrifices as are required for the fulfilment of any private vow which he may have taken.

22-27. The Priestly Blessing.—The wording of the Blessing closely resembles that of certain of the Psalms (Ps 67 [1], 29 [11], 4 [6], 31 [16], 119 [135], 80 [3, 7, 19]), and it is probable that the Blessing, though now found in P, was derived by the priestly writer from some pre-exilic hymn. It is not very appropriate in its present position, and was perhaps originally associated with Lev 9 [22].

23. unto Aaron and unto his sons. Cf. 2 S 6 [18]; Dt 10 [8], 21 [5].

VII. The Offerings of the Princes.—The erection of the Tabernacle took place on the first day of the first month in the second year (Ex 40 [17]). The offering of the princes, which was made on the day following the completion of the Tabernacle ([1]), thus took place a month earlier than the census described in 1-4. The census is, however, presupposed in [2]. (The princes named are the same as in 1-2.)

1. anointed it and sanctified it. Cf. Ex 30 [26] ff., 40 [9] ff.; Lev 8 [10] f.

9. In earlier times the Ark had been carried on a cart (1 S 6 [7] ff.; 2 S 6 [3] ff.). But as its associations became more sacred, more stringent regulations were laid down for its transport. It was to be carried, according to the Chronicler, on the shoulders of the Levites (1 Ch 15 [2, 13, 15, 26]). The present verse goes further, and commands that the sacred furniture be carried only by members of a single family of the Levites, viz. the Kohathites (cf. 4 [15]).

10 f. The probable meaning is that the princes offered their gift of sacrificial material on the same day as they presented their gift of wagons and oxen ([3]). Then, on twelve successive days, each individual prince offered his gift afresh, the value of the gift being the same in each case.

89. An isolated fragment, recalling the promise made in Ex 25 [22].

VIII. 1-4. The Golden Lampstand.—This was to be so set up (RVm) that the light was thrown forward on to the north wall of the Holy Place, in the direction of the Table of Shewbread (Ex 25 [37], 26 [35]).

5-22. The Purification and Presentation of the Levites.—An amplification of 3 [5-13]. The section contains several duplicates; thus Moses is twice commanded ([9, 10]) to present the Levites before Jehovah (cf. also [13]), and the 'waving' of the Levites is variously represented as effected by Moses ([13, 15]) and by Aaron ([11, 21]).

7. to cleanse them. Cf. Lev 8 [12], where the Priests are said to be not merely cleansed, but sanctified: i.e. the rite in their case had a positive, and not only a negative, significance. **sprinkle the water of expiation.** Lit. 'the water of sin,' i.e. for the removal of sin. The Priests, unlike the Levites, were wholly washed, and then sprinkled with anointing oil and with blood (Lev 8 [6, 12, 30]). **let them wash their clothes.** The Priests, on the contrary, were to be clad in new and specially prepared clothes (Ex 28 [4]; Lev 8 [7, 13]).

8. Far more elaborate directions are given in Lev 8 [14] ff.

10 f. The Levites were given to Jehovah by the whole congregation of Israel (in lieu of all the firstborn), and were by Him given as servants to the Priests ([19]). They thus represented the people before Jehovah, offering to Him the service that was His due; and at the same time they protected the people from the dangers of too close an approach to the divine Presence.

12. Cf. Lev 1 [4], 16 [21].

15. The mention of the cleansing of the Levites should naturally precede the notice of their entry upon their duties (as in [21] f.).

23-26. Cf. 4 [3]. According to the present passage, Levites who attained the age of fifty were to cease from all responsible work in the sanctuary, but were still permitted to render voluntary service to their brethren.

IX. 1-14. The Supplementary Passover.—The date of the section is given as the first month of the second year after the Exodus, and the events related would thus have occurred before the date given in 1 [1]. Detailed instructions regarding the Passover have been given by P in Ex 12. These instructions are now supplemented by the command that anyone who is prevented (by uncleanness or by absence) from keeping the Passover on the fourteenth day of the first month shall, under pain of exclusion from the congregation, fulfil his obligations on the corresponding day in the following month. An instance of the keeping of this supplementary Passover is found in 2 Ch 30 [15].

6-7. Their difficulty was occasioned by

the fact that the Passover fell within the period of seven days during which they were required by law to separate themselves from the rest of the congregation (cf. 5^{2} ff., 19^{11}).

14. a stranger, i.e. one of alien birth who enjoyed certain rights of protection while living among the Israelites (cf. Ex 12^{43} ff.).

15-23. A description, unconnected with what precedes or what follows, of the appearance of the cloud over the Tabernacle. For the various conceptions found in J, E, and P of the appearance and movement of the cloud, Ex 13^{21} *v.n.*

15*a*. Cf. 7^{1}.

18. Previous to the arrival at Sinai, the Israelites had marched according to the commands of Jehovah communicated to them through Moses (Ex 17^{1}). Now, after the erection of the Tabernacle, the rising and settling of the cloud gave respectively the signal for breaking camp and encamping, while the direction of the journey continued to be indicated by the express command of Jehovah to Moses (cf. ^{23}, 10^{13}).

X. 1-10. The Two Silver Trumpets.

5. when ye blow an alarm. Cf. 31^{6}.

6. The LXX introduces after this v. a notice of a third and a fourth alarm for the camps on the west and on the north.

9. in your land, i.e. in Canaan.

X. 11-XXI. 9. JE, P. Events North of Sinai and West of the Arabah.

X. 11-28. P's Account of the Departure from Sinai.

11. The Israelites left Sinai nineteen days after the giving of the command to take the census (cf. 1^{1}).

14-28. The order of march here given differs from that in 2^{1-31}; the three Levitical families set out separately, each bearing its respective burden (cf. 2^{17}).

12. the wilderness of Paran. The wilderness of Paran—whence, according to P, the spies were later despatched and whither they returned ($13^{3, 26}$)—lay somewhere between Mount Sinai and Canaan. Its precise boundaries are difficult to determine, but it probably lay south of Palestine and west of Edom, embracing the territories of Zin and Kadesh. Zin (which, according to Nu 34; Jos 15, formed part of the southern border of Judah) is in 13^{21} (cf. ^{3}) represented as situated north of Paran; and, according to the editor of 20^{1}, it included the district of Kadesh (cf. also 27^{14}, 33^{36}; Dt 32^{51}). The final editor of 13^{26}, however, associated Kadesh with Paran (cf. also 32^{8} and the LXX of 33^{36}). Kadesh thus seems to have been regarded as situated either in Zin or in Paran, and it is probable that the name Paran was applied loosely to the whole expanse of territory which lay between Sinai and the borders of the Promised Land.

17*b*. **the tabernacle,** i.e. the various articles enumerated in $4^{24-26, 31}$ f.

21. the sanctuary, i.e. the holy things enumerated in 4^{4-14}.

29-36. JE's Notice of the Departure from Sinai—a parallel account to that given in $^{11-28}$.

29. Hobab. The name is derived from J, for in E Moses' father-in-law is styled Jethro (Ex 3^{1}, 4^{18}, 18^{1-12}). It is Hobab, not Reuel, who is here described as 'Moses' father-in-law,' the name Reuel being probably an ancestral or clan name (Ex 2^{18} *v.n.*).

32. Hobab's final decision is not given, but cf. Jg 1^{16} (reading there 'Hobab the Kenite') and Ex 18^{27}. The attitude adopted by Hobab on this occasion gives support to the modern theory as to the position of Sinai-Horeb. It suggests (^{30}) that the country towards which the Israelites were journeying did not lie on the direct route from Sinai to Midian. But if Sinai be identified with the modern Jebel Musa (in the south of the peninsula) or with Jebel Serbal (in the west), as tradition has it, then the journey of the Israelites northwards from Sinai and the journey of Hobab towards his own land would coincide for at least part of the way, and there would be little force in Hobab's objection that if he accompanied the Israelites he would be taken out of his direct route. Hence it seems more probable that Sinai lay somewhere within the mountainous districts of Edom, not far from Kadesh (see Dt 33^{2}; Jg 5^{4} f.). If this situation be the correct one, then on leaving Sinai the Israelites would march northwards towards Canaan, and Hobab would naturally have turned eastwards in the direction of his own land Midian (Ex 3^{1} *v.n.*).

33. the ark . . . went before them: three days' journey. This phrase (which is quite appropriate in clause *a*) is best omitted here, for if the Ark were always three days' journey in advance of the Israelites, it could give them little assistance in the choice of direction.

36. The idea that the Ark returned periodically to the families (not, as RV, thousands) of Israel is seemingly an anachronism, for during the sojourn in the wilderness the Ark did not return to the people—the people rather overtook the Ark. The idea of the periodic 'return'

of the Ark is more suited to the time of the settlement in Canaan (cf. 1 S 4 [3] ff.; 2 S 6 [9. 17], 11 [11]).

XI. **1. the fire of the Lord.** Cf. Ex 3 [2], 9 [23] f., 19 [16] ff.

3. Taberah. An unidentified site, mentioned again only in Dt 9 [22].

4-35. This section is composite, and contains accounts of two (or possibly three) quite unconnected incidents, viz. the lust of the people for flesh ([4-10. 18a. 18-24a. 31-35]), (?) the expostulation of Moses with Jehovah ([11] f., [14] f.), and the appointment of the seventy elders to assist Moses ([16] f., [24b-30]). The account here given, by JE, of the provision of the manna and quails is parallel to that found in Ex 16 (P). In Ex 16, however, the provision is represented as made before the arrival of the people at Sinai; here it is made after their departure from Sinai. There the manna and the quails are provided together; here the quails are provided after the manna. There prominence is given to the manna; here to the quails. There no judgement is pronounced upon the people for their self-indulgence; here a judgement is pronounced before the food is provided ([20]), and its execution is duly noted ([33]).

4. the mixed multitude. Cf. Ex 12 [38].

4-6. This complaint that the people had no flesh to eat is strangely at variance with the frequent mention of the flocks and herds which they possessed (Ex 12 [32. 38], 17 [3], 34 [3]; Nu 20 [19], 32 [1] ff.). It is also worthy of note that though the people cry out for flesh, it is to the fish and the vegetables of Egypt that their thoughts return.

7-9. Manna (Ex 16 *v.n.*).

11-12. Originally there must have stood before these verses some account of the particular occasion which called forth Moses' expostulation (cf. Ex 33 [12] ff.).

12. Have I conceived . . . have I brought them forth . . . ? The pronoun is emphatic in both clauses.

13. The sequel to [10]. Some connecting sentence ('And Moses said unto Jehovah') has probably been suppressed.

14-15. The sequel to [12]. With [15] cf. Ex 32 [32]; 1 K 19 [4].

16-17. The Appointment of the Seventy Elders.—This appointment is probably supplementary to the one made on Jethro's advice (Ex 18 [13-26]; cf. 24 [1. 9]), for [16] suggests that the people were already organized under various elders and officers. It is doubtful whether there was originally any connexion between these verses and [11] f., [14] f. But in the present form of the narrative a connexion is clearly intended, for [17b] represents the appointment of the elders as a divine concession to Moses' self-confessed inability to perform unaided the task of leading the people into Canaan.

18-24a. The sequel to [13]. Between [13] and [18] there must originally have stood a notice (addressed to Moses) of Jehovah's willingness to satisfy the desire of the people for flesh.

24b-30. The sequel to [16] f.

25. they prophesied, but they did so no more. This may mean that so far from assisting Moses in the government of the people (as promised in [17b]), the elders simply fell into a temporary prophetic frenzy, and later returned with Moses into the camp ([30]).

26. The probable meaning is that Eldad and Medad were members of the whole body of elders from among whom the seventy were chosen. **28.** Cf. Ex 33 [11].

31-35. The sequel to [24a].

31. from the sea. It is along the Mediterranean shore between Egypt and Palestine that quails fall in the greatest numbers, and the reference here is not impossibly to the Mediterranean Sea. If, however, it was a south-east wind which brought up the quails (cf. Ps 78 [26]), then the sea will be the Red Sea proper or the Gulf of Akaba.

32. ten homers. 1 homer = approximately 88 gallons. **they spread them all abroad,** i.e. to be dried in the heat of the sun.

35. Kibroth-hattaavah and **Hazeroth** are both unidentified.

XII. **1. the Cushite woman.** The reference appears to be not to Zipporah (Ex 2 [21]), but to a wife who is not mentioned elsewhere.

3. very meek. The word translated *meek* denotes a disposition towards God rather than towards man—'humble before God.' It suggests Moses' absolute dependence upon the divine guidance in all his difficulties.

10. Miriam alone suffers punishment (cf. Dt 24 [9]), possibly because she was primarily responsible for the complaint against Moses (cf. the order of names in [1]).

XIII.-XIV. **The Mission of the Spies.**—These chapters afford what is perhaps the clearest instance in Numbers of a narrative formed by the fusion of JE and P. According to JE, the spies (under the leadership of Caleb) were sent by Moses from Kadesh-barnea (cf. 32 [8]) to examine the nature of the Negeb or southern districts of Canaan. They proceeded as far as Hebron, nineteen miles south of Jerusalem, and on their return they described

the land as a very fertile one, but one which—in view of the gigantic stature of its inhabitants—the Israelites would be quite unable to conquer. Caleb dissociated himself from the latter part of this report, and sought to persuade the Israelites that the land could with very little difficulty be reduced. But the other spies persisted, and the people wept and murmured against Jehovah. Jehovah thereupon spoke of utterly rejecting Israel, but Moses interceded for them and secured their pardon. Jehovah, however, decreed that Caleb alone of all the present generation should enter Canaan, and Moses was commanded to turn back and lead the people again in a southerly direction towards the desert land which lay around the Red Sea. The Israelites thereupon attempted to advance northwards into the Negeb, but were repulsed by the Amalekites and Canaanites, and driven back as far as Hormah.

According to P, the spies were despatched from an unnamed station in the wilderness of Paran, and they explored the land from the wilderness of Zin as far as Rehob and Hamath, in the extreme north of Palestine. They thus traversed the whole of what was in later times considered to be Israelitish territory. On their return, all the spies—with the exception of Caleb and Joshua—reported unfavourably on the land, asserting that it was barren and unfertile. The people thereupon behaved as is reported in JE, and threatened to stone Joshua and Caleb for persisting in their favourable report. The story concludes in much the same way as does the story of JE—the people were condemned to a further period of wandering in the wilderness, Joshua and Caleb alone being exempted from the sentence of general exclusion from Canaan.

XIII. 1. Cf. Dt 1 [22] f., where the sending of the spies is represented as due, not to the command of Jehovah, but to the suggestion of the people themselves.

2. every one a prince. It is clear that each tribe acknowledged more than one prince, for the princes named in [4-15] are not the same as those who represented the various tribes on the occasion of the census (1 [5-15]).

4-15. With the exception of Joshua and Caleb, none of the princes here mentioned are referred to elsewhere.

6. Caleb. According to an earlier tradition Caleb was a Kenizzite (32 [12]; Jos 14 [6, 14]). 'It is a well-known fact that the tribe of Judah consisted of mixed elements: the genealogy in 1 Ch 2 includes among the descendants of Judah the North Arabian tribes of the Kenites and the Jerahmeelites, and the clan of Caleb which was of Kenizzite, i.e. of Edomite, origin (cf. Gen 36 [11, 15, 42]). Whether or not these clans originally formed an integral part of the tribe of Judah, it is clear that so early as the days of David they were regarded as standing in a very intimate relation to that tribe' (Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, 30).

16. Though frequently referred to in JE as the minister of Moses (Ex 17 [9] ff., 24 [13], 32 [17], 33 [11]; Nu 11 [28]), Joshua has not previously been mentioned in P. According to P the name Jehovah was not revealed until a date later than that of Hoshea's birth, and hence the name Joshua (meaning 'Jehovah is salvation') could only have been given after the revelation recorded in Ex 6 [2] f.

17*b*-20. JE. The spies receive a comprehensive commission.

17*b*. Get you up this way by the South. Better 'Get you up then into the Negeb.' The Negeb is 'the arid steppe-region extending from a little south of Hebron, where the hills gradually sink, to Kadesh-barnea about fifty miles south of Beer-sheba' (Burney, *op. cit.*, 13). **the mountains.** The reference is either to the hill-country in the Negeb itself (immediately north of Kadesh-barnea), or to the southern slopes of the central mountain range of Judah (immediately north of the Negeb).

21. P. the wilderness of Zin: 10 [12] *v.n.* **Rehob,** or Beth-rehob (Jg 18 [28]; 2 S 10 [6]), lay in the extreme north, near to Laish, in the territory of Dan. The exact site is unknown. **the entering in of Hamath,** a frequent description of the ideal northern limit of Israel (cf. 34 [8]; Jos 13 [5]; Am 6 [14]; Ezek 47 [20], 48 [1]). The reference is either to the southern or (more probably) to the northern extremity of the pass between the Lebanon and anti-Lebanon ranges. Hamath itself lay on the Orontes, some 115 miles north of Damascus. **22-24.** JE.

22. Ahiman . . . The memory of the sons (clans) of Anak, who were popularly represented as being of gigantic stature, lingered long in the minds of the Hebrews (Jos 15 [14]; Jg 1 [10, 20]; Dt 1 [28], 2 [10, 21], 9 [2]). The name **Talmai** is in 2 S 3 [3], 13 [37] applied to a king of the Aramæan state Geshur (probably north of Gilead). **Zoan** (Tanis) lay in the north-east Delta, near to Lake Menzaleh, some eighty miles north-east of Cairo. The precise date of its building is unknown, but it seems to have been in existence before 2000 B.C.

25-26a. P. Return of the Spies to Paran.

26b-31. JE. Return of the Spies to Kadesh.—Kadesh is generally identified with the modern 'Ain Kadîs, fifty miles south of Beersheba (see also on 10 [12]).

27. the land whither thou sentest us, i.e. the Negeb and the district around Hebron (cf. [22]).

29. Similar lists of the pre-Israelitish inhabitants of Canaan recur frequently in the Old Testament, but they are of little historical value. They are clearly intended to present 'an impressive picture of the number and variety of the nations dispossessed by the Israelites' (Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 97).

30 is probably misplaced, for the commotion to which it refers is not mentioned until 14 [1] (see on 14 [3] f.).

32a. P. And they brought up. RV 'up' is misleading. Better *And they brought forth*, i.e. out of their mouths. **The land, through which we have gone . . .** i.e. the whole land of Canaan (cf. [27]). For the description which follows cf. Lev 26 [38]; Ezek 36 [13]. **32b-33. JE.**

33. the sons of Anak . . . Nephilim. Better *the sons of Anak are of the Nephilim*, i.e. the Anakites are a branch of the Nephilim. The clause is wanting in LXX, and is probably a gloss. The Nephilim are mentioned again only in Gen 6 [4].

XIV. **2.** Cf. 20 [3] f.; Ex 14 [11] f., 16 [3].

3-4. JE. This proposal to return to Egypt under a new leader may well have called forth Caleb's words of reproof and of comfort which now stand in 13 [30].

6-7. P's account of the report of Joshua and Caleb.

8-9. JE. In their present position these verses are a continuation of the speech of Joshua and Caleb in [7]. The phraseology, however, proves that they originally formed part of JE's narrative (in which Joshua does not figure). They are therefore best understood as the conclusion of Caleb's (misplaced) speech in 13 [30].

9. they are bread for us. Cf. Ps 14 [4], 53 [4].

10. P. Sequel to [6] f. The stoning of Joshua and Caleb is prevented only by the appearance of the glory of Jehovah over the Tent of Meeting (see on 9 [15-23]).

12-25. JE. The conception of the Deity revealed in this passage is primitive, for Jehovah's majesty and renown among the nations are represented as dependent on the success which attends His efforts to lead His people into the Promised Land. If Jehovah fails the people, He will pale into insignificance by the side of the deities of other nations. Any refusal on His part to fulfil His intentions will be interpreted as due, not to lack of will, but to lack of power. Moses speaks throughout as one who is solicitous, not for his own well-being, but for the reputation of his God.

13-14. The text is corrupt, and cannot with any confidence be restored. The general sense is, however, clear, and the substance is repeated in [15] ff.

13. The meaning is that the Egyptians must inevitably hear of Jehovah's rejection of His people, because the impression made upon them by the events of the Exodus was such that they would naturally lend a ready ear to any information which might reach them regarding the subsequent fortunes of the Israelites.

14. Translate, with LXX, *And moreover, all the inhabitants of this land* (i.e. the districts bordering upon Canaan) *have heard* . . . Moses here turns to a consideration of the effect which would be produced on nations such as the Amorites, Moabites, and Edomites, if Jehovah carried out His threat ([12]). These nations had in the past heard glowing accounts of the power of Jehovah and of His continued presence in the midst of His people, and their appreciation of His might would naturally diminish if He reversed His previous policy of clemency towards the Israelites ([15] f.). **face to face.** Cf. 12 [8]; Ex 33 [11].

18. Cf. Ex 20 [5] f., 34 [6] f.; Nah 1 [3]; Ps 103 [8].

20 ff. Jehovah promises not to slay the people without exception ([15]), but declares that He will punish them in another way.

21. Cf. Is 6 [3]; Ps 72 [19].

24. The promise to Caleb that he and his seed should possess the Negeb and the district of Hebron (cf. 13 [22, 27]). The sequel is found in Jos 14 [6-15], which represents Hebron as granted to Caleb by Joshua, in accordance with the original Divine promise (cf. also Jos 15 [13]; Jg 1 [20]).

25. Amalekites and Canaanites (cf. Dt 1 [44], Amorites) prevent any further northern advance, and the people are bidden to return south. In 13 [29] Amalek dwells in the Negeb, while the Canaanite occupies the valleys to the west and east of the central mountain range of Palestine. Here their names are coupled, and they dwell in an unspecified valley. According to [40-45] they dwell in the hill-country. The apparent discrepancy between these last two references is explained by the fact that the Hebrew word translated 'valley' is never applied to any extensive plain away from hills, but always to wide ravines running up into a mountainous

country. It is the highlander's word for a valley as he looks down into it. The same people might therefore be described as dwelling either in a valley or in the hill-country.

26-38. P (in the main). Sequel to [10]. All the people above twenty years of age, with the exception of Joshua and Caleb, are condemned to death in the wilderness. Their children, after forty years of wandering, are promised admittance into Canaan. All the spies except Joshua and Caleb are (? immediately) slain.

29. this wilderness, i.e. Paran (cf. 13 [3, 26a]). **all that were numbered of you,** i.e. as related in 1 [1-43].

33. forty years. The forty years in the wilderness are clearly to be understood here (and in 32 [13]; Jos 14 [10]) as a time of unrelieved punishment. In other passages, however, the period of wandering (while not ceasing to be a period of chastisement) is represented in a more favourable light (cf. Dt 2 [7], 8 [3], 29 [5]; Am 2 [10]).

39-45. JE. The people are grieved at the Divine sentence ([25]), and make a vain attempt to advance directly north.

39. these words. The reference is probably to [11-25].

40. we have sinned, i.e. in refusing to heed Caleb's assurance that the land was capable of being reduced.

44*b*. The implication is that the Ark was situated within the camp (cf. 1 [1])—a conception favoured by P rather than by JE. **45. Hormah:** 21 [1-3] *v.n.*

XV. **1-16.** A fixed scale (to come into operation when the Israelites have reached Canaan) of the amounts of meal, oil, and wine which are to accompany animal sacrifices (Lev 2 has dealt with independent meal offerings). The present scale is recognized elsewhere only in P (Ex 29 [38-42]; Nu 28 f.).

4. an ephah, approximately 1 bushel. **an hin,** approximately 12 pints.

14-16. Cf. 9 [14].

17-21. A contribution to be made to Jehovah of the dough of each batch of bread baked in Canaan (cf. Ezek 44 [30]; Neh 10 [37]).

20. the heave offering (i.e. contribution) **of the threshing floor.** Cf. 18 [27]; Ex 22 [29], LXX.

22-31. Sins committed in ignorance, either by the community as a whole ([24-26]), or by an individual ([27-31]).

22. all these commandments. The phrase suggests that a series of commandments originally stood before this verse.

23. and onward throughout your generations. The present law was to apply to accidental breaches of laws already given, and also of laws contemplated in the future. With the requirements of the law cf. Lev 4 f.

32-36. The Law of the Sabbath-Breaker (cf. Lev 24 [10-23]).—The decision given in [35] supplements Ex 31 [14] f. by specifying the particular form of death which was to be inflicted.

35. all the congregation . . . The responsibility for the execution was thus distributed over the whole body of Israelites.

37-41. An enactment regarding the wearing of tassels on garments (cf. Dt. 22 [12]).

38. fringes . . . borders. Better *tassels . . . corners.* **a cord of blue.** Cf. the cloth of blue which covered the Ark (4 [6]). The cord was to attach the tassel to the corner of the garment.

XVI. **The Rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.**—Another clear instance (cf. 13 f.) of a narrative formed by a fusion of JE and P. The work of two priestly writers is also to be seen, viz. P and P^2. According to JE, a rebellion was fomented by Dathan and Abiram, sons of Eliab, (?) and On, the son of Peleth—all Reubenites, and as such members of the tribe which once possessed, but had lost, the primacy (cf. Gen 49 [3] f.). These men expressed dissatisfaction with Moses, complaining that he had not fulfilled his promise to lead them into Canaan, and resenting his exercise of civil authority. When summoned by Moses to appear before him, they refused to obey ([12-15]). Thereupon Moses, accompanied by the elders of Israel, sought out the murmurers in their tents, and commanded the rest of the congregation to depart from among them ([25] f.). Then, when he had refuted their false charges, the earth opened, and Dathan and Abiram, with their households and their goods, were swallowed up ([27b-34]). The narrative describes a civil revolt against Moses personally, and the authenticity of the incident, in the main, need hardly be doubted. The author of Dt 11 [6] seems to have had only this story of JE before him when he wrote. Ps 106 [17] similarly makes mention only of Dathan and Abiram, but [18] appears to refer also to the fate which befell Korah (see below), without naming him.

Combined with JE is a narrative (P) of an entirely different rebellion, which arose from causes quite distinct from those already described. According to P, Korah (a member of an unspecified tribe) and 250 princes of the congregation protested against the privileged position of the

Levites, as represented by Moses and Aaron. The ground of their claim was that 'all the congregation are holy, every one of them' (3). Moses thereupon invited them to bring their censers, and to offer incense before the Lord. This they did; and the fire of Jehovah fell and consumed them all for their presumption (35).

The sequel to P's narrative is contained in 16 41-17 13, where the peculiar authority of the Levites is vindicated against the claims of the secular tribes. That the rebellious company mentioned by P was not composed wholly (if at all) of Levites is proved by the fact that in 27 3 Manassites disown, on behalf of their father, any complicity in the insurrection of Korah.

The clearness of P's story is somewhat obscured by the additions made by P^2 (7b-11, 16 f., 36-40), who represents Korah and his followers as Levites, and their rebellion as a protest made by the Levites generally against the exclusive rights of the Aaronic family to serve in the Priesthood. The sequence of events is the same as in P, and resulted in the complete vindication of Aaron's privileges.

1. Korah. See Ex 6 16, 18, 21. The genealogy here, as in Ex 6, has probably been inserted by P^2. The name Korah is in 1 Ch 2 43 applied to a son of Hebron the Judahite, whereas the Korah here mentioned is represented as being a nephew of Hebron the Levite. It is, however, highly probable that the two Korahs are in reality one and the same, and that Korah the Judahite was by later genealogists converted into Korah the Levite. In the original story of P, therefore, Korah was probably understood, if not actually stated, to be a Judahite, a member of the leading secular tribe. As such he would be a fitting leader of a revolt supported by 'all the congregation' (3) against the exclusive claims of Levi. Then in the additions made by P^2, Korah was transformed into a Levite, and represented as the champion of the Levites in their protest against the exclusive claims of the Aaronic family. **On, the son of Peleth,** is not mentioned again in the Old Testament, and the occurrence of the name here is probably due to textual corruption.

2. they rose up before Moses, i.e. Dathan and Abiram revolted against Moses, as is related in 12 ff. *2b-7a.* P.

2b. **princes of the congregation,** i.e. the representatives of the non-Levitical tribes. **called to the assembly** is probably intended to describe the princes as men who were summoned for consultation as need arose.

3. they assembled themselves, i.e. Korah and the 250 princes. **against Moses and against Aaron.** Cf. 2 'before Moses.' **all the congregation are holy.** P elsewhere recognizes this holiness in a general way (e.g. in 5 3), but refuses to acknowledge that the holiness of the congregation as a whole is as great as that of the Levites in particular.

6-7. Korah and his company are invited by Moses to submit to a divine ordeal. If no harm befalls them when offering incense before Jehovah, then their claim to equal holiness with the Levites will be acknowledged.

7. ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi. Possibly these words originally formed the conclusion of Korah's speech to Moses and Aaron in 3. If, however, the words are genuine in their present position, they must come from P^2, and abruptly mark the beginning of a fresh section (in which Korah and his followers are represented as Levites).

8-11. P^2. Moses upbraids Korah and the Levites for their discontent at the position already assigned to them (in virtue of which they do the service of the Tabernacle), and maintains that in claiming the further privilege of serving in the Priesthood they are rebellious not against Aaron, but against Jehovah Himself, since the distinction between Priests and Levites is one of Divine appointment. [For the separation of the Levites from the secular tribes, and their service of the Tabernacle, see 1 47 ff., 3 6 ff., 8 5 ff.]

11. and Aaron, what is he . . .? Cf. Ex 16 7b, 8b.

12-15. JE. The original introduction to JE's story presumably contained a notice of the outbreak of the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram, prior to the summons that they should appear before Moses (12).

13. a land flowing with milk and honey. This description is nowhere else applied to Egypt.

14. wilt thou put out the eyes of these men? Cf. the modern phrase 'to throw dust in the eyes.' The men referred to are the followers of Dathan and Abiram, described in 2 as 'certain of the children of Israel.'

15. Respect not thou their offering. No previous reference has been made to any 'offering' by Dathan and Abiram. In the present incomplete state of the narrative, the clause is best understood as a prayer that Jehovah would withhold from the malcontents His favour. For the acceptance or refusal of an offering, see Gen 4 3-5. *15b.* Cf. 1 S 12 3.

16-17. P^2. Sequel to 8-11; and the parallel in P^2 to P's narrative in 6 f.

18-24. P. Sequel to [3-7a].

21. Because of the support accorded to Korah ([2b, 19a]), the whole congregation renders itself liable to extermination by Jehovah.

22. the God of the spirits of all flesh. The phrase recurs only in 27 [16] (cf. Job 12 [10]; Ec 12 [7]). **shall one man sin . . . ?** i.e. shall the congregation as a whole be punished for the sin of the individual Korah? The standpoint of the questioner seems to be that of the strongly individualistic Ezekiel.

24. the tabernacle of Korah . . . both here and in [27] is clearly due to an editor, for not only do Dathan and Abiram belong to a different stratum of narrative from Korah, but also the congregation has already been described as assembled at the door of the Tent of Meeting ([19]). Further, the word 'tabernacle' is nowhere else, in prose, applied to a human habitation, whereas it is used repeatedly of the Tabernacle of Jehovah. Most probably the original reading was 'the tabernacle of Jehovah' (as in 17 [13]).

25-34. JE (in the main). Sequel to [12-15].

25. the elders of Israel. Cf. 11 [16, 30]. The corresponding persons in P are styled 'princes of the congregation' ([2b]).

27a. P. Sequel to [24].

28-30. As in P ([5-7a]), Moses proposes a Divine test of his position. If Dathan and Abiram die an ordinary death, then their claim to equality with Moses will be vindicated. The people as a whole are addressed, and Dathan and Abiram are referred to in the third person (note 'these men,' [29]).

30. Cf. Ps 55 [15, 23].

32. and all the men that appertained unto Korah. This reference to Korah is quite unexpected, and the clause is clearly an editorial insertion derived from P.

35. P. Sequel to [24, 27a]. **fire came forth from the Lord.** Cf. Lev 10 [2]. The princes were punished for their impiety in offering incense; the fate of Nadab and Abihu was due, not to their having offered incense as such, but to their having offered *strange* fire or incense.

36-40. P^2. Eleazar collects the censers which had been used by Korah and his followers (and which, through having been presented before Jehovah, had become holy), and makes of them a covering for the altar. That this section is from P^2 is proved by [40], which states that the covering was to serve as a reminder that none but the descendants of Aaron might draw near to offer incense before Jehovah. The late date of the section is indicated also by the fact that in Ex 27 [2] (P) the altar is said to have been overlaid with bronze when it was first made. Thus the verses are an insertion intended to explain an already existing state of affairs.

37. Eleazar, rather than Aaron, is deputed for the task, since the High Priest was required to avoid contact with the dead even more scrupulously than were the ordinary Priests (Lev 21 [10-12, 1-4]). **scatter thou the fire,** i.e. the hot coals which had been placed in the censers ([7, 18]), and which must be scattered lest they should be profaned by common use.

37b-38. Read *for they—the censers of these sinners—have become holy at the cost of their lives.* The censers had become holy through being presented before Jehovah, but only at the cost of the lives of Korah and his followers: for Korah and his princes were not Priests, and had therefore to suffer death for venturing to draw near before Jehovah.

40. unto him, i.e. unto Eleazar.

41-50. P. Sequel to [35]. The people complain that by the death of Korah, their representative, they themselves had been attacked. In consequence of this complaint, a plague from Jehovah broke out among them, and was stayed only at the prayer of Moses and Aaron.

46. Moses said unto Aaron. We may infer that Moses and Aaron interceded for the people (as in [22]), and that Moses thereupon received from Jehovah the instructions which he now gives to Aaron. **make atonement for them.** Atonement was usually made by blood (Lev 17 [11]) or, less frequently, by means of a sin offering or burnt offering (Lev 1 [4]). For atonement by means of the payment of money, see Ex 30 [15]. In the present instance the sin had been committed by means of fire, and atonement must be made in the same way.

47 f. Aaron here risks that contact with the dead, to avoid which Eleazar acted as his substitute in [36-40].

XVII., like P's account of the rebellion of Korah, has for its object the vindication of the exclusive right of the tribe of Levi to approach the presence of Jehovah. Of this tribe Aaron is the representative, and by the budding of Aaron's rod rather than the rod of one of the other twelve tribal representatives the unique privileges of the Levites are vindicated.

3. Aaron's name upon the rod of Levi. There were to be thirteen rods in all—one for each of the secular tribes, and an additional one for the tribe of Levi.

3b. Read *for there shall be one rod for the head of their families,* i.e. for

Aaron, the representative of all the divisions of the tribe of Levi.

9 f. Each of the representatives of the twelve secular tribes receives back his rod, while that of Aaron is laid up as a permanent memorial of this signal proof of the superiority of Levi.

12 f. The people confess that they had sinned in claiming that right of approach to Jehovah which belonged to Levi alone.

XVIII. **1-7.** A further statement of the respective duties and privileges of the Priests and of the Levites.

8-32. A table of what is due to the Priests from the people generally ($^{8-20}$), and from the Levites in particular ($^{25-32}$); and a table of the dues of the Levites from the people ($^{21-24}$).

8-20. The Dues of the Priests from the People.

8. the charge of mine heave offerings. Better *that portion of my contributions which is reserved* (from the fire). **by reason of the anointing.** Better as margin.

9. The Priests were to receive all except the reserved portion of meal, sin, and guilt offerings. This portion was, in the case of meal offerings, a handful (Lev 2^{1-3}), and in the case of sin and guilt offerings, the blood and certain fat pieces (Lev 4^{26} [cf. 3^{3-5}], 7^{1-5}). The burnt offering is not mentioned, because no part of it was to be eaten by the Priest (Lev $1^{9, 13}$). The skin, however, became the Priest's property (Lev 7^{8}).

10. As the most holy things. Better 'In the most holy place' (cf. Lev $6^{16, 26}$, 7^{6}; Ezek 42^{13}, 46^{20}). **every male.** Cf. Lev $6^{18, 29}$, 7^{6}.

11. The portions of a peace offering usually assigned to the Priest were the breast and the right thigh (Lev 7^{31} f.). The breast was 'waved' before Jehovah before becoming the property of the Priest, and is therefore specifically described as the 'wave breast' (^{18}).

14. Cf. Ezek 44^{29}. The reference is probably to objects dedicated to Jehovah by individual Israelites.

15-17. The firstlings of all clean cattle were to become the property of the Priest, but the firstborn of man and the firstlings of unclean beasts were to be redeemed at a fixed rate (see on 3^{40} ff.).

18. The Priest receives the whole of the flesh of the firstlings of clean animals, as he does the specified portions of peace offerings.

20. The Priests are refused landed possessions in Canaan (cf. ^{23} f., 26^{62}; Dt 10^{9}, 18^{1} f.; Jos 13^{33}; Ezek 44^{28}), and are to receive in lieu thereof the aforementioned sacred dues (cf. 35^{1-8}).

21-24. The Dues of the Levites from the People.—The Levites were to receive one-tenth of the offerings of the children of Israel, but it is not definitely stated whereof that tenth was to consist. Probably it was to be a tithe of the produce of the soil, as in Dt 14^{22-29}, 26^{12-15}. (The only mention of a sacred tithe of cattle is found in Lev 27^{30-33}; 2 Ch 31^{6}.) In Deuteronomy it is specifically laid down that the tithe (or its money equivalent) was to be used for two successive years in the provision of a sacred feast at Jerusalem—a feast in which the Levite (i.e. the Levitical families generally, including Priests) was to be invited to join. Then, every third year, the tithe was to be stored up at the offerer's own home, and was to be devoted to the relief of 'the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow.' The law of Deuteronomy thus represents the tithe as only partially devoted to the relief of the Levites. The law in Nu 18^{21-32}, however, requires that the tithe be appropriated wholly by the Priests and Levites, and this requirement is probably to be understood as a claim made by P, in his usual manner, for the granting of greater consideration than had been usual in the past to the needs and requirements of the sacred Levitical caste.

25-32. The Dues of the Priests from the Levites.—The Levites were to contribute to the Priests a tithe of the tithe which they had received from the people. The remaining nine-tenths of the original tithe might then be consumed by the Levites wherever they chose (cf. ^{10}).

30. unto the Levites. Read *unto you* (as in ^{27}).

XIX. **The Law of Uncleanness.**—In 5^{2} it is commanded that he who was unclean by the dead be put out of the camp. This ch. describes the method whereby his uncleanness was to be removed. He was to be sprinkled on the third and on the seventh day with water specially prepared; he was to bathe himself in pure water and wash his clothes; and on the seventh day, at even, he was to be pronounced clean. (A similar process was to be followed in the case of any unclean vessel or tent.) The present law (which is not applicable in the case of a polluted Nazirite) differs from Lev 5^{1-6} in not requiring a guilt offering in the case of one who unwittingly incurred defilement.

2. a red heifer. Sacrificial animals were usually males, but here (as in Dt 21^{1-9}) a heifer is required (cf. the ewe-lamb of 6^{14}, and the she-goat of 15^{27}).

The choice of female animals on special occasions is possibly due to the fact that they were the most valuable in the estimation of a pastoral people.

3. Eleazar the priest. 16 [37] *v.n.*

5. Nowhere else is the blood of a sacrifice said to be burned. It was usually drained off, and either poured out before the altar or else thrown on the horns of the altar. Seldom, also, was the skin burned (cf. Ex 29 [14]; Lev 4 [11, 20], 8 [17], 16 [27]).

6. cedar wood, and hyssop, and scarlet. These are also employed, but in a different manner, in the ceremony of purification from leprosy (Lev 14 [4] *v.n.*).

9. water of separation, i.e. water for the removal of impurity. Such water was to be procured, as occasion required, by putting into running water a portion of the ashes of the heifer, and of the cedar, hyssop, and scarlet ([17]). **it is a sin offering.** Better 'it is a means of the removal of sin.'

12. on the third day. Read as RVm (cf. [19], 31 [19]).

14-22 appear to form a fresh section, describing in detail the uses to which the 'water of separation' was to be put, and relating to unclean things as well as to unclean persons. **18.** Cf. Ps. 51 [7].

XX. 1-21. Events at Kadesh.

1. The people as a whole (after leaving the southern districts of Paran) arrive at Zin (in the northern half of the wilderness) —the place whence (according to P) the spies had commenced their espial of the land (13 [21]). The precise date of this arrival is not given, but it was probably the fortieth year (see below). **and the people abode in Kadesh.** Regarding the length of the stay at Kadesh there is some discrepancy between JE and D. According to JE, the Israelites went to Kadesh immediately after leaving Sinai, presumably during the second year after the Exodus, and were still there at the end of the Wanderings (20 [14]). It is true that they were commanded to turn back into the wilderness 'by the way to the Red Sea' (14 [25]), but no mention is made of their having obeyed this command. JE simply states that the Israelites were, in the fortieth year, still encamped at Kadesh (20 [14]), and that at the end of their stay there they made a circuit around Edom so as to reach the east side of Jordan (21 [4]). Thus, if the narrative of JE is complete, we must assume that some thirty-eight years were spent at Kadesh. According to D, the Israelites, after the defeat at Hormah, remained at Kadesh for an indefinite, but clearly short, period of 'many days' (1 [46]), and then apparently spent thirty-eight years in compassing Mount Seir (2 [1, 7, 14]). It is difficult, if not impossible, to decide definitely between JE and D. For attempts to reconcile the discrepancies, see Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 33; and cf. Burney, *Judges*, cix, 440.

2-13 are intended to explain why Moses and Aaron, after surviving the Wanderings, failed to lead the people finally into the Promised Land. The details of the narrative are conflicting, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine clearly where Moses' sin lay, for the original account seems to have been purposely modified out of respect for the memory of Moses and Aaron. The sin, whether of unbelief ([12]) or of rebellion ([24], 27 [14]), possibly revealed itself when Moses struck the rock instead of merely speaking to it. But Moses had been specifically commanded to take with him his rod ([8]), and the natural presumption is that he was intended to use it in some such way as Aaron used his rod at the time of the plagues (Ex 7 [20], 8 [16] f.). If this presumption be correct, then possibly Moses' sin lay in the fact that he smote the rock not once, but twice ([11]). The difficulty is enhanced by the fact that in [10] it is the people as a whole who are referred to as *rebels*, while in [24] it is (presumably) Moses and Aaron alone who exhibit a rebellious spirit. (But see on [10].) Possibly, as is suggested by Ps 106 [33], the sin was one of speech rather than of action: Moses may have disputed Jehovah's command, and may have expressed some doubt as to whether His proposed method of providing water would prove effective.

10. Hear now, ye rebels. It has been suggested that the words 'Shall we (or "Can we") bring them (not "you") forth water out of this rock?' were originally addressed by Moses and Aaron to Jehovah, and that Jehovah replied with the words 'Hear now (or, as LXX, "Hearken unto me"), ye rebels.' Then followed a command that Moses should strike the rock. If this suggestion be adopted, Moses' sin will have consisted not in his striking the rock (instead of speaking to it), but in his presuming to question the Divine command.

12. The execution of this sentence is noted in [23] ff. (Aaron) and in 27 [12-14] Dt 32 [48-52] (Moses).

13. Meribah. Ex 17 [1-7] *v.n.*

14-21. JE. On being refused permission to pass through the territory of Edom, the Israelites are obliged to turn south in the direction of the Gulf of Akaba.

They then march round the south border of Edom; and, turning north, continue their way along the east border of Edom and Moab in the direction of the Arnon (cf. 21 [43]; Jg 11 [18]).

22-29. P. The Journey from Kadesh to Hor. Death of Aaron.—If Hor be identified with Jebel Madurah on the north-west border of Edom, to the north-east of Kadesh, then the Israelites would naturally pass through at least a portion of Edomite territory on the journey from Kadesh to Hor. If Hor be identified with Jebel Harûn (i.e. Mount Aaron, near Petra, on the east of the Arabah), then they must have penetrated far into Edomite territory. In either case P's narrative is at variance with that of JE in [21b] (cf. also Dt 2 [4-8], which, though referring to the occasion of the northward advance towards the Arnon, represents the Israelites as crossing the east frontier of Edom).

28. Cf. 33 [38]. According to Dt 10 [6], Aaron died at Moserah (cf. Nu 33 [30] f.)—an unidentified site. **29.** Cf. Dt 34 [8].

XXI. **1-3. The Conquest of Arad.**—The Israelites are represented as advancing almost directly north from Kadesh to Arad (the modern Tell 'Arâd, seventeen miles south of Hebron), and not as turning south from Kadesh to compass the land of Edom (20 [14-21] *v.n.*). According to Jg 1 [16] f. the destruction of the city afterwards known as Hormah was effected by the two tribes of Judah and Simeon, who advanced south from Jericho. Thus Nu 21 [1-3] and Jg 1 [16] f. give divergent accounts of the conquest of Hormah. Further, Nu 14 [45] states that the Israelites had previously experienced a repulse at Hormah, and it is hardly probable that they would again have advanced in a body (as represented in 21 [1-3]) in order to make a fresh (and, as events proved, a successful) attack upon the district. The probability is that the main body of Israelites travelled around Edom in order to attack Canaan from the east, while the tribes of Judah and Simeon, together with their Kenite and Kenizzite allies (see on 13 [6]), moved north from Kadesh into the Negeb and successfully reduced it. Jg 1 [16] f. will then be correct in attributing the destruction of Hormah to these particular tribes, but incorrect in ascribing it to the occasion of a southern movement from Jericho.

1. Atharim. Unknown. RVm has little to recommend it.

4-9. The Brazen Serpent.

4. The reference to Hor in clause *a* links the passage loosely to 20 [22-29] (P), while the reference to the compassing of the Red Sea links it to 20 [14-21] (JE).

6-9. 2 K 18 [4] relates how the image of a serpent (whatever its origin may have been) had long been an object of superstitious worship in Jerusalem. The author of the present section, by attributing the manufacture of a brazen serpent in the wilderness to the commandment of Jehovah Himself, probably sought to refute the popular notion (current among the Hebrews as among Eastern peoples generally) that the serpent was a source of healing. Jehovah, and not the serpent, was for him the source of healing (cf. Wisd 16 [5] ff.). Poisonous serpents are still found in great numbers in the deserts of the Exodus. With the curing of serpent-bites by means of a serpent-image we may compare the action of the Philistines, who sought to counteract a plague of mice by despatching beyond their borders golden images of mice (1 S 6 [4] ff.).

10-XXXVI. 13. JE, P. Events East of the Arabah and the Dead Sea.—Though the greater part of this section is derived from P, little support is given to P's previous representation that the Israelites, on leaving Kadesh, marched directly across the northern portion of Edom (see on 20 [22-29]).

XXI. **10. Oboth** lay near Iye-abarim in the desert districts east of Moab, then the v. presupposes a march south from Kadesh, along the southern and eastern borders of Edom (20 [14-20] *v.n.*).

11. Iye-abarim. The addition of *Abarim* locates the site of Iyim (33 [44] f.) as east of the Jordan valley or of the Arabah (the extension of the Jordan valley south of the Dead Sea).

12. the valley of Zered is generally identified with the Wâdy-el-Aḥsa, which runs from the south-east into the southern end of the Dead Sea. But this Wâdy appears to have formed the southern border of Moab (between Moab and Edom); and in order to arrive at Iye-abarim (in the districts east of Moab) the Israelites must already have crossed, or have skirted, the Wâdy-el-Aḥsa. The valley of Zered must therefore have been situated further north, between the Wâdy-el-Aḥsa and the Arnon.

13. The Israelites cross the Arnon and pitch to the north of it, in the territory of the Amorites (cf. [21], where the Israelites are represented as still outside Amorite territory). [13] and [21] may, however, be reconciled on the assumption that the words *on the other side of Arnon* were spoken from the point of view of one who lived north of the Arnon. [13] would then

mean that the Israelites pitched south of the Arnon, and outside Amorite territory.

14-15. An ancient song is cited in support of the statement that the Arnon formed the boundary between the territory of the Moabites and that of the Amorites (cf. [20], 23 [14], where Pisgah, which lay north of the Arnon, is spoken of as situated in Moabite territory).

16-18. If **Beer** ([16]) be identified with the Beer-elim ('Well of mighty men') of Is 15 [8], the mighty men referred to will possibly be the princes and nobles mentioned in [18].

17. Another popular song of an unknown antiquity. For interesting Arabian parallels see *I.C.C.*, 288.

18. from the wilderness. Better, as LXX, *from Beer*.

19. Neither **Mattanah** nor **Nahaliel** has been identified with any certainty. **Bamoth** ('High-places') is possibly to be identified with Bamoth-baal (22 [41]).

20. the valley that is in the field of Moab. If the valley intended be the Wâdy 'Ayûn Mûsā (which runs from Mount Nebo into the north end of the Dead Sea), then the Arnon is not here understood to form the north border of Moab (cf. on [14] f.). **the top of Pisgah.** Pisgah (or Nebo: Dt 3 [27], 32 [49], 34 [1]) was one of the numerous hills which intervene between the plateau of Moab and the Jordan valley, to the east and north-east of the Dead Sea. The district which it overlooked—the Jeshimon—was either the wilderness of Judah, north of the Dead Sea and west of Jordan, or (more probably) the wilderness north of the Dead Sea and east of Jordan.

21-33. Conquest of Amorite Territory between the Arnon and the Jabbok (cf. Dt 2 [26-36]; Jg 11 [19-22]).—The Amorites, with whom Israel had no kinship, are conquered. Cf. the specific command to drive out the Amorites (Dt 2 [24, 31]) and the equally specific command to refrain from attacking either the Moabites or the Ammonites (Dt 2 [9, 19, 37]).

23. Jahaz. Unknown.

24. for the border . . . was strong. Read, with LXX, *for Jazer was the border of the children of Ammon*, i.e. Jazer lay on the border between Amorite and Ammonite territory. It seems to have been possessed at different times by the Amorites ([32]), the Moabites (Is 16 [8]; Jer 48 [32]), and the Ammonites (1 Mac 5 [6] ff.).

25. all these cities. A full list of the captured cities must originally have stood before this v. (cf. [32], 32 [3]).

26. out of his hand. Read *from Jabbok*, as suggested by [24]; Jg 11 [22].

27-30. This poem is introduced in support of the statement ([26]) that territory originally Moabite had been conquered by the Amorites. With the exception of [27b] ([28b]), [29e] there is no reference in the poem to the Amorites, and it is probable that the destruction which is described was a destruction of Moab, not by the Amorites, but by the Israelites, and that this destruction was effected, not towards the end of the period of the Wanderings, but on some occasion during the period of the monarchy. The poem will then be understood either as an exhortation to the Israelites to rebuild those Moabite cities which they had recently destroyed, or as an ironical invitation to the Moabites to rebuild their ruined homes. Possibly the verses were written on the occasion of some such conquest of Moab as is recorded on the Moabite Stone (*c.* 900 B.C.).

27. The description of **Heshbon** (thirteen miles east of the northern extremity of the Dead Sea) as **the city of Sihon** does not necessarily imply that the city was at this time an Amorite possession. The description may well have survived after the city had been recovered by the Moabites.

28. The manner in which this verse is quoted in Jer 48 [45] makes it clear that **Heshbon** was the starting-point, and not the cause, of the conflagration. Hesbhon was not the destroying city, but the destroyed. **Ar of Moab.** Ar is generally described as situated in the Arnon valley, on the north or north-east border of Moab. At the time indicated in [26], however, the Arnon cannot have formed the north border of Moab, since Heshbon (which lay twenty-four miles north of the Arnon) was included in Moabite territory.

29. Unto Sihon . . . This line (which is metrically superfluous) was probably introduced into the original poem by an editor who supposed that the song celebrated an Amorite victory over Moab.

30. The text is highly corrupt. Read, on the basis of LXX and Vulgate, *and their seed* (i.e. the Moabite seed) *is perished from Heshbon even unto Dibon*. **Dibon,** the modern Dhîbân, lay some four miles north of the Arnon. **Nophah.** Unknown. **Medeba,** the modern Mâdeba, lay some six miles south of Heshbon.

33-35. The phraseology, and the absence from 22 [2] of any reference to a conquest of Bashan, suggest that the verses have been introduced from Dt 3 [1-3].

XXII. 1. beyond the Jordan at Jericho. The meaning is not that the Israelites crossed the Jordan and encamped near

Jericho, but that they encamped east of the river, over against Jericho.

2-XXIV. 25. Balak and Balaam.—These chs. are clearly composite in character, being derived from E (mainly) and J.* According to E (22 2-21, 35b-41), Balaam the Aramæan (22 5 *v.n.*) was forbidden by God to accede to Balak's first request that he would come and curse the Israelites (12). Balak's second request, however, met with a more favourable response, and Balaam was permitted to accompany Balak's messengers, but only on condition that he spoke of the Israelites in such terms as should be put into his mouth by God (20). According to the fragmentary narrative of J (22 22-35a), Balaam the Ammonite seems to have commenced his journey to Moab without having obtained Jehovah's permission. His journey was therefore interrupted by the sudden appearance of the angel of Jehovah, and the fact of Jehovah's anger against him was made known to him. He thereupon made full confession of his guilt, and was eventually permitted to continue on his way, under the same conditions as were laid down in E (but see on 35a).

The narrative is remarkable for its portrayal of the character of Balaam, and for its insistence on the great truth of Jehovah's providential care for His chosen people. By many writers, both Jewish and Christian, Balaam is understood to be little better than a selfish and grasping seer, whose one desire was to obtain Jehovah's permission to curse the Israelites (so that he might be enabled to obtain the rewards which Balak promised), but whose designs were thwarted by Jehovah's refusal to grant his request. All such estimates of the prophet's character, however, have been influenced by P's account of Balaam's conduct (see on 22 4, 7), and fail to do adequate justice to the original story in JE. JE emphasizes the submission of the prophet to the will of his God. Nothing could persuade him to oppose that will (22 13, 19, 34)—nothing less than the detailed proclamation of the Divine message would satisfy him (22 18, 24 13), for he was the vehicle of the Divine revelation (24 2).

But more important than the character of Balaam is the character of Balaam's message. This is delivered in four calm and dignified oracles, whose measured language seems to reflect the absolute conviction of the prophet that his words were the words of the Almighty, and were therefore quite incapable of being refuted. The message covers the whole history of Israel. Balaam's thoughts dwell in turn on the past history of the nation, on its present condition, and on its future destiny. In the past he finds the reason for the present, and in past and present the guarantee of the future.

In the first oracle (23 7-10), Balaam briefly explains the reason for his visit—he had come in response to Balak's invitation. But he immediately declares that the desire which prompted that invitation could never be satisfied, for Israel was great not only in number but also in privilege. Israel was Jehovah's nation, and under His protection they enjoyed, until the very end of life, a confidence which the seer longed to make his own.

In the second oracle (23 18-24), the prophet declares the utter folly of expecting Jehovah to change His purpose towards Israel. The original blessing could never be reversed, for the people were not only undeserving of a curse, but actually deserving of a blessing. Jehovah Himself was with them yet, as He had been in Egypt, and His tender care towards them was undiminished. Therefore the nation need fear no human Balak, for they were irresistible in their heaven-given might.

The third and fourth oracles (24 3-9, 15-19) differ from the preceding in not being addressed directly to Balak, and in containing a fuller statement of Balaam's qualifications to speak in the name of Jehovah. But their burden is in effect the same, viz. the prosperity and might of Israel. The third oracle describes in glowing terms the fairness and fertility of Israel's territory, and continues in more detail the thought of Israel's overwhelming power. Balaam is also represented as looking forward to the glorious future which the nation should enjoy when once the kingdom had been established in Canaan. But it is in the fourth oracle (which Balaam delivered uninvited) that this future is most fully described. The Israel of the present is here not once mentioned. The seer fixes his gaze wholly on the future; and he sees the nation secure under a mighty and illustrious king, and casting down its enemies one by one to the ground.

XXII. 4. **the elders of Midian.** In 31 8, 16; Jos 13 22 (cf. 2 P 2 15; Rev 2 14) there is preserved a late tradition which associates Balaam with the Midianites, and presents him in a most unfavourable light. This tradition may well represent a protest against the idea that Balaam, a foreigner, could ever have been a suitable recipient

* But see p. 420*b*.—A. G.

of a revelation from Jehovah, the God of Israel. The reference here (and in [7]) to 'the elders of Midian' is therefore best understood as an editorial attempt to correlate the early with the late conception of Balaam's character.

5. the River, i.e. the Euphrates. The long journey of 400 miles from Pethor to Moab would naturally be made on camels (cf. Gen 24 [10]; 2 K 8 [9]) rather than on asses—a fact which suggests that [22-35a] belong to a version of the Balaam story which locates the seer's home nearer to Moab than Pethor was. (In this case the reference to the ass in [21] is perhaps due to an editor who sought to reconcile the two narratives.) **to the land of the children of his people.** Read, with some of the Versions, 'to the land of the children of Ammon.' (The difference is but slight in Hebrew.) On this reading Balaam is described not as an Aramæan, but as an Ammonite.

7. In early times no exception was taken to the acceptance by seers of payment either in money or in kind (cf. 1 S 9 [7] f.; 1 K 14 [3]; 2 K 5 [5], 8 [8] f.). Later, however, this customary payment came to be regarded as, in a sense, a bribe, and false seers invariably accommodated their reply to the value of the gift offered them (cf. Mic 3 [5,11]; Jer 6 [13]; Ezek 13 [19]). Thus for a seer to accept payment for his services was tantamount to a confession of moral worthlessness. The later Balaamite tradition, therefore, in its desire to calumniate Balaam, naturally emphasized the fact that he showed readiness to accept the rewards which Balak sent (Dt 23 [4]; 2 P 2 [15]; Jude 11).

22-35*a*. The description of the country which Balaam traversed is clearly more appropriate to the territory between Ammon and Moab than to that between Pethor and Moab. Thus the verses lend support to the suggestion that in J Balaam is represented as an Ammonite.

22. The mention of the Divine anger follows strangely upon the mention, in [20], of the Divine approval, and suggests that J originally related how Balaam set out for Moab without first having consulted the Divine will (cf. [34]).

35*a*. Go with the men. If these words are genuine, they presuppose an original mention in J of a Moabite embassy to Balaam. But the wording is suspiciously similar to that of [20], and it is probable that the angel's reply, as originally found in J, has been suppressed by an editor in favour of God's reply, as given by E in [20].

35*b*. An editorial insertion, intended to connect [36] ff. (E) with [21].

39. Kiriath-huzoth ('City of Streets') is not mentioned elsewhere.

41. the high places of Baal. Better as margin (cf. 21 [19]). **he saw . . . the utmost part of the people,** i.e. he saw merely a portion of the Israelitish host.

XXIII. **2. Balak and Balaam offered.** The sacrifice was clearly offered by Balak alone (cf. [3, 6, 14] f., [17, 30]), and the mention of Balaam as having assisted at it is erroneous. (The verb is singular in the Hebrew.)

3. to a bare height. [Probably *to seek enchantments* should be read. See p. 420*b*.—A. G.]

4. On subsequent occasions ([16], 24 [2]) no mention is made of Balaam's addressing God. Probably the words here attributed to him were originally spoken by Balak to Balaam, and related Balak's fulfilment of the command given him by the seer in [1]. The correct order would then be [1, 2, 4*b*, 3, 4*a*, 5].

7-10. Balaam's First Oracle. — See p. 420*b*.

9. a people that dwell alone, i.e. in safety (cf. Dt 33 [28]). **And shall not be reckoned.** Better *and that do not reckon themselves.* The words are expressive of Israel's sense of its vocation to be Jehovah's peculiar people (cf. Ex 19 [5] f.; Dt 7 [6]).

10*b*. Read *Or who can number the myriads of Israel?*

10*c*. the righteous. Hebrew, Jesharim. Cf. the 'Book of Jashar' (Jos 10 [13]; 2 S 1 [18]), which was probably an ancient collection of Hebrew songs, celebrating the prowess and uprightness of national heroes. Cf. also the poetical title 'Jeshurun' (Dt 32 [15], 33 [5, 26]; Is 44 [2]). No idea of a future life is to be read into [10*c*, *d*]. The words express Balaam's hope that death might not come upon him violently and unawares (cf. Ps 55 [23]; Job 4 [7]), and that the remaining years of his life might be blessed with prosperity, even as were the years of the ideal Israelite.

13. Balak now (in [13*a*]) proposes to allow Balaam to see the whole of the Israelitish host. But an editor, realizing that a third (and presumably complete) view of the people was to be permitted Balaam from the top of Peor ([28]), has inserted a qualification ([13*b*]) to the effect that the seer was now, as on the first occasion (22 [41]), to see only a section of the host.

18-24. Balaam's Second Oracle.—See pp. 420*b*-421*a*.

21. the shout of a king, i.e. the shout wherewith a king is welcomed (cf. 1 S 4 [5]; 2 S 6 [15]). The parallelism with the

preceding clause suggests that the King is Jehovah (cf. Jg 8 [23]; 1 S 8 [7]; Is 33 [22]).

22b. The reference is not to God, but to Israel (cf. Dt 33 [17]). In Gen 49 individual tribes are compared with various animals. Here the people as a whole is likened to an untamable and dangerous beast (cf. Job 39 [9-12]).

23a, b. The probable meaning is that in Israel no recourse is had to magical means of discovering the fate in store for the nation. The very fact of the presence of God in the midst of His people ([21c, d]) is sufficient guarantee that the future will be prosperous. Frequent mention is, however, found in the Old Testament of the prevalence among the Israelites of illegal magical practices (cf. 1 S 28 [7] ff.; Hos 4 [12]; Is 8 [19], 44 [25]; Jer 27 [9]; Zech 10 [2]). **Now shall it be said of Jacob . . .** Better '. . . to Jacob and to Israel.' The sense intended is perhaps similar to that of Am 3 [7]. But the Hebrew is ambiguous, and the connexion of [23] with its context is doubtful. The natural sequel to [22] is found in [24]; and [23] is best regarded as an interpolation.

28b. Cf. the description of Pisgah in 21 [20]. Mount **Peor** is not mentioned again. Peor, as the name of a deity, occurs in 25 [18], 31 [16]; Jos 22 [17]; while the full name Baal-peor is found in 25 [3, 5]; Dt 4 [3]; Ps 106 [28]. A locality Beth-peor, House of (the Baal of) Peor, is mentioned in Dt 3 [29], 4 [46], 34 [6]; Jos 13 [20]; while Baal-peor is seemingly employed as a place-name in Hos 9 [10].

XXIV. **1. as at the other times.** No mention has been made of any previous employment by Balaam of magic to obtain a Divine communication relative to the blessing or cursing of the Israelites. The reference must therefore be to Balaam's methods in his capacity as professional seer (cf. 22 [6]). [But see on 23 [3].—A. G.]

3-9. Balaam's Third Oracle.

3. The Hebrew word translated **closed** (RVm **opened**) is of very doubtful meaning. RV refers to the physical eye; RVm to the eye of the mind (cf. [4c]). **Falling down,** i.e. (possibly) in sleep, or in a trance.

7a. Israel's future prosperity is depicted under the figure of a water-carrier who bears on his shoulders overflowing buckets.

7a, b. The text is doubtful, and it has been proposed to substitute: 'Peoples shall tremble at his might: And his arm shall be upon (i.e. against) many nations.' The metaphor of fertility is then restricted to [6], while that of warfare is found throughout [7].

7c, d. The mention of the Israelite king suggests the period of the monarchy as the date of composition. It is not possible to date the poem precisely, for the reference to Agag is doubtful, there being in 1 S 15 no indication that the power of Amalek was ever such that it might be adduced as a criterion of the power of an Israelite king.

8e. The mention of arrows occurs strangely in a context which compares the might of Israel with that of a beast of prey. Read *And shall smite asunder his oppressors* (cf. clause *c*), or *And shall smite asunder their loins* (cf. clause *d*).

15-19. Balaam's Fourth Oracle.

17. not nigh, i.e. in time. **a star.** For the metaphor, cf. Is 14 [12]; Rev 22 [16]. **the corners of Moab.** Better *the temples* —Moab being personified. **And break down . . .** Read *And* (shall smite) *the crown of the head of all the sons of tumult* (cf. Jer 48 [45]).

18. This mention of the fate in store for Edom is probably not original, in view of the terms of [14].

19. the remnant, i.e. of the enemy. **from the city.** The words are presumably parallel to *out of Jacob* in clause *a*—in which case the city intended will be the capital of the destroyer.

20-24. Three Independent Oracles.— These fragmentary oracles are not in their original context, but owing to their poetical form have become attached to the Balaamite oracles. Editorial links are furnished in the opening clauses of [20, 21, 23].

20. the first of the nations, i.e. in power, not in time. Amalek, so far as we know, never enjoyed a pre-eminence among the nations ([7c, d]), and the emphasis of the present verse is contained not in clause *a*, but in clause *b*. It is the destruction in store for Amalek, rather than her one-time glory, that occupies the writer's mind. An almost complete destruction of Amalek was effected by Saul and by David (1 S 15 [7], 30 [17]). **21.** Cf. Ob [3] f.

23. when God doeth this. Better as margin. The reference is to Asshur and Eber ([24]).

24. Eber—the singular of Abarim (21 [11]). The reference is probably to the districts east of the Euphrates and the Tigris. The name **Kittim** is applied in Is 23 [1, 12] to the inhabitants of Cyprus; in 1 Mac 1 [1], 8 [5] to the Greeks generally; and in Dan 11 [30] to the Romans. In the present passage (cf. Jer 2 [10]; Ezek 27 [6]) the Kittim represent the Western powers generally, just as Asshur and Eber represent the collective might of the East. The prophecy of [23] f. is thus 'a foretelling of the utter overthrow of the sovereignty of the Eastern monarchies by the advanc-

ing power of the great empires of the West. The beginning of the fulfilment was seen in the campaigns of Alexander the Great, but it was much more truly and permanently realized in the development and growth of the empire of the Romans' (*H.D.B.*, iii, 7).

XXV. 1-15. A composite section, derived from JE (1-5) and P (6-15). JE relates the intercourse of the Israelites with the Moabites, P that with the Midianites. Neither narrative is complete—the conclusion of JE and the introduction to P having been suppressed.

1-5. **Intercourse with the Moabites.**—Are in their turn composite, as is proved by the double mention of *Israel* and *the people* in 1, and by the discrepancy of the punishments mentioned in 4 f.

1*a*. JE's parallel to P's summary statement in 22 1. **Shittim** (Abel-shittim, 33 49) lay some six miles east of Jordan (Jos 2 1, 3 1).

2. **for they called.** Better *and they called.* Participation in the idolatrous sacrifices was not the cause, but the consequence, of the illicit intercourse with the daughters of Moab. **their gods.** Better *their god*, i.e. Chemosh (21 29).

3. **Baal-peor**, i.e. the Baal (or local deity) of Peor (23 28).

4. It is the chiefs of the people, and not the actual offenders, who are to be punished (cf. 5, where the actual offenders are ordered to be slain). The primitive conception of morality revealed in 4 is paralleled in 2 S 21 1-14. **before the sun**, i.e. publicly (cf. 2 S 12 12).

5. The original conclusion of JE (which must have related the execution of the Divine command in 4 f.) has been suppressed by an editor.

6-15. **Intercourse with the Midianites.**

6. **while they were weeping.** A reason for this mourning was probably supplied in the original introduction to P. To judge from the existing narrative, that introduction must have described the association of the Israelites with the Midianites, the infliction upon them of the horrors of a plague (8), and their subsequent assembling at the door of the Tent of Meeting. Zimri's sin will therefore have consisted not merely in his having associated with Cozbi, but still more in his having introduced his paramour into the very midst of the Israelite camp.

7. According to the writer of Ps 106 30 f., the conduct of Phinehas in this crisis rendered him worthy to be considered a second Abraham (see also Ecclus 45 23-25; 1 Mac 2 26, 54).

8. The death of Zimri (and Cozbi) seems to have been accepted as sufficient to atone for the sin of all the men of Israel.

12-13. Though Ezekiel (44 10-31) exalted the Zadokites he did not attribute to them descent from Phinehas. His omission to do so was, however, repaired by a later priestly writer (1 Ch 6 4-8, 50-53; Ezr 7 2-5). The present passage is probably intended to support the post-exilic claim of the Zadokite descendants of Phinehas to serve exclusively in the Priesthood.

15. **Zur** is represented in 18 as a prince of Midian, and in 31 8 as one of the five Midianite kings.

16-18. An editorial conclusion, showing points of contact with both JE (note the mention of Peor, 18) and P (note the mention of the Midianites and of the plague).

XXVI. 1-51. **Details of the Second Census.**—As on the occasion of the first census (1-3), the Levites were to be numbered apart from the secular tribes (62).

3-4. Read *And Moses and Eleazar the priest numbered them . . . at Jericho, from twenty years old and upward, as the Lord commanded Moses. And the children of Israel, which came forth out of the land of Egypt, were Reuben . . .*

9*b*-11 are obviously based on 16 in its present composite form.

11. According to 16 35 Korah and his followers were destroyed by fire. Not all of Korah's descendants, however, experienced this fate, as is proved by the reference to the Korahites in 26 58, and by the frequent mention of the 'sons of Korah' as an organized guild of singers connected with the second Temple (see titles of Ps 42-49, 84 f., 87 f.). The verse is probably an insertion intended to explain the existence, in the writer's own day, of these Temple singers.

51. See on 1 1-46.

52-56. The division of the land was to be effected by Moses after the Jordan had been crossed (cf. 33 51, 34 2). In point of fact, however, Moses did not himself enter Canaan (27 12 ff.), so that the command here given him would naturally be executed by his successor Joshua. The method by which the land was to be divided is vague; on the one hand the division was to depend on the size of the various tribes, and on the other on the fall of the lot. Possibly it was to be decided by lot in which part of the country the several tribes were to settle, whether in the north or south, east or west, and then the precise limits of their respective

portions were to depend upon their numbers.

62. 35 1-8 *v.n.* 65. Cf. 14 30.

XXVII. 1-11. **A Law Relating to Landed Property.** 1. Cf. 26 33.

7. According to earlier law, property descended from father to son (Dt 21 15 ff.), while in default of male issue recourse was had to the custom of levirate marriage (Dt 25 5 f.). This custom continued in force until New Testament times (Mt 22 24), and the author of the present section can hardly have been unacquainted with it. It is thus probable that he disapproved of it, and sought, by acknowledging the female right of succession, to obtain the same result as the custom of levirate marriage was intended to secure. A qualification of the present verse is found in 36 1-12.

8-11. The case of Zelophehad's daughters is made the basis of a comprehensive law involving the practical application of one of the guiding principles of Hebrew society. According to Hebrew theory, property was a sacred trust from Jehovah (Lev 25 23), and it must therefore not be allowed permanently to pass out of the possession of the family of him to whom it was originally entrusted. The same principle also underlay the custom of purchase within the family (Ruth 4; Jer 32 6 ff.), and the theoretical, if not practical, observance of the Year of Jubile (see on 36 4).

12-23. **The Appointment of Joshua as Moses' Successor.**

14. Cf. 20 2-13. **to sanctify me . . .** This clause is explanatory of the Divine word (or command) referred to in 14a.

20. The honour of Moses, like his spirit (11 17, 25), is represented as in a sense physical and quantitative.

21. Joshua was not to be privileged to speak to Jehovah directly, as Moses had been (12 7 f.; Ex 33 11), but was to receive his communications mediately through Eleazar, who in turn was to learn the Divine will by means of the Urim and the Tummim (not, as RV, Thummim): Ex 28 30 *v.n.* **at his word,** i.e. the word of Eleazar.

23. The subject is Moses (cf. 18 f.).

XXVIII.-XXIX. appear to be supplementary to the similar calendar of feasts found in Lev 23, and contain a post-exilic scale of compulsory offerings to be made publicly on certain specified days, viz. daily (28 3-8); on the Sabbath (9 f.); on the day of the new moon (11-15); daily during the Feast of Unleavened Bread (17-25); at the Feast of Weeks (26-31); on New Year's Day (29 1-6); on the Day of Atonement (7-11); daily during the Feast of Tabernacles (12-34); on the twenty-second day of the seventh month (35-38). The animals required are in each case males—lambs, rams, and bullocks serving as burnt offerings, goats as sin offerings. Every sacrifice was to be accompanied by an offering of meal, oil, and wine, as prescribed in 15 1-16.

XXVIII. 2. **my offerings made by fire.** The scale is concerned only with burnt offerings and sin offerings (cf. 15, 22, 29 5, 11, 16 ff.). Peace offerings (29 39) are not considered.

3-8. **The Daily Burnt Offering.**—Cf. Ex 29 38 ff.

3. **This is the offering . . . which ye shall offer.** The offerings were to be provided by the community as a whole (cf. Neh 10 32 f.). A scale similar to the present one is found in Ezek 45 18-46 15, but there it is the prince who is charged with the duty of providing the offerings.

9-10. **The Sabbath Offering** (cf. Neh 10 33; 2 Ch 8 13).—This was to be equal in amount to the daily offering.

10. The scale was cumulative, in that the special offerings of the various days were to be additional to the regular daily offering—(?) being offered immediately after the morning sacrifice (23).

11-31. The offerings were to be identical on the first day of each month, daily from the 15th to the 21st of the first month, and on the day of firstfruits, viz. two bullocks, a ram, seven lambs, and a goat.

11-15. **The New Moon.**—The festival of the new moon is mentioned elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in 10 10. It was clearly a popular pre-exilic festival (Is 1 13; Am 8 5), and continued to be observed after the Return (1 Ch 23 31; 2 Ch 8 13; Ezr 3 5).

13. **a several tenth,** i.e. one-tenth in each case.

17-25. **The Feast of Unleavened Bread.**

24. **for seven days,** i.e. daily during the period of the Feast (Lev 23 5-8; Dt 16 1-8).

26-31. **The Feast of Weeks.**

26. **the day of the firstfruits,** i.e. the day on which firstfruits (cf. 18 12) were presented before Jehovah (Lev 23 17, 20). This day was also known as the Feast of Harvest (Ex 23 16) and the Feast of Weeks (Ex 34 22; Dt 16 10).

31. The parenthesis **they shall be . . . without blemish** should probably be restored after 27 (cf. 19).

XXIX. 1-11. The special offerings appropriate to the first and the tenth days of the seventh month were identical, viz. a bullock, a ram, seven lambs, and a goat. (A similar offering was required on the twenty-second day of the month, 35-38.)

1-6. New Year's Day.—Originally the month Tishri (September to October), when the harvest was gathered (Ex 23 [16], 34 [22]), seems to have been the first month of the Jewish year. In course of time, however, the month Nisan (March to April) came to be so regarded (Ex 12 [2]), and the period of the Exile saw the completion of this change. Thus, on the new method of reckoning, New Year's Day would fall on the first day of what was, in the old calendar, the seventh month of the year (Lev 23 [24]; cf. 25 [9], which suggests that it was the tenth, not the first, day of Nisan which was observed as New Year's Day). On this day there would be three distinct offerings, viz. the daily burnt offering, the offering appropriate to the first day of a month, and that appropriate to the day in question.

7-11. The Day of Atonement (cf. Lev 23 [26-32]).—On this day there would be three distinct offerings, viz. the daily offering, the offering appropriate to the day in question, and the sin offering of atonement ([11]). The details of this last offering are given by P in Lev 16.

7. ye shall afflict your souls, i.e. ye shall humble yourselves, and strictly abstain from all food and drink.

12-34. The Feast of Tabernacles (Booths).—Cf. Lev 23 [33-36. 39-43]; Dt 16 [13-15]. On the first day of the Feast the offering was to consist of thirteen bullocks, two rams, fourteen lambs, and a goat. On the six following days the offering was to be the same, save that the number of bullocks was to decrease by one daily.

XXX. The Conditions of the Validity of a Vow.—Vows were not infrequently made in pre-exilic times (see Jg 11 [30] ff.), but it was not until after the Exile that laws were framed for their regulation (Dt 23 [21-23]; cf. Mt 5 [33-37]). According to the present law (which stands alone in the Old Testament in its discussion of the validity of a woman's vow), the vow of a man ([2]), of a widow, or of a divorced woman ([9]), was to be unconditionally binding. That of an unmarried woman was to be binding only if her father approved of it ([3-5]). If a woman married when under a vow, the vow was to continue in force unless her husband raised an objection at the time when he first heard of it ([6-8]). Any vow which she might take after marriage was to be subject to her husband's consent ([10-12]). A husband who consented to his wife's vow, and later rescinded that consent, was himself to bear the responsibility for the non-fulfilment of the vow ([15]).

6. the rash utterance of her lips. Undue haste in uttering a vow was to be no excuse for the non-fulfilment of it.

9 interrupts the sequence between [8] and [10], and is probably misplaced.

10 ff. relate to the vow of a woman living with her husband, and do not imply (as RV suggests) that the vow of a married woman was to be binding even after the death of the husband, or after the dissolution of the marriage bond.

13-15. The conditions here summarized would be equally applicable in the case of father and daughter.

XXXI. War against Midian.—Though the occurrence of a campaign against Midian is not improbable (cf. 25 [16] ff.), the details here given are clearly unhistorical, for the Israelites are represented as slaying every man in Midian ([7]) and burning all their cities ([10]), without themselves suffering a single casualty ([49]). The real purpose is to emphasize the need of ceremonial cleanness ([19-24]), and to set forth the method to be adopted in the distribution of booty taken in war ([25-54]).

6. the trumpets for the alarm. Cf. 10 [1-10].

7-10. Such destruction is wholly incompatible with the later mention of the Midianites as a powerful nation (cf. Jg 6-8; Is 60 [6]).

8. Cf. Jos 13 [21], and 22 [4] *n.*

16. For the erroneous association of the Midianites with Peor, cf. 25 [18].

19-24. Purification after Battle.—Cf. 5 [2], 19 [11-13, 16].

20. These general instructions are elaborated in [21-24]. Every metal article was to be purified by fire and by the water of impurity (19 [9]), while every article liable to destruction by fire was to be cleansed by means of water only.

25-54. The Method of the Distribution of Booty.

27. One half of the booty was to be allotted to those who had actually fought against Midian, and the other half to the rest of the congregation—in accordance with the custom established by David in 1 S 30 [24] f. (cf. Jos 22 [8]).

28-30. Of the booty allotted to the warriors one portion in 500 was to be given to Jehovah for the maintenance of the Priests, while of that allotted to the congregation one portion in 50 was to be given to the Levites (cf. 18 [8-24]).

50 ff. The officers present before Jehovah such jewels of gold as they had acquired (cf. the similar munificent gift described in 7).

54. for a memorial. Cf. Ex 30 [16]. The gift would serve the double purpose of helping to defray the necessary expenses

of worship, and of witnessing to the generosity of those who made the gift.

XXXII. **The Settlement of Certain Tribes East of Jordan.**—The pastoral tribes of Reuben and Gad are permitted to settle east of Jordan, but only on condition that they first assist the remaining tribes in the conquest of Canaan (1-32).

1. **Reuben . . . Gad.** The order of names is reversed throughout the remainder of the chapter, possibly because of the pre-eminence which Gad enjoyed at the time when the narrative was composed (cf. Dt 33 20 f.). **the land of Gilead.** Gilead comprised the whole of the territory east of Jordan from the Arnon to the Yarmuk (which flowed into the Jordan a few miles south of the Sea of Chinnereth), and was divided by the Jabbok into two halves, each of which might be referred to as 'the land of Gilead.' The reference here is to South Gilead, for all the cities enumerated in 3 lay south of the Jabbok.

8-13. Derived in the main from JE. The reference to Joshua (12), however, points to P (cf. 14 30). For the position of Kadesh, see on 10 12, 13 26.

17-18. Cf. Dt 3 18-20, where Moses expressly commands the tribes to cross the river.

33 is questionable, owing to its abrupt mention of the **half tribe of Manasseh** in conjunction with Gad and Reuben. There existed among the Hebrews a strong tradition to the effect that the three tribes settled together on the east of Jordan (see Dt 3 12 f.; Jos 14 3; and cf. Jos 22 7), but this tradition seems to have been unknown to the author of 1-32. 33a would thus appear to be a late insertion. The reference to the kingdoms of **Sihon** and **Og** (33b) also seems to be an editorial description of *the land which Jehovah smote* (4).

38. **(their names being changed.)** The clause is a direction to the reader to substitute for Nebo and Baal (which were the names of heathen deities) names which had no heathen associations: cf. the substitution of Ish-bosheth ('Man of shame,' 2 S 2 8) for Eshbaal ('Man of Baal,' 1 Ch 8 33).

39-42. **The Settlement of Manasseh East of Jordan.**—This incident may once have formed part of the narrative embodied in Jg 1 27-29 *v.n.* (Jos 16 10, 17 11-13), and Jos 17 14-18.

39. **Gilead.** The reference is clearly to the northern half of Gilead, since the southern portion had already been occupied by Gad and Reuben (see on 1).

XXXIII. 1-49. **The Itinerary from Egypt to Moab.**—Sixteen of the names given are not found elsewhere, while many of the sites are unidentified.

2. Cf. Ex 17 14, 24 4, 34 27 f.; Dt 31 9, 22, 24. In view of the admittedly high literary attainments of the Babylonians from very early times, and the extent of the area over which their influence spread, there seems to be no reason to question the ability of Moses to express himself in writing.

4. No mention of the burial of the Egyptian dead occurs in Exodus.

38. Cf. 20 28.

50-56. **The Command to Drive out the Canaanites and to Settle in Canaan.**—The emphasis with which any association of the Israelites with the Canaanites was always condemned affords eloquent testimony to the fascination which Baal-worship exercised upon the minds of the Israelites during the period of the settlement in Canaan (cf. Ex 23 24, 32 f., 34 12-16; Dt 7 1-5, 12 2 f.).

54. Cf. 26 52 ff.

XXXIV. 1-15. **The Boundaries of Israel's Territory West of Jordan.**—Cf. Ezek 47 13-20.

3-5. **The Southern Boundary.**—The eastern limit of the southern boundary was marked by the south-east extremity of the Dead Sea. From this point it turned south-west along the border of Edom, and passed through the wilderness of Zin, keeping to the south of Kadesh-barnea. Thence it took a north-west turn, and followed the line of the Brook of Egypt as far as the coast. The border was thus approximately semicircular in shape.

4. **the ascent of Akrabbim.** Probably a pass in the Wâdy-el-Fikrah, which runs from the south-west into the Dead Sea. Neither **Hazar-addar** nor **Azmon** has been identified.

5. **the brook of Egypt,** i.e. the Wâdy-el-'Arîsh, which passes through the northern portion of the Sinaitic peninsula, and empties itself into the Mediterranean midway between Pelusium and Gaza. It is frequently specified in the Old Testament as the south-west boundary of Canaan (Jos 15 4; 1 K 8 65; Is 27 12).

6. **The Western Boundary.**—In Ezek 47 20 this boundary is defined as the Mediterranean Sea, as far north as a point on the coast due east of the entering in of Hamath. In reality, however, the Mediterranean never formed the actual western border, for the Philistines occupied the southern end of the Maritime plain, while the Phœnicians held Tyre and Sidon in the north.

7-9. **The Northern Boundary.**—This

commenced at a point on the coast opposite the Lebanon range, and extended across the country as far as the Jordan. Its precise course cannot be determined, for neither Zedad nor Ziphron has been identified.

8. Hor. Not the Hor of 20 [22], but one of the heights of Lebanon. **the entering in of Hamath:** 13 [21] *v.n.*

9. Hazar-enan lay on the north border of the territory of Damascus (Ezek 48 [1]), in the district in which the Jordan takes its rise.

10-12. The Eastern Boundary.—This was to extend from Hazar-enan to the Sea of Chinnereth, and thence to follow the east bank of the Jordan as far as the south-east extremity of the Dead Sea.

11. Shepham. Unidentified. **Riblah.** Not the Riblah of 2 K 23 [33], which lay on the Orontes, sixty-five miles north of Damascus, but an unknown site between Hazar-enan and the Sea of Galilee. **Ain** ('Well'). The name is too vague to permit of the site being identified.

16-29. A list of the representatives of the nine and a half tribes who were to assist Eleazar and Joshua in the division of the land.

XXXV. **1-8. Levitical Cities and Cities of Refuge.**—The secular tribes were to give to the Levites forty-eight cities, six of which were to serve as Cities of Refuge. This requirement that the Levites should inhabit cities of their own is in direct contradiction to 26 [62]. It is also at variance with the position attributed to the Levites in the historical and prophetical books, and in Deuteronomy. In pre-exilic times Priests did not inhabit special cities, but were found, e.g., at Shiloh (1 S 1 [3]), at Nob (1 S 21 [1], 22 [19]), and at Bethel (Am 7 [10]). Though they were recognized as owners of property (1 K 2 [26]; Jer 32 [6] ff.; cf. Dt 18 [8]), it is not clear whether this was in virtue of their position as private individuals or in virtue of their office. In any case there is not sufficient evidence to show that the requirement of Nu 35 [1-8] was generally observed in pre-exilic times. The law of Deuteronomy (beginning of 7th century) required all the country Levites to abandon their local altars, and to serve as ministers at the central sanctuary, deriving their sustenance not from any possessions of their own, but from the generosity of the people generally (12 [12, 19], 14 [29], 16 [11]). It is thus clear that the theory of P was a theory only, and did not reflect early practice. The first attempt to provide a fixed possession for the Priests and Levites was made by Ezekiel, in his vision of the future (48 [8-14]); and the present passage is therefore to be understood as an attempt to support the post-exilic claims of the Levites by reading back into the narrative of early times conditions which were only ideal even in Ezekiel's day.

8. Jos 21 *v.n.* (P) records the carrying out of Moses' command.

9-34. The Distinction between Murder and Manslaughter.—The employment, by one who had slain his fellow, of a weapon of iron, stone, or wood, was to be accepted as evidence of intention to kill, in the absence of definite proof to the contrary. If such proof were forthcoming, then (despite the use of a murderous weapon) the slayer was to be declared guilty of manslaughter only, and not of murder. The responsibility of deciding between a case of manslaughter and one of murder was to rest with the congregation as a whole ([24]). A convicted murderer was to be slain by the avenger of blood ([19]). A homicide was to be restored to the City of Refuge into which he had at the first been received, and was to remain there in safety until the death of the then High Priest. Should he leave his asylum during the lifetime of the High Priest, his life was to be forfeit to the avenger of blood. After the death of the High Priest, however, he was to be allowed to return unmolested to his own home ([25-28]).

12. the avenger, i.e. the next of kin of the victim, whose duty it was to secure for his family the equivalent of the blood which had been shed. This he did by slaying the murderer. In early times the homicide as well as the murderer was liable thus to be slain, while even the members of the murderer's family were not immune from vengeance (2 S 21 [1] ff.). The present law represents an advance upon early custom, for it insists that the murderer alone is to be put to death—and that only after careful enquiry has been made by the whole congregation.

14. Dt 19 [1-13] *v.n.*

25. In early days the right of sanctuary was associated with altars, where homicides were safe under the protection of the Priest (Ex 21 [14]; 1 K 1 [50], 2 [28]). This privilege would naturally lapse on the death of their protector.

30. Cf. Dt 17 [6].

31-33. A summary statement to the effect that the life of a murderer might not be redeemed by a money payment (nor might money be accepted in lieu of the manslayer's period of virtual imprisonment in the City of Refuge). The stain of innocent blood could be removed only

by the shedding of the blood of the murderer.

XXXVI. **A Supplement to 27 [1-11].**—The case of Zelophehad's daughters is further discussed, and it is ordained that they, and all other female landowners, must marry within their own tribe. The possibility of Zelophehad's daughters marrying outside their own tribe of Manasseh was not considered in 27; hence if the original law had not been supplemented, the very object of that law (viz. to secure to each tribe the continued possession of the lands originally allotted to it) would have been defeated.

4. In the Year of Jubile (so called from the Hebrew word for *trumpet*, Lev 25 [9]), property which had been sold returned automatically to its original owner or his representatives (Lev 25 [13]), but property which had been acquired by inheritance was not recoverable. According to the theory of Lev 25 [8] ff., sale in the strict sense of the term would be unknown in Israel. 'The utmost that an owner . . . could do was to grant a lease of the property, the term of the lease to expire at the next jubilee, however near that might be; . . . the price was to be regulated by the number of the crops due before the jubilee.' It is highly improbable that the Jubilee Year was ever historically observed. 'The denunciations of land-grabbing in Isaiah and Micah show that no such law was operative even if in existence. Moreover, no single undisputed historical allusion to the jubilee exists' (*H.D.B.*, iv, 325).

DEUTERONOMY

By J. Battersby Harford

Introduction.—The true follower of Jesus Christ cannot take up this book without deep reverence and love, for to Him it was manifestly most precious. Within it He found that inculcation of whole-hearted love to God, which was to Him the first and great commandment (Dt 6 [4] f.; Mk 12 [29] || s). From it He took the missiles with which He discomfited the Tempter (Dt 8 [3], 6 [16, 13]; cf. Mt 4 [4, 7, 10]; Lk 4 [4, 8, 12]). His Apostles cherished a like regard for Deuteronomy. It is quoted some thirty-two times in the New Testament, and Westcott and Hort recognize less direct references to its words in about eighty passages.

If the student is a literary and historical scholar, he will find in Deuteronomy problems of authorship and date which are of great interest and great intricacy (see 2-6 below), but if he be first and foremost a humble follower of his Lord, the solving of these problems will be subordinate in importance to the supreme task of listening to what God will say to him from this ancient Scripture (see A).

Space being necessarily limited in this Commentary, the notes deal in the main with those matters of history, geography, and phraseology which require elucidation. The devout reader will find no difficulty in applying to his own life the spiritual lessons of the book.

It is taken for granted that the reader will possess and use a copy of the RV *with references*. These have been admirably compiled, and will be found to supplement and complete the references in the Commentary.

(A) **The Spiritual Ideals and Message of the Book.**—The thoughtful reader of the Bible speedily becomes conscious that he is breathing a high and holy atmosphere which distinguishes the sacred books of the Hebrews from all other ancient literature with which he is acquainted. It is the atmosphere of the presence of God. But also, within this literature, he becomes aware of marked differences. He perceives a progressive advance in the conception of God and of religion. Of this Deuteronomy is an outstanding example. In noble and eloquent language the inspired writer or writers set forth (i) the unique glory of Jehovah as the 'One' and only God; 'He is God in Heaven above and upon the earth beneath: there is none else' (6 [4], 4 [35-39], 10 [14, 17]). Israel must therefore have none other gods beside Him (5 [7], 6 [14, 15], etc.). (ii) He is a Spiritual Being. Israel 'saw no form' when Jehovah spake unto them in Horeb, and therefore Israel must make no image of Him after the manner of the heathen around. (iii) Jehovah is 'the great God, the mighty and the terrible' (10 [17]). Israel must therefore 'fear' Him and 'serve' Him, and loyally keep His commandments (6 [13], 10 [12, 13, 20]). (iv) Above all, Jehovah 'loves' Israel. He has chosen the nation to be His special possession (4 [37], 7 [6-8], 10 [15], etc.). He has made a covenant with it (4 [13], 5 [2] f., 9 [9-11];

cf. Hos 6 [7], 8 [1]). He has given to it the land of promise with all it contained (6 [10-11], 8 [7-10]). Even His provings of it in the wilderness and His chastisements have been prompted by a Father's love (8 [5]). Such love on the part of Jehovah calls for a corresponding love on the part of His people. Israel must love Jehovah with all its heart and soul and strength (6 [5], 10 [12], 11 [1, 13, 22], 13 [3], 19 [9], 30 [6, 16, 20]), must be faithful to the covenant, and cherish the memory of all His goodness and His gifts (8 [2, 11]), and must serve Him whole-heartedly (8 [18], 6 [12, 13]). Israel is a holy people, i.e. a people *set apart* by Jehovah to be especially His, and therefore must live a separated life, refusing to have anything to do with the idolatrous worship of the Canaanites, observing the special laws and regulations which Jehovah has laid down and carrying His principles of justice, mercy, and righteousness into its whole religious, moral, and social life (7 [6], 14 [2, 21], 26 [19], 28 [9]). (The parallelisms with Hosea and Jeremiah in thought and expression are noteworthy.)

Deuteronomy, it has been well said, 'is a book of national religion, but it is withal a book of personal religion, and so of universal religion.' The stress laid upon holy love, loyalty, and obedience transfers attention from mere national observances to the state of individual hearts, and so Deuteronomy prepares the way for 'the greatest of Israel's sons' to proclaim love to God as the supreme law, not only for Israel, but for the whole world (see J. E. Carpenter, quoted by Driver, xxxiv).

This spiritual teaching is in no way affected by the literary questions discussed in the following sections. God speaks to us, whoever may be the agent whom He inspires for the purpose.

(B) **Deuteronomy is a Compilation.**—The book, as we now have it, is a compilation and received its final editing after the Exile. In form it consists, for the most part, of addresses delivered by Moses to the Children of Israel in the land of Moab at the end of the fortieth year after the Exodus (1 [1-5]). But 'the discourses are put together with introductory and concluding notes (which, however, differ little in style from the rest of the work), and the last part of the work with its account of Moses' death, and in one or two places what seem unmistakable indications of JE and P hands (in 31, 32, and 34) point clearly to editorial redaction' (Orr, 251. For this and other references see Bibliography at end.) The style and phraseology of Deuteronomy clearly mark it off from the rest of the Pentateuch. 'There are marked differences between the Deuteronomic and the JE and P styles' (Orr, 253). 'Particular words and phrases recur with extraordinary frequency, giving a distinctive colouring to every part of the work' (Driver, *Deuteronomy*, lxxvii [quoted with approval by Orr, 253], and see lxxviii-lxxxiv). It is obvious that the narrative framework is not by Moses. The writer or writers speak of Moses consistently in the third person (1 [1, 5], 4 [41, 44], 5 [1], 27 [1, 9, 11], 29 [1, 2], 31 [1, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 22, 24, 25, 30], 32 [44, 45]; cf. 32 [48] (P), 33 [1] (JE), 34 [1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12] (JEDP). But, further, the fact that 'a distinctive colouring' runs through practically the whole book points to the conclusion that the speeches, as well as the narratives, are in their phraseology the composition of the author or authors. 'Ancient writers permitted themselves much freedom in ascribing to historical characters speeches which they could not have actually delivered in the shape in which they are now assigned to them.' 'In the Chronicles, e.g., David, Solomon, and various early prophets express ideas and use idioms which are distinctively late, and are mostly peculiar to the compiler of Chronicles himself' (Driver, lvii-lviii). The Deuteronomic writer, therefore, does not do anything unjustifiable and unfair in putting these speeches into the mouth of Moses. 'The composition of a book of exhortation or instruction in the form of addresses by Moses—provided this is only a literary dress—is not *a priori* to be ruled out as inadmissible or incompatible with just views of Scripture' (Orr, 249). And when we consider the fundamental principles of Deuteronomy, we may say with Driver (lix) that 'in substance they are Mosaic,' although the rhetorical form in which they are presented is that of 'the post-Mosaic author.'

(C) **When, then, was Deuteronomy Compiled ?**—(1) There are those who still stand valiantly for the Mosaic authorship, while admitting that there has been subsequent editorial revision and adaptation.

(*a*) If, however, we compare two groups of discourses, professedly delivered by the same man within six months of one another (viz. Nu 26-36 and Dt), we find a difference in vocabulary, in outlook, and situation, and in legislation so great that it seems impossible to believe that both came from the same hand.

(*b*) Moreover, if we study the laws in

Deuteronomy itself (12-26), we find (*a*) little attempt to treat subjects for legislation in an intelligible order, and (*b*) many laws deal with problems which could only have come into sight after settlement in the land (e.g. 21^{1-9}). The code seems to be, not the original work of a single mind and elaborated at one time, but a compilation of laws due to various minds and dealing with problems which cropped up, one after the other, through a considerable period of time.

(2) The main body of scholars identify Deuteronomy (in part, at least) with 'the Book of the Law,' upon which was based the Reformation under Josiah. 'Deuteronomy insists upon two special reforms . . . really corollaries from its fundamental principle. . . . The first was the nationalization of worship; the second was its centralization at Jerusalem' (Welch, *R.I.K.*, 207). And when we turn to 2 K 22-23 we see that these are the keynotes of the Reform under Josiah. A long list of parallels can be drawn up showing the close connexion between Deuteronomy and that Reform. At some earlier time, not earlier than Hezekiah nor later than Josiah, the regulations in Dt 12-26 were *compiled*. Probably various shorter collections of laws existed at the principal sanctuaries, including very ancient usages and customs side by side with more recent decisions and with sacrificial regulations. In Deuteronomy we find these put together probably very much in the order in which they stood in the earlier collections, but recast as regards a good deal of the phraseology. We can thus account for different forms of the same law co-existing within the same book, and for the heterogeneous assortment of much of the material.

(3) Professors Hölscher and Kennett would have us date Deuteronomy in the 6th century B.C. The former argues that many of the laws (about the tithe, harvest festivals, firstlings, etc.), taken in conjunction with the declaration that Jerusalem was the sole legitimate sanctuary, are seen to be quite impracticable. They are therefore the dreams of priests in exile. It seems, however, only to require common sense to see through these supposed impracticabilities. Professor Kennett, on the other hand, regards Deuteronomy as the work of the Jewish communities left in Palestine. He dates even J and E after the Reform of Josiah, and their combination into JE after the carrying away of the priests from Jerusalem. Deuteronomy, therefore, must be still later, but probably before 530 B.C. His arguments are extremely ingenious, and some scholars are inclined to go a considerable way in the direction indicated by these two writers.

(4) Professor Welch of Edinburgh, however, bids us pause, and invites us to regard the legislation in 12-26 (after eliminating 12^{1-7}) as the product of the religious movement led by the earlier prophets from Samuel onwards. 'The place which Jehovah thy God shall choose to place his name there' does not, he says, mean one central sanctuary, but any local sanctuary of pure Jehovah-worship. But a careful study of the twenty-one passages in Dt 12-31, in which this phrase occurs, and comparison with similar phrases with regard to the land, the way, etc., in 1^{8}, 8^{2}, 26^{1-3}, etc., seem clearly to show that the phrase, as it now stands, can only mean the one sanctuary at Jerusalem. Moreover some, even much, of the legislation may be of early origin and yet the final compilation be sometime within measurable distance of Josiah's reign.

Is it possible, in the face of these conflicting views, to construct a theory which will explain the facts? It seems reasonable to believe that (i) in Deuteronomy we have a compilation of laws and groups of laws, laid down at different times, at different centres, and by different authorities. The laws about tithe, first-fruits, and sacrifices originally required only that they should be offered at a local sanctuary of Jehovah. (ii) But experience proved the difficulty of controlling the ritual and customs of these local shrines. A certain school, composed both of priests and prophets, deemed that purity of worship could only be secured by centralization. One or more of their number took the original laws, breathed into them the new ideals, and expressed them in the new phraseology, altered the phrase which commanded attendance at local sanctuaries, so as to make attendance henceforth obligatory at the central shrine, and made the meaning clear by prefixing 12^{1-7}. Probably part of 1-11 was the original preface to the new law-book, and part was added later.

(D) **The Influence of Deuteronomy on the Historical Records.**—The historical books from Joshua to 2 Kings, in the Hebrew Old Testament, are entitled 'The Former Prophets.' In them history is written for the purpose of edification. From earlier records those narratives are selected which lend themselves to such treatment, and these are worked up and

enclosed as it were in a framework of comment, which aims at interpreting God's dealings with His people in the past to His people in the writer's own day. The interesting point for us here is that the standpoint of the compilers is the standpoint of Deuteronomy. Jos 1, e.g., is redolent with the phrases of Deuteronomy, and in the books of Kings the monarchs of both kingdoms are uniformly judged by their attitude towards the Temple at Jerusalem (see the Introductions to the historical books). It is not too much to say that the whole of the Hebrew literature then extant was worked over by men whose minds were dominated by the ideals of Deuteronomy.

(E) **The Historical Retrospects in Deuteronomy.**—(i) The first retrospect (1-3) gives a clear and consecutive account of the events from Horeb to 'the plains of Moab,' but leaves blank two periods, viz. the journey from Horeb to Kadesh, and the thirty-eight years' wanderings in the wilderness. In the exhortation which follows (4^{1-40}) the speaker goes back to the deliverance from Egypt and the awfulness of the revelation on Mount Sinai and the giving of 'the ten words' on two tables of stone. A note is inserted (4^{41-43}) stating that Moses 'then' separated three cities to which the manslayer might flee, on the east side of Jordan. 4^{44-49} seems to be a new commencement. The discourse or discourses which follow make reference to the deliverance from Egypt (three times: 6^{21-23}, 7^{18-19}, 11^{28} = Ex 12-13), the overthrow of Egypt's host at the Red Sea (11^{4} = Ex 14^{24} ff.), the tempting at Massah (6^{16}; cf. 33^{8} = Ex 17^{7}), Horeb, the first forty days in the Mount (9^{9-10*} = Ex 24^{12-18}), the molten calf (9^{11-16} = Ex 32^{1-24}), the breaking of the first tables of stone (9^{17} = Ex 32^{19}), the destruction of the calf (9^{21} = Ex 32^{20}), the making of an ark by Moses (not recorded in present text of Exodus), and the hewing of a second set of tables of stone, with which he goes up into the Mount (10^{1-3} = Ex 34^{1-4}), forty days' intercession (9^{18-20}, 10^{10}; cf. Ex 32^{30}, 33^{12-23}, 34^{28}), 'the ten words' written on the tables by Jehovah ($10^{2, 4}$ = Ex $34^{1, 28}$), brought down by Moses and placed in the ark ($10^{2, 5}$, no parallel in present text of Exodus), the provocations at Taberah (9^{22} = Nu 11^{3}, Massah (9^{22}, and see above), and Kibroth-hattaavah (9^{22} = Nu 11^{34}), the refusal to advance at Kadesh (9^{23} = Nu 14), the forty years in the wilderness ($8^{2, 4}$ = Nu 14^{33}), the manna ($8^{3, 16}$ = Ex $16^{4, 15, 35}$; Nu 11^{6-9}), Dathan and Abiram (11^{6} = Nu 16), the fiery serpents (8^{15} = Nu 21^{6}), the giving of water out of the rock at Meribah Kadesh (8^{15}; cf. 33^{8}, 32^{51} = Nu 20^{8}), the death of Aaron at Moserah (10^{6}; ctr. Nu 20^{22-29}), the separation of the tribe of Levi to carry the ark, etc., at (?) Jotbathah (10^{8-9}; ctr. Nu 3^{5}-4^{49}, and 8).

(ii) On comparing these references, the discovery is made that, both in the continuous narratives in 1^{6}-3^{29} and 9^{8}-10^{11}, and also in the scattered references throughout, Deuteronomy follows the sections of Exodus and Numbers, which are assigned on other grounds to JE. Even in passages in which JE and P are interwoven, Deuteronomy regularly bases itself upon the sections which are assigned to JE, and avoids those which belong to P. The fact that $10^{2, 5, 6, 8-9}$ refer to events not recorded in existing JE passages and contrary to P passages points to the conclusion that not all of JE was included in the final Pentateuch.

(F) **The Main Collection of Laws (12-26).**—This collection, when compared with the other collections in the Pentateuch, exhibits the following phenomena:

(i) It is based upon the laws in JE (Ex 20^{22}-23^{33}, 34^{10-26}, 13^{3-16}), sometimes repeating a law verbatim, sometimes expanding, sometimes recasting in its own characteristic phraseology.

(ii) It has a number of parallels with the law of holiness (Lev 17-26 and probably Lev 11^{2-23}; Nu 15^{37-41}, 33^{52} f., ^{55} f.). These parallels relate to the substance rather than to the wording of the laws. There is no literary dependence, with one exception (Dt 14^{3-20}; Lev 11^{2-23}).

(iii) It has only slight parallelism with the rest of the priestly code in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. 'There are no verbal parallels'; much that is of central significance in P is absent from Deuteronomy; where they touch common ground, Deuteronomy and P exhibit striking differences. The Tabernacle, the sons of Aaron as the priests in distinction from the Levites, the Levitical cities, the meal, guilt, and sin offerings, the Day of Atonement, are never mentioned. The status of the Levites, the annual feasts, tithes, firstfruits, etc., are very differently treated.

Bibliography

(1) **Introduction:** A. H. McNeile, *Deuteronomy: its Place in Revelation*, 1912; D. C. Simpson, *Pentateuchal Criticism*, chap. v, 2nd edition, 1924; J. S. Griffiths, *The Problem of Deuteronomy*, 1911, conservative; H. M. Wiener, *The Main Problem of Deuteronomy*, 1920, etc.;

A. C. Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, 1925, *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom*, 1912; Hölscher (article in *Z.A.W.*, 1921, etc.); R. H. Kennett, *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, 1920, etc.; J. Battersby Harford, *Since Wellhausen*, chap. v. (The Author, Ripon, 1926). See also articles in the Dictionaries of the Bible.

The most recent German discussions of Deuteronomy are: W. Stärk, *Das Problem des Deuteronomiums*, 1924; M. Löhr, *Das Deuteronomium*, 1925; K. Budde, *Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias* (*Z.A.W.*, 1926).

(2) **Commentaries which may be consulted**: Driver in *I.C.C.*; Harper in the *Ex. B.*; G. A. Smith in *C.B.*; Wheeler Robinson in the *Cent. B.*

I. 1-5. Introductory.

1. The audience—'**all Israel**' (fourteen times in Deuteronomy, in Pentateuch only again in Ex $12^{3,6}$ (P) and 18^{25}; Nu 16^{34} (E), which are not quite the same); the speaker—'**Moses**' (and so 1^{5}, etc.); the place—'**beyond Jordan**' (from the point of view of Western Palestine, as 1^{5}, 3^{8}, 4^{41-49}). **in the wilderness in the Arabah**: the wilderness may mean that of the wanderings (1^{19}, 2^{1}), or that to the east of Moab (2^{8}), but neither is congruous with the Arabah, which is the deep valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea (1^{7}, 11^{30}), is west of Moab, and extends south to the Gulf of Akabah (according to 2^{8}). **Suph**: cf. Suphah (Nu 21^{14}, but see RVm) or, as LXX, Vulgate = the sea of Suph (i.e. reeds), i.e. the Red Sea, as Ex 10^{19}, etc.; cf. Ex 2^{3} 'the flags.' **Paran** (1 K 11^{18}, between Midian and Egypt): cf. 'Mount Paran' (Dt 33^{2}; Hab 3^{3}), and 'the wilderness of Paran' (Gen 21^{21}; Nu 10^{12} *v.n.*, etc.), but these are far from 'the plains of Moab.' **Tophel, Laban, Hazeroth, Di-zahab**: these names cannot be satisfactorily identified with places 'beyond Jordan.' Libnah and Hazeroth are mentioned on the route from Horeb to Kadesh (Nu $33^{17,20}$). The reference in ^{2} to the journey from Horeb suggests that 1^{6-2} belong to an account of that journey, and have been transplanted here.

2. Horeb (nine times in Deuteronomy, and so Ex 3^{1}, 17^{6}, 33^{6} (all E); 1 K 8^{9} (= 2 Ch 5^{10}) (D^{2}), 19^{8}; Ps 106^{19}; Mal 4^{4}) ctr. Sinai (J in Ex 19 and 34, six times, P in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, twenty-four times) in 33^{2}. **Mount Seir**, i.e. the hill country of Seir (cf. ^{7}), as $2^{1,5}$; Gen 32^{3}, 36^{8-9} = Edom proper. **Kadesh-barnea** (1^{19}, 2^{14}, 9^{23}; Nu 32^{8}, etc.), often simply **Kadesh** (1^{46}, etc.) = 'Ain-Kadis, a small oasis fifty miles south of Beersheba, where a stream flows out from under a massive rock. The route mentioned in this verse is 160 to 170 miles long. Robinson (*B.R.*, ii, 565-567) took eleven days.

3. P alone (in the Pentateuch) reckons by months and days (cf. Ex 12^{1-42}, 16^{1}, 19^{1}; Nu 1^{1}, etc.). **fortieth year**: see 2^{7}. **according unto all**, etc.: cf. Ex $39^{32.42}$, 40^{16}, + six times. **Sihon** and **Og**: see 2^{26} ff., 3^{1} ff., etc. **Ashtaroth** (plural of Ashtoreth) must have been a town at which Ashtoreth, the Canaanitish goddess, was worshipped (? = Tell 'Ashtore, fifteen miles north of Der'at). **Edrei** probably = Edre'at (Der'at) on the south border of Bashan ($3^{1,10}$); cf. Jos 13^{12}: 'in Ashtaroth *and* in Edrei,' and so LXX, Vulgate here.

5. the land of Moab, as 29^{1}, etc., ctr. 34^{1}. **began**: rather 'set himself' (as Gen $18^{27,31}$: 'have taken upon me'). **declare** in old sense = 'make clear, expound.' **this law**: i.e. the laws contained in Dt 12-26, as 4^{8}, etc.

6-III. 29. Retrospect of Israel's History from Horeb to Beth-peor.—The first part of the first discourse by Moses (according to present arrangement).

I. 6. The LORD as always = Jehovah (see Ex 3^{15}, 6^{2-8}). **Jehovah our God** occurs twenty-three times in Deuteronomy: cf. my (3), thy (231), his (2), your (46) God (total, 305 times). It enforces the fundamental truth of the Covenant-relationship between Israel and Jehovah.

7. turn you and take your journey, as Nu 14^{25}, but there in a command to turn back from Kadesh, as 1^{40}. **the hill country** (lit.: the hill) **of the Amorites** = the south of Judah. **Amorites** = (especially in D and E) the early inhabitants of Canaan generally, both west and east of Jordan, occupying the hill-country (ctr. usage in 7^{1}, where it is = one of seven nations). **Canaanites** in D and D^{2} apparently = the inhabitants of the Arabah and part of the coast of the Mediterranean (11^{30}; Jos 5^{1}, 13^{4}). **The land of the Canaanites** may here be used in this limited sense, or of the whole of Canaan, as in later usage. The construction suggests that **the land . . . Euphrates** is a later addition. The Amorites seem to have been wiped out (Am 2^{9-10}) and regarded in after days as giants (1^{28}), whereas the Canaanites remained as thorns in the side of Israel (Jg 3^{1-5}; Nu 33^{51-55}). **the lowland** (Hebrew, the Shephēlah): i.e. the region of foothills between the hill-country and the coast lands; cf. the 'lowlands' of Scotland. A list of the towns of the Shephēlah is given in Jos 15^{33-44}, **the**

south (Hebrew, the Negeb): i.e. the 'dry land' in the south of Judah (Gen 12 [9], RVm; Nu 13 [17]; Jos 15 [21-32]), where the meagre vegetation is dried up by the summer heat. **the seashore**: i.e. the coast lands.

9-18. The Appointment of Heads and Captains to Act under Moses.—Cf. Nu 11 [14, 16-17, 24-30] (note the parallels, [14], 'I am not able to bear . . . alone'; and [16], 'officers'), and Ex 18 [12-26] (note [18], 'thou art not able to . . . thyself alone'; [25], 'and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands,' etc.). In Numbers 'the Elders' receive the spirit of *prophecy*; nothing is said about judging. In Deuteronomy, Exodus and Numbers seem to be combined. Very possibly Ex 18 stood at one time at the end of the Horeb stories.

15. captains = 'rulers' in Ex 18 [25] (elsewhere frequently translated 'princes' or 'chiefs'). **officers** (Hebrew, shōterim) = (i) subordinate officials (Ex 5 [6-19]; Dt 20 [5-9]; Jos 1 [10], 3 [2]); associated (ii) with Elders (Nu 11 [16]); (iii) with judges (Dt 16 [18]); (iv) with both together (Jos 8 [33], 23 [2], 24 [1]); (v) with 'princes' or 'rulers' (as here); (vi) at a later time classed, along with princes and judges, as Levites (1 Ch 23 [4], 26 [29], 27 [1]).

16. judges apparently = the 'heads' and 'captains' of [15]. See 16 [18-20] note.

17. The cause that is too hard for you = Ex 18 [26].

9, 16, 18. at that time occurs frequently in the retrospects (ten times in 1-3, also 4 [14], 9 [19], 10 [1, 8]).

19-28. Journey from Horeb to Kadesh. Mission of the Spies. Murmuring.—Cf. Nu 13 [26], 'Kadesh,' [17-21a, 22-24, 26-29] (JE), ctr. Nu 13 [1-17a], etc. (P); see Nu 13, introductory note.

19. terrible wilderness, as 8 [15] = the wilderness of El-Tih, an arid, featureless waste, verdant only in the larger wadys and during the spring and winter rains. **Horeb** and **Kadesh**: see [2]. **Amorites**: see [7].

22. The people take the initiative: ctr. Nu 13 [1-2] (P). D in all probability followed JE here as throughout the rest of the story, but JE's beginning of the story has in Nu 13 disappeared in favour of the beginning in P.

23. twelve men, one man for every tribe. So P. Probably JE had the same. One indication of this is that the word for 'tribe' in Deuteronomy is shēvĕt (JE's word) and not *măṭṭĕh* (P).

24. mountain, rather 'hill-country' as in [20]. **valley** = torrent-valley = 'brook' in 2 [13]. **Eshcol,** name given by the spies, because of 'the cluster' of grapes (Nu 13 [23-24], E); not identified, but apparently near Hebron (Nu 13 [22], J). **spied out.** In the Hebrew JE's word is used (Nu 21 [32]; Jos 14 [7], not P's; Nu 13 [2], etc.). See [33] below.

25. a good land. Nine times in Dt 1-11; cf. J, Ex 3 [8]; P, Nu 14 [7]. **the sons of the 'Anakim,** as 9 [2a]; cf. 2 [10, 11, 21]; Nu 13 [22, 28, 33]; Jos 15 [14] (11 [21-22], R[d]), a race of great stature.

29-39. Moses' Expostulation. Jehovah's Wrath. Moses and the older Generation shall not see the good land. Joshua and the younger Generation shall possess it.

30. who goeth before you, as [33]; Ex 13 [21]; Nu 14 [14] (cf. 'with you': Dt 20 [4], 31 [6]). **before your eyes.** Eleven times in Deuteronomy, less frequent elsewhere.

33. seek out: translated here as in Nu 10 [33]; elsewhere 'spy out,' as Nu 13 [2], etc., P; see Nu 9 [15-23] note.

35. of this evil generation: not in LXX nor in Nu 14 [22] f.

36. Caleb alone as Nu 13 [30] (J) and 14 [24] (JE); Jos 14 [6-15] ('and concerning thee' is an editorial insertion): ctr. Nu 13 [6, 16], 14 [6, 30, 38] (P). According to Jos 14 [6, 14], 15 [17]; Nu 32 [12], Caleb is a Kenizzite. According to Nu 13 [6] (P) (see note), he is of the tribe of Judah.

37. for your sakes. The fact that Moses did not enter the Land of Promise is thus explained. Although he in no way abetted the murmuring of the nation, yet he was their leader, and was to that extent involved in their rebellion (so also 3 [26], 4 [21]): ctr. Nu 20 [10-12], 27 [14]; Dt 32 [51] (all P), which attribute his exclusion to an event which happened thirty-seven years later.

38. Joshua . . . which standeth before thee (for the phrase cf. 1 K 10 [8]; Dt 10 [8]). Joshua comes into the story, not as one of the spies, but as 'Moses' minister' (Ex 24 [13], 33 [11]; Nu 11 [28]; Jos 1 [1]), who belongs to the younger generation, and is at once designated as Moses' successor (ctr. Nu 27 [15-23], in which Joshua's appointment is made thirty-seven years later).

39. your little ones . . . prey (as Nu 14 [3, 31]), not in LXX, Vulgate, and probably late insertion.

40-46. Command to Turn South. Presumptuous Attack. Defeat. Stay in Kadesh.—Turn you . . . Red Sea = Nu 14 [25]. *'the way of the Red Sea,'* as 2 [1]; Nu 14 [25], 21 [4], i.e. along the coast of the gulf of Akabah (cf. 2 [8]; 1 K 9 [26]).

41-45. See Nu 14 [39b-45] (JE).

41. We will go up. *We* (emphatic), not the children.

44. the Amorites. In Nu 14 [43-45] 'the Amalekite and the Canaanite.' See [7]

note. **in Seir.** Seir or Edom seems to be usually the region east of the Arabah, but, if used correctly, is here used of the region west of the Arabah. Jos 11 17, 12 7 speak of 'Mount Halak that goeth up to Seir,' as part of the south limit of Canaan, and Trumbull speaks of an elevated plain of es-Seer in that neighbourhood. Very probably we should read (with LXX, Syriac, Vulgate) 'from Seir to Hormah.' **Hormah.** In Jos 12 14, 15 30, 19 4; 1 S 30 30; 1 Ch 4 30, Hormah is one of a list of towns in the south of Judah or Simeon 'in the Negeb on the border of Edom.' The site is uncertain, but was somewhere north of Kadesh. Nu 21 3 and Jg 1 17 seem to give two other and different explanations of the name, as arising from later incidents.

46. The stay in Kadesh (cf. Jg 11 17; Nu 20 16) was for 'many days, according to the days that ye abode there.' A vague idiomatic phrase, such as Semitic writers often employed, when unable or unwilling to speak explicitly (cf. 29 16; 1 S 23 13). **many days:** see 2 1.

II. 1-15. **Thirty-Eight Years' Wanderings—from Kadesh to the Torrent of Zered.**—1a records the carrying out of the command in 1 40. If 14 be taken with 1b, it would seem that 'many days' covers thirty-eight years, which were spent in 'compassing Mount Seir.' If this be so, then 'many days' in 1 46 can only stand for a few months, and 3, 'ye have compassed this hill-country long enough, turn you northward,' is the long-delayed signal to resume the march to the Land of Promise. Compare (1) the narrative in JE, so far as it remains to us: Nu 14 25, 20 1b. 14-21. 22a and 21 4b, 'and they journeyed from Kadesh, by the way of the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom,' 12; (2) the narrative in P: Nu 10 12, 13 26, 'wilderness of Paran'; 14 33-34, 20 1, 'wilderness of Zin' (? in fortieth year); 23b-29c, 'Mount Hor'; 21 4a. 10-11, 22 1, 'the steppes of Moab beyond Jordan.'

4-8. Israel to pass along the east border of Edom peaceably.

7. **these forty years,** i.e. from Ex 15 onwards (8 4). **this great wilderness** must therefore = the whole region from the wilderness of Shur (Ex 15 22) to the south of Edom, regarded as one.

8. Israel passes 'from beside' the Edomites, leaving behind them the road leading through the Arabah (from Akabah to Hebron), Elath (= the modern Akabah), and Ezion-geber (near and north of Elath), and proceeding north-east up the Wady-el-Ithm to join the road east of Moab (= the Pilgrim road of Mohammedan times from Damascus to Mecca: see *H.D.B.*, v, 370, and map), which traverses 'the wilderness (i.e. uncultivated pasture-lands) of Moab.'

9. **Moab** here, as usually, if not always, = the people (see *E. Bi.*, 'Moab'), 'the children of Lot' in this verse and in Gen 19 37; Ps 83 8. **Ar** (18 and 29; Nu 21 15 and 28; cf. 22 36; Is 15 1), site apparently in the valley of the Arnon, the northern boundary of Moab at this time: (2 18. 24; Nu 21 13, 22 36). Later, Moab seems to have held the territory to the north, which became known as 'the field' or territory of Moab (21 20, J), and in the lower lands opposite Jericho, as 'the steppes' of Moab (35 1, P)

10-12. An Insertion Relating to Former Inhabitants.—**Emim** (11 and Gen 14 5 † *v.n.*), the Moabite name for the prehistoric people, reputed to be of giant stature. Possibly = terrifiers, i.e. of a ghostly kind. **Anakim:** see 1 28; **Rephaim:** apparently originally a distinct race (Gen 14 5, 15 20, etc.), but their name came to be used as = giants. Rephaim also = ghosts or shades (Is 14 9), probably in view of ancient ruins of great works and supposed gigantic tombs (3 11). **Horites** (22; Gen 14 6, 36 20-30): the aboriginals of the hill-country of Seir. The name probably means 'cave-dweller.' There exist innumerable caves round Petra, which were still used in Jerome's day. **as Israel did** can only have been written after the conquest of Canaan.

13. **The brook (torrent-valley) Zered:** probably the Wady Kerak (called Wady El Franji in its upper course). For torrent-valley, cf. 1 K 17 3-5, where the same word is used of the ravine and of the torrent.

14. **thirty and eight years:** see note on 1. **'the generation of,'** rather, 'the generation even.' **sware,** as 1 34 f.; Nu 14 21-23 (JE); cf. Ps 95 11; Heb 3 11. 18, 4 3.

15. See 1 Cor 10 5-11.

16-19, 24-25. Israel is to Leave the Children of Ammon Unmolested and Attack Sihon the Amorite.—No parallel in Numbers. The kingdom of Sihon lay between the Arnon and the Jabbok on the east of the Jordan. The Ammonites occupied the hill-country still further east (cf. Nu 21 24). Israel is to turn left. **the children of Lot** (Gen 19 38): cf. 9.

20-23. Another Antiquarian Insertion (cf. 10-12).—**Zamzummim** (? = Zuzim in Ham: Gen 14 5) possibly = 'whisperers.' Zîzîm is the Arabic for 'the eerie sound of the Jinn,' haunting ancient ruins (see note on 10 above). **Avvim** (in Jos 13 3 † *v.n.* alongside the Philistines), the original

inhabitants of South-West Palestine (Gen 10[14]; Am 9[7]; Jer 47[4]). Caphtor = Crete or Nile Delta.

24. valley (same word as 'brook' in [13]) **of the Arnon:** an immense cañon with stupendous cliffs (2,000 feet high where the main road crosses some eight miles east of the Dead Sea), and over two miles across from edge to edge.

26-37. Defeat and annihilation of Sihon, King of Heshbon, and his people (cf. Nu 21[21-25], 20[17-19]).

24-26. Heshbon, on the high tableland (RVm, 3[10]; Jos 13[16]), some 4,000 feet above the Dead Sea, sixteen miles east of the Jordan, where it runs into the Dead Sea, with a considerable spring below, which fertilizes the valley. Assigned to Reuben according to Jos 13[17]. Moab possessed it at a later date (Is 15[4], 16[8, 9]).

26. the wilderness of Kedemoth. The town is mentioned Jos 13[18]; 1 Ch 6[79]: the region in which the head-waters of the Arnon are to be found on the confines of the desert east of Moab.

30. as at this day: frequently used by D and writers of that school to call attention to the fulfilment of promise or threat (4[20, 38], 8[18], 29[28]; Gen 50[20], etc.). **32. Jahaz:** see Nu 21[23].

34. utterly destroyed: see 7[2], not in Nu 21[25]. **city of men** (RVm) practically = city male-population (so also 3[6]); word for 'men' rare in prose (cf. 4[27], 26[5], 28[62]; Gen 34[30], 'few in number') = first part of the name Methuselah. **left none remaining,** as 3[3], and (D[2]) eight times in Jos 8, 10, 11, and 2 K 10[11] †.

36. Aroer, now 'Ara'ir: a heap of ruins on the north edge of the great ravine. **the city that is in the valley** (as Jos 13[9, 16]; 2 S 24[5], each time after Aroer) perhaps = Ar. **unto Gilead,** probably meaning unto North Gilead, which began at the Jabbok (Nu 21[24]; Jos 12[2]). **the land of the children of Ammon** lay along the upper courses of the Jabbok where it runs south to north, and in the neighbouring hill-country.

III. 1-11. Defeat and annihilation of Og, King of Bashan, and his people.

1-3. Practically word for word = the passage in Nu 21[33-35], which seems to be based upon this passage in Deuteronomy. **Bashan** (Hebrew, 'the Bashan,' i.e. lit. 'the soft and fertile ground'), a region of rich pastures and forests north and north-east of Gilead (see 32[14]; Ps 22[12]; Ezek 39[18]; Mic 7[14], etc.). **Edrei:** see 1[4].

4. all the region of Argob ([13, 14]; 1 K 4[13]). Identified by Targums and many moderns with el-Leja, a volcanic formation twenty-two miles by fourteen, lying forty miles east of the Sea of Galilee, elevated 20-30 feet above the plain. It consists of innumerable rocks of basalt, and is fissured in every direction. But this identification is extremely questionable; 'regeb' means 'clod of earth,' and 'the region of Argob' is much more likely to have been pasture-land to the west of the Jebel Hauran (see map in *E. Bi.*, 5144).

6. inhabited city: see 2[34].

8-9. mount Hermon (as Jos 11[17], 12[1, 5], 13[5, 11]; 1 Ch 5[23]): the great mountain-buttress (9,166 feet high) south of Antilibanus, from which it is separated by the deep ravines, Litani and et-Teim. It is almost due west of Damascus; its summit is usually covered with snow, and it is widely visible in Palestine. From it on the south flows the Jordan.

9. An insertion similar to 2[10-12, 20-22]. **Sirion,** as Ps 29[6]. **Senir,** as Ezek 27[5]; Ca 4[8]; 1 Ch 5[23]. See also 4[48].

10. the plain. RVm, 'the tableland.' When used of the east of the Jordan = the tableland of Moab (or Reuben), as 4[43]; Jos 13[9], etc., 4,500 feet above the Dead Sea. **all (the) Gilead** (cf. 2 K 10[33]): lit. the 'hard' region, but = the hill-country lying between the Yarmuk running into the Jordan just south of the Sea of Galilee and the wady of Heshbon or even the Arnon, and cut in two by the Jabbok. Gilead sometimes = the whole region occupied by the Israelites east of Jordan ([12-13]; Nu 32[39], etc.), but also sometimes = the north (2[36], 3[15]) or south (Nu 32[1]; Jos 13[25]) parts alone (see map, *E. Bi.*, 1727). **all (the) Bashan** (see [1]). **Salecah** (Jos 12[5]) = Salchad, on one of the southernmost heights of Jebel Hauran, in the extreme south-east corner of Bashan. **Edrei** (1[4]). Both are situated near tributaries of the Yarmuk.

11. Another Insertion of Later Date.—of the remnant of the Rephaim (Jos 12[4], 13[12]): see 2[11]. **bedstead,** elsewhere in Hebrew always = couch, but may here = an ancient sarcophagus of black basalt, such as are found in great numbers east of Jordan. The basalt contains about 20 per cent. of iron, and has the colour and hardness of iron. **of a man,** i.e. of the usual size (cf. Is 8[1]; Rev 21[17]). **Rabbah** (Jos 13[25]; 2 S 11[1], 12[26], and 17[27]; Jer 49[2, 3]; Ezek 21[20]; Am 1[14]) = modern Amman, on the upper waters of the Jabbok, about twenty-five miles north-east of the mouth of the Jordan and to the west of the mass of hills, which separated the Ammonites from the Amorites of Hesbon. The one important city of the Ammonites. It is not explained how Og's

'bed' came to be in Rabbah and not in Bashan.

12-17. The conquered land is given to the 2½ tribes: cf. Nu 32 [33], ctr. [22, 28-30].

13*b*. An inserted note, as [9] and [11]. Read as RVm (*all that Bashan is called the land of the Rephaim*).

14-17. A supplementary notice, inserted by a later hand.

14. **Jair**: see Nu 32 [41], where the Havvoth-jair are said to be in Gilead (and so Jg 10 [3-4] and 1 Ch 2 [22] f.); in 1 K 4 [13] they are expressly distinguished from 'the region of Argob.' D^2 (Jos 13 [30]) follows D here. **son of Manasseh**: i.e. descendant (cf. 1 Ch 2 [22]). **Geshurites and Maacathites** = two Aramean tribes on the (west) border of Bashan; their territory = Golan (4 [43]), east of the Sea of Galilee, Jos 12 [5], 13 [11-13] (D^2); cf. Gen 22 [24]; 2 S 15 [8]; 1 Ch 19 [6], etc.; according to 1 Ch 2 [23] Geshur and Aram took Havvoth-jair from Jair's descendants. **unto this day** implies a longer interval of time than a few months. Not by the same hand as [12-13] (cf. 2 [22], 10 [8], etc.; Jos 4 [9], etc.; Jg 1 [21], etc.).

15. **Machir** (cf. Nu 32 [39-40]): son of Manasseh, father of Gilead (Nu 26 [29]; Jos 17 [1]). **Gilead** here = North Gilead.

17. **Kinnereth** (Jos 11 [2], 19 [35]): the city situated probably on the north-west side of the lake to which it gave its name (Nu 34 [11]; Mt 14 [34], 'Gennesareth,' etc.); see 1 K 15 [20]. **the sea of the Arabah** (4 [49]): the Salt Sea (Gen 14 [3]; Nu 34 [3, 12], etc.), in combination as here (Jos 3 [16], 12 [3]) = the Dead Sea, a title apparently first used by classical writers in the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. **slopes** (4 [49]). RV text gives the best rendering (see Jos 10 [40], 12 [8]). **(the) Pisgah**, always with the article, probably meaning 'the cloven': cf. 4 [49], 3 [27], 34 [1]; Jos 12 [3], 13 [20]; Nu 21 [20], 23 [14]. No peak is now so named. See further 34 [1].

18-22. **Command to the 2½ tribes and to Joshua.**

18. **you**, meaning the 2½ tribes.

18-20. Cf. Nu 32 [6-38].

20 and 25. **beyond Jordan**: i.e., here, the west of Jordan (ctr. 1 [1]).

21-22. No parallel in Numbers (cf. Dt 1 [38]). **Ye.** The writer's thought passes to the people generally. The charge to encourage Joshua is given in [28].

23-29. **Moses' Petition. He may See, but not Enter, the Good Land. Joshua is to Lead Israel therein.**

24. **O Lord GOD** (9 [26], which see): i.e. Lord Jehovah.

25. **mountain**, rather *hill-country*, as 1 [7], etc.

26. **wroth**, a stronger word in Hebrew than 'angry' in 1 [37], 4 [21]. The same word is used, Ps 78 [21, 59, 62].

27. Cf. 34 [1, 4] (JE).

28. **charge**: same word as 'commanded' in [18-21]: cf. Is 10 [6], 1 S 13 [14], 25 [30] (RV 'appoint'). **encourage** (1 [38]); **strengthen** ('be courageous and strong': 31 [7, 23]; Jos 1 [6, 7, 9, 18]). Nu 27 [12-21] is parallel to [27-28] here, but the incidents are differently conceived and expressed, and are placed before Nu 32 (which corresponds to Dt 3 [12-20]) instead of after it. The natural inference is that they are independent narratives.

29. The close of the retrospect which began in 1 [6]. **valley** = ravine or glen, a different word from 2 [24], used in same phrase, 4 [46], 34 [6]; cf. 'the valley of Hinnom'; thirteen times (Ps 23 [4], etc.). See *Sinai and Palestine*, App., 2. **Beth-peor** (4 [46], 34 [6]; Jos 13 [20], and cf. Nu 23 [28]). The exact site is uncertain. Eusebius puts it near Mount Peor, opposite to Jericho: cf. Baal-peor (4 [3]; Nu 25 [3, 5, 18]).

IV. 1-40. **Exhortation to keep the statutes . . . taught to them, remembering the greatness of Jehovah's revelation of Himself at Horeb.**

1. **And now** connects the exhortation with what precedes, but it is noteworthy that the exhortation is based on the revelation at Horeb, whereas the retrospect deals with events after that revelation. **statutes and judgements**, as 5 [1], 6 [1].

2. Cf. Rev 22 [18-19].

3-4. Reference to Nu 25 [1-5]. Here we have history idealized. Idolaters are, to a man, destroyed. The faithful, to a man, survive. **Baal-peor**, 'because of'; lit. 'in.' In second case at least 'Baal of Peor,' i.e. the local Baal worshipped on Mount Peor (3 [29]; Ps 106 [28]).

5. **I have taught** implies a previous exposition of the law; ctr. 'I am teaching' (lit.) in [1].

7. **a God so nigh.** Adjective is in plural, probably to denote that heathen gods are meant here. 10-14. See Ex 19.

10. **to fear me all the days** (6 [24]; Jer 32 [39]).

12. **no form, but see** Ex 24 [10-11]. **only a voice** (Ex 19 [19], 20 [1]).

13. **his covenant** ([23] and twenty-four times in Deuteronomy; Ex 19 [5a], 24 [7-8], 34 [10, 27-28]), as embodied in the Ten Words (RVm): see Ex 34 [28] and Dt 5 [2-22]. **and he wrote them upon two tables of stone** (9 [10], 10 [4]; Ex 24 [12], 31 [18], 32 [16], 34 [1, 4]). God is the writer, not (as it stands in Ex 34 [28]) Moses.

14. The command 'at that time' to teach 'statutes and judgements,' as ad-

ditional to 'the Ten Words,' is fulfilled thirty-nine years later in the field of Moab.

15-18. No form seen on Horeb, therefore no image admissible in worship. likeness, as Ezek 8 10.

19. Worship of the host of heaven equally precluded by the nature of the Horeb revelation. It was prevalent in the period of the later kings (2 K 17 16, etc.; Zeph 1 5; Jer 8 2, etc.; Ezek 8 16). divided: i.e. allotted (29 26, RV text and margin) to be worshipped by them.

20. brought you out of the iron furnace, out of Egypt (as Jer 11 4; 1 K 8 51 [D2] †). for your sake (1 37 note).

24. Quoted Heb 12 29.

25-31. Warning: Exile will be the penalty of disobedience; yet repentance will obtain mercy. A passage full of meaning to Israel in exile.

28. which see not, etc. Cf. Ps 115 5-7, 135 16-17, and Hosea, Isaiah, Habakkuk, Jeremiah.

29. Wording as Jer 29 13. heart and soul (6 5): heart=intellect (Jer 5 21, RV text and margin), soul=affections (24 15, Hebrew).

30. the latter days: lit. the end of the days, i.e. on the horizon of the prophet's vision. Fairly frequent phrase in the prophetical books. Relative, not absolute, finality.

32-40. Further appeal to the greatness of Israel's experience of Jehovah.

34. Wording as 26 8; Jer 32 21.

36. instruct: rather *discipline, chasten,* as 8 5; Pr 19 18.

38. as at this day. *Prima facie* meaning is that they are now in possession. nations greater and mightier (see 7 1).

41-43. Moses Appointed Three Cities on the East of Jordan to which the Manslayer might Flee.—Probably this is by a later hand (see 19 1-13 notes). It clearly marks off 1 6-4 40 from the discourse which follows.

43. Bezer, somewhere on the eastern border of Moab. Ramoth: ?=es-Salt or el-Jalud. Golan: cf. the modern district Jaulan (see 3 14 note).

44-49. Preface to the Discourse and Exposition of Law: 5-26, 28.—Cf. 1 1-6 and for references to places 2 36, 3 17, 29. Probably this belongs to an originally independent edition of Deuteronomy, and may be itself composite (note 'the law' 44 and 'the testimonies,' etc., 45).

45-46. The practical identification of the Exodus and the smiting of Sihon shows that the writer lived at a time when the forty years 'had dwindled to a point.' Sion for Hermon: ? read Sirion as 3 9 (so Syriac).

V.-XI. An Exhortation, leading up to the Exposition of Laws (12-26, 28).

V. 1. All Israel (1 1). Hear, O Israel (6 4, 9 1, 20 3; cf. 4 1, 6 3 †).

3. not with our fathers, but with us, as 4 23, 11 2, 7. our fathers: i.e. the patriarchs, as 4 31, 37, etc.

5. The people hear Jehovah's voice, but Moses 'shews,' i.e. declares, the actual words afterwards.

the word. LXX, Syriac, Targum, Vulgate, 'the words.'

6-22. The ten words, spoken by Jehovah in the Mount to all the assembly and then written upon two tables of stone. Cf. Ex 20 1-17 notes. The variations here are in the style, and reflect the humanitarian spirit, of D.

12, 15, 16. as Jehovah thy God commanded thee. . . . Clearly comments, not part of the words of Jehovah Himself.

21. In Ex 20 17 house first. In primitive usage 'house' included wife and family and household, as 12 7; Jos 24 15, etc. D puts 'wife' first, reflecting a later usage.

22. and he added no more (cf. 9 10). Sharp distinction made between Decalogue and subsequent legislation. tables of stone (9 9-17, 10 1-5). assembly (cf. 4 10, 9 10, etc.).

23-33. People ask Moses to be their go-between. Jehovah approves (18 16-17; Ex 20 19-21).

26. living God (1 S 17 26, 36; Jer 10 10, 23 36 †): cf. (different Hebrew) 2 K 19 4, 16 †; Jos 3 10; Hos 1 10; Ps 42 2, 84 2 †.

33. all the commandment (singular)=the primary duty of 6 5: cf. 30 11, 6 25, 8 1 + five times; combined here with statutes, etc. (plural), as 6 1, 7 11.

29, 33. Note parallel in Jer 7 23.

VI. 1-3. Observe the commandment and all will be well.

3. in a land. 'in' not in Hebrew: either 'a land,' etc., is misplaced, or some preceding words have dropped out.

4-5. The Supreme Command based upon a Supreme Truth.—The Shĕma (='Hear') which at a later time was ordered to be recited twice daily by every Israelite. Quoted Mk 12 29-30, etc.

4*b*. RVm reveals the various possible ways of rendering the Hebrew. Possibly both unity and uniqueness are intended—Jehovah can neither assume different phases in different localities or conditions, nor be regarded as one of many. But the last RVm rendering would mean 'one God for Israel, and Israel must honour no other,' and this may be the actual meaning (cf. 1 Ch 29 1, 'alone,' Hebrew 'one'). 4 35, 39 (? of later date)

explicitly affirms that there are no 'other gods,' and so Jer 2 [11], 16 [20].

5. As Jehovah is one, so Israel must give undivided allegiance to Him. **love Jehovah thy God** (see Intro., 1). In Deuteronomy ten times, not elsewhere in Pentateuch. **with all thy heart**, etc. The phrase in Deuteronomy eight times, in Joshua and Kings (D^2) six times, in Chronicles three (two in parallels to Kings), in Jer 32 [41] (of God) once †. **with all thy might** = 2 K 23 [25] of Josiah †. Everywhere else 'might' is used adverbially, 'with force,' i.e. exceedingly.

6-9. These words to be written upon the heart and upon doorposts, and to be taught to children (11 [18-20]; cf. Ex 13 [9]), hence the phylacteries (Mt 23 [5]) and mezuzah of Judaism (see *E. Bi.* under 'Frontlets'). In Exodus figurative, but here perhaps [8, 9] literally, especially [9].

10-15. lest thou forget. To go after other gods will be their destruction (8 [11-17]).

2. house of bondage: lit. of slaves. Ex 13 [3, 14] (JE), 20 [2] (= Dt 5 [6]); Dt 7 [8] + three times, elsewhere four times, always of Egypt.

13. The fear of Jehovah is fundamental (4 [10] + twelve times).

14. other gods: seventeen times in Deuteronomy (but 31 [18, 20] is not D); eighteen times in Jeremiah, and thirteen times by compilers of Judges and Kings; not in Isaiah or other prophets.

16-19. Israel is not to tempt Jehovah.

16. tempt, i.e. test, prove, as Gen 22 [1]; Ex 20 [20]; Dt 8 [2] note. **Massah** (i.e. Testing): 9 [22], 33 [8]; Ex 17 [1b-7]; Ps 95 [8].

20-25. An instruction to be given to inquisitive children.

20. when thy son, etc. = Ex 13 [14] (R^d).

24. to fear . . . for our good alway: 4 [10]; Jer 32 [39]. **as at this day** (2 [30]).

25. it shall be righteousness . . . (24 [13]; cf. Gen 15 [6]).

VII. **1-11. Israel is to 'devote' the seven nations of Canaan and to destroy all objects used in idol-worship.**

1. seven nations greater and mightier than thou (4 [38], 9 [1], 11 [23]). Israel was comparatively weak and few in number (ctr. 1 [10], 26 [5]; Nu 1 [46]). **seven**: Jos 3 [10], 24 [11] (D^2); cf. Dt 20 [17] (six), 1 [7] (two); Gen 15 [19-21] (ten).

2. RVm Hebrew 'devote' (2 [34], 3 [6], 7 [26], 13 [15-17], 20 [17]) = set apart to God, and so make taboo to men. In the case of persons, it meant death; of things, it meant giving to the sanctuary. So also on the Moabite Stone; and see Lev 27 [28-29]; Jos 6 [17-19], 7 [11-15]; 1 S 15, etc.

4. me = Jehovah. For change of person cf. 11 [14] f., etc.

5. pillars, Asherim (see 16 [21-22] note).

6. See Introduction and Ex 19 [5-6]. **holy people**: as 14 [2, 21], 26 [19]; cf. Lev 17-26.

7. fewest: see note on [1].

8. Jehovah's **love** for Israel, as [13], 23 [5], not expressed in Pentateuch outside Deuteronomy; = Hos 1-3, 11 [1-4]; cf. Jer 31 [3]; Mal 1 [2], etc. **redeemed**: ransomed, as Ex 13 [13, 15], 34 [20]; Nu 18 [15-17], *fig.*; 2 S 4 [9]; Hos 13 [14].

9-10. The God of Israel is a supremely moral Being, showing mercy and judgement (10 [17-21]).

9. mercy: rather lovingkindness, as Hos 2 [19], 4 [1], 6 [4, 6] (RVm), 10 [12], 12 [6]. **a thousand generations** (cf. Ex 20 [6], RVm).

12-26. If His people obey, Jehovah will bless and give victory. They must not be afraid, but destroy both the peoples and their idols: cf. Ex 23 [23-33] (edited by R^d; note especially 'none . . . barren,' 'the hornet,' 'by little and little,' their gods 'a snare'): Jos 24 [12] (R^d).

26. a devoted thing: see note on [2].

VIII. **1-18. Thou shalt remember all the way** ([19-20]), **otherwise ye shall perish.**

2. these forty years ([4], 2 [7]); idealized as a golden age ([3-4]); cf. 29 [5]; Ps 78 [24]; Ex 16 [4] (P): Neh 9 [15, 21]. **humble, prove**: the purpose of the Divine education and discipline.

3. Quoted by our Lord (Mt 4 [4]). **every thing . . .** i.e. if bread fails, Jehovah can ordain something else, such as, here, 'manna' (Ex 16 [12], etc.).

5. chasteneth (4 [36] note).

9. iron ? = iron-like basalt (3 [11]). **brass**, i.e. copper. Iron and copper have been found in Lebanon and Edom, but apparently not in Canaan proper.

15. fiery serpents (Nu 21 [6-9]). **scorpions**, peculiar to Deuteronomy. **water out of the rock** (Nu 20 [8b]; Ex 17 [1-6]).

16. manna, as [3].

19. walk after . . . and serve . . . and worship (as Jer 13 [10], 16 [11], 25 [6]).

IX. **1-X. 11. Jehovah goes Before as Devouring Fire, not because Israel is Righteous, but because other Nations are Wicked. Israel is Stiffnecked and Rebellious, as shown especially by Events at Horeb.**—Did this whole section once stand before 1 [6] as part of the historical introduction? See Ex 24 [12-15a, 18b], 31 [18b], 32 [1-6 (7, 14), 15-35], 34 [1-4, 28] (note the verbal identities). [9 [22-24] is a digression and 10 [6-9] a later insertion.]

IX. **1. Hear, O Israel**: a fresh beginning.

3. quickly: ctr. 7 [22].

9-11. tables of stone, as (JE) Ex 31 [18b], etc., (D), 4 [13], 5 [22], etc. **tables of the covenant** ([9, 11, 15]): ctr. 'tables of the testimony' (P), Ex 31 [18a], 32 [15], 34 [29]. 1 K 8 [9]

and parallel 2 Ch 5 10 (R^d) are the only passages outside the Pentateuch which connect the tables with 'the covenant.'

9, 18, 25, X. 10. forty days and forty nights. The first and last verses clearly correspond with Ex 24 18, 34 28 (both JE). The second and third appear to refer to the same 'forty days' as 10 10. The present wording of 10 8 ('as at the first time' and 'hearkened,' etc.) seems to imply this, but it is noticeable that Ex 32 30-35 speaks of an intermediate 'going up' for intercession, distinct from the other two.

10. the day of the assembly: 10 4, 18 16 (phrase only in D); cf. verb 4 10 and subst. 5 22, 23 2-8.

14-15. The intercession of Ex 32 11-13 before descent is omitted.

20. Peculiar to Deuteronomy.

22-24. Parenthetical. **Taberah** (Nu 11 1-3). **Massah** (6 16, 33 8; Ex 17 7). **Kibroth-hattaavah** (Nu 11 34). **Kadesh-barnea** (1 19, 26; Nu 13 26, 14 3, 4.

25=18, and see note above. A notable instance of prevailing intercession. So Hebrew 'and.' For idiom in 25a cf. 1 46.

26. O Lord Jehovah: as 3 24, in Pentateuch otherwise only Gen 15 2, 8; historical books eleven times, prophets twenty-six times (Amos six, Jeremiah five, Ezekiel eleven, others four).

28. Cf. Nu 14 16 (in story of spies).

X. 1-5. Another Visit to Top of Horeb. Ark made. Second Delivery of Tables of Stone and Placing of Them in the Ark.—Cf. Ex 34 1-4, where ark is not mentioned. Was it originally in JE's account, but left out by Editor, so as not to clash with the P account of making of ark *after* second return from the top (Ex 37 1-9)?

1. Second or (?) third visit (see note on 9 9, 18, 25, 10 10). **Hew.** The first tables in Ex 32 15-16 are said to be 'the work of God.' **4.** Cf. 9 10.

5*b*. Not now in Exodus.

6-7. An inserted fragment of itinerary, apparently from E. The four names of places occur in Nu 33 30-33 (P), but in different order. The four sites are unknown. According to Nu 33 37, 20 22-29, Aaron dies on Mount Hor. Deuteronomy and JE know nothing of Mount Hor. Bracket should be after 7 (not after 9 as in RV).

6. Eleazar in JE only again Jos 24 33, in P frequently (Ex 6 23, etc.). Perhaps inserted here by R^p.

8-9. The tribe of Levi set apart for priestly ministry.

8. at that time: i.e. during sojourn at Horeb (1-5 originally standing immediately before 8). Did JE (Ex 32-34) contain originally an account of this setting apart, as resulting from Ex 32 26-29? (ctr. P in Ex 28-29; Lev 8; Nu 3). **Unto this day** (3 14 note). The tribe of Levi are to perform three *priestly* functions: (1) to bear the ark (31 9; Jos 8 33, etc.); (2) to stand before Jehovah and minister (7 12, 18 3, 5, 7); (3) to bless (21 5 [Nu 6 23-27]). See 18 1-8 note. **the ark of the covenant (of Jehovah):** characteristic of D and D^2 (31 9, 25, 26, etc.). The earlier phrase was 'the ark of Jehovah,' as Jos 3 13, etc., and so originally in passages where the Deuteronomic expression now stands (see LXX, 1 S 4 3-5). **9=18 2.**

10. See note on 9 9, 18, 25. **10*b*=9 19*b*.**

11. Ex 33 1 places this command *before* the second ascent (Ex 34).

12-22. Devotional conclusion. Call to heart-circumcision, fear, and love.

14-18. The greatness *and* the love of Jehovah.

16. circumcise, etc. (30 6; Jer 4 4).

19. the stranger: i.e. the foreign settler or sojourner 'under protection' (14 21 note, 1 16, 16 11, etc.; cf. verb, 18 6; Gen 12 10). **for ye were strangers . . .** =Ex 22 21 (? R^d).

22. threescore and ten: as Gen 46 27 (including two born in Egypt); Ex 1 5 (P). **as the stars** (1 10, etc.).

XI. 1-32. Exhortation continued, with further retrospective allusions to events in the wilderness.

1 and **18. Therefore:** Hebrew, 'and.'

2. not your children, (7) **but you:** cf. 5 3, 3 21, 4 3.

6. As Nu 16 1, 32a, 27b, 30, 33. No mention of Korah and his company (P).

10-12. In Egypt crops were dependent on irrigation; in Palestine they receive rain in autumn ('former') and spring. These may be withheld, if Israel serves other gods.

18-21. Cf. 6 6-9; Ex 13 16.

23. See 7 1 note.

24. Phrase as 2 5; Jos 1 3-4 (D^2), 14 9. **hinder:** RVm 'western.'

26-28. A blessing and a curse (cf. 28).

29-32. Command to set the blessing on Mount Gerizim and the curse on Mount Ebal (see 27).

30. beyond Jordan: as 3 20, 25 from standpoint of speaker in Moab. **the way of the going down . . .:** 'the western road.' **Gilgal:** the well-known Gilgal is near Jericho, twenty-eight miles south-south-west of Gerizim. Probably some 'stone-circle' near Shechem is meant. **the oaks of Moreh** (cf. Gen 12 6; Jos 24 26). The descriptions of locality are so conflicting that it is difficult to believe that they come, as they stand, from the hand

of the original writer. **Moreh** may be not a proper name but = Director (i.e. the priest who gave answers to those who came to consult the Oracle. Cf. 17 [10], 'teach' from same root), and cf. Jg 9 [37]; lit. 'the Soothsayers' Terebinth (oak),' which may be the same tree.

XII.-XXVI. and XXVIII. **Compilation and exposition of Laws** (1 [5]).

XII. 1-28. **Laws relating to Worship and the Central Sanctuary.**—Four sections ([1-7, 8-12, 13-19, 20-28]). Of these the last two are probably earlier in time. Note (1) second person singular in [13-28] as compared with second person plural in [1-12] ([1b, 5b, 7b] seem to be editorial additions); (2) the less exact definitions of [26-27] compared with [6, 11], etc.; (3) parallels to Jeremiah in [2] and [11]; (4) the covering of the same ground.

2. the places: i.e. of worship (cf. Gen 12 [6], 13 [3-4]). **hills, every green tree:** cf. Jer 2 [20], 3 [6, 13]. **pillars, Asherim:** see 16 [21-22] note.

4-5. In contrast to the many 'places' of the Canaanites, Israelites are to have one 'place,' where alone they may sacrifice and feast before Jehovah. the place which Jehovah . . . shall choose occurs twenty-one times in seven different forms in 12-31: cf. Jos 9 [27]; 1 K 11 [36]; 2 K 21 [7] (all D^2); see Intro., 2 (4). **out of all your tribes** here only in Deuteronomy in this connexion, but 18 [5] of Levitical priest and 1 K 8 [16] ff., 11 [32], 14 [21]; 2 K 21 [7], with parallels in Chronicles, of Jerusalem. **to put his name there** ([21], 14 [24]; 1 K 9 [3], 11 [36], 14 [21]; 2 K 21 [4, 7]): cf. 'cause his name to dwell' in [11].

6. burnt offerings (see Lev 1); **sacrifices** = peace offerings (Lev 3); **tithes** (Lev 27 [30]; Nu 18 [21-24]); **heave offering** (Nu 15 [19]) **of your hand** ([17], 15 [3], 16 [10, 17]) = voluntary personal offering; **vows of freewill offerings** (Lev 7 [16], 22 [18-21]); **firstlings** (15 [19-23]; Ex 13 [2, 12] f., 22 [29-30]; Nu 18 [15-18]).

7. The sacrifice was followed by a feast on portions of the sacrificial flesh, in which all 'the house' was to share. Note that there is no reference to sin or trespass offerings.

8. we do here this day . . . own eyes (for last clause see Jg 17 [6], 21 [25]). Such words are inconsistent with the idea that there was at that time a stately Tabernacle worship, with strict regulations against irregularities set up by Moses himself (P).

11. to cause his name to dwell there (14 [23], 16 [2, 6, 11], 26 [2]; cf. Jer 7 [12] [of Shiloh] Ezr 6 [12]; Neh 1 [9] †).

12. the Levite that is within your gates ([18] [19], 14 [27, 29], 16 [11, 14], 18 [6]; cf. 26 [11-13]). Hebrew Levi, with the def. art., used collectively. See 18 [1] note. **within thy gates** in Deuteronomy twenty-six times = walled cities, towns, villages (5 [14], etc.; cf. Ex 20 [10]; 1 K 8 [37]; parallel 2 Ch 6 [28] †)

13-19. Offerings to be made and Feasts kept only in Jehovah's chosen 'place.' But domestic animals may be killed and eaten at home non-sacrificially, if care be taken as to the blood.

14. in one of thy tribes = 2 S 7 [7], 'any one of the tribes': cf. 18 [6], 'any of thy gates'; but 2 S 15 [2] = this or that one.

15. kill. Hebrew usually means 'sacrifice,' but [15] and [21] used of non-sacrificial killing. **the unclean and the clean:** i.e. ceremonially, as [22], 15 [22]. See Lev 7 [20]; cf. 1 S 20 [26]. **the gazelle and the hart** (14 [5]). It was always legitimate to eat at home the flesh of animals taken in hunting.

16. the blood ([23-25], 15 [23]; cf. 1 S 14 [32, 34]; Lev 17 [10-14] [H], and 3 [17], 7 [26] f.; Gen 9 [4] [P]). For want of an altar, it is to be poured upon the ground and the 'soul' thus returned to God.

20-27. A parallel injunction to [13-19] with variant phrases.

20-21. The reason here given is that of too great distance from the sanctuary.

23-25. Adds to the prohibition of [16] the reason—the blood is the life (lit. the 'soul').

27. Of the burnt offering the whole, of the thank offering the blood only, is to come upon the altar.

29-31 or 32. Israel is not to serve Jehovah, as the nations served their gods (cf. 7 [25] f.).

31. their sons . . . do they burn . . .: cf. Jer 7 [31], 19 [5], and see Dt 18 [10]; Lev 18 [21], 20 [2-5]; 2 K 16 [3], etc.).

XIII. **Apostasy to be Stamped Out.**—[1-5] A prophet, or [6-11] a relation, or [12-18] the inhabitants of a city, inviting to apostasy, to be put to death (cf. 17 [2-7]).

1. prophet: see 18 [9-22]. **a dreamer:** cf. E in Gen 20, 28, 31, 37, etc.; Nu 12 [6], and see Jer 23 [25-29, 32] (especially [28], while some dreams are as straw), 27 [9], 29 [8].

2. the sign come to pass: ctr. 18 [22]. No prophetic message or dream which invites Israel to serve other gods can be from Jehovah, no matter what sign or wonder may be produced.

3*b*-4 may be a later addition (note 'ye' in the middle of a 'thou' section), but it gives a theological explanation of why signs by false prophets sometimes come to pass (cf. 1 K 22 [19-23]).

5. spoken rebellion: as Jer 28 [16], 29 [32]. **put away:** exterminate, as 17 [7, 12], etc., as the holiness of Israel demanded.

9. Cf. 17 6-7.

10. **stone**: same Hebrew word as in 17 5, 22 21, 24; Jos 7 25b; Ex 8 26, 17 4, 19 13, 21 28-32; ctr. the later word (rāgam), Lev 20 2, 27, 24 14, 16, 23; Nu 14 10, 15 35 f., Dt 21 21; Jos 7 25a.

13. RVm Hebrew, sons of worthlessness (Belial); same word 15 9; Jg 19 22, etc.; cf. 2 Cor 6 15.

14. **ask diligently**: 17 4, 19 18.

16-17. **the devoted thing**: see 7 2 note. **every whit.** RVm, 'as a whole burnt offering' (33 10; Ps 51 19; Lev 6 22 f.; 1 S 7 9 [Jg 20 40]).

XIV. 1-21. **Israel is a holy people, and therefore must not** (1-2) **use heathen mourning customs or** (3-21) **eat unclean animals.**

1. **the children**: lit. 'sons,' as Is 1 2; cf. Ex 4 22-23; Hos 11 1, ('my son') of the nation. **cut yourselves . . . baldness**: as Jer 16 6; Am 8 10; Is 22 12. In these latter passages no sign of disapproval; they are the common practices of ancient times. But *now* regarded as unworthy of Israel. See Lev 19 28 (H).

3. **abominable thing** = abomination (7 25, etc.). In Deuteronomy seventeen times (out of twenty-seven in Pentateuch).

4-20. Quoted unchanged from some source (cf. Lev 11 2-23). The basis of these prohibitions is uncertain. Some may be in opposition to heathen beliefs or customs.

13-18. **after its kind**, as Gen 1 21-25.

19. **winged creeping things**: lit. swarming things (Gen 1 20 f., RVm) that fly, i.e. winged insects.

20. **fowls** here = 'flying or winged things.' The verse allows certain exceptions to the rule in 19, as Lev 11 21-22.

21. Such eating prohibited, because it would be eating 'with the blood' (12 16). **the stranger,'** not being subject to 'the Law' (ctr. Lev 24 22, etc. [P], 17 15 f.) might so eat. **stranger**, i.e. a foreigner permanently resident (10 19). **foreigner**, i.e. one who merely makes a temporary stay. **Thou shalt not seethe . . .**, the only law repeated three times in the Pentateuch = Ex 23 19b, 34 26b.

22-29. **Tithes**: cf. Am 4 4; Gen 28 22.

22-23. A tenth of the produce of the field (corn, wine, and oil) to be brought to the chosen sanctuary and eaten before Jehovah, together with the firstlings.

24-26. Special provision, if the way be too long.

27-29. Special arrangements in the third year for the relief of the poor (ctr. Nu 18 21-28 and Lev 27 30-33 in which a later stage is to be seen). No definite date laid down; not necessarily only one visit a year.

27. Best taken as the beginning of the regulation following.

28. **all the tithe** is to be laid up within the towns, etc., and not taken to the sanctuary. The Levite (18 1-8) and the poor (10 18-19, etc.) are to receive it—either in public feasts or in individual doles, as needed (26 12-15).

XV. 1-11. **The Year of Release.**

1. See note on 12.

2. **shall release**: lit. thrown down (2 K 9 33), let fall. In Ex 23 10-11 used figuratively of land left fallow, here used of debt either remitted or suspended in the same seventh year (31 10). These loans were charitable (23 19), not commercial (a later development).

3. **foreigner** (14 21 n.). He is not subject to the law of the fallow year and therefore does not need release.

4-6. Ideal prospect, which (11) is not likely to be realized in practice.

6. **lend** (see 24 10-11).

7-11. A poor Israelite to be helped, although year of release be near.

12-18. Hebrew slave to be freed in seventh year.

12 and 1. = Jer 34 9, 14; based on Ex 21 2-6, but note 'Hebrewess' (the woman servant no longer by custom a concubine, as in Ex 21 7-11), and 'the door' (not of the sanctuary, but of the house). Ex 21 6 has been generally understood to mean the former, but 'Elohim' may = the household teraphim. There is no parallel here to Ex 21 3-4. See also regulations in Lev 25 39-46 (H and P).

15. Cf. 5 15, 16 12, 24 18, 22.

19-23. **Firstlings**: 12 6, 17, 14 23; cf. Ex 13 11-16, 22 29 f., 34 19 f., mainly JE. Cf. and ctr. Ex 13 2; Nu 18 15-18 (Lev 27 26 f.) (P). In Ex 22 30 sacrificed on eighth day, here annually at the sanctuary, probably at the Passover. In Nu 18 assigned to Aaron, and not available for the offerer. This was a later usage.

21-23. See 17 1 and 12 15-16.

XVI. 1-17. **Three Annual Pilgrimages**: cf. Ex 23 14-18, 34 18-23, 12 21-27, 13 3-10; Lev 23; Nu 28-29; Ex 12 1-13, 14-20, 43-49; Nu 9 1-14. **Feast** (10, 13): see Ex 23 14; cf. the Haj (= the Hebrew word here) to Mecca. The three Feasts (16) were originally agricultural (as Exodus), but two of them have in Deuteronomy also historical significance.

1-8. **The Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread** (Hebrew *Mazzoth*).—Deuteronomy combines two feasts which in JE are treated separately. **Abib** = fresh ears (as Ex 9 31; Lev 2 14). For the month see Ex 13 4, 23 15, 34 18, all in connexion with the Feast of Mazzoth. P

characteristically 'the first month' (Ex 12 [2], etc.) = the post-exilic Nisan (Neh 2 [1]) D does not fix the day of the month, and regards Mazzoth as beginning on the day of the Passover. In P it begins the next day (Nu 28 [16-17]).

1. **hold** (lit. make) **Passover**, phrase used mainly by priestly writers.

2. **of the flock and the herd**: better 'even sheep and oxen.' In Ex 12 [3-6] (P) lamb (or kid)—a later usage. **in the place . . . there** (12 [5]) as opposed to (5) **within any of thy gates.** Hitherto the Passover seems to have been a homestead rite (Ex 12 [21-27]) (JE+R[dp]).

3. The Feast of Mazzoth, which, according to Ex 13 [3-10] (JE+R[dp]) was instituted the day after the first Passover, and is distinct from the Passover in 23 [15] and 34 [18], is here combined with it. In P the two are instituted at the same time and before the first Passover (Ex 12 [14-20]).

4*b*. **neither . . . until the morning**: cf. Ex 34 [25] (23 [18]), 12 [10].

4, 6. **at even** (Ex 12 [6], RVm).

6. **at the season**: lit. appointed time (Ex 9 [5]), here apparently the appointed hour.

7. **roast**, RVm 'or seethe,' as 14 [21]; 1 S 2 [13, 15], the very process which P says is not to be applied to the paschal lamb (Ex 12 [9]). Some think the word here = 'cook' generally: cf. 2 Ch 35 [13] but ?

7-8. If these verses both form part of the original text the rest of the feast of Mazzoth, including the 'assembly' on the seventh day, must be kept at home, unless the home ('thy tents') is close to the sanctuary, whereas Ex 13 [6] speaks of the seventh day as a 'haj' to Jehovah.

8. **no work**, and so P (Ex 12 [16]).

9-12. **The Feast of Weeks.** Ex 34 [22] (2 Ch 8 [13]): cf. Ex 23 [16] ('of harvest'); Lev 23 [15-21]; Nu 28 [26-31] ('weeks') = Pentecost.

9. **Seven weeks**, from the beginning of corn-harvest. Again no fixed calendar date: ctr. Leviticus and Numbers. Deuteronomy makes no explicit reference to firstfruits (ctr. Ex 23 and 34 and Nu 28), but see [10] and 26 [1-11]. **after the measure of the freewill offering . . .** (RVm), the amount of the offering to be fixed by the offerer according to his prospering: ctr. Nu 28 [27] ff.; cf. [17] and 12 [6].

11. See 12 [7, 12], etc.

13-15. **The Feast of Booths** (and so Lev 23 [34] [P]; Zech 14 [16-19]; Ezr 3 [4]; 2 Ch 8 [13] †: cf. Neh 8 [14-18]) called in JE Feast of Ingathering (Ex 23 [16], 34 [22]). Again no calendar date. It would fall about the end of September. 14. **rejoice**, as [11].

16-17. Three pilgrimage feasts a year, at which all Israel's males shall appear before Jehovah (as Ex 23 [17], 34 [23]). Passover here merged in Mazzoth. Not national, but family, gatherings; not all at calendar dates, but varying from year to year according to the seasons, and according to the part of the country in which each family lived.

16. **appear**: lit. 'in the presence of,' but many read the Hebrew as = 'see the face of.'

16*b*. **none . . . empty**, as Ex 23 [15*b*] and 34 [20*b*].

17. **as he is able**: see RVm and cf. [10].

18-20. **Judges and Officers.**

18. **Judges** (1 [16], 25 [2]); with 'priests' (17 [9, 12], 19 [17-18]); with 'elders' (21 [2]; Ezr 10 [14]); with both and with 'officers' (29 [10] [LXX reads Judges for tribes]; Jos 8 [33], 23 [2], 24 [1] [all R[d]]). **shalt thou make.** By whom or how is not stated; the king appoints in 2 Ch 19 [5]. Not necessarily a novel institution. D traces them back to Moses in 1 [16]. See also note on 19 [12]. **Officers** (1 [15]).

19. Practically = Ex 23 [6] (3) (cf. Lev 19 [15]), [8] and see 17 [6-7].

21-22. **Asherah or pillar beside the altar of Jehovah forbidden**: cf. 7 [5], 12 [3]; Ex 34 [13] (R[d]), of Canaanite altars, etc.; cf. Lev 26 [1] (H); Jg 6 [25-30]; 1 K 14 [23]; Is 17 [8], 27 [9]; Mic 5 [13] f., etc. **Asherah** = pole, planted in the ground beside an altar, probably representative of a sacred tree. **Pillar**, probably originally = a natural rock (Gen 35 [14], 28 [18, 22]), but later an artificial obelisk, the distinguishing mark of a holy place. Originally used at sanctuaries of Jehovah without offence (Ex 24 [4]; Is 19 [19]; Hos 3 [4] [10 [1-2]]; and see 1 K 7 [15-22]; 2 Ch 3 [15-17]). **the altar**: cf. Ex 20 [24-26]. The phraseology suggests that these two verses are an earlier pre-Josianic law, inserted here possibly by another hand. Note also the close connexion of subject between 16 [18-20] and 17 [8] ff. It may be that 17 [1] and 17 [2-7] are also out of their original place. See note below.

XVII. 1. **A blemished sacrificial victim is an abomination**: 15 [21]; cf. Lev 22 [20] (H).

2-7. **Apostasy**: cf. Ex 22 [20]; [2-7] closely allied to 13, and perhaps originally formed part of it. 5. **stone**: Hebrew as 13 [10] n.

6 = 19 [15]: cf. Nu 35 [30] (P).

7*a* = 13 [9]. 7*b*. Cf. [12], 13 [5].

8-13. A supreme tribunal. In subject-matter congruous with 16 [18-20].

8. **too hard**: lit. too wonderful, as in 30 [11] RVm; Gen 8 [14]; Jer 32 [17]. The word in 1 [17] is different. **get thee up.** The sanctuaries were on heights, and so Jerusalem. **the place . . .** (12 [5] *u.n.*).

9. the priests (18 [1] n.). Priests and judge combined in one tribunal (19 [17], 21 [2-5]: cf. 2 Ch 19 [8, 11]). **Thou shalt enquire.** LXX and Samaritan, 'they,' i.e. the members of the Court (cf. 19 [18]).

9, 10, 11. shew, i.e. declare (5 [5]).

14-20. If Israel sets up a King, he must be [15] **Jehovah's choice,** [16-17] **not like Solomon,** [18-20] **a student of this law** (cf. Hos 8 [4]; 1 S 8 [4] ff.).

15. from among thy brethren: cf. 18 [18]. **a foreigner.** Northern Israel more in danger of this than Judah. The radical objection to a foreigner was his ignorance of Jehovah's law.

16*b*. forasmuch . . . (Note second person plural), probably an insertion.

18-19. Presupposes 31 [9] ff. or [24] ff.; if a later insertion, [20] naturally follows [17], as 8 [14] follows 8 [13].

XVIII. 1-8. The Levitical priests.

1. The priests the Levites (17 [9, 18], 24 [8], 27 [9]; Jos 3 [3], 8 [33]); 'the priests, the sons of Levi' (21 [5], 31 [9]); 'the priest(s)' (17 [12], 18 [3], 19 [17], 20 [2], 26 [3]; Jos 4 [3, 8]); 'the tribe of Levi' (10 [8], and here, Jos 13 [14]); 'the Levite that is within your (thy) gates' (12 [12, 18], 14 [27], 16 [11, 14]); 'the Levite' (12 [19], 14 [29], 18 [6] [Hebrew], 26 [11, 13]); 'the Levites' (27 [14], 31 [25]). In Deuteronomy one order of ministers only. 'Deuteronomy knows no Levites who cannot be priests' (see 10 [8] n.). The Levite has no inheritance (10 [9], etc.), i.e. no territory of his own; he has his share of the fire-offerings to Jehovah, and is commended to the charity of Israel (12 [12], etc.). With this the historical and earlier prophetical writings agree. When we come to Ezekiel, distinction is made between Jerusalem, and country, Levites. In P (Lev 8-10; Nu 3, 4, 18 [1-7]) only Aaron and his sons are priests, and so in 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Levites 161 times, priests 175, as distinct Orders. **all the tribe of Levi,** perhaps originally not in [1], but subject of verb in [2], cf. 10 [9], for in Hebrew of [2] the verb and pronouns are in the singular. The LXX has in [1*b*] 'the offerings (Karpomata) of Jehovah are their inheritance, they shall eat them.' **fire-offerings,** sixty-two times in P, otherwise only here and Jos 13 [14]; 1 S 2 [28] (R[D].)

2. as he hath spoken: not recorded in existing Pentateuch.

3-4. The priests' right or due in peace offerings and firstfruits. **shoulder,** mentioned Nu 6 [19] (Nazirite law); **cheeks** and **maw** (stomach), not mentioned elsewhere in connexion with sacrifice: ctr. Lev 7 [32-34]; Nu 6 [20] (P); 1 S 2 [13-16] appears to reflect an earlier stage, when the dues were not defined. **the priest,** i.e. the particular priest in attendance.

4. firstfruits and **first** (same word in Hebrew): see Ex 23 [19], 34 [26]; Dt 26 [1-11]; Nu 18 [12]: cf. 2 Ch 31 [5]. **the first of the fleece:** here only.

5. him, i.e. the tribe of Levi, and see 10 [8], 21 [5]; 1 S 2 [28].

6-18. A country Levite coming to the chosen sanctuary and ministering there shall be given a like portion with those already there (but see 2 K 23 [9]).

6. sojourneth: see 10 [19] note, 14 [21] note; ctr. Nu 35 [1-8], where forty-eight cities are assigned to the Levites. **the place . . .** (12 [5] note).

8. the sale of his patrimony: lit. 'his sellings according to the fathers'—a very obscure phrase, but there is nothing to show that it was landed or even hereditary property.

9-32. Wizards *v.* Prophets.—Keynote in [13-15]. The ancient world was 'hag-ridden by superstition' as to means of ascertaining the divine will and purpose. Nine kinds of wizards are enumerated here: (1) Moloch-sacrificer (12 [31]: cf. Lev 18 [21], 20 [2-5] [H] 2 K 16 [3], etc.); (2) Diviner (1 S 6 [2]; Ezek 21 [21] f.); (3) Augurer ([14]; Lev 19 [26]; Is 2 [6], etc.); (4) Enchanter, or one that observes omens (Gen 44 [5, 15]; Lev 19 [26]; Nu 23 [23]); (5) Sorcerer (Ex 7 [11], 22 [18]; Jer 27 [9], etc.); (6) Charmer (Ps 58 [5]; Is 47 [9, 12]); (7) and (8) the consulter of ghost or familiar spirit (Lev 19 [31]; 1 S 28 [3-14]; 2 K 23 [24], etc.); (9) an enquirer of the dead (Is 8 [19]), an inclusive term.

13. perfect, as Gen 17 [1] = without moral blemish; Lev 1 [3], etc., of physical perfection.

14-15. but as for thee. Israel is in a different position from any other nation. **a prophet . . .** Jehovah will make known His will through prophets, as once through Moses. A single prophet is not meant, but a prophetical order. The promise, however, received a culminating fulfilment in the Messiah (Ac 3 [22] f., 7 [37]). **from the midst of thy brethren,** as [18], and so LXX, Sam. here omit 'of thee.'

16-17. Cf. 5 [23-28]. **the day of the assembly** (9 [10], 10 [4]).

20. Cf. Jer 29 [23] and context.

21-22. The criterion of prophecy is fulfilment (cf. Jer 28 [9]). This must be qualified by 13 [2] f. (Jer 18 [7-10]; Jon 3 [9-10]).

XIX. 1-13. Cities of Refuge: 4 [41-43]; Ex 21 [12-14]; Nu 35 [9-34] (P); Jos 20 (D[2]).—The three cities in [2] seem to be west of Jordan and those of [9] east of Jordan. 4 [41-43], according to which Moses separated three cities of Jordan in his lifetime, is not alluded to. Nu 35 agrees in substance

with Deuteronomy, but is fuller and very differently phrased. Jos 20 says that the children of Israel in the days of Joshua set up the six cities, three on the west, three on the east, of Jordan.

4. unawares: lit. 'without knowledge.' Nu 35 [11] RVm, 'through error.'

6. avenger of blood (2 S 14 [11]; Nu 35 [19] ff.; Jos 20 [3-9]). Hebrew 'Goël' = 'one who reclaims or revindicates a right,' then 'one who releases, redeems' (Ru 3 [9, 12] RVm; Job 19 [25]; Ps 19 [14], etc.).

9. These cities could be taken as additional to the three in 4 [41-42], and the three in [2] above, but Jos 20 only knows of six altogether, and 4 [41] ff. is apparently not known to the writer of 19 [1-13].

11-13. The murderer, however, is not to escape. Only blood can atone for blood wilfully shed. Note the part played by the elders (cf. 21 [2-6, 19, 20], 22 [15-18], 25 [7-9], etc.). In Deuteronomy they exercise judicial functions. The Goël is the executioner, but the elders must first try the accused and hand him over, if found guilty, to the avenger.

14. Removal of landmark (27 [17]; Hos 5 [10]; Pr 22,[28], 23 [10]; Job 24[2])—a serious crime. **they of old time**: lit. 'the former ones' = ancestors (Lev 26 [45]). This law, therefore, refers to a time subsequent to the settlement in Canaan.

15-21. The law of witness.

15 reaffirms 17 [6] as a general rule (cf. Nu 35 [30] [P]).

16. an unrighteous witness: lit. 'a witness of violence' (Ex 23 [1]; Ps 35 [11] RVm). **wrongdoing**, RVm 'rebellion' = defection—in 13 [5] in a religious sense, here more generally. **17.** See 17 [8-9].

21. life for life, etc., as Ex 21 [23] f.; Lev 24 [18-20]. See Mt 5 [38].

XX. War. Regulations.—Peculiar to Deuteronomy. Would come more naturally between 21 [9] and [10].

2. the priest. War a religious duty, consecrated by sacrifice, as 1 S 7 [9], 13 [9-12]; cf. the phrase 'consecrate a war' (Mic 3 [5] RVm; Jer 6 [4], etc.).

5. the officers (1 [15] note). **dedicated it**: a good custom, not mentioned elsewhere.

6. used (28 [30]; see Jer 31 [5] RVm. 'Hebrew *profane*, or *make common*,' etc.) = the fifth year 'use' in Lev 19 [23-25].

7. As 24 [5].

9. captains of hosts, as 1 K 2 [5]: cf. Dt 1 [15].

11. tributary: rather as RVm.

12-14. Irreconcilable with Christian standards, but lenient as compared with cruelties often practised in ancient warfare (Am 1 [3, 13], etc.).

15-18 look like an addition to reconcile [12-14] with 7 [1-4].

16. aught that breatheth: lit. 'any breath,' as Jos 10 [40], 11 [14], etc.; only of human beings.

19-20. Ctr. 2 K 3 [19, 25]; cutting down palm trees frequent in Arabic warfare, so also Assyrian, etc.

20. bulwarks: rather 'siegework.' Same Hebrew word in [19] 'besieged.'

XXI. 1-9. The dead body found in the field. Clearly a law of primitive character.

2. elders and judges (16 [18] note), Ezr 10 [14]. Possibly judges here called in only for measuring, as in [3-6] elders only.

5. the priests the sons of Levi (18 [1] note); needed to see that the correct Jehovah-formula is used.

7. answer and say, as 26 [5]: cf. 27 [14] f.

8. forgive: lit. cover (or wipe away)—of God, as 32 [43]; Jer 18 [23]; Ps 65 [3] ('purge away'); and especially Gen 32 [20]: lit. 'I will cover his face with the present'; in P always of the priest, as Lev 1 [4], 4 [20], etc. ('make atonement').

10-XXV. Miscellaneous laws, mainly civil and domestic.

XXI. 10-14. female captive: connected with war-legislation of 20; peculiar to Deuteronomy. **10*a*** = 20 [1a].

14. let her go . . . Cf. Jer 34 [16]; Ex 21 [8].

15-17. Right of the firstborn. Peculiar to Deuteronomy.

17. a double portion, as 2 K 2 [9] (Zech 13 [8]). **the beginning**, as Gen 49 [3] RVm 'firstfruits,' etc. **right of firstborn** = 'birthright' in Gen 25 [31-34].

18-21. Incorrigible son. Peculiar to Deuteronomy, but cf. 27 [16]; Ex 21 [15, 17]; Lev 20 [9].

18, 20. stubborn and rebellious = Jer 5 [23] (Hebrew); Ps 78 [8].

19. elders of his city (19 [12]). **the gate**, where the elders sat and administered justice (22 [15], 25 [7]; Ru 4 [1, 2, 11]; Am 5 [10, 15], etc.). **21. stone**: 13 [10] *v.n.*

21*b* = 13 [5, 11], 17 [13], 19 [20].

22-23. Body hung on a tree *after* execution (as Jos 10 [26-27]; 2 S 4 [12]). **accursed of God.** Quoted Gal 3 [13], but omitting 'of God.'

XXII. 1-4. Thy brother's things lost or animals strayed or fallen.

1, 4. Cf. Ex 23 [4, 5] ('enemy').

2-3. Peculiar to Deuteronomy.

5. Peculiar to Deuteronomy; directed against the simulated changes of sex in Canaanite and Syrian heathenism (Robertson Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, 365).

6-7. Peculiar to Deuteronomy, indicating either respect for parenthood (5 [16]) or right to the produce, but not to the bird itself.

8. Peculiar to Deuteronomy, but cf.

Ex 21 33-36. Eastern roofs are flat (Jos 2 6; Ac 10 9).

9-11. Natural distinctions are to be observed (cf. Lev 19 19).

9*b*. Peculiar to Deuteronomy. **be forfeited**, i.e. to the sanctuary (so RVm); cf. same verb Lev 6.

12. RVm 'twisted threads' (1 K 7 17 †: cf. Nu 15 38 'tassels,' where also a motive is given) (cf. Mt 9 20, 23 5).

13-20. **Laws relating to marriage.** See also 24 1-4, 25 3-9.

14. **shameful things**: lit. caprices of words.

17. **the garment** = wrapper or mantle, used often for sleeping on (24 13) as well as for wearing by day (22 3, 5).

19. **amerce**, i.e. fine. **his wife**, *his*, emphatic. **put away** (24 1a).

21. **the men of her city**: cf. 21 21, 13 10. **folly**: almost always used of acts of immorality: cf. Is 32 6 RVm 'fool'; Jer 29 23.

22. Penalty for adultery, as Lev 20 10: cf. Ezek 16 38. 40, etc., and Jn 8 5.

23-24. **treated as** = adultery, betrothal being as binding as marriage.

23-27. Peculiar to Deuteronomy.

28-29. Cf. Ex 22 16 f. 29*b*. As 19*b*.

30. So 27 20; Lev 18 8, 20 11. **father's wife**, i.e. step-mother.

XXIII. 1-6. **Persons Inadmissible into the Assembly of Jehovah.—Jehovah's assembly**, i.e. the religious community (Nu 16 3, 20 4; Mic 2 5; 1 Ch 28 8 †).

1 may be directed against the religious mutilations of the Galli, but the kings of Israel and Judah adopted the employment of eunuchs from neighbouring courts (1 S 8 15 RVm; 1 K 22 9, etc.), and this regulation is probably similar to 14 1; Lev 21 20, 22 24: ctr. the more spiritual conception of Is 56 3-5: cf. Ac 8 27-38.

2. **bastard.** Probably = the offspring of an incestuous union or of one within the prohibited degrees of affinity (Lev 18 6-18, 20 10-21), not = one born out of wedlock.

3-6. Cf. Lam 1 10; Neh 13 1. **they met you not . . .** Dt 2 19 ff. is silent on this point, and 2 29 seems to imply the contrary. **when ye came forth out of Egypt** could hardly be spoken of an event which took place forty years after the Exodus by one who spoke only six months after that event had taken place. **they** (Hebrew 'he') **hired** (Nu 22 5, etc.). **Mesopotamia**, RVm as in Gen 24 10c 'Aram-Naharaim.'

6. **not seek their peace** (Ezr 9 12: ctr. Jer 29 7).

7-8. **Edomite and Egyptian admissible in the third generation.** Cf. 2 4 (ctr. Am 1 11-12, etc.); Is 19 18-25.

9-14. **Camp-purity.** Cf. Nu 5 1-4.

15-16. **an escaped slave**, i.e. one who comes from a foreign land. **Thou** = Israel, and **one of thy gates** = an Israelitish city.

17-18. **Religious Prostitution Abominable to Jehovah.—harlot, sodomite**: see RVm: lit. 'sacred' persons, i.e. dedicated to a deity for purposes of religious prostitution. **hire**: Hebrew word regularly of a harlot's hire, as Mic 1 7, etc. **dog**: opprobrious name for a 'Kadesh.'

19-20. **Usury forbidden in the case of a brother.** Cf. 15 3; Ex 22 25; Lev 25 36-37. Loans in ancient days were for relief of distress only. For commercial loans see Mt 25 27. **20. foreigner** (15 3).

21-23. **Vows.**—No parallel in JE, but cf. (P) Nu 30 2. See Gen 28 20; 1 S 1 11, etc.; Dt 12 6, etc.; and RV ref.

23. **a freewill offering**, rather adv. 'freely.'

24-25. **Neighbour's crops.** Cf. Mt 12 1.

XXIV. 1-4. **Divorce.** Not commanded, but recognized as customary. 1-3 are all governed by 'when,' 4 is the concluding clause which in English would be naturally introduced by 'then,' 'then' and 'that' in 1 are in Hebrew 'and.' And so in 2: lit. 'and she departs . . . and goes and becomes . . .' No parallel law. Lev 21 7, 14, 22 13, Nu 30 9 speak of the divorced woman, but contain no legislation. Jer 3 1 seems to refer to Deuteronomy. For whole passage see Mk 10 2-12. **unseemly thing** = 'unclean thing' (23 14, RVm 'Hebrew nakedness of a thing').

1, 3. **bill of divorcement**: lit. 'a writ of cutting off' (Jer 3 8; Is 50 1; Mt 5 31, 19 7; Mk 10 4). A formal document formally delivered was legally customary.

4. **defiled.** Cf. use of same term in Lev 18 20, Nu 5 13, 14, 20 of adultery: cf. Mt 5 32. **the land**, as Is 24 5; Lev 18 25.

5. **The newly married man.** Peculiar to Deuteronomy (cf. 20 5-7).

6. **The handmill**, indispensable (cf. 12-13 and Mt 24 41; Ex 11 5).

7. **man-stealing**, as Ex 21 16.

8-9. **leprosy.** The priests the Levites know how Jehovah would have leprosy dealt with, and their instructions must be carefully carried out (cf. 17 10b). No parallel in JE; two long chapters in P (Lev 13, 14).

8*b*. I: probably = Jehovah: cf. 'me' (7 4).

9. **Miriam.** Nu 12 (JE).

10-13. **pledges.** See 6, 10-11. Peculiar to Deuteronomy.

12-13. As Ex 22 26 f.; ctr. Am 2 8.

13. **garment** (22 17).

14-15. **the poor hired servant**, as Lev 19 13b.

16. Personal Responsibility.—Peculiar to Deuteronomy. Among the ancients the family of a criminal often suffered with him (Est 9 13 f.; Jos 7 24 f.; 2 S 21 1-9). Quoted by the compiler (2 K 14 6: cf. Ezek 18).

17-18. Justice to weak. As 6; Ex 22 21 f., 23 6, etc. 18 = 22, 15 15.

19-21. gleanings. Cf. Lev 19 9 f., 23 22.

XXV. **1-3. Bastinado.**—Peculiar to Deuteronomy. Bastinado was inflicted on the soles of the feet. This rule restricts its severity. See 2 Cor 11 24. **seem vile unto thee,** rather 'be dishonoured before thine eyes' (verb as 27 16).

4. No Muzzling of Ox.—Peculiar to Deuteronomy and characteristic; quoted 1 Cor 9 9; 1 Tim 5 18). Threshing by unmuzzled oxen still prevails in Syria, etc.

5-10. Levirate Marriage.—Peculiar to Deuteronomy. The motive was to prevent the extinction of a family. An ancient tribal institution (see Gen 38), which, with variations, has prevailed very widely in different parts of the world.

5. dwell together on the same family estate; otherwise the law did not apply. **perform the duty of an husband's brother:** one word in Hebrew; a proof that 'a husband's brother' was an important relation in ancient Hebrew society.

6. As Ru 4 5, 10, although strictly this is not a levirate marriage. Boaz is a Goēl (Lev 25 25 f.), not a Levir, but acts as such, because Naomi has no surviving son. Lev 18 16, 20 21 is either the general law, which in the exceptional circumstances herein dealt with is set aside, or the legislation of a later time.

11-12. Immodest Acts.—A typical case is selected. Even when it is committed in extenuating circumstances, it is to be dealt with without pity.

13-16. Just measures, as Lev 19 35-36.

17-19. Amalek, as Ex 17 8-16. The injunction suits the situation in the land of Moab, but it comes oddly in the connexion here. 1 S 15 speaks of total annihilation, but the Amalekites reappear in 1 S 30: cf. 1 Ch 4 43.

XXVI. **1-11. Firstfruits.**— It is a question whether the whole (as 18 4 implies), or only part of the firstfruits was given to the priests (the Hebrew of 2 strictly = 'some of the first').

3. the priest . . . (17 9, 19 17, 18 3 *v.n.*).

3b, **5-10***a*. Formulas prescribed by the priest, and said after him (21 7). The second largely consists of reminiscences of JE in Gen 47 and Ex 1, 3, 4 with one or two from Nu 20.

5. Syrian: RVm 'Aramean.' Jacob's mother and his two wives came from Aram (Gen 24 4, 10 RVm, etc.), he himself resided there for many years, and Abraham calls it 'my country.' **ready to perish:** RVm 'wandering' or 'lost' (so of animals, Jer 50 6; Ezek 34 4; Ps 119 176.)

8, 9. Cf. 4 34; Jer 32 21-22.

10. set it down. The priest (4) being the actual agent.

11. rejoice, i.e. in the sacrificial feast (12 7, 12, 18, 16 11, 14).

12-15. Formula after Tithing.—Cf. 3, 5-10.

12. Tithe of the third year was not brought to the sanctuary, but laid up 'within thy gates' (14 28 f.).

13. before Jehovah, i.e. at the sanctuary, probably at the Feast of Booths. **the hallowed things,** i.e. the tithe. **put away** (13 5 etc.). **any of thy commandments,** i.e. regarding the tithe (see 14).

14 has guarded the tithe from ceremonial defilement (cf. Nu 19 11, 14; Lev 22 3-6). **for the dead** (14 1), alluding to sending gifts of food at funerals (2 S 3 35; Jer 16 7), or 'to the dead,' alluding to custom of placing food in the grave (Tob 4 17; Ecclus 30 18).

16-19. closing exhortation. Of which 28 no doubt originally formed part.

17-18. avouched: lit. 'caused to say,' each party to the covenant 'causing' the other to say what he will do. So **to be** = 'that he will be.'

18. a peculiar people (7 6; Ex 19 5 *v.n.*; and see Intro., I; cf. Jer 7 23, etc.).

19. As 28 1. **in praise,** etc. RVm 'for a praise,' etc., as Jer 13 11 f. **as he hath spoken,** i.e. Ex 19 6.

XXVII. **Mount Ebal.**—**Moses** in 1, 9, 11 as in 1 1-5, etc., marks off this chapter from 26 and 28, and all the phenomena point to its being a later insertion and composite (1-8 'ye' and 'thou' intermingled; 2b, 3a duplicated in 4; 2, 4, 8 great stones and 5-7 'altar' intermingled; 2 'on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan,' but 4 'Mount Ebal' many miles away).

1. the elders. Here only in Deuteronomy associated with Moses. Were they in original text (note Hebrew verb in singular and 'I command') ?

2, 4. plaister, i.e. coat with lime, so as to provide a smooth surface for writing upon—an Egyptian custom.

3. that thou mayest go in. Occupation of the land to come *after* the ceremony (ctr. Jos 8).

4. Ebal. Sam. has 'Gerizim.' One or other probably an arbitrary alteration. 'Gerizim' may be original here (cf. 12, and see Jn 4 20).

5-7. As Ex 20 24-25, 24 4-11; Jos 8 30 f.
8. As 3 and Jos 8 32-35.

9-10. **possible original link between 26 and 28.** They are unconnected with 8 or 11, and note 'this day' as 26 16-18.

9. **the priests the Levites** (18 1). **all Israel** (1 1).

11-13. **Gerizim and Ebal** (11 26-30; Jos 8 33).

12. **Levi** here stands with his brethren, the sons of Leah and Rachel. Ctr. position of Levites in 14.

14-26. **Twelve Imprecations.**—All the offences are forbidden or deprecated in JE, H, and D, but not all in any one other code, and resemblances are rarely verbal. They can hardly be the original sequel of 11-13. They may be (part of) an old liturgical document inserted later.

14. **Levites.** If used as in Deuteronomy (see 18 1, 7); if as in P (see Lev 8-10).

15 ff. **Amen:** lit. adjective 'firm, so adverbially 'verily' (1 K 1 36; Jer 11 5, 28 6, and [liturgically as here] Nu 5 22; Neh 8 6; Ps 106 48).

16. **set light by** (25 3 *v.n.*).

XXVIII. **Final Exhortation.**—Cf. Ex 23 20-33 and Lev 26 3-45.

1-14. **The blessings which will follow obedience.**

1. **And it shall come to pass.** Does not follow naturally on 27, whereas it follows admirably 26 16-19 and 27 9-10 n. **set thee on high**, as 26 19. 4. As 7 13.

10. **shall see that Jehovah's name is called over thee** (so lit.). For sense see RVm in 2 S 12 28; 1 K 8 43; Jer 7 10, 11, etc.

15-68. **The Curses which will Come on the Nation if it Disobeys.**—A series of pictures of calamity, parallel to those of blessing (1-14).

22. **sword.** Rather as RVm 'drought' with Sam., Vulgate.

25. **tossed to and fro.** Rather as RVm 'a terror unto,' as Jer 15 4, 24 9, 29 18, 34 17 in Hebrew.

26. As Jer 7 33 (16 4, 19 7, 34 20).

27. **emerods.** As RVm 2 'plague boils' (1 S 5 6, 9, 12, 6 4, 5 †).

35. Leprosy. Cf. Job 2 8.

36*b* = Jer 16 13. 49. Cf. Jer 5 15.

51. Cf. Jer 5 17.

53. Cf. Jer 19 9; cf. 57 below.

58. **written in this book.** Cf. 61. According to these expressions the Deuteronomic law from the first was a written book (29 21, 30 10, 31 26), whereas 31 1, 9 says Moses first 'spake,' and then 'wrote.'

63*a* = Jer 32 41.

64*a* = Jer 9 16, 16 13. Clearly Jeremiah knew Deuteronomy (or *vice versa*).

68. **ships.** Probably the slave-galleys of the Phœnicians. 29 1; this verse in the Hebrew Bible is the conclusion of 28. The covenant at Horeb is based on Ex 20-23; the covenant in the land of Moab is based on Dt 12-26, 28.

XXIX.-XXX. **A Supplementary Discourse.**—Divisible into four sections: 29 2-9, 10-29, 30 1-10, 11-20. Note numerous phrases in common with Jeremiah.

XXIX. 2-9. Recapitulates the ideas of 4-11 in much the same language. 2*a* = 5 10.

6. **know that I am Jehovah.** Only here in Deuteronomy; almost as Ex 7 17, 8 22b (JE), and Ex 6 7, 7 5, etc. (P); Ezekiel (more than fifty times). The shorter Hebrew form of 'I,' used in Deuteronomic discourses only here and 12 30, indicates that the writer adopted the phrase from current speech.

10. Lit. 'ye are stationed' (cf. 1 S 10 19, 'present yourselves,' and Jos 24 1). **tribes:** rather 'judges' (difference of one letter only), so LXX (see 16 18 note). **officers** (1 15 note).

11. **camps** (Hebrew 'camp'): often in JE and P, but in Deuteronomy only here and 2 14 f. of the abode of Israel as a whole (23 9-14 speaks of a military camp after Israel has settled in the land). **stranger**, i.e. sojourner, an indication of the period of the writer (see 10 18, etc.).

13. See 26 17-18, etc.; Ex 6 7.

15. The covenant involves future generations.

17. **abominations.** Better 'detestable things' to distinguish it from another word (used in 7 25, etc.; see Jer 16 18 for the two). Only here in Pentateuch, but frequent in time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. **idols**, or 'idol-blocks,' in Pentateuch only here and Lev 26 30; in 1 and 2 K six times, Jeremiah one, Ezekiel thirty-nine.

19*b* = Jer 23 17. **stubbornness of heart.** Jeremiah eight times and Ps 81 12 †.

19*c*. Lit. 'to sweep away the watered (Is 58 11) with the parched' (Ezek 19 13 'thirsty'), i.e. all. The reference is to herbage. Result regarded as purpose (cf. Hos 8 4).

20. 'will not be willing to pardon.' **written** (28 58 note).

22 ff. Not now individual man (as 18-21), but nation. The dread future regarded as certainty.

24 f. As Jer 22 8 f.; 1 K 9 8 f.

28. **rooted** ('plucked'), only here in Pentateuch; Jeremiah thirteen times, elsewhere seven. **in anger . . .** = Jer 21 5, 32 37. **as at this day:** the Exile a present-day fact (2 30 note).

29. **the secret things**, i.e. the future, in contrast to revealed present duties.

XXX. **Supplementary discourse continued.**

3. will turn thy captivity (as Am 9 [14]; Jer 29 [14] + six times): lit. 'turn a turning,' so 'change decisively thy fortune or condition,' not 'bring back thy captivity,' which is expressed in a later clause here, as in Jer 29 [14], etc. **4.** Cf. Neh 1 [9].

5. the land, etc.: cf. Jer 30 [3].

6. circumcise (10 [16] and Jeremiah). 9 = 28 [11]. **10. if:** rather 'when.'

11-20. The previous ten verses declare that in that sad future of Israel's Exile, when Jehovah sees His people penitent, He will again rejoice over them for good. In [11] 'For' implies that a reason for Jehovah's future mercy is going to be given, but instead we find an exhortation to present obedience, based on the 'nearness of the word.' If 32 [45-47] originally stood between [10] and [11], they provide an excellent transition to [11-20].

11. this commandment ([20], 11 [22], 19 [9], 6 [4-9]): not = the whole mass of laws, but the love of God and obedience to Him. Quoted in Rom 10 [6-8] as applicable to the Gospel 'word.'

15-20 present the great choice to be made. Here the discourses end.

XXXI.-XXXIV. Narrative of Pentateuch resumed, the nucleus being (as in Genesis to Numbers) JE, expanded by D, and completed by the addition of fragments from P.

XXXI. **1-8. Parting words by Moses.**

1. Moses went (from where he was) **and spake these words,** i.e. words preceding (so Hebrew), but these cannot be 29-30, for they have already been spoken: they were probably 3 [23-28]. **6-8.** Cf. Jos 1 [6], etc.

9-13. Law written and given to priests and elders with a view to public reading at the Sanctuary.

9. the priests, etc. (21 [5], 18 [1] note). **bare the ark** ([25], 10 [8] note). **year of release** (15 [1]). **feast of tabernacles** (Booths) (16 [13] ff.), **the place . . . before all Israel:** clearly one central 'place' to which 'all Israel' comes. **thou:** LXX has 'ye.'

14-23. Commissioning of Joshua.—A composite passage, not Deuteronomic in style ([14, 15, 23] have many links in phraseology with JE, and give a different account of Joshua's appointment from that of D in 1 [37] f., 3 [21] and above [7-8], and from that of P in Nu 27 [15-23]. [16-22] are relative to 'the Song' in 32 [1-43], and seem out of place here).

14 f. tent of meeting (Ex 33 [7] note, etc.). The tent only here in Deuteronomy.

15. pillar of cloud (Nu 12 [5]; Ex 33 [9-10] (both JE).

16-18, 20-21. they, them, us, our: in Hebrew mostly in singular, referring to 'this people' as a unit.

16. go a whoring. Probably phrase originally referred to the immoralities of Canaanite worship (Hos 4 [12-14]), but often figurative (Hos 2, 3). **strange** (strictly 'foreign') **gods:** cf. Jos 24 [20, 23]; Gen 35 [2, 4] (both E); Ps 81 [9b] (not 9[a]); Mal 2 [11].

19. ye, i.e. Moses and Joshua. (cf. 32 [44]), but some would read 'thou' as in next clause.

19 and 21. The Song is to witness both to the fact that they had been forewarned and to the goodness of Him whom they have despised. So in [26] the Law.

23 followed originally [14-15], Jehovah ([14]) giving the charge, not Moses ([22]).

24-29. Levites to put the book of the Law in the ark, etc. Once more Deuteronomic in style. [24-27] is either a sequel or perhaps rather a duplicate of [9-13].

25. the Levites. Ctr. [9] 'the priests the sons of Levi.' **26. witness** ([19] and [21]).

28-29. According to some, a second introduction to 'the Song' (cf. [19-21]), but **assembly** in [30] seems to refer back to [28], and [28] **these words** more naturally refer to 'the words of this law' ([24-26]; cf. 32 [45-47]). Very possibly [24-29] once stood before 29 [2]-30 [20]. The proposal to appeal to heaven and earth in [28] would then be carried out in 30 [19], and [28-29] would refer to the Law and not to the Song.

30 introduces the Song (cf. [22] and 32 [44]).

XXXII. **The Song of Moses**—*Date.*—The settlement in Canaan is in [7] 'the days of old'; Israel ([6-18]) has fallen into idolatry, and ([30]) is in low estate; its deliverance ([36] ff.) lies in the future. It has been assigned to the times of Jehoash or his son Jeroboam II (2 K 13 [25], 14 [25], etc., about 780 B.C.), but theological and literary features suggest the age of Jeremiah or Ezekiel (about 630 B.C.), and it has noticeable affinities with Proverbs and Job.

1-6. General theme—the faithfulness, etc., of Jehovah and His people's folly.

4. The Rock, of God (six times in the Song, etc.).

5. The Hebrew text in course of transmission has suffered corruption. **perverse,** 'twisted' (cf. Pr 8 [8] + ten times, etc.). **crooked** (cf. Job 5 [13], etc.).

6. bought: RVm 'possessed' or 'gotten' (cf. Is 1 [3] 'owner').

7-14. Historical retrospect.

8. according to . . . sons of Israel, i.e. so as to preserve an adequate home for Israel. Moffatt's translation 'each with its guardian angel' is based upon the LXX reading 'sons of God (El).' Angels, according to this reading, have the nations

as their portion; Israel is 'Jehovah's portion.'

10. waste. As Gen 1 [2]; Jer 4 [23]; Job 12 [24] = Ps 107 [40] ('wilderness').

11. eagle, strictly 'vulture' (Tristram).

12. strange, 'foreign,' as 31 [16].

13. increase, 'fruitage' = Lam 4 [9].

14. butter, i.e. butter-milk (cf. Jg 5 [25]). Read and rams at the end of the second line. The third line will then begin: 'herds (lit. "sons") of Bashan.' **Kidney-fat,** i.e. the choicest of the wheat.

15-18. Jeshurun's unfaithfulness.

15. Jeshurun = the Upright One (33 [5, 26]; Is 44 [2]).

16. Lit. 'strangers,' as Jer 2 [25], 3 [13], etc.

17. demons (Shêdim): Ps 106 [37] †. Shîdu was the name of the demi-gods, represented by bull-colossi in the front of Assyrian palaces. LXX has 'daimonia.' **no god,** or 'no-gods,' as Jer 2 [11], 5 [7], 16 [20]; 2 Ch 13 [9]: cf. [21] 'not-El.' **dreaded,** or 'shuddered at' (Jer 2 [12]; Ezek 27 [35], 32 [10] †).

18. gave thee birth, of God, as Ps 90 [2]; RVm: cf. Pr 8 [24-25].

19-27. Jehovah's resolve to punish.

22. a fire . . . anger = Jer 15 [14], 17 [4]. **unto lowest Sheol** (cf. Am 9 [2]: see RVm, Gen 37 [35]). (Sheol thirty-three times in Job, Psalms, Proverbs, and thirty-one times elsewhere.)

24 f. Cf. the four sore judgements in Ezek 14 [21] ([15-21]); Hab 3 [5]. **burning heat,** Hebrew Resheph, name of Phœnician Fire-god, whose fiery darts produced pestilence; here = the Fire-bolt (Ca 8 [6]; Job 5 [7]; Ps 76 [3], 78 [48] †).

28-43. But also to intervene and give victory.

29. latter end, i.e. the inevitable issue of the course they are taking.

31 ff. their, i.e. the heathen nations.

32 f. For is parallel to 'For' in [31].

33. dragons. Old English for serpents, 'reptiles.'

34. this, i.e. the moral corruption of the nations. It will be punished.

35. Lit. 'to me vengeance' (as Rom 12 [19]; Heb 10 [30]), but Sam., LXX 'to the day of vengeance' (difference in Hebrew of one additional consonant), as Jer 46 [10]. This fits in with [34] 'sealed for the day' and with the parallel clause of this verse.

36. judge, i.e. 'vindicate,' as Gen 30 [6].

39. I, even I. Short Hebrew form of 'I,' 29 [6] *v.n.* **I am He** (Is 41 [4] *v.n.*, 43 [10-13], 46 [4], 48 [12] †: cf. Ps 102 [27], lit. 'thou art He'). **make alive,** not resurrection, but rescue from mortal peril (1 S 2 [6]; 2 K 5 [7]).

42. the head of the leaders. Better *the head of flowing locks* (see RVm and cf. Nu 6 [5]; Ezek 44 [20], Hebrew †), perhaps reference to warriors consecrated to war and under vow like a Nazirite.

43. Rejoice . . . Probably = 'Sing joyously, O nations, of his people.' **for his land, for his people:** read, as Sam., LXX, Vulgate 'the land of his people.'

44. came (and spake): cf. 31 [1], i.e. from where he was. **Hoshea,** elsewhere in Nu 13 [8, 16] (P) only. Either here later addition or textual error (Sam., LXX, Vulgate 'Joshua').

45-47. Final Exhortation (Deuteronomic phraseology).—Speaks of 'the words of this law,' not of 'the Song.' It would therefore be more appropriate between 30 [10] and 30 [11] (see note there).

47. it is your life. Cf. 30 [15, 19] and especially [20].

48-52. Moses Commanded to Ascend Mount Nebo (phraseology is that of P).—Cf. Nu 27 [12-14]; [48] 'that selfsame day,' as Gen 7 [13], 17 [23, 26], etc. (P); Ezek 2 [3], etc.; [49] and [52] 'I' ('ani), as P regularly, see 29 [6] note; [49] 'for a possession,' as Lev 14 [34], etc. (P): ctr. Dt 4 [21], etc. (D); 'be gathered . . .' only in P, Gen 25 [8], etc.; [50] 'Hor the mountain,' so always in the Hebrew, Nu 20 [22-27], 21 [4a], 33 [37-41], all P; 'Meribah of Kadesh,' Nu 27 [14] (P); Ezek 47 [19], 48 [28]; 'wilderness of Zin,' as only in P.

XXXIII. **The Blessing of Moses.**—Cf. and ctr. Gen 49 [2-27]. The Blessing has no denunciations; the tone is more religious; circumstances are prosperous (? in the days of Jeroboam I or II).

6-25. the original poem, [2-5, 26-29] **later lyrical framework.**

1. the man of God, title given to Moses here and Jos 14 [6], Ps 90 title †; frequently of prophets in 1 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings.

2. Sinai (1 [2] note). **Seir,** as Jg 5 [4]; Hab 3 [3]. **rose,** as the rising sun: lit. 'beamed forth,' as Gen 32 [31]; Mal 4 [2]; Is 60 [1-2]. **Mount Paran,** as Hab 3 [3]: see note on 1 [1]. **from . . . holy ones.** Probably original text 'with holy myriads,' or 'to Meribath-Kadesh,' 32 [51] (Hebrew consonants in both cases almost = present text). **law.** dâth is a Persian word (Ezra, Esther, Daniel only), perhaps originally *yoqedeth*, 'a burning' (fire): cf. Hab 3 [4].

3. the peoples. LXX has 'his people. 'sat down,' Hebrew very doubtful. ? 'went forth' (as Hab 3 [5]). **at thy feet,** lit. 'according to thy foot,' i.e. whithersoever thou wentest (as 1 S 25 [42], Hebrew).

4. 'Moses . . . law.' ? interpolation, for **inheritance** (lit. 'possession,' as Ezek 11 [15] and six times) not suitable of 'law,' but = Canaan, as Ex 6 [8] ('heritage') and Ezekiel.

5. **Jeshurun** (26, 32 15 note).

6. **Reuben.** The tribe seems to have dwindled and lost its possessions to Moab (Jg 5 15 f.; Jos 13 15 ff.; Is 15-16; Jer 48).

7. **Judah.** Other tribal blessings (except 6) all begin: 'and of — he said.' Simeon omitted (ctr. Gen 49 5)—perhaps because early absorbed into Judah (cf. Jos 19 1-8 with 15 26-32. 42, and see Jg 1 3. 17), but some would read 'Simeon' here instead of 'Judah,' and connect 7b with 11 as the original blessing of Judah. This would restore the usual order Levi-Judah. 'bring him to his people' implies that the tribe is separated from the rest of Israel. Is this a prayer for the reunion of Judah to Israel after the disruption?

7b. **with his hands he contended,** or read 'with thy hands contend' and continue 'and be thou . . .'—a continuation of the prayer in 11a. **8-10. Levi.**

8. **Thummim . . .** (Ex 28 30; 1 S 14 41; LXX). **godly one:** Hebrew word akin to 'mercy' in 7 9 note. **whom,** i.e. the tribe, as represented by Moses and Aaron (Ex 17 1-7; Nu 20 1-13), but this is very doubtful. Another current version of Massah and Meribah (not recorded in present Pentateuch) may be referred to.

9 seems to refer to Ex 32 27-29, but verbs may equally be present tense, and 'for they' suggests that the passage may be meant to describe the impartiality of the Levitical Judge.

10. **incense.** Rather 'sweet smoke' of the fat of sacrifices, as Ps 66 15 and usually: cf. verb in Lev 3 5, etc.

11. See 7 note. **substance** = 'wealth' (8 17) or 'strength' (1 S 2 4; 2 S 22 40).

12. **Benjamin.** Rachel's sons here put after Leah's first four. **The beloved of Jehovah:** ctr. Gen 49 27. 'beloved' as Jer 11 15; Ps 60 5, and for sense cf. Gen 44 20. **he** (i.e. Jehovah) **dwelleth between his** (i.e. Benjamin's) **shoulders.** The Temple site was just within the border of Benjamin. 'shoulders' metaph. of a reclining man, but used also of the shoulder of a mountain in Jos 15 8, RVm, 18 16 referring to the site of Jerusalem.

13-17. **Joseph** = Ephraim and Manasseh: cf. Gen 49 22-26.

13. **for:** lit. 'from' (indicating the source or nature of the blessing); translate *by* or *with*. **for the dew,** read 'above,' as Gen 49 25. **coucheth** (Hebrew) = 29 20 'lie upon,' and Gen 49 25, usually of animals.

14. **moons:** lit. 'months,' but with play upon cognate word 'moon': cf. 'sun' in parallel clause.

14-16. **precious things** (Ca 4 13. 16, 7 13 †), may be a north Israel Aramaism.

15. Cf. Gen 49 26 RVm; Hab 3 6). **chief things:** rather 'top,' lit. 'head' (Ps 72 16).

16. **the bush** (Ex 3 2-4 †). **dwelt:** elsewhere always of an abiding occupancy (as 12), and possibly so meant here. **that was separate** (same word as Nazirite: Nu 6 2, see RVm), or 'prince,' 'the crowned one' (Nah 3 17; Lam 4 7, RV text).

17. Ctr. Gen 49 23. **wild ox** (Ps 22 21, 92 10; Nu 23 22; Hebrew 'reem' = Assyrian 'rimu,' not = Arabic 'ri'm,' an antelope, as RVm, Nu 23).

18-19. **Zebulon** and **Issachar.** Cf. Gen 49 13-15 (same order) and 35 23, and Ex 1 3 (P) (reversed order). Leah's two sons, born after the four sons of the handmaidens (see Gen 30). **Zebulon,** as Gen 49, has access to the sea. **Issachar** is more stay-at-home.

19. **call,** i.e. invite to a sacrificial feast (1 S 9 13-14, Hebrew). **the peoples,** i.e. foreign nations, the periodical feasts being occasions for trade, like the medieval fairs. **the mountain:** perhaps Tabor. Local sanctuaries were customary at this time. **sacrifices of righteousness** (Ps 4 5, 51 19 †). **treasures of the sand:** Josephus and Strabo say that the sand about 'Akko was much used in the manufacture of glass.

20-22. **Gad and Dan.** Cf. Gen 49 16-19 (together, but in reverse order), sons of Zilpah and Bilhah respectively (see Gen 30 6. 11, 35 25-26).

22. **he that enlargeth,** i.e. God or a victorious leader. **Gad,** a martial tribe, as Gen 49.

21. **provided . . . for himself.** RVm; Hebrew 'saw,' as Gen 22 8. **the first part:** first in value, or in order of occupation (Nu 32 1-5, etc.). **lawgiver:** RVm 'ruler' (Jg 5 14; Is 33 22; Gen 49 10): military and judicial functions in primitive days were generally combined. **with:** a reasonable conjecture. The Hebrew text is hardly intelligible as it stands. The two and a half tribes co-operated with the rest in conquering Canaan. **justice, judgements,** apparently = the command to drive out the Canaanites (Ex 23 31-33).

22. **Dan, a lion's whelp** (in Gen 49 9 said of Judah): cf. Gen 49 17, a serpent or adder. **from Bashan,** of the lion, but may also have been meant to apply to Dan, for Bashan, according to Jos 12 1. 5, extended as far as Hermon: cf. Jos 19 47; Jg 18 29 (Laish is a Hebrew word for lion: Is 30 6).

23-25. **Naphtali and Asher.** The one a son of Bilhah, the other a son of Zilpah (cf. Gen 49 20-21, 30 8-13, 35 25 f., and note

on 20-22 above). Naphtali is to have not only the 'hill-country' (Jos 20 7), but also the semi-tropical region on the west of the sea of Galilee. **West**: Hebrew 'sea,' i.e. the sea of Galilee (Is 9 1; Nu 34 11). **south**: unusual poetical word, used Job 37 17; Ecclus 1 6, 11 3; Ezek 20 46 and (twelve times) 40-42 †.

24-25. Asher (Gen 30 13, RVm) bordered Naphtali on the west; soil productive, especially of olives. **with children**: lit. from; cf. usage in 13 note, but RVm 'above sons' as Jg 5 24; Gen 3 14. **bar**: i.e. 'bolts,' as verb in Jg 3 23-24; cf Ca 5 5.

26-29. Conclusion. See introductory note to chapter.

27. One of the great words of the Book.

28. the fountain. The stream of descendants.

XXXIV. **The Death of Moses.**—(Composite P 1a, c. 5b, 7-9; JE 1d-5a, 6; D and Rd 10-12.)

1*a* continues the narrative from 32 48-52c, 'went up' being same (Hebrew) verb as 'get thee up' (cf. Nu 27 12). **plains**, or 'steppes' (plural of Arabah), **of Moab** (P only, twelve times; Nu 22 1, etc.; ctr. 5-6 'land of Moab'), the level ground between Jordan and mountains of Moab, 9 miles N. to S. by 5-7 E. to W.; cf. 'steppe' in Is 35 1, 51 3 ('desert'). **Nebo** (32 49; Nu 33 47). **Pisgah** (3 17 note). **of Gilead**, rather 'even Gilead.'

3. the Plain: more lit. 'the Round' or circle (Gen 13 10 RVm, 19 17, 25, 28) **of the valley**, 'even the valley-plain,' i.e. broad level valley, as 8 7, 11 11; Is 40 4; Jos 11 17. **the servant of Jehovah**, of Moses, as Ex 14 31; Nu 12 7-8; Jos 1 1, 13, 15, 8 31, and cf. Heb 3 5, etc.

6. valley (i.e. ravine or glen) **over against Bethpeor** (3 39 note). **sepulchre** = 'grave' (Gen 35 20 and [better] 'burying place' 47 30: all J).

9. Moses had laid his hands (Nu 27 18, 23 [P]).

10. A long time had elapsed since Moses, during which prophets had arisen, but none like unto Moses. A fitting close to the Pentateuch. In the Gospels Elijah appears alongside Moses, but with and above them both stands One who was not merely the greatest of the Prophets, but the 'beloved Son' of God (Mk 9 2-7, and parallels in Matthew and Luke).

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORICAL BOOKS

By G. W. Wade

For a just appreciation of the historical books of the OT certain conditions bearing upon their origin and design need to be taken into account. Among the matters calling for consideration are their collective extent, the aims of their writers, the nature and quality of the sources available for such historical compositions, and the methods whereby, and the spirit wherein, these sources were handled. To judge the productions of the OT historians by the standards of a different age and race, without regard to the materials at their disposal, or the purposes, circumstances, and literary usages which governed their undertakings, is not only to be false to the principles of impartial criticism, but also to prejudice the religious influence which their works are calculated to exert; whilst it is an equal mistake to assume that their religious value carries with it historical inerrancy.

The Extent of the Historical Books.—The extent of the surviving records furnishing *data* for a reconstruction of the history of Israel is remarkably small in comparison with that of the literary remains of some other ancient peoples (especially the Greeks and Romans). All the literature of the Israelites, from the earliest times almost to the beginning of the Christian era, can be comprised within a single volume of no great compass. Naturally, therefore, for an account of certain periods of Hebrew history and of certain sides of Hebrew life materials are deficient. And as a consequence of either the total absence of material in some connexions, or the extreme paucity of it in others, it is inevitable th atvery different conclusions can be drawn from the same *data*, since, if the few facts related are to be intelligibly combined, the historical imagination has to be exercised, and this may be exceedingly free in its range.

The Aims of the Writers.—National history presents many aspects; and the recording of it illuminates various sides of human experience and activity, each of which can become the subject of special interest. In an accouut of a people's past, attention may be focussed upon its external political relations, or upon its internal social and economic conditions,

or upon its religious conceptions and practices. But none of these, not even the last, did the historians of Israel expressly aim at illustrating, though their compositions throw light upon more than one. They were not, indeed, greatly concerned to supply information about the past for its own sake. Their real object was to manifest their belief in the control exercised by Jehovah, the God of Israel, over the fortunes and destiny, primarily of His own people, and secondarily of the world at large. The relations of Israel with surrounding nations, the good or evil administration of its successive rulers, the development that occurred in its religion, all come more or less into view in the course of the narratives; but the aim of the authors may best be defined as the setting forth of their own faith in Jehovah's Power, Providence, and Purity, and its verification in the experiences of their race. The OT, in short, is a record of Israel's past, compiled by writers whose outlook upon bygone or contemporary events was that of *prophets*, i.e. of men whose belief in God and in His inspiration of themselves was so intense and absorbing that they estimated the importance of occurrences and personalities almost entirely by the measure in which they considered them to exemplify or to subserve the Divine activity and the Divine ends. It was therefore with reason that by the Jewish scribes the historical books (exclusive of Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther) were termed the *Former Prophets*, whilst the prophetic books (Isaiah to Malachi, exclusive of Daniel) were distinguished as the *Latter Prophets*. The fact that the OT is dominated by its writers' belief about, and confidence in, Israel's God, of whose nature and character increasingly true notions were gradually in the course of time acquired by them, accounts for many of the peculiarities of the books constituting it. For instance, the choice of subjects for inclusion or omission, and the disproportionate attention paid to certain sides of the national life or of individual characters, at once become intelligible, as soon as the authors' point of view is apprehended. Thus the writers concentrate upon such periods as the conquest of Canaan under Joshua, upon the reigns of Saul, David, and Solomon, of Hezekiah and Josiah, and upon the Restoration from the Exile, because these were critical moments in the history of the Hebrew race and its religion; whilst scarcely any space is given to the reign of Omri (who was so powerful a sovereign that the Assyrians designated the land of Israel by his name) or to that of Jeroboam II (who restored the Northern Kingdom, which had been diminished under his immediate predecessors, to its former limits), the reason seemingly being that these reigns, regarded from a religious aspect, were negligible. In estimating, therefore, the importance, from a purely secular standpoint, of certain personalities and policies in Biblical history, we need to remember that the documents furnishing the materials for our judgements proceed from their opponents. Among a Semitic people religion and politics were so closely intertwined that the religious sympathies of its historians could scarcely fail to affect their account of political conditions or movements.

In connexion with the religious pronouncements of the OT historians upon events related by them, it is desirable to distinguish between the reasonableness of the view taken of the general fortunes of their race, and that of some of the explanations furnished of particular occurrences. In regard to the latter, what is recorded is occasionally accounted for by reference to some offence against Jehovah, evoking His resentment, in cases where we have learned to look for an explanation in another direction. Thus the death of Uzzah (2 S 6[6,7]) is attributed by the historian to the Divine anger occasioned by Uzzah's touching the sacred Ark; whilst we, in the light of later ideas about God and His world, would rather explain what happened by reference to the infirmities to which human life is subject, and would trace the occurrence to some physical cause, like apoplexy or heart disease (cf. Jn 9[1-3]), or to terror at hands being laid upon so sacred an object.

The considerations noted above help to explain why predictions and miracles figure so largely in the historical books; for narratives of how successes or disasters were foretold by Jehovah's prophets, and how the Almighty wrought marvels through them, were calculated to promote and confirm the conviction that Israel was the peculiar people of the God of the whole earth. In connexion with such narratives it may be observed that there is nothing intrinsically irrational in the supposition that the Deity can vary at will the course of nature, of which He is believed to be the Creator, since we ourselves are able, within certain narrow limits, to alter our environment; though whether a marvel is really a 'miracle' in the sense of a real departure

from the Divinely regulated sequences ordinarily observed in physical nature and constituting the basis of our expectations and inferences can; in strictness, be determined only when we have become acquainted with the whole of the universe. Moreover, the conclusion that some of the Hebrew prophets were really endowed with exceptional psychical powers, enabling them to produce, as represented, extraordinary physical effects on other personalities, is countenanced by the analogies which are offered by certain present-day experiences (e.g. faith-healing and cures by suggestion). Nevertheless, as regards several of the miracle-stories (e.g. those in Ex 4; Nu 22; Jos 3, 4, 6; 2 K 2, 4) our wider acquaintance with the ruling methods of Divine action and our more careful weighing of historical evidence afford a presumption that it is less likely that what is recorded in them actually occurred as described than that it originated in defective observation, or in exaggerated reports, or even in pious invention (for it was a Semitic trait to enforce truths less by abstract arguments than by dramatic stories). Similarly, whilst there is strong evidence that many of the prophets possessed a remarkable faculty of prevision, qualifying them to read the future with far more than ordinary penetration, yet it may be suspected that the account of a prediction so circumstantial as that contained in 1 K 13[2] owes something to the imagination of a narrator acquainted with the fulfilment related in 2 K 23[15-18].

Their Sources.—Before proceeding to review the sources of information at the service of the Hebrew historians, it will be well to notice certain disadvantages from which both they and those upon whom they drew suffered, in common with many ancient writers belonging to other races. One was the absence in antiquity of any generally recognized chronological era, reference to which would have made it easy to bring the events of Israel's history into their right position in the history of the world at large; whilst the paucity of allusions in the OT (especially in the books dealing with early periods) to occurrences outside Israel, with which we have some acquaintance from other quarters, renders much of the chronology difficult of ascertainment even in an approximate degree. Among the chronological *data* actually furnished may be mentioned the figures defining the duration of the bondage in Egypt (Gen 15[13]; Ex 12[40, 41]), and the interval between the Exodus and the building of Solomon's Temple (1 K 6[1]). The duration of the Wanderings and of the alternate periods (between the Conquest of Canaan and the Age of the Kings) of national independence and subjection is similarly indicated (Nu 14[33]; Jg 3[11, 30], 5[31], 8[28], etc.); and in the annals of the Monarchy not only is the length of the reigns of successive kings generally specified, but after the disruption of Solomon's kingdom the accession-years of the sovereigns of Israel and Judah are also brought into relation with one another. The figures given, however, are not always self-consistent even in the Hebrew text; and there is often disagreement in respect of them between the Hebrew and the LXX. Moreover, grave suspicion attaches to the value of some of the early figures through the fact that so many consist of 40 or of multiples of 40; the frequent repetition of these round numbers suggests that no trustworthy traditions about the intervals thus defined were available. From the middle of the 9th century, however, the dates of various events related in the OT can be approximately discovered through comparison with the cuneiform inscriptions (in which occur the names of several kings of both Israel and Judah, beginning with Ahab, whose forces were present at a battle fought against Assyria in 854) and through references to the regnal years of successive Persian rulers.

A second circumstance militating against accuracy of detail in Hebrew history is the slight acquaintance which the Hebrews, prior to the Exile, had with foreign countries. A people who were chiefly engaged in agricultural and pastoral pursuits had scant motives for obtaining topographical information about the outside world; travel was difficult and trade limited; maps were unknown; and reports concerning remote regions would inevitably be unprecise, at least until the Hebrew race became comprised within one or other of the great empires of the East. For instance, the direction in which other lands lay in respect to Palestine was sometimes vaguely conceived (Zeph 2[13]), and the names of distant peoples were liable to be confused and distorted (Gen 10[7, 8]).

A third cause prejudicial to accuracy in historical writings generally is the difficulty of estimating and transmitting correctly large numbers (the tendency of ancient writers to exaggerate being signally exemplified by the size attributed to Xerxes' army by Herodotus). The liability of the Hebrew historians to magnify figures is put beyond doubt by

a comparison of those given in Chronicles with the corresponding figures occurring in the parallel passages of Samuel and Kings (cf. 1 Ch 21 [5-6] with 2 S 24 [9], and 1 Ch 21 [25] with 2 S 24 [24]) and by the intrinsic incredibility of some where comparison with earlier estimates is impossible (e.g. 2 Ch 17 [14-19]).

We may now pass to a survey of the nature of the sources lying behind the historical books from Jos to Neh and Est. These cover about seven centuries from the 12th (if the Exodus occurred about 1220 B.C.) to the 5th, and vary in character with the times dealt with. (If, as some authorities believe, the Hebrews are to be identified with the *Habiru*, a people who invaded Palestine early in the 14th century, when that country was occupied by Egyptian garrisons, the period covered will, of course, be more extensive, the Exodus being placed about 1445. There is, however, no evidence in the books of Jos and Jg that the Israelites either found Egyptian forces in Canaan when they entered it, or suffered later from Egyptian invasions, as they would have done, had they been settled there prior to 1220.) The value of an historian's work (apart from the personal equation) depends, unless he is actually contemporary with the events he treats of, upon his access to authorities bridging the interval between himself and the past he describes, and upon the quality of such authorities.

(*a*) For the Invasion and Occupation of Canaan by the nomadic Israelite tribes, and for the establishment of the Monarchy, the earliest historical materials would probably consist almost exclusively of songs and ballads celebrating the experiences and the achievements of the collective Hebrew race, of separate tribal groups, or of individual chiefs. These songs and ballads would be transmitted orally, so long as conditions were unfavourable to the production of documentary records; but later, many of them appear to have been reduced to writing in a work entitled the *Book of Jashar* (Jos 10 [13]; 2 S 1 [18]). Though the poetical creations of an early age, handed down by word of mouth, lack fixity, and are very liable to be modified in transmission, yet they can generally be trusted to preserve in outline faithful memories of critical occasions and events; and so long as no stress is placed on detail, they are for the historian a valuable source of evidence. A notable example of such poems, containing a good deal of information concerning a war between Israel and the Northern Canaanites, is the Song of Deborah (Jg 5).

(*b*) After the beginning of the Monarchy there must have been available numerous documents, drawn up at royal courts and religious centres, especially at the Temple in Jerusalem, comprising particulars about the national resources, the leading officials, and the principal occurrences in successive reigns. Allusion is made more than once to ' a remembrancer ' or ' a recorder,' whose office it would be not only to keep the king in mind of his duties and functions, but also to collect and put on record information useful for both himself and his successors.

(*c*) Eventually, on the basis of such official records, were presumably composed the Chronicles and Histories of the Kings cited in the larger works contained in the OT under similar titles (2 Ch 16 [11], 28 [26], 35 [27]). Literary analysis has further proved that there must once have existed other historical narratives, not alluded to in any surviving work, out of which various books of the OT were compiled by a process of amalgamation (pp. 216 and 248). Moreover, it is probable that the stories about Elijah and Elisha, comprised in Kings, once circulated in written shape before incorporation in the latter work; and references to records ascribed to various prophets occur in 1 Ch 29 [29]; 2 Ch 9 [29], 12 [15], 20 [34], 32 [32].

Their Methods.—In considering the Methods of the Hebrew historians, notice must be taken of (i) the manner in which they handled their materials; (ii) the spirit marking their reconstruction of the past.

(i) Hebrew literary habits were sharply distinguished from the usages of modern writers by the practice of embodying in new works pre-existing compositions with little change, and without any acknowledgement of indebtedness, as may be seen from Chronicles, wherein long sections of Samuel and Kings are reproduced almost verbally, and embedded amid passages proceeding from the Chronicler himself. Later writers felt themselves at liberty to appropriate wholly or partially in this way the work of their predecessors because there prevailed no sense of literary property, most compositions amongst the Hebrews being anonymous. One result of such incorporation of the actual words of one writer in the compilation of another was the not infrequent occurrence, in the later work, of incompatible representations through the inclusion of borrowed passages inconsistent with the borrower's own statements (see 2 Ch 15 [17] beside

14 [3, 5]). A like conflict of representations on a larger scale is to be expected wherever a compiler has dovetailed together two or more sources by means of a minimum of connecting links supplied by himself: the hypothesis that in this way the Pentateuch and the books of Samuel have been constructed best explains the presence in them of a large number of variant accounts of the same incidents, often marked by divergent conceptions and ideals, and couched in dissimilar phraseology. Such a procedure as is here described was not peculiar to the Hebrew historians, for in Arabic writings of post-Christian date this kind of patchwork occurs, 'consisting of short passages borrowed (with or without modification) from older works and fitted together by the compiler' (*Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 13).

(ii) Still more important for an estimate of the value of the histories included in the OT is the spirit in which the writers composed them. Noteworthy characteristics are the following: (*a*) There seems to have been a proneness to put a literal sense upon poetic figures of speech, if we may judge by the manner in which a short passage from the book of Jashar is interpreted by the writer, or one of the writers, of Joshua (10 [13]); whilst there was a tendency on the part of later writers to magnify any element of wonder contained in the narratives of their predecessors (see Ex 14 [22, 29] compared with 14 [21]). (*b*) There was a disposition on the part of some later narrators to re-write freely the history of early times in order to harmonize it with ideas and usages current in their own day, in spite of the fact that they had access to authorities standing much closer than themselves to those distant times. This practice is exemplified by the Chronicler, who modifies much of the history contained in Samuel and Kings, in order to bring it into accord with the post-exilic arrangements with which he was familiar, conspicuous instances of this habit being found in his accounts of the reigns of David, Joash, and Uzziah. (*c*) It may be suspected that some narratives, purporting to be historical, should properly be defined as *Midrash* (a term translated 'commentary' in 2 Ch 13 [22], 24 [27]), the expression describing, among other things, the expansion of themes by means of improving stories, designed to enforce a religious lesson. In the Apocrypha the books of Tobit, Susanna, and Judith fall under this head; whilst within the Hebrew OT the books of Chronicles contain various passages which appear to have originated less from an interest in actual history than from a desire to promote edification (e.g. 2 Ch 13, 20 [1-30]); and the book of Esther appears to be, in the main if not altogether, an historical romance. The fact that in the last-mentioned work the name of God is altogether lacking (at least in the Hebrew) somewhat disguises its religious purpose, though the writer's belief in the indestructibility of Israel really affords ample evidence of his deep faith in Israel's God, and his desire to diffuse such faith among his countrymen.

It remains to add a few words about the literary qualities of the Hebrew historians. Their narratives in general are characterized by extraordinary vividness and animation; and in the portrayal of scenes and the depicting of events they are unsurpassed for dramatic power. A factor contributing to their effectiveness is the circumstance that speeches and dialogues are reported by them in what are ostensibly the actual words of the speakers, instead of the drift of what was said being merely summarized. This is the case even on occasions when the Deity Himself is described as holding converse with His prophets or other persons (instead of being represented as inspiring them through the action of His Spirit). In contrast to the liveliness and variety of the early narratives which have been incorporated by subsequent compilers is the stiffness of the framework in which they are often placed, this being generally marked by a formal arrangement and a monotonous and stereotyped diction. Historical compositions of post-exilic origin are, as a rule, much more prosaic than similar writings dating from the times of the Monarchy, a prominent feature of the later productions being the interest manifested in numbers, quantities, names, and genealogies.

From what has been said above it will be seen that the historical books of the OT furnish not so much a history of Israel as materials for a history; and their contents, even as materials, are, from a secular point of view, neither full nor very informing. They throw comparatively little light upon secondary causes; and it is only occasionally that it is possible to detect, as we read their narratives, a sufficient explanation of an event in its prior conditions and circumstances, such as the modern historian seeks to discover (e.g. 2 S 15 [1-6]; 1 K 12). Even the nature and measure of the changes in Israel's religious faith and practice during the centuries embraced

by these books is obscured through the absence, in the revisers and editors to whom their present form is due, of any idea of historical development; for they, presupposing that the Law as they knew it was the product of one age, and that an early one, and was the Divinely appointed standard of organization and ritual for subsequent times, judged by what was laid down in it the conduct of the generations intervening between Moses and themselves. Nevertheless, the shortcomings of the Hebrew historians, whether early or late, are more than counterbalanced by their belief in God's direction of their nation's career, and by their steadfast endeavour to explain the fortunes of their people upon religious principles. By them God is represented as bringing their race into special relations with Himself, and as acquainting it, through varied experiences, with His character and His requirements. In their thoughts about God, indeed, their predominant tendency was to separate Him from His creation, and to imagine Him as setting in motion the forces of the world from outside, rather than as being immanent and pervasive in all its movements and life; but in this respect the difference between the Hebrew and the modern view is largely a matter of emphasis, for transcendence and immanence are both essential to a right conception of the Creator and Sustainer of the universe. And in holding to the conviction that their nation was an exceptional channel of God's self-revelation, it can scarcely be denied that they were justified, if we reflect how pre-eminently Israel has been the instructor of mankind in religion and morality (for it was within Judaism that Christianity was born and cradled), and if, without underrating anything else of worth which God has imparted to humanity at large through other races, we rank religious and moral values above the rest.

All study of the Historical books will be seriously defective unless it is accompanied by the study of the Prophetical books. Many of these are composite, and consequently have to be analyzed into their constituent elements, dating from various periods, before they can be used profitably in connexion with historical enquiries. But when this has been done, and their several parts are set against the background of the times in which they originated, they not only correct or supplement the histories with first-hand evidence respecting various events, but they also illustrate most impressively the spiritual forces wherewith God trained Israel for its mission in the world. As has been previously implied, the conceptions entertained by successive prophets were, viewed broadly, progressive; and it was through this inspired insight that the religion of their race, which, as understood and practised by the mass of the people at an early period, did not differ greatly from that of kindred Semitic nations, eventually issued in the Monotheistic faith which Christianity has inherited.

THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL

By L. E. P. Erith

Israel's history may be said to begin with the migration of a band of Semites from Babylon as reported in Gen 11 [27-32]. For the earlier prehistoric legends contained in Gen 4-11 reference should be made to the Commentary. It will be our purpose here to describe the various stages in Israel's development: tribal, national, and political; and for that purpose we will divide the history into periods as follows: (1) Patriarchal Period; (2) Exodus Period; (3) Transition Period; (4) Early Monarchy; (5) Divided Monarchy; (6) Decline and Fall of Judah; (7) Captivity and Restoration. It will be assumed that the reader is more or less acquainted with the Biblical narrative, so that we need not repeat what is already probably familiar, but endeavour to interpret the Biblical records, which are characteristic Oriental narratives, into terms of Western thought; and, especially, to supplement them where possible and to emend them where necessary in the light of information furnished by external records, e.g. of Babylon, Egypt, and Assyria.

(1) **Patriarchal Period.**—The Hebrew tribes were part of a people known generally as Semites who came originally from Arabia, and, in course of time, grew sufficiently powerful, not only to overrun western Asia, but even successfully to invade Egypt. Gen 10 [21-31] describes the various branches of Semite stock as descendants of Shem, hence the name

'Semite.' 'By the Semites is generally understood the group of peoples known as the Aramæans (Syrians, etc.) in the north, the Babylonians and Assyrians in the east, the Arabs in the south, and the Phœnicians, Hebrews, Moabites, etc., in the west' (S. A. Cook, *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, 182). The earliest mention of Semites in Palestine in connexion with the beginning of Hebrew history is found in the recently discovered Cappadocian Tablets. Some hundreds of these were unearthed at Kara-Euyuk in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea. They are written in cuneiform, and consist mostly of the letters and contracts of a Semitic commercial community settled there *c.* 2300 B.C. They corroborate the testimony of Babylonian records, which describe the conquest of Babylon and the founding of the first Babylonian dynasty by Semitic invaders, 'men of the land of Amurru,' the Babylonian designation of Palestine. This first dynasty ruled in Babylon from *c.* 2225-1926 B.C., and its most powerful king was Hammurabi (*c.* 2123-2081); and he may certainly be identified with 'Amraphel king of Shinar,' mentioned in Gen 14^{1} as contemporary with Abraham. We can thus date Abraham's entry into Palestine *c.* 2100 B.C.; and the Cappadocian Tablets show that the inhabitants of Palestine at the time of Abraham's migration were an older branch of the same Semite stock. The significance of this will become apparent in the interpretation of the story of Esau and Jacob.

The cause of the migration from Ur, pictured in Genesis as a pilgrimage of Abraham and his family, may be found in the change of religion effected by Hammurabi in Babylon. Hammurabi's two predecessors, Abil-Sin and Sin-muballit, were, as their names imply, adherents of the moon cultus. Hammurabi, however, instituted in Babylon the worship of the sun god, Shamash, a change which caused the adherents of the old religion to migrate. Now Ur, whence the emigrants set out, and Haran, where one body of them settled, were the southern and northern centres of the moon cult, and when the meaning of Sinai, the name of the early Hebrew sacred mountain, is appreciated there can be little doubt that the earliest Hebrew conception of God was connected with the loving and kindly attributes of Sin, the moon deity (see Burney, *Judges*, 249-253). The Hebrew narrative of Genesis, therefore, rightly regards this migration as a religious movement.

One body of the emigrants stayed in Haran, and subsequently became the Aramæans (RV Syrians), a nation descended, according to Gen 22^{21}, from a 'grandson' of Nahor, Abraham's brother (cf. Gen 10^{23}). Another body, represented by Abraham and Lot, journeyed on, turning south into Palestine, and became known as the Hebrews='from the other side,' i.e. of the Euphrates (cf. Gen 10^{21}, where 'children of Eber'='Hebrews'). Some time after the arrival of Abraham and his tribe in Palestine yet another body of Semites migrated into Egypt, where they founded the Hyksos, or Semitic, dynasty. The date of the establishment of this dynasty is uncertain, but the Hyksos ruled over Egypt till *c.* 1580 B.C., when they were overcome and expelled by Ahmosi I, the founder of the 18th dynasty. The story of Abraham's journey to Egypt and subsequent dismissal (Gen 12^{10-20}) may conceivably be an echo from Hebrew tradition of the Hyksos dominion and overthrow. Ahmosi drove the Semitic Hyksos back into Palestine, and later kings of the 18th dynasty, notably Thutmosi I and III, conquered Syria and Palestine, and incorporated them into the Egyptian Empire. These countries appear to have consisted of several small states, some of them governed by native vassal princes, others by Egyptian officials, and Palestine thus remained under Egyptian rule till the accession of the Pharaoh Amenhotep IV (Akhnaton) *c.* 1375-1358, whose reign saw the downfall of Egyptian empire in Palestine. There are two valuable sources of information which tell how Egypt came to lose her Asiatic provinces —namely, the tablets discovered at Boghaz Keui, the site of the ancient Hittite capital, and the Tell-el-Amarna Tablets. The Boghaz Keui records show that a powerful Hittite empire had grown up in Asia Minor during the period of the 18th dynasty, and the Hittites under Shubbiluliuma had pushed their conquests down to the Lebanons, and, by so doing, had seriously weakened the power of Egypt in Palestine. The result of this Hittite pressure from the north appears in the Tell-el-Amarna Tablets, discovered in 1887 on the site of Akhnaton's new capital. These tablets are copies of diplomatic correspondence between Amenhotep III and IV and various foreign rulers, together with reports and appeals for help from vassal princes and Egyptian governors in Palestine. Many of these letters show that Palestine was being invaded by a people

called Sa-gaz, whom Arad-Hiba, the governor of Jerusalem, designates as Habiru. Of the identification of Habiru with Hebrews there is no longer any doubt; and so we learn that during the period of Egyptian weakness in Palestine the country was being overrun by Hebrew invaders, who, as Arad-Hiba says, 'are capturing the fortresses of the king'; and he mentions among other places their capture of Shechem (cf. Gen 34). This Hebrew invasion described in the Tell-el-Amarna Tablets is possibly the basis of the Biblical story of Jacob's return with his 'sons' from Haran. The letters of Arad-Hiba appealing for troops are addressed to the 'heretic' Pharaoh, Amenhotep IV, who changed the religion of Egypt from the worship of Amon to that of Aton, and so changed his name to Akhnaton. This Pharaoh was too busily engaged in establishing a new faith to attend to the needs of his provinces in Asia, and so in his reign Egypt lost Palestine. The 18th dynasty was now coming to an end. Tutankhamen (*c.* 1358-1350) was its last king of any importance. The only remaining point we need notice is the evidence of the inscriptions and of the Tell-el-Amarna letters to the fact of famine in Palestine, and of Semitic migrations into Egypt during the closing years of the dynasty. Several of the Tell-el-Amarna letters mention officials in Egypt with Semitic names, especially one Yanhamu, who was governor of a corn-growing district, a position similar to that ascribed to Joseph in Genesis; and an inscription on the tomb of Horemheb, Tutankhamen's commander-in-chief, and afterwards Pharaoh, gives a pictorial representation of Egyptian officials receiving Asiatic refugees who seek permission to enter Egypt in time of famine. There are thus clear indications that towards the end of the 18th dynasty Semitic officials held high positions in Egypt; and also that emigrants, driven by famine from Canaan, sought asylum in that country.

Before passing on to reconstruct the narrative of Genesis it may be well to state some principles of interpretation which should be borne in mind. In the first place, we must remember that the events pictured as occurring within the lives of four generations of patriarchs really occupied several centuries; but events of remote antiquity, when written up at a later time, tend to become telescoped, and, though a generally correct sequence may be preserved, the time is shortened in the telling. That some idea of this was present in the minds of the narrators may be inferred from the abnormal longevity ascribed to the patriarchs. Secondly, it is clear that the patriarchal stories are personifications of tribal movements, pictured as the personal histories of far-away ancestors whose names have survived. For example, the names of several 'sons' are those of people such as Moab and Ammon (Gen 19^{30-38}), and Midian (Gen 25^{2}), Jacob and Edom (Gen 25^{23-34}). And thirdly, the writer reads back into primitive times the national tribal unity of his own day, and represents the tribes, as in the story of Jacob and his 'sons,' acting in concert in a manner which would have been impossible in the patriarchal age.

Keeping these considerations in mind, we may now attempt to outline the patriarchal history in the light of information supplied by external sources. We see that the journey of Abraham and his relations from Ur and the settlements in Haran and Palestine represent extensive tribal movements which were going on for some centuries. In Haran and its neighbourhood one body of these Semitic emigrants settled and multiplied, and became in course of time the nation called Syrians in our English Bible. Another body went on into Palestine and became numerous and powerful enough to invade Egypt, and to found a dynasty there—the Hyksos. A new dynasty arose in Egypt *c.* 1580 B.C., and the Hyksos were expelled and driven back into Palestine. This caused a further expansion of the Hebrews in that country, represented in Genesis as the separation of Abraham and Lot. For some time now Palestine was under the rule of Egypt, till the Hittite Empire arose in the north. Meanwhile fresh bodies of settlers had been coming from the old colony at Haran, represented by Rebecca, Isaac's wife; and internal feuds between the older Semite stock in Palestine, = Esau-Edom, descended from the Semites of whom we read in the Cappadocian Tablets, and the later settlers, = Jacob, had driven the latter back to Haran. This is personified as the law of ultimo-geniture and the feud which resulted in the family of Isaac. Then, under Hittite pressure from the north, new bodies of Aramæans, called in the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence Sa-gaz and Habiru, and in Genesis Jacob and his 'sons,' followed by Laban, were driven down into Palestine and were enabled to gain a footing there by the weakening of Egyptian rule in the reign of Akhnaton. The boundary treaty made between

Laban and Jacob, as described in Gen 31 [46-53], is a proleptic definition of the southern limit of the Syrian kingdom in the period of the monarchy. The capture of Shechem by the Hebrews, mentioned in the Tell-el-Amarna letters, is described in Gen 34. This new body of Semitic invaders is known as Israel (cf. Gen 32 [28], 35 [10] for Jacob's change of name). The sequence of events preserved in Hebrew tradition is corroborated by Egyptian records, for Thutmosi III (*c.* 1479) mentions 'Jacob-el' among other places which he has subdued in Palestine; while Mineptah (*c.* 1222) records a defeat of 'Israel,' a record which must be discussed in the next section.

Conditions in Palestine as described in the Tell-el-Amarna letters—internal strife and the influx of a large body of Semitic invaders—were precisely those which would be likely to cause a famine and to drive large numbers of Israelites to seek refuge in Egypt towards the close of the 18th dynasty. The Biblical story of Joseph, and the migration of Jacob and his family, supported as it is by Egyptian records and by references in the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence, may thus be regarded as preserving a true tradition of what took place *c.* 1360-1350, though, as we shall see, there is good reason to doubt the statement, due to writers who lived at a much later time, that all the Israelites in a body migrated to Egypt.

(2) **The Exodus Period.**—The kings of the 19th Egyptian dynasty set themselves to recover the dominion of Palestine; and, if our correlation of Genesis with Egyptian history in the preceding section has been correct, this will be the dynasty of the Israelite oppression and Exodus. It may be noted that in Ex 1 [8] the Hebrew for the 'new king' implies a change of dynasty. Records left by Sety I and Rameses II mention 'Asaru' (=Asher) among their conquests in N. Palestine, the locality assigned to Asher in the OT (Jos 19 [24-31]); and Mineptah, the successor of Rameses II, has left a record enumerating various peoples whom he subdued in Canaan, among whom 'Israel,' here mentioned for the first time in extra-Biblical records, is included. These records show that not all the Israelites in Canaan had migrated to Egypt. Now, if Egyptian kings of the 19th dynasty were fighting to recover Palestine and to subdue Israelites in that country, they would naturally take measures to prevent the Hebrews settled on their northern frontier from joining forces with their kinsmen in Palestine; and the repressive policy thus adopted is probably the basis of the tradition in Exodus, both of the oppression of the Israelites and of Pharaoh's refusal to let them go. There are indications in Ex 1 and 2 which seem to suggest that Rameses II was the principal oppressor; e.g. 1 [11] tells of the building of store-cities—Pithom and Raamses—by the Hebrews in Egypt; and there is abundant evidence that Rameses II had a great deal of building done in the neighbourhood of the Delta, his military base for the campaigns in Palestine, and the district in which the Israelites in Egypt had settled; and one of his store-cities—Pithom—has been identified and excavated (*Cambridge Ancient History*, II, 151-2). Ex 2 [23] ('in the course of those many days') may perhaps refer to the long reign of Rameses II, which lasted from 1292 to 1225. If this king was the Pharaoh of the oppression, then the Exodus will have taken place in the reign of his son Mineptah, *c.* 1225-1215, and we may follow the majority of scholars and date the Exodus at approximately 1220 B.C.

This view of the date gains further support from the rapid decline of the Egyptian Empire after the death of Mineptah, when Egypt again lost her hold on Palestine. This was caused by the aggressions of 'the people of the sea,' i.e. from the N.E. shores of the Mediterranean, prominent among whom were the Philistines. These overcame the Hittites, and advanced south both by sea and land down to the Delta. Rameses III defeated them and drove them back *c.* 1190, but his victory proved only a temporary check. The Philistines came on again and gained possession of the coast lands from Carmel to S. Canaan, and made good their footing against all comers. Within '40 years,' therefore, after the death of Mineptah, conditions in Palestine would be favourable for the entry of the tribes under Joshua.

It should, however, be noted that this dating of the Exodus, though adopted by most scholars, is questioned by others, who accept the theory of Josephus that the Exodus corresponds to the expulsion of the Hyksos by Ahmosi I in 1580. This theory has been restated most fully by Dr. Hall (*Ancient History of the Near East*, 403 ff.), whose arguments cannot lightly be set aside, though space precludes a full discussion here. The main objection to identifying the *expulsion* of the Hyksos with the *escape* of the Hebrews under Moses is that this early date throws the Biblical records into inextricable con-

fusion, and presupposes too long a time, nearly 200 years, between the Exodus and the entry into Canaan, since Egyptian records state that the Hyksos were driven back directly into Canaan by Ahmosi, whereas Hall identifies the Habiru raids of the Tell-el-Amarna letters with Joshua's invasion. Also, if this theory is correct, the conquests of Sety I, Rameses II, and Mineptah must belong to the period of the Judges, and, though the argument from silence may not be pressed, yet it is surely remarkable, as Burney pointed out, that 'while much is told us in the Book of Judges of the aggression of comparatively petty antagonists, not a word is said as to any collision with the great power of Egypt.' The present scanty evidence makes certainty impossible, and it is quite likely that before long fresh data may be forthcoming. In the meantime, while keeping an open mind, we incline to a date for the Exodus which, while consistent with the available evidence, does not differ so widely from the Biblical records.

Apart from the Joseph tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh, we may probably include Simeon and Levi among the Hebrews in Egypt. Gen 34 describes their treacherous capture of Shechem, which, in the Judges period, is again in the possession of the Canaanites (Jg 9). This would seem to indicate what Gen 34 [30] suggests—namely, that the Canaanites mustered sufficient strength to oust Simeon and Levi, who, being thus driven from their settlement, might well seek refuge in Egypt. According to Gen 42 [24] Simeon was detained there by Joseph as a hostage, while Ex 2 [1, 2] describes the parents of Moses as Levites. We may thus assume that the Exodus tribes consisted of Ephraim, Manasseh, Simeon, and Levi. After reaching the Sinai Peninsula it would seem that Simeon and Levi joined Judah in the extreme south of Palestine on the border of the desert, while Ephraim and Manasseh went on to the east, and finally entered Canaan under Joshua by crossing the Jordan at Jericho. The difficulty in attempting to reconstruct the route of the wanderings as contained in Exodus and Numbers is perhaps due to the combination in the Biblical narratives of the separate movements of Simeon and Levi into Judah, and of Ephraim and Manasseh through Edom and the district S.E. of Jordan (see p. 136*a*).

(3) **Transition Period.**—Assuming that the Exodus took place during the reign of Mineptah, this period occupied about 200 years, as the reign of Saul may be dated with reasonable accuracy *c.* 1025-1010. The chronological note in 1 K 6[1], which gives 480 years as the length of the period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple in the fourth year of Solomon's reign, is based on an artificial calculation of twelve generations, and cannot be regarded as correct. The Biblical estimate of 'forty years,' = a generation, for the wanderings in the wilderness must be taken to cover the time from the Exodus till Joshua's entry into Canaan. The description given in the book of Joshua of the total conquest of Canaan by the twelve tribes acting together under Joshua is not historical, and is contradicted both by the older source used in the book itself and by the narrative of Judges (see p. 190*a*). A more reliable account is contained in the old record which underlies Jg 1. From this we see that the first effect of the Exodus was the northward advance of Judah, reinforced by Simeon and Levi. This movement, by which Judah extended its territory to the line of fortresses stretching across southern Canaan from Jericho to Gezer, probably took place before Joshua's entry (see Jg 1[1]). Joshua's actual achievement consisted of the subjugation of part of central Palestine and the settlement of Ephraim and Manasseh in the central hill country. According to the old document contained in Jg 1 other Hebrew tribes were already settled, though precariously, in different parts of the country: Zebulun and Asher in the north, Naphtali and Dan in the S.E. of central Palestine.

The entry of Ephraim and Manasseh caused some modification in the position of the Hebrews already settled in Palestine, especially in the central district, where Dan and Naphtali were squeezed out and forced to find a footing in the north; while, as we have seen, Judah, with Simeon and Levi, was able to extend its territory in the south. Thus, after the entry of the Exodus tribes the Hebrews in Canaan tended to form four tribal groups—namely, Judah, Simeon and Levi in the south in an isolated position, cut off from the rest of the tribes by the line of fortresses already mentioned; Ephraim and part of Manasseh were in the central hill country, cut off from Judah on the south, and from the tribes in the north by the plain of Esdraelon, at first in possession of the Canaanites, and strongly fortified on its southern border. As these two tribes were cramped for room, part of Manasseh, on Joshua's advice, migrated to the east of Jordan (see Jos 17 [14-18]), thus forming with

Reuben and Gad a third tribal group in Gilead. The remaining tribes, after Dan and Naphtali were dislodged by Ephraim and Manasseh, occupied positions to the north of the central plain, Esdraelon.

The history of this period shows the gradual amalgamation of these groups till the ultimate union of the tribes under Samuel produced the nation of Israel and the Monarchy. It should be noted that the books of Joshua and Judges form parallel, not consecutive histories of this period, and that the tribes at first acted independently in repelling foreign raids and in making their settlements secure. The statements in Judges which seem to imply that all the tribes acted together under the various Judges are due to the Editor, and are not supported by the old records which underlie the present book. We are, however, able to trace a growing recognition among the tribes and tribal groups of the need for united effort against their common foes. At the opening of the period Judah, Simeon, and Levi had gained a settlement in the south, and Ephraim and Manasseh had secured themselves in the central hill country. Other tribes under individual leaders known as Judges gradually freed themselves from foreign oppression and made good their footing in their respective territories. Afterwards, the tribes began to unite, both to repel invasion and to extend their territories. The most important combination of tribes was brought about by Deborah and Barak in order to gain possession of the important central plain of Esdraelon, guarded by a belt of fortress cities on its southern border—Beth-shean, Ibleam, Taanach, Megiddo—which cut off the Joseph tribes from union with the Hebrews in the north. To attack the Canaanites of the plain all the tribes except Judah and Simeon were called to arms, and six responded (Jg 5). This successful campaign seems to have been prompted by an earlier victory of the northern tribes over Jabin, king of Hazor, attributed to Joshua in Jos 11[1-15], but see on Jg 4. Gideon, in his campaign against Midian, was assisted by contingents from Asher, Zebulun, and Naphtali, thus consolidating the union between the central and northern groups. Under the lead of Jephthah the trans-Jordanic tribes overcame Moab and Ammon and secured the land of Gilead. Thus three of the tribal groups had established themselves by combination in central and northern Palestine and in Gilead beyond Jordan. Judah, however, remained at first in isolation in the south, and was entirely under the dominion of the Philistines (see Jg 15[11]). The Philistine oppression ultimately put an end to the isolation of Judah, for this powerful people, established in the maritime plain south of Carmel, rapidly extended its sway over the country, till successive defeats during the judgeship of Eli, in which the sacred Ark was lost, left the Hebrews at their mercy. Samuel's attempt at resistance cannot have been so successful as the story of 1 S 7 would imply. His victory at Eben-ezer could have caused only a temporary check, since in the early days of Saul's reign the Philistine supremacy was complete, and the Israelites were disarmed and helpless under Philistine rule (see 1 S 13[19-23]). But the union of the tribes under Samuel in resisting a common enemy made Israel conscious of its nationality and produced the demand for a king—'now make us a king to judge us like all the nations.'

Before closing this section we may note the clear signs in the Judges period of the two growing forces which were ultimately to cause the disruption of the nation. Judah's independent development in the south was laying the foundation for a separate kingdom; while the powerful tribe of Ephraim, claiming a position of pre-eminence (see Jos 17[14]; Jg 8[1], 12[1]), was not likely to submit for long to be governed by a royal house of Judah.

(4) **The Early Monarchy: Saul, David, and Solomon.**—Saul was elected as king over a people and a country completely dominated by the Philistines, who had garrisoned Palestine (1 S 10[5]) and disarmed the Israelites. One effect of this Philistine tyranny was that the lesser peoples on Israel's borders became aggressive—Moab and Ammon on the east, Amalek and Edom in the south, and Zobah in the north; and it seems likely that Saul's first military success, his defeat of the Ammonites who were besieging Jabesh-gilead, was actually won before he became king (1 S 11). It was probably the prompt military genius which he displayed on that occasion which procured his election to the throne. Saul was undoubtedly a capable ruler, who, by organizing a standing army with a commander-in-chief, Abner (1 S 14[50-52]), put his people in a position to resist the Philistine inroads. His first two campaigns against the Philistines, at Michmash and Ephes-dammim (1 S 13, 14, 17), in the latter of which David achieved distinction as a warrior, seem to have been successful in checking their advance in the south, but at Mount Gilboa Saul was

defeated and slain in his attempt to dislodge the Philistines from the central plain. That Saul's efforts on behalf of the newly formed nation were appreciated by his people seems clear from the fact that he retained the loyalty and even the affection of Israel till his death, as the grateful action of the men of Jabesh-gilead proves (1 S 31[11-13]); while the fears of the witch of Endor testify to his efficient domestic administration. Although he failed to overcome the Philistines he subdued Israel's other foes—Moab, Ammon, Edom, Zobah, and Amalek (1 S 14[47, 48]); and his military organization showed Israel its ability to meet the Philistines on something approaching equal terms, and laid the foundation on which David built.

After the death of Saul the Philistines seem to have retained possession of central Palestine, so that there could be no immediate successor as king of Israel. Saul's son, Ish-bosheth, was established by Abner at Mahanaim, E. of Jordan, as ruler over Gilead; while David at Hebron became leader of his own tribe of Judah. This divided rule, which was paving the way for the later disruption of the kingdom, appears to have lasted for 7½ years (2 S 5[5]), and was ended by Abner, who, apparently dissatisfied with the incompetent Ish-bosheth, made overtures to David for the reunion of the tribes, which was shortly effected, though Abner lost his life in the negotiations. Ish-bosheth was assassinated, and David was invited to become king over all the tribes. David's first act as king was the capture of Jerusalem. This gave Israel the advantage of a fortress city as a central rallying point; and when the Philistines made their next attack David was able at first to withdraw to Jerusalem to prepare his forces (2 S 5[17]), and in the campaign which followed the Philistines were defeated so completely that they were never again a serious menace to Israel. David was now able to make Israel the dominant power in Palestine, and 2 S 8 gives a summary of his conquests. He overcame Zobah in the north, put Syria to tribute and garrisoned Damascus, subdued Moab, Ammon, and Amalek, and occupied Edom. The possession of Edom was of great importance to the new Israelite kingdom, since it commanded the trade route to the ports of Elath and Ezion-geber on the Red Sea, the possession of which, together with the treaty made with Tyre, set Israel on the road to commercial prosperity. Israel's rapid rise to power under David was rendered easier by the decline of Egypt and the struggle between Babylon and Assyria, from which Assyria had not yet emerged victorious. So, for the time, under David and Solomon, the kingdom of Israel enjoyed its one brief period of real political power. The list of David's officials (2 S 8[15-18], 20[23-25]) shows that he centralized a regular government at Jerusalem. In spite, however, of all he did for Israel, David could not command the loyal support of his people as Saul had done. Two rebellions reached serious dimensions, and the latter, caused by the jealousy of Ephraim (2 S 20), came near to dividing the kingdom even in David's reign. The extensive building operations, carried out by forced labour, wrongly rendered 'tribute' in RV, sowed the seeds of disaffection which grew up under Solomon, and produced revolution at his death.

The kingdom that David had gained by conquest Solomon consolidated by diplomacy and enriched by commerce. In his reign Israel once more came into contact with Egypt by a marriage between Solomon and the daughter of Pharaoh, probably Siamon (*c.* 970-950), the last but one Tanite king of the 21st dynasty, who advanced into Palestine and captured Gezer, which he bestowed upon Solomon as a wedding present. Gezer was an important fortress which had hitherto proved impregnable, and its possession was a useful asset to the military strength of Israel. In addition to this Solomon built other fortresses at strategic points, enumerated in 1 K 9[15-18]. He increased the army by a force of cavalry and war-chariots, and, having thus provided for the peace of his kingdom, enabled it to achieve commercial prosperity. He made use of the trade route which David had opened up through Edom to establish a merchant fleet in partnership with Tyre at Ezion-geber on the Red Sea; and the commercial treaty with Tyre also enabled Solomon to carry out David's plan for the building of the Temple, thus paving the way for the centralization there of the worship of the whole country. Under Solomon the kingdom of Israel, extending 'from the River (Euphrates) unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt' (1 K 4[21]), reached the zenith of its power; but before the end of his reign signs of the coming collapse began to appear. The tributary states of Edom, Zobah, and Syria were becoming restive and giving trouble; and the tribe of Ephraim, chafing under the burden of forced labour imposed by a king from Judah, broke into revolt under Jeroboam.

Although Solomon was powerful enough to crush all opposition and to keep his kingdom intact his glory passed with him, and at his death Israel's short spell of temporal power was ended.

(5) **The Divided Monarchy.**—The revolution at Solomon's death and the consequent division of the kingdom seem to have been effected with the loss of only one life, and that, significantly, of Adoram, the minister of forced labour, who had held office under David and Solomon. Henceforth the northern kingdom, now called Israel, consisting of ten tribes, was the dominant Hebrew power. The southern kingdom, Judah, consisting only of that tribe with Benjamin, played but a subordinate part in subsequent history. Israel's territorial position brought it inevitably into contact with the great Empires. It lay on the highway between Egypt and Assyria, and was bound to be affected when either of these powers was active. Judah was secluded among the hills, off the highway of the nations, and, but for entangling alliances and political ambition, might have remained generally free from disturbance.

Before the death of Solomon Egypt, under Sheshonk, the Biblical Shishak, the first Pharaoh of the 22nd dynasty, was again aiming at empire in Palestine, and there seems little doubt that Shishak, who sheltered Jeroboam, was promoting intrigues against Solomon on the principle *divide et impera*; and he soon took advantage of the disruption he had helped to engineer. We are told in 1 K 14 that in the fifth year of Rehoboam Shishak came up against Judah and exacted a heavy tribute, but the Biblical narrative gives no indication that this invasion of Judah was merely part of the Pharaoh's Palestinian campaign, of which a full account is preserved in Shishak's own record, inscribed on the Temple of Amon at Karnak. The list of 156 conquered towns and districts in this inscription shows that Israel as well as Judah was put to tribute by Shishak, and there is no reason to doubt its accuracy. As Prof. Peet remarks, 'To raise the difficulty that Shishak would hardly have attacked his former guest in this way is to display complete ignorance of Egyptian, and indeed of all Eastern diplomacy' (*Egypt and the O.T.*, 161). The period of Egyptian sovereignty over the Hebrew kingdoms must, however, have been short lived. The power of Egypt again decayed, and we can well believe the Hebrew tradition which records the defeat of 'Zerah the Ethiopian' by Asa of Judah about 25 years later. The name 'Zerah' seems to be a corrupt Hebrew form of Osorkon I, the successor of Shishak, who was then reigning. This defeat of Egypt set Israel and Judah free for a time from foreign rule.

Meanwhile, however, a serious menace to Israel had arisen nearer at hand. The kingdom of Syria, which had given trouble to Solomon, now regained its independence, and in alliance with Asa of Judah successfully invaded N. Israel. Syrian pressure on Israel caused the downfall of the house of Jeroboam, and of the usurper Baasha, which resulted in a period of stress and confusion till the throne was seized by Omri, 'the captain of the host.' Omri was perhaps the most able of Israel's rulers. He restored stability to the northern kingdom, gave it a capital, Samaria, and organized its defences against the Syrians. He made peace with Judah, and an alliance with Tyre through the marriage of his son Ahab with Jezebel, the daughter of the Tyrian king. Ahab, who inherited his father's military and political ability, carried on the war with Syria till he defeated Ben-hadad and made peace on terms favourable to Israel. He also strengthened the alliance with Judah by marrying his daughter Athaliah to Jehoshaphat. His effort to promote union among the Palestinian kingdoms was inspired by sound statesmanship, for the growing power of Assyria, now rapidly extending towards the west, was threatening the independence of all the smaller states. During the early years of Ahab's reign Ashur-nazir-pal had extended the Empire of Assyria to the Lebanons, and had received tribute from Tyre and Sidon. This led to the formation of a defensive league in Palestine, and when Shalmaneser II advanced westward in 854 B.C., he was met by the confederate armies of eleven states, including Israel and Syria, at Qarqar on the Orontes, where, as his own inscription claims, he completely defeated them. This league against Shalmaneser accounts for the three years without war between Israel and Syria mentioned in 1 K 22 [1]. Shalmaneser's inscription, which gives full details of the forces of the allies, shows that at this time the military strength of Israel consisted of 2,000 war-chariots and 10,000 infantry; and it is significant that the Palestinian armies were supported on this occasion by 'a thousand men of Musri,' which is certainly Egypt, and not the small kingdom north of Palestine.

After this defeat the war between Israel

and Syria was resumed, but Israel was now weakened by internal disaffection due to the attempt of Jezebel to suppress the worship of Jehovah, which aroused the powerful opposition of the prophet Elijah. Moab, under its king Mesha, seized the opportunity to revolt, and an account of the rebellion is preserved in Mesha's own record, the Moabite Stone, which shows that the Moabites had taken several Israelite towns east of Jordan. The result of this was that in the Syrian campaign which followed Ahab was defeated and killed. The house of Omri did not long survive Ahab, whose elder son reigned for only one year, being succeeded by his brother Jehoram, who, in company with Ahaziah of Judah, was assassinated by Jehu, the leader of the opposition to Jezebel. In the second year of Jehu's reign (841) Shalmaneser II again advanced on Palestine, defeated Hazael of Syria, and exacted tribute from Israel. The record of Jehu's payment of tribute is inscribed on the famous Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser, now in the British Museum. Syria seems to have recovered rapidly from this reverse; and Hazael and Benhadad inflicted such crushing defeats upon Israel that Jehoahaz, the son of Jehu, was left with only ten out of Ahab's two thousand chariots. Syria's victories, however, again attracted the attention of Assyria, and Adadnirari III came down on Palestine and completely subdued Damascus, exacting tribute also from Jehoahaz of Israel and the other states of Palestine. This suppression of Damascus accounts for the victories of Jehoash and Jeroboam II, recorded in 2 K 13 [22-25], 14 [23-28], which enabled Jeroboam II to make Israel the principal power in Palestine during the short period of Assyrian depression which lasted till the accession of Tiglath-Pileser III, whose records form a useful commentary on the history both of Israel and Judah at this time.

The alliance between the two Hebrew kingdoms did not continue under the dynasty of Jehu; and Amaziah of Judah, by his ill-advised challenge to Jehoash, brought himself and his kingdom into subjection to Israel. The result is seen in the records of Tiglath-Pileser, who states that in the year 739 'nineteen districts of the city of Hamath . . . which in their faithlessness had made revolt to Azriyau of Yaudi (=Uzziah of Judah) to the territory of Assyria I annexed: my officers, my deputies I appointed over them.' The explanation of this seems to be that Uzziah, hoping to avenge his father's defeat, had made this alliance with Hamath, not against Assyria, but in order to harass Israel. The military activities of these two states had, however, aroused the suspicions of Tiglath-Pileser, and brought him down uncomfortably near to Israel. The result was the formation of another league on the same lines as that led by Ahab in the earlier period. Israel and Syria joined in a defensive alliance against Assyria, and, in order to secure their flank, set out to suppress Judah. This was the cause of the Syro-Ephraimite coalition and the war against Judah which began at the end of Jotham's reign in 737 (2 K 15 [37], 16; Is 7). Ahaz, who succeeded Jotham, got desperate at the long siege of Jerusalem and, in spite of Isaiah's warning, sent to Tiglath-Pileser for help against Israel and Syria. Isaiah's advice in counselling Ahaz to sit still was sound, for he saw that Tiglath-Pileser would certainly crush the Syro-Ephraimite league in his own interests, whereas Ahaz was proposing to pay him to do his own work, a policy which would lead to the total subjection of Judah. In answer to the appeal of Ahaz, Tiglath-Pileser came down on Palestine in 733, subdued Damascus and N. Israel, and deported the inhabitants (2 K 15 [29]). Deportation of conquered races was a new policy introduced by Tiglath-Pileser in order to lessen the likelihood of revolt in his provinces, a policy which was responsible for the subsequent mixed populations in northern and central Palestine. Ahaz was now summoned to do homage to his overlord of Assyria at Damascus, and both Israel and Judah were thus brought directly under the yoke of Assyria. Tiglath-Pileser records that he slew Pekah and appointed Hoshea as ruler over Israel, now rapidly nearing its end; for Egypt, alarmed at the extension of Assyrian rule over Palestine, incited Hoshea to rebel, with the result that Shalmaneser IV came down and besieged Samaria, which was captured in 722 by his successor Sargon, who records: 'The city of Samaria I besieged, I took . . . 27,290 of its inhabitants I carried into captivity . . . people from all lands, my captives I settled there; my officers I appointed governors over them; tribute and dues I exacted of them.' The kingdom of Israel now became a subject province of Assyria, peopled partly by captives from other lands, a mixed population known subsequently as the Samaritans, of whom the majority must still have been Hebrews, a fact which becomes apparent when we compare the numbers,

27,290, whom Sargon deported from Israel, with the 200,150 whom Sennacherib withdrew from Judah, a much smaller kingdom. It is true, however, that Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal afterwards brought in further bodies of foreign settlers.

(6) **The Decline and Fall of Judah.**—When Hezekiah succeeded Ahaz on the throne of Judah he found himself ruler over a kingdom which his father's policy had saddled with the burden of a heavy tribute to Assyria, and for most of his reign he was planning revolt in conjunction first with Egypt and then with Babylon, which was now beginning to revive. At the death of Sargon there were extensive revolts throughout the Assyrian Empire, and the first six years of Sennacherib's reign were occupied in subduing rebellious vassal states. In 701 he advanced on Palestine, supported in revolt by Egypt, and inflicted a severe defeat on the Egyptian forces and their allies at Altaqu. He then turned aside to deal with Judah and Hezekiah, and his own inscription supplements the Biblical narrative: 'Hezekiah of Judah, who had not submitted to my yoke, 46 of his strong cities, fortresses and smaller towns without number, I besieged, I took, 200,150 people, horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen and sheep without number, from the midst of them I brought out, I counted them as spoil. Himself as a bird in a cage in Jerusalem his royal city I shut up. Siege works against him I constructed, and those coming out of the gate of the city I turned back.' Sennacherib, we notice, does not claim the capture of Jerusalem, nor does he mention the pestilence which, according to 2 Kings and Isaiah, decimated his army and compelled his retreat. We hear, however, of no further Jewish revolt against Assyria. When Esarhaddon attacked Egypt, Manasseh of Judah, along with other Palestinian states, paid him tribute, and Jewish soldiers fought in his army. Under Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal Egypt was completely conquered and became tributary to Assyria. The effort to conquer Egypt had, however, exhausted the strength of the Assyrian Empire, which was further weakened by the Scythian invasion of Western Asia in 630 B.C., and was unable to withstand the attacks of Nabopolassar, the founder of the neo-Babylonian Empire, who, with the aid of the Medes, besieged and captured Nineveh in 612 B.C. A recently discovered tablet, which chronicles the history of Babylon from the tenth to the seventeenth years of Nabopolassar's reign, shows that Assyria held out for two years longer at Harran with the aid of Egypt. This tablet enables us to supplement and correct the OT account of the end of Josiah's reign, for it shows clearly that Pharaoh-Necho marched northward to the Euphrates not, as 2 K 23[29] implies, against, but to the help of the struggling remnant of Assyria at Harran against the allied forces of Scythians, Medes, and Babylonians, and thus confirms the statement of Josephus (*Antiquities*, X, 5, 1) that Necho went up 'to fight with the Medes and Babylonians who had overthrown the Assyrians.' Moreover, Josiah did not, as the misleading translation of RV in 2 K 23[29] suggests, lead an army to oppose Necho. The Hebrew is 'went to meet him,' the formula used in describing a vassal's attendance when summoned to the presence of his suzerain. Josiah was still the vassal of Assyria, and Necho, marching to the help of Assyria, seems to have been doubtful about Josiah's loyalty, probably with good reason, and, wishing to make sure that in his progress towards Harran he would not have Judah as an enemy behind him, sent for Josiah to meet him at Megiddo, and finding treachery in him had him summarily executed. Returning from his unsuccessful attempt to support Assyria, Necho deposed Jehoahaz, and placed Jehoiakim, another son of Josiah, on the throne of Judah. But Necho's power soon came to an end. Nebuchadrezzar defeated him at Carchemish in 605, and Judah thus became subject to Babylon, now the dominant Empire in Western Asia. In 601 Nebuchadrezzar entered Palestine, and Jehoiakim swore allegiance to him, but soon began planning rebellion. Nebuchadrezzar, whose energies were occupied elsewhere, was content for the moment to send a small contingent of his own troops with native levies to keep Judah quiet (2 K 24[2]). Jeremiah the prophet stood practically alone in counselling submission to the new power, foreseeing clearly that persistence in rebellion would mean the overthrow of the Jewish kingdom; but his warnings were disregarded. Egypt began to plot with Judah against Nebuchadrezzar, and in 598 Jehoiakim revolted, but died the next year, leaving his son Jehoiachin to bear the brunt of Nebuchadrezzar's punitive expedition in 597. Jerusalem was besieged and surrendered, and Nebuchadrezzar carried off Jehoiachin and the leading Jewish families, including Ezekiel, into captivity to Babylon, appointing

Zedekiah as vassal king over the remnant in Judæa. The Jewish nation was thus divided. The principal families were settled in Babylon, while the rest under Zedekiah were left in Judæa. Each of these two Jewish groups now had its prophet: Jeremiah in Jerusalem, Ezekiel in Babylon, and both prophets warned the remnant in Judæa against any further attempts at revolt, and the warnings of both were unheeded. As soon as things began to settle down again in Jerusalem, Zedekiah began to intrigue with Egypt against Nebuchadrezzar, and went on preparing rebellion for 9 years. At last, in 588, relying on the promises of Egypt, Zedekiah ventured to rebel, with the inevitable result. Nebuchadrezzar came down and besieged Jerusalem, which fell, and the Jewish kingdom with it, in 586. Nebuchadrezzar set up Gedaliah as governor over 'the poorest of the land,' whom he allowed to remain; but civil faction soon arose, and resulted in the assassination of Gedaliah; and the panic-stricken Jews, fearing Nebuchadrezzar's further fury, fled to Egypt, taking Jeremiah with them.

(7) **Captivity and Restoration.**—Judging from the correspondence of Jeremiah and the ministry of Ezekiel in Babylon, the Jewish exiles there seem to have settled down in comfort, so that when Cyrus conquered Babylon in 538 B.C., and issued his edict allowing the Jews to return, only a minority availed themselves of the permission. The 48 years of the Captivity were marked by a considerable literary activity which produced the priestly code of Law, an addition to Deuteronomy, drawn up on the lines laid down by Ezekiel. This code, now contained in Leviticus and Numbers, profoundly influenced both the religious and political development of the restored Jewish community, and formed the basis of later Judaism.

It was the policy of Cyrus, as shown in his own inscriptions, to win the loyalty of subject races by clemency, by restoring the national religions, and by allowing captives whom Nebuchadrezzar had settled in Babylon to return to their own countries under the governorship of native princes. On this principle he appointed Zerubbabel, a descendant of the royal house of David, as ruler of the Jews who returned to Palestine. Those who came at first with Zerubbabel the prince and Joshua the priest were probably few. The census contained in Ezr 2, duplicated in Neh 7, giving the numbers as 42,360, besides servants, belongs to the end and not to the beginning of the restoration period, and is the total estimate of all who returned by degrees throughout the period; and that these were recruited mainly from the poorer classes in Babylon may be inferred from the comparatively small number of servants, 7,337. It seems clear that some Jews had remained still in Judæa. Probably not all had fled after the murder of Gedaliah, and others may have returned, but the community over whom Zerubbabel ruled as Tirshatha or governor would be both small and poor. The richer majority who stayed in Babylon, together with the refugees in Egypt, formed the beginning of the Dispersion, the gradual extension of colonies of Jewish settlers all over the civilized world which had taken place before the Christian era.

The first 18 years of the restoration period seem to have been occupied by the Jews in building houses and settling themselves as comfortably as they could among the ruins of Jerusalem. An attempt to rebuild the Temple, made in the early days of the settlement, was frustrated by the Samaritans, and was not renewed till the accession of Darius in 521. The revolts which broke out all over the Empire on that occasion, described by Darius in his Behistun inscription, inspired the prophets Haggai and Zechariah with the hope of establishing Jewish independence once again under a Davidic king, Zerubbabel. The first step towards the realization of this hope was to rouse the people to rebuild the Temple, and thus to provide a central point round which to rally religious and national ambitions. So long as the Temple lay in ruins a general depression was natural, but once it was rebuilt the prophets could point to it as an earnest of better things to come. That Haggai and Zechariah were inspired by political ambition as much as religious zeal seems probable from the former's address to Zerubbabel, which might be taken as an instigation to revolt (Hag 2 [20-23]); while the disappointment felt when Darius had successfully subdued his rebellious vassals is reflected in Zech 1 [11-17]. There was thus good reason for the suspicion of Tattenai, the imperial governor in Syria, and for his injunction restraining the work of building till confirmation of Cyrus' edict was received from Darius. Whether Zerubbabel yielded to the persuasion of Haggai and revolted or not is uncertain. We hear no more of him after the prophecy of Zechariah, and he is not mentioned in the account of the dedication of the Temple.

A Jewish tradition records that he died in Babylon, and it is quite likely that Darius moved him out of the way of temptation. However that may have been, nothing came of the prophets' political aspirations; but the efforts of Haggai and Zechariah were so far successful that the Temple was completed in 516. Of Jewish history during the 70 years which followed we have no record till the prophecy of Malachi, *c.* 445, just before the coming of Nehemiah. It does not fall within our scope here to discuss the difficult literary and historical problems raised by the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah (see p. 285*b*). The subject is fully treated by Dr. C. C. Torrey in his *Ezra Studies* and by Dr. L. W. Batten in the *I.C.C.* on *Ezra and Nehemiah*. It is here assumed that 'Artaxerxes the king,' in whose twentieth year Nehemiah came to Jerusalem, was Artaxerxes I, and Nehemiah's arrival may therefore be dated 444 B.C.; while Ezra arrived in the seventh year of Artaxerxes II, 398 B.C., 46 years later. The conditions described by Malachi as prevalent in Jerusalem—namely, neglect of the Temple ritual and of payment of tithes, the offering of blemished animals in sacrifice, intermarriage with foreigners, social injustice and oppression of the poor—are just those which Nehemiah set himself so vigorously to reform. His first undertaking on his arrival was to survey the city and arrange for the building of the walls. In face of his official status as Persian governor of Judæa the opposition of Sanballat, governor of Samaria, who had previously prevented the rebuilding of Jerusalem, was rendered powerless, and the city under the firm rule of Nehemiah was soon rebuilt and fortified. He then turned his attention to religious and social reforms, and his work was of the greatest importance, since by organizing the Jewish state on the basis of the priestly Law he laid the foundations of the Judaism which we meet in the pages of the NT. In two directions Nehemiah's work had far-reaching results. His organization of the payment of tithes and dues to the priesthood as regulated by the Law caused the priests to become by far the most wealthy class in the community and led to the subsequent government of the state by a wealthy priestly aristocracy; while his rigid and even violent opposition to foreign wives tended to foster the growth of a spirit of narrow, national exclusiveness. Nevertheless the charge that the Jews neglected their missionary vocation cannot be substantiated (see Harnack, *Mission*, I, and R. Levy, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 38-77). Ezra, who followed in the footsteps of Nehemiah, was a priest-scribe, expert in the knowledge of the Law and qualified to interpret it. He stands at the beginning of the development which resulted in the supplementing of the Law by the gradually increasing body of scribal interpretation, the 'tradition of the elders' of the NT.

From the time of Nehemiah and Ezra till the accession of the Seleucid ruler Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) in 175 B.C., we have practically no direct information of the progress of the Jewish state in Palestine; but the discovery of an important collection of Aramaic papyri at Elephantine has revealed the existence of a large Jewish community in Egypt at the time of Ezra with Temple and priesthood and ritual of their own. The most interesting of these papyri are duplicate copies of a petition sent by the Jews of Elephantine in 408 to Bagohi, the Bagoas mentioned by Josephus, the Persian governor of Judæa, imploring his assistance and sanction for the rebuilding of their Temple which had been destroyed at the instance of a minor Persian official in Egypt. This petition shows that the Temple at Elephantine was standing when Cambyses invaded Egypt in 525, so that for a time it must have been the only Jewish Temple in existence. The writers of the petition refer to the Jerusalem High Priest Johanan, who is also mentioned in Ezr 10, and Neh 12[11,22], and by Josephus; and they appeal to the sons of Sanballat, Nehemiah's old enemy, who is described as the governor of Samaria. Of special interest is the contrast furnished by these documents between the religious views of the Egyptian Jews and the strictly orthodox Judaism of the restored Palestinian community. We find, for example, from marriage contracts that the Jews in Egypt were by no means opposed to marrying foreigners. Moreover, they recognized Egyptian deities, by whom oaths were taken and for whose worship Jewish funds were subscribed. The sons of Sanballat were appealed to equally with the High Priest at Jerusalem as co-religionists, a courtesy which would hardly have pleased Nehemiah. And the very fact of a Temple with a High Priest and sacrifices in Egypt was a direct infraction of the cherished law of the central sanctuary. Reading these documents we see that Jeremiah had some justification for his strictures on the heathenish practices of the Jews in Egypt (Jer 44); and there is little wonder that appeals from Elephantine

were resolutely ignored by the priests of Jerusalem. Yet these Egyptian Jews were conscious of no heterodoxy, and they complain naively to Bagohi of the silence of the Judæan priesthood: 'We sent a letter . . . to Johanan the High Priest and his colleagues the priests who are in Jerusalem . . . and the nobles of the Jews. They have not sent any letter to us.' There is a copy of Bagohi's reply, which was favourable, and an order was given to rebuild the Temple.

With the conquest of Persia by Alexander in 332 the Jews in Palestine came under Greek rule, and when the new city of Alexandria was built in Egypt a large and influential Jewish colony settled there, whose closer contact with Greek civilization and culture produced a marked influence on the development of Jewish theology, as seen in the writings of Philo. At Alexander's death his vast Empire soon broke up. Egypt was seized by one of his generals, Ptolemy, under whose dynasty the Jews in Egypt found favour and prospered. The Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures, the Septuagint, which became the Bible of the Jews of the Dispersion, was prompted and encouraged by the sympathetic interest of Ptolemy II (Philadelphus) in Jewish history and religion. The Asiatic part of Alexander's Empire had been seized by another general, Seleucus, who made his Syrian capital at Antioch, from which city his descendants took their royal title. There followed a hundred years' war between the houses of Ptolemy and Seleucus for the possession of Palestine, and during all this time Judæa was under Ptolemaic rule; but the final victory lay with Antiochus III in 198, and the Jewish state now formed part of the Seleucid Empire.

Of the history of Judæa during the reign of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), 175-164, we have a fairly full account in 1 and 2 Maccabees, from which we find that Nehemiah's legislation had resulted in the priesthood becoming the governing class in Jerusalem. The High Priest was now the political as well as the ecclesiastical head of the Jewish state, and the office was regarded as a political prize and had become the object of discreditable intrigue. The government was modelled on the lines of the Greek Senate; the Jewish national council being composed mainly of the priests and members of priestly families, who were more intent on political power than on legal righteousness. But there had also grown up a scribal movement, interpreting the Law as the rule of life, a movement disregarded by the priestly aristocracy but upheld by the pious among the people who had become a distinct party known as the Hasidim or Pietists, in opposition to the more worldly minded priestly aristocracy. The Hasidim looked with increasing disfavour at the adoption of various amenities of Greek civilization by the governing classes. Their leader at the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes was Oniah III, the High Priest himself, practically in a minority of one among his own class, who were engaged in intrigues to depose him. Their opportunity came when Epiphanes attempted to remodel his Empire and to unify it on the basis of Hellenism. The leader of the Hellenizing party in Jerusalem was Jason, a younger brother of the High Priest, who, by judicious bribery and unscrupulous intrigue at the Seleucid court, managed to oust his brother and to secure the High Priesthood for himself. His attempt to turn Jerusalem into a Greek city brought together in determined opposition all those who were zealous for the Law of their fathers, i.e. the Hasidim, afterwards known as the Pharisees, to whom, whatever their subsequent limitations, belongs the credit of preserving true religion in Israel and of resisting successfully, though at the cost of terrible suffering, the persecution by which Antiochus Epiphanes sought to suppress the worship of Jehovah in Jerusalem.

Books

The most essential book for the study of the History of Israel is, of course, the Old Testament itself. *An Introduction to Old Testament Study*, by E. Basil Redlich, gives a scholarly and simple explanation of the principles of interpretation. *Old Testament History*, by G. W. Wade, makes full use of modern scholarship in reconstructing the history of Israel. The reader should also make frequent use of any good map of Palestine and Western Asia.

ADVICE TO THE ORDINARY READER OF THE HISTORICAL BOOKS

By the EDITORS

IN 'old-fashioned' Commentaries the books of the Bible were treated for the most part as indivisible wholes; and, after some preliminary remarks on the authorship (assumed to be simple) and on the date and characteristics of each book, the Commentary consisted of explanations of the meaning of the text as it stands, where they were thought to be needed, and practical reflections tending to edification. For the spiritual use of the Bible, it is greatly to be desired that we should get back to something as simple and as practical. But in our generation this cannot be. We cannot, as reasonable men and women, resist the conviction that the analysis of the text given in the above *Introduction to the Historical Books* and in the earlier *Introduction to the Criticism of the Pentateuch* must be accepted in its main lines, with the new dating of the sources and the account of the process of editing through which they passed. There follows from this a vast disturbance of the old-fashioned conception of the historicity of the Old Testament Scriptures. The early chapters of Genesis are, we find, in substance folklore, reformed under a true inspiration of God's Spirit so as to be made vehicles of high spiritual truth, but not transformed into history. The stories of the patriarchs again contain real history, but, as they stand, they are legends a great way removed from the record of events as they actually occurred. To come down to a later time: Moses stands as a great historical figure, but we see him with a legendary halo. So it is with Joshua, and later with Elijah and Elisha. In the Book of *Judges* we get real history, but it is fitted into a non-historical framework from which the actual history can only be recovered by an elaborate critical effort. The same is true of the Book of *Samuel*, until with the beginning of the kingdom we get down to solid historical ground; but in the later history of the divided kingdom the actual facts are again seen partly through a mist—the mist of later ideas as to how things ought to have happened, and therefore, it is supposed, must have happened from the prophetic or priestly point of view—though the mist is much less dense in *Kings* than in *Chronicles*. Again, the reconstruction of the history of the Return and the Persian Period is only to be effected by a difficult process of analysis of the Books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*. Finally, it has to be admitted that the stories in Esther and Daniel are not properly history at all, but edifying stories on a remote basis of tradition.

All this profound change in our estimate of the historical books of the Old Testament has to be accepted. The details are indeed not always certain, and there may be changes in critical conclusions and reactions at this point and that. But substantially it must be acknowledged that the old estimate of the historical character of all the books has become impossible for reasonable men and women.

Then what is their worth to be for those who are only remotely interested in the details of ancient history or incapable of following the work of the critics? What use, on the new estimate, has the plain man for those books? What is their spiritual value? Elsewhere in this volume the suggestion will be found that the spiritual value of the books is to be secured by reverting to the old belief in the 'mystical meaning' of Scriptural incidents and words, a meaning (as Origen thought) independent of their relation to history (see pp. 695*a*-696*a*), but the editors cannot identify themselves at all fully with this anticipation. At any rate, first of all we desire to give advice on different lines. We would say: (1) Accept the critical verdicts just summarized as inevitable, and accustom your minds to regard Hebrew history as passing through the phases normal in all history—folklore, tradition, contemporary records, the free use of past history for purposes of present edification. You should notice that for the pure historical enquirer the truth of a document does not increase with its modernity or diminish with its antiquity. Very modern documents can be very legendary and very ancient documents can be strictly accurate chronicles. For the strict historian the value of a document depends upon the relation of the writer to the events he records and the apparent absence of any disturbing motive. In the Old Testament there is some such strict history—contemporary, or at least authentic, records, where no disturbing motive appears to be at work; for instance, the record of the reign of

David in Jerusalem and some narratives which appear in the Book of *Judges*; but the most strictly historical records are sometimes not at all edifying, and have been practically ignored in the Christian Church. It is the idealizing history which has been found (as it was intended to be) useful for edification. But here we come upon a most remarkable fact. The popular history of England or of America or of Germany or of France has not been true and pure history. It has been deeply idealized in order to glorify the country concerned. The history of Israel as it was compiled, partly out of records and partly out of tradition, by writers deeply embrued with the prophetic inspiration, was idealized history no doubt, but its motive was *not* national self-glorification. It was something quite different. It was to represent how a continuous purpose of God was at work in Israel and for Israel, which pursued its course in spite of the obstinate rebellion and stubborn wickedness of the people. Natural self-satisfaction no doubt there was in Israel, but the writers of the books constantly chastise it. This is a unique phenomenon in literature. Here we get what gives the Old Testament its spiritual value. It is the record of the preparation of the Kingdom of God—how God educated a barbarous group of tribes and trained them, stubborn and wicked as they were, for a spiritual purpose of which we see the fulfilment in the New Testament. It is the recognition of this that ought to make the ordinary modern man feel the profound interest of the Old Testament as his forefathers could not feel it. The old 'moral difficulties of the Old Testament' have for us really vanished. That savage and indiscriminate slaughter should appear to Joshua and Samuel, and the sacrifice of his son should appear to Abraham, as the command of God becomes intelligible when we see that the real mind of God, disclosed to us in our Lord, could only become gradually understood as, in the slow process of a divine education, the thick integument of a yet barbarous conscience was changed into such a clear and sensitive medium as (shall we say) the conscience of an Isaiah or a Jeremiah. *After all, the real importance of history lies in perceiving what it is coming to—what is its tendency.* The historians of the Old Testament, no doubt, are not critically precise about the facts, but they do really understand the actual tendency and meaning of the history which they record. They are true interpreters if not always exactly true recorders.

(2) In the life of our Lord we see 'the Word made flesh.' The idea and the fact are one. We need nothing but the real record; and such real record we have got of words and facts which were as truly divine as they were actually human. *But the Old Testament was prophetic: its value lies in what it points to: the facts do not yet express the whole divine idea or purpose.* The characters which are most full of instruction, such as Moses, Joshua, Elijah, and Elisha, are more or less idealized; sometimes, as in Daniel and Job, they are almost characters of romance or drama, not of history. But we have only to recall to our minds that the best spirit of all nations has been mainly nourished not on history, as modern scholars laboriously reconstruct it, but on an historical tradition based upon actual occurrences but idealizing the facts, such as the history of the Roman Livy or Shakespeare's historical plays; and besides it has been deeply influenced by characters of drama or romance which have appealed to men as true to life, though they were the ideal constructions of their authors. So it was with Israel. (On the figures of romance we would refer to a note on *Daniel*, p. 546*a*.) But all these characters are true to life and express to us the real method of God's training of men. Nothing can cause them to lose their value.

(3) Finally, we would say the Bible has been given you, in the providence of God, as it stands. It was the Old Testament as it stands which became the Scriptures of Christ and His Church. In proportion as you are a student you will want to master the historical origin and literary character of its several parts. But when you have done that, so far as you are able to, and willingly or reluctantly have accepted the new estimates of the books, as this Commentary seeks to give them to you, you will go back to the Bible as it stands. You will remember that the prophetic spirit was at work in the whole literature more or less fully, in later editors as well as earlier recorders.*

* For instance, there is given above on p. 138 an account of Balaam's character and action as it was apparently represented in the different sources used by the editor of the Book of Numbers. But great preachers such as Butler, Newman, and Robertson have discovered in the final composite account of Balaam a profounder meaning than lies in any of the sources taken separately. To the writer of the note it would seem fairly certain that the inspiring Spirit of God was at work in the mind of the final compiler, as really as in that of the earlier writers, whether the compiler was conscious of it or not.—C. G.

If you are wise you will like to read the old Bible in a new translation, which makes more intelligible to you the actual meaning of the words. From this point of view Dr. James Moffatt's translation is greatly to be recommended. No doubt many passages will remain obscure to you, but the bulk of the books will be clearly intelligible; and it is the plain parts of the Bible that really matter. *There you will see the history of the divine training of the Church of God under the Old Dispensation and under the New, and you will see also the training of individual character, as much in the partly or wholly ideal figures of the Old Testament as in the more purely historical characters of the New.* And through it all you will find in manifold forms the expression of a word of God, given to lead mankind into the way of truth and to discipline him for the Kingdom of God. Of this 'pearl of great price' there is no danger that historical criticism will deprive you.

JOSHUA

By L. E. P. Erith

(Note.—The reader is strongly advised to turn up references as they occur, especially to Deuteronomy, since exigencies of space preclude quotations in full. It is also advisable to consult a map frequently.)

The Books of Joshua and Judges should be studied together, because they are parallel, not consecutive 'histories' of an important period in Israel's national and religious development. Both purport to give an account of Israel's settlement in Canaan after the Exodus; but they differ very widely in their description of this settlement. The Book of Joshua describes the conquest of Canaan as rapid and complete, taking place during Joshua's lifetime, all the tribes acting in concert under his leadership. Judges, on the other hand, represents the settlement as gradual and difficult, a continual struggle on the part of isolated tribes against oppression by the native races. The conquest of Canaan, according to Judges, was the slow and laborious work of many generations, and the union of the Hebrew tribes was only gradually brought about by the necessity for combination against their Canaanite oppressors.

Since both Joshua and Judges thus cover the same ground, though in a widely different manner, it will be convenient, in order to avoid repetition, to deal in this introduction with the religious background and the historical problems common to both. Before we proceed, however, to discuss the historical question we must first consider the stages by which our Book of Joshua has reached its present form.

(1) **Composition and Contents.**—The present Book of Joshua is a compilation consisting mainly of two earlier narratives of Joshua's conquest of Canaan and of his settlement of the tribes in their respective territories. The former of these two narratives, 1-12 and 23, is the work of a Deuteronomic writer who based his story on the source JE. This account describes Joshua's conquests as accomplished rapidly and completely in a series of victorious campaigns. After the overthrow of Jericho and Ai he is induced to make a league with the Gibeonites, a powerful community in central Palestine, as a result of which he gains possession of the south country by defeating a coalition of five kings who had allied themselves against Gibeon (10). He then overcomes north Palestine by completely destroying a combination of various rulers headed by Jabin, king of Hazor (11 [1-5]). The remainder of 11 emphasizes the thoroughness of Joshua's victories, while 12 summarizes the preceding narrative of JE in Numbers and Joshua by enumerating the conquests both of Moses ([1-6]) and of Joshua ([7-24]). This Deuteronomic history concluded with a farewell discourse, now contained in 23, ascribed to Joshua, on the same lines as that of Moses in Dt 31 [1-8]. This discourse was removed to its present place by the final editor, who wished to insert the second narrative (13-22) before recording the farewell speeches.

To gain an understanding of the book it is advisable now to read carefully 1-12, and to note the Deuteronomic editor's evident intention to convey an impression that Joshua's victories were even more complete and far reaching than the narrative of JE recorded. See, for example, the editorial notes in 10 [40-43], 11 [16-23]. It is then easy to appreciate the difference between this and the second narrative (13-22), which is taken from the priestly source, and describes the terri-

tory allotted to the various tribes. The influence of the priestly writer is seen here in the provision made for the priests and Levites (13 [14], 14 [4], 18 [7], 21), and in the introduction of a new authority, Eleazar the priest, who now appears as joint leader with Joshua, and even takes precedence of him (14 [1], 17 [4], 19 [51], 21 [1]). Embedded in this narrative are fragments of an older record, used also in Jg 1, which gives an account of the settlement very different from that of the Deuteronomic history of the earlier chapters. For example, in 10 [36-39] we have been told that Joshua destroyed Hebron and Debir with all their inhabitants, 'he left none remaining,' yet in 14 [6-15] and 15 [13-19] = Jg 1 [10-15], we read that these districts are assigned to Caleb, who has to conquer them (14 [12]; cf. Jg 1 [20]), which he does with the aid of his son-in-law, Othniel, who takes Debir (15 [13-19]). Again, such statements as 15 [63] = Jg 1 [21], that the children of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites; 16 [10] = Jg 1 [29], that Ephraim could not overcome Gezer, which, as a matter of fact, remained unconquered till Solomon's reign (1 K 9 [16]), are completely at variance with the former chapters which narrate Joshua's destruction both of Jerusalem and Gezer with all their inhabitants (10 [33], 12 [7-12]). Other extracts from this older record are 13 [13], 17 [14-18], which also describe the failure of the Hebrews to dislodge the natives, and 19 [47], which tells of an independent conquest made by Dan (cf. Jg 18).

It is thus clear that the Book of Joshua itself does not contain a consistent record. The impression of a complete conquest of the whole land by Joshua, given in 1-12, has to be modified and corrected in view of direct indications to the contrary contained in the later chapters. We have then to try to reconstruct from external history, with the help of the older record already noted, the probable sequence of events in the course of Israel's conquest of Canaan. We shall then be in a better position to estimate the historical value of Joshua and the writer's reason for telling the story in the way he has done. But first it may be well to mention an important consideration which the reader of Joshua and Judges should bear in mind. The Hebrew historian was very prone to anachronism. That is to say, he read back into past history the developed conditions of the later period in which he himself lived. Thus in these two books the compiler relates of Israel as a united nation events which really apply only to one tribe or clan and to a small locality. So we find that conquests are credited to the whole of Israel under Joshua's leadership which were actually due to the independent efforts of individual tribes or families; while in Judges, instances of oppression and successful resistance are related of Israel as a whole, when in reality only one tribe and one locality were affected. For example, the statement 'he judged Israel forty years' is never literally true. There was not, and, as we shall see, there could not have been, at this period any organized unity of the tribes as a nation.

(2) **Historical Background.**—We may conveniently commence with the Exodus as the turning-point in the history of this period. We may assume that it happened, as most scholars hold, during the 19th Egyptian dynasty, under Mineptah, son of Rameses II, the Pharaoh of the Oppression. Mineptah reigned *c.* 1225-1215 B.C. We may say at once that it is very unlikely that all the Hebrew tribes in Palestine migrated to Egypt. The writers of Genesis have preserved a substantially true tradition when they picture different parties of Israelites driven down into Egypt at different times by the stress of famine in Palestine; but the evidence of history does not support the impression they convey that all the various Israelite elements in Canaan eventually combined to migrate into Egypt, subsequently suffered oppression there, and finally escaped under the leadership of Moses. It was not the whole nation of Israel which was led out of Egypt by Moses or into Canaan by Joshua. Some Hebrew tribes had remained in Palestine all the time, and others had made an entry independently of Moses or Joshua. The reader will find the evidence for this convincingly set out in detail in Dr. C. F. Burney's Schweich Lectures, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, and in section 6 of the Introduction to his Commentary on Judges, and also by Dr. S. A. Cook in *Cambridge Ancient History*, II, ch. xiv.

We have next to try to identify the Hebrew tribes in Egypt. According to the Biblical tradition the main body were the Joseph tribes (Gen 27 ff.). We have also mention of Simeon, who is said to have been detained in Egypt by Joseph (Gen 42 [24], 43 [23]), and we may assume that Levi, the companion tribe of Simeon, was there also, as Moses is said to have been born in Egypt of Levite parents (Ex 2). We can trace the fortunes of Simeon and Levi back to Gen 34, which is clearly a personification of tribal history, and tells how these two tribes or clans gained possession of Shechem by treachery.

We have then to account for their later association with Judah and their presence in Egypt. Probably the hint of reprisals on the part of the Canaanites (Gen 34 [30], 49 [5, 6]) is based on fact, for Simeon and Levi did not retain possession of Shechem, and it may well be that they were subsequently driven out, greatly reduced in numbers, and forced down to the South. This would account for the later territorial position of Simeon and the close connexion of Levi with Judah. Dwelling on the edge of the desert, these two tribes would be most likely to seek asylum in Egypt in time of famine. We may thus reasonably infer that 'Israel' in Egypt consisted of the Joseph, Simeon, and Levi tribes.

The Biblical narrative further supports the evidence of external history that various Hebrew tribes were gradually gaining a settlement in Canaan independently of Joshua and at an earlier date. The highly idealized view of the conquest of Canaan related in Joshua, which pictures the united tribes taking possession of the country in a series of victorious campaigns under Joshua's leadership, is the product of a later age, and is due to the tendency of the narrator to read into early history the later organized unity of the nation in which he was living. The earlier and more reliable old document which underlies Jg 1, and of which traces appear in the second half of Joshua, is of first-rate historical importance, and describes only two tribal conquests in Canaan as a result of the Exodus, viz. that of Judah and Simeon (Jg 1 [1-21]), and that of the Joseph tribes (1 [22-26]). Now the account of the invasion of southern Canaan by Judah and Simeon is clearly an amplification of another extract from this old document preserved in Nu 21 [1-3], which shows that the invasion by Judah and Simeon took place from the South, the tribes working upwards towards the North. (For the editorial amplifications in Jg 1 see notes on text *ad loc.*) We may then trace the course of events as follows: Judah was a tribe settled in the far South of Canaan at the time of the oppression of other Israelites in Egypt. After the Exodus Judah was joined by its former associates, Simeon and Levi, and, thus reinforced, was enabled successfully to invade southern Canaan and to effect a much wider settlement, pushing its conquests up as far as the line of powerful Canaanite fortresses which stretched across the country from Jericho to Gezer. This line of fortresses effectually cut off Judah and Simeon from union with the tribes settled in the centre and north of Palestine, and was the cause of the isolation of Judah and of the independent position which this tribe occupied in the later history. We notice that Judah and Simeon were disregarded in the effort at union made under Deborah and Barak for the conquest of the central plain, and in Deborah's song these two tribes are not mentioned, either for praise or blame. This isolation of Judah contributed largely to the ease with which the kingdom was divided at Solomon's death.

The other tribes are shown by this old document in Jg 1 to be already in Canaan, not in the position of conquerors, but existing merely on sufferance as semi-nomadic settlers among the native population. That this is really a pre-Exodus condition seems certain from the fact that Asher is described in terms precisely similar to the rest of the tribal settlers (Jg 1 [27-36]), and we have seen from the evidence of Egyptian inscriptions that Asher was already in North Palestine when other Israelites were in Egypt (p. 177*a*). We may thus take it as reasonably certain that only the Joseph tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh, were led into Palestine by Joshua, and that his actual conquest was the partial annexation of the central hill country as recorded in Jg 1 [22-29].

It may be added that the date of the Exodus does not materially affect the above argument. At whatever time the Exodus may be held to have taken place, the fact remains that the old Hebrew history pictures some Israelite communities as settled in Palestine before the entry of the Exodus tribes.

(3) **Standpoint and Purpose.**—It will have become evident that the Book of Joshua does not contain an historically accurate account of the Hebrew settlement in Canaan. But to compile a scientific historical treatise was not the writer's purpose. He is concerned more with religious truth than with historical accuracy. His standpoint is that of a religious teacher, and he is writing with a didactic purpose to show the result of obedience to the Divine Law. He has, therefore, idealized the conquests of Israel under Joshua in order to teach the permanent religious lesson that the prosperity of a nation depends upon both people and rulers following whole-heartedly the Will of God. Hence his constant reference to Joshua's obedience to the Divine Law as taught by Moses, e.g. 'As the Lord commanded Moses His servant, so did Moses command Joshua, and so did Joshua; he left nothing undone

of all that the Lord commanded Moses' (11 15; cf. 8 30-35, 10 40, 11 9, 12, 20, 23, and see further notes *ad loc.*).

(4) **Religious Background.** — As the result of the entry of the Exodus tribes there arose a conflict of religions in Palestine. The native Canaanite religion was nature-worship, the religion of an agricultural people, who regarded the Baals of the various territories as the authors of fertility both of crops and herds. Associated with the god of the soil was the goddess Ashtart, or Asherah as she was frequently called in Palestine; and the ritual of their worship centred round the sexual act of reproduction performed by the worshippers with the religious prostitutes of both sexes attached to the sanctuaries at the local High Places. A clear description of Baal-worship with its demoralizing influence is given by the prophet Hosea, whose own wife left him to become a sanctuary prostitute (2-4). There can be little doubt that the Palestinian Hebrews had become largely contaminated by this form of worship; it was the popular religion, and it tended to reduce their conception of the God of Israel to the level of the local Baalim. It was a debasing type of religion, material in conception and licentious in practice. This explains the uncompromising attitude of the prophets towards the High Places, and the extreme measures enjoined by Deuteronomy for abolishing the local sanctuaries (12 2, 3, 16 21, 22), and for exterminating the native races (20 16-18). That is why Joshua is represented by the Deuteronomic editor as putting the conquered Canaanites under the ban (*herem*) and destroying them utterly.

Now the Exodus tribes had learned from Moses a high, ethical conception of their God. The great religious lesson taught by Moses in the wilderness was the Covenant relation between God and His people, a relation which demanded a high standard of moral righteousness on Israel's part. It was this higher conception of religion which the Exodus tribes carried into Palestine. There would naturally be a tendency for these tribes to approximate their religion to that which they found practised around them as they passed from the nomadic to the agricultural life, and doubtless many did so. Yet we find clear indications that the true religion taught by Moses was never allowed entirely to lapse into Canaanite heathenism. There were three agencies during this period by which true religion was kept alive in Israel, all emanating from the Exodus tribes: (*a*) the faithful nucleus among the Joseph tribes, e.g. the Abiezer clan of Manasseh under its chieftain Gideon; (*b*) the order of Nazirites; (*c*) the instructed Levites. These three agencies maintained a true conception of God and His requirements as taught by Moses till Samuel, himself an Ephraimite and Nazirite, founded the order of Prophets.

I. is an introduction written by the Deuteronomist who has edited 1-12, and is designed to connect this narrative with the closing section of Deuteronomy. The chapter is instructive as showing the standpoint of the writer. His object is to represent the Divine promise of support for Joshua as conditional on his obedience to the law as given by Moses (7-9). This explains the religious purpose with which he has edited his source JE so as to heighten the effect of Joshua's victories, which are regarded as a reward of his obedience to the law.

4 describes rather obscurely the boundaries of the land promised to Joshua. We should perhaps read 'from the wilderness to this Lebanon.' The territory indicated here represents the widest area over which Israel ever held rule in the reigns of David and Solomon. It foreshadows the idealization of Joshua's conquests which is to follow. The *Hittites* were not natives of Canaan, but were an Anatolian people, members of an Empire on a totally different level from the petty city-states of Canaan Recent research has shown that under the powerful Emperor Shubbiluliuma, whose capital, Hatti, the modern Boghaz Keui, lay about 200 miles north of the Taurus mountains, the Hittite power successfully combated the arms of Egypt in Palestine during the closing years of the 18th dynasty. all the land of the Hittites may thus be a reminiscence of the country taken by them at that time. The Hittites who are subsequently mentioned in Joshua among the native races of Canaan will be bodies of settlers who remained, much as the Hebrews did.

8 cannot refer to the *book* of Deuteronomy, for it is generally agreed among scholars that Deuteronomy, a codification of the teaching of the earlier prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, was not promulgated till the reign of Josiah. But there is, however, no reason to doubt that Moses had given to the Exodus tribes a basis of religious and civil law which may well have been reduced to writing (24 26 *v.n.*).

12-18 are an echo of Nu 32, save that

there no mention is made of half Manasseh who migrated to the east of Jordan at a later date (see on 17 14-18). The readiness with which Reuben and Gad are pictured here as consenting to share in the difficult task of annexing Canaan is strangely at variance with their attitude of aloofness from the rest of the tribes for which they were taunted by Deborah and punished by Gideon (Jg 5 15-17, 8 15-17), and is not historical, but due to the writer's wish to represent Joshua as the leader of a united Israel.

II.-VIII. describe the invasion of central Canaan, and the conquest of Jericho and Ai. The annexation of this central district, including the taking of Bethel, which is omitted here, formed, as we have seen good reason to suppose, the full extent of Joshua's conquests. It is significant, therefore, that these events are narrated at far greater length than the much more important victories attributed to Joshua over allied Canaanite forces in the south and north, which are briefly summarized in 10 and 11, and which can hardly be historical. Joshua's real victories would naturally be described at length, and would gain many accretions as they were handed down in his tribe during the course of centuries; but there is no reason to doubt that these chapters (2-8) embody a true historical tradition.

II. describes Joshua's preparation for the assault on Jericho by the sending of spies. The hand of the Deuteronomic editor appears clearly in 11, where he attributes to Rahab, a heathen Canaanite, an expression of pure monotheism, a truth which Israel itself did not grasp till the days of Amos. Her words, 'the Lord your God, He is God in heaven above and on earth beneath,' are taken directly from Dt 4 39.

III. and IV. describe the crossing of the Jordan and the setting up of memorial stone pillars to mark the event. Two accounts are interwoven here, with considerable Deuteronomic additions, and this explains the inconsistency as to the ultimate location of the stones. It is easy to see that two sources have been combined, for in 3 17-4 3 and 4 8, after the people have passed over, twelve men are bidden to fetch twelve stones out of the midst of Jordan and to lay them down in the lodging place. At 4 4 another source is used. The crossing has not yet begun, and Joshua sends twelve men before the Ark to take up twelve stones out of Jordan and to carry them over, and in 9 we are told that he set the stones up **in the midst of Jordan . . . and they are there unto this day.** The Deuteronomic editor adds in 20 that Joshua set up the stones in Gilgal. Characteristic Deuteronomic additions are 6, 7, 20-24, the provision of instruction for future generations, cf. Ex 12 25-27. The stone pillar, *maṣṣēbah*, was an ancient symbol of the Presence of God, cf. Gen 28 17, 18, and continued to be used down to the time of Hosea (see 3 4). It was forbidden by Deuteronomy, and that explains why the stone pillars at Gilgal in this edition of Joshua are regarded as memorials only (contrast 24 26, 27, E).

The ease with which the Jordan was forded may well have been due to natural causes. We are told that the waters were dammed some distance off (16), probably by a landslip, for there is a striking parallel to this incident in the Arabic historian Nuwairi's account of the Jordan being dammed by a landslip in this neighbourhood so that the river bed was dry in 1267. It would be natural for the Hebrew historian, who attributed everything extraordinary to direct Divine agency, to describe such an event as due to miraculous intervention on behalf of Israel. But although we need not assume that the Jordan was crossed by supernatural means, we can see the religious lesson that underlies the story. Before this great undertaking Joshua bade the people 'sanctify themselves.' They believed that God was with them, and the Ark symbolized His Presence and His help. They were guided and protected by the Divine Presence, and must sanctify themselves to be worthy of that guidance and protection. Once the Jordan was crossed Gilgal (4 20) became the base for Joshua's military operations (cf. 5 10, 9 6, 10 6, 15, 43, 14 6).

V. The term **Amorites** (1) is used here in its original meaning as a general designation for the natives of Canaan. In early Babylonian records Palestine is called 'the land of Amurru.'

2-12. Circumcision and the Passover.—On the threshold of the promised land the tribes led by Joshua sanctified themselves (cf. 3 5) in preparation for the task that lay before them by two solemn religious observances. Circumcision had apparently been neglected among the Israelites in Egypt; but now the rite must be resumed as an act by which the tribes dedicate themselves to God, and, according to P, as a necessary preliminary to the Passover (Ex 12 48), 'no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof.' The temporary, unsettled conditions of the wilderness are now past, and, with a settled life in prospect, religious duties must be observed.

4-7 are editorial, finding a cause for Joshua's renewal of circumcision in the tradition of forty years' wandering in the wilderness (Nu 14 30-33), till all who had come out of Egypt had died except Caleb and Joshua.

5. The editorial statement that all the people who came out of Egypt were circumcised is at variance with 9, which clearly implies that the circumcised Egyptians looked with scorn on the uncircumcised Hebrews, much as the Hebrews subsequently regarded the Philistines. Moreover, the very early narrative of Ex 4 24-26, which shows that Moses had not been circumcised in Egypt, supports the original source here. If we bracket the editorial verses we get a consistent story in 2, 3, 8, 9. The explanation of the name **Gilgal** as the 'rolling away' is, like many Hebrew derivations, based on assonance rather than philology. Gilgal means properly a circle, i.e. of sacred stones.

13-15, continued in 6 2 ff. These verses contain what Sir George Adam Smith (*H.D.B.*, s.v. 'Joshua') rightly calls 'the finest religious conception in the book. It is a noble illustration of the truth that, in the great causes of God upon the earth, the leaders, however supreme and solitary they seem, are themselves led. There is a rock higher than they; their shoulders, however broad, have not to bear alone the awful burden of responsibility. The sense of supernatural conduct and protection, the consequent reverence and humility which form the spirit of all Israel's history, have nowhere in the Old Testament received a more beautiful expression than in this early fragment.' What Joshua saw with the eye of faith is recorded as an objective reality.* The **captain of the host of the Lord**, like the 'angel of the Lord,' represents God in manifestation to the spiritual vision of one who waits on the Divine Will. This is clear from the continuation of the narrative, which is interrupted by 6 4, for in 6 2 it is God Himself who speaks to Joshua.

VI. **The Taking of Jericho.**—This chapter describes in dramatic metaphor the ease with which the tribes under Joshua took Jericho by assault. There is no reason to suppose that anything supernatural occurred. **The wall fell down** flat is merely literary hyperbole intended to convey the completeness of the victory; and probably nobody would be more amazed than the actual writer to learn that his words were ever required, as a point of faith, to be understood literally. That Jericho did indeed offer some resistance seems clear from 24 11, 'and the men of Jericho fought against you'; but Jericho, as Sir G. A. Smith points out (*Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 267 ff.), was always easily taken in war, and he enumerates several occasions on which it fell at once before an attack in force. The position of the city made its defence very difficult, and its people were too effeminate and luxurious to make any great effort. 'Jericho never stood a siege, and her inhabitants were always running away.' Excavations of the old walls have revealed a breach on the eastern side through which Joshua may have entered. It is perhaps hardly necessary to point out that had the walls collapsed entirely Rahab and her household could scarcely have escaped (cf. 2 15 with 6 22-25). The circuit of the walls with trumpets and shouting probably denotes a demonstration in force designed successfully to terrorize the inhabitants, already alarmed by rumours of Israelite victories on the east of Jordan (2 9-11). Rahab's confession of the fear caused by reports of Joshua's advance is closely parallel to the Tell-el-Amarna letters from Arad-hiba, governor of Jerusalem, to the Pharaoh Amenhotep IV, describing the effect of Habiru raids on Canaan.

17-19 state the law of extermination or sacred ban (*herem*), which decrees that conquered cities are to be devoted entirely to God, i.e. utterly destroyed. The people are not to profit by loot, but all valuables are to 'come into the treasury of the Lord.' Dt 20 16-18 gives the ethical reason for this, 'that they teach you not to do after all their abominations which they have done unto their gods'; see Intro. (4).

26, the curse on the rebuilding of Jericho with its fulfilment in 1 K 16 34, probably points to the customary human sacrifice at the founding of a city. That human sacrifice was not unknown in Israel is clear from the story of Jephthah's daughter; and recent excavations in Palestine, notably at Gezer, have completely proved the practice of offering human foundation sacrifices (Driver, *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible*, 67-72).

VII.-VIII. **The Sin of Achan and the Capture of Ai.**—Ai was a strong fortress, occupying an important strategic posi-

* We cannot deny the possibility of theophanies or angelic appearances in material form: but if it appears more probable that no uninterested bystander would have seen what Joshua saw, or heard what Joshua heard, the divine communication to him would not have been less real, because made only to the eye and ear of the soul.—Ed.

tion which barred Joshua's progress westward. Its reduction was therefore a matter of necessity for gaining possession of central Canaan. In 7 the editor has combined two historically true but originally unrelated episodes, Achan's sin from J and Joshua's repulse before Ai from E. That Joshua met with an initial repulse before the strong fortress of Ai we can well believe, and there is no reason to doubt the existence of one Achan of Judah, a notorious evil-doer, who transgressed the law of the sacred ban. But that the sin of Achan was the cause of Joshua's defeat before Ai is open to serious question. As he belonged to Judah he can scarcely have been with the tribes under Joshua, and his violation of the law of *herem* probably took place in connexion with some campaign in Judah. The editor has combined these two events in pursuance of his didactic purpose, viz. to show the disastrous result of disobedience to the Deuteronomic law. To a Hebrew writer with a religious lesson to teach it would be a small thing to transfer to the campaign of Joshua in central Palestine a breach of the law which really took place on a different occasion in Judah.

VII. **24.** The fact that Achan's whole family suffered with him is in accordance with the Deuteronomic conception of the nation or clan or family as the moral unit rather than the individual. The doctrine of individual responsibility, and consequent reward and punishment, is first stated definitely by Ezek 18, in answer to popular reaction against the hard-and-fast ruling of Deuteronomy.

24 and **25** illustrate the Deuteronomic editing of the older source. To the original JE account the editor has added, following Dt 13 [16, 17], which enjoins the burning of all the spoil, a list of Achan's loot and its subsequent consumption by fire. Hence the confusion in the present text. **25***b* should read 'and they burned them with fire, but stoned him with stones.'

VIII. **1-29,** recording the successful stratagem by which Joshua, taught by defeat, finally reduced Ai, is quite straightforward and needs no comment. We notice again in [29] the meticulous care with which the editor draws attention to Joshua's observance of Deuteronomic regulations (cf. Dt 21 [23]).

30-35. This account of the ratification of the Law on **Ebal** and **Gerizim** added by the Deuteronomic editor may well embody a true tradition. It is based on Dt 11 [29, 30] and 27, and is intended to show Joshua's obedience to the behest of Moses. While there is no reason to doubt the essential truth of this, the account as it now stands, both in Dt and here, has, however, been considerably expanded, e.g. the exact location, Ebal and Gerizim, can hardly have been determined by Moses, and was added in Dt *post eventum*; and there is the usual anachronism of the twelve tribes acting in concert, which was impossible at this early stage in the settlement. The basis of fact appears to be that Moses had enjoined on the wilderness tribes the strict observance of the Covenant laws in their new home across Jordan. Joshua, in obedience to this injunction, did cause the tribes under him to ratify these laws as soon as they had gained a footing in Canaan. Ebal and Gerizim were convenient for the purpose, hence they were read back into Deuteronomy. This observance does not violate the Deuteronomic law of the central sanctuary, which is not regarded as coming into force till the Temple was actually built in Jerusalem. The insertion of the account of this solemn ratification of the Covenant laws at this point is significant. It is not out of place, as many critics suppose, but is in precisely its right place, marking the end of Joshua's real conquests, viz. the subjugation of central Canaan. The rest which follows in 9-11 is a didactic idealization, and is not historical. Gerizim, afterwards the site of the Samaritan Temple, is 'this mountain' of the Samaritan woman's question to our Lord in Jn 4 [20].

IX. **The Treaty with Gibeon.**—The Deuteronomic editor places this in striking contrast to the warlike attitude assumed towards Israel by the other Canaanite states. There is no doubt that a treaty was made with Gibeon, certainly before the reign of Saul; and it may well be that after their settlement in central Canaan the Joseph tribes sought an alliance with these powerful neighbours on their southern border, 'because Gibeon was a great city, as one of the royal cities . . . greater than Ai, and all the men thereof were mighty' (10 [2]). The making of the treaty has clearly been written up in this chapter to magnify the prestige of Joshua. The account contains obvious anachronisms, e.g. in [18] ff. 'the princes of the congregation' make the treaty, and Joshua assigns to the Gibeonites the menial offices of hewing wood and drawing water for the Temple services ([23, 27]). In 2 S 21 the Gibeonites appear, not in a state of servitude, but as independent allies whom Saul had tried to exterminate. They were not reduced to subjection till

Solomon enslaved the native peoples of Canaan to provide labour for his building operations.

X. **Joshua's Conquest of Southern Canaan.**—This chapter is based on an old account of the battle of Beth-horon, which the editor has amplified into the subjection of the whole of the south country. The basis of fact seems to be that some Israelites joined their new allies of Gibeon in a war against neighbouring petty states, caused doubtless, as the narrative records, by the apprehension felt by the other states of this alliance between the newcomers and Gibeon.

13. The Hebrews and Gibeonites were victorious, their victory being celebrated in song in **the book of Jashar,** an old collection of folk-songs on early Hebrew victories (cf. 2 S 1 [18] and 'the book of the wars of the Lord,' Nu 21 [14]). The prayer to the sun and moon to stand still, and their response ([12, 13]) is, of course, poetic imagery parallel to Deborah's statement that 'the stars in their courses fought against Sisera' (Jg 5 [20]).

26, 27. 8 [29] *v.n.*

28-39. The enumeration of the places which Joshua took and utterly destroyed, exterminating their inhabitants, is plainly unhistorical, and is contradicted later in the book, e.g. Gezer was not taken (16 [10]), and Hebron and Debir were taken by Caleb and Othniel (15 [13] ff.).

40-43. The final general summary is intended to heighten still further the impression of Joshua's complete conquest of southern Palestine.

40 describes the country according to its physical features from the central range to Kadesh-barnea in the far south, 50 miles S. of Beer-sheba. Of this, only the central hill country was taken by Joshua; the south was annexed by Judah and Simeon (Jg 1 [1-17]), and the Philistines remained masters of the maritime plain.

XI. is the complement of 10, and is equally unhistorical, designed to complete the tale of Joshua's subjugation of all Palestine by a successful campaign in the north against a confederation of northern states led by Jabin, king of Hazor. We meet Jabin again in Jg 4, where he is 'mightily oppressing the children of Israel,' a passage which reads somewhat strangely if Joshua and Judges are to be regarded as consecutive histories, since here Jabin is slain by Joshua, his city burned with fire, and his people exterminated. On the taking of Hazor Jg 4 *v.n.*

10-23 are by the Deuteronomic editor, and contain his concluding summaries of Joshua's conquests: [10-15] in the north, [16-23] throughout Palestine, and [23] finally assigns to Joshua the whole conquest and the settlement of all Israel in their possessions.

13. the cities which stood on their own mounds. The Hebrew *tillam* is the same word as that used in 8 [28] for the 'heap' of ruins to which Joshua reduced Ai. Hence it would seem that 'the cities which stood on their own mounds' were those which had been previously destroyed and rebuilt on their former ruins. Excavation in Palestine shows that many cities had been thus rebuilt, often more than once. The verse states that such cities were not burned by the victorious Israelites, though the reason for this discrimination is not apparent.*

21. the Anakim, literally 'long-necked men,' were probably, as Dr. G. W. Wade suggests (*O.T. History*, 73), 'remnants of an aboriginal race of great stature' who survived in the neighbourhood of Hebron.

XII. is a further and final summary by the Deuteronomic editor of Israel's victories; [1-6], from Nu 21 [21-35], under Moses; [7-24], under Joshua.

XIII.-XXII. We come now to the second main division of the book, the story by the priestly writer, P, of Joshua's settlement of the tribes in their respective territories. This ascription to Joshua of the allotment of all the tribal settlements is on a level with P's ascription to Moses of all the later ceremonial regulations for worship and sacrifice in the Temple. As Dr. Burney points out (*Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, 26), 'This document is of immense value for the topographical information which it affords, and as an indication of the districts occupied by the different tribes at a period when Israel became practically dominant in Palestine and the tribes had been welded into a nation, i.e. we may say approximately, from the reign of David and onwards; but the view which regards Joshua as settling by lot the final districts to be occupied by the tribes in such a thorough and final manner as to define with precision the boundaries between the different heritages, is of a piece with the view which supposes the whole of Palestine, with the exception of the maritime plain occupied by the Philistines and Phœnicians, to have fallen

* Possibly because the Tell, standing higher than the *khirbet* of modern Palestine, was generally walled, and could not be taken (Gezer was such a place). See Macalister, *A Century of Excavation in Palestine*, 39.

completely into the hands of the Israelites as the fruits of Joshua's victories—a view which, as we have seen in the light of earlier evidence, does not represent the historical course of events.' It does, however, as we have seen, incorporate extracts from a much earlier document which are of real historical value.

XIII. defines the territories of the tribes Reuben and Gad and half Manasseh on the east of Jordan, and opens with a statement of the 'very much land' which yet remained to be possessed, a statement in striking contrast to the assertion of 11 [23], 'so Joshua took the whole land.' These opening verses were probably added by the compiler from an older source. The land remaining to be possessed included the whole maritime plain occupied by the Philistines, a district east of Jordan, and the far northern country. For the **Geshurites**, an E. Jordanic tribe, see [13].

3. the Shihor which is before Egypt probably denotes the E. branch of the Nile. This southern boundary is usually defined as 'the river of Egypt,' i.e. the modern Wady 'l Arish. The association of the half tribe of Manasseh ([7, 8]) with Reuben and Gad at this early stage is anachronistic (see on 17 [14-18]).

13, recording the failure to dispossess Geshur and Maacath, is an extract from the older document.

14, 33, showing the writer's interest in Levi, are characteristic of P.

XIV.-XV. **The Territory of Judah.**—14 [1-5] contains P's introduction to the whole allotment of the land west of Jordan. Here, distinctive of P, Eleazar the priest appears taking precedence of Joshua (cf. 17 [4], 19 [51], 21 [1]). In 14 [6-15] the compiler has inserted a Deuteronomic record of Caleb's claim to Hebron, based on a promise given by Moses (Nu 14 [24]; Dt 1 [36]), and in 15 [13-19] he has incorporated an extract from the older document, repeated in Jg 1 [9-15], recording Caleb's conquest of Hebron and Debir, but Jg 1 [9-15] *v.n.* The rest of these chapters describes in detail the territory of Judah.

XV. **63** is an extract from the old document relating the inability of Judah to dispossess the Jebusites from Jerusalem, quoted again in Jg 1 [21], where, however, Benjamin is wrongly substituted for Judah.

XVI.-XVII. **The Territory of the Joseph Tribes.**—16 [10] is from the old document, showing that Gezer had not been taken by Joshua. It remained unconquered till Pharaoh subdued it and gave it as a dowry with his daughter to Solomon (1 K 9 [16]). 17 [14-18], also from the older source, is interesting as giving the historical account of the migration of half Manasseh to the East of Jordan, which enables us to correct the frequent anachronism representing Moses as the author of this settlement. The Joseph tribes found themselves too cramped. Their extension southward was prevented by the line of Canaanite fortresses which cut off central from southern Canaan, and northward they were confronted by a similar line which guarded the southern border of the Plain of Esdraelon. Though they had squeezed Dan out from the S.W. corner of the central district (see on Jg 18), they still wanted room to expand; and so Joshua recommended them ([17, 18]) to go up to the hill country, cut down the forest, and settle there. This hill country clearly cannot be on the west of Jordan, since that is already occupied and is too small ([16]), and the term *ya'ar* or forest, by which Joshua describes it, is that suitable to Gilead, which is so designated in 2 S 18. We therefore conclude that the movement of part of Manasseh, led by Machir (17 [1]), to the east of Jordan, as described in Nu 32 [39], took place subsequently to the settlement of the Joseph tribes in central Canaan.

XVIII.-XIX. **The Settlement of the Remaining Tribes.**—18 marks a break in the narrative. The sanctuary at Shiloh is now the centre, and [3] clearly implies that the remaining seven tribes are on a different footing from those of Joseph and Judah. This is significant, and forms an undesigned corroboration of the older record, which shows that the only territories gained by conquest were those taken by Judah with the help of Simeon, and by the Joseph tribes; see Intro. (1).

XX. **Appointment of Cities of Refuge.**—A Deuteronomic ordinance ascribed by P to Joshua here, and to Moses in Nu 35 [9-15]. The early Covenant legislation presupposes that every local altar afforded sanctuary (Ex 21 [13, 14]; cf. 1 K 1 [50], 2 [28]). When the Deuteronomic legislation abolished the local altars it became necessary to provide asylum by assigning 'cities of refuge,' a provision ascribed to Moses in Dt 4 [41-43], 19 [2-9]. The need for such cities had, of course, not arisen till Josiah's reformation took away the local sanctuaries. The position of these cities is designed to make sanctuary equally accessible from all parts of the country.

XXI. **Assignment of the Levitical Cities.**—The chapter is a complete anachronism, but indicates what were the priestly cities at the time of writing.

XXII. **The Departure of the Trans-Jordanic Tribes, and the Altar of Witness.**—P's narrative here is probably based upon the fact that an altar was erected on the W. bank of Jordan to mark the religious unity of the tribes on either side. The discussion as to its legality recorded here probably reflects an incident that may well have arisen as a result of Josiah's reformation, and which the priestly writer has transferred to this early period for didactic purposes. Deuteronomic writers do not regard the law of the single sanctuary as binding till after the building of the Temple, but those of the priestly school assume that it was always in force. So the writer here wishes to point a moral for the men of his day by adorning a tale of the zeal displayed by their forefathers in upholding the law.

XXIII. **Joshua's Farewell Discourse** as recorded by the Deuteronomic editor. This chapter, which reflects the language of Deuteronomy throughout in its warning against apostasy, is closely parallel to Moses' farewell speech recorded in Dt 31 [1-8]. It belongs to the former half of the book, and doubtless stood originally after 12, concluding the Deuteronomic edition of Joshua's conquests. It has been moved to its present position by the compiler. It brings out forcibly the permanent religious lesson, which is the real basis of Deuteronomy, that the first duty of a people is to be faithful to their God.

XXIV. **Renewal of the Covenant by Joshua at Shechem.**—This chapter has been added by the compiler from the source E. The duty of the nation, as stated in the preceding chapter, is also the duty of the individual, and Joshua's religious sincerity and high example find expression in the simple declaration, **as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord** ([15]).

26. the book of the law of God is an unusual term. This document, E, belongs to a period before the formation of the code of Deuteronomy; but there is no reason to doubt that Moses put his Covenant legislation into writing; and a copy of that, endorsed by Joshua on behalf of the Joseph tribes, is possibly what is meant here. Shechem with its sacred tree and pillar was a very ancient holy place (see Gen 12 [6]).

27. this stone shall be witness against us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord which he spake unto us shows a trace of primitive animistic beliefs.

Books

C.B. and *Cent. B.* are both useful Commentaries. The article by Sir George Adam Smith in *H.D.B.* may also be profitably consulted. Burney's *Israel's Settlement in Canaan* forms an excellent historical introduction.

JUDGES

By L. E. P. Erith

The Book of Judges covers a period of transition in the history of the Hebrews, and deals with the settlement of the various tribes in Palestine, their gradual combination into one people, and their conquest of the native Canaanites. Hitherto the Hebrews had been merely nomadic tribes, related but not united, living in separate districts with no common interests, as strangers among native races either in subjection or, with the possible exception of the tribes of Judah and Joseph, at best on sufferance (see Jg 1). Thus, at the opening of the period the Hebrews were a people of separated tribal units, without cohesion, country, or government of their own. In Judges we see these separated units recognizing closer ties of relationship, gradually combining, and in a fair way to becoming a settled nation. The book describes the nation in the making; and the tribal traditions used by the compiler form a valuable record, historically trustworthy, narrating the story of the settlement in Canaan, the early development of the nation, its ethical standards and religious beliefs.

(1) **Composition and Contents.**—The book as it stands at present is a compilation based on a Deuteronomic edition of an older history of early tribal settlements in Canaan, which occupies 2 [6]-16 of the present book; 1-2 [5] and 17-21 being later additions, though from early sources, by the compiler, or final editor. In all probability the older history used by the Deuteronomic editor extended originally to the institution of the monarchy, omitting the present 17-21. Eli and Samuel are spoken of in exactly the same way as the earlier Judges, e.g. 1 S 4 [18], Eli 'judged Israel forty years,' precisely the formula of Judges. The account of

the birth of Samuel is closely parallel to that of Samson (1 S 1 and Jg 13), and his title of Judge is referred, not to his judicial assize, but to his victory over the Philistines at Mizpah (1 S 7 [15]); the office of Judge being, as we see throughout the book, really that of a military dictator. For examples in modern history of a similar office we might compare Cromwell and Napoleon (see note on Gideon). The assize is the development of the judgeship; and the speech of Samuel, 1 S 12, which contains a retrospect of the period of the Judges, is exactly the conclusion we should expect for this history, corresponding to the farewell discourses of Moses and Joshua in the preceding books. The Deuteronomic editor has fitted a selection of the older narratives into a framework of his own, which is clearly distinguishable by the regular recurrence of fixed phraseology and artificial chronology, e.g. the people offend Jehovah—Jehovah delivers them into the hand of an enemy—the people cry unto Jehovah in their distress—Jehovah sends them a deliverer—the enemy is beaten off and the land has rest, usually for forty years.

The present book stops short in its history of popular heroes at Samson, and concludes with two independent narratives taken from old sources: (*a*) the sanctuary of Micah and the migration of Dan (17 and 18); and (*b*) the outrage at Gibeah and consequent decimation of Benjamin (19-21). That these are insertions into an earlier edition seems clear from the fact that the story of the Philistine oppressions which begins with Samson is continued naturally in 1 S in the account of the judgeships of Eli and Samuel. We may thus analyze the contents of the present book:

A. 1-2 [5]. A summary of the positions of the various tribes at the time when the elements from Egypt had reached Canaan, with a brief account of the conquests of the Judah and Joseph tribes. This was added to the Deuteronomic history by a later compiler, and is based on the old document noticed in Jos 12-21, a record of first-rate historical importance. Allowing for editorial amendments, it contains a trustworthy account of the condition of the tribes at the beginning of the period.

B. 2 [6]-16 [31]. The history of the Judges compiled by the Deuteronomic editor. 2 [6]-3 [6] are clearly intended to form an introduction to this history and to connect it with the end of Joshua, for which purpose Jos 24 [28-31] is repeated here in 2 [6-9]. We notice the characteristic anachronism, already remarked in Joshua, by which the editor attributes to Israel as a whole, events which belong properly to one tribe or clan and to a relatively small district [see Jos, Intro. (1), par. 3].

C. 17-21. Two additional narratives gathered from old sources, inserted by the final editor to illustrate (1) the religious (17 and 18), and (2) the social (19-21) conditions of the period.

(2) **Standpoint and Purpose.**—The main history of the Judges, like that of Joshua, is edited by a member of the Deuteronomic school, i.e. an exponent of the teaching of the prophets. The editor here writes from the same standpoint as in Jos 1-12, but with a different purpose. In Joshua he is concerned to show the result of obedience to the law of Deuteronomy, and his object is to exhibit Joshua as a shining example of obedience to that law. In order to do this he has represented the conquests of Joshua ideally, and attributed to him a career of victory which is regarded as the reward of his faithful observance of Deuteronomic enactments. In Judges, on the other hand, the editor's object is to point out the result of disobedience to the law, to show that Israel's slow and painful task in gaining possession of Canaan was the punishment for their disregard of the law and for their apostasy from their God. For this purpose he generalizes very largely, and attributes to the whole of Israel shortcomings and misfortunes which were really, as the older history records, purely local and tribal. The tribes were never able to act in concert. Their greatest effort at combined action, under Deborah and Barak, only succeeded in collecting contingents from six tribes.

(3) **The Chronology of Judges.**—It seems clear that the Deuteronomic editor has not arranged the old tribal traditions on which he based his narrative in any chronological order, and we cannot, therefore, date the succession of events or of Judges with any certainty. As Dr. Burney has pointed out (*Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, 4, 5), the period of 480 years from the Exodus to the building of the Temple in Solomon's fourth year (1 K 6 [1]) is based on the artificial device of reckoning by twelve generations of leaders, from Moses to David, allowing forty years to a generation. 'Such a scheme of chronology, in order to "work," must inevitably presuppose that the stated periods were *successive*, without any overlapping. The Israelite leaders must be regarded as exercising authority *over Israel as a whole*; and the chronological scheme is therefore bound up with

the theory that Israel as a whole formed a unity of twelve tribes from the period of the Exodus and onward. This is clearly the theory of the editorial parts of the Book of Judges as regards the authority exercised by the Judges; yet it is no less clear that the old narratives themselves picture a large amount of disorganization among the tribes, and rightly regard the Judges as merely local leaders, not successive rulers of all Israel.'

For the historical and religious background see Jos, Intro. (2) and (4).

I.-II. 5 form a later introduction added by the final compiler, P, who had access to an older history not used by the Deuteronomic editor, whose book began at 2^6. The basis of this introduction is the old document quoted occasionally in Jos 13-21, giving details of the districts occupied by the various tribes, and recording the failure of most of them to dispossess the natives. 'The purpose of P's introduction is to explain the unsettled condition of affairs as related in the narrative of Judges, by the addition of details known to him which had not been incorporated by the main editor in his introduction, 2^6-3^6' (Burney, *Judges*, 2). The compiler has altered this document in places, suitably to his standpoint, but the editorial amendments are easily discernible, e.g. the opening statement, 'And it came to pass after the death of Joshua,' has been added because of the insertion of this narrative at the close of the preceding book of Joshua, though the old record clearly refers to events that took place before the death of Joshua. Moreover, the statements in the parallel passages in Jos, e.g. 15^{63} and 17^{12}, that the Israelites *could* not drive out the original inhabitants, have been altered here (1^{21} and ^{27}) to '*did* **not drive out**' in view of the compiler's judgement that Israel wilfully disobeyed the law enjoining the extermination of the Canaanites (cf. 2^{1-5}).

This is a difficult section of the book, presenting complicated problems which demand a fuller discussion than is possible here. An adequate treatment of the questions raised occupies 51 pages in Burney's Commentary and 61 in Moore's. We can only attempt to give here the main conclusions reached in these two standard works.

The old document related only two conquests in Canaan, viz. that of the south country by Judah with the aid of Simeon ($^{2-21}$), part of which has been already recorded in Jos 15^{13-19}, and that of the central hill country by the Joseph tribes under Joshua ($^{22-29}$). Other tribes, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, Dan, are pictured as already there, but only with difficulty able to maintain their positions ($^{30-36}$).

I. 2-21. Judah's Conquest of the South.

2-7 record the taking of Bezek and the capture and mutilation of its king, **Adonibezek.** These verses present considerable difficulty. The only other mention of **Bezek** is in $1\,S\,11^8$, which cannot be the place intended here, as it is much too far north. Burney and Moore both give good reasons for the suggestion that we should read 'Adoni-zedek' and identify this king with the Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem who is mentioned in Jos 10 as leading a confederacy of the southern Canaanite states against Gibeon, and as being defeated by Joshua; 'in which case we would seem to have an account of his fate different from that given by E in Joshua 10' (Burney). This suggestion is supported by the statement of ^{7} that 'they,' i.e. the mutilated monarch's followers, **brought him to Jerusalem, and he died there.**

8 is an editorial insertion at variance both with ^{21} and with Jos 15^{63}. Jerusalem was not conquered till David's reign.

9-15 record the taking of Hebron and Debir, as in Jos 15^{13-19}, but there Caleb is said to have taken Hebron, whereas here Judah takes it and then hands it over to Caleb (^{20}). Possibly this is the original account.

16-21 describe a further advance by Judah, accompanied by the related clan of Kenites, across from Jericho, **the city of palm trees,** westward. The site of **Zephath,** renamed **Hormah,** is unknown.

18 is contradicted by 3^3 and Jos 13^3, which show that the Philistine cities were not subdued, and the very next verse here (^{19}) records Judah's failure to 'drive out the inhabitants of the *valley*,' the Hebrew word used, *emeq*, denoting the maritime plain occupied by the Philistines in which these cities were situated. We should therefore follow LXX, which reads 'Judah did *not* take Gaza,' etc. The five Philistine cities from the south northwards were Gaza, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Ekron, and Gath. For the **sons of Anak** (^{20}) Jos 11^{21} *v.n.* In ^{21} the old document had 'Judah' (cf. Jos 15^{63}). The editorial alteration to Benjamin here is due to the fact that in the compiler's time Jerusalem was included in Benjamin's territory (see Jos 18^{28}).

22-29. The Settlement of the Joseph Tribes.—The compiler seems here to have abbreviated his source, which probably contained a record of the actual conquests of Joshua, viz. the subjugation of the

central hill country (Jos 8 *v.n.*); in contrast to the idealized narrative of Jos 1-12, though here, of course, the name of Joshua is omitted because the narrative has been inserted at a point in the general history subsequent to his death. The Joseph tribes, Ephraim and Manasseh, were the only Hebrew elements which Joshua led into Canaan. The attack was made from Gilgal, on the Jordan, and Ephraim and Manasseh managed to gain a footing in the central hill country, and [22-25] describe their capture of Bethel, a description omitted from the book of Joshua, which relates only the reduction of Jericho and Ai in this district. But the Joseph tribes were hemmed in by Canaanite fortresses north and south, and [27-29] record their failure to reduce these fortresses. Manasseh was unable to dislodge the Canaanites from a line of fortified cities lying on the north of the central hill country and guarding the southern border of the plain of Esdraelon. These are enumerated in [27]. The expression **Beth-shean and her towns**, etc., literally 'her daughters,' might be better rendered 'and her suburbs,' and so throughout the verse. The term denotes hamlets or villages living under the protection of the mother fortress city. These fortresses thus formed a belt across the land, preventing the Joseph tribes from extending into the plain of Esdraelon, and cutting them off from the Israelite settlements in the north. Similarly Ephraim could not take the important fortress of Gezer on the south of their settlement, and Gezer remained independent till the reign of Solomon (1 K 9[16]). At this point the old document probably continued with the passage quoted from it in Jos 17[14-18], recording the complaint of the Joseph tribes that their territory was too narrow, and Joshua's recommendation to them to go over to the east of Jordan, a recommendation followed by the migration of a Manassite clan to Gilead as described in Nu 32[39] (Jos 17[14-18] *v.n.*).

30-36 record the somewhat precarious settlement of four other tribes, Zebulun and Asher in the north, and Naphtali and Dan temporarily in the south-west corner of the central hill country. These two tribes were closely connected, their origin being ascribed to the handmaid Bilhah (Gen 30[5-8], 35[25]). Of the towns mentioned in [33, 34], which they were unable to gain, those which have been identified, viz. **Beth-shemesh** and **Aijalon**, are in the south of the central hill country. In Jos 19[32-48] the later northern territory of these tribes is indicated together with the cities in which they formerly tried to settle. After the entry of the powerful Joseph tribes, **Naphtali** and **Dan** were so uncomfortably crowded by the pressure of **Ephraim** on one side and the Philistines on the other that they found it expedient to seek a home elsewhere, and eventually settled in the far north. The migration of Dan is described in 18, and doubtless Naphtali soon followed them.

The reader should now consult a map to get an idea of the position of the Hebrew tribes at the beginning of this period. They tend to divide into four main groups. Judah, Simeon, and Levi in the south, cut off by a line of fortresses from the central hill country where Ephraim and Manasseh were gaining a settlement. The plain of Esdraelon, at present inaccessible to the Hebrews, cut off these two groups from the tribes settled in the north, Asher and Zebulun, and afterwards Naphtali and Dan. On the east of Jordan in Gilead, were Reuben, Gad, and part of Manasseh. The small tribe of Benjamin seems to have been settled on the north border of Judah, and Issachar on the north of Esdraelon, south of Zebulun and Asher.

II. 1-5. The priestly compiler concludes his introduction by stating his theory, as enunciated by a divine messenger, that the troubles caused to Israel by the native Canaanites were a punishment for disobedience to the law and the consequent corruption of their religion through their illegal intercourse with the Canaanites. The kernel of the old record is to be found in [1a] and [5b], describing the removal of the centre of activity of the Joseph tribes from Gilgal to Bethel (Bochim), which P has amplified for didactic purposes into a movement of the whole of Israel.

1. the angel of the Lord denotes God in manifestation, and is perhaps a figure employed to represent by an objective and concrete image the subjective idea of a divine message conveyed to man's religious consciousness, revealing the Will of God (cf. 6[11-23] and 13, and see on Jos 5[13-15]). **Bochim** should be read 'Bethel' with LXX.

4, 5. The derivation given for the name Bochim = weepers, is clearly artificial, based on the editorial insertion [1b-5a]. The name is probably due to the sacred tree at Bethel, called 'Allon-bacuth' = oak of weeping (see Gen 35[8]).

6-III. 6 form the Deuteronomic editor's introduction, giving his theory of the history of the period. 2[6-10], repeated from Jos 24[28-31], are designed to connect this narrative with the preceding book of

Joshua In 2 [11-19] the editor gives a brief summary of the history he is about to write, and reveals the religious standpoint which he intends to illustrate by the stories he has collected. His purpose is to interpret the history, and to explain upon religious principles why Israel suffered such severe oppressions from surrounding nations in the time of the Judges, and so to impress upon his readers the sound prophetic lesson that unfaithfulness to God is always punished, that whenever His people fall away from Him He leaves them defenceless before their foes. The writer thus uses the stories of the Judges to warn his contemporaries against apostasy.

II. 11-13 state the form of religion which held such fatal attractions for the Israelites in Canaan. Canaanite religion was closely connected with the soil and its fertility, and the productive forces of nature were worshipped as deities under the titles of **Baalim** and **Ashtaroth** ([13]). Baal is a title meaning 'lord' or 'owner,' the god of the locality. With Baal was associated the goddess Ashtart (plural, Ashtaroth). 'There can be no doubt that a principal (if not *the* principal) conception embodied in the Canaanite Ashtart was that of the mother-goddess, to whom was due the fecundity of nature' (Burney, *Judges*, 58). These deities were worshipped at the many local sanctuaries, known as 'the high places.' Beside the altar stood a stone pillar, *maṣṣēbah*, representing the male deity, and a wooden pole, *ashērah*, as an emblem of the goddess. The revolting nature of the high-place worship, centring round the sexual intercourse of the worshippers with men and women consecrated for the purpose, amply justified the severity of prophetic condemnation (see especially Hos 2). The law against the high places is stated in Dt 12 [2-4].

Having expressed his own view, that the native Canaanites had been allowed to remain in order to punish Israel for apostasy, the editor gives in 2 [20]-3 [6] the theories of E (2 [20-23] and 3 [4]) and of J (3 [1-3]). E suggests that they were left to 'prove Israel, whether they will keep the way of the Lord to walk therein'; while the reason given by J is that succeeding generations of Israel may have experience of war.

III. 7-11. **Othniel Judge in Judah.**—This narrative of the first oppression and deliverance consists of little more than the editorial framework, which it usefully illustrates, with the bare mention of oppressor and deliverer, the 'Judge.' It was clearly only a local affair in Judah; but the reference to **Cushan-rishathaim**, king of Mesopotamia, is obscure. Nothing is known of such a monarch, and his designation is obviously a nickname = 'Cushan of double-dyed villany.' The name 'Kashsha-rishat,' of a woman, actually occurs in Kassite records, and the Kassite dynasty was ruling Babylon during the Judges period. The alteration of the Kassite 'rishat' into Hebrew 'rishathaim' =double villany, would be a tempting pun, the dual form being suggested by the Hebrew for Mesopotamia, 'Aram-naharaim.' Probably the record preserves an indistinct recollection of a Kassite raid, on the lines of that related in Gen 14, through Edom, which penetrated into Judah and was repulsed by Othniel, a noted warrior (cf. 1 [13]), and leader of the Kenizzite clan of Judah. The **forty years** of [11] is a conventional number to indicate roughly a generation.

12-20. **Ehud Judge in Benjamin.**—This story of the Moabite oppression of Benjamin and the deliverance wrought by Ehud is clearly told in graphic language. The territory of Benjamin (see map) lay handy for Moabite raids, and the small tribe would very easily be put to tribute by its more powerful neighbours. Apparently Ehud obtained some help from Ephraim ([27]), and Benjamin, thus reinforced, was able to rebel successfully. Here, as elsewhere, 'Israel' is an anachronism, both oppression and deliverance being tribal and local. **Ammon** ([13]) was the adjoining nation to Moab on the east of Jordan. That these two races were regarded as akin in some degree to Israel is shown by the account of their origin given in Gen 19 [30-38]. Amalek was a marauding Bedouin tribe living on the S.E. of Judah (cf. Nu 13 [29], 14 [25, 43, 45], and 1 S 15). **the city of palm trees**, as in 1 [16], is Jericho.

15. **a man left-handed.** Although Benjamin means 'son of the right hand,' left-handedness, or possibly ambidexterity, appears to have been a characteristic of the tribe (cf. 20 [16] and 1 Ch 12 [2]).

19, 26. **quarries** should be 'graven images.' Gilgal was an ancient sanctuary. The RV has the correct translation in the margin.

31. The judgeship of **Shamgar** probably did not form part of the book as it left the Deuteronomic editor's hands. 4 [1] follows naturally on 3 [20]. There is no reason, however, to doubt the existence of Shamgar and his success against the Philistines, which is confirmed by 5 [6]. His designation, **son of Anath**, throws an

interesting side-light on the religion of the period, for Anath was a pagan goddess, consort of the Babylonian Anu, the god of heaven. Her worship in Palestine is attested by the name of the city, Beth-Anath (1 [33]) and Anathoth, the home of Jeremiah. The cult of this goddess, known as 'the queen of heaven' among the Israelites, was strongly denounced by Jeremiah (7 [18] and 44 [15] ff.).

IV.-V. **Deborah and Barak: The Conquest of the Central Plain.**—These chapters describe the successful attempt by a confederacy of central and northern tribes to gain possession of the strategically important plain of Esdraelon. As long as this strongly fortified plain remained in the possession of the Canaanites it blocked the progress of the Hebrew tribes towards cohesion and nationality. Its capture was a necessity if the tribes were to combine so as eventually to become masters of the whole land. The conquest here described seems to belong to a period in the history of the Judges later than its position in the book would indicate. The Israelites were not at first able to attempt any combination on a large scale, while here ten tribes were invited to participate in the campaign, and six did so. Further, we note from [17] that Dan was settled in its northern home at the time.

There are two distinct accounts of the conquest: 4 in prose, belonging to the old source used elsewhere by the editor; and 5 in verse, the Song of Deborah, a poem contemporary with the events described, and consequently a very valuable historical document. These two accounts contain marked differences in detail, e.g. in 4 it is Jabin king of Hazor who is the oppressor, and Sisera is the leader of his army. Barak belongs to the tribe of Naphtali, and the only tribes mentioned as taking part in the conflict are Naphtali and Zebulun. In 5 there is no mention of Jabin, and Sisera is regarded as an independent ruler. The campaign is a united effort to which all the tribes except Judah and Simeon are invited and in which six take part. Barak appears to belong to the tribe of Issachar ([15]). Moreover, 4 itself contains clear inconsistencies. Jabin is king of Hazor, a city in the north beside lake Huleh, while Sisera, his general, lives at Harosheth in the S.W. corner of the central plain, 34 miles away; and as Palestine was made up of small city states, the king of Hazor would not be ruling over territory extending thus far. Deborah's seat, between Ramah and Bethel, was about 90 miles from Kedesh in Naphtali; and the two armies could not have acted together at that distance. The scene of the battle is Kedesh in [9]. Barak assembles his army on Mount Tabor in the N.W. of the central plain, about 60 miles from Kedesh ([12]), and then [13-15] depict the battle as fought in the Kishon valley. Sisera, if he were Jabin's general, might naturally be expected to seek refuge in the fortress at Hazor instead of fleeing past it to Heber's tent. These internal discrepancies in 4 are, however, easily explainable, for it is clear that traditions of two separate campaigns have been telescoped and treated as one. The Jabin episode has really no connexion with Barak and Deborah. A tradition of the overthrow of Jabin king of Hazor in the north is preserved also in Jos 11, where, after the manner of the editor of that book, a complete triumph is ascribed to all Israel under Joshua. The tradition is probably an echo of a local exploit of the two tribes, Naphtali and Zebulun in the north against the king of Hazor, due to Naphtali's migration north from the central hill country after the entry of the Joseph tribes (see note on 1 [30-36]). Naphtali, with the aid of Zebulun, thus gained a settlement at the expense of Jabin. This initial success of two northern tribes may well have given rise to the idea of a combination between the tribes N. and S. of Esdraelon to gain possession of this important plain. If, therefore, we leave on one side the passages in 4 which refer only to the defeat of Jabin, there is no longer any real divergence between the prose and verse accounts of the campaign against Sisera, and we may reconstruct the train of events as follows: First Zebulun and Naphtali had united in the north to overcome Jabin king of Hazor. Their success seemed to warrant an attempt at a more ambitious conquest, viz. an amalgamation of the central and northern tribes to gain possession of the plain of Esdraelon. Such an attempt probably originated with the tribe of Issachar, which from its position was directly harassed by the Canaanites of the plain. The tribal leader of Issachar, Barak, in league with Deborah of Ephraim, made plans with the northern tribes for a concerted attack on Sisera and his army. The plan of campaign devised by the leaders of the two tribal groups arranged that Barak should concentrate his forces in the wooded district of Mount Tabor, where they could easily be hidden; while Deborah, by advancing on the south of the plain, would lure Sisera from his base at Harosheth across the Kishon to

Megiddo. A time was chosen when the Kishon was in flood; and while Sisera was engaged with Deborah's army, Barak made a flank attack and prevented him from recrossing the Kishon, thus cutting off his retreat on his base. The two Israelite armies by converging on Sisera drove him up the Kishon valley and hemmed his army in, forcing it into the narrow gorge of the Kishon, where it was destroyed; the Canaanite rout being increased by a storm which caused the Kishon to rise rapidly. (N.B.—The reader will find that reference to a good map will help him considerably to gain a clear conception of this campaign.)

IV. **1-3.** The oppression here described is properly that of the tribe of Issachar by Sisera, who ruled in the plain of Esdraelon. Jabin of Hazor belongs to a different tradition as explained above.

3. nine hundred chariots of iron (cf. 1 [19]). The Israelites could at first only make headway in the hilly districts. Their lack of chariots put them on very unequal terms with the Canaanites of the central, or the Philistines of the maritime, plain. This was a defect in Israel's military equipment which was not remedied till the reign of Solomon (1 K 10 [26]).

5. dwelt should be 'sat,' as RVm. The Hebrew verb denotes a formal assize. Deborah sat beneath a sacred tree and was consulted as an oracle. Her position thus gave her considerable influence among the Joseph tribes.

6, 9-11 are confused with the Jabin record, hence the introduction of Kedesh in Naphtali.

6. It is significant that Deborah's invitation to Barak, **Hath not the Lord, the God of Israel, commanded,** is based, like the song in 5, upon the higher religious conception of the wilderness. It is not the Baal of Canaan, but the God of Sinai, whom Deborah, a member of the Exodus tribes, regards as the Leader of Israel's armies. This shows the influence of the teaching of Moses as opposed to the lower religious idea of the local Baalim held by the Palestinian tribes.

11. Heber the Kenite. The vocalization of the English Bible obscures the connexion between Kenite and Cain, both from the same Hebrew root. *Qayin*, =a lance or spear, probably denotes that members of this tribe were workers in metal, smiths (cf. the tradition of Tubal-cain in Gen 4 [22]); hence the family of Heber had probably migrated to the north in pursuit of their craft; and this would explain also Jael's readiness with a hammer.

17-22 describe in graphic language the end of Sisera. The poem, 5 [25-27], gives a slightly different account of the manner of his death, picturing Jael as smiting him down in the act of drinking.

23, 24 are the conclusion of the editor, who regards Jabin as the principal enemy.

V. **The Song of Deborah.**—*' The historical value of the Song of Deborah can hardly be exaggerated. It is the oldest extant monument of Hebrew literature, and the only contemporaneous monument of Hebrew history before the foundation of the kingdom ' (Moore, *Judges*, 132). The Song depicts the condition to which the central tribes had been reduced by Canaanite oppression ([6-8]), and regards this condition as the result of apostasy, **they chose new gods, then was war in the gates** ([8]). The writer has a clear vision of the potential nationality of the tribes by combination into 'Israel,' and the Song is inspired throughout by intense religious patriotism, a belief that Jehovah, the God of battles, had come from Sinai to lead His people to victory ([4, 5, 7]). This is the standard by which the tribes are condemned who failed to answer the call to arms, **because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty**; and this is the standard by which Jael is accounted blessed for her murder of Sisera, in which the writer sees only a glorious act of patriotism in contrast to the cowardly neutrality of **Meroz**, [23, 24], and regards Jael as the instrument of Divine vengeance upon her people's foe.

3-5. The conception of God expressed here, as throughout the poem, is that of the Exodus tribes, of Jehovah of Sinai, the Warrior-God of battles, a conception which, however imperfect, was vastly higher than the idea of God held by the Palestinian tribes, which reduced Jehovah to the level of the gods of the soil, the agricultural Baalim of the Canaanites. Here the God of Israel is thought of, not as the Baal or lord of Israel's territory in Canaan, but as coming from Mount Sinai through Edom to lead His people to victory. It is the nomad idea of God in contrast to that of the agriculturist. For the thought of [4], quoted in Ps 68 [7], cf. Dt 33 [2]; Is 63 [1-3]; Hab 3 [3].

14-23. The tribes who took part in the conflict were those whose interests were most directly affected (see map), Ephraim, Benjamin, Manasseh, Zebulun, Naphtali, and Issachar. The tribes in

* For a suggestion that 5 is the source of 4, and that the Song is not by Deborah, see p. 420*a*. —A. G.

Gilead, Reuben and Gad, seem to have been noted for lack of patriotism, for which they were severely punished by Gideon (8 1-21); while Asher and Dan were apparently too far north to feel any immediate concern in this effort. The taunting denunciation of the slackers expressed in 15b, 16, and the curse on Meroz, 23, show that a sense of patriotism, and of the essential unity of the tribes, was now beginning to make itself felt.

23, 24 form an effective antithesis in which the courageous patriotism of Jael is contrasted with the cowardly neutrality of Meroz.

25. Both rhythm and sense are excellently rendered by Moffatt: 'Water he asked, and milk she gave him, brought him curds in a lordly bowl.'

The text of the song has suffered in the course of transmission, and some passages are obscure, e.g. in 14a the present Hebrew text is 'from Ephraim their root in Amalek.' RV, by supplying a verb, 'came down,' has produced a grammatical, though meaningless sentence. Burney emends to 'From Ephraim they spread out on the vale.' The translations of this chapter, embodying various textual emendations, in Burney's Commentary and Moffatt's Old Testament are both excellent.

VI., VII., VIII. **Gideon Judge among the Central Tribes.**—Two traditions have been preserved and combined in these chapters, but the slight discrepancies caused by the combination are obvious and merely superficial, and in no way impair the essential historicity of the narrative. For example, in 7 24-8 3 the Midianite leaders, named Oreb and Zeeb, are taken and killed by the Ephraimites at the fords of Jordan. At 8 4 another account is continued in which the kings of Midian, called Zebah and Zalmunna, are captured and executed by Gideon himself beyond Jordan in revenge for the death of his brothers. Other unimportant divergencies in detail due to variant traditions will be easily recognizable and do not call for special comment.

This movement against Midian in which Asher, Zebulun, and Naphtali combined with the central tribes seems to have grown out of Gideon's execution of what was to him the sacred duty of avenging the death of his brothers (8 18-21). This inspired him with the greater task of avenging the wrongs his people had suffered from the Midianites; and, to a man of his religious convictions, (6 11-24), the first step was to bring his own clan back from their apostasy to Jehovah, and to purge their worship from its Canaanite accretions (6 25-32). Of the two records which have been interwoven in these chapters, one seems to have been concerned principally with Gideon's prosecution of his personal blood-feud, the other with his leadership of the tribal campaign.

VI. 1-6 describes the oppression by Midian and the condition to which the central tribes were reduced. The Midianites were a Bedouin people remotely related to Israel (Gen 25 1-6).

4. The reference to **Gaza** is somewhat surprising since the rest of the narrative speaks only of central Palestine, and does not imply that the Midianite oppression extended so far south. Possibly these introductory verses contain a recollection of an independent raid in the south at about the same time by **the Amalekites and the children of the east** (3).

7-10 are not in the style of the Deuteronomic editor, but reflect the language of E. They seem to be part of the introduction to one of the two records which have been combined in this narrative. This extract is cut short abruptly at 10, and 11 is obviously the continuation from 6.

8. **a prophet.** The Hebrew is literally 'a man, a prophet,' just as Deborah is designated 'a woman, a prophetess' (4 4). It is quite likely that the record from which these verses are taken went on to describe the prophet's choice of Gideon just as, at a later date, Samuel chose Saul to deliver Israel from foreign oppression (1 S 9 15 ff.).

11-24 narrate the Divine commission given by **the angel of the Lord** to Gideon to free his people from the yoke of Midian. For the conception of 'the angel of the Lord' 2 1 *v.n.* Here it seems clear that the angel is God Himself in manifestation (see 14), **the Lord looked upon him and said**; but that Gideon actually saw and spoke with the objective Presence of the Almighty can perhaps hardly be maintained (cf. Jn 1 18). Nevertheless, when used of God's dealings with man, 'seeing' and 'hearing' are terms whose meaning must not be unduly pressed. In the case of mystical experience they frequently express a kind of 'vision' and 'audition' which is not that of the eye and the ear. This narrative is closely parallel both in thought and expression to 13, which describes a very similar visitation to the parents of Samson. That Gideon received a Divine message may be regarded as certain, but the writer personifies the message as a *messenger*, i.e. an angel, and so Gideon's

subjective, spiritual experience, in which he hears the voice of God and recognizes that he has been chosen to execute the Will of the Almighty, is translated into the objective and concrete, and described as direct speech first with the angel of the Lord (11-13), and then with Jehovah Himself. The reality of Gideon's conviction that he has indeed been in direct communion with God fills him with awe and fear, and again the Divine message is personified, in 22, 'Alas, O Lord God! forasmuch as I have seen the angel of the Lord face to face,' words which recall St. Peter's expression of awe when he realized the Presence of God Incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth (Lk 5 8).

11. **oak** should be 'turpentine tree,' a sacred tree in the local sanctuary at Ophrah, the home of the Abiezer clan of the tribe of Manasseh (cf. 19).

19-21, which recall Gen 18 6-8, illustrate the primitive idea of sacrifice as a meal which the Deity shares with His worshippers. In early Israel it was thought that God came down to partake of the sacrifice and departed in the flame which consumed the offering. References to the manifestation of God in fire are numerous, e.g. Ex 3 2 ff. Cf. 13 20, where, as here, we see the beginning of the idea of safeguarding the Divine transcendence by the introduction of an angel as intermediary.

20. Many of the ancient rock altars excavated in Palestine contain cup-like depressions which probably served to hold the broth of an offering of this nature.

22. Cf. 13 21, 22. For the idea that man may not see God and live, cf. Ex 24 9-11, 33 18-23. But Ex 33 11 states that God used to speak (frequentative) to Moses 'face to face' as here to Gideon.

25-32 come from the other record, and describe Gideon's destruction of the adjuncts of the nature cults at the shrine of his clan. This record is instructive, as it illustrates the difficulty encountered in opposing the popular and corrupt nature worship of Canaan. It should be noted that Gideon was a member of the Joseph tribes, and this record shows us an attempt to restore the true ideal of religion as taught by Moses to these tribes in the wilderness.

25. The text of the first half of the verse, referring to the bullock, has been mutilated, and the Hebrew as it stands is unintelligible. Burney emends to 'take ten men of thy servants, and a bull,' etc. The command to 'throw down the altar of Baal, and cut down the Asherah' is in accordance with the law in Dt 12 3, 16 21, 22. The Asherah was a wooden post, emblem of the goddess of fecundity, Ashtart, probably known also as Asherah in Canaan, goddess of good fortune (see Burney, 195-198). Nothing is said here of the pillar, *maṣṣēbah*, and it would seem that this symbol of the male deity was not regarded as an offence till the promulgation of Deuteronomy (cf. Hos 3 4); but the Asherah is always and everywhere condemned. No Hebrew religious teacher would ever tolerate a feminine element in Israel's worship.

32. **Jerubbaal.** 'It is probable that, while the meaning of the name may really be "let Baal contend," or "Baal contends," Baal is here, as often elsewhere a title of Jehovah; and the original purpose of the name was to place the bearer of it under the guardianship of the Deity: "let Baal contend," *sc.* for the bearer of the name, i.e. be his advocate' (Burney, 201). The alteration of Jerubbaal to Jerubbesheth, 2 S 11 21, seems to support this interpretation. There can be no doubt that 'Baal' was in early days used as a title of Israel's God, but the use of the title was forbidden later by the prophets, and the name Baal was changed to 'bosheth' = shameful thing, hence Jerubbesheth, Ishbosheth, etc. Probably Hosea was the prophet who first made the alteration (cf. Hos 2 16, 17, 9 10); and in Rom 11 4 we notice that Baal has the feminine article, implying that St. Paul himself substituted *aischune* in thought.

33-VIII. 21. **Gideon's Campaign against Midian.** — The Midianites had penetrated into the central plain, now in the possession of the Hebrews, where Gideon's brothers had been slain on Mt. Tabor (8 18), and the Midianite forces were assembled in the valley of Jezreel (6 33; see map). Having penetrated thus far, they were a direct menace to the northern tribes, and this accounts for the alliance of Asher, Zebulun, and Naphtali with Gideon.

VI. 34. **the spirit of the Lord came upon** (lit. clothed itself in) **Gideon.** 'The meaning seems to be that the Divine Spirit took complete possession of Gideon, so that he became, as it were, its incarnation, and was thus employed as its instrument' (Burney, 203).

36-40. Gideon's request for a sign indicates his religious character and his dependence upon God. The first sign would imply nothing extraordinary, since wool would hold the dew long after it had evaporated from the stone floor, hence his request for the reverse phenomenon which convinced him of Divine direction.

VII.-VIII. 3, recording Gideon's reduction of his army to 300 men, and the successful stratagem by which he surprised and routed the Midianites, is perfectly straightforward and calls for no comment. The method by which he finally selected his small force (4-8) was soundly practical. Experienced warriors would know better than to dip their faces into the leech-infested pools of Palestine.

VIII. 1-3. Overbearing arrogance seems to have been a characteristic of the tribe of Ephraim, and probably accounts for the fact that Gideon had not previously asked for their help. They adopted the same attitude toward Jephthah (12 1-6), but on that occasion their arrogant complainings met with a less courteous reply.

4-21. According to the tradition recorded in the preceding section the campaign ended with the slaughter of the Midianite princes, **Oreb and Zeeb,** at the fords of Jordan.

4 resumes the other tradition, which records the flight of **Zebah and Zalmunna, the kings of Midian,** across Jordan and Gideon's pursuit and ultimate capture of them in Gilead after the men of Succoth and Penuel had scornfully refused to help him (15, 16 *v.n.*). Gideon's method of 'teaching' the men of Succoth (16) illustrates the somewhat barbarous ethic of the age. There is no need to emend to 'threshed' as some commentators suggest.

18-21 describe the end of Gideon's personal vendetta against the Midianite chieftains.

22-32. **Gideon's Judgeship.**—This passage gives us the fullest account in the book of the status of the Judge, and shows how it was paving the way for the institution of the monarchy. Hereditary rule over the central tribes was in fact offered to Gideon, and though he declined the honour, yet he seems to have maintained during the rest of his life a position of dignity marked, according to Oriental ideas, by a numerous harem and family. The successful leader who had freed his tribe from foreign oppression would naturally, after the campaign, be the man to whom his people would look for continued leadership in resettlement. In his own tribe his word would be law, and he would constantly be called upon to give judgement in disputes as the one person to whom all parties would listen with respect, hence the title of Judge. We see this developed more fully under Samuel, who had a regular circuit of assize. Then, when Israel became a nation of united tribes the judgeship passed naturally into the monarchy. Samuel was the last Judge because he was the first to govern a united Israel. When the Hebrews began to be conscious of their nationality they felt the need of a king (1 S 8 5).

24-27 show that in sincerity of religious conviction Gideon was in advance of his age. He claims nothing for himself, but devotes the spoil of Midian and the offerings of his people to the greater glory of God.

27. The nature and form of an **Ephod** seem to have varied at different times. As worn by Samuel and David (1 S 2 18 *v.n.*; 2 S 6 14), it was clearly a religious vestment. In P also it is a priestly garment (Ex 28). Here it appears to be an image of some kind which the writer deprecates as inconsistent with true religion.

31. The designation **concubine,** as Burney points out, does less than justice to the status of the native wife whom Gideon had married. According to an early Arab custom in a marriage of this kind the wife continued to live with her own people, where her husband would visit her occasionally, as Samson did his Philistine bride (14). The children of such a union were brought up among the mother's family, and the bearing of this circumstance on Abimelech's future career in Shechem will be readily recognized. It is clear from this marriage that Hebrews and Canaanites were now living peacefully together in the central hill country. Shechem, previously taken treacherously by Simeon and Levi (Gen 34), has now passed again into the possession of the native Canaanites.

33. **Baal-berith** means 'Baal of the covenant,' possibly in reference to the deity worshipped in common at Shechem by Hebrews and Canaanites after the death of Gideon.

IX. **Abimelech King in Shechem.**—This narrative is important because it gives us a picture of the social and religious conditions prevailing among a portion of the central tribes in the Judges period. Before Gideon's defeat of Midian both Hebrews and Canaanites had suffered alike, and both races gratefully acknowledged the subsequent rule of Gideon, an alliance being cemented by Gideon's marriage to a Shechemite woman, the mother of Abimelech; and in the city-state of Shechem, after Gideon's death, Hebrews and Canaanites lived side by side and worshipped a common deity, Baal, or El-Berith, the god of the covenant (see on 8 33). Abimelech's seizure of the throne was thus facilitated by his parentage, and his rise to power

was disgraced by the typically Oriental expedient of murdering all possible rivals (5). His reign was, however, a short one. A Shechemite notable, Gaal, by an appeal to racial pride, incited the natives to rebel against their half-caste ruler (26-28), and a brief civil war was terminated by Abimelech's death at the hands of a woman (53). The writer uses the story of Abimelech to inculcate the moral lesson that evil-doing will certainly be requited by Divine chastisement (23, 24, 56). There is no question as yet of an Israelite monarchy. Abimelech was king only of the small city-state of Shechem.

6. The coronation of Abimelech was a religious ceremony. Both turpentine tree and pillar imply that it took place in the sanctuary.

18. Jotham's disparagement of Abimelech's mother is a typically Oriental form of abuse.

23. For the idea that God used spiritual agencies to inflict punishment on those who had incurred His displeasure, cf. 1 S 16 14, 18 10, and 1 K 22 19 ff.

27. The vintage festival, a feature of the Canaanite nature cults, is described more fully in 21 19-23.

28. Gaal cleverly contrasts the long lineage of Shechemites of pure breed with the mixed birth of the upstart Abimelech. **Hamor, the father of Shechem,** dates back to patriarchal times (Gen 34).

37. **the oak of Meonenim,** properly 'the soothsayers' turpentine tree,' a well-known sacred tree and landmark.

45. **and sowed it with salt.** 'A symbolic action, apparently intended to indicate that nothing thereafter was to live and flourish there' (Burney, *ad loc.*).

X. 1-5. Brief notices of two Judges, Tola in Issachar and Jair in Gilead.

6-XII. 7. **Jephthah Judge in Gilead.**—This record is concerned principally with the oppression of the tribes east of Jordan in Gilead by their neighbours the Ammonites (see map). The Ammonites had also crossed the Jordan and made raids both on the central tribes and on Judah. The narrative shows us a further stage in the movement towards a monarchy (10 18-11 11), and illustrates the religious ideas and practices of the Hebrews at this period.

X. 6-16. Here the editor's characteristic formula that the distresses suffered by Israel are the Divine punishment for apostasy (6-8) is supported by the original source which contains the people's confession and Jehovah's condemnation of their idolatrous worship, indicating the development of a religious consciousness of sin in serving other gods (10-16). In 7 the Philistines are mentioned along with the Ammonites, but a fuller account of the Philistine oppressions is reserved for the story of Samson.

12-XI. 11. **The Election of Jephthah as Judge.**—This section shows how the stress of foreign invasion awakened the desire for a leader as head over the tribes east of Jordan. When all the tribes of Israel had combined, this desire naturally produced the monarchy as described in 1 S 8 5. Jephthah had proved his fitness for military command in very much the same way that David did in a later generation, as head of a band of outlaws (2; cf. 1 S 22 2).

XI. 12-28. Jephthah's speech defending the Hebrew claim to possess Gilead by right of conquest at the time of the Exodus presents some difficulty, since his arguments are addressed throughout not to Ammon but to Moab. He points out that the Hebrews had 'compassed the land of Edom and the land of Moab,' and left them unmolested. Then, passing on to the north of the Arnon, the boundary of Moab, they had overthrown the armed forces of Sihon and annexed his land, to which Jephthah claims they had now a perfect right, having acquired it fairly by conquest. Chemosh (24) is the name of the god of Moab (cf. 1 K 11 33, 2 K 3 27); the god of Ammon being known as Milcom (1 K 11 33, 2 K 23 13). The simplest explanation of this discrepancy seems to be, as Burney suggests, that this section 'is part of a variant tradition, according to which Jephthah appeared as a deliverer of the Israelites in Gilead from the aggressions not of the Ammonites, but of the Moabites.'

21-24 illustrate the religious ideas of the period. Jephthah asserts that it was the God of Israel who led His people to victory over the Amorites, and that consequently they hold the land by Divine right, just as the Moabites have been given their land by their god, Chemosh.

24 shows that the Hebrews were not yet monotheists. Jehovah, as the God of Israel, had sole claim on His people's allegiance and worship, and to forsake Him and serve other gods was a sin; but Israel was still far from the knowledge that there is no other god. To the Israelites of Jephthah's day the existence of Chemosh, the national god of Moab, was as real as that of Jehovah the God of Israel. Not till Amos was the truth of monotheism fully revealed and unmistakably taught

29. the spirit of the Lord: cf. 3 [10], 6 [34], 13 [25] for this expression of belief that the leaders were strengthened and supported by Divine power, and see note on Jos 5 [13-15].

30-40. Jephthah's Vow.—The remarkable thing about this vow and its performance is that it is recorded without any expression of disapproval. The Hebrew of [31], of which the RV unfortunately gives a misleading rendering, makes it clear that Jephthah *intended* a human sacrifice, and the writer does not appear to regard such a sacrifice as contrary to the spirit of Israel's religion. We may compare the king of Moab's offering of his son to Chemosh (2 K 3 [27]), where the writer evidently believes in the efficacy of the sacrifice. It was believed generally among the peoples of Palestine, as indeed throughout the ancient world, that on special occasions it was right to offer to the deity one's most precious possession—a child; and it would seem that in their earlier stages of religious development the Hebrews shared this belief. Human sacrifice was, however, condemned with no uncertain voice by the prophets; and the most probable explanation of the E narrative of Abraham's projected sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22) is that it forms a prophetic midrash of the 8th century B.C. to teach that God does not require such an offering. In this connexion the words of Micah, an 8th century prophet, are instructive (see Mic 6 [7, 8], where he answers the question as to human sacrifice: 'Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?' by showing what Jehovah, the one only God, requires of man—'to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God'). For a full discussion of the whole question of human sacrifice among the Hebrews see Burney's Commentary, 329-331.

XII. **1-6.** The arrogant jealousy of Ephraim, already seen in their attitude towards Gideon (8 [1-3]), here meets its match in Jephthah, and receives sharp and severe punishment.

6. Most commentators quote the parallel incident of the Sicilian Vespers in 1282, when the French were self-betrayed by a similar linguistic test, viz. the pronunciation of *ceci e ciceri*, where in Italian the *c* is hard.

8-15 contain brief notices of three more Judges, in which we note again the growing dignity of the status of Judge ([9, 14]).

XIII.-XVI. **The Philistine Oppression and the Samson Stories.**—The career of Samson differs from that of the other Judges inasmuch as his exploits against the Philistines are purely personal. He leads no tribe to victory and gains no freedom for his people, nor does his character compare favourably with that of the great leaders who wrought deliverance in their day. Though he may have been the hero of popular stories for his fights with the Philistines, his strength and courage and wit, yet his career as reported in these chapters furnishes a warning of what to avoid rather than an example of what to follow. Samson, endowed with great qualities of mind and body, used the gifts of God for no higher purpose than the gratification of his animal passions. It is a dismal story of lust and brawls and useless slaughter, lightened only by the simple piety of his parents.

XIII. **The Birth of Samson.**—This chapter gives us a glimpse of the piety of home life in early Israel closely akin to 1 S 1. The religious experience of Manoah and his wife is very like that of Gideon, and is explained in the notes on 6 [11-24].

2 indicates that the career of Samson belongs to an early date in the period. The tribe of Dan is still in the S.W. of the central district, bordering on Philistia and Judah, and it may be that the events recorded here actually took place before the Joseph tribes had entered Palestine.

5. Samson is the earliest instance of a Nazirite; cf. Samuel (1 S 1) and the Rechabites (2 K 10 [15] and Jer 35, and Am 2 [11, 12]). These are the only pre-exilic references to the Nazirite vow. In P (Nu 6 [1-21]) the law of the Nazirite is codified, but there it refers only to a vow taken for a limited period. That is the distinction between the Nazirites before and after the exile (cf. St. Paul's vow, Ac 18 [18], 21 [17] ff.).

The idea of the Nazirite vow would seem to be in origin, as indicated in Jer 35, where dwelling in tents is part of the Rechabite custom, an attempt on the part of those who amid Canaanite corruption remained true to the teaching of Moses to conform in simplicity of life to the customs of the wilderness. In this connexion the unshorn head recalls the simple nomadic life in distinction from the habits and amenities of a more settled civilization; while abstinence from wine is opposed to the drunken licence of the Canaanite vintage festival, an agricultural custom. Wine would be rare, if not unknown, in the wilderness. It is not a product of nomad and pastoral, but of agricultural life. So we may see in the Nazirites part of the nucleus of the

faithful who kept alive in Israel the spiritual ideals of religion which Moses had taught in the wilderness, and which Samuel founded the order of prophets to perpetuate and develop. Samson, the first Nazirite, is not a very happy example of the virtues of the order.

15-23. For the meaning of sacrifice as illustrated by the offering of Manoah and his wife 6^{19-21} *v.n.*

17, 18 are important, inasmuch as they show that the primitive anthropomorphic conception of God is passing into a mystic and spiritual apprehension. God, unlike man, may not be fully known by name, seeing that it is 'wonderful.' The same Hebrew word is used in Ps 139^{6}, which provides a fitting commentary on this passage: 'Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I cannot attain unto it' (cf. Gen 32^{29}).

XIV.-XVI. **Samson and the Philistines.**—The Philistines seem at this time to have held Judah in complete subjection (14^{4}), a state of things to which the men of that tribe meekly submit—they even go to the extent of trying to capture Samson for their rulers ($15^{11, 12}$). Clearly Samson's character did not inspire sufficient trust among his contemporaries for them to contemplate taking him as a leader. There is no question of any rising against the Philistines; Samson merely carries on his own private feuds, always over women. Samson's wit is shown in his riddle and puns, expressed in verse. It is not easy to reproduce the paronomasia in English, though Moffatt makes a good attempt in his *New Translation of the Old Testament*. His renderings are: 14^{14}, 'From the eater came something to eat, from the strong came something sweet'; 14^{18}, 'Had you not used my heifer for your plough, You never would have guessed my riddle now'; 15^{16}, 'With the jaw-bone of an ass I have piled them in a mass! With the jaw-bone of an ass I have assailed assailants!' (but see Burney *in loc.*); 15^{19}, **En-hakkore** means 'the spring of him who calls,' sc. upon God, a sacred spring in the neighbourhood of Samson's exploits, hence the name is explained by the writer as originating in Samson's thirst.

At the end of 16 the main or Deuteronomic edition of Judges now breaks off abruptly, and the final compiler has completed the book by inserting two further narratives based on sources apparently unknown to the earlier editor. The original Deuteronomic edition probably continued with the account of the judgeships of Eli and Samuel following 16, and now contained in 1 S 1-12, thus giving a connected record of the Philistine oppressions during the Judges period.

XVII.-XXI. These five chapters are an appendix narrating two principal events, both connected with the Levites, and both belonging to an early date in the period (see notes on 18^{30} and 20^{28}). These narratives, inserted by the final compiler, a member of the priestly school, illustrate the life, religion, and ethics of the Hebrews at the time.

XVII.-XVIII. **Micah's Sanctuary and the Migration of the Tribe of Dan.**—In this story we see something of the home life and religion of an Ephraimite family, and the beginnings of the Levite priesthood. The migration of Dan, with the forcible annexation of Micah's sanctuary and priest, and the massacre of the men of Laish, show the crude ethics of the time. Burney gives a detailed analysis to show that these two chapters form a combination of two traditions drawn from the old sources J and E; but as both traditions are 'in all essentials strikingly similar' there is no literary problem to call for comment. Burney concludes that 'the story may take rank . . . as one of the most ancient and valuable historical sources which we possess dealing with the conditions of life in Canaan during the period of the Judges' (416).

XVII. **3-5.** These verses are instructive, as they show what were regarded as legitimate adjuncts of the true worship of Israel's God in the second generation after Moses. The graven and molten images which Micah set up, and which his priest, the grandson of Moses (18^{30}), sanctioned, show that the revised form of the Decalogue contained in Ex 20 and Dt 5 was not yet in force, even if in existence: 'every man did that which was right in his own eyes.' On the **ephod** (^{5}) 8^{27} *v.n.*

That **teraphim** were images of varying size intended to represent the deity is clear from Gen 31^{30-34}, where Laban accuses Jacob of stealing his gods, *elohim*; and they were small enough for Rachel to hide by sitting on them. The Teraphim which Michal put in David's bed to deceive Saul's assassins must, however, have been of larger dimensions (1 S 19^{13-16}). Their religious meaning and value at this period would be to serve as a continual reminder of the Presence of God in the home. Micah's appointment of one of his sons as priest shows that at this time there was no regular priesthood, though the Levites were beginning to supply a need, and Micah

was glad eventually to secure the services of a regular priest (12). **Now know I that the Lord will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest.**

5. **consecrated one of his sons** is a misleading translation; better 'installed' or 'appointed.' The Hebrew is literally 'filled the hand of.'

6. Although the priestly editor has recorded faithfully the religious observances of a past age as he found them in his source, yet he could scarcely be expected to approve of them, and so he excuses the irregularities of Micah's sanctuary with the comment that it was a lawless age: 'In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes,' a remark which he finds occasion to repeat more than once.

7-13. **The Levite Priesthood.** — This passage records the first historical appearance of a Levite exercising priestly duties. The elaborate description of a regular hierarchy contained in the priestly source of the Pentateuch is, of course, not historical, but is due to the anachronistic tendency of the writer to read back into patriarchal times the ecclesiastical organization of his own day. In the age of the patriarchs Levi was a purely secular tribe, closely associated with Simeon, and characterized in the old poem called 'The Blessing of Jacob' (Gen 49 5-7) as treacherous and violent. But in the so-called 'Blessing of Moses,' a poem which belongs to the period of the divided monarchy (Dt 33), Levi has become the priestly tribe, guardian of the sacred lot, giving oracles and teaching judgements and law (*torah*) in Israel, and performing the sacrificial ritual. We have then to try to trace the steps by which a tribe noted for savage treachery and violence has come to lose its independence and to be attached to Judah as a college of priests (7, 8).

There can be little doubt that the need of a priesthood grew out of the fuller apprehension of the teaching of Moses on the spiritual Being of God and His moral requirements from man. As a religious consciousness developed in Israel along the lines laid down by Moses, man began to feel a need for communion with God, for learning what God would have him do, so that he might order his conduct in accordance with the Divine Will. Especially was this the case in any time of crisis or doubt or difficulty. Men came, in fact, to 'enquire of the Lord' from Moses in such numbers that, as Jethro pointed out to him when advising him to appoint assistants, he would not be able for long to stand the strain involved (Ex 18 13-27). Clearly some special training was needed for interpreting the Divine Will to man; and we may probably trace the origin of the Levite priesthood to the steps taken by Moses in following his father-in-law's advice. He would naturally instruct the Levites of his own tribe in the methods of obtaining responses by means of the sacred lot for those who came to enquire of the Lord, and would teach them also how to interpret the Divine Will as a guide to moral conduct. Thus the Levites came, after the Exodus, to give up their secular position, and to live in the territory of Judah as a college of priests, having the town of Bethlehem assigned to them as a home. Hence, in these narratives of Judges we find Levites travelling in Palestine exercising their office. In these early days priests were not regarded as necessary for offering sacrifice; their primary function seems to have consisted in giving oracles in answer to enquiries as to the Divine Will (18 5, 6). Hence the term *torah* = 'direction' or 'guidance,' as given by the priests, inadequately translated 'law' in the English versions. Both Saul and David took priests on their campaigns for this purpose (1 S 14 18, 23 6-12, 30 7, 8).

XVIII. **The Migration of Dan.**—Dan's original settlement was in the S.W. of the central hill country. The tribe's subsequent migration to the north of Palestine was caused by the entry of the Joseph tribes into the central district. The Canaanites dislodged by Ephraim and Manasseh moved further west, and Dan, hemmed in on all sides, by the sea, the Philistines, the Canaanites, and the Joseph tribes, had no choice but to seek a home elsewhere. This chapter describes the search of the Danites and its success, their consequent migration and annexation of Micah's sanctuary and priest on the way.

5, 6. **Ask counsel,** etc. These verses describe what was the principal function of the Levite priests at this period (cf. 1 S 14 18, 23 6-13, 30 7, 8).

7-10 (cf. 27, 28) illustrate the imperfect ethics and religious ideas of the time. The Danites had no compunction in gaining a home by raiding 'a people quiet and secure.' The reason given to justify such a proceeding on religious grounds was, according to Deuteronomy, that the natives were heathen, and likely to corrupt the Israelites, 'that they teach you not to do after all their abominations' (Dt 20 18). There is no thought of converting the heathen. Israel was pain-

fully slow to recognize its missionary vocation.

11-26. This barefaced robbery and intimidation of Micah can find no excuse, though perhaps the editor's remark at the opening of the chapter, 'In those days there was no king in Israel,' is intended to explain it. The priest apparently was not reluctant to be a Bishop in Dan rather than a domestic chaplain to Micah.

30 gives us the origin of the sanctuary at Dan, and explains Jeroboam's choice of it at a later date as the northern sanctuary for the kingdom of Israel (1 K 12 [29]). We are here told the name and family of this Levite, Jonathan, the grandson of Moses. **Moses** is undoubtedly the original reading, though a pious scribe of a later age, wishing to save Moses the shame of a grandson of such questionable morality, has changed it to **Manasseh** (see RVm).

31. Shiloh appears to have been a central sanctuary during the Judgeship of Eli and Samuel, though we hear no more of it after the capture of the Ark by the Philistines.

XIX.-XXI. **The Outrage at Gibeah and its Punishment.**—This narrative presents a very complicated literary problem, with which we have no space to deal in detail, and we can only mention the main points of difficulty, and indicate the lines along which a solution may be sought. There can be no doubt that these chapters contain a true historical tradition, and 19, describing the outrage at Gibeah, except for the last two verses, reproduces faithfully the old source used by the priestly editor. But in 20 and 21 it is clear that he has not only combined two sources but has written them up with a didactic purpose. The first point we notice is that this editor represents all Israel as assembling to decide what must be done to punish the crime. An assembly of this kind would have been, however, impossible at the early date to which the events belong, and is inconsistent with the old records throughout the book. The editor's object is, of course, to show to the men of his day, by an example drawn from their past history, what was the national duty when a notorious sin was committed. The numbers in 20 are greatly exaggerated, e.g. 25,000 men of Benjamin are said to have been killed in one battle (20 [35, 46]), yet the whole armed force of Dan (18 [11]), numbers only 600. Moreover, Jabesh-gilead can hardly have been entirely depopulated as recorded in 21 [10-12], since in Saul's reign it was a strongly fortified city standing a siege by the Ammonites. Further, we notice two places of assembly for Israel: Mizpah (20 [1], 21 [1, 5]) and Bethel (20 [18, 26], 21 [2]); and this gives us a clue to the historical basis of 20 and 21. Mizpah was near Jerusalem, in Judah's territory, and Bethel was the sanctuary of Ephraim; and the Levite concerned was attached to Judah, and had been living in Ephraim (19 [1]). Both Judah and Ephraim were therefore immediately affected, and we shall probably be right in supposing that these two tribes alone took measures to punish the outrage. Judah assembled at Mizpah, and Ephraim at Bethel, and both sought to coerce Benjamin into punishing the criminals of Gibeah, a coercion which Benjamin forcibly resisted and suffered accordingly.

XIX., describing the outrage, which was due to the thwarted desire of the men of Gibeah to indulge in the vice of Sodom, is told in language closely parallel to Gen 19 (J), which pictures a similar scene at Sodom. The chapter reveals the crude ethics and morality of the period, especially the terribly low view of women. The Levite has no hesitation in giving his concubine to the rabble, and it was not the violation of the woman, but of the laws of hospitality and of property, for which punishment was exacted. This chapter presents a clear and straightforward narrative which calls for little comment.

22. sons of Belial. The meaning of the term is adequately expressed by Moore, 'vile scoundrels,' but the derivation of 'Belial' is obscure. The Rabbinic explanation, 'men who have thrown off the yoke of heaven,' is at least as likely to be correct as modern etymological speculations.

23-28 illustrate the defective moral standards of the age. The host proffers his daughter to appease the passions of the mob in order to safeguard the law of hospitality, regarded as more important than a woman's chastity, or life; and the Levite exposes his concubine to violation to shield himself.

29. For this method of calling for assistance cf. 1 S 11 [7]. The statement that the Levite sent **throughout all the borders of Israel** is clearly editorial.

XX. **1.** This verse contains plain evidence of the priestly editor's hand. The Hebrew for **the congregation** and **was assembled** is the technical ecclesiastical phraseology of a much later age. The section ([1-16]) representing the assembly as held at Mizpah belongs to a source which

described Judah's preparation to exact punishment.

17-29, where the assembly is held at Bethel, come from another source which is concerned with the measures adopted by Ephraim to punish Gibeah.

18, 26-28 show that at this time Bethel was the sanctuary of Ephraim with the Ark, and a priesthood descended from Aaron. Ephraim's sanctuary was afterwards at Shiloh till this was destroyed by the Philistines and the Ark captured during the Judgeship of Eli (1 S 1-4), when Bethel again became the religious centre and, as a well-established sanctuary of his own tribe, was adopted by Jeroboam as the southern sanctuary of the kingdom of Israel (1 K 12 [29]). If the reader will compare carefully [30-35] with [36-48] he will have no difficulty in seeing for himself that these sections are two separate and very similar accounts of the same event, the latter being rather more circumstantial.

XXI. throws further light upon the ethical standards of the time. The neighbouring tribes had taken an oath not to let their daughters marry into the tribe of Benjamin, and that oath is regarded as sacred and on no account to be violated; but the need of wives for the men of Benjamin is supplied by two expedients, the morality of which the priestly editor could not approve, but which he explains by his usual comment, 'In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes.'

5-12 may well preserve a true historical tradition. Gilead was noted for failure to interest itself in the common welfare of the Hebrews (see 5 [15-17], 8 [5-17]), but the town of Jabesh-gilead can scarcely have suffered the fate here described for the reasons stated in the introductory note.

16-25. The rape of the daughters of Shiloh, organized as an expedient to allow the Ephraimites to keep the letter of their oath while violating its principle, is morally inexcusable. The festival described is the vintage festival of the Canaanite nature cults.

Books

Burney's Commentary on Judges is a mine of valuable information on the whole history of the period. Moore's edition of Judges in the *I.C.C.* is also a standard work. These two Commentaries provide an exhaustive treatment of the subject.

For smaller books, the *C.B.* or the *Cent. B.* will be found useful.

RUTH

By W. H. A. Learoyd

Character.—The Book of Ruth is a brief idyll of life in Palestine during the period of the judges. The story is one of the most familiar in the Old Testament, and may be summarized as follows: Elimelech, a man of Bethlehem-Judah, emigrates in a time of famine to the land of Moab, taking with him his wife, Naomi, and his two sons, Mahlon and Chilion. There he dies, while his sons marry wives of the women of the land. In course of time both the sons die; Naomi returns to Bethlehem, one of her daughters-in-law accompanying her, while the other remains in Moab. Arriving at Bethlehem during barley-harvest, Ruth, the daughter-in-law, goes to glean in the field of Boaz, a near relative of Elimelech. She soon makes the acquaintance of Boaz, who, having regard for the obligations of kinsmanship, marries her, and so becomes the ancestor of David. The book concludes with a genealogy showing the descent of Boaz from Perez, the son of Judah.

Aim.—The chief aim of the book seems to have been to furnish a genealogy of David. Since the Books of Samuel, though otherwise very full in their information regarding David, omit his genealogy, Ruth would seem to have been written to fill up this deficiency. Special stress is laid on the fact that Ruth was a Moabitess; the national hero of the Hebrews was partly descended from a people that were often their foes. The book has a didactic object in the way in which the action of the story turns on the recognition of the duty on the part of a near relative to marry the widow of a man, when he has died without leaving a son. A broader policy as regards foreign marriages would appear to be advocated, but to say that this book is a polemic against the legislation of Ezra and Nehemiah means reading a little too much into this simple story, and demands a date too late to harmonize with the general Hebrew style.

Date.—Little definite can be said re-

garding the date of the book. Some modern critics ascribe a very late date to its composition, chiefly on the grounds that the writer treats the custom mentioned in 4, and upheld in Deuteronomy, as though it had fallen out of use at the time when the book was written. Yet the single verse (4 7) which implies this is but a parenthesis, and may well be an explanatory gloss which has crept into the text at a later date. If the writer of the rest of the chapter had written this explanatory verse, would he not have placed it after, and not before, the custom which he was explaining? The presence of some so-called Aramaisms and other late expressions is also said to demand a late date. Other words are called late because they are not met with in any of the earlier books; but this is an argument from silence, and lacks weight. 'The general beauty and purity of the style of Ruth point more decidedly to the pre-exilic period than do isolated expressions to the period after the Exile' (Driver). The way in which the foreign marriages of Mahlon and Chilion are mentioned suggests a pre-Deuteronomic date, as do the references to gleaning in 2. The literary and linguistic style of Ruth is far more like that of Samuel than that of late books like Chronicles.

Canonicity.—In the Hebrew Bible, Ruth is placed in the Kethubhim, the last and latest division of the Canon. This does not necessarily demand a late date for the book's origin, but may only indicate that the book was not regarded, for some time, as being suitable for public reading, perhaps on account of the acquiescence which it appears to give to marriage with foreigners. Its later reception into the Canon was doubtless due to its connexion, by the genealogy, with David. The LXX, Vulgate, and other versions place the book between Judges and Samuel; this is its correct position so far as contents are concerned.

Bibliography

Cooke, *C.B.*; Thatcher, *Cent. B.*

I. 1-5. Elimelech's Emigration and Death.

1. Since Boaz is represented as being the great-grandfather of David, the events narrated must have taken place towards the end of the period of the judges. The famine may have been due to the depredations of the Midianites.

2. Elimelech, i.e. 'My God is King.' **Naomi,** i.e. 'Amiable.' The names **Ruth** and **Orpah** are Moabitish, and are of uncertain meaning. **Ephrath** was the ancient name of Bethlehem.

3. This would appear to be contrary to the Deuteronomic law which emphatically condemned foreign marriages. In Dt 23 3 Moabites are especially forbidden to enter the congregation.

6-18. Naomi Returns to Bethlehem accompanied by Ruth.

8. The words **her mother's house** refer to the Eastern custom of the women occupying separate apartments from those of the men; the daughters live in those of the mother.

11. Naomi is referring to the custom which required a man to marry his brother's widow if he had not left a son. If a son was born of this marriage, he was held to belong to the dead brother.

15, 16. The idea which underlies Ruth's words, **and thy God my God,** appears to be 'I will come with you, although I know it means a change of god for me.' According to the ideas of the time she was leaving the territory of Chemosh and entering the territory of Jehovah.

19-22. The Arrival at Bethlehem.—The verb translated by 'they said' is feminine in the Hebrew. This would seem to indicate that it was the female portion of the inhabitants which greeted Naomi.

20. Unable to avoid contrasting her bereaved homecoming with her more prosperous departure, Naomi asks that her name may be changed from 'Amiable' to 'Bitter.' This is the only occasion of the Divine Name 'Almighty' (Shaddai) appearing alone in prose, although it does so fairly frequently in the poetical books, especially Job.

22. Barley-harvest began at the end of March, immediately after the Passover.

II. 1-23. Ruth Meets Boaz.

2. The tone of this and later verses suggests an earlier stage of development than that presupposed by Deuteronomy and Leviticus, where the owners were prohibited from gleaning, and the leaving of the ears for the poor was strictly enjoined.

8. The men did the reaping; the maidens came after tying up the sheaves.

14. vinegar represents the Hebrew 'Chomez,' a cooling sauce popular in the East.

17. An ephah of barley equals about 25 pounds.

20. to the living and the dead. What Naomi means is that God shows kindness to the dead by the way in which He looks after their widows. **near kinsman.** The Hebrew (*Goël*) really means the next-of-kin whose right it was to redeem his dead relative's property; cf. also

Nu 35 [19] *v.n.* It was the duty of the Goël to take the widow, if the relative had died childless.

III. 1-18. **Ruth Claims Boaz as Goël; he Acknowledges the Duty.**

2. Use was made of the evening breeze to separate the corn from the chaff.

3. **get thee down.** Bethlehem stood on the ridge of a hill.

9. The reference is to the Jewish marriage custom of the man throwing the skirt of his robe over his bride, thereby signifying that he has taken her under his protection.

16. **Who art thou?** i.e. in what circumstances dost thou return? Has Boaz acknowledged his kinsmanship and accepted its obligations?

IV. 1-5. **Boaz Calls into Judgement the Next Kinsman.**

1. **the gate,** i.e. the open space before the gate where public affairs were discussed.

3. Naomi was probably reduced to a state of want; it was now open for the nearest relative to buy back the land.

4. The Hebrew word rendered by 'inhabitants' should rather be taken as 'those sitting here.'

5. Since it was Naomi, and not Ruth, who had sold the land, it is better to read here 'thou must also buy Ruth,' as in [10].

6-17. **He Refuses; Boaz Marries Ruth.**

7, which is probably an explanatory gloss (see Introd.), treats the custom of drawing off the shoe as having become obsolete. The word rendered **confirm** is, in the original, a definite Aramaism, and supports the idea that this verse was written at a late date.

14. The **near kinsman** is not Boaz, but the child who is now considered as accepting the rights and duties of Naomi's son.

15. The number seven is used as a round number meaning several: cf. 1 S 2 [5], 'The barren hath born seven.'

17. Obed, i.e. 'one who is serving.'

18-22. **Genealogy of David.** — This genealogy, which shows David's descent from Perez, the son of Judah, does not form an integral part of the book, and was probably added at a later date. It is obviously incomplete, since only ten names are given, while the period covered is many centuries. Not only have unimportant individuals been omitted, but even whole generations. St. Matthew, in his genealogy of Jesus, copies this passage word for word.

I. AND II. SAMUEL

By J. F. Stenning

Titles.—The two books of Samuel, according to the Hebrew Canon, originally formed a single book: the division into two books is due to the LXX translators, who treated the books of Samuel and Kings as a complete history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and divided them into four Books of the Kingdoms.

Contents.—The two books fall naturally into four main divisions:

(*a*) 1 S 1-14 (15): Samuel and the establishment of the monarchy; (*b*) 1 S 16-2 S 8: Saul and David; (*c*) 2 S 9-20: David's reign; (*d*) 2 S 21-24: an appendix. These divisions are marked off by three concluding summaries—1 S 14 [47-51]; 2 S 8 (of which 3 [2-5] and 5 [13-16] originally formed part); 2 S 20 [23-26]—which are obviously the work of the editor who was responsible for the final form of the books. It is probable (see below) that 1 S 15 (the rejection of Saul) was omitted by this editor, and was later restored to the narrative. These divisions, which cover the history of the period from the birth of Samuel to the end of David's reign, may be subdivided as follows:

(*a*) 1 S 1-15: From the birth of Samuel to the rejection of Saul.

(1) 1 [1]-7 [1]: Samuel's birth and childhood and the priesthood of Eli to which Samuel succeeds (1 [1]-4 [1a]).* The downfall of the house of Eli; the capture of the Ark of Jehovah by the Philistines, and its restoration (4 [1b]-7 [1]).

(2) 7 [2]-15 [35]: Samuel as judge over Israel delivers them from the Philistines (7 [2-17]). The election of Saul as king, and the deliverance of Jabesh-gilead from the Ammonites (8-11). Samuel's farewell address (12). Saul's struggle with the Philistines (13, 14), and his rejection after the defeat of Amalek (15).

(*b*) 1 S 16-2 S 8: From the first appearance of David till he becomes king over Israel and Judah.

(1) 1 S 16-31: David enters the service

* But Samuel is not called 'priest' unless 2 [35] *v.n.* is referred to him in its original form.—Ed.

of Saul (16). His military successes and his popularity arouse the jealousy of Saul, and he is forced to flee from the latter's court (17-22). Saul's attempts to capture David, and the sparing of his life by the latter (23-26). David as a Philistine vassal (27-30). Saul's last struggle with the Philistines and his death (31).

(2) 2 S 1-8: David's lament (1); the struggle between David and Ishbosheth; David's accession as king over Israel and Judah (2 ^{1}-5 ^{3}); the capture of Jerusalem and the final defeat of the Philistines (5 $^{11-25}$); the removal of the ark to Jerusalem (6); the promise to David and his dynasty (7); the summary of David's wars (8).

(*c*) 2 S 9-20: The history of the succession.

(1) David and Meribbaal (9); the wars with Ammon, and David's sin (10-12).

(2) Absalom's rebellion (13-19); the revolt of Sheba (20).

(*d*) 2 S 21-24: An appendix consisting of—

(1) Historical incidents: the famine and its consequences (21 $^{1-14}$); a series of exploits against the Philistines (21 $^{15-22}$); further exploits and lists of David's heroes (23 $^{8-39}$); the census and its results (24).

(2) Poetical passages: a psalm (22); David's 'last words' (23 $^{1-7}$).

It is unfortunate that the present division of the books of Samuel and Kings now separates 1 K 1-2 from the former book; for these two chapters are much more closely connected with the reign of David, to which they form an admirable conclusion, than they are with the reign of Solomon.

The history of the composition of the books of Samuel is very similar to that of the book of Judges. Here too we find (*a*) clear traces of the existence of an older history compiled from two parallel yet independent sources united by a later editor into a composite document; (*b*) obvious marks of the activity of a Deuteronomic editor particularly in the way of omission; and (*c*) later additions by subsequent editors.

(*a*) An examination of the contents of these books makes it clear that the main incidents in the history of Saul and David have been preserved in a twofold form. Thus we have two accounts of the choice of Saul as king and of his rejection, of David's introduction to Saul and of his flight from the latter's court, of the sparing of Saul's life by David, and of the death of Saul. In nearly all these cases both accounts have been preserved almost completely, and the links by which the redactor has attempted to harmonize the two narratives (except in the stories of David's introduction to Saul and of the latter's attempts on David's life) can be clearly discerned.

There is considerable diversity of opinion among critics with regard to the origin of the two accounts, but there is at least a strong presumption in favour of the view that they are closely allied to the Hexateuchal sources J and E. The two accounts cover practically the same ground, but are obviously independent of one another, being clearly distinguished by their different points of view, and, to a certain extent, by their literary style. For what is obviously the older account depicts a state of society and of religion during the early days of the monarchy which is very similar to that which is found in the earlier narrative of the books of Judges. The simple graphic style of this account as well as the *naiveté* of its religious point of view obviously belong to a period of great antiquity; but in the absence of definite *linguistic* evidence we are not justified in identifying it with J, though this symbol has been adopted in the commentary for the sake of convenience. The later account, on the other hand, presents noticeable affinity with E, more especially in the description of Saul's election as king. Moreover, it is less objective than the older account, and its representation of history is obviously influenced by the prophetic teaching of the 8th century, more especially by Hosea. The fact that part only of this second account, viz. 1 S 7-12, exhibits definite linguistic resemblance to E may be best explained by the hypothesis that it is derived, in the main, from a later recension of E, viz. E_2.

On this theory as to the origin of the two main sources the date at which they were united into a composite whole cannot be earlier than the 7th century B.C.

(*b*) But, as in the books of Judges and Kings, the form of the books of Samuel has been largely influenced by a later editor of the Deuteronomic school who did not hesitate to omit those portions of the history which he regarded as unsuitable to, or inconsistent with, the religious teaching which he wished to convey. Thus he omitted 1 S 15 (the rejection of Saul) and the whole of 2 S 9-24, substituting the concluding summaries of the reigns of Saul and David contained in 1 S 14 $^{47-51}$ and 2 S 8; the similar summary (1 S 7 $^{13-17}$) has also been largely recast by him. Traces of his work are also to be found in the chronological notices

(1 S 7 [2], 13 [1]; 2 S 2 [10, 11], 5 [45]), as well as in the present form of 1 S 2 [27-36] and 2 S 7. Other passages, mainly from E_2, which have been expanded by the Deuteronomist, are 1 S 12 and 2 S 12.

(*c*) The older accounts, however, were not altogether superseded by the later recension, and the Deuteronomic omissions were subsequently restored by an editor of the 5th or 4th century, though not always in their original sequence. Thus the fact that the concluding summary (2 S 8 [16-18]) is repeated in 20 [23-26] seems to show that originally 2 S 21 [1-14] and the closely allied 24 originally preceded 9, and that 2 S 9-20 were restored at a later date. To an even later date are to be assigned the poetical fragments: 1 S 2 [1-10] (Song of Hannah), 2 S 22, 23 [1-7], and the sections 1 S 16 [1-13] (anointing of David), 19 [18-24] (Samuel as head of the prophetic guild), and 21 [10-15] (David's first visit to Achish).

Text.—The text has probably suffered more in the course of transmission than any other prose book in the Old Testament, and as a consequence the number of passages which, as they stand, are either untranslatable or conflict with the context, is exceptionally large. Fortunately the labours of a long series of Hebrew scholars has enabled us, in the majority of cases, to restore an approximately correct text by the aid of the ancient versions, more particularly the LXX and Lucian's revision of LXX. In this connexion it must be remembered that our present Hebrew or Massoretic text dates at earliest from the 1st century A.D., and that the LXX translation of the Pentateuch, which was followed somewhat later by that of the other books of the Old Testament, dates from the 3rd century B.C. The Hebrew text represented by the LXX is therefore considerably older, and presumably therefore nearer the original than that of our Hebrew Bible. There still remain, however, a large number of passages in which recourse can only be had to conjectural emendation. In the accompanying notes, references to the LXX and to Lucian's revision have invariably been given whenever the restored text rests upon the readings of those versions.

Bibliography

H. P. Smith (*I.C.C.*); Kennedy (*Cent. B.*); S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and Topography of Samuel.*

I. SAMUEL

I. 1-IV. 1*a*. The birth and childhood of Samuel (E or E_2). The book opens with the story of the birth and early life of Samuel during the judgeship of Eli. Hannah, the childless wife of Elkanah of the tribe of Ephraim, prays for a son, and vows that, if a man child is given to her, she will dedicate him to the service of Jehovah. Her prayer is heard, and she fulfils the vow by handing over Samuel to Eli, the chief priest of the sanctuary at Shiloh. Here Samuel grows up in the service of Jehovah, his conduct being in marked contrast to that of the two sons of Eli, who openly abuse their sacred office. While still a youth, Samuel receives a divine revelation foretelling the downfall of the house of Eli. From this time onward all Israel recognizes him as a prophet of Jehovah.

With the exception of 2 [1-10] (Hannah's Song) and 2 [27-36] (the message of the anonymous prophet) the section is clearly derived from ancient material. The intimate picture which it gives of family life in early Israel, the description of the worship at Shiloh, as well as the references to sacrificial procedure, the vivid account of Samuel's dream, all bear the stamp of early tradition. But the Samuel whose early life and upbringing is here set forth is obviously not the comparatively unknown seer of J's account of the introduction of the monarchy (9 [1] ff.), but the theocratic ruler, or judge, of all Israel who, according to E, first summons the people to repentance and then delivers them from the Philistines.

1. **Ramathaim-zophim**: read 'a certain man of the Ramathites [or "of Ramah"], a Zuphite.' In 1 Ch 6 [27] he is represented as a Levite.

3. The annual feast which Elkanah used to attend was that of the ingathering (of autumn fruits), known later as the Feast of Tabernacles. Shiloh, during the period of the Judges (18 [31], 21 [19] f.), was the chief sanctuary of Israel at which the ark was kept. The narrative makes it clear that it was an actual building with doorposts (1 [9]) and doors (3 [15]), and could be described as a 'temple' (1 [9], 3 [3]) or 'house of Jehovah' (1 [7, 24]).

4-7. The continuation of [4*a*]: 'And it came to pass on one occasion when Elkanah sacrificed,' is given in [7*b*], 'that she wept and would not eat.' The long parenthesis in between describes how her rival wife used to provoke Hannah on these annual visits.

a double portion: an inadmissible rendering. Read *a single portion: nevertheless he*, etc. (RVm).

9. Read, on the basis of the LXX: *So Hannah rose up after they had*

eaten and presented herself before Jehovah.

11. and there shall no razor come upon his head: these words are a later addition. Subsequent history gives no indication that Samuel was a Nazirite from his birth.

12 f. This passage shows that in early times drunkenness was frequently the accompaniment of sacrificial feasts (cf. Is 28 [7]).

20. Samuel (Hebrew *Shĕmūēl*) = either 'name of God' (cf. Penuel, Reuel) or 'his name [a periphrasis for Jehovah] is God' (cf. Joel). The addition of the words 'Because I have asked him of Jehovah' was not intended to give a scientific derivation of the name, but merely to connect it with the circumstances of Samuel's birth; for similar assonances cf. Cain, Moses.

24 f. three bullocks: read *a bullock of three years old* (RVm). Read *and she entered into the house of Jehovah in Shiloh, and the boy was with her. And they slew the bullock, and the mother of the boy came to Eli.*

28. and he worshipped Jehovah there: read, on the basis of LXX (to 2 [11]), *and she left him there before Jehovah,* and connect with 2 [11a] (reading with LXX *and went to Ramah*); the narrative makes it evident that Hannah was not accompanied by Elkanah on this visit. The separation of the two clauses is due to the insertion of the Song (2 [1-10]).

II. 1-10. Hannah's Song. It is generally agreed by critics that this psalm bears no relation to the circumstances of Samuel's birth, and that it cannot have been composed by Hannah. The reference to the king in [10] presupposes a later age than of Hannah, and the whole tenor of the poem points to a more advanced stage of Hebrew thought, the leading idea being the sovereign power of Jehovah. The ascription of the poem to Hannah is doubtless due to a mistaken application of 1 [5b] to the circumstances of Hannah, while the fact that the song was inserted in a different place in LXX points to its being a very late addition. The writer opens with a jubilant profession of faith in Jehovah, the outcome presumably of some signal display of divine mercy. He then rebukes his enemies for their arrogant attitude towards Jehovah. The central thought, viz. Jehovah's government of the world, is developed in a series of antithetic clauses, illustrating His control over the destinies of mankind ([4-8]); Jehovah's dominion is a guarantee that He will preserve His 'holy ones' and destroy the wicked ([9]). Finally, the coming judgement will result in the exaltation of His 'anointed one.'

2. For there is none beside thee: a later addition.

3. and by him actions are weighed: read probably (with LXX) *and a God who weighs actions.*

5. have ceased: add *to toil,* by a slight emendation of the next word 'yea.'

6. the grave: read *Sheol,* the abode of departed spirits. Many scholars maintain that the psalmist is here expressing a belief in a resurrection of the dead; in that case the song must be assigned to a late post-exilic period (cf. Is 26 [19]; Dan 12 [2]). More probably he is merely emphasizing the extent of Jehovah's power, that His will is supreme not only on earth but also in Sheol (cf. Is 7 [11]).

8. The last two clauses, which are omitted by LXX, introduce a new idea which is hardly in keeping with the rest of the verse; probably they are not original.

9. Render as RVm, *his godly ones*; the word is characteristic of the later psalms.

10. the king . . . his anointed: the reference is to the Messianic King of later Jewish hopes (cf. Ps 2 [6], 18 [50], etc.).

11-17. The sin of Eli's two sons lay in their seizing a larger share of the sacrificial flesh than was customary. At a later age the priest's due was regulated by law (Dt 18 [3]), but at this period the amount was presumably dependent upon the free-will of the worshipper. [15-17] describe a more serious offence. Not only did the priests disregard the usage of the sanctuary, but they laid themselves open to the charge of sacrilege in that they demanded their share of the flesh before Jehovah's portion (the fat) had been consumed upon the altar.

13. Read as RVm. As the text stands, [13, 14] would appear to describe the ordinary procedure of the priests; in reality they record a flagrant abuse of established custom.

18-21. Samuel's early ministry.

girded with a linen ephod: apparently a short tunic or shirt secured at the waist with a girdle (cf. 2 S 6 [14]). The phrase, which is used regularly of the dress of the priests, is to be distinguished from the phrase 'to wear,' or rather 'to bear an ephod' ([28], etc.).

22-25. Eli's ineffectual rebuke of his sons.

22. The last half (LXX omits) is a later insertion based on Ex 38 [8].

23. Read: *'Why do ye these things which I hear from all the people? Nay,*

my sons, not good is the report which I hear the people of Jehovah spreading.'

25. Render: *If a man sin against a man God will mediate* (for him), *but if against Jehovah a man sin, who can intercede for him?* In ordinary cases of wrong-doing there is an appeal to God, who acts as arbiter through His representative the judge; but if an offence is committed against Jehovah Himself, there is no tribunal before which the case can be tried, and the offender therefore exposes himself to the direct vengeance of God.

27-36. The prediction of an anonymous prophet of the downfall of Eli's house. In its present form this prediction can hardly be earlier than the 7th century B.C., since it presupposes (*a*) the monarchy (35) and (*b*) Josiah's reforms (36). In contrast with the main body of the narrative the prophecy does not deal with the immediate future, i.e. the disaster of 4 and the subsequent succession of Samuel to the priesthood, but surveys the whole history of Eli's descendants. The most probable explanation both of the literary form of the section and also of the confused statement of 31-36 is that the original denunciation simply foretold a sudden disaster to the house of Eli (31a, 33b), a permanent weakening of his family (32b), and the succession of Samuel to the priesthood (35), and that a later writer of the Deuteronomic school expanded the earlier document into a prediction of the rise of the Zadokite priesthood, the disaster of 4 being replaced by a reference to the massacre at Nob (22), and the description of Samuel as the 'faithful priest' (35) applied to Zadok, who superseded Abiathar, the grandson of Eli, in the reign of Solomon.

28. to burn incense: render *to offer sacrifice*, lit. 'to produce the smoke' (of sacrifices): the meaning 'to burn incense' belongs to a later period.

to wear an ephod: render *to carry an ephod*. The verb translated 'wear' means 'to bear,' or 'carry,' and is never used of an article of dress; **ephod** also, when used of a garment, is always defined by the adjective 'linen.' In the book of Samuel the ephod is frequently mentioned as a means of obtaining an oracle, and the passages in which it occurs clearly indicate that it was a portable object (14 3 [LXX], 23 9, 30 7); here and in 14 3, 22 18 it is described as being 'carried'; in 23 6 Abiathar brings it down in his hand (cf. 21 9). It is hardly doubtful that the ephod in these passages denotes some kind of image as in Jg 8 27 *v.n.*: cf. 17 5.

29a. Read (cf. LXX): '*Wherefore dost thou look with an evil eye upon my sacrifice and upon my offering, and honourest,*' etc.

31 ff. The text of these verses is admittedly very corrupt; LXX (B) omits 31a and 32b. As it stands 31a and 33b clearly refer to the massacre of the priest at Nob (22), from which Abiathar alone escaped (33a), and the 'faithful priest' (35) must be Zadok, who superseded Abiathar upon the accession of Solomon. But, unless 32a is rejected, 31 must refer to some event in Eli's own lifetime, viz. the disaster of 4, the survivor of 33 being Ahitub (14 3) and the 'faithful priest' Samuel. Since, however, the sign of 34 is the disaster of 4, it is obvious that 31 must refer to some event subsequent to this disaster and to Eli's death, and 32 becomes meaningless. Probably the best explanation of the confusion is that suggested above.

36. The description of the fate of Eli's descendants is obviously coloured by the experience of the priests of the high places after the reforms of Josiah (2 K 23). Despite the provisions of Dt 18 6-8, the latter were not allowed to minister at the altar, though they were given a share of the dues of the central sanctuary (cf. 2 K 23 9).

III. 1-IV. 1a. Samuel's call, and the prediction of the downfall of Eli's house.

The picture which is here given of the sanctuary at Shiloh, and the vivid description of Samuel's dream, clearly reflect an early tradition entirely in keeping with the narrative of 1 and 2.

12 clearly refers back to 2 27 ff., but was probably inserted subsequently to the recasting of that section. 11 leads us to expect an explicit statement of the coming judgement rather than a reference to a prediction of which Samuel is presumably ignorant.

13. For I have told him that: read '*And thou shalt tell him that I am about to judge* [i.e. punish] *his house for ever.*'

did bring a curse for themselves: read with LXX *were blaspheming God*. The original text was altered on religious grounds (cf. Ex 22 28).

IV. 1a-VII. 1. War with the Philistines: capture and restoration of the ark.

The Israelites twice suffer defeat at the hands of the Philistines at Ebenezer. On the second occasion the ark, which had been brought from Shiloh to ensure Israel's victory, is captured, and Eli's two sons slain. The news of the disaster causes the death of the aged Eli, and this is followed by the death of his daughter-in-law. The ark is taken by the Philis-

tines first to Ashdod and then to Gath, but its presence is accompanied by such disaster that Ekron refuses to receive it. After seven months the Philistines decide to send it back with a guilt offering, and it is accordingly sent to Bethshemesh, whence it is removed later to Kiriath-jearim.

The section forms a suitable continuation of 1-3, and also prepares the way for the appearance of Samuel as the deliverer of Israel in 7. But though its position and contents point to E as its probable source, there are not many linguistic traces of that document, and many scholars assign it to J. In favour of this latter view they urge (*a*) that the ark and not Samuel—who is not even mentioned—is the main subject; (*b*) that the downfall of the house of Eli is treated as a side-issue; and (*c*) that the religious ideas associated with the ark reflect a very early stage of Israel's religious development. In all probability the section is not to be assigned exclusively to either J or E, but is a composite work derived from similar accounts of the history of the ark which were handed down by both sources. It is, however, evident that the history of the ark has not been preserved in its entirety. It must originally have included a fuller account of the struggle with the Philistines, for the subsequent history makes it plain that the Philistines later obtained a firm footing in the hill-country of Central Palestine (cf. 10 [5], 13 [3], 14 [1] f.), and also destroyed Shiloh, with the result that the priesthood was transferred to Nob (21: cf. Jer 7 [12, 14], 26 [6]).

IV. 1. Read with LXX: *And it came to pass in those days that the Philistines were gathered together to battle against Israel, and Israel went out against them to battle.* The Philistines (Hebrew *Pĕlishtīm*) are now usually identified with the sea-rovers, called Pulasati, who assisted the Libyans in their attack on Egypt in the fifty-eighth year of Rameses III (*c.* 1200 B.C.). They are stated to have come from Caphtor (Dt 2 [23]; Am 9 [7]), which is usually identified with Crete. In the time of the Judges they were already settled in the maritime plain to the south of Joppa. At the beginning of this campaign they moved up to Aphek in the plain of Sharon, probably in the neighbourhood of Lydda (=Antipatris).

3. **the ark.** The ideas associated with the ark in these chapters bear a close resemblance to those which are found in Nu 10 [35] ff. In the latter poetical fragment the ark is plainly regarded as the visible symbol of Jehovah's presence, or as the embodiment of the 'Presence' (as opposed to such temporary manifestations as the 'angel of Jehovah,' Ex 33 [14] f.), if, indeed, it is not actually identified with him (see *Cent. B.*, Appendix). The language of the elders (3), the dismay of the Philistines (7 f.), the references to its capture (21 f.), and the words of the men of Bethshemesh (6 [20]), clearly reflect the same early point of view. In the oldest sources it is called 'the ark of Jehovah' or 'of God,' but in Deuteronomy and the writings influenced by it the title is changed to 'the ark of the covenant [of Jehovah],' as the chest containing the tables of the Law. In the priestly code it is called 'the ark of the testimony.'

7. **God is come into the camp**: read, on the basis of LXX, *These are their gods; they have come to them to the camp.* The use of 'God' absolutely in reference to Jehovah is improbable in the mouth of the Philistines. The repetitions in [7-8] are clear indications of the combination of two accounts.

8. **in the wilderness**: either a gloss, or, if 'and with the pestilence' is read, a fragment of the parallel source.

13 f. The Hebrew is confused, probably owing to conflation, one source representing Eli as sitting by the gate of the temple and first learning of the disaster from the outcry which it caused in the city, the other describing the messenger as coming directly to Eli as he waited by the wayside. LXX 'beside the gate watching the way.'

19-22. The awkward sequence of events in [20] and [21] and the repetition of [21b] in [22] again point to the combination of two accounts.

21. **Ichabod.** The explanation 'inglorious' is very doubtful: it probably represents a popular etymology like that of Samuel (1 [20]).

V. 2. **Dagon.** The old view that Dagon was a fish-god cannot be maintained. More probably Dagon was a Canaanite god of agriculture (Hebrew *dāgān*=corn), whose worship was adopted by the Philistines.

5. Add with LXX at the end *but always leap over it* (cf. Zeph 1 [9]). The writer connects this custom with the Dagon incident, but it was widespread in the ancient world.

6. **tumours**: render *plague-boils*, some form of bubonic plague. LXX adds a reference to mice (see RVm).

VI. 1-VII. 1. **Return of the ark.**

VI. 1. The original narrative must have furnished some conclusion to the incident at Ekron, and described the further action

of the Tyrants; in 6 [1] f. it is the people who take action. LXX again inserts a reference to mice (see RVm).

4. and five golden mice. The unexpected mention of the images of mice seems to indicate that the Philistines had also suffered from a plague of mice, and this explanation is supported by the additions of LXX in 5 [6], 6 [1]. Most critics, however, in view of the statement 'for one plague was upon you all,' maintain that the images of the mice were merely emblems of the plague of boils, since mice and other small rodents were known to be 'carriers' of bubonic plague: they treat the later references of LXX, therefore, as harmonistic additions. But this theory fails to explain the presence of the emblems (five golden mice) alongside of the five golden tumours, and also assumes a drastic treatment of the text by the LXX translators for which there are but doubtful parallels. A more natural explanation of the variations is that the two sources, from which the narrative is derived, differed as to the nature of the plague, one describing it as a plague of boils, and the other as a plague of mice. The text for the most part followed the former account, but traces of the latter have been preserved in 5 [6a] ('and devastated them') and in 6 [4. 5], as well as in the additions of LXX (5 [6], 6 [1]). The LXX text of [4] and [5], which omits 'the five golden mice' in [4] and 'the images of your tumours' in [5], probably represents the original form of those verses in their respective sources.

15. A post-exilic addition in accordance with the standpoint of P (Nu 4 [15] f.).

18. even unto the great stone: read *and the great stone . . . is a witness*; [17. 18a] are a later addition.

19. See RVm. The reading of the LXX (except the obvious gloss 'and fifty thousand men') is clearly more original.

21. The narrative implies that the ark was now safely restored to Israelite territory, but though Bethshemesh and Kiriath-jearim lay outside the boundaries of Philistia proper, it is not improbable that they were both at this time subject to Philistine suzerainty. This theory would fully account for the absence of any reference to the ark till the final defeat of the Philistines (2 S 5, 6).

VII. 2-XII. **The institution of the monarchy.**

These chapters afford a striking illustration of that combination of two independent and mutually exclusive narratives which is a marked feature of the book of Samuel. For the only possible solution of the discrepancies which they exhibit is that they are derived from two different sources, which differ fundamenally with regard to (*a*) their attitude towards the monarchy; (*b*) their representation of Samuel; and (*c*) their description of the political condition of Israel. According to the earlier account (9 [1-10. 7. 9-16], 11 [1-11. 15], J): (*a*) Saul is the instrument chosen by Jehovah to effect the deliverance of His people: in other words, the monarchy is a divinely appointed institution; (*b*) Samuel, a local seer, is the medium of Jehovah's revelation to Saul, but after anointing the latter as king, he takes but little part in the subsequent history; (*c*) Israel is depicted as suffering under Philistine oppression: the specific purpose for which Saul is chosen is that he may save Israel from the Philistines, 'for [says Jehovah] I have seen the affliction [LXX] of my people, because their cry has come unto me' (9 [16]). In the later narrative (7, 8, 10 [17-24], 12, E or E_2): (*a*) the people ask for a king because Samuel's sons are not worthy to succeed him, and because they wish to be like other nations: this request is represented as an act of apostasy towards Jehovah; (*b*) Samuel throughout is the judge of all Israel, who acts as the representative of Jehovah: he is king in all but name, and as such hands over the reins of government to the newly appointed king; (*c*) the demand for a king is not justified by external circumstances, for the Philistines had been crushed at Mizpah, 'and came no more within the border of Israel (7 [13]). In contrast with the simple objective character of the earlier source, the later narrative is coloured by the writer's views with respect to the monarchy, which have led him, on the one hand, to minimize the need for a king, and, on the other, to magnify the office and work of Samuel. The fact that this narrative shows many of the characteristics of the Deuteronomic school of writers has caused many scholars to assign it to a member of this school, and to assume that the Deuteronomic editor has entirely recast the material at his disposal in order to produce an idealized history more in accordance with the views of his age. Such a procedure, however, would be without analogy in the books of the Old Testament. The books of Judges and Kings, which have admittedly been revised by Deuteronomic editors, show clearly that their revision took the form, not of rewriting earlier material, but partly of expanding and adding to it, partly of omitting what was regarded as unsuitable. Further, this theory ignores

the fact that this didactic method of writing history did not originate with the Deuteronomic school, but was in vogue long before the end of the 7th century B.C., and probably took its rise from the teaching of the 8th-century prophets. Lastly, it must be borne in mind that the line of demarcation between at any rate the later structure of E (E_2) and D cannot always be drawn with certainty, and that many expressions, which were formerly regarded as distinctive of D, probably came into currency at a considerably earlier date.

VII. 2-17. At the instigation of Samuel the people put away their foreign gods, and a great national assembly is held at Mizpah. While Samuel is offering sacrifice Israel is attacked by the Philistines, but the latter are miraculously discomfited. Samuel erects a *maṣṣēbah*, or stone pillar, to commemorate the deliverance, and calls it Ebenezer (Stone of Help). Then follows the statement that 'the Philistines came no more within the border of Israel' and had to restore the cities which they had previously taken. The section concludes with an account of Samuel's judicial functions. The representation of Samuel in this chapter agrees with that of 1-3 and 8, but the section has been considerably revised by a Deuteronomic editor, particularly in [13] and [14]: the idealized description of Israel's relations with the Philistines in these verses entirely lacks historical support.

3, 4. It is noticeable that the oppression of the Philistines is here attributed to Israel's worship of foreign gods (cf. Jg 10 [6] f.).

7 f. In the eyes of the Philistines the gathering at Mizpah could have but one object, viz. revolt.

12. **Shen**: read with LXX *Jeshaneh*.

saying, etc.: read *saying, It is a witness that Jehovah hath helped us.*

13-15. See above. The earlier narrative of Saul's election (at Gilgal), as well as the subsequent history of his reign, show that the Philistine domination continued until the beginning of David's reign over all Israel (cf. 14 [52]).

VIII. 5. The demand for a king, in the view of the writer, involves nothing less than the rejection of Jehovah, for Jehovah Himself is their King. This view of the institution of the monarchy first finds expression towards the close of the northern kingdom (Hos 8 [3] ff., 10 [3], 13 [10] f.).

9. **the manner of the king.** As the following verses show, this phrase does not denote the constitutional prerogatives of the king, but rather the manner in which he will abuse his sovereign powers. The description doubtless reflects the experiences of the people under the rule of the later kings, especially in northern Israel.

16. **young men**: read with LXX *cattle*.

IX. 1. **a mighty man of valour**: render *a man of substance* (cf. 2 K 15 [20]).

6 f. The unnamed city is usually identified with Ramah (1 [1]), but this would seem to be excluded by the narrative. Probably Budde is right in supposing that the name of the city, as given in J's narrative, was deliberately omitted because the latter preserved a different tradition as to Samuel's native town. We may infer that some notice introducing Samuel and giving the name of the city has fallen out, since the first mention of Samuel by name ([14]) comes very late in this narrative. The section is of great importance as illustrating the position and functions of the *Rō'eh*, or seer, in early Israel. It is clear that he was recognized as endowed with exceptional knowledge, and was therefore consulted in any difficulty, whether in the religious sphere or in the ordinary affairs of everyday life. The fee which he received on such occasions consisted either of money or its equivalent (cf. Nu 22 [7. 17] f.; 1 K 14 [3] f.). As the subsequent history shows, the 'seer' was quite distinct from the ecstatic prophet (*nābī*) (cf. 10 [5] ff.).

9. A marginal note dating from a period when the title **prophet** (*nābī*, in the later sense of the term) had superseded that of *Rō'eh* or **seer**.

12. **high place.** Prior to the Deuteronomic legislation (Dt 12 [2] ff.), worship at a high place or shrine was both lawful and customary. Saul is depicted as entering the town while the sacrifice (the peace-offering) was taking place and before the meal, which formed a prominent feature of the sacrifice, had begun. This passage shows that the functions of the seer were by no means limited to divination.

22. **the guest-chamber**: render *the dining-hall*, in which the sacrificial meal was held. According to LXX a similar building existed at Shiloh (1 [18]).

24. **and that which was upon it**: render with most moderns *and the fat tail*, still regarded as a delicacy in the East. This tail was regarded as part of 'the fat' by later legislation (Ex 29 [22]; Lev 3 [9] f.), and had to be burnt upon the altar. The last half of the verse is hopelessly corrupt; possibly we should read, 'Be-

hold, that which has been kept is set before thee! Eat, for unto the appointed time it has been kept for thee to eat with the guests.'

25. he communed . . . early: follow LXX, RVm.

X. 1. Is it not that the Lord: read with LXX, Vulgate, '*Hath not Jehovah anointed thee to be prince over his people Israel? And thou shalt have authority over the people of Jehovah, and shalt save them out of the hand of their enemies, and this shall be to thee the sign that Jehovah hath anointed thee to be prince over his inheritance.*'

5. the hill of God: render *Gibeah of God*, probably the old name for 'Gibeah of Saul,' the modern *Tell-el-Fūl*, three miles north of Jerusalem. The presence of an 'officer' (or garrison) at this spot in the heart of Central Palestine illustrates the extent to which the Philistines had subjugated the country.

a band of prophets. From the description of the prophets (*nĕbī'īm*), which is given in this chapter it may be gathered (*a*) that they were not associated with Samuel; (*b*) that they were a well-known phenomenon at this period; and (*c*) that they roamed about the country in bands, carrying musical instruments. The object of these latter (cf. the modern dervish) was to induce that condition of physical excitement and frenzy which was especially characteristic of those religious devotees. While in this condition (at times highly contagious: ^{6}, 19^{18} ff.) they indulged in wild and extravagant gestures and uttered loud ecstatic cries. From the lack of control which they exhibited on such occasions and from their disregard for appearances they were easily mistaken for madmen (cf. 18^{10}; 2 K 9^{11}; Hos 9^{7}; Jer 29^{26}). The absence of any previous mention of those bands of prophets makes it probable that the movement was of comparatively recent origin, and since the period at which they first became prominent coincides with that of the Philistine domination, it is natural to infer that they were the product of the political conditions of the time, and that their object was primarily a patriotic one, viz. to stir up their countrymen against the foreign invader. But, from the point of view of early Israel, patriotism was practically synonymous with religious devotion, since the presence of foreigners in the land of Israel was not merely a national disgrace but an insult to the God of Israel, whose land was thereby defiled. With the cessation of the Philistine domination the immediate object of these prophets was attained, but the movement still continued and gave rise to a definite religious body whose members were known as the 'sons of the prophets,' i.e. members of the prophetic guild. They had permanent settlements at Bethel, Jericho, and Gilgal, and were especially active during the period of Syrian aggression in the reigns of Ahab and Jehoram. Judging by the depreciatory reference in Am 7^{10} ff., they had already fallen into disrepute by the middle of the 8th century B.C.

7. as occasion serve thee. No restriction is placed upon Saul's actions: the fulfilment of the signs will be a sufficient guarantee that he is divinely guided. As the history shows, the occasion came about a month later when the Ammonites attacked Jabesh-gilead (11^{4} f.).

8. A later insertion designed to introduce 13$^{7b\text{-}15}$. It is in flat contradiction to ^{7}, and interrupts the natural sequence of ^{7} and ^{9}.

12. Is Saul also among the prophets? The whole point of the question turns on the unlikelihood of a man of Saul's parentage and social position associating with these wandering fanatics; this point is further emphasized by the succeeding question, which calls attention to the obscure origin of the prophets. Another explanation of the proverb is given in the very late passage 19^{22} f.

13. to the high place: read either 'to the house,' i.e. his home, or 'to Gibeah.'

17-24. Saul's election by lot (E).

This section clearly belongs to the later narrative, and forms the sequel to 8.

21. Insert with LXX, *and he brought near the family of Matri, man by man.*

22. Read as RVm.

24. Budde suggests very plausibly that the last clause of the verse was originally preceded by the statement 'and Samuel anointed him as king,' since the later narrative must have contained some statement to that effect (cf. 12$^{1, 3}$).

25-27*a*. Unless, with Löhr, we place these verses after 12, as part of the later narrative, they must be regarded as an attempt of the compiler to harmonize the two sources, of which the sequel is given in 11$^{12\text{-}14}$. The natural sequel of Saul's election is Samuel's farewell speech in 12, from which it is now separated by the Jabesh-gilead incident.

25*a*. The later editor evidently took the phrase 'the manner of the kingdom' (8^{9}) to refer to a codified statement of the royal prerogatives.

27. The last clause belongs to the next chapter. Read as LXX (RVm).

XI. **The relief of Jabesh-gilead. Saul's election as king at Gilgal** (J).

1-11, 15. This chapter describes the occasion foreshadowed by Samuel (10 7), and forms the immediate sequel to 9 1-10 16.

7. and after Samuel: omit as a later gloss.

12-13. If 10 25b-27a are retained as a misplaced fragment of E, these verses can hardly be separated from them.

14. The renewal of the kingdom is obviously a device of the compiler for bringing the two accounts of Saul's election into harmony.

XII. The position of Samuel and his attitude towards the monarchy show that this chapter belongs to the later narrative. It closely resembles the parting address of Joshua (Jos 24, E), and is admirably fitted by its contents to form the conclusion of the pre-Deuteronomic book of Judges, which almost certainly included Eli and Samuel among its judges. In its present form the address exhibits undoubted traces of Deuteronomic expansion, especially in the historic survey (6-15), but the substance belongs to an earlier period (E_2).

3. to blind mine eyes therewith: LXX (RVm) is confirmed by Ecclus 46 19.

11. Bedan: read with LXX *Barak*.

and Samuel. The mention of Samuel must be due to a later editor, who forgot that Samuel himself was the speaker. Possibly he was acquainted with the older version of Judges, which included Samuel as the judge who delivered Israel from the Philistines.

12*a* is a later insertion: it directly contradicts the narrative (cf. 8) and also the statement at the end of 11.

15. as it was against your fathers: read RVm (LXX).

XIII.-XIV. (J) give an account of how Saul attempted to carry out the task for which he had been chosen, viz. the deliverance of Israel from the Philistines. They cannot, however, form the immediate sequel to 11, for (*a*) Saul is now the father of a grown-up son, Jonathan (cf. 9 1 ff.); (*b*) some previous notice of Jonathan is presupposed by 13 2 f.; and (*c*) the troops under Saul were most probably a fresh levy summoned to meet an attack of the Philistines. It is not unlikely that an account of the early part of Saul's reign has been omitted to make room for 12. Besides the introductory verse (13 1), there are three other later additions: 13 7b-15a, 19-22, and 14 47-51).

XIII. **1.** A later chronological note similar to those which are found in 2 S 2 10, 5 4; 1 and 2 K. Render: *Saul was . . . years old when he began to reign, and he reigned . . . years over Israel*; the two of the RV has arisen from a faulty repetition of the word 'years.' It was doubtless intended to fill in the blanks later.

2. Michmash, the modern Muḥmās on the northern side of the *Wady es-Suwēnit*, some two miles north-east of Geba.

Gibeah: read *Geba* here and in 14 2, 16 (cf. 13 16). Geba, the modern *Jeba*, was on the south side of the Pass of Michmash, about three miles north-east of Gibeah; the latter, the modern *Tell-el-Fūl*, was three miles north of Jerusalem. The similarity of the two names has caused them to be frequently interchanged; in 3 we must read 'Gibeah.'

3. Read: *And Jonathan smote the officer of the Philistines who was in Gibeah* [10 5], *and the Philistines heard, saying, The Hebrews have revolted, and Saul blew the trumpet throughout all the land.* The term 'Hebrews' is only applied to Israel in the Old Testament when the speaker is a foreigner, or to distinguish Israel from foreigners.

4. to Gilgal: omit as an editorial gloss similar to 10 8. From a military point of view it would have been the height of folly for Saul to retire from the high central ridge to the Jordan valley, and 16 shows that he did nothing of the kind. The words are obviously inserted to prepare the way for 7b-15a.

5. thirty thousand: read with LXX, *three thousand*. The verse indicates that the Philistines had driven in the Israelite outpost at Bethel (2) and compelled Saul to retire on Geba.

7. Now some of the Hebrews: an inadmissible rendering of a corrupt text. Read either 'and much people had,' etc., or 'and they crossed over.'

7*b*-15*a*. The rejection of Saul at Gilgal. The source of this section and its relation to the rest of the narrative are difficult to determine. It can hardly form part of J's narrative, since it interrupts the sequence of 7a and 15b, and is not even hinted at in the subsequent account of the campaign against the Philistines. Nor can it be ascribed to E, because the latter's story of the rejection is given in 15. On the other hand, the meeting between Samuel and Saul (8 f.) was apparently the first that had taken place since the events of 10 8; hence the writer, it may be inferred, had no knowledge of 11 12-14, and his account must have been current prior to the combination of J and E. Probably, as Budde suggests, the section is a later addition to the J narrative, inserted

by a writer who conceived that the non-continuance of Saul's dynasty must be due to some serious transgression. This he found in Saul's failure to stand the test of complete submission to the divine will as expressed in the command of Samuel.

9. and the peace offerings: a later addition. The occasion was one of grave danger for which the burnt offering alone was suitable.

19-22. Probably a fragment relating to the repressive measures adopted by the Philistines (cf. Jg 5 [8]; 2 K 24 [14] ff.), accommodated to the narrative by means of [22].

XIV. **Jonathan's exploit and its sequel.**

2. Gibeah: read *Geba*, and render *by the threshing-floor* instead of 'in Migron.'

4. The scene of the exploit was the pass or ravine of Michmash. The Philistine and Israelite outposts were on the north and south of the ravine respectively, and Jonathan is depicted as making his way down into the *wady*, and then climbing up the steep cliff on the further side.

7. Read with LXX: *Do all to which thine heart inclines: behold, I am with thee; as thy heart so is my heart.*

13. slew them: better *dispatched them.* 'An armour-bearer was not a full-grown warrior, but a sort of page or apprentice in war . . . whose most warlike function is to kill outright those whom his master has struck down' (W. R. Smith, *O.T.J.C.*, 2nd edition, 431 f.).

14. The last clause is hopelessly corrupt.

15. Read: *And there was a trembling in the camp and in the field, and the raiders, they also trembled.*

16. Gibeah: read *Geba.* The last clause should run *and behold, a tumult surging hither and thither.*

18. Read RVm (LXX). A later scribe substituted 'the ark of God' as the more suitable expression, ignoring the fact that the ark had been left at Kiriath-jearim, and that the ephod was the regular medium for obtaining an oracle at this period.

21. Read with LXX: *And the Hebrews who had been in service to the Philistines heretofore, and who had gone up with them into the camp, they also turned to be with the Israelites,* etc.

23. Beth-aven: read with LXX (Luc.) *Bethhoron.*

24. And the men of Israel were distressed that day: read on the basis of the LXX: *And all the people were with Saul, about ten thousand men, and the battle was spread over the hill-country of Ephraim. And Saul imposed a great vow of abstinence on that day and adjured the people, saying,* etc. The imposition of a food taboo was intended to secure the favour of Jehovah.

25, 26. Read on the basis of LXX: *And there was honeycomb upon the face of the ground, and when the people came to the honeycomb, behold, its bees had gone; but no man,* etc.

28. And the people were faint. Probably by a slight change we should read 'and he warned the people.'

32 f. In their eagerness to satisfy their hunger the Israelites slew and devoured the spoil without observing the proper ritual, viz. pouring out the blood to Jehovah. Such an observance is clearly demanded in Dt 12 [15] f., though the actual prohibition of eating with the blood is first found in the Law of Holiness (Lev 17 ff.).

34. that night: read *unto Jehovah.*

36-46. After the defeat of the Philistines Saul consults the oracle with reference to further pursuit, but can obtain no reply. In accordance with the ideas of the times the silence of the oracle could only be interpreted as a sign of divine displeasure, and Saul, who apparently concluded that this was caused by a breach of the food taboo of [24], at once consults the sacred lot in order to discover the guilty party. By a process of elimination Jonathan is revealed as the offender and admits his guilt. He is accordingly condemned to death, but is saved by the intervention of the people. The section is of great interest for Old Testament textual criticism and exegesis. For it not only affords a remarkable illustration of the value of the ancient versions, especially the LXX, for the correction of our Hebrew text, but also furnishes a unique account of the method employed in ascertaining the divine will by means of Urim and Thummim, or the sacred lot. This account is only imperfectly given in Hebrew, but fortunately the LXX has preserved the original text in full. We must restore [41], therefore, on the basis of LXX as follows: 'And Saul said, O Jehovah, God of Israel, why hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If this inquity be in me or in Jonathan my son, O Jehovah, God of Israel, give Urim: but if it be in thy people Israel, give Thummim.' The mutilated Hebrew text is due to the carelessnes of a scribe whose eye passed from one 'Jehovah, God of Israel' to the other, and then from one 'give' to the other. Probably the fuller text of LXX in [42] is also to be restored. Read: 'And Saul said, Cast lots between me and Jonathan my son: he

whom Jehovah shall take shall die. And the people said unto Saul, This thing shall not be: but Saul prevailed over the people. And they cast lots between him and Jonathan his son, and Jonathan was taken.' This addition is not accepted by Wellhausen and Driver, but it obviously agrees with the situation described. The people knew from the first who the culprit was, but reverence for the king kept them silent when Saul proposed to consult the sacred lots (39). They still refrain from interference during the first stage of the enquiry (40), but when the issue is left between Saul and Jonathan their feelings are too much for them, and they utter their first protest. The climax of the drama is reached in 45 when, despite the divine decision and Jonathan's confession, the people refuse to let the latter incur the full penalty of his act.

47-51. Summary of Saul's reign: his family and officers. This section, which obviously interrupts the connexion between 46 and 52, and exhibits unmistakable traces of D's influence, is to be assigned to the D editor who wished to sum up the facts of Saul's reign before introducing his successor in 16. In all probability he did not include 15 in his work, as Saul's rejection had already been set forth in 13 7b-15a. He may well have had old material at his disposal, for there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the notices respecting Saul's family, but his representation of the history is ideal rather than historical: in particular Saul's victories appear to be borrowed from the similar summary of David's reign (2 S 8). Apart from his campaigns against Ammon and the Amalekites Saul's reign was one continuous struggle with the Philistines (52), and not a series of successes (47) against the surrounding nations.

47. he vexed them: read with LXX *he was victorious.*

49. Ishvi. The form of the name preserved in LXX and Lucian points to Ishyo (=man of Jehovah) as the correct name. The alternative form was doubtless Ishbaal (1 Ch 8 33), which was changed later to Ishbosheth. Abinadab, who is mentioned in 31 2, has no doubt been accidentally omitted.

XV. **The war with Amalek: Saul's rejection** (E).

At the command of Jehovah Saul undertakes a war of extermination against Amalek, whose territory lay to the south of Judah. The expedition is successful, but Saul and the people spare Agag the king and the best of the spoil. Samuel therefore announces the divine sentence of rejection, and himself slays Agag. The chapter describes the test (12 14 ff.) which the newly appointed king failed to endure, and forms a suitable climax to the narrative of E, which it closely resembles both in style and language. Indeed, the didactic treatment of history which is characteristic of E (or E_2) is particularly noticeable in this chapter, the account of the rejection being made subservient to the prophetic lesson which the writer wishes to inculcate, viz. that obedience is better than sacrifice: it is not unlikely, therefore, that the narrative has been in part recast. On the other hand, though its contents were such as would specially appeal to the writer of D school, the absence of the latter's characteristic phraseology supports the view that the chapter was not included in D's revision. The section is quite independent of the account given in 13 7b-15a, though it agrees with it in all the main facts, viz. the scene of the incident, Saul's disobedience, and Samuel's announcement that his kingdom will be given to another.

12. Carmel: not the well-known mountain in the plain of Jezreel, but a place in the hill-country of Judah, some seven miles south of Hebron (cf. 25 2 ff.).

15 ff. Throughout the interview Saul is presented in a most unfavourable light. At first he tries to throw the blame of sparing the best of the spoil on the people, while excusing them on the ground that they acted from the best of motives. Samuel sweeps aside his defence by pointing out that the office of king carried with it the responsibility of restraining the people (17 ff.). Saul, however, still maintains that he and the people had in effect carried out Jehovah's commands, and that any deviation from their strict fulfilment was justified by the purpose to which they proposed to devote the spoil.

22 ff. Samuel's reply, which is given in metrical form, sums up the ethical teaching of the 8th-century prophets (cf. Am 5 21 f.; Hos 6 6; Mic 6 8; Is 1 10 f.). True religion, whether in the form of ordinary morality (*ṣedek*), or loving-kindness, or, as here, of obedience, stands on a higher plane than the mere performance of external ritual. Sacrifice indeed is only acceptable as the outward expression of a really religious spirit. It is obvious that this teaching reflects the ideas of a later age than that of E.

23. Render: *Rebellion is as the sin of divination: presumption is as the iniquity of teraphim.*

29. the Strength: render *the Glory*; the verse is probably a later addition.

32. delicately: read *totteringly*.

35. The statement that this was the last occasion on which Samuel met Saul during his lifetime is inconsistent with 19 [18] f., but this latter passage is late and unhistorical. [35c] should stand at the beginning of 16.

XVI. 1-13. **The anointing of David at Bethlehem.**

As neither of the two main sources (16 [14] ff. and 17 [12] ff.) display any knowledge of this incident, most scholars are agreed that it is a very late addition designed to show that David as well as Saul was anointed by Samuel. The details of the incident itself are lacking in probability, and throughout the subsequent history Saul alone is described as the anointed of Jehovah.

2. The instructions given to Samuel present several unusual features: (*a*) the sacrifice intended is apparently that of a peace offering, in which case the victims would normally be supplied by the offerer; (*b*) the animal selected is quite exceptional (only Gen 15 [9]; Dt 21 [3]); (*c*) Samuel's hesitancy and the anxiety of the elders are both inexplicable.

5. and come with me to the sacrifice: read with LXX *and rejoice with me today*, viz. by taking part in the sacrifice and the meal that followed. It is noticeable that the narrative contains no further reference to the sacrifice.

9. Shammah: read as in 2 S 13 [3] f. *Shimeah*: in 2 S 21 [21] the form 'Shimei' is given.

12. and withal of a beautiful countenance. This is hardly a possible rendering of the Hebrew. By a slight change we should read here and in 17 [42] *a stripling with beautiful eyes*.

13. came mightily upon, lit. 'rushed upon': the force of the expression, which occurs in 10 [6, 10], is here weakened by the addition 'from that day forward.'

14-XVIII. 5. **David's introduction to Saul.**

XVI. 14-23. Saul is troubled by an evil spirit from Jehovah, and his servants therefore suggest that a skilful musician should be provided to charm away his melancholy. For this purpose David the son of Jesse of Bethlehem, who is described in [18] as 'cunning in playing [and a mighty man of valour and a man of war], and prudent in speech [or "in affairs"], and a comely person,' is invited to the court where he is given the post of armour-bearer.

XVII. 1-XVIII. 5. During one of Israel's numerous encounters with the Philistines, Saul and his army are defied by the giant Goliath of Gath. Despite Saul's lavish promises no Israelite is willing to meet the giant until David, the youngest son of Jesse, who has been sent by his father from Bethlehem with supplies for his brothers, volunteers to accept the challenge. After seeking to dissuade David on account of his youth, Saul wishes to equip the youth with his own armour, but the latter wisely declines to use weapons to which he is not accustomed.

The contest ends in the complete discomfiture of the Philistine, who is struck down by a stone from David's sling. After the conclusion of the fight Saul, on enquiry, learns the parentage of the youth from his own lips. Jonathan conceives a great affection for the young man, and adopts him at his bosom friend, while the king insists on his remaining at court.

In their present form the two accounts of David's introduction to Saul given in 16 [14] ff. and 17 [1] ff. differ widely in three respects. According to 16 [14] ff. (J): (*a*) David is a man of mature age and an experienced warrior; (*b*) he owes his introduction to the court to his personality and skill, and is appointed to a post which entails his constant attendance on Saul; (*c*) the king is fully aware of his parentage, and in fact obtains Jesse's consent to David's residence at court. In the other account (17 [1] ff.): (*a*) David is a shepherd lad who is unaccustomed to ordinary weapons of war; (*b*) he lives with his father at Bethlehem, and first comes under Saul's notice when he offers to fight the Philistine; (*c*) Saul only discovers his parentage after the conclusion of the fight. These remarkable discrepancies are most naturally explained by the hypothesis that they are due to the combination of two sources, a solution which is confirmed by the attempt of the compiler to harmonize the two narratives in 17 [15]. But the problem of the sources, or rather of the extent of the sources, is complicated by the fact that the genuine text of the LXX (codex Vaticanus) omits 17 [12-31, 38*b*, 41, 48*b*, 50, 55]-18 [5]. It is highly significant that this shorter text eliminates two of the discrepancies mentioned above [(*b*) and (*c*)], and since the description of David in 16 [18] as 'a mighty man of valour and a man of war' is almost certainly a later insertion, the grounds for dissociating that part of 17 which is preserved in the LXX version from the J narrative disappear. Moreover, the verses omitted by the LXX, when read consecutively, give an almost complete account of David's fight with the Philistine giant,

though in a different setting to that of 1-11. 32 ff. It is noticeable, also, that the section 12-31 connects very awkwardly with what precedes and follows (see below), while the words of David in 32 would come more naturally from Saul's armour-bearer than from an unknown youth. In view of the evidence supplied by the LXX it is hardly doubtful that the verses omitted in that version really belong to E, and that the remainder of 17 forms part of J's narrative. The description of the actual fight was probably very similar in both sources, and the editor in the main adhered to J's version, but traces of another source are to be seen in 41 and 50. The shorter text of the LXX can best be accounted for by the supposition that the whole of E's version was not incorporated in the Hebrew text from which the LXX translation was made.

XVI. **14.** The disease from which Saul suffered was apparently some form of recurrent mania rather than melancholy. The ancient world regarded all diseases, and especially all mental diseases, as caused by the agency of evil spirits. The description of the evil spirit which affected Saul as an agent of Jehovah points to the beginning of a wider conception of Jehovah's power and influence.

18. and a mighty man of valour, and a man of war. This description of David is not consistent either with his post of armour-bearer (see on 14 13), or with Saul's request to his father (19) (cf. also the language of Saul, 33 f.), and was probably inserted later in order to connect this verse with 14 52.

19. which is with the sheep: a harmonistic addition presupposing more knowledge on Saul's part than the narrative warrants.

XVII. **4. named Goliath of Gath.** According to 2 S 21 19 Goliath of Gath was slain by Elhanan the son of Jair in the reign of David. Critics are agreed that the latter statement is the more historical, and that the name of the giant slain by an otherwise unknown warrior Elhanan was transferred in course of time to the nameless giant slain by David. For it is noticeable that throughout J's account (save here) the Philistine champion is described either as 'the Philistine' or 'this Philistine.'

12-31. E's account of the fight omitted by LXX (B).

12. Now David was the son of . . .: read *Now there was a man, an Ephrathite . . .* In its present ungrammatical form the verse is an unskilful attempt to harmonize the following section with the previous narrative; originally it formed the beginning of a fresh section.

15. A harmonistic addition; according to E David was unknown to Saul till after the fight (53 f.).

16. Probably a later addition. E's account must have contained some introductory notice of the scene of the encounter and of the Philistine champion which has been omitted by the compiler: cf. 23, where a knowledge of the giant's challenge is presupposed.

23. It is hardly conceivable that the giant's name was given here for the first time in E's narrative: no doubt the name is a later insertion.

26. the living God. This title only occurs in Dt 5 26; Jer 10 10, 23 36. Probably this last clause, which is repeated in 36, is a Deuteronomic addition.

31. and he sent for him. The Hebrew can only be translated 'and he took him.' Read with LXX (Luc.) *and they took him and brought him unto Saul.*

39. and he essayed to go: read with LXX *and he wearied himself to go.*

41. Wanting in LXX (B), and probably therefore an extract from E's account parallel to 48a.

45. the God of the armies of Israel. This explanation of the title Jehovah Ṣĕbā'ōth (Lord of Hosts) reflects a primitive conception of Jehovah as the national God who led the armies of Israel, which has its counterpart in the ideas underlying the history of the ark.

46-47. These verses have been expanded by a writer of the Deuteronomic school.

50. LXX omits. The verse is a variation of 49 and belongs to E.

51. and took his sword. As an armour-bearer David would be equipped with a short sword or dagger (cf. 39), with which he dispatched the giant.

52. Gai: read with LXX *Gath*, unless the whole clause is to be omitted as an incorrect form of the last clause of the verse.

54. and brought it to Jerusalem: clearly a later insertion, though found in LXX (B). Jerusalem remained in the hands of the Jebusites till after David's accession.

XVIII. **6-31. Saul's growing jealousy of David.**

In this chapter the LXX (B) again gives a shorter and more original text, which affords a straightforward and consistent account of David's relations with Saul and of the latter's growing resentment, and like the shorter version of 17 is to be assigned to J. The song of the women

first excited Saul's jealousy and distrust, 'and Saul was afraid of David' (12). He accordingly removes him from attendance on his person and gives him the command of a body of troops. David, however, proves himself a capable leader, with the result that 'Saul stood in awe of him' (15). Saul next offers him his daughter Michal in marriage on condition that he obtains a hundred Philistine foreskins. David carries out this task successfully, and marries Michal. 'And Saul saw and knew that Jehovah was with David, and that all Israel (LXX) loved him, and he was yet the more afraid of David' (28, 29). The verses omitted by LXX are 6a, 8a, d, 10, 11, 12b, 17-19, 21b, 29b and 30. The additions of the Hebrew text are, with the exception of 10, 11, either fragments of E's narrative or the work of the redactor.

10, 11 (J). This open attempt on David's life is obviously out of place so early in the narrative. Psychologically it is improbable that Saul should have recourse to open violence before he had exhausted the less direct methods described in this chapter. It would be natural to ascribe these verses to E, but 19 9, 10 (the parallel account) belong to that source: hence these verses must be regarded as a misplaced fragment from J.

raved, as RVm, i.e. was in a condition of mad frenzy.

17-19 (E). Saul had promised his elder daughter in marriage to the slayer of the Philistine giant (17 25) according to E's narrative.

who are my kinsfolk, as RVm.

21b is an attempt on the part of the redactor to harmonize the two accounts of David's betrothal (17-19 and 20-29).

27. two hundred: read *one hundred* (cf. 2 S 3 14).

XIX., XX. The difficulties and inconsistencies which arise in connexion with this narrative of Saul's open display of hostility towards David, and of Jonathan's intervention on behalf of his friend, are largely due to the combination of the two main sources, 19 being derived in the main from E, and 20 from J. Critics are agreed that 19 18-24 is a very late and unhistorical insertion.

XIX. **1-7.** This account of Jonathan's mediation is really parallel to the further narrative of J in 20. Once this fact is realized the difficulties created by Jonathan's statement in 20 2 disappear.

8-10. It is probable that the incident of the spear-throwing originally preceded 1-7 and formed the immediate sequel to 18 19.

11-17. Saul attempts to slay David in his house, but the latter escapes by the aid of his wife. If with H. P. Smith we assign this dramatic incident to J, it forms an admirable climax to the latter's version of Saul's attempts on the life of David describing how Saul sought to kill him on the very night of his marriage. The objection to this view, that it necessitates the ascription of 20 to an independent source, since Jonathan denies (20 2) that David is in any danger, is not necessarily conclusive. Saul's jealousy of David and his designs on his life must have been an open secret, and if, as 20 implies, Jonathan had no inkling of his father's motives in promoting David, it is conceivable that this attempt also, which must have been carried out with great secrecy, had been kept hidden from him.

11. And Saul sent: read on the basis of LXX: *And it came to pass on that night that Saul sent,* transferring the words 'that night' from 10 (where they have no point) to 11.

13. the teraphim: Gen 31 19, Jg 17 5 *v.n.* The presence of images in David's house is certainly unexpected, but the introduction of such superstitious objects is possibly to be ascribed to Michal.

18-24. David's flight to Ramah. The grounds for rejecting this section as very late and unhistorical are briefly: (*a*) A meeting between Saul and Samuel is excluded by 15 35; (*b*) the representation of Samuel as head of the prophets is inconsistent with the earlier tradition (cf. 10 5); (*c*) the natural direction of David's flight would be to his kinsfolk in the south (cf. 21, 22 1) and not to Ramah in the north; (*d*) an entirely different and obviously more genuine explanation of the proverb 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' has already been given in 10 10 f.

This section has unfortunately given rise to two misconceptions which have been widely accepted by commentators in the past: (1) that the community of prophets at Ramah lived in a 'college' or 'school' (Ewald's explanation of 'Naioth'), and (2) that Samuel was the head of this community. There is in reality as little historical foundation for either of these inferences as there is for the theory that the prophets were engaged in literary work.

XX. (J). In order to convince Jonathan that Saul was seeking to slay him, David devises a plan for testing Saul's feelings towards him. He will absent himself from his customary seat at the royal table. If his absence is remarked, Jonathan is to explain that he had given David leave to attend a family sacrifice at Bethle-

hem. Saul's reception of this excuse will afford the required clue to his real attitude towards David (1-10). (Jonathan promises to let David know what is the result of the plan, and makes a covenant with him [11-17].) If the king takes exception to Jonathan's explanation of David's absence, the latter is to hide himself in some place near, and on the third day Jonathan will make a pretence of practising archery, and by his commands to his attendant will indicate to David what has happened (18-23). The plan works: on the second day Saul notices David's absence, and when Jonathan offers his explanation breaks out into violent anger against his son (24-34). The next day Jonathan goes to the rendezvous, and by his orders with regard to the arrows warns David that he must flee (35-39). (Jonathan and David bid each other farewell (40-42).)

1. The opening clause is an addition by the compiler who inserted 19 18-24.

5. **the new moon**, i.e. the day on which the new moon first appeared. The religious festival held on this day was regarded as of great importance (cf. Am 8 5; Hos 2 11; Is 1 13, where it is mentioned along with the Sabbath).

I should not fail to sit: read with LXX *and I will not sit.* David's presence at the king's table was not due to any special occasion, such as the feast of the new moon, but was his regular practice (cf. 25).

11-17. A later addition which interrupts the course of the main narrative. No reason is given for the withdrawal into the field (11), and Jonathan's request to David seems to imply that he is aware that the latter will succeed to the throne; The text is very corrupt, especially in 14-16, where we should probably read on the basis of LXX: 'And oh that, if I am still alive, oh that thou wouldst show towards me the kindness of Jehovah; and if I should die, oh that thou wouldst not cut off thy mercy from my house for ever. And if, when Jehovah cutteth off the enemies of David, every one from the face of the earth, the name of Jonathan be cut off from the house of Saul [LXX, Luc.], then may Jehovah require it at the hand of David' (cf. 24 21).

19. **by the stone Ezel**: read *by yonder mound.*

20. **and I will shoot three arrows**: read on the basis of LXX, *and on the third day I will shoot arrows.*

21. **Behold, the arrows are . . . take them and come**: read *Behold, the arrow . . . take it—then come for,* etc.

25. **stood up**: read with LXX *was in front,* i.e. sitting opposite Saul.

40-42. A later addition which makes nonsense of the preceding narrative. **out of a place toward the South**: read with LXX 'from beside the mound' (cf. 19).

XXI., XXII. **David's Flight to Nob, and the Massacre of the Priests.**

David flees to Nob where, under a false pretext, he obtains food for his men and also the sword of (Goliath) the Philistine giant (1-9). He then journeys towards the south-west, and finally settles in the stronghold of Adullam, where he is joined by his kinsfolk and a large number of those who were discontented or oppresed; for greater security he places his parents under the protection of the king of Moab (22 1-4). Meantime, Saul at Gibeah had been informed of David's retreat. He first learns, however, of David's visit to Nob from Doeg the Edomite, who had been present at the interview between David and Ahimelech. He summons the latter and the priests of Nob, and accuses them of conspiring with David. Ahimelech in vain protests his innocence, and on Saul's orders Doeg slays all the priests. Abiathar alone escapes and takes refuge with David (6-23). The two chapters (apart from 21 10-15) appear to connect quite naturally, and are usually assigned to J, but closer investigation makes it probable that the editor has had recourse to two sources, taking 21 1-19 from E and its sequel, 22 from J. It is noticeable that great emphasis is laid in 21 on the sacred character of the bread supplied by Abimelech, while in 22 stress is laid on the fact that Ahimelech had 'enquired of God' for David; the description of Doeg also differs in the two chapters. No doubt both sources contained complete accounts of David's visit and its result.

XXI. 3. Read with LXX: *And now if there are five loaves under thy hand, give them into my hand.*

4. **holy bread**, i.e. shewbread, lit. 'the bread of the presence.' This was laid before Jehovah, and so consecrated. According to later legislation it consisted of twelve loaves, which were renewed every Sabbath and could be eaten by the priests only (Lev 24 5 ff.). This passage shows that greater liberty with regard to their disposal was permitted in earlier times.

5. The exact meaning is uncertain. Render: *Of a truth women have been taboo in reference to us as heretofore when I have gone forth* (viz. on a military expedition), *so that the gear* (clothes, arms, etc.) *of the young men is holy, even though it is a common* (i.e. not a sacred) *journey; how much more so when to-day they will*

be consecrated with (their) *gear?* (Driver). David argues that it has been his practice to insist on sexual taboo even on ordinary expeditions as opposed to regular campaigns; for the latter the warriors were solemnly consecrated.

7. detained before the Lord. Doeg, though a foreigner, was a worshipper of Jehovah. The term 'detained' implies that he had incurred some defilement from which he had to be purified before he could enter the sanctuary.

the chiefest of the herdmen: read *the mightiest of the runners* who formed Saul's bodyguard (22 17 RVm).

9. The name of Goliath here and in 22 10 is a later insertion.

behind the ephod: this passage is important as indicating that the ephod must have been a figure or image which stood erect (see 2 28).

10-15. A very late addition similar to 16 1-13, 19 18-24. The object of the writer was doubtless to substitute a shorter and less compromising visit to Achish for the genuine account given in 27. It is most improbable that David should seek refuge with the hereditary enemies of his country until all other manner of escape had failed; the phrase 'king of the land' attests the late origin of the section.

XXII. **1. the cave of Adullam:** so 2 S 23 13; elsewhere (4, 5; 2 S 23 14), the more correct term 'stronghold' is used. Adullam is identified with the modern Aid-el-Ma on the edge of the *Shephēlah*, about twelve miles south-west of Bethlehem.

5. Gad elsewhere (2 S 24 11=1 Ch 21 9) is described as David's seer. His introduction here is an anachronism, while his instructions to David are meaningless unless with Syr. 'Mizpeh' is read for 'hold' in 4 and 5. Adullam was in Judah.

6. on the height, as RVm.

14. and is taken into thy council: an inadmissible rendering. Read with LXX *and is captain over thy bodyguard.*

18. that did wear a linen ephod. Omit 'linen' with LXX, and render as elsewhere *who bore the ephod* (cf. 2 28).

19. A late addition. The description is very similar to that of 15 3 (the ban on Amalek), but there is no analogy for the ban being applied to an Israelite city except in the very late story Jg 20, 21.

XXIII.-XXVII. **David as an outlaw.**

XXIII. **1-14.** David delivers Keilah from the Philistines, but retires from the city on hearing that Saul is proposing to besiege it, and later takes refuge in the wilderness of Ziph (where he is visited by Jonathan, 15-18).

1. Keilah: a frontier town of Judah, almost three miles south of Adullam.

6. A marginal note which has crept into the text explaining how David was able to obtain an oracle. As a matter of fact Abiathar had joined David at Adullam (22 20).

11. Will the men of Keilah, etc. This question is obviously premature in view of 12, and should be omitted.

14. in the wilderness: *sc.* of Judah on the west of the Dead Sea.

in the wilderness of Ziph: a small but comparatively fertile plateau to the south of Hebron.

15-18. This section is a late addition similar to 20 11-17, 40-42.

15. in the wood: read here and in 16, 18, 19 *in Horesh* or *Horeshah.*

19-XXIV. 22. E's account of the sparing of Saul's life by David.

The Ziphites inform Saul of David's whereabouts, and the king goes off in pursuit to the wilderness of Maon, but, when on the point of surrounding David and his men, receives an urgent summons to repel an attack of the Philistines, and has to abandon the pursuit. On his return he learns that David has removed to Engedi, and immediately sets off for that district. By chance Saul enters the cave in which David and his men had taken up their quarters. David rejects the suggestion of his followers that he should slay Saul, but unknown to Saul cuts off the skirt of his robe. After Saul had departed, David calls after him and tells him what he has done in proof of his innocence of any design against Saul's life. Saul is greatly moved by David's chivalrous action, and confesses that the latter is more righteous than he is; and the two separate. That this narrative is a parallel version of the story set forth in 26 is beyond dispute. In each account the main theme—the sparing of Saul's life—is the same, the scene of the incident is the same, and lastly the dialogue is couched in very similar language. The main grounds for regarding 26 as the older are (1) its more precise statement as to David's companions (8 as opposed to 24 3 ff.); (2) the early religious conceptions underlying 26 19, 20; (3) the shorter and simpler language employed by Saul (21, 25) as contrasted with 24 17-21; and perhaps (4) the greater likelihood of the occasion of the incident in 26 7 ff., viz. the bold venture into the king's camp.

19. in the wood: render *in Horeshah.* The indefinite 'strongholds' excludes a more precise definition of the locality:

hence the last clause is to be rejected as an insertion from 26 [1].

22. make yet more sure: render *make further preparations.* The remainder of the verse is very obscure, and many scholars emend to 'know and consider his place where his fleeting [LXX] foot may be.'

24. the wilderness of Maon: the extensive steppe lying to the east of the modern *Ma'in*, four and a half miles south of Ziph.

in the Arabah. This cannot be right, since the *Arabah* is the technical term for the deep depression through which the Jordan flows, whereas the wilderness of Maon is some 3,000 feet high.

29. Engedi. The modern *Ain-jidi* is a spring on the western slopes of the Dead Sea and some 600 feet above the latter. As the Dead Sea is nearly 1,300 feet below the level of the Mediterranean, it is impossible to describe David as going up 'from Maon to Engedi.' Probably the verse is a later insertion.

XXIV. **4-7.** The sequence of events is greatly improved if, with most scholars, the order is altered to $4^a, 6, 7^a, 4^b, 7^b$.

13. The inference to be drawn from the proverb is that David is not wicked, since he has not harmed Saul. Others, however, explain it as meaning that the destruction of the wicked is the inevitable result of their misdeeds. The fact that the last clause repeats the first clause of ^{12} points to the verse being a marginal gloss.

16. that Saul said, Is this thy voice, my son David? These words recur in 26 [17], where they are entirely in keeping with David's visit to the camp by night, and where David's reply is given. Here they have no point, and are to be rejected as a later insertion.

18. and thou hast declared this day: read: *This day thou hast magnified that which thou hast done to me in the way of good.*

20 ff. Saul's reference to the succession of David is hardly probable in this context, and the text has clearly been expanded by a later editor in the light of subsequent events (cf. 20 [14] f.).

XXV. **Nabal and Abigail** (J).

Nabal of the clan of Caleb was a wealthy sheep-owner of Maon, whose flocks were sent at certain seasons to the pastures of Carmel. Here they had been protected by David and his men from the Bedawin tribes living on the borders of the desert. David at the festival of sheep-shearing asks for some return for his services in the past. Nabal, who probably was aware of the straits to which David was reduced, denies any obligation and gratuitously insults David's messengers. David at once sets out with 400 men to punish Nabal for his insolence. Meanwhile, Abigail, the beautiful wife of Nabal, had been informed of her husband's churlish behaviour. She at once realizes the danger of the situation, and starts off, unknown to Nabal, to intercede with David, taking a large supply of food as a present. The two companies meet halfway. Abigail frankly admits her husband's folly, but pleads for forgiveness, urging that in time to come David will be glad that he has not incurred bloodguiltiness by taking vengeance on Nabal. David acknowledges the wisdom of what she says, accepts the present, and promises to forgo his vengeance. On her return Abigail finds her husband drunk, and waits till the morning before telling him of the danger which he had so narrowly escaped. The shock of the news coming on top of his excesses brings on a paralytic stroke, and ten days later Nabal dies. After a short interval David marries Abigail, thus allying himself to the powerful clan of Caleb. He further increases his influence in the south of Judah by marrying Ahinoam of Jezreel (in Judah). Michal had previously been given by Saul to Paltiel, a Benjamite.

1*a*. An editorial note of the death and burial of Samuel derived from 28 [3].

Paran: read with LXX *Maon.* The wilderness of Paran between the peninsula of Sinai and Edom lay too far to the south.

2. Carmel: see on 15 [12]. Sheep-shearing like harvest and vintage was an occasion of great festivity and hospitality (cf. Gen 38 [13]; 2 S 13 [23]).

3. Abigail is described as a capable woman and comely, Nabal as an unmannerly boor.

of the house of Caleb: the clan to whom the district around Hebron belonged (Jg 1 [20]): it was later absorbed by Judah.

6. to him that liveth in prosperity: read with a slight emendation *to my brother* (cf. 2 S 20 [9]; 1 K 9 [13]).

10. my water: read with LXX *my wine.*

22. Nabal (RVm): 'fool' hardly expresses the force of the Hebrew word, which denotes a selfish boor, one who regards neither God nor man (cf. Is 32 [5] f.). Render (with Driver) *Churl is his name, and churlishness is his nature.*

26. Smith is probably right in omitting as a gloss. It interrupts the natural sequence of Abigail's speech, and the wish that David's enemies should become

like Nabal implies that she foresaw the latter's speedy death.

29. Read with a slight change of the text *and should a man rise up . . . then may the life of my lord be bound up in the bundle of life with* [i.e. under the protection of] *Jehovah thy God.*

43. Jezreel: not the northern city in the plain of Esdraelon, but a town in the neighbourhood of Maon, Carmel, and Ziph (Jos 15 [56]).

XXVI. **J's account of the sparing of Saul's life.**

This account differs from that of E in regard to the way in which Saul falls into David's hands. On one occasion during Saul's pursuit of David, the latter boldly penetrates into the royal camp by night, accompanied only by Abishai the son of Zeruiah. Owing to the negligence of the guard they reach Saul's tent unperceived. David restrains Abishai from laying violent hands on the king, but carries off the latter's spear and cruse of water. David then retires to a neighbouring height whence he rouses the sleeping camp. He first taunts Abner for sleeping at his post, and when Saul recognizes his voice, makes a pathetic appeal to the king himself. Saul's better feelings are aroused by David's words and by his action, and he promises to refrain from further persecution. David sends back the spear, and they go their respective ways.

1. the hill of Hachilah: usually identified with the long ridge *Dahr el-Kola*, five and a half miles east of Ziph, which runs out towards the Dead Sea desert, or Jeshimon.

4. of a certainty. The same phrase occurs in 23 [23], but here the construction of the sentence demands the name of some place.

6. Ahimelech the Hittite, only mentioned here.

Abishai, the brother of Asahel and Joab. Contrary to usage, the brothers are always described as 'the sons of Zeruiah,' according to 1 Ch 2 [16] the sister of David. Smith suggests that their father may have been a foreigner, and the marriage a *sadika* marriage (see Jg 8 [31], 14 [1] ff.). Less probable is the view that the mother's name was given because of her relationship to David, or because the father was already dead (2 S 2 [32]).

17. Owing to the darkness ([7]) and also to the distance which separated them ([13]), Saul's only clue to the identity of the speaker is his voice.

19 ff. David can conceive of only two possible reasons for Saul's hostility towards himself. Either it was directly caused by Jehovah who had been offended by some action of David, in which case he might be propitiated by an offering, or it was due to some misrepresentation on the part of men; if so, let them be accursed of God, for the effect of their action would be to compel David to serve other gods.

19. let him accept an offering. The Hebrew goes back to the early anthropomorphic conception underlying the ritual of sacrifice (cf. Gen 8 [21]).

20. a flea: read with LXX *my life.*

25. Saul's reply is in striking contrast to the long statement of 24 [17] ff.

XXVII. 1-XXVIII. 2 (J). David realizes that he cannot hope for any permanent reconciliation with Saul, and that his present mode of life cannot go on indefinitely. He therefore enters the service of Achish, king of Gath, and at his own request is assigned the city of Ziklag. The remoteness of the city from the Philistine capital enables him to deceive Achish as to the object of the expeditions which he now undertakes against the desert tribes dwelling in the extreme south of Palestine; to guard against any discovery of his deception he is forced to destroy all those who fall into his hands. The Philistines prepare for a further campaign against Israel, and David is appointed to the command of the royal bodyguard.

XXVII. **6. Ziklag:** usually identified with *Ṣuheliḳa*, eleven miles south-east of Gaza. It is mentioned as belonging to Judah (Jos 15 [31]), and also to Simeon (Jos 19 [5]): according to Neh 11 [28] it was still in Israel's possession as late as the Exile.

8. the Geshurites and the Girzites: probably a duplicate form of the same name, since LXX gives only the first name. Nothing is known of a tribe of any such name in the south of Palestine: the Geshurites of 2 S 3 [3], who dwelt on the north-east of the Sea of Galilee, are obviously out of the question.

which were of old: read *which is from Telam* (cf. Jos 15 [14]).

9. The last clause seems to imply that David had his headquarters at Gath. Hence Wellhausen rejects [7-12], the contents of which are not presupposed by 30. A more probable explanation is that David had to hand over part of his spoil to his overlord (Kennedy).

10. the South: Hebrew *Negeb* (see pp. 129*b* and 635*b*).

XXVIII. 3*b*-25. **Saul and the witch of Endor.**

Saul, who has been unable to obtain a divine oracle by any of the orthodox methods, is driven in despair to consult

a necromancer. He accordingly disguises himself, and makes his way by night to Endor, which lay to the north of the Philistine position. After assuring the woman, whom he wishes to consult, with regard to her security from punishment, he requests her to bring up Samuel. The request arouses the woman's suspicions, and on looking more closely she recognizes her visitor as Saul. The king calms her fears, and the proceedings are resumed. The medium claims to see a spirit in the shape of an old man whom Saul identifies as Samuel. In reply to the king's question the spirit announces the defeat of Israel on the morrow and the death of Saul and his sons. The shock of the news, coupled with the fact that he had taken no food all day, is too much for Saul, who falls into a faint. Later he is persuaded to take some food before departing.

The story attests the widespread belief in necromancy in Israel. This belief dates from early days, when it was believed that the spirits of the dead still retained the outward semblance of their former selves, were acquainted with what took place on earth, and exercised a powerful influence on the fortunes of their descendants.

When the later conception of Sheol with its shadowy existence became the accepted doctrine, the practice of necromancy was regarded as inconsistent with the worship of Jehovah, and was vigorously opposed by all, who like Saul were devoted to Jehovah's service. It is only as a last desperate expedient that the king has recourse to this 'black magic.'

7. a woman that hath a familiar spirit: render *a woman who is a necromancer*, lit. 'the mistress of a ghost or spirit.' In the *locus classicus* Dt 18 [11], the phrase 'a consulter with a familiar spirit or a wizard' should be translated 'one that consulteth a ghost or a familiar spirit.' There were two classes of mediums or necromancers: (*a*) those who professed to call up any ghost, and (*b*) those who consulted the particular spirit which was their 'familiar' (Driver on Dt 18). From Is 8 [19], 29 [4] we learn that the oracles obtained in this way were delivered in a thin twittering voice, which seemed to come out of the ground, doubtless a true description of the ventriloquistic method employed by the necromancer (cf. LXX *engastrimuthoi*). Driver explains that 'the medium pretends to see a ghost which she describes, but her dupes only hear a voice, which by ventriloquism seems to come from the ground.'

12. and when the woman saw Samuel. Most moderns agree that 'Samuel' here is a mistake for 'Saul.' Render *and when the woman looked at Saul.* On looking closely at her visitor she is able to penetrate his disguise. [13] f. show that any mention of Samuel would be premature.

13. a god: Hebrew 'Elohim,' here used, as in Is 8 [19], for the *manes*, or spirits of the dead.

16. and is become thy adversary. This rendering can only be retained if the Hebrew is amended; many scholars follow LXX, Syriac in RVm.

17-19*a*. A later insertion based on 15: see below.

hath wrought for himself: read with LXX *hath done unto thee.*

19. be with me: read with LXX *with thee shall be fallen.*

As indicated above, Saul's visit to Endor should immediately precede 31. In its present position it interrupts the main narrative in which 29 follows after 28 [2]. This order is confirmed by the statements of the respective movements of the Philistine and Israelite armies. In 29 [1] the Philistines first assemble at Aphek in the plain of Sharon, while the Israelites encamp at Jezreel. After the departure of David and his men the Philistines advance to Jezreel and the Israelites fall back on Mount Gilboa. But according to the narrative of 28 [3] ff. the Philistines were already at Shunem, just north of Jezreel, while the Israelites are at Mount Gilboa. Thus the positions of the two armies in 28 correspond to a later stage in the advance of the Philistines than that described in 29 [1].

The reasons for assigning 28 [3] ff. to J are briefly: (1) Samuel is depicted rather as the seer of 9, 10 [1-16], and not as the 'judge' of the later narrative; (2) the general character of the section is more in keeping with the earlier source. The undoubted reference to 15 in [17-19*a*] cannot be urged in support of the view that the section as a whole belongs to E, for these verses can hardly have formed part of the original narrative; they are a later insertion from 15 (cf. the repetition of the same clause at the beginning and end of [19]). Budde accounts for the present position of the section by supposing that it was omitted from religious scruples by the Deuteronomic editor, as were Jg 9, 16, and afterwards restored by the final editor, though in the wrong place.

XXIX. (J). When the Philistine troops pass in review before their princes, the latter take exception to the presence of David and his men on the ground that

the approaching battle would afford the former too tempting an opportunity of making his peace with Israel at their expense. Achish is reluctantly compelled, therefore, to dismiss David, and he and his men return to Ziklag. David apparently resents this suspicion of his loyalty to Achish, but the action of the princes undoubtedly released him from a very difficult position.

1. by the fountain which is in Jezreel: usually identified with *'Ain Jalud* at the foot of Mount Gilboa, but the construction of the Hebrew is an unusual one, and it is probable that some place-name has dropped out after the word 'fountain.'

3. these days or these years: read with LXX *for a year or two years.*

10. Insert with LXX at the end of clause *a, and go unto the place which I appointed to you, and think no evil in thy heart, for thou art good in my sight.*

XXX. (J). Meantime the Amalekites had taken advantage of David's absence to make a raid on the south of Judah, and when the latter returns to Ziklag he finds the city in ruins and the inhabitants carried off as captives. His followers at first lay the blame on their leader, and threaten to stone him; but David puts his trust in Jehovah, and after consulting the ephod sets off in pursuit. At the brook Besor he is forced to leave 200 of his followers who were too exhausted to continue. The remaining 400 push on, and with the aid of an Egyptian slave, who had been abandoned by his master, overtake the raiders. The Amalekites are surprised while celebrating their success, and their whole force, save 400 young men who rode on camels, put to the sword. All the captives are recovered and much booty secured. On the return journey a dispute arises as to the division of the spoil, and David lays down the rule that on a campaign those who guard the baggage shall share equally with those who fight. From his own share of the spoil David sends rich presents to the elders of various cities in the south of Judah as well as to others living in the localities which he had frequented during the period of his outlawry.

9. The last clause should be omitted as a gloss to 10^{5b}.

the brook Besor: possibly the *Wady esh-Sheri'a,* four or five miles south of *Suhelika* (27^{6} *v.n.*), but the identification is purely conjectural.

17. of the next day: read *to put them to the ban.*

20. The text is in disorder. Read on the basis of LXX: *And they took all the flocks and the herds, and drove them before them, and said.*

23. Ye shall not do so . . . given unto us: read on the basis of LXX: *Ye shall not do so, my brethren, after what Jehovah hath given us and hath preserved us,* etc.

24. P in Nu 31^{27} ff. does not hesitate to ascribe the rule here established by David to Moses.

26-31. The cities enumerated were all situated in the extreme south of Judah, and must not be confused with better-known places bearing similar names, e.g. Bethel, Aroer, etc. The clans of Caleb and Jerahmeel were allied to Judah, and later absorbed by it. By his diplomatic action David strengthens the friendly relations which he had already established during his sojourn in the south of Judah.

XXXI. 1-2 S. II. 27. **Double account of the death of Saul at the battle of Mount Gilboa; David's lament.**

The battle which followed after the visit to Endor resulted in the severe defeat of Israel and the death of Saul and of three of his sons. The bodies of the king and his sons are carried off to Beth-shan, whence they are recovered by the men of Jabesh-gilead. The news of the defeat and of Saul's death is conveyed to David at Ziklag. David and his men mourn and fast till evening. Then follows David's lament. The main part of these chapters is to be assigned to J, but portions of E's account of Saul's death have been preserved in 2 S $1^{6-10.\ 13-16}$. According to the earlier source Saul, who was probably wounded (LXX), commits suicide after his armour-bearer had refused to slay him; in E's account a fugitive Amalekite kills him while he is suffering from cramp (or giddiness), though unwounded. The divergence of the two accounts has been explained by supposing that the Amalekite invented the story of 2 S 1^{6} ff., but (*a*) the narrative contains no hint of his story being false; (*b*) in the subsequent reference to the battle (4^{9} ff., J) the messenger is represented as simply reporting the death of Saul, not as claiming to have killed him; (*c*) 4^{12} ff. implies that David himself slew the messenger for having laid hands on the Lord's anointed.

XXXI. = 1 Ch 10^{1-12}.

Abinadab is wrongly identified in RVm with Ishvi (14^{49}); the latter apparently was not at the battle.

3. and he was greatly distressed: read with LXX *was wounded.*

4. thrust me through and abuse me. The first verb is to be omitted with Chronicles, and the second rendered

make mock of me. Saul is afraid that they will take him alive and make mock of him, as they did in the case of Samson (Jg 16).

7. on the other side of the valley, i.e. the broad valley of Jezreel, which runs down in a south-eastern direction from the north of Gilboa to Beth-shan and thence to the Jordan.

and they that were beyond Jordan, i.e. on the east of Jordan. The clause is wanting in Chronicles, and is probably a false gloss; there is no evidence that the Philistines ever penetrated beyond Jordan.

9. the house of their idols: omit *the house of* with Chronicles and LXX.

10. the house of the Ashtaroth: render *the temple of Astarte,* probably that at Ashkelon (Herod., i, 105).

and they fastened his body to: render *they exposed his body on.* Chronicles 'they fastened his skull to the house of Dagon'!

Beth-shan, now *Beisan,* an important fortress overlooking the valley of Jordan and commanding the entrance to the valley of Jezreel.

12. and burnt them there. Since the burning of the dead is only regarded as a heightening of the death penalty (Jos 7^{25}), and Amos (2^{1}) mentions it with abhorrence, the text can hardly be correct. Probably we should read *and they made lamentation for them* (cf. 25^{1}, 28^{3}), and substitute *bodies* for **bones** in ^{13}. In 2 S 21^{12} it is recorded that David took away the bones and buried them.

II. SAMUEL

I. 2. a man came out of the camp. The description of the messenger as an Amalekite is only found in the later narrative ($^{6\text{-}10,\ 14\text{-}16}$); here probably an Israelite soldier is meant (cf. 4^{12}).

5. An editorial addition.

6. the chariots and horsemen, lit. 'the chariots and the owners of the horsemen.' The word for 'the owners of' makes no sense and is probably a marginal gloss, part of which has crept into the text here and part in ^{18} (see below). 1 S 31^{3} ff. has 'archers,' which is more probable, since the scene of the battle was hardly suited to chariots and horsemen.

9. anguish: the meaning of the Hebrew word is uncertain, and both 'cramp' and 'giddiness' are conjectural.

11, 12 form the immediate sequel to ^{4}.

13. Another editorial addition; the messenger had already given the information required (^{8}).

17-27. David's lament over Saul and Jonathan.

There is no ground for doubting the Davidic authorship of this poem. According to ^{18} it was preserved in the collection of early Hebrew poetry, which was known as 'the book of Jashar' (p. 172*a*), but unfortunately the text has suffered considerably in the course of transmission. In the first part of the lament ($^{19\text{-}22}$) the poet introduces his main theme, viz. the death of the two great national heroes, whose weapons had hitherto been invincible. The thought of the rejoicings of the Philistines over their downfall gives an additional bitterness to the nation's mourning, and in the fulness of his grief the poet curses the scene of this cruel disaster. In the second half ($^{23\text{-}27}$) he utters a glowing panegyric of the departed heroes, which reaches its climax in the wonderful description of the love of Jonathan. It is remarkable that throughout the poem there is an entire absence of religious thought or expression. The poem is rather the passionate outburst of a real poet who is inspired solely by the thought of the loss which has befallen the nation and himself

17. lamented with this lamentation. The poem, like 3^{33} f., is described as a *Kīnā,* the technical term for the dirges sung over the dead by professional mourners, generally women.

18. The text is hopelessly corrupt. The rendering **and he bade them** is inadmissible: the Hebrew can only be rendered 'and he said,' a phrase which should immediately precede the poem. The words 'the song of' are added by the revisers, with the implication that 'the bow' was the title of the elegy, but this would not be a suitable title, nor is it probable that the title would be expressed in such a way. Lastly, the statement 'behold, it is written in the book of Jashar' should undoubtedly follow ^{17}. The majority of commentators regard the words 'the children of Judah' as a corruption of the first line of the poem: this is very probable. On the whole, the best explanation of 'the bow' (LXX omits) is that of Wellhausen, who regards it as the second half of a gloss ('owners of bows') to ^{6}, of which one part found its way into the text of ^{6}, and the other into that of ^{18}. If 'the bow' is omitted we may adopt Smend's emendation 'Weep, O Judah.'

19. Thy glory. The Hebrew can only be rendered 'the gazelle' or 'the beauty,' but neither of these gives an adequate sense. The LXX presupposes a similar

consonantal text, which by a slight emendation gives 'be grieved.' If this emendation is accepted, the opening stanza will run:

'Weep, O Judah,
Be grieved, O Israel.
Upon thy heights (lie) the slain;
How are the mighty fallen!'

21. neither fields of offerings. The word of 'offerings' cannot be right, and should probably be emended to 'death' (LXX, Luc.). The verb 'descend' or 'fall' is also supplied by LXX and Luc., probably rightly. Render *Ye mountains of Gilboa, may no dew descend nor rain upon you, ye fields* (or 'mountains,' Luc.) *of death.*

23. Render:

'Saul and Jonathan, the beloved and the lovely,
In their lives and in their death were not divided.'

24. delicately: read *with fine linen garments.*

25. As the text stands the poet once more addresses himself to Israel ('thy high places').

Many scholars, however, regard this reference as improbable, and restore partly on the basis of LXX (Luc.) 'Jonathan, my heart by thy death is pierced through' (Budde).

II.-IV. The struggle between the house of Saul and the house of David.

The deaths of Saul and Jonathan were followed by David's accession to the throne of Judah at Hebron. The rest of the tribes, however, support Ish-bosheth, Saul's sole surviving son, whom Abner the captain of the hosts had established at Mahanaim. In the struggle that ensued the southern kingdom gradually gained the upper hand, until a quarrel between Ish-bosheth and his all-powerful general caused the latter to secede to David. Abner, however, was treacherously slain by Joab in revenge for the death of Asahel, and shortly afterwards Ish-bosheth himself was assassinated. The only incident of the seven years' war which is recorded is that of the fight at Gibeon, which had for its sequel the death of Asahel. The absence of any reference to the Philistines is very remarkable, since both David and Ish-bosheth must have acknowledged their suzerainty: probably they were content to let the internecine struggle pursue its own course.

II. 1. Hebron, originally in the possession of the clan of Caleb, was now reckoned as the chief city of Judah. Its position, some twenty miles to the south of Jerusalem, in the centre of the district in which David had spent so many years as an outlaw, rendered it peculiarly suitable for his capital.

4-7. David's message of thanks to the men of Jabesh-gilead for their pious action in burying the bones of Saul and his sons. Possibly the message conceals an attempt on David's part to win the men of Jabesh-gilead to his side.

8. Ish-bosheth, 'a man of shame.' The original name Ish-baal='man of Baal' has been preserved in 1 Ch 8 [33], 9 [39]. In the early days of the monarchy the name Baal ('master,' 'owner') was used without scruple as a title of Jehovah, but a later age took exception to this usage owing to the association of the name with foreign cults, and substituted the word 'bosheth' (shame) for it.

Mahanaim: on the east of Jordan to the north of the river Jabbok (Gen 32 [2]).

9. the Ashurite: read probably *the Asherites* (Jg 1 [32])=the tribe of Asher.

10, 11. With the exception of [10b] these verses are a late editorial insertion.

12. Gibeon: the modern *El-Jib,* some five miles north-north-west of Jerusalem.

16. Helkath-hazzurim: 'the field of flints,' or possibly '(sword) edges.' Probably *hazziddim* 'of sides' was the original name given with reference to the fact that each combatant plunged his sword into his fellow's side.

23. with the hinder end of his spear: read *backwards with his spear,* i.e. with a backward stroke: the last clause of the verse is a gloss from 20 [12].

24. The pursuit must have been carried some way beyond the wilderness of Gibeon by sunset. Read probably 'when they were come to the hill to the east of the road in the wilderness of Geba,' i.e. to a point some five miles east of Gibeon whence a road ran down to the Jordan valley.

27. Render: '*As Jehovah* [LXX] *liveth, if thou hadst not spoken, then* (only) *after the morning would the people have ceased from pursuing every one his brother.*' The reference is not to [14] (RVm), but to Abner's appeal to stop the pursuit in [14].

III. 2-5. A notice of David's family which has been transferred from 8.

3. Chileab: 1 Ch 3 [1] 'Daniel,' LXX Dalouia. Possibly the LXX represents an original Dodiyyah. The 'Daniel' of 1 Chronicles would in that case be a corruption of the alternative form 'Dodiel.' Nothing more is known of this son of David.

7 f. After 'Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah' LXX (Luc.) adds 'and Abner took her,' *sc.* in marriage. Although Abner

pretends to make light of the matter, Ish-bosheth's reprimand was fully justified. From the Oriental point of view marriage with one of Saul's concubines was tantamount to claiming the throne (cf. 16 [21]; 1 K 2 [21] f.).

12. on his behalf: read with LXX (Luc.) *to Hebron*; the rest of the clause, **saying, Whose is the land?** has arisen by dittography.

17-19. A parenthesis describing how Abner had been preparing for David's recognition by Israel.

27. unto the midst of the gate: read with LXX *to the side of the gate.*

29. that leaneth on a staff: render *one that holdeth the spindle*, i.e. a weak effeminate person.

IV. **The assassination of Ish-bosheth.**

2-5. Two historical notes which have been inserted by a later editor.

Beeroth: 'Wells,' generally identified with *el-Bireh*, four miles north-north-east of Gibeon, and nine miles north of Jerusalem. The point of the note is to explain how the old Canaanite inhabitants of Beeroth, one of the four cities which made a league with Israel under Joshua (Jos 9 [17]), had been forced to flee to Gittai (presumably outside Israelite territory), where they became 'sojourners.' Gibeon apparently (cf. 21 [1] ff.) preserved its dependence for some considerable time longer.

4. Mephibosheth. The original name was either Merib-baal, 'the lord (Jehovah) contends' (1 Ch 8 [34], 9 [40a]), or Meri-baal, 'the lord's (Jehovah's) hero' (1 Ch 9 [40b]). As in the case of Ish-baal (2 [8]) 'bosheth' was substituted for 'baal,' but here a further change was made by altering the first part of the name.

6. Read with LXX (as RVm).

10 f. See on 31 [1-2] S 2 [27]. The argument of [11] clearly implies that the messenger was slain by David himself on account of his bad news.

V., VI. relate (*a*) **the Crowning of David as King over all Israel** (5 [1-3]); (*b*) **the Capture of Jerusalem** (5 [6-10]); (*c*) **the Two Victories over the Philistines** (5 [17-25]); and (*d*) **the Removal of the Ark to Jerusalem** (6).

The capture of Jerusalem and its establishment as the capital of Israel and Judah marks a turning-point in the historical and religious development of the nation as a whole. But, though the transference of the ark is described at some length, the editor clearly attached but little interest either to the history of the city which was destined to be the centre of Jewish life and religion for many centuries to follow, or to the, historically, hardly less important overthrow of the Philistine domination. Yet it is hardly doubtful that both these events were originally described at greater length, and that 5 is merely an extract from the records of J.

Further incidents connected with the Philistines have, it is true, been preserved in 21 [15-22] and 23 [8-23], but nothing further is recorded of the capture of Jerusalem beyond the obscure verses (5 [6-10]). The compilatory character of 5 is shown by the position of these verses, for the wars with the Philistines ([17-25]) should follow immediately after the union of Israel and Judah.

V. **4, 5.** A chronological note of R^D similar to that in 1 K 2 [11] (cf. 1 S 13 [1]).

6 ff. Jerusalem, the *Urusalim* of the Tell el-Amarna letters (*c.* 1400 B.C.), formed one of the chain of Canaanite cities which completely separated Judah from the central portion of Palestine during the period of the Judges. The failure of Judah to drive out the Jebusite inhabitants is recorded in Jos 15 [63]; Jg 1 [21].

6. Render as RVm. In the opinion of the Jebusites the fortress was so strong that the blind and the lame were sufficient to defend it: the concluding clause is a gloss.

7. the stronghold of Zion, i.e. the south-east hill of Jerusalem, on the north of which was built the temple, and on the south Solomon's palace.

8*a*. None of the emendations of this corrupt and obscure half-verse is entirely satisfactory. The most probable is that suggested by Driver, 'let him go up in (or "by") the water-channel,' supposing that word rendered 'watercourse' refers to the water-shaft connected with the 'Virgin's Spring' on the east of Ophel, by which the garrison was enabled to maintain the water supply.

8*b* is a false gloss explaining the origin of a well-known saying with reference to the exclusion of the blind and lame from the Temple (cf. Lev 21 [18]).

9. And David dwelt in the stronghold. The removal of the royal residence from Hebron to Jerusalem, which is here briefly narrated, was no doubt largely dictated by political motives. Hebron in the extreme south could never have been acceptable to the northern tribes, but the natural strength of the old Jebusite city as well as its position rendered it eminently suited to be the capital of a united Israel.

11, 12. Hiram king of Tyre, the friend and ally of Solomon. Either the name is wrongly given for that of his father Abi-baal, or the verses are a later insertion.

13-16, like 3 2-8, should be placed after 8 14.

17-25. The recognition of David as king by all the tribes not unnaturally roused the Philistines to fresh activity. Hitherto they had apparently refrained from interfering with the internal politics of Israel, but now that the nation was united under one king they were forced to take the offensive or lose their hold over central Palestine. In the result they were twice defeated and henceforward exercised but little influence on the history of Israel and Judah.

17. **went down to the hold.** The verb 'went down' makes it clear that 'the hold' is not 'the stronghold of Zion,' but the stronghold of Adullam (1 S 22 1), whence David afterwards 'went up' to the valley of Rephaim (19). The scene of the battle is the same as that of 2 S 23 13 f., where the Philistines are stated to have a garrison at Bethlehem.

18. **the valley of Rephaim,** the modern *el-Baq'a,* between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, some three miles south-west of the former.

20. **Baal-perazim:** 'Baal of the bursts-ings forth.' 'Probably the name was applied originally to a fountain bursting out of the hill-side' (Driver). Here the name is explained by David's victory, Baal being clearly used as a title of Jehovah (cf. 1 S 14 49 *v.n.*; 2 S 2 8).

21. **images:** read with Chronicles and LXX *gods.*

VI. **The removal of the ark to Jerusalem** marks the first stage in that centralization of religious worship which was one of the most characteristic features of later Judaism. For the presence of the ark, the ancient symbol of Jehovah, in the new capital necessarily carried with it the recognition of Jerusalem as the centre of the religious life of the nation.

It has been suggested with great probability by Kennedy that the neglect of the ark during the reign of Saul was due to the fact that throughout this period *Kiriath-jearim* (1 S 6 21) had been under the jurisdiction of the Philistines, and that the ark in consequence had not been accessible to the Israelites.

1. This notice clearly describes the preparation for some hostile enterprise, and has no connexion with the religious ceremony that follows. Kennedy conjectures that it orginally introduced an account of further military operations which put an end to the Philistine suzerainty over the cities of the Gibeonite league, including Kiriath-jearim, and thereby opened the way for the removal of the ark. He further supposes that this account was suppressed by the compiler as inconsistent with his view that the ark had all along been under Israelite control.

2. **from Baale Judah:** read with 1 Ch 13 6 *to Baalah of Judah.* Baalah is identified with Kiriath-jearim in 1 Ch *l.c.* and Jos 15 9, 60, 18 14.

7. **for his error,** etc.: read with Chronicles *because he put forth his hand to the ark, and he died before God.* Whatever was the actual cause of Uzzah's death, whether the shock which he experienced on realizing that he had broken the taboo associated with the ark, or the strain induced by his efforts to save it, the explanation here given clearly reflects an early religious standpoint according to which all contact with sacred objects was fraught with danger to the unauthorized individual.

13. **Obed-edom the Gittite.** Like many other foreigners in the service of David, Obed-edom was certainly a worshipper of Jehovah.

18. It is noticeable that David throughout this episode exercises priestly functions: clothed with the linen ephod he offers sacrifice, and blesses the people in the name of Jehovah at the conclusion of the ceremony.

VII. **David proposes to build a house for Jehovah,** but is informed by Nathan that Jehovah does not desire this. Instead Jehovah promises that David's dynasty shall be established for ever; David's prayer of thanksgiving.

The whole purport of the message conveyed by Nathan is that David is not to build a house, that is a temple, for Jehovah, but Jehovah will build a house, that is a dynasty, for David. In 13, however, we find a different conception of the message, which takes David's 'seed' to mean Solomon only, and understands the message as referring to the building of the temple by the latter. Elsewhere in the chapter both 'seed' and 'house' denote David's descendants or dynasty, and there is no reference to the temple of Solomon. Hence most commentators agree in treating 13 as a later Deuteronomic interpolation. The rest of the chapter is probably to be ascribed to a later stratum of E.

6. **have walked in a tent,** etc.: read on the basis of 1 Ch 17 6 *have gone from tent to tent and from dwelling to dwelling.* The 'tent' refers to the ancient 'tent of meeting,' and 'the dwelling' to the temporary sojournings of the ark, such as at Kiriath-jearim. The narrator seems to have no knowledge of the temple at Shiloh.

11*b*. The prophet makes known the main point of his message, viz. the permanence of David's dynasty, a point which he develops further in [12]. Except in [13] the terms are quite general, and refer to David's posterity as a whole and not to any particular member of it.

13. **a house for my name.** This phrase is characteristic of the Deuteronomic framework of Kings (cf. 1 K 3 [2], 5 [3-5], 8 [18] f.), and has its origin in the regular formula employed in Deuteronomy with reference to the central sanctuary 'to cause his name to dwell' or 'to set his name there.'

15. Read with Chronicles *and I will not take away my mercy from him, as I took it away from him that was before thee.*

21. **for thy word's sake, and according to thine own heart:** read *to glorify thy servant hast thou promised, and according to thine own heart hast thou wrought in making thy servant know all this greatness.*

23. Read on the basis of LXX and 1 Ch: *And what other nation is there on the earth like thy people Israel, whom its God went to redeem for himself as a people, to make himself a name and to do for them great and wonderful things, to drive out before his people a nation and its gods?*

VIII. **Summary of David's Wars and Lists of his Principal Officers.**

This chapter was evidently intended by the editor to form a concluding summary of David's reign. Like 1 S 14 [47-51] it is to be assigned to the Deuteronomic editor, who omitted the whole of 9-20 from his edition. In the brief review of David's wars ([1-14]) he is clearly drawing from a fuller narrative, [3-8] in particular being a condensed account of the war with Syria (10). The notices of David's family at Hebron (3 [2-5]) and at Jerusalem (5 [13-16]) come probably from the same hand, and should be placed after [14].

1. **the bridle of the mother city:** the meaning of the phrase is quite uncertain; it is usually taken to mean the hegemony of the Philistine metropolis.

2. Nothing is known of this war with Moab, though later Moab was a tributary of Israel, and the Stone of Mesha attests the unfriendly relations between Israel and Moab during the reign of Omri. On the other hand, 1 S 22 [3] f. points to friendly relations in the past.

3. **to recover the dominion:** read with LXX, Chronicles, *to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates.*

4. **took from him:** read *slew of them.* It was not customary at this period to take large bodies of prisoners.

10. **Joram:** read with Chronicles *Hadoram.*

13. **when he returned from:** read *And when he returned from smiting the Syrians he smote Edom* (Chronicles, LXX) *in the valley of Salt.* The similarity between the two words Syria (*Arām*) and Edom has led to their being frequently confused. The Syrians dwelt in the north-east of Palestine, while the valley of Salt was in the extreme south in the neighbourhood of Edom (2 K 14 [7] f.: cf. Ps 60 title).

16-18 recur in a slightly different form in 20 [23-26].

17. **and Zadok,** etc.: read *and Abiathar the son of Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, and Zadok were priests.*

18. **Cherethites, Pelethites:** these formed David's foreign bodyguard (cf. 15 [18], 20 [7]). The Cherethites came from the south (*Negeb*, 1 S 30 [14]), and were presumably a Philistine clan (cf. Zeph 2 [5]; Ezek 25 [16]). The name supports the theory that they came originally from Crete. The Pelethites (*Pĕlēthi*) were probably also a Philistine clan, but the name cannot be treated as a form of Philistine (*Pĕlishti*).

and David's sons were priests: Chronicles 'were chief about the king,' a characteristic alteration in accordance with later views as to the priesthood. The statement of the text is quite in accord with the practice of the early monarchy, when the priesthood was still not confined to any particular tribe or family (cf. Jg 17 [5]).

IX.-XX. **The History of the Succession to the Throne.**—The events set forth are closely connected with, and mutually dependent on, one another, the section as a whole being distinguished by unity of plan and conception. The aim of the narrative clearly is to trace the steps by which the way was prepared for the accession of Solomon. The writer accordingly narrates (*a*) David's relations with the descendants of Saul (9); (*b*) the circumstances which led to David's becoming acquainted with Beth-sheba, and to the birth of Solomon (10-12); (*c*) the story of the murder of Amnon, David's firstborn (13); (*d*) the rebellion and death of Absalom (20). The concluding incident, viz. the attempt of Adonijah, the fourth son, to obtain the throne (1 K 1) belongs to the same narrative.

IX. The narrative obviously requires some introduction, and since David's question presupposes that he was ignorant of the existence of any survivors of the house of Saul, it has been conjectured

that 21 1-14 originally preceded this chapter. The vengeance exacted by the Gibeonites on the house of Saul would account for the form of David's enquiry as well as for his treatment of Mephibosheth (19 28); and lastly it would furnish a suitable introduction to the history of the succession.

X.-XII. **The war with Ammon: David's sin.**

David sends an embassy to condole with Hanun king of Ammon on the death of his father Nahash, but the ambassadors are grossly insulted, and a war ensues. The Ammonites secure the aid of a large force of Syrians, and prepare to give battle outside their capital Rabbah. Joab, with the pick of the Israelite army, attacks and defeats the Syrians, while the Ammonites retire into the city (1-14).

(The Syrians under Hadadezer collect a large army on the east of Jordan, but are defeated by David with heavy loss [15-19].) In the following spring Joab is sent to besiege Rabbah (11 1). David remains at Jerusalem, where he commits his great sin with Bath-sheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite, one of his warriors. After vainly attempting to conceal his sin, David instructs Joab to bring about the death of Uriah. His orders are promptly carried out, and David then marries Bath-sheba, who bears him a son (11). The prophet Nathan, by a parable, awakens the king to a sense of his guilt, and announces the punishment for his crime. The child of Bath-sheba dies despite David's intercession, but another son, Solomon, is born later (12 1-25). The account of the siege of Rabbah is then resumed. At the final assault David commands in person; he captures the city and carries off great spoil; the inhabitants of Rabbah and the other Ammonite cities are condemned to various forms of hard labour (12 26-31).

X. 6 ff. The Syrian mercenaries were obtained from various principalities in the district now known as the *Jaulān*, lying between Mount Hermon and the river Jabbok.

7. and all the host of the mighty men: read *and all the host and the mighty men.* The latter were a body of select troops who formed a small standing army; they are here opposed to 'the host,' i.e. the levies raised for the occasion (cf. 20 7). In the battle that ensued Joab has to fight on two fronts. He accordingly leads the picked troops against the Syrians as the more formidable opponents, leaving Abishai to attack the Ammonites with the levies.

12. and for the cities of our God: read *and for the ark of God.* That the practice of taking the ark into battle still continued is shown by 11 11.

15-19. It is not possible to determine with any certainty either the time or the details of this second campaign against the Syrians. The abrupt mention of Hadadezer in 16 points to some earlier mention of his name such as is found in the parallel account (8 3 ff.). Probably his name was originally given in 6, since 8 3 f. and 10 16 both support the view that he was the overlord of the other Syrian princes. In any case these verses can hardly be in their place here, since the natural sequel of 14 is given in 11 1. In the latter Joab is still in command, whereas David himself takes the field against Hadadezer in this section. It is more probable that the conquest of the Jaulān was undertaken after and not during the war with Ammon.

XI. **3. Uriah the Hittite:** Uriah and Eliam were members of the 'Thirty' (23 34, 39). Eliam, the father of Bath-sheba, was the son of Ahithophel (15 12). The fact that Uriah ('Jehovah is my light') bore an Israelite name and had married an Israelite wife, indicates that foreigners, though technically only *gērim*, or 'protected strangers,' were admitted to the privileges of Israelite citizenship at this period.

6 f. In order to conceal his sin David recalls Uriah from the front, but the latter refuses to visit his house on the ground that he is still on active service. David then makes him drunk, but the warrior remains true to his conception of his duty. As a last resort David sends orders to Joab which will ensure Uriah's death in battle.

12. and the morrow: read as RVm.

21. Jerubbesheth, for 'Jerubbaal' (Jg 7 1). The substitution of *besheth* (=bosheth: cf. 2 8) for 'baal' in this name only occurs here.

22. Insert with LXX at the end of the verse *even all things concerning the war. And David was angry with Joab, and he said to the messenger, Wherefore went ye so nigh,* etc., repeating the words of 20-21 down to 'why went ye so nigh the wall?'

XII. 1-15*a*, which has suffered from later expansion in 10-12, probably did not form part of the original narrative in which 11 27 was followed immediately by 12 15*b*, 'and Jehovah smote the child,' etc. Further, the account of David's intercession (15*b*-23) entirely ignores Nathan's

announcement of the death of the child (14). In all probability the section, which is clearly based on early material, was derived from another source.

6. fourfold: read with LXX *sevenfold.*

10-12. A later expansion based on the subsequent history. It is clear from 14 that the divine punishment, in view of David's repentance, does not extend beyond the death of the child.

14. Read '*Howbeit because thou hast scorned Jehovah in this thing.*'

26. the royal city: read *the water city* as in 27, i.e. the fortification which protected the water supply of Rabbah.

30. of their king: read with LXX *of Milcom,* the national god of Ammon.

were precious stones: read with Pesh. *was a precious stone, and it* (the stone) *was set,* etc.

31. Read as RVm. The theory that the passage refers to various forms of torture is not supported either by the language or by the construction of the Hebrew.

XIII., XIV. **Amnon and Absalom.**

Amnon, David's firstborn son and presumably his successor, is slain by Absalom the next heir for violating his half-sister Tamar. Absalom flees to his maternal grandfather, the king of Geshur, with whom he remains for three years (13). Joab, with the aid of the wise woman of Tekoa, then obtains the king's consent to Absalom's return. After two years Absalom stirs up Joab to arrange a meeting with David, which results in the reconciliation of father and son (14).

XIII. **1.** The mother of Tamar and of Absalom was Maacah, the daughter of the king of Geshur (3 3); Amnon was the son of Ahinoam, the Jezreelitess (3 1), and therefore only half-brother to Tamar. Marriage with a half-sister was apparently permissible at this period (13 13: cf. Gen 20), though forbidden by later legislation (Lev 18 9).

16. Read on the basis of the LXX (Luc.): '*Not so, my brother, for greater is this wrong in sending me away than the other that thou didst unto me.*'

18. a long garment with sleeves, as RVm. The meaning of the phrase, which only occurs here and Gen 37 3 f., is uncertain.

21. Add with LXX, Vulgate, *yet he did not vex the spirit of Amnon his son, for he loved him, because he was his firstborn.*

27. Add with LXX *And Absalom made a feast like the feast of a king.*

32. for by the appointment of Absalom this hath been determined: a doubtful rendering of a difficult text. Read *for upon the mouth of Absalom hath there been a scowl* (Ewald).

34. But Absalom fled: to be omitted: Absalom's flight is recorded in its proper place in 37.

and, behold, much people, etc.: read on the basis of LXX *and, behold, much people came by the way of Horonaim* (=the two Horons) *by the descent; and the watchman came and told the king, saying, I see men coming from the way of Horonaim on the hill-side.*

XIV. The wise woman of Tekoa, at the instance of Joab, persuades the king by a pitiful story to allow Absalom to return to Jerusalem. Here he remains for two years, but is unable to obtain full forgiveness from his father until he forces Joab to arrange a meeting with the king. The wise woman, according to her story, was a widow with two sons, one of whom slew the other. She appeals to the king, because by the law of blood revenge her kinsfolk demanded the death of the surviving son, and she was therefore in danger of being left childless. Having secured the king's promise that her son should be spared, she proceeds to apply her parable to David's treatment of Absalom: by making the latter an exile the king is acting in the same way as her kinsfolk. David shrewdly suspects that the woman has been prompted by someone and asks if it is Joab; on hearing that it is, he consents to Absalom's return, but refuses to see him. Absalom waits two years, and then coerces Joab into taking further action on his behalf. A meeting with his father is brought about and the two are reconciled.

14. Read, with a slight alteration, '*but God will not take away the life of him who deviseth plans not to banish from him one that is banished.*' In *a* the wise woman uses the uncertainty of human life as an argument for immediate action; in *b* she points out that the recalling of the exile, instead of entailing divine punishment, will rather meet with God's approval, for by so doing the king will enable Absalom to return to the worship of Jehovah (1 S 26 19).

15-17 are out of place here: they should be inserted between 7 and 8.

25-27. A description of Absalom's beauty and his family of which the post-exilic date is indicated by the late phrase 'after the king's weight.' Further, according to 1 K 15 2, Absalom's daughter was called Maacah, while 18 18 states definitely that he had no son.

XV.-XIX. **Absalom's rebellion.**

XV. 1-12. With a view doubtless to strengthening his claims as heir-apparent Absalom assumes semi-royal dignity, and seeks to gain popularity by affecting an interest in all those who have any case to submit to the king's judgement: in this way he 'stole the heart of' the men of Israel. After four years (LXX, Luc.) he obtains leave to visit Hebron under pretext of a vow, and there has himself proclaimed king.

7. Hebron was admirably suited for Absalom's purpose, as its inhabitants were probably somewhat disaffected owing to the removal of the government to Jerusalem: possibly also the union with the northern tribes was not viewed with too much favour by Judah and the clans allied to it.

12. Ahithophel of Giloh was the grandfather of Bath-sheba, and may well have been actuated by feelings of resentment towards David.

13-XVI. 14. **David's flight.**

On hearing of Absalom's revolt David at once decides to leave Jerusalem. As the troops defile out of the city on their way across the Kidron Valley, David seeks to dissuade Ittai the Gittite, whose troop of 600 was marching in rear of the royal bodyguard, from sharing his fortunes, but Ittai vigorously protests his fidelity to the king's cause, and is allowed to proceed (15 $^{13-22}$). The king next orders Zadok and Abiathar to take the ark back to Jerusalem, and arranges that their two sons shall keep him informed of what happens in the city ($^{23-29}$). At the next stage of the retreat, the ascent of the Mount of Olives, Hushai the Archite is also bidden to return to Jerusalem, in order that he may defeat the counsels of Ahitophel, and also supply the sons of Zadok and Abiathar with information ($^{30-37}$). A little further on David meets Ziba, the servant of Mephibosheth, who informs him that Jonathan's son is remaining in Jerusalem with the idea of regaining the kingdom. David thereupon transfers Mephibosheth's property to Ziba (16 $^{1-4}$). While still on the road to the Jordan David is cursed by Shimei of Benjamin. Abishai wishes to avenge the insult, but is restrained by David (26 $^{5-14}$).

XV. **17.** Read *and the king went forth, and all his servants after him; and they took up their stand at the last house.* The king and his suite halted at the last house of Jerusalem above the Kidron Valley, while all the troops marched by on their way to the Jordan. The phrases 'all the people' (^{17}) and 'all his servants' (^{18}) must be transposed (LXX).

18. and all the Gittites: read *and the men of Ittai the Gittite.* Ittai was presumably a soldier of fortune who had recently joined the service of David.

23. Read *and all the people wept with a loud voice; but the king stood in the valley of Kidron while the people passed on before him in the direction of the olive tree which is in the wilderness.*

24. Read *and, lo, Zadok and Abiathar were bearing the ark of God, and they set down the ark of God until all the people,* etc. A later editor has substituted 'and all the Levites with him' (an obvious anachronism) for 'and Abiathar.' The presence of the ark is here treated as a matter of course, but David realizes that Jehovah's purpose cannot be affected by the presence, or otherwise, of this ancient symbol, and orders the priests to take the ark back. The suppression of Abiathar's name reflects the view of a later age according to which Zadok was the sole representative of the priestly caste, but the Hebrew indicates that David in $^{25-27}$ was addressing both priests (cf. ^{29}).

27. Art thou not a seer? Read '*See now, do thou and Abiathar return,*' etc.

32. Hushai the Archite. Add with LXX *the friend of David* as in 16 ^{16}: probably this was a court title.

XVI. 3. Probably the truer explanation of Mephibosheth's absence is given in 19 ^{25} ff.

7 f. Shimei's charge of bloodshed certainly acquires greater force if, with Budde, we place 21 $^{1-14}$ (slaying of Saul's descendants) at the beginning of David's reign.

14. came weary. The name of the place to which they came has obviously fallen out. LXX (Luc.) adds 'to the Jordan,' which is quite suitable (cf. 17 ^{16}).

15-XVII. 14. **Absalom at Jerusalem: Hushai and Ahitophel.**

14. Hushai defends his desertion of David on the ground that Absalom has been chosen both by Jehovah and by the people; he further urges that he has merely transferred his allegiance from father to son.

XVI. **20 f.** On the advice of Ahitophel Absalom takes possession of his father's harem, thus openly asserting his succession, and at the same time making it evident that the breach with his father was final.

XVII. **1 ff.** Ahitophel next asks leave to pursue David at once with a large force. He argues that a sudden attack will cause David's troops to desert and leave him

defenceless, and that his death will result in the universal recognition of Absalom as king. The advice appeals to Absalom, but Hushai counsels delay on the ground that a repulse at the start might easily lead to a panic among the followers of Absalom, and suggests that an overwhelming force was necessary with Absalom in command. In the end Absalom follows Hushai's advice, and in so doing seals his own fate.

3. Read with LXX '*and I will bring back all the people unto thee as a bride returneth to her husband: thou seekest but the life of one man; and all the people will be at peace.*'

11. The real object of Hushai's advice is to give David time to organize his troops and prepare a defensive position.

to battle: read with LXX *in their midst.*

15 f. Information of what had transpired is sent by the sons of Zadok and Abiathar: the latter are observed and pursued, but escape and convey Hushai's message to David that no time should be lost in crossing the Jordan. The king at once crosses the river with all his troops, and proceeds to Mahanaim, where he is hospitably received by the neighbouring sheikhs.

25. **Ithra the Israelite:** read with 1 Ch 2 [17] and LXX *Jether the Ishmaelite.* Amasa's mother Abigail was, like Zeruiah, the sister of David.

28. Read *brought couches for lying down, and rugs and basons and earthen vessels; and offered wheat,* etc., *to David and to his people to eat.*

29. **cheese of.** The word only occurs here, and its meaning is quite conjectural: if 'cheese' or 'dried curds' is correct, the word has become misplaced.

XVIII. **Defeat and death of Absalom.** David divides his forces into three parts under Joab, Abishai, and Ittai respectively, but is persuaded by the people to remain in the city himself. Absalom's forces are heavily defeated, and a large number of fugitives perish in the rocky 'jungle of Ephraim.' In his flight Absalom is caught by the head in the branches of an oak, and is left suspended in mid-air as his mule rushes on. Joab is informed of his plight, and slays him despite the special order of the king that Absalom's life should be spared. He then calls off the pursuit.

6. **the forest of Ephraim:** render *the jungle of Ephraim,* somewhere in Gilead.

9. Absalom is carried by his mule under an oak, and his head is so tightly wedged in a fork of the branches that he is unable to free himself: there is no indication that he was caught by the hair.

18. As Absalom was still a young man, the reason given for the erection of a memorial is hardly a probable one. Possibly, as Budde and Klostermann have suggested, the verse originally stated that David erected a memorial pillar to his son, because he had left no son. This conjecture is supported by the reading of LXX 'for he said, *He* has no son to keep *his* name in remembrance.'

10-32. The news of Absalom's death is carried by Ahimaaz the son of Zadok and a nameless Cushite after Joab had tried to dissuade the former. In the race to Mahanaim Ahimaaz outruns the Cushite, but, when confronted with the king, is afraid to announce the truth about Absalom: David first learns of Absalom's death from the Cushite.

21. **the Cushite.** Cush corresponds roughly to the modern Sudan (cf. Is 18 [1]). The man was nameless probably because he was a slave.

23. By making a detour and so reaching the highway Ahimaaz was able to outdistance his fellow-runner, who apparently went straight across country. The 'way of the Plain' was doubtless the local name for the road leading to the Plain, i.e. the broad expanse of the Jordan valley, north of the Dead Sea.

33-XIX. 8. David's grief for his son is so great that what should have been an occasion for rejoicing is turned into mourning, and the victorious troops slink into the city as if ashamed of their victory. It is not until Joab has administered a sharp rebuke to the king for his selfish sorrow, and warned him that he is endangering the throne, that the latter consents to appear in public.

XIX. 8*b*-43. A revulsion of public opinion now takes place among the people, and they call up their leaders to reinstate the king. Their words are reported to David, whose first concern is to win back his own tribe of Judah. He sends Zadok and Abiathar to urge Judah on the score of kinship not to be behindhand in bringing the king back to his house, and promises to make Amasa commander-in-chief in place of Joab. The message effects its purpose, and the men of Judah go to Gilgal to meet the king.

16 ff. Shimei, who is accompanied by a thousand men of Benjamin, is the first to make his peace, though Abishai urges that he should be put to death.

The narrative is interrupted by a parenthetical notice of the zeal displayed by Ziba in helping the king's household

to cross the river. Render *Now Ziba . . . had rushed down to the Jordan before the king, and kept passing to and fro over the ford in order to bring over,* etc.

18. when he was come over: render *as he was about to pass over.*

20. the first of all the house of Joseph. This claim of Shimei of Benjamin to belong to the house of Joseph supports the view that Benjamin was originally reckoned among the northern tribes.

24 ff. Shimei is succeeded by Mephibosheth, who defends himself from the charges made by Ziba. David cuts short his long-winded explanation by ordering the inheritance to be divided between the two.

31-39. The aged Barzillai, who had been the king's host at Mahanaim, accompanies him as far as the Jordan, and then takes his leave. The king invites him to his court, but Barzillai declines on the score of age, and asks that his son Chimham may go in his stead.

31. and he went over Jordan: read *and passed on with the king to escort him to the Jordan.*

36. Read '*Thy servant would pass on a little way with the king.*' Both here and in [31] 'Jordan' has been added by a scribe who failed to see that the verb rendered 'to pass' or 'cross over' was here used in the sense of 'to pass on.'

39. and the king went over: read with LXX (Luc.) *but the king stood still.* The king took leave of Barzillai before crossing over ([43]).

40-43. Rivalry of Israel and Judah.

On reaching the other side of Jordan the king is escorted by all Judah and half Israel. The latter complain, not unnaturally, that Judah had stolen a march on them, though Israel and Judah alike were the king's subjects. The Judæans retort that they were nearer of kin, though they had not taken advantage of their tribal connexion. The men of Israel in reply appeal to their larger number and to their descent: moreover, they had been the first to speak of recalling the king. The latter had the best of the argument, but 'the words of the men of Judah were fiercer than the words of the men of Israel.'

40. Read with LXX *and all the men of Judah were passing on with the king,* etc.

41. and all David's men with him: read *seeing that all David's men are his people.*

42. or hath he given us any gift? read *or hath any portion* (from his table) *been brought to us?*

43. and we have also more right, etc.: read with LXX '*and I am also the first-born rather than thou.*'

XX. The revolt of Sheba.

The immediate result of the dispute was a fresh revolt headed by Sheba, a Benjamite, which had for its object the restoration of Israel's tribal independence. Amasa fails to carry out his commission of raising the levies of Judah within the prescribed time, so Abishai is sent off with David's standing army. The two contingents meet at Gibeon, where Joab, who had accompanied Abishai, treacherously murders Amasa. Meantime Sheba has fled to Abel-beth-maacah in the extreme north. This city is besieged by Joab, but is saved from destruction by the intervention of a wise woman who induces the people to slay Sheba, and delivers his head to Joab. The chapter ends with a repetition of 8 [16-18].

7. Read *And there went out after him Abishai and Joab and the Cherethites,* etc. Joab was still in disgrace, but the sequel shows that he accompanied the expedition and speedily assumed the virtual command.

8*a*. came to meet them: read *came at the head of the people,* i.e. the levies. *b* should probably be read 'and Joab was girt with a sword underneath his dress, and upon it (i.e. outside) was a sword fastened upon his loins in the sheath thereof, and it came out and fell.' Like Ehud (Jg 3 [16]), Joab had a (second) sword concealed under his military dress with which he stabbed Amasa.

14. Read (with Budde) *Now he* (Sheba) *had gone through all the tribes of Israel, but they treated him with contempt, and he came to Abel-beth-maacah; and all the Bichrites went in after him.*

Abel-beth-Maacah, the modern *Abil,* about four miles west of Dan (*Tell-el-Kadi*) in the extreme north.

15*b*. Read (with Klostermann) *and there came a wise woman out of the city and stood upon the rampart, while all the people who were with Joab were devising means to throw down the wall; and she said, Hear,* etc. The rampart was a small outer wall, or outwork, at a little distance from the city wall.

18. Read on the basis of LXX *They used to say aforetime, Let them ask in Abel and in Dan whether that has ever come to an end which the faithful of Israel had established, but thou seekest to,* etc. The woman reproached Joab with seeking to destroy a city which was noted for observing the ancient tradition of Israel.

22. Read on the basis of LXX *Then*

the woman went into the city and spoke unto all the people in her wisdom.

23-26. David's officers of state.

This repetition of 8 [16-18] is probably due to the editor who replaced 9-20, his object being to preserve the original connexion of 21 [1-14] with the earlier chapters.

XXI.-XXIV. An appendix of miscellaneous fragments.

These chapters now break the original connexion of 9-20 with 1 K 1 [11], and must therefore have been inserted after the division of the books of Samuel and Kings. Their contents are: (*a*) the famine in Israel and the death of Saul's sons at the hands of the Gibeonites (21 [1-14]); (*b*) a series of exploits against the Philistines (21 [15-22]); (*c*) A Hymn of Triumph (22 =Ps 18); (*d*) David's 'Last Words' (23 [1-7]); (*e*) further exploits against the Philistines and list of David's heroes (23 [8-39]); (*f*) the census and its consequences (24). The two narratives (*a*) and (*f*) are closely related both in style and content, and belong to the beginning of David's reign. Not improbably their order has been reversed, (*f*) following originally after 6, while (*a*) preceded 9 (Budde). If, as is generally supposed, these two sections were omitted by the R^D editor, it is difficult to see why they were not restored at the same time as 9-20, especially as 21 [1-14] bears on the history of the succession.

XXI. 1-14. On consulting the oracle David learns that the famine from which Israel had suffered for three years was due to the blood-guilt which Saul had incurred by his breach of the covenant with Gibeon (Jos 9). The Gibeonites refuse to take any money compensation, and demand that seven of Saul's sons should be delivered to them for execution. David hands over the two sons of Rizpah and the five sons of Merab. Rizpah keeps guard over the dead for six months until David has their bones, with those of Saul and Jonathan, buried in the family sepulchre of Kish.

The incident affords yet another illustration of the primitive religious outlook of this period. The prolonged famine is directly ascribed to the wrath of Jehovah which, so it was thought, had never been properly appeased after Saul's violation of an ancient covenant. This crime could only be expiated by blood, and since the offender was no longer alive, the blood of his children is demanded by the injured party, a claim which is obviously regarded both by David and by the narrator as a just one. No record of any attempt by Saul to exterminate the old Canaanite inhabitants of Gibeon has been preserved, though, as we have seen, the historical note on the sister city of Beeroth (4 [2, 3]) hints at a similar incident.

1. It is for Saul, and for his bloody house: read with LXX *Upon Saul and upon his house* (*rests*) *blood*, i.e. the guilt of innocent blood (cf. 16 [8]; Dt 19 [10]).

6. in Gibeah of Saul, the chosen of the Lord: read *in Gibeon, in the hill of Jehovah.*

7. On the view adopted above as to the original position of the section this must be a later insertion.

8. Michal: read *Merab.*

9. The beginning of the barley harvest falls some time in April, while the first rains occur in October. The coming of the rain was a sign of Jehovah's forgiveness; hence Rizpah might now hope for permission to bury her dead. The exposure of the dead to the birds and wild beasts was equivalent, according to the ideas of the times, to exclusion from Sheol.

15-22. The four exploits recorded here and the exploits of David's heroes in 23 [8] ff. obviously belong to the same narrative, and are to be referred to the period of the final struggle with the Philistines (5 [17-25]).

15. with him, etc.: read *with him, and dwelt in Gob, and they fought with the Philistines. Then arose . . . who was of the sons of the giants,* etc. The name of the Philistine is concealed in the words rendered **and David waxed faint,** which make no sense.

19. the son of Jaare-oregim: read with 1 Ch 20 [5] *the son of Jair.* The Chronicle has attempted to harmonize this passage with 1 S 17 by changing 'the Bethlehemite' (*beth-hal-laḥmi*) into 'Lahmi the brother of' (*eth-Laḥmi-aḥi*). There can be no doubt that this verse gives the true version of the slaying of Goliath, and that later tradition has transferred the name Goliath to the nameless giant of 1 S 17.

XXII. This psalm is not found in Chronicles, and has evidently been inserted from the Psalter.

XXIII. 1-7. David's 'Last Words.'

A didactic poem setting forth the contrast between the righteous and the unrighteous ruler. As in the case of the very similar 'Blessings' of Jacob (Gen 49) and Moses (Dt 33), the ascription of authorship must not be taken literally, since the style and contents point to a considerably later date than that of David. The text unfortunately is very corrupt.

1. the sweet psalmist of Israel: render

the darling of the songs of Israel, i.e. the favourite theme of Israel's poets.

8-39. List of David's heroes.

The list is also given in 1 Ch 11 [11-41], and twelve of the names recur in 1 Ch 12 [2-15].

8-12. The exploits of the Three.

chief of the captains: render *chief of the Three.*

Josheb-basshebeth a Tahchemonite: read *Ish-baal the Hachmonite.*

the same was Adino the Eznite: read with 1 Ch 11 *he brandished his spear over.*

9. Read *Eleazar, the son of Dodai, the Ahohite.*

with David, when: read with 1 Ch 11 *he was with David at Pas-dammim* (=Ephes-dammim, 1 S 17 [1]), *when the Philistines were gathered together to battle.*

11. with a troop: read *to Lehi.*

13-17*a*. The story of how three of the Thirty risked their lives to gratify David's wish for a drink of water from the well of Bethlehem is out of place here, and should be placed after the list of the Thirty. A later editor has wrongly taken the word 'three' here as equivalent to 'the Three' of [8] ff.

13. in the harvest time into the cave: read *at the beginning of harvest to the hold of Adullam.* The positions occupied by the opposing forces are the same as those of 5 [17-18].

18-23. Abishai and Benaiah.

The exploits of these two members of the 'Thirty' are given exceptionally because they were the most distinguished members of the second Order; probably they were next on the list for any vacancy among the 'Three.'

18. chief of three: read *chief of the Thirty.*

had a name among the three: read *yet he had not a name among the Three.*

19. Read *Behold, he was more honourable than the Thirty and became their captain; howbeit he attained not to the Three.*

20. Probably we should accept Klostermann's ingenious restoration 'he pursued the young lions into their lair, and smote them after he had gone down and slain the (old) lion in the midst of a pit.'

22. Read *yet he had not a name among the Three* (cf. [19]).

24-29. The Thirty.

The list according to [39] contains thirty-seven names, though our text only gives thirty-three. Probably other names were added when vacancies occurred through death, as in the case of Asahel the first on the list. The qualification for admission both to the Three and to the Thirty was the performance of some conspicuous act which required great personal strength and bravery. It is noticeable that Joab despite his position and rank was not a member of either Order.

XXIV. The Census.

David is moved to number the people and intrusts the task to Joab, who, after a strong protest, carries out the census in less than a year. On its completion David repents his action, and is given the choice of three punishments by God. He chooses the pestilence which rages (for three days), but on reaching Jerusalem the angel of destruction stays his hand by the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite. Acting on God's instructions David erects an altar at this spot after buying the site from Araunah.

This chapter has been rightly described as 'the charter of the most famous of the world's holy places' (Kennedy), for it is hardly doubtful that the site of David's altar was that of the great altar of burnt offering in Solomon's temple, now known as *Kubbat-aṣ-ṣakhra*, or Dome of the Rock, the celebrated Mohammedan mosque.

The incident here recorded, like 21 [1-14], belongs to the beginning of David's reign over all Israel when Joab was still commander-in-chief. The object of the census was to obtain a record of all the males who were available for military purposes (cf. [9]).

1. If, as seems probable, the chapter originally preceded 21 [1] ff., the words 'and he added' are due to the later editor.

and he moved David against them. The narrative reflects the same point of view as 21 [1] ff. The famine is the divine punishment for David's sin in numbering the people, an act to which he has been instigated by Jehovah (cf. 1 S 26 [19]), whose anger has been kindled against Israel. Thus Israel's misfortune is directly due to Jehovah, whose authority cannot be challenged. To a later age it was inconceivable that Jehovah should be represented as inciting men to evil, hence the Chronicler (26 [1]) has not hesitated to alter the text to 'And Satan stood up against Israel and moved David,' etc. Wherein the sin of numbering the people consisted is not stated. Probably it was regarded in some way as an infringement of the rights of Jehovah and was therefore characterized as sinful, a point of view which would be entirely in accord with popular feeling on the subject.

5. Read *And they passed over Jordan,*

and began from Aroer, and from the city which is in the midst of the valley towards the Gadites, and on to Jazer, i.e. they started on the extreme south of the country on the east of Jordan, worked up to the north, and then down through West Palestine to Beersheba.

6. the land of Tahtim-hodshi: read *the land of the Hittites to Hermon.*

to Dan-jaan: read *to Dan, and from Dan they went round about towards Zidon.*

10-17 are in some confusion. David's confession in [10] comes prematurely, while [17] ought to precede [16]. Budde regards the whole account of Gad's intervention as a later addition similar to 12 [1-15a] (Nathan).

15a. Read with LXX *So David chose the pestilence; and it was the days of wheat harvest when the pestilence began among the people: and there died,* etc.

15. Araunah: Chronicles 'Ornan,' LXX 'Orna'; probably the former is more correct. Araunah was presumably one of the original inhabitants of the city who had been suffered not only to live, but also to retain his property.

I. AND II. KINGS

By A. Guillaume

In this book (for like its predecessor it was originally one, not two) we have the history of the monarchy from the last days of David down to the death of Jehoiachin, the last king of Judah.

The principles of the authors and editors of this book have been explained already (p. 172*b*), and it only remains to indicate the peculiar worth of the book to the student of the Bible. Valuable as the chronological data are for an understanding of the sequence of events, and the description of the interplay of conflicting political and social aims for a full comprehension of the pressing difficulties which the prophets had to encounter, the vital significance of the book may be said to lie in its portrayal of (*a*) the development of prophecy in Israel, and (*b*) the nation's failure to adopt the principles of the prophets as their own. The writers are interested in history but absorbed in religion. History was important to them because it explained the present and pointed the way to a brighter future. It showed how the religion of Jehovah grappled with and finally overcame the nature-cults of Canaan, and it could be made to prove that God in the long run blessed those who obeyed Him, but rejected those who were indifferent to His laws.

The whole book is pervaded with the Deuteronomic attitude towards local altars and sanctuaries, and as in the editor's opinion that issue was of paramount importance, judgement is passed on all the kings in accordance with their tolerance or intolerance of provincial sacrifices.

The editor cites as sources the Acts of Solomon (11 [41]), and the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah and Israel respectively. But besides these he obviously had at hand many other ancient records and documents such as the Book of Jashar, Annals, Court histories, Temple archives, Prophetic biographies, and others which we can only guess at. These are put together and fitted into a chronological framework which, allowing for the vagaries of an Oriental people, must be pronounced extraordinarily accurate on the whole.

Bibliography

Skinner, *Cent.B.*; Barnes, *C.B.*; Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Kings*; Kittel, *H.K.*; and Benzinger, *K.H.C.* All Old Testament histories bear more or less directly on this book. The *Clarendon Bible*, iii, T. H. Robinson (1926), is useful. Its photographic illustrations help the reader to understand the past.

The book falls naturally into three parts: (A) 1 K 1-11; (B) 1 K 12-2 K 17; (C) 2 K 18-25.

(A) I.-XI. The United Kingdom

I. The struggle for the crown, *c.* 970 B.C. This chapter is a continuation of the narrative 2 S 9-20 *v.n.*, and is a fine specimen of Hebrew prose. It can hardly be anything but a contemporary's appreciation of the situation at court. The old king is at the mercy of intrigants, and has to deal with state affairs in his bedroom. The gradual unfolding of the characters in this tragic story excites a deep sympathy for the handsome Adonijah. Allowed by his father to assume the royal prerogatives, he went too far and actually proclaimed himself king. His public humiliation followed hard on the heels

of his momentary triumph, but his suspicious brother was not to be easily placated. Adonijah's love for Abishag won the support of his rival's mother, but it cost him his life. If literary excellence were the first consideration the loss of the rest of this gifted writer's history would be irreparable. His writing is marked by a becoming reticence and scrupulous impartiality. He gives us the facts and leaves them to speak for themselves. But religiously his value is negligible.

1-4. David's enfeebled state, showing (*a*) how he was at the mercy of those who brought him news, and (*b*) how Adonijah and Abishag met.

1. old. He was seventy (2 S 5 4) if he came to the throne at forty and reigned thirty years (cf. 2 11).

3. Shunammite: Shunem, now Sulam, overlooking the Valley of Esdraelon.

4. the king, etc., i.e. she was not a member of the royal harem; and therefore no claim to the succession could justly be laid by the man who married her on the ground that he had succeeded to the monarch's peculiar property. The son inherited his father's concubines among the Arabs until Muhammad put an end to the practice.

5-10. Adonijah attempts to seize the crown.

Adonijah was the fourth and eldest surviving son of David; of his mother Haggith nothing is known. He imitated his elder brother, the former heir-apparent, Absalom, in appearing in public with a bodyguard and chariots; although he had powerful allies in the persons of Joab and Abiathar, last of the line of Eli, no doubt the presence of David's old warriors, 'the mighty men,' on the side of Solomon turned the scale against him. David had been elected by the people, and it is possible that he had put off nominating his successor in the belief that popular election would spare him the necessity of choosing one of his sons to the exclusion of the others. In the past a 'judge' had been a natural leader whom the people obeyed in peace as they had in war. Henceforth there were to be *heirs* to the throne.

6. displeased him at any time: Hebrew 'pained him all his life.' He had never thwarted his son.

8. Benaiah, the officer commanding the foreign mercenaries (2 S 20 23).

9. slew: RVm sacrificed. The ambiguity points to a time when the terms were synonymous. The sacrificial feast was held at an ancient sanctuary with a sacred stone (Zoheleth perhaps = serpent) and a sacred well (En). En-rogel may be Job's Well (Bir Ayyub) at the spot where Kidron joins Hinnom Valley; or it may have long since disappeared in the earthquake mentioned by Jos., *Ant.*, x, 4.

all the king's sons: Solomon stood alone.

all the men of Judah: Absalom, too, had had their support. Their want of stability and extraordinary complexity of character were no doubt due to their mixed origin. They had absorbed Kenites, Edomites, and Canaanites.

11-27. Nathan and Bath-sheba's conspiracy.

Doubtless Nathan had acquired a moral ascendancy over David since the time he had so seriously rebuked him (2 S 12). It is strange perhaps that he should have espoused the cause of the child of the woman with whom David had so greatly sinned; but it is to be remembered that in 2 S 12 25 he claims Solomon as the Beloved of Jah.

12. Nathan assumes that the first act of the new king will be to butcher his half-brother and her mother. Such terrible atrocities pursued the Hebrew monarchs from their beginning to their end (p. 274*b*).

14. confirm: better *supplement*.

15. Bath-sheba does not follow Nathan's advice to the letter. She does not ask: Did you swear that Solomon should succeed you? She asserts it as a fact.

the king was very old: these words explain everything.

20. RV = Israel's eyes are on *you*. RVm = immediate action is expected. Either meaning is appropriate.

21. shall be counted offenders: lit. *sinners*, and suffer the penalty of such. Bath-sheba appears to have been a shallow, stupid, but not unkindly woman.

24. These are precisely the words (applied to Solomon) which this disingenuous person had put into the mouth of Bath-sheba. He plays the part of the faithful servant disconcerted by Adonijah's sudden action which he pretends to think the king is privy to.

25. captains: read *Joab the captain* with LXX. There was but one. God save king. Hebrew rather = *Vive le roi*.

28-40. David appoints Solomon his successor.

David acknowledges his oath, though the impression is left on the reader that his weakness has been played upon, and no such explicit and solemn promise had ever been made. The steps by which, with a flash of his old genius for organization, he nullifies the effect of Adonijah's *coup d'état* are worthy of note. Solomon

must ride the king's own beast, be attended by the principal officers of state, and receive the anointing of a religious coronation. Only then may he advance to the throne itself.

33. Gihon is the Virgin's Spring in a cave in the west wall of the Kidron Valley, known now as the Valley of the Lady Mary. 'The precipitous rock with the fortress above it, the open cave with the mysterious intermittent fountain, apparently directed by an immediate supernatural agency, must have formed a fitting theatre for the first coronation of an Israelite king in Jerusalem' (G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, i, 108).

34. anoint him. The exact significance of anointing is unknown. According to *R.S.*[3], 383, it conveyed to the recipient the virtues of the sacrifice. The idea of consecration by the divine Spirit was a later refinement, though from the earliest times anointing would seem to have given the recipient a commission from God. It was one of those acts of the cultus which the Hebrews adopted from a barbarous and heathen past and transformed into a ceremony pregnant with spiritual meaning.

38. Cherethites and Pelethites: 2 S 8[18] *v.n.* The tables have been turned. Once the Philistine army contained Hebrews (1 S 14[21]).

39. Tent: 2 S 6 *v.n.*

40. MT is probably right as against LXX which renders 'danced.' The site was most unsuitable for the latter exercise.

41-53. The discomfiture of Adonijah.

At the end of their meal the guests are disturbed by the noise of the throng returning from Solomon's coronation. Jonathan, no doubt anxious for the safety of his father Abiathar, hastens forward with the alarming news, and the effect is instantaneous. All leave the wretched prince, who flees panic-stricken to sanctuary to await his brother's pleasure. Thence he is torn away, and endures the last humiliation of contemptuous dismissal at his younger brother's hands.

41. trumpet: really a horn; a military, not a musical instrument, like those engraved on the Arch of Titus. The horn sounded the alarm in war, and it was this sound that caught the veteran Joab's ear.

42. a worthy man: an artist has written this. Seated among his friends, jovial, well fed and merry, how pathetic is his 'Come in, my good man: you are sure to have good news'!

43. Verily: a poor rendering. The particle repudiates: 'No good news, I fear.'

49. were afraid is weak. Render *trembled*: the lesser emotion is ascribed to the prince in [50].

50. horns of the altar: these were sacrosanct, though why we do not know (cf. Ex 29[12]; Lev 4[25, 30, 34]).

51. this day: follow RVm.

52. Solomon gives but a conditional promise, and he is to be the judge as to whether the condition is fulfilled.

II. 1-12. David's last counsel and his death.

In [2-4] David commands his son to keep the Mosaic Law in words which echo the Book of Deuteronomy. It is needless to explain why they cannot be regarded as part of the original document of 1-2. Let it suffice to say that though David could not have used the words attributed to him, yet it is more than probable that he did recommend his son to be faithful to the religion of Jehovah as it was understood in his day. The editor has adapted his words to enforce his thesis that prosperity for king and people is impossible without that service of God and man which Deuteronomy commands.

[5-6] make a painful impression. Joab, the man of blood, with all his faults had been a true servant to David, who had not dared to execute him for his treacherous murders. In his old age he is to be put to death for crimes which might well have been forgotten. Still it must be remembered that it was felt to be an outrage that blood shed unlawfully should go unavenged, and from this point of view David was acting rightly in recommending an execution he should himself have ordered years before. The death of Shimei cannot be justified in the light of later Hebrew religious knowledge; and we can only regret that the generosity of David was soured by senility, and that the 'wisdom' of Solomon was so perverted.

3. law of Moses: cf. Dt 11[1], 8[6], 10[12], 11[22], 4[40], 7[11], 10[13], 4[45], 6[17, 20]. Deuteronomy is especially connected with kingship. The reigning monarch was specially charged to read it (17[18-20]); it was, as a code, first put into use by a king (2 K 23[3]); and its spirit pervades the editorial judgement on the several kings.

5. did unto me: these words show how keenly David felt the reproach of Abner and Amasa's blood. The former held his safe-conduct (2 S 3[21]); the latter he had hailed as kinsman (2 S 19[13]). David had confessed that he lacked the power to restrain Joab and his family (2 S 3[39]), and if his tolerance of Joab was due to 'respect

of persons,' doubtless his son would invite general confidence in his justice and fairness if he slew the guilty, whatever his rank and standing.

blood of war: read with some versions 'innocent blood on *my* girdle . . . *my* loins,' etc. This shows that David really felt responsible for the avenging of these men.

6. according to thy wisdom, i.e. find a pretext or occasion.

8. a grievous curse. The belief in the potency of a curse still survives in Arabia. A tradition attributed to Muhammad states that a curse uttered against an innocent person returns and smites the reviler, or if he be righteous it falls upon a Jew! Here perhaps David is acting in fear. If the curse can be made to 'return upon' Shimei (cf. [44]) David's house will escape its malignant power.

10-11. The first example of the 'framework.'

13-25. Adonijah's imprudence and death.

The writer has carefully explained in 1[4] that Abishag was in no sense David's wife, and therefore it would be hazardous to assert that Adonijah had the throne in view when he tried to marry her. Still the analogy of 2 S 3[7] and 16[21] shows that the possession of a sovereign's harem in popular estimation carried with it a right to the throne. But Bath-sheba had no suspicion of an ulterior motive. It is a tragic fact in the history of the near East, of which the Bible affords examples from Sennacherib to Herod, that few kings dare leave near male relations alive to contest their throne. Solomon must be judged as a child of his time and race. The beautiful prayers put into his mouth belong to an age which had progressed far beyond his conception of God.

22. Why not ask for the crown straight out! A slight omission gives the superior reading: *Seeing that Abiathar the priest and Joab . . . are on his side.* If Solomon had cause for his suspicion it is not stated.

26-27. Abiathar is deposed. [27b] is a gloss by D. The effect of the deposition of the house of Eli was far-reaching. From Zadok (LXX Saddouk), who succeeded and whose descendants ultimately dispossessed the Levites, sprang the Sadducees. True to their origin they maintained their position in Maccabæan and early Christian times by a close alliance with the ruling power.

28-34. The execution of Joab.

The story of Joab's death is valuable in that it shows that the right of sanctuary could not always avail. Evidently Benaiah, the slayer, had scruples in killing his victim at the altar, though he was to profit by his death; he only does so when he has transferred responsibility to the king.

28. he turned not after Absalom. A reminder of what David and of course his younger son owed to the man who is to be slain.

31. take away the blood. Blood can only be cancelled by blood. It would not do to let Joab die of starvation at the altar.

36-46. The execution of Shimei.

III.-XI. The reign of Solomon, *c.* 979.

The ordinary reader will be conscious of the fragmentary character of many of the records contained in these chapters. They are due to the assembling of information culled from various ancient annals and temple records. But the general intention of demonstrating the majesty and state of Solomon is perfectly clear. His wide empire, his wealth, his public buildings, his possession of a united Israel where neighbours could live peaceably together, his almost supernatural wisdom, and, above all, his Temple, conspired to make him the greatest figure in Hebrew history in the eyes of his countrymen.

There was another and a darker side which these records reveal, but this was for ever thrown into the shade by the glory of his early years.

Unhappily we know little of the religion of these days. The fusion of Hebrew and Canaanite—no doubt hastened on by Philistine aggression—was all but complete, and the simpler worship of a semi-nomadic people had been contaminated by close association with the licentious rites of the Baals. Uncertainty as to the content of Hebrew belief before the conquest and the extent to which Egyptian and Babylonian culture held sway in the following centuries makes the problem of the human origin of our faith insoluble. Whatever the religion of Israel was a thousand years B.C., Solomon may be said to have 'established' it; he gave it the disadvantages as well as the advantages of a state religion. The religion of the capital set the tone for good or evil. With all its faults it was superior to the ignorant superstitious worship of the country villages, though it lacked austerity and sincerity. Against the fulminations of Jeremiah we ought to set the sublime vision vouchsafed to Isaiah in the Temple, just as we must weigh the lofty spirit of Deuteronomy against the heathen altars of the kings who reigned in Jerusalem.

III. 1. **Pharaoh's daughter.** According to Petrie (*Egypt and Israel*, 66) she must have been a daughter of Pasebkhanu II, 987-952. Egypt at this time was divided into two kingdoms, and it is the comparatively petty Pharaoh of Tanis who married his daughter to Solomon.

2, 3. **only the people sacrificed,** etc., is obviously editorial (cf. *C.B.*).

4-15. **Solomon's sacrifice at Gibeon and his dream** (cf. 2 Ch 1 [3-13]).

Whether the belief in the divine origin of Solomon's power and wealth was due to his real merits, or whether it was postulated afterwards when he had become the national ideal of a righteous king, we cannot say. In view of the sad declension which marked the closing years of his reign it is difficult to believe that the former was the case. What is important is to observe that the writers of the OT almost always surpass those of other nations in spiritual insight. They saw how, after religious exercises and meditation, inspiring dreams of God's gracious promises sanctified the lives and invigorated the minds of His servants, and they gave to their national hero a halo of which perhaps he was unworthy. Notice too the great advance on Gen 28 [20]. Jacob bargains with God for food and clothes and safety: Solomon asks for power to serve others.

16-28. **Solomon the wise judge.**

On 'wisdom' see pp. 307*b* f. Here it is shrewd observation.

18. None but the women concerned would ever know the truth. An interesting parallel to this story was found painted on the wall of a house in Pompeii—see illustration in Jeremias's *Das A.T. im Lichte d. alt. Orients*[2], 493.

28. **the wisdom of God was in him, to do judgement:** cf. Ex 18 [15]. Judgement was a sacred act. Orthodox Judaism and Islam still regard legal decisions as a normal religious function, and there is a profound truth in this, alien though it may be to us who are apt to separate the religious from the secular. To please God man must obey His law: the judge determines the interpretation of the law: therefore he is God's mouthpiece. Thus respect for law and indifference to religion is a paradox unknown to the Semite.

IV. **Organization and administration.**

1. **princes,** i.e. high executive officers. This list should be compared with 2 S 8 [15], 20 [23-26], and LXX in 2 [46*b*].

3. **recorder:** perhaps rather 'vizier'; one whose duty was to *remind* (*hizkir*) the king of affairs of state.

4*b* must be copied from 2 S 20 [25].

5. **the king's friend:** an ancient office which existed in Canaan before the Exodus —an indication of the extent of Canaanite influence on public life.

6. **levy:** rather 'forced-labour gang'. (Ex 1 [11] *v.n.*).

7-28. The areas of local administration can best be followed with map and commentary. Suffice it to say that the districts seem to be geographical rather than tribal. [21-26] are in the wrong order, but the LXX preserves the right sequence. [27-28] stating the officers' duty should follow [19], and [22-23] then complete the account. [20-21] are generalizing statements from an unknown source.

24. **on this side the river:** RVm **beyond the river** is right. The phrase betrays the later writer. Of course 'on this side' gives the meaning from the Palestinian standpoint, and the phrase must date from a time when Palestine was viewed from east of the Euphrates (cf. Neh 2 [9]; Ezr 4 [17]).

27. **those officers:** Hebrew 'these,' proving that the verse followed [19].

29-34. **The fame and wisdom of Solomon.**

Again the statements are vague. Solomon's wisdom here approaches more closely to the idea of wisdom found in the Wisdom literature. He is the author of 'proverbs,' especially those dealing with trees (cf. Jg 9 [8] and 2 K 14 [9]) and the animal world. Doubtless this passage commemorates an ancient tradition which ascribed many of Israel's gnomic sayings to Solomon.

29. **largeness of heart:** the heart is the seat of the understanding. 'The heart is the seat of knowledge' is a dictum of a well-known Arabian philosopher.

30 is important in its mention of *Egyptian* wisdom in connexion with *proverbs*. See p. 382*a*.

31. Nothing is known of these sages. They cannot be the men named in 1 Ch 15 [17. 19].

V.-VII. **The building of the Temple and the Palace.**

The importance of the Temple in the later history of the Hebrew people can hardly be overestimated; but it is doubtful whether the first Temple exercised the profound influence wielded by its successors. In Solomon's day it was the outward and visible sign that Israel vied with the surrounding nations in the housing of its king and its God. Built on the highest point of Sion (the eastern hill), and filled with all the costly appointments Solomon's wealth could command, in its position within the palace *enceinte*, it is to be

compared with Windsor Chapel rather than with Westminster Abbey. The nation's pride in its magnificence must have been tempered with the reflection that the country's resources in men and treasure had been poured out unsparingly to provide its massive walls and costly fittings. During the monarchy it was the resort of the aristocracy rather than of the Judæan peasant.

Still, despite the innovations that were introduced into the cultus and the idolatrous rites patronized by many of the kings, like all great sanctuaries it inevitably exercised a great influence on the more able as well as the more devout members of the nation, and so a use was gradually formed which in time became the normal expression of Israel's worship. Its site had been sacred from a remote antiquity, and as a place of pilgrimage it was so firmly established that the first concern of Jeroboam's polity was to provide a substitute.

V. 1-12. **Preparations for building.**

Hiram=Hirom in [10, 18] (Josephus and Assyrian *Hirummu* agree with the latter) is said by Winckler to have reigned from *c.* 968 to 935.

for he had heard that they had anointed him: the LXX 'to anoint Solomon.' If this is a corruption of MT it is a strange one. If it is original, then Solomon was Hiram's vassal, though the subsequent relations of the two kings give little support for the hypothesis.

4. adversary: Hebrew *satan*. 11 [14, 23] state that Jehovah raised up as Satans Hadad and Rezon. The word in pre-exilic times was innocent of theological import. [3-5] are probably to be ascribed to the Deuteronomic editor.

5. the name of . . . my God. A god could only be successfully invoked by those who knew his name. Enormous importance was (and still is in Islam) attached to names. The NT is truly Hebraic in the stress it lays on the sublime import of the name Jesus (Mt 1 [21]; Lk 1 [31]).

9. A similar plan was adopted when the second Temple was built (Ezr 3 [7]). A most interesting account of the adventures of an Egyptian envoy who went to secure timber from the Lebanon in the 12th century B.C. will be found in Burney's *Judges*, xcvi.

10-12. The price paid in kind was enormous, and in addition Solomon had to cede to Hiram a considerable tract of territory (9 [10-13]).

13-18. The organization of forced labour.

The conscription of no less than 180,000 men under 3,300 officers must have been an intolerable burden on the resources of a small country, and the arrangement whereby they served only one month in every three could at best have been but a partial alleviation of the hardship caused to an agricultural population which depended on field work and the care of its livestock. The mortality among the workers must have been high, and the hatred of the hapless people correspondingly bitter. Solomon's selfish policy was destined to wreck the unity of the tribes for ever, and the favourable verdict on his wisdom and greatness can only have been passed when the great schism had become ancient history. It is rash to attempt to date an idea or a religious belief; but it may be said that when the northern kingdom had been crushed by foreigners, and when the southern kingdom felt its isolation, it would be but natural to look back on the age when Israel and Judah dwelt securely at unity under their own king as a Golden Age. Such idealizations, which ignore ugly facts, are to be found in every nation's history, e.g. Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome*.

13. all Israel must be right as against 9 [20-21], which asserts that only the Canaanitish peoples were conscripted, else the schism of the ten tribes would hardly have occurred. Still perhaps there is a grain of truth in the latter in that the foreign elements in the population may have had to bear the brunt of these exactions. But again we do not know how far these peoples had been assimilated by this time. They certainly have no separate national existence in the OT records.

14. by courses, i.e. in relays.

15. Well-chosen illustrations of forced labour copied from ancient monuments will be found in Ball, *Light from the East*, 109.

A Note on the Date of Solomon's Temple

The date given here is unfortunately only relative, and (see p. 177*b*), as the date of the Exodus is in dispute, and there are strong reasons for believing that 480 is a rough estimate founded on a tradition that twelve generations separated the Exodus from the Temple, it is well to receive the information with reserve. Still, if Solomon began his reign in 970, the fourth year in which the foundation was laid would be 967 B.C. Add 480, and we get 1447, which brings us into the reign of Amenhotep II, in whose reign one

school of ancient historians place the Exodus. Again, add to this the 430 years Israel spent in Egypt, according to P's account in Ex 12 [40], and we get 1877, agreeing with Petrie's date of the supremacy of the Semites in Egypt. Then add 215 years to cover the patriarchal period, and we get the date 2092 for Abraham, and thus Biblical chronology can be said to show a fairly close approximation to a credible scheme, for Abraham is then a contemporary of Hammurabi (2123-2081), the Amraphel of Gen 14. But the gaps in our knowledge and the inconsistencies in the data make it hazardous to ask more than a proximate probability in this scheme. Thus the OT gives us 534 years from the Exodus wanderings to the fourth year of Solomon, and that without allowing any time for the judgeships of Joshua, Samuel, and even Saul. In agreement with this Josephus states that the Temple was built 592 years after the Exodus. The whole question is beset with difficulties which can only be resolved by fresh archæological discoveries.

VI. 2-38. The Temple.

One of the clearest and most scholarly descriptions of the Temple is the article by Kennedy in *H.D.B.*, iv, 906. Here it must suffice to indicate its principal features. According to modern ideas the Temple was very small. It was only 90 × 30 feet, and only 30 feet high; to this we must add the porch which gave on to the main building and accounted for 30 × 15 feet. Thus the whole structure was only 40 yards long. The above figures assume that the cubit was 18 inches. Kennedy favours 20 inches. The standard measurement was apparently altered in Babylon (cf. Ezek 40 [5] and 43 [13]).

Much as we learn from this account, much information is lacking, e.g. as to the size of the Temple courts. Barnes quotes Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 61: 'Behind a forecourt open to the sky rose a colonnaded hall, beyond which was a series of small chambers containing the furniture and implements for the Temple services. The central chamber in the rear was occupied by a small room, the holy of holies, in which stood a shrine hewn from one block of stone. It contained the image of the god.' The immemorial pattern in the Near East seems thus to have been portico, cella, holy of holies and side buildings, and *mutatis mutandis* this form is still preserved in the mosques. The interior of Solomon's Temple, entirely lined with cedar carved with the skill of the ancients with cherubim, pomegranates, and flowers, and terminating in the mysterious golden *debir* or inner shrine, viewed in the arrow shafts of light shooting through the crenellated (?) windows in the morning and evening hours, must have overawed the visitor with the sense of the Unseen One who dwelt within. For it must be remembered that the primary purpose of the Temple (in Hebrew 'house') was 'to house' the deity, not to provide a site for congregational worship.

The *debir* (RV *oracle*) was a cube 30 × 30 × 30 feet, and was afterwards known as the Holy of Holies, the visible sign and location of the Divine Presence. The existence of this holy of holies down to the destruction of Herod's Temple, together and side by side with the affirmation that God whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain will not be confined within this 'house' (8 [27]), points not so much to a want of logic as a recognition of man's need of immanence, an outward and visible sign of God's immanence and God's presence. Just as within infinity we attempt to mark out times and seasons, and so gain a sense of order and proportion, so within the awful mystery of God's omnipresence, which he fully recognized, the Jew of later days marked out a place which by prayer, consecration, and intention he claimed was uniquely God's.

3. temple (*hekal*) **of the house**: rather 'nave of the temple.'

11-13. An insertion (? P) preparing the reader for the tragedy of the Temple's overthrow. God's indwelling is to be conditional; and every care is subsequently taken to show how flagrantly the condition was broken by a lawless and disobedient nation.

15-22 are extremely complicated. The LXX is most useful, and should be studied by those who desire more light on the subject. The word rendered **oracle** means *hinder part*, i.e. *chancel*. It is interesting to note that the sole surviving monument of an ancient Arabian *naos*, the Ka'ba at Mecca, is also a cube. The altar of shewbread stood before the *debir*.

17. Read with LXX (L): *And forty cubits was the length of the temple before the chancel.*

20. pure gold: lit. 'ingot-gold.'

he covered the altar with cedar can hardly be right. LXX omits the following words in [21], and for the whole reads 'He made an altar in front of the chancel.' But as the altar was the table for the shewbread, the note that it was made of cedar is needed. 'The transition from the name "altar" to "table" is shown

by Ezek 41 [22]: cf. also Ex 25 [23] ' (Skinner). To these add Heb 13 [10].

21-22. The LXX omits the statements that the whole of the Temple was overlaid with gold. Doubtless they are a later insertion as we hear nothing elsewhere of this mass of gold.

23-28. The cherubim.

The etymology of the word 'cherub' is still uncertain. When Ezekiel (1 [5-26]) describes them as possessing four faces—lion, ox, eagle, man—with the figures and hands of men and the feet of calves, it is uncertain whether he is thinking of the cherubs of the first Temple; those of his own imagination; or creatures similar in some respects to those illustrated in Ball, *L.E.*, 28, 30. Ezekiel's cherubs sustain the throne of Jehovah. Ps 18 [10] speaks of Jehovah riding upon a cherub: hence Kittel thinks it was the personification of the thunder-cloud, an hypothesis which does not explain *all* the facts.

Such composite figures are found in the art of all Israel's neighbours, and it is possible that they belong to the same mysterious circle of ideas as the totem. Monstrosities were a source of deep wonder and awe to the ancients, and were associated with the mysterious powers of unfathomable nature. And the cherub was a monstrosity. In Israel the cherub had to submit to that purifying process which all elements inherited from heathenism were made to undergo. It was made into a slave of God, his steed on which he rode, and the guardian of his holy resting-place. But one step further and it was removed to the heavenly sphere as in En 14, etc.

26. the inner court, i.e. of the Temple, for the palace had its own court.

VII. The Palace.

Besides the two courts just mentioned there was a third which surrounded the whole complex of buildings. The building ran from south to north, beginning from the great public hall formed by the house of the forest of Lebanon. A visitor to the king would enter a rectangular hall 150 × 75 feet, rising to a height of 45 feet, the whole of it lined with cedar. Passing through this handsome room he would come into an open court in face of a magnificent porch. Beyond this lay the Hall of Justice with Solomon's cedar throne, and, still further on, the palace of hewn stone within its own court, and finally the Temple with which the description began.

1. Solomon spent nearly twice as much time on his own house, but he built the house of God first.

13-51. The Temple furniture.

A skilled artificer is procured from Tyre to superintend the casting of the numerous metal instruments needed in the worship of the Temple. As a mongrel Israelite he was well fitted to undertake the establishment of a foundry in the Jordan Valley. His father was a Tyrian metal-worker, and his mother a woman of Naphtali (2 Ch 2 [14] of Dan). His name (cf. 2 Ch 2 [13], 4 [16]) was perhaps Huram-abi = Huram is my father. The two great pillars which he cast (so LXX rightly), with their complicated network of festoons and pomegranates, apparently stood clear of the building, and were thus similar to the twin pillars of ancient sanctuaries. (Nisibin = two pillars, indeed took its name from them.) Their significance is unknown. At Tyre, according to Herodotus, Melkarth was worshipped in the form of two pillars, but it is much more likely that there, as in Babylonia, two gods were represented (see *Cent. B.*). However, Phœnician tombs afford excellent illustrations of slavish imitation of Egyptian symbols where all knowledge of their original significance has been lost, and it is not impossible that the pillars merely followed the conventional style. But against this is the fact that they were named, and also the persistence of obelisks in the Hebrew cultus. As to the names: Jachin, 'He shall establish,' *might* be the Phœnician equivalent of 'Yahweh,' but it implies that the root of YHVH was supposed in Solomon's time to be the same as HYH—a very doubtful hypothesis, and leaves us to guess why the pillar should bear a Phœnician name; Boaz = in it (or him) is strength, but it is written as a compound word, and such, apart from proper names, are non-existent in Hebrew. Is it possible that the device on the pillars was meant to be read as a sentence, 'He will establish strength herein'?

The ten wheeled stands ([27-39]) are said in 2 Ch 4 [6] to have been used for conveying water (from the molten sea?) to the great altar. Illustrations of stands from Larnaka in Cyprus will be found in Burney.

VIII. The dedication of the Temple.

A comparison with LXX shows that this chapter has been worked over by a late hand, many of the additions being little older than the Christian era. When these interpolations are removed we have a picture of an ancient dedicatory service. The principal men are invited, and to mark the continuity of the new sanctuary's worship with the nation's past Solomon brings up the ark from the old Jebusite

stronghold to its resting-place in the chancel under the shadow of the wings of the cherubim. A public banquet on a scale of unexampled magnitude with gifts to the populace reminds the country of the importance of the new régime. During the solemn offering of the dedicatory sacrifices the sun is darkened, and Solomon improvises a poem which is at the same time a dedicatory prayer. On to this the Deuteronomic editor has grafted a prayer and blessing of great beauty, whose dominant note is loyalty to Jehovah. Typical of the Deuteronomic school, that sane conservative party which sought to maintain all that was best in the cultus while giving whole-hearted allegiance to the teaching of the prophets, the prayer bases itself on the covenant. It is of the utmost importance to grasp what this writer has to say about the Temple. Anxious as he is to assert the paramount importance of the sanctuary at Jerusalem, he does not overstate it. The Temple is specially dear to Jehovah because He was *asked* (26 f.) so to regard it. The special limitation of the deity is therefore an accommodation to the limitations of His people; it is not because He Himself wishes to dwell in a house made with hands.

Historically Jerusalem became the only centre where sacrifice was acceptable to Jehovah, because the local sanctuaries were the homes of idolatry and lasciviousness: ideally the Temple came into existence as the sequel of the ark of the covenant which had been the symbol of God's presence in the far-off days of the nation's wanderings.

1-11. Removal of the ark to the Temple. The additions which were made by P after the LXX was translated should be studied in the commentaries. Notice especially in 5 P thinks of the nation as a church, and therefore calls it *the congregation*.

2. the feast, i.e. of Tabernacles.

4. tent of meeting. It is hardly credible that the *tent* which Moses made in the wilderness was extant in Solomon's day. No mention is made of it in 2 S 6, where it is explained that David had to provide a tent. Moreover, once the ark was housed the tent ceased to be necessary. The later history of the ark is shrouded in obscurity.

8. there they are, unto this day: an indication of the early date of this source. The LXX wrongly omits the words.

9. There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone. Some scholars have suggested that the ark did contain an image of Israel's God, claiming that it resembled the coffers containing the images of the gods and goddesses of Egypt; but there is not a shred of evidence for the theory, and if the words are polemical, as some assert, they need not be held to contradict a belief of Israelites that the ark held an image, but rather to remind them how their ark differed from the arks of the heathen.

10-11. When the ark is laid within the sanctuary, the cloud descends and darkens the building, so that sacrificial worship is impossible. The thick cloud, the ancient symbol of God's presence, is again with them: cf. Ex 33 9, 'the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the Tent.'

12-13. Solomon's hymn.

In the LXX a longer form of this canto occurs (wrongly) after 53. To allay the general alarm at the sudden darkness Solomon improvises verses as the seers of Arabia calmed or encouraged their tribesmen in the presence of danger. The poem has been brilliantly reconstructed by Dr. Thackeray, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 76, on which the following is based:

> 'The sun of majesty is beclouded in the heavens;
> The Lord said he would dwell in thick darkness;
> Build my house, a house splendid for thyself!'
>
> (For the Sabbath: set to falsetto voices: an excerpt from the Book of Jashar.)

The Majesty (Hebrew *hôd*) of God is above the heavens (Ps 8 1); He clothes Himself with it (104 1). The LXX has '*out of* thick darkness,' which Thackeray would read and interpret as God's promise to depart from His recognized ways (cf. Ex 20 21), and leave the darkness of the thunder-cloud to dwell in an earthly abode. To the present writer the meaning given above seems more probable.

13. I have . . . built. The LXX describes Solomon as imploring God's help in the building of a house suitable for Him. The concluding rubric is similar to others where extracts from the Book of Jashar are made. In this case they are reached by retranslating the Greek into unvocalized Hebrew, which then furnishes the requisite text.

On the ancient connexion of this passage with the Feast of Tabernacles and with solar worship see Thackeray *in loc.*

14-61. Solomon's orations.

(*a*) 15-21, an address to the people; (*b*) 22-53, the prayer of dedication; (*c*) 54-61, the blessing of the people. The whole is from D or D^2.

14-21. Cf. 2 Ch 6 3-11 and 2 S 7 1-13.

14. turned his face about, i.e. from the altar to the people; in 22 he turns back

again to the altar. **stood:** Wellhausen compares the practice of Muslims who stand to assist at the communal sacrifice.

15. **with his hand fulfilled:** so [23] and Jer 44 [25]†. The phrase means 'performed it himself.' 'By the hand of' must not be taken literally as by RV in Gal 3 [19].

16. **my name.** God could be summoned by name. In this lay the awful sin of lip-service from a faithless people. The longer reading in 2 Ch 6 [6] is no doubt right.

21. **a place for the ark.** The word for 'place' is *maqom*, the equivalent of the *maqams* which are to be found everywhere in the Muhammadan East—shrines which shelter the tomb of some saint. The Temple was to be the shrine or *maqom* of the ark, which was associated with Moses the law-giver, just as the *maqam* at Mecca shelters the sacred stone on which Abraham stood when he built the Ka'ba.

22-53. This beautiful prayer in itself calls for no comment. Justice and truth are ensured on earth among men of goodwill if they are mindful of the covenant with God which ensures communion with Him.

22. **before the altar.** To the Chronicler it was incredible that Solomon should arrogate to himself the priestly office, and so he adds a characteristic gloss.

27. A reminder of a necessary limitation of the idea of an objective Real Presence.

31. Cf. Ex 22 [11].

34. **bring them again unto the land.** The text has been read with the wrong vowels. Emend *let them dwell in the land*. The people could not 'make supplication in this house' ([33]) if they were in exile.

37. **in the land of their cities:** emend *in any of their gates* (cf. Dt 15 [7]).

39. A wonderful statement of the individual man living unto God. God knows the mind of every man that it is peculiar to the man himself.

41-43. The foreigner, not the naturalized and protected sojourner, is to be the object of Jehovah's care. Thus may the Gentiles be drawn to Him. Such an enlightened kindly spirit is found elsewhere only in the Deutero-Isaiah.

44. **thou shalt send them.** War among the Semites has always been regarded as sacred and imposed by God. Cf. Mesha, king of Moab, 'Chemosh said to me, Go take Nebo against Israel,' and the *jihad* or *holy* war in Islam. **pray . . . toward the city:** a practice first vouched for in Dan 6 [10].

46-51. **It is not impossible that these** verses are a pre-exilic reflection on the fate of the northern kingdom, and it would not have required much imagination to fear a like fate for Judæa which was constantly playing off one great power against another. Still, the text is in disorder in [52], and the passage may fairly be suspected as a later addition.

54-61. The blessing, omitted by Chronicles as an infringement of the priests' right (cf. Nu 6 [22-27]).

61. **perfect:** this word (*shālēm*), both here and often in the NT, does not mean ideal perfection such as none can attain to, but rather *complete*, or *whole*, as opposed to something partial or defective. The Israelite's mind was to be completely with God. The words Islam and Muslim come from this root; Muhammadans explain them as meaning 'surrender' and 'resigned,' and it is worth noticing that Skinner paraphrases 'completely surrendered.'

62-66. The dedicatory sacrifices. The huge numbers are later exaggerations. Sacrifice was an integral part of dedication (cf. 1 Mac 4 [53]).

64. **brazen altar.** It is strange that this has not been mentioned hitherto.

Note on the Altars at Jerusalem

A narrative, which is probably not later than 9th century (2 S 24 *v.n.*), relates how David *set up* and *built* an altar in the threshing-floor of Araunah. Now according to the Chronicler (2 Ch 3 [1]), the threshing-floor fell within the compass of Solomon's Temple, so that the inference is that the Temple was built on the site of an existing Hebrew altar which was probably constructed of unhewn stone. It is strange that in these chapters there has been no mention of the construction of an altar, and various explanations have been suggested. The brazen, or better 'bronze,' altar of [64] appears unheralded, and 9 [25] gives no help. Smith's explanation (*Rel. Semites*[3], 485) that 'the brazen altar of 2 K 16 is identical with one of the two pillars Jachin and Boaz' seems to the writer unsound, because Smith's philological objections to the text of 16 [14] being groundless, and the text consequently sound, there is no reason for objecting to the statement there that Ahaz moved the old brazen altar to make way for the new Damascene model.

Skinner's suggestion that sacrifices were offered on the rock by Solomon is possible, though, on the whole, analogy with Hebrew practice and adherence to tradition require us to suppose that Solomon used the altar erected by his father. In that

case what was the *bronze* altar? If Solomon really made (*built* is not a natural word) a bronze altar, why is no certain mention made of it when utensils and vessels of far less importance are carefully enumerated, and why was it not carried off with the rest of the Temple bronze? All we can say is that a bronze altar was in use before the time of Ahaz, and that it *may* go back to Solomon himself. See further Gray, *Sacrifice in the O.T.*, 130.

IX. 1-9. **Jehovah appears to Solomon.**

In a dream Solomon is divinely assured of the permanence of the Davidic dynasty if he will be obedient to the commands of God. The cause of the disruption of the kingdom (observe *over Israel* in 5) is Solomon's disobedience. So far the passage is pre-exilic; but 6-9 seem to imply that the destruction of the Temple is a fact to be explained. But 8 46-51 *v.n.*

2. as he had appeared unto him at Gibeon: to make it clear that the vision was only a dream.

3. hallowed is wrong. Solomon had hallowed the Temple (*qiddesh*) by dedication and sacrifice. Jehovah *declares it holy* (*hiqdīsh*): so also in 7.

8. though this house be so high. The text is corrupt. Follow Syriac and Targum, and read *and this house shall be a heap of ruins.* The presence of deserted ruined sites, once the scene of human habitation, frequently gave rise to such reflections; thus Sodom and Gomorrah, and in the Quran the ruins of Ad and Thamud and Madyan.

10-14. Galilee is ceded to Hiram.

Apparently the reason was that Solomon needed ready money. Solomon had paid in kind for the timber and labour lent by Hiram. The north naturally lay open to penetration by the native Syrians, and it began to lose caste as early as this: already in Isaiah (9 1) it is Galilee of the Gentiles.

13. Cabul, perhaps for *êk bûl,* 'Where is the produce?'

15-23. Solomon's fortifications.

Anyone who follows the course of the British campaign in Palestine will observe Solomon's acumen in seizing and fortifying the strategic points of the land.

19. store cities: military depots probably near the frontiers.

20-22 must be read with 5 13 and 11 28, otherwise the great schism remains unexplained. No doubt non-Israelites bore more than their share of this toil, but by this time intermingling must have been general. **unto this day** must mean some time before the Exile.

24. The advent of Pharaoh's daughter evidently marked a great change in the relation of king and people. The old tribal freedom of approach was destroyed when Solomon retired with his foreign princess behind the walls of his palace, and it is significant that the next king of Israel was one who lived among his people.

26-28. The Red Sea fleet.

Denied access to the Mediterranean by the lack of a serviceable harbour and the amazing activity of the Phœnicians in the north, Solomon with an enterprise unequalled in Hebrew history secured the long overland route from Jerusalem to the Ælanitic Gulf of the ancients (now el-Aqaba). With Tyrian aid he organized a fleet which plied along the Red Sea as far as Ophir. Unfortunately there are many claimants to the ancient title of Ophir (see *H.D.B.*), but on the whole some port in Oman on the western side of the Persian Gulf seems probable.

26. in the land of Edom. The Edomites regained their independence fairly early in Solomon's reign (11 22 LXX); but presumably Solomon was able to protect his caravans by an armed escort, just as the Turks till recently protected the pilgrim trains in the same territory.

X. 1-13. **Visit of the Queen of Sheba.**

An immediate sequel to Solomon's commercial ventures in the Red Sea was the state visit of the Queen of Sheba, then an important and highly civilized empire in the south-west of Arabia, whose capital was Marib. Nothing more is known of the queen, though Arabian and Abyssinian legend has been busy with her name. She is famed in Islamic stories as Bilqis. 'We hear of Arabian queens, if not at this time, still about 250 years later, when Sargon received tribute from the queen Shamsi and Ita'amara the Sabæan. And the recently discovered realm of Lihyan is shown . . . to have had a queen among its rulers' (D. S. Margoliouth, *Schweich Lectures*, 1921, 49).

The sudden arrival of a mercantile marine from an obscure North Arabian principality called for investigation, and the queen is surprised to find that rumour was for once true. She attributes Solomon's prosperity to the favour of his God.

14-15. Solomon's import of gold is incredibly large, and is said to be equal to £4,000,000 in weight.

15 is obscure, but almost certainly refers to import and export duties, and tolls levied on merchants.

18-20. The ivory throne was obviously based on an Egyptian model (9 24 *v.n.*).

22. ships of Tarshish: not of course literally, for that were impossible, but ships capable of going to Tarshish, 'the

East Indiamen of the ancient world' (Skinner). **ivory, and apes, and peacocks:** unfortunately all three words are of doubtful meaning (cf. LXX).

23-29. Solomon the magnificent.

Within the matter-of-fact statements of the early chroniclers there are interwoven idealized and generalized statements of his glory. There is something sublime in the editors' contempt for mere facts. The belief that Israel once had a king all-righteous, all-wise, and all-glorious had a value for all Israelites yet unborn; the fact that he traded with South Arabia and grossly misgoverned his subjects had none. This conception of Solomon is well illustrated in the hymn 'Hail to the Lord's Anointed, Great David's greater Son!'

28. Render: *Now the export of the horses which S. acquired was from Musri and from Coa; the king's merchants used to bring them from Coa for cash.* These are names for Cappadocia and Cilicia.

29. did they bring: render *through whom they were exported.*

XI. 1-13. Solomon's polygamy and idolatry.

The kernel of this section is ancient, and phlegmatically records the sad decline in Solomon's character. The ancient parts are [1, 3a, 7]. The remainder is the work of D, whose object is to show that Solomon's misfortunes developed naturally out of his apostasy and marriages with heathen. Late though the protest of D may be, it contains much historic truth. Luxury and vain display impoverished and enslaved his subjects, while intermarriage blunted the national religious consciousness. The furious reaction in the days of Elijah was no doubt the crisis of a long impatience with heathen contamination.

2. Cf. Dt 7 [1-4]; Jos 23[7].

4. when Solomon was old. It is not D's view that the weakness was confined to S's old age, and this must be a later insertion (cf. LXX).

7. abomination: Hebrew *shiqqus*, 'detestable thing,' an intentional alteration of an original 'god of' (cf. LXX here and in [2]). Later orthodoxy refused even to recognize the existence of heathen gods. This attitude accounts for the strong repugnance towards Greek thought—the product of those so contemptible as to worship the work of their own hands.

6. wives which burnt incense. LXX (L) gives the original reading 'burning,' etc. Solomon himself sacrificed to idols.

11. rend the kingdom from thee: lit. 'from upon thee.' It was S's regal garment, visible territorial majesty (cf. Ps 104 [1]; Eph 6 [14]).

12. out of the hand of thy son, i.e. as he is about to put it on, and so assume sovereignty.

14-25. Sundry rebellions.

Clearly these troubles began soon after Solomon's accession. Despite his zeal for fortifications his martial spirit was quenched by sensuality. Only through the strong and stable government of his father was he able to enjoy for his own lifetime a peace bought at the expense of his successors. For a reconstruction of what appears to be a duplicate account of this story see Burney, 158. The LXX here is important.

14. an adversary: Hebrew *satan* (Job 1 [11] *v.n.*).

24. they went to Damascus: LXX 'he (Rezon) captured Damascus.' Thus one of Israel's strongest enemies came to power.

26-40. The rebellion of Jeroboam.

The LXX gives a widely different account of the career of Jeroboam, and the problems thus raised have not been satisfactorily explained (see *Cent. B.*, 443). It is evident that at one time two independent traditions were current. On the whole the LXX seems superior, but the MT is a more self-consistent narrative. According to MT the cause of Jeroboam's rebellion was the symbolic act of Ahijah the prophet: in LXX, being given charge of the labour gangs of the house of Joseph he fortified Sareira, and with 300 chariots at his disposal defied Solomon. Doubtless this action marked him out as the leader of the northerners against the oppressive tyranny of Judah.

29. the Shilonite, i.e. of Shiloh, Israel's ancient sanctuary. No Shilonite would have cause to be grateful to Solomon. The numbering of the tribes 12-10-1 (not 2) is very strange. Symbolic acts have always exercised a profound influence on Semitic peoples. By them prophets sought to express the inevitable nature of God's purpose as declared by them (cf. Ac 21 [11]).

32-39. Here D enforces the lesson. By this time (*c.* 620) it was apparent to all that the schism was calamitous. Both sides had been weakened, religion decentralized and dethroned, and small communities left exposed to the temptations natural to idolatrous and lewd Israelites of mixed descent. God's ways had therefore to be justified to men. It was the people's disobedience which led to schism and overthrow.

41-43. Another example of the 'framework' (2 [10] *v.n.*).

(B) 1 K XII.-2 K XVII. The Divided Monarchy

XII. 1-XIV. 20. **Jeroboam I of Israel, 932-911 (?).**

XII. 1-20. **The Revolt.**—A mere boy of sixteen (the LXX must be right as against MT in 14 [21]), Rehoboam came to the throne at a most difficult time. He could not have shown greater imprudence, and the breach between Israel and Judah became irreparable. The narrative is obviously only fragmentary, as its abrupt beginning would suggest.

2. Jeroboam dwelt in Egypt: read with 2 Ch 10 [2] *Jeroboam returned from Egypt.*

4. The Israelites did not desire any other king. They wanted to live as free men.

8. young men: lit. 'boys' in contempt. Such a course would be strange in a man of mature years, but natural in a boy of sixteen (*v.s.*).

15. a thing brought about: Hebrew 'a turning': cf. 'the wheel of fate.'

16. A defiant song.

20. Judah only, but as Jerusalem lay within Benjamin's territory a certain number of the Benjamites went with Judah, though the bulk adhered to Israel.

21-24 are only an apparent contradiction, as they belong to a later source.

21. The numbers are exaggerated.

24. This ill accords with the statement in 14 [30] that there was constant war between the two kingdoms.

25. Jeroboam fortifies Shechem (now Nablus) and Penuel in Transjordania.

26-31. The golden calves.

In the eyes of later writers the calf or probably bull-worship established by Jeroboam was the crowning infamy of his reign. There can be no doubt that Jeroboam meant these bulls to be images of Jehovah, and as such they were a violation of the essential characteristic of Israelite religion. The place of bulls and oxen in the religion of Babylonia, Egypt, and Syria is well known. Jeroboam's identification of Jehovah with a bull-god was syncretistic; no doubt he hoped to provide a bridge between his Israelite and Canaanite subjects. An extraordinarily close parallel to this political device is to be found in the action of the Caliphs of Damascus, who set up Jerusalem against Mecca as a rival pilgrim sanctuary. The occurrence of the same words of institution in Ex 32 [4, 8] suggests that the iconoclastic controversy of the writer's day was present from the very beginning of 'Jahwism.' The appointment of a non-Levitical priesthood was another way in which Jeroboam followed an ancient practice which made for disunion. The editors rightly perceived that the northern kingdom took a path which led away from spiritual religion, and their incessant insistence upon the wickedness of Jeroboam sprang from a desire to preserve their nation's clearer vision of God's character.

32. feast, i.e. the Pilgrimage of Tabernacles.

XIII. **A Judæan man of God at Beth-el.**

This story presents many problems. Its morality is doubtful, its meticulous prophecy of an unimportant event to take place 350 years later (2 K 23 [16-18]) is unparalleled in Scripture, and its relation to the book as a whole is somewhat obscure. The writer apparently desired to show that the destruction of the idolatrous worship of Beth-el had been decreed from its inception, and that anyone who ventured to disobey the command of God on any pretext whatsoever must expect sudden judgement.

18. angel: angels bringing prophetic messages are not mentioned elsewhere till Ezekiel. **lied unto him:** no motive is given for this deception, which strengthens the supposition that this is only a Midrash or homiletic story composed in order to inculcate the absolute necessity of obeying God's command.

XIV. 1-18. **The death of Abijah.**

The prophecy has many features in common with 16 [1-4], 21 [20-22. 24]; 2 K 9 [7-10]; the kernel is ancient, but [7-11. 13-16] are certainly editorial additions. In the LXX the narrative is richer in detail, and occurs in another context.

9. above all that were before thee: an obvious anachronism.

14. that day: but what? even now is nonsense. The best emendation is Kittel's 'in that day. Moreover, then will Jehovah smite,' etc.

15. Asherim: Dt 16 [21]; Jg 6 [26] *v.n.*

21-31. Rehoboam of Judah, 932-916.

25-28. Invasion by Shishak. The Egyptian invasion was more serious than these verses might imply. The temple at Karnak preserved a long list of Israelite as well as Judæan cities which paid tribute to Shishak. The splendour of Solomon's Temple began to wane in the lifetime of his son.

XV. 1-8. **Abijam of Judah, 916-914.**

1. LXX *Abijah.* They give six years as the length of his reign.

2. daughter of Abishalom. Absalom is meant, and *bath* here stands for granddaughter.

5. It is strange that this important qualification occurs only here.

9-24. Asa of Judah, 914-874.

He must have been Abijam's brother—not his son—if the name of his mother is correctly given. There is no valid reason for doubting the tradition that this early attempt at reform actually took place, though the language is for the most part Deuteronomic.

13. abominable image: lit. 'a thing of horror.' What this was we cannot say. It is bound up with the question whether *Asherah* sometimes means a goddess. There certainly was a goddess of that name (probably = Tyche = Fortuna) among the Amorites. Often sacred objects used in a cult were credited with the properties and sanctity of the god itself. If Asherah here = goddess, then an idol is probably meant (see *R.S.*[3], ed. S. A. Cook, 560).

16-22. A Syro-Judæan alliance.

Ramah was only five miles north of Jerusalem, and thus its possession by the king of Israel must have been a constant anxiety to Judah. The petty kingdom of Damascus held its own so long because of the constant strife between the two Israelitish kingdoms.

18. The second spoliation of the Temple.

22. Mizpah: commanding Jerusalem from the north.

25-32. Nadab of Israel, 912-911.

Asa was the last king of Judah who came to the throne in the reign of Jeroboam, and the editor is now at liberty to treat of Israelite kings till the last reign beginning within Asa's kingship. This method he pursues till the end of the northern kingdom in 722.

27. Gibbethon: a frontier town where probably Baasha commanded the soldiery.

33-XVI. 7. Baasha of Israel, 911-888.

This section is entirely editorial: the double account of the prophet Jehu should be noticed. The second statement in [7] is difficult to account for.

XVI. 8-14. Elah of Israel, 888-887.

11. Again a change of dynasty is effected by the extermination of the blood royal. **kinsfolks** (Hebrew *goels*): those whose duty it would be to avenge his blood.

15-20. Zimri of Israel, 887.

A reign of one week. The troops now chose their ruler, and Zimri was vanquished by the strongest leader the northern kingdom ever had.

19. The formula is purely mechanical. Zimri can have done nothing in the time to further the policy of Jeroboam.

21-28. Omri of Israel, 887-876.

The discrepancy between the figures in [23] and [29] is to be explained by the fact that [23] reckons Omri's accession from the date of the suppression of his rival Tibni, while [29] reckons it from the death of Zimri. Civil war must have gone on for four years. The LXX reckons twelve years from the death of Tibni, and thus brings Omri's reign into that of Jehoshaphat, who ought, according to the scheme of the framework, to be dealt with before Ahab. The LXX actually inserts Jehoshaphat's accession between Omri and Ahab. Omri was known to the Assyrians as the founder of a strong dynasty, and the Moabite Stone is another contemporary witness to his skill in war. Samaria, his city, was second only to Jerusalem in natural advantages, and was wellnigh impregnable. Despite his reputation among foreigners his career is passed over in the OT with the comment in [25] that he was worse than all his predecessors, and the reference in Mic 6[16] to the 'statutes of Omri,' which may imply that he was responsible for the furtherance of Syrian heathenism.

29-34. Ahab of Israel, 876-854.

The end of Ahab's reign is recorded in 22. It was of great significance in that the opposition to foreign customs found at last a leader. Again we find concrete evidence in demonstrably early documents that the religion of Israel was *not* the same as that of the surrounding nations. The compromise which had been tolerated when Jehovah was hailed as Baal was shattered when it became apparent that Baal could not be identified with Jehovah, if he was the Baal of the Tyrians. The Deuteronomist and the perhaps contemporary historian are at one in maintaining that the calves of Jeroboam were a light matter compared with the establishment of the worship of the Tyrian Baal as the national religion.

31. as if it had been a light thing. Render: 'And the least thing was his walking,' etc.

Ethbaal, the Ithobal of Josephus, is said in *K.A.T.*[3], 129 to have reigned from 887-876.

32. Baal, i.e. the Baal of Tyre, Melqarth.

34. Jos 6[26] *v.n.*

XVII.-XIX. Elijah.

How much the Christian Church owes to Elijah can never be determined. Certainly he was one raised up by God to stem the evil tide of heathenism and to prevent the religion of Israel from sinking to the level of surrounding paganism. Skinner's rendering of Wellhausen's words (*Israelitische u. Jüdische Geschichte*[3], 74) deserves a place at the head of any estimate of the life of Elijah: 'To him Baal and Yahweh represented, so to speak, a

contrast of principles, of profound and ultimate practical convictions; both could not be right, nor could they exist side by side. For him there existed no plurality of Divine Powers, operating with equal authority in different spheres, but everywhere one Holy and Mighty Being, who revealed Himself not in the life of nature, but in those laws by which alone human society is held together, in the ethical demands of the spirit.'

We cannot perceive step by step how spiritually minded men in the long years between Moses and Elijah maintained their hold of the great ethical principles to which the Law strives to give concrete form, nor can we perceive at all clearly through the prevailing struggles for political supremacy and even national existence how the continuity of 'church life' was preserved. The hidden springs of belief and conduct are only revealed in history when a crisis calls forth the men of God from individual obscurity to a place of prominence. Thus it is that Elijah stands beside Moses despite the centuries which lay between. The function of Elijah (his 'spirit and power') was to make 'the disobedient to walk in the wisdom of the just.' The impression which Elijah made on his contemporaries was never effaced. In our Lord's day it was firmly believed that no lasting reform could be made till an Elijah arose. (An interesting account of the part played by Elijah in Rabbinic Judaism will be found in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*.)

The narratives of Elijah are quite distinct in source from the rest of the book. And 17-19, at all events, are untouched by the editor, whether because they were inserted in the book after his time or not is uncertain. They are certainly very early. Driver's verdict (*L.O.T.*[9], 194) is that they 'exhibit the ease, and grace, and vividness which belong to the best style of Hebrew historical narrative.' A remarkable feature is Elijah's lamentation over the fallen *altars* of Israel (19 [14]), which is the strongest evidence of the lack of Judæan bias.

XVII. **1. Elijah's Prophecy.**—Every reader has been struck by the dramatic suddenness of Elijah's appearance. This may be due to the introduction having been omitted, or to the writer's grasp of forceful writing. Giving or denying rain was a divine privilege in antiquity, and both in Judaism and in Islam the prayers of certain good men were held to be of great effect in procuring rain. According to Menander the drought was ended by the prayers of Ethbaal the king-priest of Tyre. For rain-makers in antiquity see S. A. Cook in *R.S.*[3], 580.

sojourners: Elijah was not a foreigner as the word implies. Read with LXX *from Tishbe of Gilead.*

2-7. Elijah at Cherith.

3. hide thyself. Elijah must already have become an outlaw.

Cherith probably flowed into Jordan from the east.

8-24. Elijah at Zarephath.

12. He arrives at the moment when the widow's last reserve of food is all but exhausted.

17-24. Cf. 2 K 4.

18. to bring my sin to remembrance. The words are borrowed from a sacrificial context. As an offering reminds God of what the offerer would have Him remember, so God's prophet by his presence has called God's attention to what otherwise He might have overlooked.

21. soul. The most complete statement of the meaning of soul will be found in *The People and the Book*, 354. Here it means *breath*, and it is interesting to observe that LXX reads 'breathed into the child' (cf. 2 K 4 [34]).

XVIII. **1-19. Elijah meets Ahab.**

The persistence of the drought led Ahab, in his anxiety to preserve his horses on which his army depended, to go through the land himself. Obadiah his steward goes through the land parallel with his master and suddenly meets Elijah. The thought of reporting his discovery, unless he can produce the prophet in person, fills him with terror, for Elijah is believed to be responsible for the drought of 17 [1]. Elijah undertakes to meet Ahab. He accuses him of apostasy, and goes on to demand that the king shall summon the priests of the Baal to a public test, and we are left with the impression that it was to obtain this trial that Elijah risked his life in venturing into Ahab's presence.

4. when Jezebel cut off the prophets of the Lord. Despite Skinner's assertion, it is difficult to see why Jezebel need have slain the prophets of Jehovah unless she desired to suppress His religion.

12. The **spirit** (or wind) of Jehovah could remove the prophet from men's ken (cf. 2 K 2 [16]).

18. troubler: one who brings national misfortune.

19. Asherah: 15 [13] *v.n.* But the words are a gloss. These 400 are ignored in the final reckoning.

20-40. Elijah on Carmel.

Carmel, where 'Vespasian worshipped at the solitary altar, embowered in in-

violable thickets, to which ancient tradition forbade the adjuncts of temple and image' (*R.S.*[3], 156), was still the scene of what in essentials was an ancient Canaanite feast. This lofty range commanding sea (*v.i.*) and land, held sacred by the Phœnicians, was eminently suitable for the decisive battle of religions. The greatness of Elijah is enhanced by the recognition of the outward similarities of the two religions. Baal had his prophets, filled with the frenzy which sometimes characterized Jehovah's early prophets; they claimed to produce rain and to foretell the future. Even their limping dances had something in common with Israelitish customs. Elijah ignores the superficial and appeals confidently to God. The lightning from heaven, withheld when Baal's priests pleaded, descended at his word and gave, so far as a 'sign' from heaven could, testimony to the reality of that in which he trusted.

21. halt ye between two opinions. This is not the meaning. It was not a case of vacillating wills but of apostasy. Render *limp ye upon the two knee-joints.* Sacred dances were often performed with a limping gait: on its significance cf. *R.S.*[3], 671.

26. leaped: again 'limped.'

27. 'He must be musing!' 'He must have turned aside or be on a journey!' The second suggestion is a euphemism ridiculing the idea of Baal being a god.

29. they prophesied probably means no more than 'they raved' (1 S 10[10] *v.n.*).

31-32*a*. An interpolation of P contradicting [30]. In the LXX these verses precede [30*b*].

36. May God vindicate Himself and His servant.

38. Unless this really happened it is difficult to see how the history of Elijah can stand. Jackson, in Peake, points out that 'Elijah is pre-eminently the prophet of Jehovah manifested by fire,' mentioning Horeb, the soldiers in 2 K 1[10], and the ascension.

41-46. The end of the drought.

42. bowed himself down: 2 K 4[34, 35] †. There is nothing mysterious about this word. It is the same as the Syriac *gehen* in Mk 1[7], and is often used of bending or crouching in prayer.

43. Go again seven times. LXX adds 'and the servant went again seven times.' It is possible to feel the prophet's suspense.

44. The mud in the valley would make the roads useless, and thus he reached Jezreel before Ahab.

XIX. 1-18. Elijah flees to Beer-Sheba and Horeb.

Instead of complete and final victory after Carmel, Elijah is faced with death and disaster. His magnificent venture of faith has gone for nothing, and in despair and weariness he prays that he may at least be allowed to die. Elijah epitomizes the experience of the men of God of all generations.

2. LXX begins 'As sure as you are Elijah and I am Jezebel!'

3. he saw. All versions read the same consonants 'he was afraid' as RVm.

4. Only in solitude does he give way to his despair. **I am not better than my fathers** apparently means 'I have no desire to retain the life they no longer have.'

5. angel: LXX 'someone.'

8. Horeb. Here, where the God of Israel revealed Himself at the first (Ex 3[1]), might Elijah hope to meet his God. A forty days' fast linked him with Moses and with Jesus.

9*b*-11*a* are an interpolation, the purpose of which is obscure (cf. [11*a*] and [13]).

11*b*-18. Nature's great terrors overwhelm the prophet—wind, earthquake, and fire—but God was not in them. The hushed whisper of the silence which followed brought the voice of God to Elijah. It bade him explain his actions, rebuked his despondency, and gave him counsel how to root out the Baal and to continue the succession of Jehovah's prophets. The contrast between Jehovah's deliberate avoidance of the clothing of violence and the warlike tone of His message is most marked. It would be tempting to suppose that Jehovah's words ended at 'return on thy way' (cf. LXX). But as Jehu, not Ahab, felt the full weight of Hazael's arm, the addition, if addition it is, must be very early; a *post eventum* prophecy would be correct in its details.

11*b*. 'And lo, Jehovah was about to pass by (*sc.* the cave, cf. [9]), and there was a great wind before Jehovah' (the intervening words may be a gloss—the Hebrew syntax is not normal).

12. a still small voice, or 'the sound of a light whisper' (cf. Job 4[16]).

13. wrapped his face in his mantle: cf. Quran, Surahs 73 and 74 (The Enwrapped), with Nöldeke's interesting parallels.

14. thy altars: their destruction is deplored: in Deuteronomic circles it would be commended.

17. shall Elisha slay: there is no record preserved of such an act.

19-21. The call of Elisha.

19. mantle. This fell to Elisha with the gift of his master's spirit (2 K 2[13, 14]).

Cf. the position of Muhammad's *burda* in Islam.

XX. **Ahab's war with Syria.**

This chapter should probably be read with 22. In 854 Ahab, allied with the king of Syria, was warring against Assyria at Qarqar. If the Bir-idri of the inscription be Ben-hadad we must suppose either that they fought as allies after Ahab's generous treatment of a conquered foe, or if the events of this chapter followed Qarqar, that the allies fell out among themselves. Ahab, seen through northern eyes, is a brave, wise, and chivalrous king. This writer's interest is political rather than religious.

1-22. The siege of Samaria.

Doubtless the beginning of this story, giving the reason for the war and the stages of the Syrian advance, is missing, and the obscure tactics of Ahab are probably to be explained as due to ruthless curtailment of the narrative. The difference in Ben-hadad's demands in [3] and [6] is perhaps that the first meant ransom, the second unconditional surrender. At any rate, Ahab's counsellors felt they had nothing to lose in risking their lives.

11. Tell him: for this LXX's 'Enough!' must be right. The proverb following has only four words in Hebrew.

12. set yourselves in array: one word in Hebrew, meaning no more than 'Get ready.'

17. the young men. The reason is not apparent.

23-34. Ahab's victory at Aphek.

23. It should be noted that the theory that Jehovah was merely a local God is sternly repudiated by the anonymous prophet ([28]).

24. The native levies are to be commanded by Syrians, not by their own princes.

29, 30. The numbers are exaggerated.

31. A striking tribute to the generosity of the Israelites.

33. Render: *And the men took it as an omen, and quickly seized it* (the word 'my brother') *from him.*

35-43. Ahab denounced for clemency.

This episode is probably drawn from another source. The merciless severity of the old Semitic ban (Jos 7 *v.n.*) is invoked by the conservatives who found a refuge among bands (Hebrew 'sons') of prophets. These bands appear especially in association with Elisha, but they go back to a remote past. The passing, or rather purification, of prophecy from these wild natures into the holy and reverend figures of Israel's prophets is one of the marvels of revealed religion.

36. Cf. 13[21] for a similar unethical pronouncement.

41. discerned: exactly how we do not know.

XXI. **Naboth's vineyard.**

This chapter seems to come from yet another writer; [20b-23, 24-26] are from D. The variants in LXX are of great interest. The story needs no comment.

XXII. 1-40. Ahab's death at Ramoth-gilead.

The continuation of 20. Evidently Ben-hadad had treacherously refused to give up the heights commanding the approach to Israel and Judah from Transjordania. Jehoshaphat is reluctantly brought in—perhaps for family, probably for state reasons.

6 may not mean more than 'and may Jehovah deliver it,' or even 'that Jehovah may,' etc.

7. besides. It would be interesting to know why Jehoshaphat discredited the 400 prophets. Apparently they *were* prophets of Jehovah, but it is hardly certain; for (*a*) LXX omits 'besides,' and (*b*) there is an antithesis between 'word of Jehovah,' 'the prophets,' and a 'prophet belonging to Jehovah,' whether intentional or not. Hence it is precarious to assert that there were 'two forms of Jahwe-worship existent.' There were certainly two types of men—the court chaplain (found again in Jer 28) and the fearless preacher of righteousness.

11. push: better 'gore them.'

13. A piece of good-natured advice.

15. Ironical.

17. A prophecy of Ahab's death.

19. Therefore: LXX 'Not so!'

20. A remarkable example of the way Micaiah explained to himself the phenomenon of false prophecy: it was used by Jehovah to compass his ends. The greater prophets, rejecting this early attempt to understand the enigma, asserted that false prophets deliberately invented their messages.

28. The beginning of Micah's prophecy wrongly identified with this Micah.

32. cried out: probably to make the charioteer withdraw. He had not Ahab's courage, who ([35]) died facing the enemy.

38. Cf. 21[19], not an exact fulfilment.

41-50. Jehoshaphat of Judah, 874-850. See further 2 K 3.

47-48. Read *And the deputy of king Jehoshaphat made ships*, etc.

51-2 K I. 18. Ahaziah of Israel, 855-854.

51. The synchronism is wrong somewhere. Lucian reads 'twenty-fourth year.'

I. 1. **Moab revolts.**

The famous inscription (now in the Louvre) which commemorates the successful insurrection of the Moabites under their king Mesha says: 'Omri, king of Israel, afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was angry with his land; and his son succeeded him, and he also said, I will afflict Moab. In my days said he . . .? but I saw my desire upon him, and upon his house, and Israel perished with an everlasting perishing.' It will be seen that Chemosh claims to have regained his independence from Ahab, so that there is an error of a few years in the Hebrew history. No doubt Moab's chance came during Ahab's hard struggle with Ben-hadad. The Moabite Stone is of great importance as a contemporary record of a people closely akin to Israel. Its text can be read in Burney and Driver, *N.H.T.S.* and *S.P.C.K. Texts for Students.*

2-17*a*. Elijah prophesies the death of Ahaziah.

Ahaziah slights the God of Israel, and Jehovah's prophet pronounces his doom. Why Ahaziah should enquire of a Philistine oracle we cannot say, though the Philistines had a reputation as 'soothsayers.' Baal-zebub means apparently 'Lord of flies'; some have suggested that it is an intentional corruption of Baal-zebul 'Lord of the Height' (Mt 10 [25] *v.n.*).

8. Cf. Mk 1 [6].

9 f. Many critics regard this as a legendary addition to the narrative; ethically it stands on the same level as 2 [23-24]. There can be no doubt that the history of a great man has suffered from the well-meant intentions of later hagiographers. Both these stories savour of the Apocryphal Gospels. They indicate what lesser men would have done, or liked to have done, had they stood in Elijah's privileged relation to Jehovah.

Our Lord rebuked James and John for asking Him to authorize their bringing down fire upon the Samaritans (Lk 9 [53, 54]).

17*b*. **in the second year**: these words are really a misplaced fragment of the formula introductory to Jehoram of Israel. Lucian omits.

II. **1-18. Ascension of Elijah.**

The mystery which surrounds the fate of Elijah is reflected in the literary problems the prophetic histories present. All are agreed that we have but selections from those histories; but the relation of this section to earlier stories is not so clear. Why does Elijah doubt whether Elisha shall succeed him in view of 19 [16, 19]? And whence have these prophetic communities at Bethel and Jericho sprung? True, these may be the 'four hundred,' but nothing in the narratives has prepared us for the organization implied here.

The threefold test of Elisha recalls our Lord's thrice-repeated question to Peter. This great story illustrates the value of unquestioning obedience and the certainty of the fulfilment of a noble ideal. Succession to the spiritual greatness of the saints is granted to those who attain to the Beatific Vision. Whatever be the explanation of Elijah's mysterious translation, it left Elisha with a sense of authority and a mission. He was unhesitatingly accepted as Elijah's successor. No 'explanation' of this story is possible; but Skinner's careful words may be quoted: 'The religious imagination had clothed the idea of Jehovah's omnipotence in forms derived from earthly warfare; his heavenly army contained horses and chariots invisible to mortal eyes, composed of the fiery element in which Jehovah dwells.'

9. RVm is right.

12. These words would naturally mean the chariots in some way allocated to Israel by Jehovah. But a comparison with 13 [14] makes it probable that they refer to Elijah as Israel's champion. **horsemen**: LXX 'the horse' would almost exclude the latter interpretation.

16. **spirit.** It is not impossible that 'Jehovah's wind,' i.e. the whirlwind of [11], is meant.

17. **till he was ashamed**: an extraordinarily true description of a man embarrassed by the knowledge of the futility of the quest.

19-22. Elisha heals the water at Jericho.

This story is not contemporary with the healing (cf. [22]), and doubtless perpetuates a tradition that the excellence of the water was due to the prophet's intervention.

23-25. Respect due to Jehovah's prophets: 1 [9] *v.n.* To be bald was a disgrace among the Semites.

III. **Jehoram of Israel (854-843), and the war with Moab.**

The Deuteronomic editor doubtless embodies a genuine tradition of the influence of Elijah and Elisha in inducing the king to remove the obelisk (LXX has a plural noun) erected to the Tyrian Baal. The rest of the chapter is composite. It belongs partly to the historical and partly to the prophetic narratives lying behind our book. The rebellion of Moab, already recorded in 1 [1] *v.n.*, was evidently regarded by the writer as contemporary with the punitive expedition, whereas it occurred during Ahab's reign. Mesha

gives a round figure of forty years for the Israelite occupation, which he says was 'Omri's days and half his son's.' In the MT their combined reigns only amount to thirty-four years: if 'son' could be understood as 'grandson,' there would be no discrepancy.

Jehoram invites the king of Judah (MT Jehoshaphat, but Lucian Ahaziah) to co-operate with him, and they are joined by the king of Edom. The steep ascent from the Jordan Valley with the preliminary obstacle of the ford seemed too much for the allies, and so they decided to skirt the Dead Sea and invade Moab from the south. Having arrived at the border of Moab—the Wadi-el-Aḥsa, known locally as the Seil-el-Hesa—they found no water, and were in despair until Elisha prophesied a plentiful supply of water, though no rain would be seen to fall. The Seil rises far away in the eastern desert beyond the pilgrim railway, and it is possible that the pools of water seen by the Moabites were filled from a sudden and unseasonal fall of rain some fifty miles to the east. Others have supposed that the tradition is based on the present practice of digging for water in the bed of the wadi. This is against [20], and see Burney, 270. The present name Seil means 'rain torrent.' If the Moabites mistook the reflection of the sun's red rim for blood, they must have been at a considerable distance. Doubtless the point of the narrative is that the Moabites foolishly left the plateau more than 2,000 feet above the wadi and attacked the allies below. They were caught in disorder and driven back to their last stronghold, where Mesha offered his son to gain his god's favour. Either the Israelites and their allies withdrew in superstitious fear, or, as is possible though not so probable, 'the great wrath against Israel' was the furious onslaught of a despairing people who had nothing more to lose.

4. 'used to render' would be more exact.

11. As in 1 K 22 [5] Jehoshaphat wishes to be guided by a prophet.

13. Jehoram's point is that prophets of Jehovah have been consulted. Doubtless they were men like those who furthered the expedition against Ramoth-gilead.

15. **bring me a minstrel.** Music continued to be an aid to prophecy and soothsaying among the Arabs until comparatively late. 'The state of hearing a humming is the stage of the prophets who are not apostles sent with books. . . . Muhammad said: "At times inspiration comes to me like the ringing of a bell"' (Ibn Khaldun, quoted by D. B. Macdonald, *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*, 59). 'The *kahin* required certain mechanical inducements to distract the attention of his ordinary self, and give freedom to his subliminal self' (*op. cit.*, 67).

16. **Make this valley.** The verb is an infinitive absolute; it could be understood as an imperative. The idiom is peculiarly suitable to oracular speech in that it has no subject. **trenches**: either natural or artificial: the word is neutral.

19. Against this Dt 20 [19].

25. **until in Kir-hareseth . . . thereof.** These words are a corruption of which no convincing restoration has been made. The Targum identifies Kir with Kerak.

27. **there was great wrath.** Most commentators assume that the wrath was that of Chemosh, god of Moab (cf. Jg 11 [24]), to whom the burnt offering was made; but *v.s.* The campaign had no decisive result.

IV. 1-7. **Elisha miraculously supplies oil.** Cf. 1 K 17 [8].

8-37. **Elisha and the Shunammite.** This story has many parallels with 1 K 17 [17], though the differences are equally numerous.

20. A most moving and pathetic detail which has every mark of verisimilitude.

23. A proof of the ancient institution of the Sabbath, though it must have differed greatly from its successor if long journeys were a matter of course on the Sabbath day.

24. **drive.** The servant drove on the beast from behind like a modern 'donkey-boy.'

38-41. **An antidote.**

38. **dearth**: cf. 8 [1].

39. **wild gourds**: the colocynth, a most attractive looking plant, whose fruit resembles small melons. It is a powerful astringent: only an ignorant townsman would try to eat it.

V. 1-19. **The cleansing of Naaman the leper.**

5. **changes of raiment.** This was no compliment, but the act of a superior. It was a well-known practice of the caliphs (called *khil'a*, lit. 'cast off') to present their favourites or vassals with once-worn garments.

6. **the king of Israel.** These stories preserve the anonymity of the king, doubtless because the narrator did not know when the incidents happened. Jehu's reign must have seen many of them.

10. Elisha's answer is as abrupt as the Syrian king's message.

11. An example of the theatrical methods of heathen prophets.

12. The question deserves an affirma-

tive answer. Damascus is most happily situated.

17. The belief that a god could only be worshipped on his own soil was widespread in antiquity, and an echo of it is heard even in a late psalm. 'How can we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?' (cf. 1 S 26 [19]). Elisha neither approves nor disapproves.

20. No doubt Gehazi's natural covetousness was strengthened by a very natural desire to score off one of his country's most formidable foes. But he compromised the dignity of Jehovah's prophet thereby.

26. Is it a time, etc.: LXX 'And now thou hast received,' i.e. you have got the one and now you shall have the other! For an example among 20th-century Arabs of the enormous power of a belief in God acting through a holy man see A. Kennett, *Bedouin Justice*, 107.

VI. 1-7. Elisha at the Jordan.

The prophets are growing in numbers, and more houses on another site are needed for them. Elisha goes with them and recovers an axe-head dropped into the river by the device of throwing in a piece of wood. A miracle is not necessarily implied, though it is probable that the writer's intention was to record one.

6. made the iron to swim. Ewald's suggestion that the wood caught in the iron cannot be ruled out, for the wood might possibly be the subject of the verb 'to overflow': with the wood beneath it the iron 'bobbed up.'

8-23. Elisha outwits the Syrians.

Political and military sagacity made Elisha a formidable enemy, and the Syrian king determined to capture him. The force sent is smitten with blindness. The kings on either side are again anonymous.

9. coming down: probably emend to 'camping.'

15. Emend: *And the man of God rose early on the morrow and went out*, etc.

22. The implied meaning that prisoners of war were not despatched is to be rejected—else the king's question were unintelligible. We must insert a negative with LXX, 'whom thou hast not taken.'

23. A strange statement in this context!

24-VII. 20. The Syrians besiege Samaria.

What siege is referred to? Is Ben-hadad the protagonist of 1 K 20 and 22? No satisfactory answer can be given. We know that Hazael's son had the upper hand throughout Jehoahaz's reign, but there are no decisive reasons for putting the siege so late in the life of Elisha. The state of the people resembled that in the height of the siege of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.

31. The most probable explanation is that the king held Elisha responsible for the prolonged suffering because he encouraged the people to continue the resistance. All that we know of Elisha would indicate such an attitude. Clearly ([32]) he had the elders on his side.

33. messenger: read *the king*, who must be the speaker to whom Elisha replies.

VII. 6. Egyptians. Most scholars prefer to read the word as 'Muzrites,' a people of Cappadocia.

13. A clear case of dittography—for in the city read *here*, and delete of Israel . . . Israel. To risk five of the remaining horses would be a small thing, for they were practically equal to those which had been eaten.

VIII. 1-6. The Shunammite's property restored.

This story must obviously be antecedent to the visit of Naaman. The editor's purpose is to describe the character and work of Elisha. He is indifferent to chronological sequence. The same methods are all too common among Semitic writers uninfluenced by Græco-Roman love of order.

7-15. Elisha visits Hazael.

Hazael appears in the cuneiform records of Shalmaneser II, in the years 842 and 839. He was not the son of Ben-hadad, Ahab's enemy, and was probably one of his generals. This story must be connected with 1 K 19 [15]. It is tempting to infer that Elijah and Elisha furthered an insurrection against Ben-hadad, and that later events showed that they had supported a more dangerous enemy.

10. RV and RVm are both possible grammatically (cf. Gen 3 [4] Hebrew). Elisha's meaning seems to have been: You may say to him that he will recover from his sickness, but I know that his death (at the hands of others) is at hand.

11. Here he gazes sternly at Hazael who is ashamed. The sentence is obscure: lit. 'he made his face stand and set.' Following a hint in the Vulgate some tr. 'His face was set in horror,' but this has little to recommend it. Lucian's longer text 'And Hazael stood before him and set before him the gifts until . . .' looks like a gloss.

12. These atrocities were perpetrated in the same region in 1918.

13. They are not a horror, but a great thing in Hazael's eyes.

16-24. Jehoram of Judah, 850-843.

Here the editor's framework differs

from the norm. Instead of carrying Jehoram of Israel's reign to its end, he introduces the Judæan line here, because Ahaziah of Judah and Jehoram of Israel were slain on the same day.

16. Jehoshaphat, etc.: a curious error.

19. for his children read *before him.* Posterity was the lamp.

20-22. Revolt of Edom and Libnah.

21. The punitive expedition was a disastrous failure, which is concealed by textual disorder. The people did not flee because Jehoram smote the Edomites, but *vice versa.* Tr. *And it came to pass, he having risen by night, that the Edomites who encompassed him smote him* (reading *otho* for *eth*), *and the captains,* etc.

25-29. Ahaziah of Judah, 843.

26. granddaughter: RVm is right—a fact bearing on 3 *v.n.*

IX. **Jehu seizes the throne of Israel,** 843-816.

The bloody revolution furthered by Elijah and Elisha affords a melancholy example of the futility of attempting religious reforms by the secular arm. Jehu's zeal for Jehovah did nothing for the real cause of Jehovah's religion. It suppressed the Tyrian Ba'al, but it did not change the heart or the temper of the people; moreover, Jehu's house till Jeroboam II was more abjectly beneath the power of Hazael than the house of Omri had ever been. An impartial view of Jehu's barbarity is expressed by Hos 1 [4]. 9 and 10 are fine specimens of early Hebrew narrative.

1-13. The anointing of Jehu.

Ramoth-gilead: this important frontier position had evidently been regained.

3. The furtive character of the proceeding is a tribute to the power of the reigning house.

7-10*a*. An editorial addition.

11. mad fellow: a contemptuous reference to one associated with ecstasies hardly distinguishable from madness.

12. it is false. Jackson in Peake suggests reading 'A conspiracy.'

14-28. Jehu slays Jehoram and Ahaziah.

Jehu betrayed his country as well as his king in abandoning the frontier. He must have taken the bulk of his force with him, and thus opened the way for the conquests of Hazael (cf. 10 [32]).

14. Now Joram kept: read *Jehu.*

18. Is it peace? RVm is right. Joram feared that the force was in flight before the Syrians. **What hast thou,** etc., i.e. 'Mind your own business!'

21. The sins of the fathers are visited on the children.

22. What peace (cf. [18]) is strange Hebrew, and the meaning is 'What do you mean by asking "Is all well?" while,' etc.

24. 'But Jehu had drawn his bow.' He was ready to shoot as Joram's chariot wheeled round.

26. 1 K 21 [19] is rather different, a fact which testifies to the general feeling that an innocent and obscure Israelite's death was suitably avenged.

29 has obviously no place here. It is bound up with the complicated question of conflicting chronologies: see *Cent. B.*

30-37. Jehu slays Jezebel.

Jezebel at any rate dies like a queen. A 'painted Jezebel' is a phrase with a meaning which would astonish the Hebrew writer. He meant to convey that she dressed herself, like the French nobility going to the guillotine, with more than ordinary care. She calls Jehu by the name of the short-lived Zimri whom her father-in-law destroyed (1 K 16 [9]). Even Jehu seems to have felt a little compunction in [34].

30. painted her eyes. All women above the lowest classes paint their eyelids with a powder of antimony. **looked out:** the verb describes the act of looking down over the edge of something.

34. Hebrew 'And he came in and ate,' a wonderful example of restrained language.

X. 1-16. The massacre of the house of Ahab and Ahaziah of Judah.

On the whole Jehu is the most ghastly of OT characters. Jackson is too kind in seeing 'a sort of rude chivalry' in his invitation to the elders of Jezreel. Had Jehu desired to fight the house of Ahab, he would not have murdered its head in cold blood. His 'chivalry' produced the desired effect in the immediate and abject submission of the elders. When 'all the people' assembled—either in fear or horror—Jehu denies all knowledge of the atrocity. This lie might be forgiven, but the unctuous appeal to the fulfilling of the word of the Lord is unpardonable (especially as most critics attribute 1 K 21 [21] to D). This unctuous opportunism had probably deceived the prophets. But they cannot be acquitted of a measure of complicity. They bought the destruction of the Baal at a price their country could ill afford. See Hosea's condemnation in 1 [4].

The tenets of the Rechabites are too well known to need elaboration (cf. Jer 35). They can hardly be said to be a new party, for in all ages Arabia has been full of such men—the sole difference being that the Rechabites worshipped Jehovah. Thus they are the strongest possible evidence

for the survival of a nomadic Mosaic religion. They rejected the best as well as the worst features of civilization be it observed.

9. righteous: rather *guiltless*, here a forensic term. The people shrink from the terror of innocent blood which their God might 'require of them.'

11. great men: Lucian kinsmen = *goels*, all whose duty it was to avenge him. Jehu slew all those who were attached by ties of friendship and loyalty to the dead king.

13. brethren of Ahaziah. These, too, were kinsmen of Ahab (8 [26]).

15. The meeting was no chance one. The fierce Arab came to join in the massacre. The longer and correct text of LXX = 'Are you minded to co-operate with me as I with you? And Jehonadab said, I am. In that case, said Jehu, give me your hand,' etc.

17-27. The massacre of the Baal's worshippers.

The treachery characteristic of Jehu led him to go to the length of sacrificing to Baal. Doubtless the unhappy priests were forced to attend.

20. a solemn assembly: Hebrew *'aṣarah* is interpreted in *Rel. Sem.*[3], 456, as 'tempus clausum,' a time of sexual taboo. See Cook's additional note, 687.

22. vestments. Sacred occasions required 'best clothes.' The poor washed their clothes (Ex 19 [10]), or changed them (Gen 35 [2]), or put on sacred garments lent them by the priests. Sexual taboo and a special garment called *Ihram* (which means taboo) are still integral parts of the Muslim pilgrimage rites.

24*b*. MT is wrongly punctuated. Read *He who allows to escape one of the men whom I am about to deliver into your hands*, etc.

25. city is best omitted.

26. pillars. The objection that they could not be burned is rather hypercritical. The Moabite Stone was ruined by fire which split it into fragments. Still, as 1 K 16 [32] records Ahab's erection of an *asherah*, and the obelisk is dealt with in [27], perhaps *asherah* should be read here.

28-31 are not from the same hand (cf. [29] and [31]).

32-33. A note of the disastrous results of Jehu's treachery. Henceforth the Jordan was his eastern boundary.

XI. **Athaliah, 843-837, and Joash of Judah, 837-798.**

The last ruler of Ahab's line held her own, though not a Judæan, for six years, and was then executed not by a usurper, but by a concerted movement of priests and people. The priests of Jerusalem conserved the national religion. Their sense of order was always well marked, and from now onwards till the destruction of Herod's Temple they continued to contribute to the religious life of the community.

2. Jehosheba was Jehoiada's wife (2 Ch 22 [11]).

4. It is not unlikely that the foreign bodyguard had held the throne for Athaliah. When they were bought over her fate was sealed. 2 Ch 23 will not have it that the foreigners were in the Temple, and substitutes Levites.

10. Skinner's suggestion that this is a gloss from 2 Chronicles is attractive, for why were guards weaponless?

11. by the king round about: meaningless.

12. the testimony. RV supplies the crucial words. MT can hardly be right, though see Barnes, *C.B.*; Wellhausen 'bracelets' (cf. 2 S 1 [10]).

13. guard *and of* the people. MT is impossible. Read *of the people* simply. Apparently another source is being quoted wherein the people's part in the revolution was described.

16. made way: tr. *They laid hands on her.*

17. A definite national repudiation of Baalism such as Elijah and Elisha had hoped for in the north.

20. the city was quiet: a further testimony to the popular approval.

XII. **3.** Jehoiada was probably regent.

4-16. Upkeep of the Temple.

In the matter of dilapidations it was the king who took the lead. From Solomon's time the Temple had presumably been the king's own charge, but Jehoash now orders that the repairs are to be a charge on the priestly revenues. The priests were to take the money and pay for the necessary work. After a few years it was found that the priests had had the money, but had not paid for the work, so Jehoash orders that the money is to be put in a box kept at the door, and counted by one of his representatives and a priest. The money was then paid to the contractors. See 2 Ch 24 for many different details.

4. in current money: read with LXX 'the money of each man's assessment' (cf. Lev 27 [2]).

5. acquaintance. Most probably the word means 'broker,' and refers to the perquisites which the priests sold through a local tradesman. Cf. Dt 18 [8], where an obscure allusion to *selling* occurs.

7. The young king was a strong man,

or he could not have taken this line with a man to whom he owed everything.

10. high priest: it is very doubtful if this title was in use before the Exile.

17-18. Hazael ravages Judæa.

Israel must have been utterly impotent if Syria could press so far south to the maritime plain, and the complete subjugation of Judah is implied in this short notice. The Chronicler (24 [23]) evidently knew a great deal more about these events. He alludes to a crushing defeat by a small force of Syrians and to a prophecy of Zechariah the son of Jehoiada, which was evidently directed against Jehoash, who caused his death. In revenge the men named in [21] assassinated him.

XIII. **1-9. Jehoahaz of Israel,** 816-800.

This short account has obviously been tampered with. [3] implies continuous subjection to Syria; [5] denies it.

10-25. Jehoash of Israel, 800-785; **Death of Elisha.**

For an explanation of the dislocation of the framework see *Cent. B.* Elisha's indomitable spirit passes in its final effort to stimulate resistance to Syria. He joins with the king in an act prophetic of victory—the launching of the archers' missiles and the smiting of a prostrate foe. The king fails him through lack of persistence, and the fierce patriot dies with misgivings as to the future of his country.

14. 2 [12] *v.n.*

17. eastward. Damascus, of course, lay to the north. Apparently the attack was directed against the key position of Ramoth-gilead (though Aphek, the first objective, is placed by most scholars in the north of the Plain of Sharon).

21. This primitive belief in the power of the bones of holy men survives still in centres where relics are visited.

25. Relief now came to Israel through a great raid on the west made by the Assyrians. Israel suffered somewhat, but its Syrian rival was crushed.

XIV. **1-22. Amaziah of Judah,** 798-790 (?).

The chronology is at fault (cf. 13 [10] and 15 [1]). The Deuteronomist notes with approval a great advance in ethies. After two generations of independence Edom once more felt the weight of Judæan arms. Edom's importance was due to its lying athwart the trade route from the Red Sea. Unfortunately Sela cannot be identified with any certainty. Flushed with victory Amaziah challenged Jehoash, and, foolishly endangering his kingdom out of vanity, he suffered a severe defeat and was taken prisoner. Jehoash dismantled the northern wall, plundered the Temple, and took hostages for Judah's good behaviour.

10. As RVm.

11. to Judah: a note indicating an Israelite author.

19. Amaziah's folly enraged the people, and they put him to death. The feeling against him was personal, or they would not have accepted his son as king.

22. He must mean Azariah, and as **built** often means 'rebuilt,' perhaps Azariah turned to profit the conquest of his father. **Elath:** 1 K 9 [26] *v.n.*

23-29. Jeroboam II of Israel, 785-745.

We now enter the age of the prophets whose writings have survived. Jeroboam was the most successful warrior of the northern house, and the prosperity of his reign was unprecedented. He owed his success in pushing out the frontiers of his country to the enfeebled state of Syria and the temporary quiescence of Assyria. For the religious and economic conditions during his reign see the Introductions to Amos and Hosea.

25. A favourable notice from a northern source. Contrast this and [26] with [24] (D). **Jonah ben Amittai** is otherwise unknown. Cf. Introduction to Jonah.

28. Corrupt.

XV. **1-7. Azariah (Uzziah) of Judah,** 790-749.

Outside Kings Azariah is called Uzziah. The reason for the change is unknown. Judah shared with Israel a long period of prosperity. Jotham his son was regent, as he was a leper.

5. the Lord smote. Disease was often attributed to the direct action of God, because the Semites had no notion of secondary causes. **a several house:** read *in freedom in his own house*, i.e. he was not driven out from the community and city as a lesser man would have been.

8-12. Zechariah of Israel, 745.

Internecine wars broke out at the end of Jeroboam's long reign, and prepared the way for the final downfall of Israel so soon to occur. Zechariah was the fourth and last of Jehu's line (cf. 10 [30]). The chronology of this and adjacent reigns is confused. For a clear discussion of alternatives see T. H. Robinson, *Clarendon Bible*, iii, 228.

13-16. Shallum of Israel, 745.

For the prophetic judgement on the events of this time Hos 7 [3] *v.n.*

16. Tiphsah (cf. 1 K 4 [24]) should probably be *Tappuah* (cf. Jos 16 [8]).

17-22. Menahem of Israel, 745-736.

This barbarous prince is mentioned

in Assyrian annals of the year 738. Pul, despite 1 Ch 5 [26], is Tiglath-Pileser III, and the tribute paid ([19]) is recorded by him.

18-19. **all his days.** With LXX read as the beginning of [19], *In his days came.*

23-26. **Pekahiah of Israel,** 736-735.

25. **with Argob and Arieh :** meaningless.

27-31. **Pekah of Israel,** 735-732.

He reigned for three years only, and those most disastrous, for he lost the frontier lands north of Esdraelon, their inhabitants being deported to Assyria. Is 7 *v.n.* deals with his invasion of Judæa in company with Rezin of Damascus, the object being to force Judah into a confederacy against Assyria. Israel at this time, as in A.D. 70, fell between two stools. Hoshea, doubtless the nominee of Assyria, slew him.

30. Contrast with 17 [1].

32-38. **Jotham of Judah,** 739-735.

An echo of the feverish outburst of military building inaugurated by Jotham (2 Ch 27) is in [35]. He was a capable ruler who was able to recoup himself for his losses at home by tribute and provisions exacted from the Ammonites.

XVI. **Ahaz of Judah,** 735-720.

He is abhorred by D, because (*a*) he imitated northern practices (how is not stated); (*b*) he sacrificed his son; and (*c*) he personally supported what his predecessors only tolerated. For human sacrifice in Israel see p. 209*a*. Ahaz probably offered his son during the Syro-Ephraimite invasion as Mesha had done (3 [27]). With the rise of deeper ethical and personal religion in the 8th century arose also a recrudescence of barbarism.

5. **could not overcome him :** Hebrew 'could not fight' suggests that Ahaz shut himself within the city walls and refused to come to grips with Pekah. All through he follows the line of least resistance.

6. This is most unlikely to have happened, and as the versions read *Edomites* for **Syrians** (2 S 8 [13] *v.n.*), doubtless a local war of independence succeeded. **Elath** (14 [22]) had never been Syrian.

7. Ahaz foolishly paid Assyria to do its own work. Isaiah rebukes him for his failure to trust Jehovah.

9. Damascus fell in 732 after a siege of two years.

10-16. **A new altar.**

Still the king is supreme in causes spiritual as temporal. The altar he saw in Damascus would presumably be Assyrian. The detailed alterations involved are obscure; all that is clear is that the new altar was larger, and that the old altar was moved towards the north (1 K 8 [64] *v.n.*). The meaning of **to enquire by** is uncertain.

XVII. 1-6. **Hoshea of Israel,** 732-722.

It is clear from the Assyrian records that Shalmaneser fought only once against Israel, and Samaria must have fallen in 722. Hoshea was induced by Egyptian intrigue to rebel against his overlord, and the result was the deportation of 27,290—not necessarily a large proportion—of his subjects. For the chronological problems see T. H. Robinson, *loc. cit.*

4. **So king of Egypt** cannot be Shabaka, but is to be identified with Sibi, who was defeated by Sargon at Raphia in 720 (Peet, *Egypt and the O.T.*, 169).

6. These are places in northern Mesopotamia.

7-23. **A Deuteronomic sermon on the ruin of Israel.**

More than one writer has produced this sermon which in [19-20] refers to the *Judæan* Exile. The counts are Israel's ingratitude, apostasy, high places, obelisks, sacred poles, idols, disobedience to prophets, the two calves, Baal, human sacrifice, divination.

24-41. **The Samaritans.**

Again composite. It is to be noted that the king of Assyria is anonymous, and as considerable time would elapse before an inhabited country became the haunt of wild beasts, some argue that the introduction of these Babylonians and Syrians is to be dated *c.* 650 in the reign of Asshurbanipal (cf. Ezr 4 [10]). Most probably there was more than one infiltration of foreigners.

26. **manner,** i.e. cultus and means of approach generally.

29 f. seems to be a later attempt to belittle the character of the Samaritan religion.

34*b*-40 is a contradiction of the preceding, and proceeds from later hatred of Samaria.

(C) XVIII.-XXV. Judah

XVIII.-XX. **Hezekiah,** 720-692: cf. Is 36-39.

The influence of Isaiah may be seen not only in his political prophecies and exhortations, but in this first thorough attempt at a religious reformation in Judah. The deliverance of Jerusalem when all hope of succour was futile made an indelible impression on the minds of his countrymen, and most probably the reformation followed the deliverance in 701. The source of 18 [17]-20 [19] is a history of Isaiah's doings similar in scope to the Elijah and Elisha histories.

XVIII. 4. RVm is best. Until now sacri-

fices had been offered to the image of the serpent; but there is no cogent reason for regarding the serpent as an 'emblem of Jehovah,' even though it is quite true that the serpents of Nu 21 are called seraphim.

7-8 may refer to the end of Hezekiah's reign. His country suffered severely from the Assyrian invasion.

13-XIX. 37. **Sennacherib invades Judæa.** This monarch's inscription can now be read in the British Museum. He succeeded Sargon in 705 and began a great campaign down the Syrian littoral in 703, conquering all from the Hittites in the north to the Philistines in the south. He tells us that Hezekiah had imprisoned Padi the king of Ekron because of his pro-Assyrian policy. The Egyptians and their Philistine allies he defeated at Altaqu, restored Padi to his throne, and besieged Hezekiah. He took captive over 200,000 Judæans, plundered the whole country, and forced Hezekiah to pay tribute. With this account [13-16] agree.

17-XIX. 9*a* are difficult to reconcile with the preceding, and possibly are a prophetic account of another invasion in 690.

17. These are not proper names but offices, viz. (*a*) commander-in-chief, (*b*) perhaps chief eunuch, (*c*) senior officer (?).

22. If this verse were genuine it would prove that the reforms preceded the invasion. The author uses the argument of an idolater in order to refute it.

24. captain: delete.

25. Contrast with [35].

26. Syrian: better Aramaic, a verse of which occurs in Jer 10 [11]. The language of Judæa, to judge from a comparison of Amos and Hosea, cannot have differed greatly from that of northern Israel (though linguistic peculiarities appear in the narratives of Elijah and Elisha); hence it is strange to find Hebrew called Jewish before the Exile (elsewhere only Neh 13 [24]).

34. Where are the gods of Hamath? A most valuable and pertinent enquiry in the realm of comparative religion. Where, indeed, are they?

XIX. 4. the Lord thy God: the words imply that Isaiah had consistently counselled reliance upon Jehovah.

7. Sennacherib did die thus, but not till twenty years had passed.

9*b*-35 seems to be another prophetic account of the same event inserted as an introduction to Isaiah's taunt-song.

14. There is a large simplicity in the gesture and words of Hezekiah's prayer. They may well represent the spirit which informed his actions.

21*b*-34. **Isaiah's oracle.** This is written in the so-called Qinah measure, a sort of echoing refrain generally employed in elegies and also, by a spirit of mocking sympathy, in taunts.

25. Cf. Is 45 [1]. Sennacherib, as Cyrus later, was but a tool in Jehovah's hand. His boasts were contemptible in the sight of God. Herein is Israel's God different from all others.

28. 'He is no more than a half-tamed beast, who has done his work' (Robinson).

35. A pestilence broke out which decimated the Assyrian armies and compelled their withdrawal. This is generally identified with the familiar story in Herodotus, ii, 141.

37. Esar-haddon reigned from 681-668.

XX. 1-11. **Hezekiah's illness**: cf. Is 38 [1-8, 21, 22].

The parallel account in Isaiah is shorter, but not all the additions here are interpolations. A most interesting point is that the writer finds no difficulty in God changing his mind. He could be influenced by his servants' attitude to a degree now almost incomprehensible.

4. RVm is right.

6*b* is an interpolation.

12-19. **Merodach-baladan's embassy.** This man reigned in Babylon from 721 to 710 when Sargon drove him out. Thus it is clear that this episode occurred long before that of 19. Doubtless the real object of the mission was to plan a campaign against the Assyrians. Isaiah strenuously opposed all such intrigues.

17-18. It is difficult to regard these verses as genuine in view of the persecution Jeremiah underwent for a similar threat. Appeal was then made to Micah, not to Isaiah, a far greater man.

20. the pool and the conduit. Hezekiah brought the water of the Virgin's Spring into the Pool of Siloam. The inscription recording the fact was discovered in 1880, copied, and read; unfortunately it has since been erased.

XXI. 1-18. **Manasseh, 692-638.** No verse of this record comes from an early source. It is the work of D and his successor. To them Manasseh was the arch-traitor, for he awoke the wrath of Jehovah which destroyed the nation's life. Orphaned at the age of twelve, he evidently became the tool of the idolatrous party, and his unusually long reign and his violent repression of prophetic religion effectively checked the development of ethical worship till the Exile. 2 Ch 33 [11-13] says that Manasseh was im-

prisoned in Babylon where he repented; and that on his release he tried to return to the methods of his father. The first tradition may be a half-forgotten allusion to his visit as a vassal to Esar-haddon in 677.

7. 1 K 15[13] *v.n.*

10. **the prophets.** The fate of these men is probably referred to in [16].

19-26. **Amon,** 638-637.

He was remarkably young to die leaving a son of eight.

XXII. 1-XXIII. 30. **Josiah,** 637-608, **and the discovery of Deuteronomy.**

As many of the Fathers perceived, the book found in the Temple *c.* 620 was Deuteronomy. Recent attempts to post-date that book must be held improbable (p. 148*a*). The coincidences between Josiah's reforms and the provisions of Deuteronomy are too obvious to need mention. The book was probably hidden away in the Temple by some martyr or persecuted prophet of Manasseh's day. Suggestions that it is a pious fraud of the priests are uncalled for. The position it assigned to the country priests was apparently never conceded at Jerusalem, and would the priests have waited till the boy Josiah was twenty-five years of age before they disclosed their design?

XXII. 4. Cf. 12[9].

8. 'The book of the law have I found.' The order of words throws emphasis on Hilkiah's discovery.

11. No doubt Josiah's dismay was caused by Dt 28 and 29.

16. Huldah's message is redolent of Deuteronomic phrases. Still those who claim that it is not original must explain why the prophecy of the peaceful end of the godly Josiah was left unaltered.

XXIII. 1-24. **The covenanters and the reforms.**

Josiah summoned the principal members of the community and as many others as could be got into the Temple courts, and read to them the book of the covenant, i.e. the book in which the covenantal terms were contained. He then made a covenant 'before the Lord,' which was presumably the taking publicly, after invoking Jehovah, of a solemn obligation to obey His laws. To this the people assented in some way, though unfortunately the meaning of **stood to** (lit. 'in') **the covenant** is unknown.

3. **to confirm** means to establish.

4-7. **The cleansing of the Temple.**

The appalling character of heathenism is unconcealed.

8-15. **Destruction of 'high places' and idolatrous emblems.**

8. Instead of **gates** probably *satyrs* should be read (cf. Lev 17[7]; 2 Ch 11[15]).

9. **came not up** as Deuteronomy enjoined.

10. **Topheth** perhaps means 'fireplace' (cf. *Rel. Sem.*[3], 377).

11. It is commonly supposed that solar worship came to Palestine from Babylonia, and perhaps the imagery of the sun's chariot is from that source, especially as sacrifices on roof-tops ([12]) were common in Babylonia.

15. **Beth-el,** of course, lay outside Josiah's dominions, and probably here we may recognize an attempt to enlarge his territory.

16-20. A late interpolation (cf. 1 K 13[1]).

21-24. **The Passover** was kept at Jerusalem, not in the people's homes.

29-30. Josiah's death, 608. See p. 183*a*.

For **against the king of Assyria** read *unto* (*el* for *'al*), and for **king Josiah went against him,** tr. literally *to meet him.*

31-35. **Jehoahaz,** 608.

Probably as he was a younger son whom the people elected king he was a strong nationalist, and therefore not a *persona grata* to the Egyptians. What the young king was doing at Riblah so far north is not clear. Jeremiah and Ezekiel are more lenient in their judgement of this unhappy prince.

36-XXIV. 7. **Jehoiakim,** 607-597.

Nineveh fell in 612, and the Assyrian power was finally destroyed at Harran in 610. Necho lost his supremacy in 605 at Carchemish (Jer 46[2]). Jehoiakim foolishly played both powers false, and brought the invincible Babylonians into his land (p. 183*b*).

XXIV. 2. For **Syrians** probably *Edomites* should be read. Israel's ancient enemies enhanced the horrors of every siege of Jerusalem.

5. The last citation of this kind. The first editor's work was continued in the Exile by another writer.

8-17. **Jehoiachin,** 597. **The fall of Jerusalem.**

Little resistance seems to have been offered, and Jehoiachin and the most intelligent and influential members of society went into Exile.

13-14 and 15-16 are duplicate accounts.

18-XXV. 21. **Zedekiah,** 597-586. **The fall of the Jewish kingdom.**

Again the sovereign lord changes his vassal's name. Zedekiah was counselled by Jeremiah and Ezekiel to make the best of the situation and honour his word to Nebuchadrezzar; but he went over to the Zealots and ignored the fate of his

predecessors. This time a resistance worthy of Jerusalem's wonderful strategic advantages was offered. For eighteen months the Jews held the Babylonians at bay, and at last when the wall was breached, the king and his army left the non-combatants to their fate, and cut their way through the besiegers. Before they could reach the Jordan they were overtaken, and a barbarous punishment was inflicted on Zedekiah. The last sight he saw in this world was the murder of his children, and he was left alive to contemplate it.

Jerusalem was utterly destroyed and made 'a heap of stones,' and a further deportation was ordered. The narrative can be amplified from Jer 52. Zedekiah's principal advisers and courtiers were put to death.

22-26. Gedaliah's governorship. This man was a friend of Jeremiah, the son of the man who saved Jeremiah's life. At the eleventh hour there was still the chance for a prosperous God-fearing community to rise from the ruin of the state; but it was not to be. Gedaliah and the people whom he had gathered round him were treacherously murdered by Ishmael, a man of royal blood jealous of his authority. In the terror that followed the people fled to Egypt. Cf. Jer 39 [11]-43 [7], of which this passage is a summary.

27-30. Jehoiachin released from prison. The long record of Israel's kings ends with a hint of a better future to come. Their king is released and preferred above the other royal captives of his master. Amil (Evil) **Merodach** reigned from 562-560 only.

I. AND II. CHRONICLES

By A. Guillaume

Name and Character.—The position of this book (which was divided into two books in Christian times) at the end of the Hebrew Bible is a fairly accurate indication of the date of its composition. Let us add to that indication its Greek title of 'Things omitted' and Jerome's explanation of 'Chronicon,' as he called the book, 'what might well be called the Chronicle of the whole of *sacred* history,' and we have a general idea of its nature and contents. Many hard things have been written about the Chronicler. Thus Wellhausen's masterly chapter on his methods speaks of a 'deliberate, and in its motives a very transparent, mutilation of the original narrative as preserved for us in the Book of Samuel.' His style 'betrays' him; he has a 'law-crazed fancy'; his historical situations are 'impossible' and 'artificial'; his narrative 'refreshes itself with a little variety'; it is 'rude and mechanical,' and so on. Wellhausen's *History of Israel* (Eng. tr., 171-227) still has the clearest detailed statement of the Chronicler's method of editing the historical writings which lay before him; he recognized and pointed out the prevailing bent of the Chronicler's mind and interests, but it was not his intention to offer any justification for them. Now it is quite true that the Chronicler dealt as he chose with his sources; he was a Levite—very probably one of the Temple choirmen—and his interests were ecclesiastical. When he treats of mundane matters he shapes the past by the hand of God rather than by the doings of men; he loves to point to a moral: if a king suffered from ill-health or was defeated in battle, it was because he had sinned. In his application of this principle he *is* mechanical and often ignores the contrary evidence of the earlier sources. Worse still, from an historian's standpoint he insists on inserting into ancient narratives the laws, customs, and worship of post-exilic Judaism.

Yet a little imagination and a little study of later Semitic writers on *religious* history and law will vindicate the Chronicler's right to an abiding place among the great writers of great epochs—those eras which determined the trend of the dominating idea of the succeeding centuries. Did space permit we might show how the doctors of Islam shaped the laws and customs of millions of Muslims by reading back into the origins of their religion the conditions and ideas of their own age: how customs and laws unheard of by Muhammad became *de rigueur* by the simple expedient of claiming for them his precept or example. The Chronicler too lived in an age which idealized the past. David, the founder of Judah's dynasty, had become the David of Christian hymns, and accordingly the Chronicler draws a veil over the crimes which sullied his name. Thus David in Chronicles appears only

as a noble, chivalrous, and powerful monarch. He is David as he ought to have been.

The Chronicler wrote some time after 300 B.C., perhaps as late as 200 B.C., when the position to be assigned to the Law of Moses was still an open question. Was it indeed the infallible guide of men's actions? And if so, why was it that Israel's great saints had lived as though that law had never been given? It cannot be supposed that our Lord was the first to cite David as a precedent for overriding the law, and the Chronicler consciously and conscientiously set himself the task of explaining to posterity the shaping of the nation's history in accordance with the sacred law. To him the expression of God's will on Sinai was final. If saintly men were reported to have disobeyed it, or to have ignored it, the record must be wrong, and his task was to present a statement which would reconcile history and theology. Such an attitude (which has its parallel in the writings of Muslim legists who treat of an ideal past which has never existed as though it were extant) is not perhaps European, nor is it Christianity. We may call it Eastern in its fanaticism and its loyalty. But we must recognize that a good deal of what passes as Church History and of Hagiology has been written even in Europe and in the name of Christ on a like principle. The loyalty to a written law which caused men to allow themselves to be butchered by their enemies rather than fight on the Sabbath day is the same spirit as shows itself in a different field in the method of the Chronicler. The double loyalty both to the law and to Israel's saints compelled him to deal drastically with all documents which showed them at variance. He refused to countenance any apparent disagreement. It must be remembered that the Pentateuch was the first part of Scripture to become canonical, and probably when the Chronicler wrote the historical writings were not canonical: so he was free to alter them in accordance with what he felt 'must have been the case.'

The Chronicler's work has all the merits of later Judaism: its devotion to a law higher, more humane than anything the ancient world knew of; a lofty conception of the covenant relation between God and Israel; and a highly developed sense of the value of corporate worship. But he gained these great objectives at the cost of historic truth, and Nemesis followed on his success. Though the Law-abiding Israelite was shut off for ever from the contamination of the heathen—an inestimable benefit—his mental and spiritual horizon was bounded by Law. By forcing the actions of saints of old time into conformity with laws made centuries after their death the Chronicler helped to rivet those laws in all their precision upon all succeeding generations of Israelites. Thus development was cramped, and the people lay at the mercy of the authorized interpreters of an immutable law. But human nature in the gross has never shown itself able to rule its conduct by obedience to the highest principle that Love is the fulfilling of the Law, and till the reign of perfect righteousness for which the prophets, priests, and scribes of Israel yearned, the Books of Chronicles will enshrine an ideal—truly a high ideal though not the highest—of a holy nation, a nation of priests; and remain as an example of what Wellhausen calls 'the timeless manner of looking at things,' foreshadowing and destined deeply to influence the worship, constitution, and spirit of the Catholic Church, for good and also for evil.

It does not seem to be reasonably possible to accept a higher estimate than is given above of the Chronicles. Certainly we do not find here the gift of inspiration at its highest. But 'institutional' religion is a necessary element in religion. The New Covenant is 'institutional' as well as the Old. And in his enthusiastic zeal for liturgical worship and for the acceptance in faith and humility of a divine Order, the Chronicler, in spite of his lack of the sense of historical veracity, must be recognized as really inspired to write. Certainly in the Church of Christ we are bound to recognize that a like deficiency in the historical sense and the historical conscience, in large parts and over long periods of its history, has not prevented the Holy Spirit from blessing it richly with His gifts, intellectual as well as moral.

Sources and Language.—On the relation of Chronicles to Ezra-Nehemiah see p. 284*a*. The many sources quoted can be reduced to (*a*) the Book of Kings (probably not the present book, but a later version of it), and (*b*) a *midrash*. Whether this *midrash* was a separate work, or whether it was the same as (*a*) is disputed. See *L.O.T.*, 528. (*c*) The Acts of Uzziah (probably not a part of the preceding), and (*d*) possibly the *midrash* of the prophet Iddo.

The style of these three latter forbids a pre-exilic date: they are written in a style similar to the Chronicler's, which is easily separated from the excerpts from

(*a*). The difference is as great as between Lk 1 [1-4] and the rest of the chapter. An estimate of its uncouth character and a list of peculiarities will be found in *I.C.C.*, 27.

Bibliography

Curtis, *I.C.C.*; Barnes, *C.B.*, *E. Bi.*, i; Kittel, *S.B.O.T.*

I. CHRONICLES

(*Only matter peculiar to Chronicles will be noticed here.*)

(A) I.-IX. **Genealogies.**—These chapters form a genealogical introduction to the history, and take the place of chronological lists which precede most modern histories. Generally their source can be identified at once. In 3 [17-24], where the descendants of Jehoiachin are enumerated, an important variant in the principal versions brings down Zerubbabel's descendants to *c.* 200. Thus 'And the son of Hananiah was Pelatiah, and Jeshaiah his son, and Arnan his son, and Obadiah his son, and Shecaniah his son,' instead of MT 'the sons of' would represent the men of 3 [24] as belonging to the eleventh generation. On the whole, since the Chronicler tells us nothing of events so late, it is safer to assume that the RV is right.

(B) X.-XXIX. **David.**

X. **The Death of Saul.**—Excavations at Beth-shan have disclosed the fact that at this time (*c.* 1020) there were two temples there, the southern being dedicated to the god Resheph and the northern to Astarte (Ashtoreth) his consort. A monument depicting the latter as Antit, the goddess of war, has recently been unearthed. Consequently the statement in [10] that the Philistines put Saul's armour in the temple of their god (1 S 31 [10], 'the house of the Ashtaroth') means the northern temple here (not at Ashkelon, as used to be supposed). Ewald's view, that the statement in 1 Samuel that Saul's body was fastened to (perhaps exposed on) the wall of Beth-shan, and the statement here that his skull was fastened to Dagon's temple (identified by A. Rowe, *P.E.F.Q.S.* [1927], 77, with the southern temple), are both true to the original text, has now more to commend it.

12. **buried**: 1 S 31 [12] *v.n.* 'burnt.'

13-14. The first example of the writer's pragmatism. Saul brought his dreadful fate upon himself.

XI. **David made King.**—Everything irrelevant to the Chronicler's purpose is excluded, and he proceeds straight to David's kingship.

XII. **David's Warriors.**—This chapter is for the most part peculiar to Chronicles, and contains information and names which may well be trustworthy, though the language and style forbid the assumption that they are excerpts from a pre-exilic document.

18 is an ancient poem.

32, with its reference to men who understood the times 'to know what Israel ought to do,' is probably to be understood as indicating a special degree of sanctified shrewdness. To 'discern the times' was to perceive the hand of God working and shaping events. The Rabbis saw here an allusion to the astrological skill of Issachar (cf. Est 1 [12]; 2 S 20 [18]).

XIII. **Removal of the Ark from Kiriath-jearim**: cf. 2 S 6 [1-11].

1-5 are the Chronicler's. Render *Let us send an order to our brethren*, etc. Care for the ark is David's first concern (contrast 2 Samuel).

14. Render: *And the ark of God remained beside the house of Obed-edom in its own house three months.* There is an intentional correction of 2 S 6 [11], where it is said that the ark was put *in* Obed-edom's house. On the contrary the ark had its own tent, says the Chronicler.

XIV. **David in Jerusalem** = 2 S 5 [11-25].

17 is additional.

XV.-XVI. **Ceremonial Removal of the Ark to Zion.**—All but the few verses borrowed, with alterations, from 2 S 6 [12-19] are peculiar to Chronicles. David, perceiving that the breach of the taboo which caused the death of Uzza would not have occurred had the Levites had charge of the proceedings, again summons all Israel to Jerusalem and puts the Levites in command.

XV. 16-24. **Temple music.** This passage is an important witness to the musical service of the second Temple. Unfortunately an early and a later system have been combined in order to procure the authority of Israel's sweet psalmist for the latter. Cf. [19-21, 23] with the context.

20. **psalteries set to Alamoth**, i.e. 'alamoth-lyres.' Alamoth (= young women) is possibly the name of a kind of lyre played by women, just as (21) Sheminith-harps are those with eight strings; see Langdon in *J.R.A.S.* (1921), 181. Cf. Ps 68 [25], where *alamoth* play timbrels.

XVI. 4-7. **Levitical Priestly Worship.**—The threefold character of the Temple worship was memorial sacrifice, thanksgiving, praise, which are summed up in the Church's (11) sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

4. celebrate (Hebrew *hazkir*) means to put (God) in remembrance at the presentation of the meal offering known as the *azkarah* (Lev 2^{2} *v.n.*). During the sacrifice liturgical prayers and psalms were sung, and Pss 8 and 70 bear the rubric *hazkir* (cf. Briggs, *Psalms, I.C.C.*, I, lxxxii). **to thank:** the psalm assigned to the thank offering was 100, our *Jubilate.* **praise,** i.e. singing any of the Halleluiah psalms, which are 104-107, 111-117, 135-136, 146-150, according to Briggs.

7. first: RV is right. The verse explains the *origin* of the temple service of song.

8-36. A Psalm of praise and thanksgiving made up of portions of other psalms which are indicated in RVm.

41*b*. Render *to give thanks to the Lord* (singing the psalms with the refrain), *for his mercy endureth for ever.*

XVIII. **17. And David's sons were about the king,** in place of the original statement of 2 Samuel that 'David's sons were priests.'

XXI.-XXII. **1. David's Census, the Plague, and the Site of the Temple.**—2 S 24 has been altered thus: (1) Satan, not Jehovah, instigates the census; (2) only Joab takes the census; (3) the figures do not tally; (4) Levi and Benjamin are not counted; (5) David sees the angel between earth and heaven; (6) elders are with him, and all wear sackcloth; (7) Ornan and his sons hide themselves; (8) the price paid differs; (9) fire comes down from heaven; (10) 21^{26}-22^{1}, describing the choice of Israel's central sanctuary, are additional.

This chapter admirably illustrates the Chronicler's method and the ideas of his time. Satan is a proper name, not the name of an officer of the heavenly court, as in Job 1^{6} *v.n.*; angels hover between heaven and earth; they are no longer like mortals who walk and talk with men; and fire comes down from heaven.

XXII. **2-XXIX. David's Preparations for the Temple and its Service.**—The remarkable feature of this long section, which is almost entirely the Chronicler's work, is the prominence given to David. His character has been idealized and made fit for the commanding position the Chronicler assigns him. He chooses Israel's sanctuary and makes such vast provision for its Temple in men, money, and materials that little remains for Solomon to accomplish.

XXII. **8. because thou hast shed much blood.** Thus the Chronicler expands 1 K 5^{3}, where it is implied that war left David no time to build.

XXIII. **4-5.** It is really extraordinary that it should have been possible to state that as many as 24,000 Levites superintended the construction of so small a building as the Temple. It may be that the word **oversee** means 'leading the music,' however improbable it may seem, for 4,000 Levites formed an orchestra to praise God presumably while the building went on (cf. 2 Ch 34^{12}).

XXIV. **1-19. The priests' courses** were divided into twenty-four (cf. Lk 1^{8}).

20-31. Another list of Levites (cf. 23^{6}); probably a later addition.

XXV. **Musicians and Singers.**—These two classes together numbered 288, divided into twenty-four courses like the priests, so that there would be twelve in each course. As in 15^{17} all these are regarded as the descendants of three musical families. The carefully articulated worship of the Temple is a description—perhaps idealized in some particulars—of that which the Chronicler knew.

1. who should prophesy: so the Hebrew margin; the text says 'the prophets.' The close connexion between prophetic ecstasy and music (2 K 3^{15}) which was a characteristic of early Israelite prophecy seems to have revived in the later service of the Temple. In 2 Ch 20^{14} the Chronicler tells a story which would seem to imply that he regarded those who sang God's praises continually as the descendants of the prophets.

4. Hananiah . . . Mahazioth. Since Ewald most scholars have found a fragment of a psalm in these names (which are very strange in form):

> 'Be gracious unto me, Jah, be gracious unto me.
> Thou art my God whom I exalt and extol:
> Thou art my help in hardship:
> O grant me many visions of thyself.'—MOFFATT.

It is tempting to regard this as a prayer of the Chronicler himself, or perhaps some later reader who was one of the singers of Heman's guild and wrote these words in the margin at the place where his reputed ancestors were recorded. The rejected names certainly occur in $23^{13\text{-}31}$, but it is a strange coincidence that all these nine should fall *by lot* at the end of the courses, and their mention there is probably due to the desire to compose twenty-four courses.

XXVI. **More Levitical Offices.**—Gatekeepers, treasurers, storekeepers, and civil servants. The functions of these latter can only be conjectured.

XXVIII. **David summons a General Assembly and gives Solomon a Detailed Plan of the Temple.**

11. David is the real founder of the Temple which was built according to his plan. To the Chronicler 'Solomon's Temple' would have been a misnomer.

treasuries is a word found only here in OT and is Persian in provenance.

12. **by the spirit**: rather *in his mind.*

19. Difficult. Render: *The whole is in writing from the hand of the Lord* (which was) *upon me, making me comprehend all the works of the pattern.* For the phrase 'hand of God upon . . .' cf. Ezr 7 [9]; Neh 2 [8]. 'As Moses received the pattern of the tabernacle . . . by inspiration . . . so the Chronicler . . . declares that Jehovah was the source of David's knowledge' (*I.C.C.*). The LXX here has paraphrastic additions to the text which are obviously no part of the original text.

XXIX. A really noble conception of the spirit of sacrifice and worship is bequeathed us by the Chronicler in this chapter, in which he sets forth his ideal of a house built *ad majorem Dei gloriam.* No haphazard offering of money, no statutory tithe or temple tax brought the Davidic Temple into being; but, like its predecessor the 'tabernacle' (Ex 35), it was the fruit of voluntary gifts. He who gave willingly (5) was as one who performed the holy office of priest. The people's generosity was stirred, and they rejoiced (9) in the realization that it is more blessed to give than to receive. They praised God and counted it a privilege to hand back to God what (14) came to them from His hand. The prevailing note was communal rejoicing—the spontaneous happiness of a people united in the joyous service of their God.

7. **darics**: the mention of Persian darics, as obvious an anachronism to the writer as to ourselves, is inexplicable. By the side of the huge sum in talents the darics are negligible.

9. **perfect heart**: 1 K 8 [61] *v.n.* The mind of the givers was completely with their action: they did not think of some other excellent object to which it could have been devoted.

15. **abiding** is right, despite RVm. LXX excellently *hypomone. Miqveh* is always used in contrast to man's transitoriness (Jer 14 [8], 17 [13], 50 [7], and Ezr 10 [2]).

29. **history of Samuel**, etc. These were probably not separate books, but merely those sections of the Book of Samuel in which these prophets are prominent. If the Chronicler had any other source, he did not use it.

II. CHRONICLES

(C) I.-IX. **Solomon.**

1-5 are the Chronicler's own; he takes this opportunity of explaining that the tent of meeting with the brazen altar before it was at Gibeon's high place, thus exculpating Solomon from the sin of breaking the law of Lev 17 [8-9].

5. **sought unto it**: probably 'him,' i.e. Jehovah is intended.

II. 1-18. **Building Preparations**: cf. 1 K 5 [5-30].—There are so many variant details that some scholars, unnecessarily perhaps, have asserted that the Chronicler used a document other than 1 Kings.

2. **to oversee**: 1 Ch 23 [4] *v.n.*

6. The Temple is not God's house so much as a focus, a centre where the most diligent, the most costly, and the most musical service may be offered to him.*

III. 1. **in mount Moriah**: only mentioned here and in Gen 22 [2].

4. Correct the height from 1 Kings.

14. Neither Kings nor Ezekiel mentions a veil, so that the Chronicler is probably writing of the Temple of his day.

16. **chains in the oracle**: on 'oracle' 1 K 6 [5] *v.n.* But the innermost part of the Temple was not used to manufacture chains, and we must emend *He made chains like a necklace.*

IV. 7-9. The additions to, and variations from, 1 Kings are to be explained either from Zerubbabel's Temple or from another tradition known to the Chronicler.

V. 2-VII. 10. **The Dedication.**

V. 4. **the Levites took up the ark**: cf. 1 K 8 [3]. Priests and Levites are now different orders.

9. **there it is, unto this day.** A strange slip.

11*b*-13*a*. Peculiar to Chronicles.

VI. 13 does not allow Solomon to stand 'before the altar,' but on a kind of circular platform of bronze. (Elsewhere the word is used of pots and basons.)

VII. 1. Cf. 1 Ch 21 [26].

12. **an house of sacrifice**: in agreement with 2 [2].

VIII. 1-2. **Solomon's Relations with Hiram**: 1 K 9 [10-14] *v.n.*—A remarkable rewriting of history. In reality Solomon had to cede cities to Hiram; but the Chronicler dismisses such a tradition as unworthy of a great king and reverses the transaction.

3. A campaign against **Hamath-zobah** is otherwise unknown. There are other slight additions to the earlier narrative which may rest on an ancient tradition.

11. **the daughter of Pharaoh** could not be eliminated, but she is relegated to a place unhallowed by religious associations.

(D) X.-XXXVI. **The History of Judah from Rehoboam to the Edict of Cyrus.**

X.-XII. **Rehoboam.**

* Contrast the earlier conception mentioned on p. 254*b*.

XI. 5-23 contains new matter. The cities which Rehoboam fortified guarded Jerusalem from the south, and Shishak's invasion during Rehoboam's reign shows that his endeavour was prudent if unavailing.

12*b* might be rendered 'And so Judah and Benjamin became his,' and would imply that garrisons were posted at strategic points to overawe Rehoboam's own subjects. But there is less probability in this.

XII. 1-12. **Invasion of Shishak.**—The Chronicler attributes Shishak's invasion and the sufferings borne by Judah to their treachery against God. It is true that he applies this principle almost mechanically; but underlying it is the great truth that justice and fair dealing allay civil strife and enable a people to unite against external foes; while carried into international relations they forbid intrigues and undesirable alliances which excite foreign aggression. Such was the teaching of the prophets, and the Law, to which the Chronicler was devoted, sought to enforce obedience thereto.

3. **Sukkiim**: unknown; LXX 'troglodytes.'

XIII. **Abijah.**—1 K 15 [1-8] tell us no more than that there was constant war between Abijah aad Jeroboam, and that during his reign of three years he walked in the sins of his father. Here there is an account of his great victory over Jeroboam and his great piety. The source of this very late story is doubtless the **commentary** (Hebrew *midrash*) **of the prophet Iddo.** A *midrash* was 'an imaginative development of a thought or theme suggested by Scripture, especially a didactic or homiletic exposition, or an edifying religious story' (*L.O.T.*, 529), of which there are numerous examples in the NT. The root idea is *searching* to obtain a meaning not immediately apparent. Why Abijah was selected as the hero and champion of Jehovah's cause is difficult to see, unless there was an established tradition that he defeated Jeroboam.

XIV.-XVI. **Asa.**—Some scholars find two accounts of different writers here. Again *midrashic* material is predominant. Asa did remove the worst marks of Syrian heathenism, but his reforms were not so thorough as the *midrash* asserts: cf. 14 [3] and 15 [17] where *midrash* and history clash. It would be rash to assert that the story of Asa's victory over Zerah the Cushite is imaginary, though attempts to identify Zerah with Osorkon, Shishak's successor, are made in defiance of philology. The vengeance which Asa took on the cities round Gerar admirably fits the historical situation: these towns near the Egyptian frontier were used by Zerah as his base; they had remained in Egypt's hands since the last assault on Jerusalem, and Zerah fell back on them after his defeat at Mareshah; Asa pursued him thither, expelled him and his garrison, and secured himself against further attacks from that quarter. Who or what Zerah was, the political confusion in Egypt at this time precludes our explaining.

Winckler and others have argued in favour of an invasion from Arabia, but this is less probable.

XIV. 6. **fenced cities.** There is no reason for doubting the Chronicler here. Jer 41 [9] mentions a deep pit or trench which was remembered 300 years later as Asa's work.

15. **tents of cattle**: an unparalleled expression. Probably the name of a tribe has been corrupted (cf. LXX).

XV. 1-7. **Azariah's Exhortation.**—This prophet is otherwise unknown. His speech is intended to serve as an introduction to Asa's reforms. Lawlessness and insecurity marked Israelite history down to the middle period of David's reign. The writer demands reality. Israel had been without the true God, but history showed that when the people had *turned back* ([4]) to Him they had found Him. They had not had a priesthood to give them true direction, and the result had been anarchy and misery.

8-19. **Asa's Reforms.**

8. **of Oded the prophet.** Delete, or else read with LXX 'which Azariah the son of Oded had spoken.'

19. Contrast 1 K 15 [16, 32].

XVI. 7-10. **Hanani's Rebuke**: cf. 1 K 16 [1, 7].—Asa is severely rebuked for turning to Syria for aid instead of to God. The Chronicler's attitude towards physicians ([12]) is reminiscent of Ecclesiastes.

14. The **burning** was probably a sacrifice for the dead.

XVII.-XX. **Jehoshaphat.**

XVII. 1*b*-19, XIX. 1-XX. 30 are new matter. To the Chronicler Jehoshaphat's reign was one of great splendour. He is as successful in things temporal as in spiritual. He teaches the people the law, establishes courts of justice, builds military depots, and wins victories over divers enemies. His only faults were his entanglements with the wicked kings of Israel.

XVII. 7-9. This account of a systematic attempt to teach the people the law is not historical as it stands. The names are late, and of course **the book of the law of the Lord** is Deuteronomic. But the story

shows how lofty and conscientious was the post-exilic conception of religious duty. Systematic teaching in every city was the method adopted by our Lord. The inclusion of laymen among the teachers is no necessary mark of an early writer. In 17 [7] for **Ben-hail** read 'worthy men' (cf. 19 [4-11]).

XIX. **2.** The judgement on the northern kingdom is most severe.

4-11. Cf. 17 [7-9] *v.n.* Wellhausen regarded this passage as a *midrash* on the name Jehoshaphat = Jeho(vah) judgeth. We may legitimately question the historical value of the Chronicler's details, but there is no reason why a just and wise ruler should not realize that firm and stable government can only rest upon the principles of justice and equity. The high estimate of the judge's office in [6] is primitive, not late.

8*b*. Read *and for the controversies of the inhabitants of Jerusalem.*

XX. **1-30. A Miraculous Defeat of Moabites and Ammonites.**—Again a *midrash* on 2 K 3 [4-27]. Judah conquers by prayer, not by arms; Levites and singers play a great part in the struggle.

2. the sea, i.e. the Dead Sea. **Syria:** read *Edom.*

5. the new court probably belonged to the second Temple.

14. Jahaziel: 1 Ch 25 [1] *v.n.*

19. Judah's victory comes through the *praises* of God.

20. Salvation cometh by faith.

21. beauty of holiness, i.e. in sanctified priestly garments.

25. For **among them** read with LXX *cattle,* and for **dead bodies** *garments* as RVm.

35-37. Jehoshaphat's ships are destroyed because he allied himself with the king of Israel.

XXI. **Jehoram.**

2-4, 12-19 are peculiar to Chronicles. Elijah's letter is of course the composition of a later age.

19. 16 [14] *v.n.*

XXII. **Ahaziah.**

7-9 form an interesting variant from 2 K 9 [27]. There Ahaziah is smitten while in full flight: here he is caught while hiding (LXX 'being healed') in Samaria.

XXIII.-XXIV. **Joash.**

XXIII. A most remarkable series of changes in the story of the coronation of Joash eliminates the foreign bodyguard which Jehoiada won over to his side, and in their place appear the Levites. The Temple is guarded by Levites, because to the Chronicler the presence of foreigners therein was sacrilege. But cf. Ezek 44 [6]. The solemn, almost ponderous movement of events is in striking contrast with the hasty conspiracy of 2 Kings, where success hangs in the balance till the last moment. The manipulation of the narrative is most skilful in places: cf. the entirely different sense of 23 [6] and 2 K 11 [7].

XXIV. **4-14. Repair of the Temple.**—Again a great divergence from 2 Kings. There the king rid himself of the obligation of repairing the Temple, which was in great need of restoration, and made the priests responsible. They were ordered to devote certain monies to the repairs, and when they failed to put the money to its proper use Joash deprived them of it and had it collected in a box. Thus (*a*) the king was supreme in Temple matters; (*b*) the Temple had been shamefully neglected; (*c*) the priests were covetous (unless they regarded the king's order as unfair). As to (*a*) the Chronicler says Jehoiada merely fulfilled the law of Moses; (*b*) the damage had been done by the wicked Athaliah; while (*c*) he ignores as unworthy of notice. So much money was collected that the Temple was repaired and many costly vessels bought for the services.

6. tax of Moses: Ex 30 [11].

10. until they had made an end: better *until it was full.*

15-22. Joash's Apostasy. — Not in 2 Kings. Zechariah the son of Jehoiada is the Zechariah of Lk 11 [51], and was the last person in the Hebrew Bible to die unjustly, as Abel was the first.

XXV. **Amaziah.**

5-13. An expansion of 2 K 14 [7]. The story of the hire of Israelite mercenaries and their rejection before the fight probably has the germs of a half-forgotten story of the treachery of the northerners. It may be supposed that instead of doing the work for which they were hired they sacked Judæa. This would account for Amaziah's foolish challenge to Joash.

14-16. Amaziah's idolatry is only recorded here, and it is certainly strange that he should have worshipped the gods of a vanquished nation. If language be a valid test the *midrash* is a fairly early one.

XXVI. **Uzziah.**—The Chronicler had trustworthy information which was probably contained in the work attributed in [22] to Isaiah. He was evidently a gifted organizer showing equal concern for the agricultural and the military well-being of his country. His military system was apparently modelled on Assyrian lines—strong raiding parties under skilled generals and siege artillery. The cause of his miserable affliction, which was

thought to be due to the anger of Jehovah, the Chronicler finds in his venturing to burn incense in defiance of the priests.

XXVII. **Jotham.**

3*b*-6 are new, and the Syrian invasion is ignored.

XXVIII. **Ahaz.**—There is probably a core of truth in the Chronicler's representation that the help of Assyria did not save Judah from the vexations of the Edomites and Philistines. He does not say that Assyria was invoked against them as *I.C.C.* asserts.

8-15. A *midrash* appealing to the underlying unity of the Hebrew people.

17. **For again** (lit. 'and') would be better rendered *But again*.

23-24. The Chronicler views Ahaz's innovations as idolatry.

XXIX.-XXXII. **Hezekiah.**

29. **Cleansing of the Temple.**—Again *midrashic*. The Temple was cleansed through the blood of the sacrifices; the ritual is that of P. During these propitiatory, expiatory, and eucharistic offerings the song of the Levites and the music bore up the prayers of the congregation.

34 is thought to mark the Chronicler's partiality to Levites as against priests.

XXXI. inculcates the duty of supporting the priests and Levites.

XXXII. 1-23. **The Destruction of Sennacherib's Host.**—The Chronicler's faith is summed up in [19], 'They spake of the God of Jerusalem, as of the gods of the peoples of the earth, which are the work of men's hands.'

XXXIII. 1-20. **Manasseh.**

10-19 are the Chronicler's. This is the only authority for Manasseh's imprisonment and release, and some scholars have followed Wellhausen in calling it an invention. He was certainly subject to Esar-haddon at a time when revolts were frequent, and there is nothing improbable in the story, though we may date his prayer ([18]) in the Hellenistic age.

XXXIV.-XXXV. **Josiah.**—Josiah begins the reformation *before* the discovery of the book of the law.

XXXIV. 12. **set it forward:** *nasseaḥ* is used only in psalm-titles and in Chronicles and Ezr 3 [8, 9]. Except in 2 Ch 2 [2, 18] it is explicitly associated with the Levitical musicians, and in view of the Chronicler's lofty conception of the spiritual value of the choir in effective prayer, in prophecy, and in the general service of the Lord, and having regard to the great prominence he gives to music, it may be that here too he has in mind a holy work furthered by singing.

18. **read therein.** A significant alteration of 2 K 22 [10] 'read it.' To the Chronicler the book was the Pentateuch.

30. **the priests and the Levites,** in place of 2 Kings 'priests and prophets.' The Targum has, significantly, 'priests and *scribes*.'

XXXV. **Josiah's passover** was kept at Jerusalem instead of at the people's homes.

20-26. The Chronicler's version of Josiah's end is longer than 2 Kings. He is right in mentioning Carchemish.

XXXVI. 11-21. **Zedekiah and the Captivity.**—The Chronicler agrees that the priests had also become corrupt, and the nation brought upon itself the judgement of God.

21. **until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths.** Thus about 490 years had passed without observance of the sabbatical year.

22-23. Ezr 1 [1] *v.n.*

EZRA—NEHEMIAH

By John C. H. How

Introduction

(1) **Ezra-Nehemiah One Composite Work.**—There can be little doubt that the books we now know as Ezra and Nehemiah were originally *one* book, as they actually appear in the Greek version known as 1 Esdras. Further it would seem that they were originally a third part of 'Chronicles,' though in the Hebrew Canon they precede 1 Chronicles, perhaps because they were admitted to the Canon before 1 and 2 Chronicles.

(2) **The importance of Ezra-Nehemiah** cannot be overestimated. (*a*) It forms the only Hebrew narrative account we possess of the history of the Jews from 537 to about 333 B.C.—the period during which the real foundations of 'Judaism,' with its rigid exclusiveness and its intense devotion to the 'Law of Moses,' were laid. It is true that the prophets of the period (Haggai and Zechariah 520 B.C. and Malachi, perhaps 400 B.C.) throw much light on the history of the period, and the Aramaic papyri recently discovered

at Elephantine in Egypt also help to fill in gaps; but we have no other attempt at a consecutive history of any part of the period except the work Ezra-Nehemiah.

(*b*) As will be shown later, the critical study of this book presents the student with some most intricate and perplexing problems. It is right that attempts should be made to solve such problems, and we are bound to give a good deal of space to their consideration. But it must not be thought that the value of the book depends on a right solution of the puzzles it presents. Many readers may have neither the time nor the mind to attempt to wrestle with them, but would rather concern themselves with the question: 'What spiritual value has the book for us in these modern times? What message has it for the Church to-day?' We have space here only to indicate lines along which an answer might be given.

Leaving aside all critical questions and reading the books as they stand, the reader may well set himself to draw a parallel between the Jewish Church of those days and the Christian Church of these. To both the call comes for 'spiritual reconstruction.' In both there is much that might well damp the spirits of the would-be reformer. He sees the Church in a state of deep humiliation, and seeming weakness and ineffectiveness. Lawlessness and disregard for a great spiritual heritage go hand in hand with an easy concurrence with surrounding conventional standards. Yet the divine vocation of the Church stands in God's purpose, and the Spirit of God can awaken and renew, now as then.

There is a great message of hope and reassurance in this book. But there are also warnings. In the first place it may be noted that disasters like the Captivity (for Israel of old) or the late war (for modern Europe) *may* be the prelude to renewed spiritual life, but not by any merely mechanical process. There must be the response of hearts and minds that ponder and repent and act.

In the second place, it is well to remember that the awakening of the 'Church life' of the Jews in the post-Captivity period all too soon hardened into a rigid legalism and a narrow nationalism, blind to the wide and progressive purpose of the Spirit of God.

If it magnificently withstood the attacks of pagan culture in the Maccabæan age, it also refused the call of God through the true Messiah in the days of Annas and Caiaphas. Devotion to a system, or to elements as opposed to the larger whole, may blind the most ardent to the greater purposes of God, and hinder rather than further the cause of His Kingdom.

(3) **The Problems of Ezra-Nehemiah.**—The study of this work presents quite extraordinarily difficult problems for the historian of the period. If the work purports to be a consecutive narrative, it is extremely difficult to form any very clear idea of the course events took. The period of history during which events recorded in the book occurred or persons mentioned lived is an immense one, ranging from 537 (the first year of Cyrus, Ezr 1 [1]) down to about 333, when Jaddua (mentioned in Neh 12 [11, 22]) was high priest. The actual narrative does not carry us further than the reign of Artaxerxes II (405-359) at the latest (see below), and much of the period prior to this is passed over in silence. There are thus big gaps in the history, as the following chronological tables will show.

Chronological Tables

(*a*) *The Kings of Persia*, with references to passages in Ezra-Nehemiah where they are mentioned:

Cyrus, 538-529 (Ezr 1 [1], 5 [13], 6 [3]).
Cambyses, 529-522.
Pseudo-Smerdis, 522.
Darius I, 521-486 (Ezr 4 [5]; cf. Hag 1 [1]; Zech 1 [1]).
Xerxes I, 486-465 (Ezr 4 [6]) = Ahasuerus.
Artaxerxes I, 465-425 (Ezr 4 [7, 8, 11]; Neh 1 [1], 2 [1], 5 [14], 13 [6]).
Xerxes II, 425.
Darius II, 424-405.
Artaxerxes II, 405-359 (Ezr 7 [1] ?).*
Artaxerxes III, 359-339.
Arses, 339-336.
Darius III, 336-332 (Neh 12 [22]).

(*b*) *The Probable Chronological Sequence of Events Recorded in Ezra-Nehemiah.*

537. The decree of Cyrus (Ezr 1 [1] ff.) in the first year of his reign, i.e. over Babylon, and so over the Jews. Sheshbazzar entrusted with the sacred vessels (Ezr 1 [8]). The return of large numbers of Jews to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel and Joshua (Ezr 2 [1]).

7th month (Sept.-Oct.) the altar at Jerusalem set up—but the Temple still in ruins (Ezr 3 [1]).

536. 2nd month (April-May). The Restoration of the Temple begins—and ceases almost at once (Ezr 4 [1-5, 24]).

* The king mentioned may have been Artaxerxes I, as some maintain, in which case the date of Ezr 7 [1] ff. would be 458, but in this commentary the suggestion that the king is the second Artaxerxes is followed.

536-520 (i.e. 2nd year of Cyrus to 2nd year of Darius I). No record (Ezr 4 1-5, 24).

520. The Restoration of the Temple begun again (Ezr 4 24, 5 1 ff.; cf. Hag 1 1, 14).

516. 3rd of Adar, 12th month (Feb.-March). The Temple building finished (Ezr 6 15).

515. 14th of Nisan, 1st month (March-April). Celebration of the Passover (Ezra 6 19).

515-486. No record.

486, or soon after. Accusation against Jews sent to Xerxes I by Samaritans (Ezr 4 6). 486-465. No record.

465, or some time after, but before 446. Letters sent to Artaxerxes concerning the attempt to build the city walls at Jerusalem (Ezr 4 7, 8).

446. Kislev, 9th month (Nov.-Dec.). Nehemiah receives bad news from Jerusalem (Neh 1 1, read '19th year').

445. Nisan, 1st month (March-April). Nehemiah obtains permission to visit Jerusalem, and shortly after the restoration of the city walls begins (Neh 2 1-18).

25th of Elul, 6th month (Aug.-Sept.), the walls completed (Neh 6 15).

445-433. Nehemiah governor of Jerusalem (Neh 5 14 ?).

433. Nehemiah returned to Babylon (?), but shortly after obtains leave to return to Jerusalem (Neh 13 6).

433-398. No record ?

[*Note.*—The Elephantine Papyri allude to Bagoas as governor of Jerusalem in 408—perhaps as successor to Nehemiah.]

398. Ab, 5th month (July-Aug.). Ezra arrives in Jerusalem (Ezr 7 1-9, Artaxerxes =the *second* King of that name).

Tishri, 7th month (Sept.-Oct.). Ezra reads the Law (Neh 8 1).

15th day, the Feast of Tabernacles is kept (Neh 8 18).

Tebeth, 10th month (Dec.-Jan.). Commission sits on mixed marriage (Ezr 10 16).

397. Nisan, 1st month (March-April). The commission's work finished (Ezr 10 17).

24th day, a day of fasting and penitence (Neh 9 1).

The Great Covenant is signed (Neh 10).

From this point onward there is no record of the course of events, but mention is made of persons who figure in later history, as follows:

Darius III, 336-332 (Neh 12 22).

Jaddua, ? -332, High Priest at the time of Alexander's invasion of Judah (Josephus) (Neh 12 11, 12).

A study of this table will show at once that the history of the period is presented in a very patchy form. Not only are there big gaps, but also at times mere fragments of narrative are thrown in out of context with what precedes and follows (see especially Ezr 4 1-24). In the middle of Nehemiah we find a whole section relating to the work of Ezra (Neh 8 73, or perhaps 7 5 to 10 39). At times it is quite impossible to accept the chronology of the text, cf. Neh 1 1 and 2 1, where the later event is said to occur in the year before the earlier; and cf. Ezr 6 14, where a decree of Artaxerxes (465-425) is mentioned as an authority for permission to build the Temple in the days of Darius (521-486).

There are serious difficulties about accepting the sequence of events as they are recorded (e.g. the present position of Neh 5); and the relation of the work of Nehemiah to that of Ezra presents a most perplexing problem, especially if (as the text of Neh 8 8, 10 2, and 12 37 seems to imply) they were contemporaries.

(4) **The Character of the Work**—(i) *A Compilation.*—The difficulties arise from the indubitable fact that the work is a compilation made up of fragments from various sources, pieced together into a seemingly consecutive narrative, but not very successfully arranged.

(ii) *A Late Compilation.*—Further, it seems equally incontestable that the compilation was made at a date long subsequent to the events recorded. Witness the mention of Darius III and Jaddua, both of whom lived towards the end of the 4th century B.C.

The Sources: (*a*) *The Personal Memoirs.*—The English reader at once notices that some of the narrative is in the 3rd person and some in the 1st. In the following passages the 1st person is used:

Ezr 7 27-9 15; Neh 1 1-7 5 (perhaps omitting 3); 12 27-43; 13 4-31.

The passages bear the stamp of personal memoirs, and may rightly be regarded as extracts from the personal records of Ezra and Nehemiah. They have been pronounced by Cornill to be 'documents of an importance such as hardly anything else in the literature of Israel has for us.'

We may conclude then that at least two sources on which the compiler drew were writings actually contemporary with the events they record.

(*b*) *The Aramaic Sections.*—The reader of Hebrew notices further that, though the greater part of the work is in Hebrew, certain sections are in Aramaic, a kindred but quite distinct dialect. These sections are Ezr 4 8-6 18 and 7 12-26. It is impossible, in a short space, to discuss their origin or historical value. It is sufficient to note that they must have existed as (perhaps part of) a separate record which

has been incorporated into this complex work of the compiler.

(*c*) *Genealogical Lists.*—The work abounds in genealogical and other name-lists. See Ezr 2 [1-70] (2 Neh 7 [6] ff.), 7 [1-5], 8 [1-14]; Neh 10 [1-27], 11 [3-36], 12 [1-26].

It is possible that these existed in the temple archives, and were drawn upon by the compiler for insertion into his work; though, either he revised the lists, or the lists suffered a good deal at the hands of copyists in transmission, as a comparison of Ezr 2 and Neh 7 will show.

(*d*) Other narratives (e.g. Ezr 1, 3-4 [6], 6 [19]-7 [11], 10; Neh 8-9, 10 [28-39], 13 [1-3]) which the compiler either incorporated as extracts from other documents, or composed himself on the basis of information derived from various unknown sources. Neh 10 [28-39] (note the 1st person in [30-39]) looks like the record of an actual participant in the events (hardly either Ezra or Nehemiah), though possibly [38, 39] may be the work of the compiler himself, or at least a later addition to the whole passage (see note *ad loc.*). Cf. also 12 [47].

(5) **The Compiler.**—It is quite impossible to say definitely who the compiler was, but it is quite clear that he must have lived subsequently to the date 333 B.C. since he includes name lists that mention Jaddua and Darius III (Neh 12 [11, 22]). Further the compiler seems to look *back* on the history he is recording as to a past age. So in Neh 12 [26] he seems to look *back* to the days of Nehemiah and Ezra. Again his use of the appellation, 'King of Persia' for the Emperors seems to imply that he is writing in a later age, viz. the Greek period, when the Persian Empire had fallen before the Greek Alexander (see Ezr 1 [1, 2, 8], 3 [7], 4 [3, 5, 7] and [24], where it is added *in Hebrew* at the end of the *Aramaic* section; 7 [1]). The title would be unnecessary during the Persian period, and it is striking that the 'memoir' passages of the Aramaic sections do not use it, but speak of 'the King' or even 'the King of Babylon' (Ezr 5 [13]; Neh 13 [6]; cf. Hag 1 [1, 15]; Zech 7 [1]). We may go one step further and affirm that the compiler belonged to the same school of thought and theological and ecclesiastical ideas as the writer of the Chronicles.

Cornill writes (*Introduction to Lit. of O.T.*, 249): 'Wherever in Ezra-Nehemiah older sources are not present in the composition, the style, spirit, point of view and mode of expression are altogether those of the Chronicler. There is the same rigorously legalistic, Levitical character, with special predilection for the musical side of the cultus, the same joy in lists and large numbers, the same colouring of the representation in agreement with the language of the later Psalms.'

The compiler lived in an age when the post-exilic ecclesiastical system based on the 'P' elements of the Pentateuch were in full vogue, and here and there he seems to have inserted short passages that add contemporary colour to the earlier documents, notably in Neh 10 [38, 39], 12 [47]. In these passages the Tithing Law is brought into closer harmony with that of Nu 18 [26-28], where the Levites are ordered to pay Tithes of their Tithes to Aaron the priest. The limitation of the priesthood to the family of Aaron, whilst all the rest of the Tribe of Levi are assistant ministers to the priests, is one of the features of the Ecclesiastical System of the P Code and the Chronicler.

But on the whole the compiler has been faithful to his earlier records, and has inserted them without much 'editorial' change, even though this sometimes involves witnessing to a different usage from that of his own day.

It is this fact that makes the task of identifying Ezra's Law Book so difficult. It was not the full Pentateuch with the full priestly code, nor was it merely Deuteronomy, nor merely the Holiness Code of Lev 17-26, though it has affinities to each of these.

It was probably a document which showed a development on the earlier codes of Deuteronomy and 'Holiness,' but it had not reached the full development of the complete priestly code.

The question is too big and complicated to be discussed in small space, and the reader must be referred to the larger Commentaries; but enough has been said to indicate the standpoint and method of the compiler. It remains only to be said that some would actually identify the compiler with the Chronicler. As was said in the first paragraph of this Introduction, Ezra-Nehemiah may have formed part of a larger work with 1 and 2 Chronicles. If so, probably our section Ezra-Nehemiah was compiled first and admitted to the Canon. Later the first two volumes giving the Chronicler's version of the History of Judah were written, and Ezra and Nehemiah were added to it and formed the last chapters of the second part. Then, later still, 'Chronicles' was admitted to the Canon but as the last book (as it stands in the Hebrew Canon), and the Ezra-Nehemiah sections were cut off as being already admitted; but the division was made

(perhaps by the carelessness of a copyist) at the wrong verse, so that 2 Chronicles includes the first two verses of Ezra and part of the third.

(6) **The Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah.**—Though the work includes documents of perhaps unequalled historical value, the actual memoirs of Nehemiah and Ezra, yet it presents extremely difficult historical problems. Where the compiler has reproduced earlier documents, his arrangement of material cannot be regarded as satisfactory, and it would seem that we must considerably alter the arrangement to arrive at the true historical sequence.

Further the opening part of Ezra (chapters 1-3) (recording the arrival in Jerusalem of vast numbers of exiles from Babylon in the first year of Cyrus 537, and stating that they at once proceeded to set to work to restore the Temple) is very difficult to harmonize with the state of things reflected in the utterances of Haggai and Zech 1-8.

These latter books are undeniably contemporary with the period with which they have to do, namely 520 B.C., whereas it is quite possible that Ezr 1-3 is a creation of the compiler living some 230 years after the event. It is striking that Haggai and Zechariah make no reference at all to any earlier attempt to build the Temple before their day; and the audience they are addressing are not returned exiles but the 'people of the land' or 'the Remnant' (see Hag 1 [12, 14], 2 [2, 4]; Zech 7 [5], 8 [6, 11]), i.e. the poorer folk left behind in Judah when the aristocracy and official classes were carried off to Babylon (2 K 24 [14]; cf. Jer 44 [21], 34 [19]). They never mention the 'sons of the captivity' (Ezr 4 [1], etc.), i.e. the exiles who, according to Ezr 1-3, had returned in such vast numbers in 537. The leaders they address are Zerubbabel the Governor, and Joshua the High Priest, who indeed appear in Ezr 4 [2, 3], etc., but as having returned from Babylon in 537 at the head of a vast company of exiles (see Ezr 2 [1-2], 4 [3, 5]). In Haggai and Zechariah there are indications that they have only recently arrived in Jerusalem, though this is more of an 'impression' than a stated fact. According to 1 Esdras (the Greek version of Ezra) Zerubbabel appears as a young man at the court of Darius I (4 [13]) 521 B.C., who wins the favour of the king, and, like Nehemiah later, receives permission to go to Jerusalem. This he does, and in 520 (6 [1]), with Joshua, proceeds with the building of the Temple stimulated by the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah. It is true that 1 Esdras includes what appear to be the mistakes of Ezr 1-6 and a great many more besides. But it may be that amongst a number of chronological mistakes real elements of truth have been retained, and the placing of Zerubbabel's return in the reign of Darius may well be a true tradition.

When all this is said in criticism, it is extremely difficult to suppose that no notice was taken by the Jews in Babylon of the liberal decree of Cyrus in 537—an historical fact vouched for by the famous cylinder inscription of Cyrus in the British Museum—and many scholars adopt a mediating view of the history which may be presented thus:

(7) **An Attempted Reconstruction of the History**—(*a*) *The First Period, 537-516, Cyrus-Darius.*—In 537 Cyrus issued a decree granting 'a return of all lands,' of which we have the *Hebrew* and Jewish version by the Chronicler in Ezr 1. Some Jews took advantage of the opportunity to return to Judah; but not great numbers, for many were comfortably settled in Babylon and were not very anxious to brave the journey and to settle in ruined Jerusalem. They had acted on Jeremiah's advice (Jer 29 [4-10]) and made themselves at home, and fifty years of this life had passed and a new generation had sprung up that had never known life in the old Jerusalem. It is quite possible that the list of names in Ezr 2 and the parallel, Neh 7 [6] ff., numbering 42,360 in addition to thousands of servants (Ezr 2 [64, 65]), really represent not one single group of exiles returning in 537, but rather successive bodies of exiles who returned at various times under different leaders, the chief of whom are named in Ezr 2 [2]; and we may be right in omitting it from its present position in our reconstruction of the history.

We know nothing of Sheshbazzar (Ezr 1 [8, 11], 5 [14, 16]), but he was probably a Persian official entrusted with the conduct of the few returning exiles, and responsible for the safe carriage of the Temple treasures. He was apparently appointed 'governor' of Jerusalem (5 [14]), and he supervised the first beginnings of the work of building the Temple (5 [16]), and then, we may suppose, returned to Babylon. Some would identify him with Zerubbabel, but on not very convincing grounds. The Temple building began (536), but was stopped almost at once, so that the work done was really negligible and was entirely ignored by the later prophets, Haggai and Zechariah (520).

The Aramaic documents which the compiler incorporates in his narrative quite definitely witness to the first attempt to build (Ezr 5 [8] ff., [13-16], 6 [3] ff.), so that we may be certain that the story was not the invention of the compiler. He bases his history on earlier documents, perhaps actually incorporating the official communications of the Persian Emperor, written in Aramaic, the 'lingua franca' of the period, and probably stored in the Temple archives.

(*b*) 520-516.—The work was stopped by the opposition of the Samaritans, and nothing more was done until the second year of Darius (520) (see Ezr 4 [24]). At this point, it would seem, Zerubbabel and Joshua arrive in Jerusalem from Babylon, with, we cannot doubt, *some* other exiles, though perhaps a negligible number, since Haggai and Zechariah ignore them. Under the inspiring words of these two prophets, the people of the land, i.e. the poorer folk who had not gone into captivity, rose to the occasion, and led by Zerubbabel and Joshua the building began once more (Ezr. 6 [14] [omit Artaxerxes]; Hag; Zech 1-8), and was finished in 516 (Ezr 6 [15]). The Passover was kept in the following year (Ezr 6 [19]).

(*c*) *The First Gap*, 516-446.—From this point we have no record of events in Ezra-Nehemiah for a space of some 70 years, nor do the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah help us to fill the gap, as Zechariah's last utterance is dated 518 (Zech 7), two years after Haggai's last (2 [10]). It is possible, however, that Zech 3 [8], 6 [12] give us a clue for understanding Ezr 4 [6], in which it is said that the Samaritans lodged an accusation against the Jews early in the reign of Xerxes (486). Possibly the hopes of the prophets with regard to the restoration of the Davidic monarchy had been interpreted as sedition (cf. Neh 6 [6, 7]) and were so reported to the king. But this is only conjecture, and the verse in Ezra is an isolated fragment. Apart from this one verse the record is a blank until some time after 465, when it would seem some attempt was made to build the city walls at Jerusalem. It is possible that this was not the first attempt to rebuild the walls. Zerubbabel may have planned and even have begun such an attempt, but have given it up on the advice of Zechariah (see Zech 2 [1-5]). The later attempt led to renewed activity on the part of the Samaritan opponents, and again information was sent to the king and the work was forcibly stopped (Ezr 4 [8-23]), and Jerusalem still lay in ruins.

(*d*) 446-433. *Nehemiah.*—But in 446 a brighter era began. Nehemiah, the King's cupbearer in Susa, hears of the piteous state of the city of his fathers, and obtains leave from his master to proceed to Jerusalem for the express purpose of restoring the walls of the city (Neh 1, 2). In spite of opposition, perhaps rather because of it, the walls were built with almost incredible speed, and by August of 445 the work was finished (Neh 2-4 [15]).

When we reach this stage of the history we find ourselves face to face with most tantalizing puzzles. Nehemiah's leave seems to have been only temporary (2 [6]), and yet it appears that he was absent for twelve years (Neh 5 [14]). Did he return to Babylon after the completion of the walls or at some such early date? There is no mention of this, though 7 [1-3] may perhaps record his precautionary measures for the safety of the city on the eve of his departure. In 433 he was certainly in Babylon (13 [6]), but it is not clear whether 'I went unto the King' means that, being in Babylon, he went to interview the King to ask for another leave of absence, or whether it means that in 433 he went (from Jerusalem) to the king (at Babylon), but almost at once obtained leave to return to Judah. The latter view seems to be supported by 5 [14], but it is possible that the date in this verse is an insertion by the compiler, who was mistaken in thinking that Nehemiah was for twelve consecutive years in Jerusalem. In any case it is clear that in 433 he returned to Jerusalem and the second part of his ministry began (Neh 13 [6]).

(*e*) *The Relation between the Reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah.*—The relation between the ministry of Ezra and that of Nehemiah has always been a puzzle. Much turns on the question which of the three Artaxerxes is intended in Ezr 7 [1, 7]. If it is Art. I, then Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem was in 458, thirteen years before Nehemiah's work began. In which case Ezra's ministry ended in complete failure, as Nehemiah had to correct exactly the same abuses as Ezra had temporarily corrected, apparently with the full agreement of the rulers and people (cf. Ezr 10 [10-17] and Neh 8-10, Ezra's reforms, with Neh 13 [4-31], Nehemiah's reforms). According to the Hebrew he lived on during Nehemiah's time, and was present at the dedication of the Walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12 [37]). In fact, he even appears to have waited until after 445 before effecting the sure covenant (Neh 9 [38]), for Nehemiah, in MT, heads

the list of signatories (10 [1]). But it is certainly strange that neither Ezra nor Nehemiah allude one to the other in their personal memoirs; and again we are puzzled to know what Ezra was doing between 458, when he took action against the mixed marriages (Ezr 10 [16]), and 445 (or after) when he reappears to read the Law (Neh 8 [1]).

Some would meet the difficulty by reading in Ezra 7 [9] 'the twenty-seventh' instead of the 'seventh' year of Artaxerxes (I), and maintain that Ezra arrived in Jerusalem in 438, during the absence of Nehemiah in Babylon. He was in fact sent by Nehemiah, so it is supposed, for Nehemiah had done his best, but saw the need of a priest to effect a thorough reform. So Nehemiah returns to Babylon, brings about the visit of Ezra, and then returns himself in 433—to find that Ezra's reforms have really effected nothing! (Neh 13 [4] ff.). The 'sure covenant' of Neh 9 [38] was indeed misnamed.

Most of the difficulties, though not all, disappear if we understand that the king mentioned in Ezr 7 [9] was Artaxerxes II, and that Ezra did not arrive in Jerusalem until 398.

We may then read the story of Nehemiah much as it stands in the book that bears his name, though we must remove from it the long 'Ezra' section (7 [5]-10 [39]). [*Note*.—It is usually supposed that 7 [5-73] connects with what precedes and relates to Nehemiah's work. This is probably not so. It really begins the Ezra section that follows. It was Ezra who was moved to reckon the people by genealogy, not Nehemiah. Probably Ezra at one stage of his work was led to take a census and make a nominal roll of the genuine Israelite families; and he wisely used the records that already existed in the Temple archives, Neh 7 [6] and Ezr 2.]

(8) **Nehemiah's Reforms.**—Nehemiah at various periods during his ministry set himself to the work of reform. He strove valiantly and forcibly to separate the Jews from the surrounding nations, taking strong measures against all who were guilty of entering into alliance with them, whether men of high rank (Neh 13 [7-9, 28]) or the common people (13 [23-27, 30]). His appeal is rather to the experience of history than to any written Law (13 [26, 27]). To mix with foreigners would certainly lead to corruption in religion. Already the Jews had grown lax about their religious obligations, notably in the observance of the Sabbath day. The strong hand of Nehemiah came down with force upon this evil—and again his appeal is to history and experience rather than to a written Law (13 [15-22]). Within the life of the community itself there were marked failures in the spirit of fellowship. The poor had been suffering, during a time of scarcity, at the hands of the rich (Neh 5 [1-13]); whilst the Levites, who served the national Temple, and who for centuries had lived on the offerings of the faithful worshipper, were neglected and deprived of their dues from the people, and were forced to leave the city and take to work in the fields (13 [10-13]). Nehemiah takes steps to reform both these abuses, by the sheer force of his personality and energy (13 [11]), and by his readiness to lead where he called others to follow (5 [10, 14-18]). In 13 [30, 31] further reforms are mentioned as effected. But the stability of his reforms was jeopardized by the fact that they were brought about solely by the force of a great personality. As soon as his presence was withdrawn the abuses reappeared. He somehow never won the support of the priests and the ruling classes. In fact his methods were calculated rather to alienate them than to win them. His temperament was emotional and vehemently impulsive. He was passionately devoted to the service of his God, his country and his people. He could hate (Neh 4 [4, 5], 6 [14]), and he could be lavishly generous (5 [14-19]). But he was too much the autocrat and dictator to promote a movement that was to last. He could make the timid bold (4 [14]), he could rouse the lazy to work (4 [10]), he could compel the obdurate to submit to his will (13 [8, 9, 21, 25]). But the abiding witness to his energy was to be a city with a wall, rather than a community of people living by the principles for which he lived and would readily have died.

The last recorded date of his life is 433 (13 [6]), but it is clear that his ministry extended beyond that year. It is possible that chapter 5 (social reforms) is out of place where it stands, and has rather to do with the later period of Nehemiah's activity; and it may even be true that his steps for populating the city, to which we only have reference in two isolated but connected fragments (7 [4] and 11 [1, 2]), were taken during the second period, after 433, and were part of his policy of separating the Jews from the surrounding nations. He wanted to make Jerusalem the chief 'home' not only of Levites (13 [11]) and of the ruling classes (11 [1]), but also of as large a number as possible of the rest of the people. Of his death we have no record, but we know from the Elephantine Papyri that in 408, one Bagoas was

governor of Jerusalem, though we do not know when he entered on his office. He may have succeeded directly to Nehemiah. If Josephus is to be trusted (though his chronology seems to be often at fault), Bagoas was a Persian, and his policy was one of direct antagonism to the Jews, though he was a friend of Joshua, the brother and rival of Jonathan the high priest (Neh 12 [11]), who slew his brother Joshua during a quarrel in the Temple (Josephus, *Ant.*, XI, vii, 1).

Nehemiah may have fallen a victim, in the end, to the machinations of the Samaritan party, and have been recalled to Babylon to make way for a non-Jewish Persian official.

Many of the higher officials in Judah and Jerusalem were quite ready to fraternize with this new and foreign official, and, as we have seen, he had intimate friends in the family of the high priest. But others were probably violently opposed to such intimacies, and resisted the authority of the governor, and attempted to secure the policy of isolation which Nehemiah had fought for. Quarrels broke out between the two parties, and on at least one occasion blood was shed. Jonathan, the patriot, slew his brother Joshua in a quarrel about the latter's friendship with Bagoas. In consequence Bagoas adopted a policy of frightfulness and intimidation, and the people who opposed him patriotically suffered from his heavy hand, whilst those who sought his favour neglected their duties towards the Temple and its ministers, and mingled freely with the heathen, and ignored traditional ordinances of their religion such as the Sabbath. But a remarkable change was soon to take place. It may be that the prophecies known as 'Malachi' were uttered on the eve of this approaching change (see p. 627*a*).

(9) **Ezra, 398 onwards.**—If the work of Nehemiah failed to produce any lasting result, it remained for another, and a very different person to succeed where he failed. Nevertheless the way had been prepared by Nehemiah, and the refusal of his policy and the success of his opponents had led to unhappy consequences for the Jews, under Bagoas. Jerusalem was rent with party faction; and the foreign domination was costing the whole people dear (Ezr 9 [7]; Neh 9 [36, 37]). The time was ripe for some definite intervention, and Artaxerxes II (405-359) may well have realized that some new policy was required to meet the present unsatisfactory state of affairs in Judah. The man for the occasion was close at hand in Babylon itself. It was Ezra the 'ready scribe,' the skilled student and exponent of the traditional Jewish Law (Ezr 7 [6]). The king readily granted his request to go to Jerusalem and to deal with the situation, and in 398 Ezra sets out (7 [7]) with the full authority of the king to establish the Jewish Law in Judah, and if necessary to use the arm of the civil power to enforce it (Ezr 7 [25, 26]). It is possible that the king even recalled Bagoas, and sent with Ezra, or perhaps soon after him, another Jew to act as governor, with the title Tirshatha (see note (*b*) § 10). Ezra was accompanied by a large number of exiles from Babylon (1,496 according to MT; 1,690 according to 1 Esd), including priests, representatives of the royal house of David, and a large body of the non-official classes (Ezr 8 [1-14]). The Levites were, at the outset, conspicuous by their absence, perhaps because of the subordinate position to which they had been assigned since the days of Ezekiel (Ezek 44 [9-14, 15 ff.]), and because of the treatment their brethren in Jerusalem had received in more recent years (Neh 13 [10-11]), and probably were still receiving, since Nehemiah's reforms were only temporarily effective. Ezra took steps to supply their absence (Ezr 8 [15-20]), and the journey to Jerusalem began (Nisan 12, 398, Ezr 8 [31]), being completed after five months' travel (Ezr 7 [9]).

The active work of Ezra in Jerusalem is recorded for us in Ezr 9 and 10, and also in Neh 7 [5]-10. It is difficult to trace the order of events or to arrange the chapters in a way that may command a wide confidence. The dates given are not very helpful, as in each case only the month or the day of the month is given, and we cannot be certain about the year. Nor can we be certain that such introductory formulæ as 'Now when these things were done' (Ezr 9 [1]), and 'Now in the 24th day of this month' (Neh 9 [1]), had originally reference to the context immediately preceding. It may be that the months mentioned are all within the range of the two years 398 and 397; but, on the other hand, the work may have been spread over a longer period. In any case we most assuredly have only a small part of Ezra's work recorded. We probably only have a few selections of his chief achievements in these few chapters, but we may perhaps assign them to the first two years of his ministry and arrange them in the following order to obtain a logical sequence.

(*a*) *Neh* 7 [73]-8 (*following on Ezr* 8 [36]).—

Ezra had arrived in the 5th month of 398 (Ezr 7 [9]), and his company, after offering sacrifices (8 [35. 36]), scattered to their various cities to settle with their kin (Neh 7 [73]). We do not know how Ezra spent the first two months, but something must certainly have preceded the great assembly of 8 [1]. We may surmise that he had used his time in preparing the people for his first great public act, the reading of the Law (8 [1] ff.). Perhaps he had been announcing his claim to be the possessor of the Law Book, and had been proclaiming the ideals of the Law he had come to expound. In the 7th month (Neh 7 [73b]) the people flocked to Jerusalem and called on Ezra to produce the book of the Law (8 [1]). The public reading followed, and the people acknowledged the Law (8 [6]), being struck with a deep sense of penitence and grief (8 [10]). Ezra, however, encouraged them and bade them rejoice, for, it would seem, he had not at this early stage realized how far the sons of the Captivity had gone in association with the foreigners. The first step in compliance with the Law was an enthusiastic celebration of the feast of Tabernacles. It happened to be the very month for the feast (8 [14]), and the people, in their new devotion, at once scattered to prepare for the festival (8 [16-18]). But the joy was soon to give way to a sadder note, as the more stringent requirements of the Law were realized.

(*b*) *Neh* 13 [1-3]; *Ezr* 9 *and* 10.—Possibly Neh 13 [1-3] comes in here, to be followed by Ezr 9 and 10. The separation of Neh 13 [3] had been merely of a temporary character, perhaps for purposes of the feast. But the pitch of interfusion with foreigners that had been reached required far more drastic measures. In the 9th month (Ezr 10 [9]) Ezra is informed by the leaders of the people that the case is really serious (Ezr 9 [1]). The people had not really separated themselves from the heathen foreigners at all, for many were actually guilty of being united to them by marriage (9 [2]). Ezra is prostrated by the news, but in the evening he rises and makes his famous confession of national sin (9 [6-15]). But a great movement is taking place amongst the people, and one Shecaniah is to the fore in acknowledgement of the sin and proposal for amendment, 'according to the Law' (Ezr 10 [2-4]). A great assembly is summoned (10 [7]), and meets on the 20th day of the month (the 9th, 10 [9]). A commission is appointed to investigate the whole question, which begins its work on the first day of the next month (10 [16]), and ends it on the 1st day of the first month (Nisan) of the next year (397) (Ezr 10 [17]).

(*c*) *Neh* 9 [1] *ff.*-10 [39].—The sequel follows in Neh 9 [1], where we are told that the people assembled on the 24th day of this month (i.e. Nisan) for a great day of penitence and fasting. A definite separation from all foreigners is now made (9 [2]), and penitential confession gives place to praise (9 [5-37]). The time is ripe for further action, and a great Covenant is solemnly sealed by representatives of the officials and the common folk backed by the assent of those they represented (Neh 10 [1-29]). The terms of the Covenant appear in Neh 10 [30-39]. [Possibly [38-39a] is a note inserted by the compiler.]

Briefly the Covenant provided for the complete abandonment of intermarriage with the surrounding foreigners (10 [30]); for the observance of the Sabbath and the Sabbatical year ([31]); the payment of a Temple tax ([32]); a regular supply of fuel for the Temple altar ([34]); payment of first-fruits ([35. 36. 37a]) and tithes ([37b])—and, in general, a right care for the Temple and its worship.

The Covenant was a public acknowledgement on the people's part of their obligation to live by the very principles which Nehemiah had tried to enforce (Neh 13 [4] to end). Where he had failed, Ezra succeeded; and by very different methods. There is no trace in Ezra of the violent impulsiveness of Nehemiah. He is capable of deep emotion, but it is the emotion of a silent grief that emerges at last into vocal expression, not in curse but prayer. Penitential grief and fervent prayer won the day, where impulsive and violent energy failed.

(*d*) *Neh* 7 [5-73a].—It is tempting to think that the last act of Ezra's work recorded in the work Ezra-Nehemiah is to be found in Neh 7 [5-73a]. The separation of the people from the foreigners seemed to be an appropriate moment for the forming of a register of true Israelites, with a view to preserving the stock unsullied by foreign blood; and for this purpose Ezra summons the people and their rulers (Neh 7 [5]). But the work is simplified by the discovery of the registers of returning exiles compiled some years before, and laid up perhaps in the Temple. Most of the names in the register passed without dispute; but there were a few families, both of laity and priests, whose claim to be true Israelites were disputable (Neh 7 [61-64]). The priests whose claims were doubtful were deprived of their rights—at least until a divine oracle on the question could be obtained

(Neh 7 [65]). It was essential for the future purity of the race and their exclusive religion that there should be no intermarrying between true Israelites and even doubtful cases of mixed race, and that only quite certainly valid priests should minister in the holy ordinances.

The terms of the Covenant (see Neh 10 [32, 33, 35-37, 39b]) imply that the Temple 'work' (see [33]), i.e. the whole service of the sacred ministrations, had suffered considerably through the unwillingness of the people and leaders to give their offerings to the Temple and its treasury. The Temple was impoverished, and though provision was made by the Covenant for the future, there was much loss to be made up immediately. So enthusiastic are the people for reform in their new-found devotion, that generous offerings are forthcoming for this 'work,' i.e. the Temple services (7 [70]), and money pours into the treasury ([71, 72]).

(10) **Note**—(*a*) *On the Two Lists in Ezr 2 and Neh 7 [6] ff.*—It is often assumed that the list in Neh 7 [6] ff. is inserted from Ezr 2. The reverse seems to be true. The list is in its original place in the Ezra narratives (Neh 7 [5]-10), and it was inserted (out of place) after Ezr 1, being taken to be a list of the exiles who returned in 537. Probably it was drawn up considerably later than 537, reaching its complete state only by stages as the names of new arrivals in successive parties under different leaders, Zerubbabel, Jeshua, Nehemiah, etc. ([7]), were registered in the Temple archives. The list of names proper seems to end at [63]. From [64] onwards we have narrative relating to the days of Ezra (398), but the whole chapter, names and narrative, was inserted into the story of 537 B.C. after Ezr 1, though the events described were thus set in an entirely false context. In order to make the narrative fit the situation of 537, 'the work' and the 'treasury of the work' (Neh 7 [70, 71]) were to be understood to be the work and expenditure on *building* the Temple, and the passage was paraphrased in Ezr 2 [68] to give this sense. In actual fact 'the work' means the service and general ordering of the Temple (as in 1 Ch 6 [49], 9 [13, 19], 23 [4]; Ezr 3 [8], 6 [22]; Neh 10 [33]), *not* the work of building.

(*b*) *The Tirshatha*—only mentioned in the Ezra story in the section embedded in Nehemiah, viz. Neh 7 [65, 70], 8 [9], 10 [1], and in 'Ezra' 2 [63] which, as we have seen, originally belonged to the Ezra story, and is out of place after Ezr 1.

Owing to the presence of the title in Ezr 2 [63], many have supposed that the allusion there is to Sheshbazzar (1 [8]). But as has been shown Ezr 2 has really nothing to do with the situation of 536, in which Sheshbazzar figured. The title is clearly that of some prominent official, perhaps the equivalent of the 'governor,' in the days of Ezra (398 ff.). When the Ezra section (Neh 7 [5]-10) became erroneously embedded in the Nehemiah story, the Tirshatha was identified with Nehemiah (Neh 8 [9], 10 [1]). But the insertion of Nehemiah's name was due to a gloss and it should be omitted, Ezra being long subsequent to Nehemiah. We do not know who the official was, but we may suppose that he was a Jewish officer holding the Persian authority and enjoying a Persian title. He may have displaced Bagoas, by the king's order, as part of the king's more lenient policy towards the Jews. He was clearly in thorough sympathy with Ezra (Neh 7 [70], 8 [9], 10 [1]), and his judicial decision was taken as final in a peculiarly Jewish question (Neh 7 [65]).

Bibliography

Ryle (*C.B.*); Witton (*Cent. B.*); Davies (*Sp.*); Batten (*I.C.C.*); Kent, *Students' O.T.*; Oesterley in *Peake*; Kennett in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*; Siegfried, *H.K.*; G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, ii; Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century*, B.C.

EZRA

Part I.—I.-VI. 538-516 B.C.

§ 1. 538-535. Ezr 1 [1]-4 [24]. Except 4 [6] (ref. Xerxes' reign, 486-465), and 4 [7, 23] (ref. Artaxerxes reign, 465-425).

§ 2. 520-516. Ezr 4 [24]-6 [22].

I. 1.-IV. 24. **The Edict of Cyrus and the first return of exiles.**

I. 1. **first year of Cyrus.** Cyrus conquered Babylon 538 B.C., and so became 'king' in relation to the Jews in that year, though he had been king in Persia since 549 B.C.

Jeremiah.—Jeremiah had prophesied a servitude to Babylon of 70 years (see Jer 25 [11, 12], 29 [10]). Nebuchadnezzar became master of Palestine at the battle of Carchemish *c.* 605, from which date the 70 years may be reckoned. Zechariah (1 [12]) seems to have reckoned the 70 years from 587 B.C. to his own day (520 B.C.).

2. This *kind* of religious language would not be out of place in the mouth of Cyrus, as the clay cylinder bearing one of his inscriptions (now in the British Museum) testifies—but it has probably been coloured by the Jewish reporter.

3. **he is God which,** as RVm.

4. Seems to mean that any who might have to stay behind through poverty must be helped to make the journey by those who were better off—who perhaps *chose* to stay behind and merely sent offerings (as in [6]).

7. **vessels** (see 2 Ch 36 [7]). But, according to 2 K 24 [13], the vessels of gold were cut up. But see 2 K 25 [14].

8. **Sheshbazzar** — seemingly a Babylonian (to judge by his name) appointed to act for the Persian king in the interests of the Jews, and appointed Prince (or Governor ?) of the province of Judah. Some would identify him with Zerubbabel, but without sufficient grounds. Zerubbabel probably belongs to the later date, 520 B.C. See Introduction, § 7 (*a*), (*b*).

II. 1-58. See Introduction, § 10 (*a*). A list of those who returned with Zerubbabel and others ([2]) (and out of place here), leaders, laity ([3-35]), priests ([36-39]), Levites, etc. ([40-58]), of undoubted Jewish descent.

1. The province, i.e. Judah, now a province of the Persian Empire.

2. Zerubbabel (Hag 1 [2] *v.n.*). Jeshua = Joshua the high priest (Hag 1 [2]). Nehemiah, perhaps the famous Nehemiah, the later governor of Judah (444 B.C.).

40. **The Levites**—distinct from priests, and inferior, as always in the Priestly Code (P) (cf. Nu 3-4). In Deuteronomy (cf. 10 [8, 9], 18 [1-5], etc.) all Levites are priests. Ezek 44 [9-14] seems to point to the cause of the distinction. **Jeshua**—distinct from him of 3 [2].

41. **singers** (cf. 1 Ch 15 [17] ff.).

42. **porters**, i.e. door-keepers (cf. Ps 84 [10]). See 1 Ch 26 [1].

43. **Nethinim.** Only in 1 Ch 9 [2] outside Ezra and Nehemiah = 'given ones' (cf. Ezr 8 [20]; Nu 31 [30]), where perhaps we see their origin as slaves captured in war (cf. Jos 9 [23]).

59-63. Doubtful cases—amongst laity and claimants to priesthood. Decision as to the claim of the latter is deferred until the full priestly ritual is re-established and an authoritative pronouncement made.

63. **the Tirshatha.** Persian = (almost) 'His Excellency.' Here is meant (wrongly) to denote Sheshbazzar (as also in Neh 7 [65, 70]). In Neh 8 [9], 10 [2] it is used of Nehemiah. But see p. 290*a*.

holy things (cf. Nu 18 [9-11]).

Urim and Thummim (cf. Ex 28 [30]; Dt 33 [8]). Apparently two different stones or jewels carried in a pouch in the priest's breastplate, and used for the 'drawing of lots' to discover the divine will.

64. The totals—but either bad arithmetic or a disordered text gives a different total from that of the sum of the details mentioned.

[*Note.*—2 reappears in Neh 7 [6-73], as the 'book of genealogy' which Nehemiah (or Ezra ?) found; but there are some slight differences in the spelling of names and in the numbers, and [68, 69] (Ezra) differ slightly from the corresponding verses in Nehemiah ([70-72]). In Nehemiah ([70]) special mention is made of a donation by the Tirshatha. The list may also be compared with 1 Esd 5 [7-45], in which ([40]) it is *Nehemiah* who postpones decision as to the doubtful claims (Ezr [57-63]) together with 'Attharias' (a corruption of Tirshatha ?), though, according to Neh 7 [5, 6], the list was found by Nehemiah as a document dealing with past history before his own arrival in Jerusalem. It is highly probable that the genealogical lists hail from a date long subsequent to 536, and have been incorporated into the work by editors (see Neh 7 [5, 73] and Introduction, § 10 (*a*).]

III. 1-6. **Arrived in Jerusalem, they erect an altar, offer sacrifices and keep the Feast of Tabernacles.**

1. **seventh month**, i.e. of 537, assuming that the decree of 1 [1] was issued in the latter part of 538, and the actual journey begun in 537.

3. **its base**—better its correct position, its true site (the same word as in Zech 5 [11]).

the people of the countries, i.e. the mixed population that inhabited the province of Samaria (cf. 4 [1, 2, 9, 10]). There is no need to emend (as some) to 'the land.'

4. **feast of tabernacles.** 15th of Tishri (7th month) = mod. Sept.-Oct. See Dt 16 [13-15] and Nu 29 [12-34].

The verse seems to be contradicted by Neh 8 [17] (*q.v.*).

5. **continual burnt offering**, i.e. the daily sacrifices (cf. Nu 28 [8]).

new moons (cf. Am 8 [5]; Is 1 [13]; 2 K 4 [23]; Nu 10 [10], 28 [11-15]).

7. Preparation for the restoration of the Temple.

8-13. **The foundations of the Temple are laid, with joyful chant.** But some lament the past glory of the former Temple.

8. **second year**, i.e. 536. The second month = April-May. But the words may mean simply 'one year and two months' dating from their arrival in Jerusalem, the exact date of which is not recorded, so that we are not able to identify the month here recorded. According to Hag 2 [10, 18], the foundation of the Temple was not laid until Sept. 24, 520.

8, 9. **began . . . and appointed . . . then stood.** The meaning is not clear, and the text is perhaps corrupt. The verses may be paraphrased 'Z. and J.,

etc., made a start by appointing the Levites to their ministerial work in the Temple. But J., etc., were jointly appointed as foremen over the building work.'

Note that Jeshua the son of Jozadak (8) is different from Jeshua of 9. Jeshua was a common name (cf 2 36, 40). Then stood, another 'voice' of the word rendered 'appointed.' It almost means here 'received appointment.'

10. Simultaneously the builders build and the priests and Levites sing praise—their 'work' (8).

they set. Read *and the priests stood* (cf. RVm).

11. For he is good (cf. Ps 136, etc.).

12. old men . . . wept (cf. Hag 2 3).

IV. 1-5. The Jewish officials refuse an application from the Samaritans to be allowed to share in the building work.

1, 2. the adversaries, etc. The people referred to are the inhabitants of the neighbouring province of Samaria. The population was mixed, and included the remnant of the northern tribes of Israel left behind in Palestine at the fall of Samaria before Sargon in 722, and also the peoples of states further east whom the Assyrian kings deported to Palestine (cf. 10; 2 K 17 24-41).

we seek your God . . . and we do sacrifice. Seek = worship (cf. 1 Ch 22 19; Ezr 6 21). They claim to be already worshippers of Jehovah. They do not come to the Jews seeking instruction, but claiming common rights with them. MT has 'we do *not* sacrifice,' but the margin has 'we do . . . to him.' So read. The claim is not that they have kept free from pagan sacrifice, or have had no chance of sacrifice to Jahweh, but that they have preserved a continuity of sacrifice in Palestine during the days of the Jewish exile.

Esar-haddon = successor to Sennacherib as king of Assyria (680-668). There is no record elsewhere in OT of his importing colonists into N. Israel, though the Assyrian inscriptions confirm the report given here.

4. the people of the land. In 2 K 24 14; Jer 37 2, 44 21, 34 19, the expression seems to mean the poorer classes (so also perhaps in Hag 2 4; Zech 7 5) as opposed to the official classes. But here it may mean the existing (though imported not native) population of the land. It is possible, however, that even here it means not the people of the province of Samaria, but the residents in and about Jerusalem whom the returned exiles found in possession. They are not to be identified with the adversaries of 1, 2, but additional to them. Possibly they had been pressed into an unwilling service in the building operations, and were now 'on strike.'

5. The building operations are held up for some 15 years, during the latter years of Cyrus (d. 529) and the reigns of Cambyses and Pseudo-Smerdis. Darius succeeded in 521. 24 follows here.

6-23. Out of place here. The verses (7-23) have reference to the building not of the Temple but of the city walls (see 12). 6 is an isolated fragment referring to the reign of Xerxes (486-465 B.C.), and it has nothing to do with what precedes or follows. 7-23 have to do with the reign of Artaxerxes (465-425), 70 years after the events of 4 1-5, 24. 7 is another isolated fragment.

7. Bishlam, perhaps as LXX not a proper name, but 'with *salām*,' 'with compliments.' Lit. 'in peace.'

Mithredath, Tabeel, presumably Persian officials in Judah.

letter—seemingly a Persian word is used as in 7 11. The contents of the letter are not given, as 8 has to do with another letter.

Syrian, better *Aramaic* as RVm, the *lingua franca* of the Persian provinces in Syria.

8-VI. 18. This whole section is in Aramaic, not Hebrew.

IV. 8-23. The correspondence between Rehum and Shimshai and Artaxerxes.

8, 9, 10. A rather clumsy introduction to the text of the letter which begins in 11. 9, 10 seem to be an expansion of 8. There is no finite verb in 9, 10.

Rehum, etc. Persian officials. chancellor, better *councillor*; scribe, *secretary*.

10. Osnappar = Assurbanipal (668-626), Sardanapalos.

beyond the river, i.e. from the Persian point of view = west of Euphrates, i.e. the Satrapy of Syria.

11, 16. The gist of the letter. The officials fear a possible revolution if the Jews are allowed to fortify their city. Their past reputation justified the fear expressed.

17-22. The reply. The building is to cease until further order.

23. Appropriate action follows.

24-VI. 22. The ineffective opposition of the local Persian officials to the building of the Temple. The work is continued and completed. 4 24 should follow 4 5. It brings us to the date 520 B.C. (see on Hag 1 1). The 16 years from 536 (4 5) are passed over in silence.

V. 1, 2. See Hag 1 1, etc., and Zech 1 1, etc.

3. Tattenai, probably the same as Ustannai, mentioned on tablets of the reign of Darius, as (governor, etc., i.e. *here*) Satrap of the whole province west of the Euphrates. **this wall**—perhaps of the court surrounding the Temple.

4. we, read *they* as LXX.

6-17. The report sent to Darius.

6. Apharsachites = the Persians.

16. The report does not quite agree with the account in 3 (see [8-10]). But Sheshbazzar was the responsible Persian official at that time, and so was answerable for the event, though other hands did the work.

VI. 1-12. Darius returns a favourable reply.

2. Achmetha = Ecbatana, capital of Media.

7. be ye far from thence, i.e. keep out of the way.

Probably the report of the decree is coloured by the Jewish Chronicler, but there is no need to doubt the truth of its substance.

13-18. The work goes forward to completion.

14. Artaxerxes—must be omitted, as a mistaken echo of 4 [7-23] *v.n.*

15. i.e. 3/12/516. Adar = our Feb.-March.

18. See 1 Ch 23-26 where the ordering of the courses, etc., is ascribed to David. The nearest parallel in the Pentateuch is Nu 3 and 4 (the division of duties amongst the Levites).

[*Note.*—The Aramaic section ends here.]

19-22. The Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread.

[*Note.*—The language of the original is Hebrew from [19] until 7 [12].]

19. fourteenth day (cf. Ex 12 [6]; Dt 16 [1-8]).

first month, i.e. Nisan (= Abib). The year 515.

20. the priests and the Levites . . . and they killed the passover. they clearly refers to the Levites only (cf. 2 Ch 35 [10-14]). Contrast Ex 12 [6, 7], where it seems the representative of the family killed the lamb.

21. all such as had separated themselves, i.e. the people of Judah (and Israel) who had not been in exile but had remained in Palestine, and now associated themselves with the religious ideals of the returned exiles, though in the past they had been lax in the duties of their religion and had followed the customs of the non-Israelites about them.

22. feast of unleavened bread—see Ex 12 [15-20]; Dt 16 [3, 4, 8].

king of Assyria—strictly speaking an anachronism. The kingdom of Assyria had given way to that of Babylon, and Babylon in turn to Persia.

Part II.—VII.-X. **Ezra and his work.**

VII. 1-28. Ezra's journey from Babylon to Jerusalem.

1. Artaxerxes—if the *first* king of that name, his date is 465-425. But it is more probable that the second Artaxerxes is meant here (405-359).

1-5. Ezra's genealogy traced back to Aaron.

6. a ready scribe—i.e. an expert scholar and exponent. **scribe,** the same title as is used of state officials under the Monarchy in pre-exilic days = secretaries (cf. 2 K 18 [18], 22 [3], etc.). Already in Jeremiah it appears to denote students and exponents of the Law of Jehovah (Jer 8 [8]). During the Exile, it would appear, the ancient writings and traditions were collected, treasured and studied, and (as we might say) prepared for publication. The traditional laws of Israel, both such as were already in written form and such as were handed down by custom, were probably collected into some codified form. The work of a 'scribe' was probably that of studying and expounding the traditions. In such work Ezra was pre-eminent, and his purpose in going to Jerusalem was to teach the Law to the people (see [10] and cf. [25]).

7. seventh year, i.e. 458 or 398 (see on [1]).

9. began he to go—as RVm shows the text is difficult. Perhaps we should emend the vowels slightly and translate 'he had appointed (i.e. arranged) to go up'—cf. Est 1 [8] (the same word = appoint).

10. Notice the disciple (**seeking** for truth), the obedient servant (**doing** what is commanded), the missionary (**teaching** the precepts of God)—'an epitome of the ideal scribe's career' (Ryle *ad loc.*).

12-26. The letter of Artaxerxes. An Aramaic document.

12. king of kings (cf. Ezek 26 [7]; Dan 2 [37]), i.e. Emperor, with kings as his subjects. The title actually appears in Persian official inscriptions.

perfect and so forth, i.e. perfect, etc. The first of a long series of complimentary titles typical of Oriental writers, but omitted for brevity (cf. 4 [10]).

14. seven counsellors (cf. Est 1 [14]).

27, 28. The Hebrew begins again here. The Thanksgiving of Ezra. Notice the use of the 1st person. A fragment of personal memoirs—continued through 8 and 9.

VIII. Ezra's own account of the journey to Jerusalem and of his companions.

15. The arrival at the rendezvous at the Ahava river (not identified—possibly an artificial canal). Levites—were poorly represented in the Zerubbabel caravan (Ezr 2 [36]), and here have sent no representatives at all.

It has been suggested that their degradation (see Ezek 44 [9-14]) may have accounted for their unwillingness to return to Jerusalem (see *Cent. B.*, Ezra, p. 61).

16. which were teachers—lit. 'those who caused to understand' (cf. Neh 8 [7, 9]). Perhaps 'interpreters'—necessary for answering enquiries by Persian officials. Iddo may have been a non-Israelite official (see below). But perhaps they were just 'teachers,' i.e. almost 'lecturers' in the Law, under the guidance of Ezra.

17. Iddo and his brethren, etc. MT has 'Iddo his brother the Nethunim.' The RV is produced by a slight vowel change and may be right. But it is odd that the inferior Nethunim should be mentioned and not the Levites. The disorder of the text may go deeper. Nethunim may be a corruption for Seganim = Prefects (see 9 [2]). Ezra prompts the interpreters how to deal with Iddo and his fellow-prefects (so as to be permitted) to bring the requisite ministers.

20. expressed—lit. 'pricked or punctured,' i.e. ticked off on a 'nominal roll.'

24. Special custodians of the treasures are appointed from the priests and Levites, twelve of each. The RVm note 'Neh 12 [24] *Levites*' is misleading, and arises from a misunderstanding of the text. even—should be rendered *in addition to*. The sense is then 'I separated twelve of the leading priests, and (twelve Levites, viz.) Sherebiah, Hashabiah, and ten others.'

31-36. The arrival at Jerusalem. Departing on 12th of Nisan (March-April) they arrived in Jerusalem on the 1st of Abib (= July-Aug.)—see 7 [9].

IX. 1-4. A report is presented to Ezra on the prevalence of intermarriage of Jews and heathen ([1, 2]). Ezra's grief ([3, 4]) and prayer ([5-15]).

1. Every class was involved in this matter, official and unofficial (cf. [2]).

the peoples of the lands (see on 3 [3]). The first four mentioned no doubt represent such as survived of the earlier inhabitants of Palestine, though they could hardly have still existed as separate communities or even distinguishable types. The second four represent neighbouring peoples in close contact with Palestine, members of which had no doubt settled in and about Judah and Jerusalem. For Amorites probably read Edomites (cf. 1 Esd 8 [69]); the change is slight in the Hebrew. Note that Dt 21 [10] ff., 23 [7] permit a wider range of intermarriage than is here implicitly condemned.

2. the holy seed (cf. Is 6 [13]; Mal 2 [15]; Gen 17 [7], etc.).

rulers, Hebrew *Seganim*—an Assyrian word (cf. 8 [17]). They may have been Israelites holding rank as Persian officials.

6-15. A striking confession of national sin, by one who is himself not personally identified with it. The standard by which Ezra judges the nation's sin is that of the teaching of Deuteronomy (see Dt 7 [1-6], 23 [3-6]), though he refers to the commandments of the prophets. It is difficult to find any explicit utterance in the prophets on the particular sin in question (intermarriage), but Deuteronomy is in large measure the teaching of the prophets presented in 'Law' form. See, however, Am 1 [11, 13], 2 [1]; Zeph 2 [8-11]; Is 16 [6-14], etc.

The Personal Memoirs end here.

X. 1-17. The people's confession and amendment. [18] ff. a list of offenders.

2. The lead is taken by Shecaniah, who suggests practical steps for amendment. He and his father were both implicated ([26]).

6. Jehohanan, son of Eliashib. Eliashib was high priest in the time of Nehemiah (445-433 or after) (Neh 3 [1, 20], 13 [4, 28]). According to Neh 12 [11], Jonathan (= Jehohanan?) was *grandson* of Eliashib, and Jonathan is father of Jaddua, still high priest in 333 B.C. (according to Josephus, *Ant.*, XI, vii, 12 f., viii, 4). The Aramaic Papyri mention Jonathan as high priest in Jerusalem in 407. Unless the reference here is to some otherwise quite unknown Eliashib and Jehohanan, the above date seems to support the theory that Ezra's mission to Jerusalem was in the reign of Artaxerxes II (405-359).

8. For such drastic action Ezra could depend upon the support of the civil arm (see 7 [26]).

9-17. The assembly and its decisions. The assembly met on the 20th of Kislev (Nov.-Dec.), presumably of the year of Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem, well over four months after his arrival (see 7 [9]). Events did not move as rapidly as they might seem to do in reading the narrative of this book. We are clearly told only a small fraction of Ezra's activities.

13. A plea for delay. The evil was wide-spread, and the investigation, involving much waiting about in the open square whilst individual cases were examined, would be a protracted one. In view of the fact that the rainy season

had come, this was ill-advised. Let the investigation proceed in the individual cities, and let guilty culprits be summoned to Jerusalem for examination at certain fixed times, under the custody of their local elders and magistrates.

14. until this matter—read as RVm *as touching this matter.*

15. It is not clear whether the men named were the only opponents of the suggestion just made (as RV), or whether they were the men appointed to see the work through (as RVm reading the verb in same sense as it has in [14]) (see RVm). The former seems to be better suited to the context.

16. did so, i.e. acted on the suggestion of [14].

And Ezra . . . were separated. Perhaps read (as 1 Esdras, Syriac, and some LXX MSS. indicate) *and Ezra separated to himself* (=selected) *certain heads*, etc.

to examine. MT has quite clearly 'of Darius.' The consonants are very similar to those of 'to examine.' A tired copyist, thoughtlessly and mechanically, wrote 'of Darius' after the date, taking it as another of the many 'Royal dates' he had transcribed.

17. with all the men is a quite ungrammatical rendering of the Hebrew, which reads 'And they made an end with the whole matter, men who had married,' etc. It has been suggested that the words 'men who had,' etc., belong to the next verse, perhaps as a heading (in the margin) to the concluding section of the book, and were inserted here by mistake.

So we render: *And they made an end of the whole matter by the first day of the first month.* The enquiry took three months.

18-44. The names of the culprits.

The second part of [44] is corrupt. 1 Esd 9 [36] gives a clue to the right reading: 'and they put them (the wives) away with their children.'

NEHEMIAH

I. Nehemiah receives distressing news from Jerusalem ([1-3]). His confession and prayer ([4-11]).

1. Note the use of the 1st person, continuing to 7 [5], indicating that the source employed here is the personal memoirs of Nehemiah.

Chislev—9th month (Nov.-Dec.).

twentieth year—if of Artaxerxes, it must be an error for nineteenth, since the events of 2 [1] occur in the 20th year, and are subsequent to those of chapter 1. Otherwise we must read 21st in 2 [1], but 5 [14] supports the existing text of 2 [1]. The 19th year would be 446 B.C.

Shushan, i.e. Susa, one of the four principal cities of the Persian Empire, east of the Persian Gulf, a winter residence of the kings.

2. Hanani—an actual blood brother of Nehemiah, as it seems, from 7 [2].

that had escaped—one word in the Hebrew, used also by Ezra (9 [15]) in reference to the returned exiles.

3. Seems to refer to some recent happening. It cannot refer merely to the event of 586, which would be no 'news' for Nehemiah. It may well be that Ezra 4 [7-23] is a fragment of a fuller account (now lost) of the episode to which the report to Nehemiah refers.

6, 7. Cf. Ezra's confession of national sin (Ezr 9 [6] ff.).

8, 9. Cf. Dt 30 [1-5]; also Solomon's prayer in 1 K 8 [46-53].

11. Now I was, etc., should introduce the next chapter.

II. 1-8. The king grants permission to Nehemiah to go to Jerusalem.

1. twentieth year, i.e. 445. Artaxerxes I reigned 465-425 (see under 1 [1]).

4. prayer (cf. 1 [6], 4 [4, 9], 5 [19], 6 [9, 14], 13 [14]). Nehemiah, a man of action, is always a man of prayer.

6. For how long, etc. The sense may be as EVV, but the difficulty is that the question then seems to imply that only a short leave of absence was required—and Nehemiah's words, 'I set him a time,' suggest only a short period. But Nehemiah appears to have spent twelve years in Jerusalem (see 5 [15]). Can he really have asked for 12 years' leave?

Perhaps the Hebrew means 'When will your journey begin? And when will you return (to Jerusalem)?' The king indicates his consent by asking 'When do you propose to start?' And Nehemiah suggests a day for his departure.

7. the governors, etc. See under Ezr 4 [10].

9-20. Nehemiah's arrival and first experiences in Jerusalem.

10. Sanballat—mentioned in the Elephantine Aramaic papyri as Governor of Samaria.

Horonite—perhaps of Beth-horon.

Tobiah—notice the 'Yah' termination to his name. Probably he was the offspring of an Ammonite family that had settled amongst the Samaritans, and adopted their form of Jehovah worship.

the servant—either as a (freed) slave, or perhaps as an officer in the service of the governor.

12-16. Nehemiah's secret survey of the walls by night.

13. the valley gate—probably at the

S.W. corner of the city (¼ mile outside the modern walls), opening on to the Valley of Hinnom.

dragon's well—identified by Macalister with the Virgin's Fountain.

dung gate, perhaps near S.E. corner.

14. fountain gate . . . king's pool. The latter may be modern Birket el Hamra, on the S.E. side of the ancient city, nearly ½ mile south of modern S.E. corner. The former was probably the gate in the corner tower.

15. the brook, i.e. the Wady Kedron, E. of the city.

16. rulers (Ezr 9 [2] *v.n.*). LXX renders the first 'rulers' by 'guards,' and omits the second altogether.

that did the work, i.e. that had been engaged in the building before they had been forced to stop.

17-18. Nehemiah's report and appeal to the people.

19. The sneers of the opponents.

Geshem (or Gashmu, 6 [6]). Arabians may well have formed one of the elements in the Samaritan medley of nations.

20. Cf. Ezr 4 [3].

III. The building of the walls—and the organization of working gangs. The work seems to have begun early in July, 445 (see under 6 [15]).

1. Eliashib (see under Ezr 10 [6]).

sheep gate—on the N. wall of the city, about 300 yards N.N.W. of the Temple area. It has been thought that the sheep for sacrifice were led in through this gate (cf. 3 [32], 12 [39]; Jn 5 [2]).

sanctified it (twice). If the text is correct we may compare 1 K 8 [64]. The sheep-gate, built by the priests and immediately dedicated by them, might then be put to use in connexion with the sacrifices. But some think we should read 'laid its beams' as in [3], the word being in some measure similar to that for '*sanctifying*.'

tower of Hammeah—nothing is known of this, nor is there any clue as to the relative merit of the rendering of EV and RVm. Probably it lay west of the sheep-gate, and the **tower of Hananel** (cf. Jer 31 [38]; Zech 14 [10]) probably lay still further west, as the line of the wall is being traced in these verses from E. to W.

3. fish gate (cf. 12 [39]; Zeph 1 [10]; 2 Ch 33 [14])—still further west, giving entrance perhaps at the Tyropæon valley. Perhaps the gate at which the fish merchants from the N. assembled for market.

5. Tekoa, whence Amos came (Am 1 [1]), 10 miles S. of Jerusalem (cf. also 2 S 14 [2]).

their nobles—their lord, i.e. their aristocracy refused to do menial service for Nehemiah, the governor (their lord)—or Nehemiah and his associates in Jerusalem (their lords)—*not* 'Lord' as RVm ([2]). But LXX omits 'lords.' It may be a gloss (originally in the margin), RVm ([1]), explaining the word for 'noble' (mainly a poetical word, but in prose occurs Neh 10 [29] and 2 Ch 23 [20]). See [27]. The Tekoites undertook two portions.

6. the old gate (cf. 12 [39]), or as RVm. Perhaps = the corner gate (2 K 14 [13]; Jer 31 [38]) (on the site of the 'first,' i.e. the 'old' gate, Zech 14 [10]), guarding the N.W. corner of the city.

7. Mizpah, etc., difficult—either (as RV) Mizpah which was under the jurisdiction of the Satrap of the whole western province, perhaps as one of his residences; or omit '*which appertained*' and understand that the men indicated repaired the wall as far as the throne (residence or office) of the Satrap—i.e. on or near the wall of Jerusalem.

8. goldsmiths—insert *one of* (cf. **one of the apothecaries** = ointment makers). The word to be inserted is lit. 'son of' = a member of a guild, cf. 'sons of prophets' 2 K 2 [3], etc.), 'son of the carpenter' (Mk 6 [3]).

broad wall—perhaps so called because the 'old wall' was here strengthened by a layer of new wall.

11. tower of the furnaces—site not known. Perhaps 'the great rock-scarp' at S.W. corner, but just west of the valley gate.

15. pool of Shelah, i.e. Shiloah (Is 8 [6]), Siloam (Jn 9 [7]). **city of David**—the old Jebusite fortress (2 S 5 [6] ff.), now only a portion of the larger city that grew up north and west of it.

25. Trans.: *the upper tower that standeth out* (i.e. *juts out*) *from the house of the king* (as LXX).

26. Ophel. *The* Ophel, the S.W. hill (usually called Sion). See 2 K 5 [24], etc. = the mound, or the lump. **water gate**—on the east of the city, perhaps near the spring of Gihon (1 K 1 [33]) = the Virgin's Spring.

28. the horse gate—on the east wall overlooking the Kidron valley (cf. Jer 31 [40]).

29. east gate—presumably N. of the horse gate.

31. the gate of Hammiphkad—lit. the gate of the muster (i.e. perhaps military enrolment). Perhaps Ezek 43 [21] (the Miphkad of the house) refers to it. But the name is obscure and the site unknown. It seems to have been on the E. of the city (see on Neh 12 [39, 40]).

ascent, as RVm, upper chamber.

IV. Opposition by the Samaritans—first they jeer ([1-6]), but later plan an

attack (7-9). Nehemiah takes precautions to meet a possible attack (10-23).

2. **Will they fortify themselves?** A mere guess. RVm gives possible readings of Hebrew, but the sense is obscure. LXX omits and condenses the whole verse.

make an end, i.e. finish the whole work, so vigorously are they setting to it.

3. **fox,** jackal. Tobiah indicates that Sanballat's anxiety is unnecessary. The buildings are so feeble that any jackal could break them down.

5. Notice the affinity between Nehemiah's imprecations and those of some of the psalms, e.g. especially 69 22-28 and 109 6-20 (cf. also Jer 17 18, 18 21-23).

6. The work proceeds and is soon half finished.

7, 8. The opponents plan action, and prepare for a sudden attack (11). Meanwhile Nehemiah's position is the more precarious because the Jews are beginning to lose heart at the colossal task (10), and the country-dwellers bring in most disquieting reports about the activity of the enemy (11).

12. The Hebrew text seems to be in disorder. The LXX gives a satisfactory sense, 'They said unto us, They (the enemy) come up from all places against us.'

15. The enemy find their plot is discovered; they give it up, but only to try other means of entrapping Nehemiah (6 1 ff.).

16-23. Nehemiah, however, continues to take precautions, and he forms a permanent guard from his own immediate retinue of servants (16) and also arms the builders and carriers (17, **laded,** read *armed*), and arranges for a trumpet signal to summon the whole people to battle, as LXX. The country-dwellers are bidden to take up their residence night and day in Jerusalem.

23. **every one,** etc. The Hebrew makes no sense. LXX omits. The Vulgate reads 'Each only stripped for bathing'—but this seems to be a free guess. No satisfactory emendation has been suggested.

V. **Nehemiah takes steps to remedy social abuses in Jerusalem.** The well-to-do from Babylon had been oppressing the poor whom they found settled in Judah on their return.

[*Note.*—The chapter seems to be out of place here. It interrupts the sequence between chapters 4 and 6. From 14, it appears that Nehemiah had been governor for some twelve years when the events recorded happened, though (see under 14) another interpretation is possible; and 4 and 11 seem to suggest that the 'smallholders' are living on their land and not all crowded together in Jerusalem during the building operations. Probably the events took place at a much later period than those in chapters 4 and 6.]

2. Read (with slight change in MT) as in 3: *We are giving in pledge our sons and our daughters,* i.e. we are *ready to* sell our sons and daughters (into slavery) to get corn.

3. **mortgaging,** as in 2. We are ready to give in pledge.

5. The appeal of common humanity—more, common nationality.

other men—perhaps read as LXX 'the nobles.'

10. Nehemiah admits that he and his fellows are implicated in the matter. This seems to be the only sense obtainable from the Hebrew in spite of the attempts of commentators to clear Nehemiah of guilt. The AV is a forced translation arising from a similar attempt.

Nehemiah is prepared to share the sacrifice he asks of others.

14. **Moreover from the time . . . I and my brethren have not,** etc.

The verse perhaps indicates that the reforms of 1.13 took place in the later years of Nehemiah's governorship, when he could look back over 12 years' service. They do not necessarily contradict 10. Nehemiah may have generously foregone his rights of income as governor, and yet have lent money during the dearth and taken property as pledge.

But the verse looks more like a comment of the author reflecting on his history as he writes up his memoirs at some date well subsequent to the events he is recording. **I . . . have not** might then be rendered '*I* . . . did not.' Further, it is possible that Nehemiah was appointed **governor** at some time subsequent to the first year of his arrival when he effected the rebuilding of the wall. He may even have returned to Babylon, and have come back once more as 'governor.' The words **from the twentieth year . . . twelve years** may be the gloss of some editor, who supposed that Nehemiah was governor from his arrival in 445 until his recorded departure in 433 (see 13 6). Nehemiah, recording his generous offer of 10, connects with it a reference to his magnanimous conduct during the period of his (later) governorship, the date of which he did not himself record, but was supplied (wrongly) by some editor.

He then proceeds further (in 16) to reflect on his zeal for the building of the walls, and he records how he thought much more of that than of acquiring an estate,

and how he gave up his own servants to the public work. And once again (17, 18) he records the generous hospitality of his table, and his refusal of governor's taxes, when the Persian taxes were falling heavy on some of the people. And then having dwelt on his 'good works' he pleads their merit before God (19): cf. 13 14, 22, 31.

VI. **The walls are finished** (1): cf. 6 15. The Samaritans four times attempt to decoy Nehemiah into a trap without success (2-4).

2. Ono (cf. Ezr 2 33). Modern Kefr Ana 6 miles N. of Lod (Lydda), and about 20 miles N.W. of Jerusalem.

5-9. An unsuccessful attempt to intimidate Nehemiah by bringing against him a charge of treason.

an open letter—perhaps for public posting as a placard.

7. Some 'Messianic' utterances might well have been so interpreted. We have no certain oracles of the time of Nehemiah; but the utterances of Haggai and Zechariah (1-8) may have been re-echoed at this period and distorted reports of their contents may have reached the ears of the Samaritan authorities (cf. Hag 2 20-23; Zech 3 8, 6 12, 13).

9. now, O God. RVm is better (as LXX). MT has not 'O God.'

10-14. Further attempts to intimidate and entrap Nehemiah through false prophets bribed by the Samaritans.

10. shut up—probably as being ceremonially unclean, and so not permitted to enter the Temple (cf. 1 S 21 7; Jer 36 5).

Though he is a priest (son of Delaiah, 1 Ch 24 18) he is prepared to violate the Law by entering the Temple when unclean, under pretext of saving Nehemiah's life by giving him 'sanctuary' in the House of God (cf. Ex 21 13; 1 K 1 50). If Nehemiah had consented he would have laid himself open to a charge of transgressing the Law himself by entering the Sanctuary, being a 'layman' (the stranger, non-Levite of Nu 18 7); and also of being associated with a priest who entered though temporarily debarred from entrance by ceremonial uncleanness.

Such conduct would certainly have led to a breach between Nehemiah and the ecclesiastical officials; and, further, it would have been in the eyes of Nehemiah quite definitely a sin against the Divine Law (see 13).

14. See under 4 5. **Remember**, i.e. for punishment (cf. 13 29).

15-19. The city wall is finished, in spite of the opposition from 'foreigners' and intrigue amongst Nehemiah's own fellow-countrymen already recorded (1-14). Opposition and intrigue continue (16-19).

15. The date is 25/6/445. Elul = Aug.-Sept. The work therefore seems to have begun early in July. Josephus (*Ant.*, II, v, 8) says the building took two years and four months, but his chronology is not very reliable, as he assigns Nehemiah's work to the reign of Xerxes I (486-465), not of Artaxerxes as the Biblical records.

Considering the great numbers at work and the energy put out, it is not at all improbable that the work was finished in 52 days, especially when it is remembered that previous work had been done, though abandoned, and that the walls were probably only seriously damaged and not razed to the ground, and the material lay *in situ*.

16. much cast down—an unparalleled expression. Read *and it was exceedingly marvellous*, with a very slight change in Hebrew (cf. Ps 118 23—where a similar though not precisely the same Hebrew appears).

17. Intrigue between the aristocracy in Jerusalem and the Samaritan Tobiah against Nehemiah.

18. Note the intermarriage between Samaritans and Jews (for **Meshullam** see 3 4, 30). Nehemiah later had to make a vehement protest against the prevalent mixed marriages (see 13 23 ff.): cf. also 10 28, 30 and Ezr 9 and 10.

19. Commending Tobiah to Nehemiah as a generous character, but at the same time perhaps slandering (?) Nehemiah to Tobiah. Tobiah perhaps sent 'friendly' warnings to Nehemiah that his conduct might be misinterpreted by the Persian officials (cf. 6 5-7).

VII. **1-5. Nehemiah takes steps for securing the city against the intrusion of emissaries from the enemy; and also for providing it with a more adequate population.**

1. the porters, etc., i.e. gate-keepers. Probably **singers and Levites** should be omitted, as due to a mechanical repetition of a familiar catalogue of officers by a scribe. The singers and Levites were Temple officers, but here we are concerned with watchmen at the gates of the city. Possibly for **singers**, we might read with slight change in MT 'watchers.'

2. Hanani (see 1 2). **Hananiah, governor of the castle**: commanding the fortress, as, probably, a military officer.

3. watches—probably *night-watches*.

4. the houses were not builded—seems to be inconsistent with 3 and with Hag 1 4; but the reference may be not to houses as dwellings, but rather to houses as collections of persons = households; and

'built up' may be used as in Dt 25 9. On the other hand (if, as some think, this suggestion is too fanciful) it may be that Haggai is alluding rather to country houses than to city dwellings, and 3 may refer to such houses as there were left standing in Jerusalem, few though they might be. No (new) houses had been built. The true translation of the Hebrew is 'There were no houses built.'

5. See Introduction, § 10.

It is probable that 5-73 have no connexion with Nehemiah's work, but belong to the Ezra section that follows in 8.

that they might be reckoned by genealogy, i.e. for the purpose of selecting those of pure Israelite descent, so that the dwellers in Jerusalem might not be the offspring of mixed marriages.

5-73*a*. And I found, etc. The list which follows is virtually the same as that to be found in Ezr 2 1-70 (*q.v.*) (see also Introduction, § 10).

73*b*. Cf. Ezr 3 1.

VIII.-X. Ezra's actions in Jerusalem.

[*Note.*—8-10 quite clearly interrupt the sequence of events in Nehemiah's record, as 11 1 ff. is really the sequel to 7 1-4. 8-10 are a part of the Ezra history inserted here out of place. The same seems to apply to Neh 7 73*b*, and in all probability Neh 7 5-73*e* is also a part of the Ezra story.]

VIII. The people assemble and demand of Ezra that he shall produce the book of the Law (1). Ezra responds and reads from the book for several hours, while certain men interpret the Law to the people (2-8). The people are deeply impressed by what they hear (9-12).

The section comes suddenly before us without any introduction to explain why the people demand the production of the book.

We are left with the impression that, not only is the section out of place here, but also that it is a fragment of a fuller history much of which is lost. We may be right in supposing that Ezra had been proclaiming his doctrines by word of mouth and claiming as his authority the Law of Moses, but his claims had been challenged, and the people demand that he should produce the book and read it.

1. spake unto Ezra . . . to bring. MT seems almost to mean 'command.'

the book of the Law of Moses. It is impossible to say exactly what this book was, but from 14-15 it would seem that it contained at least in substance Lev 23 39-43. Most modern scholars accept the theory that, during the Exile, the traditions and customs of Israel were collected and codified, and the nucleus of the Pentateuch was thus formed. Ezra may well have brought with him a copy of this work, and have read from it such sections as were pertinent to the occasion. The work of the priests and scribes in exile had still to undergo a considerable amount of revision and addition after the return at the hands of successive editors before it became the canonical Pentateuch, known by later generations as 'the Law.'

There are many who think that Lev 17-26 (commonly known as the 'Holiness' Code) existed, in the main, as a separate document in the possession of the Zadokite priests carried into exile from Jerusalem. This may possibly have formed the core of the Law Code produced by Ezra; though it would not include some sections which were added to it later by priestly editors (e.g. 23 26-32). See under 8 14.

3. of those that could understand (cf. Ezr 8 16). Perhaps better 'Teachers' or 'Interpreters' (cf. 5 7, 8).

5. in the sight of all the people—to show that he really possessed it and was reading from it?

4, 7. The versions show considerable variety in the number and names of the persons who took a prominent part.

7. caused . . . to understand (cf. 8), i.e. probably interpreted or expounded the meaning and application of what was read.

8. distinctly. Better *giving the exact interpretation.* The root is that from which 'Pharisee' is derived (Hebrew Parash). The Pharisees were those who claimed to be faithful to the exact interpretation of the Law (cf. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, 132).

9. Nehemiah. Evidently meant by the compiler to be understood as the famous Nehemiah into whose history he has inserted this Ezra section. But some of the versions (1 Esd 5 40 and Syriac) do not admit this identification. It is difficult to understand why no mention of Nehemiah as the most prominent layman has not been made before. Many would omit the reference to Nehemiah altogether as having been inserted when the section came wrongly into its present context (cf. 10 1 and 12 26). See Introduction, § 10.

all the people wept—their consciences are pricked as they realize their sin in face of the Law they now hear, and their first impulse is to fast and mourn, in their depression.

10. Ezra deprecates their tears, and bids them feast and rejoice—and share their feasting with the needy.

the joy of the Lord, i.e. your joy in the Lord.

13-18. The Feast of Tabernacles is kept.

13. **the second day**—i.e. of 7th month (see [2]), Tishri (Sept.-Oct.), the month which in course of time came to be reckoned the *first* month of the year.

14. See Lev 23 [39-44] (H). The pre-exilic ordinances for the Feast are found in Ex 23 [16b], 34 [22b] and Dt 16 [13-17], but in these passages the Feast is a 'Harvest Festival,' and there is no fixed date. They contain no instruction regarding the collection of branches, etc., and the name 'Tabernacles' (Booths) occurs only in Deuteronomy. In the Leviticus passage the branches, etc., are mentioned, but there is no command to make 'booths' out of the material collected (see [15]). It is striking that no notice is taken of the Feast of Atonement ordered by Lev 23 [26-32] to be kept on the 10th day of 7th month. Probably Ezra's Law Book did not contain the passage. It was added at a later date (see under 8 [1]).

17. **since the days of Jeshua, etc.** In view of Ezr 3 [4] and 1 K 8 [65] the meaning seems to be that the Feast of Tabernacles had not been kept in strict obedience to the letter of the Law since, etc. The Feast had certainly been kept, but as a harvest festival, without the erection of temporary booths made from the branches collected, of which there is no mention in Ezr 3 [4].

IX. The day of national fasting and repentance.

1. **the twenty-fourth day,** i.e. perhaps of the 7th month. Two days after the 8th day of the Feast. But the chapter may be out of place: see Introduction, § 10.

2. **the seed:** see Ezr 9 [2]. **their sins,** i.e. as a nation, including the past generations.

3. **and read.** Better *they read,* viz. not the people themselves, but those appointed to do so.

4. **the stairs of the Levites:** lit. the 'ascent of the Levites'—perhaps a flight of steps leading to the Temple. Hardly the pulpit of 8 [4] (as some).

6. LXX makes Ezra utter the long prayer that follows: '*And Ezra said,* Thou art the Lord,' etc.

6-38. The Long Prayer.

It begins with a great act of adoring faith in Jehovah as God alone, Creator, and preserver of all, adored by the Heavenly court. ([6]) The God of all is peculiarly the God of Israel, who chose Abram ([7, 8]) and rescued Israel ([9-12]), and gave them the true laws ([13, 14]) and fed them with bread from heaven ([15]).

But in spite of the sinful disobedience of the nation, his compassion failed not ([16-23]), and he gave them the land of Canaan and full prosperity ([24, 25]). But continued disobedience, in spite of repeated mercies, earned repeated judgements ([26, 31]). But God, if terrible, is merciful ([31, 32]). The punishment experienced was deserved ([33-35]), but Israel now is in piteous plight ([36-37]).

So the prayer ends, abruptly as it seems; and perhaps the appeal that followed is lost. But the painting of the picture of Israel's present state was appeal enough in itself. There was no need of further words.

38. Begins a new chapter in Hebrew = 10 [1]. It is not really the sequel to the prayer that precedes it. It is not clear to what 'for all this' refers; probably to some events or speech which have been lost.

yet for all this is a possible rendering, but others are suggested, e.g. 'on account of all this,' or 'in addition to all this.' But we cannot tell exactly what was the force of the expression as we have no context to guide us. The substance of the covenant appears in 10 [29-39].

X. 1-27. **The names of the signatories,** headed by that of Nehemiah, and including certain priests, Levites, and chiefs of the people ([14]). These were clearly representatives of the class to which they belonged (see [28 29]). It is possible that Nehemiah's name is a later insertion (8 [9] *v.n.*).

28, 29. After the names of the representatives mention is made of the classes they represented. The classes stand to the contract signed by their representatives.

curse—i.e. with imprecations on any who should be unfaithful.

30-39. The terms of the covenant in fuller detail. Notice the return of the 1st person 'we,' as in 9 [38], perhaps indicating that the section comes from Ezra's memoirs (his name is not mentioned in the list of signatories); more probably the section comes from the pen of some other who witnessed the proceedings and sacred in the undertaking.

Summary of the terms of the covenant, with references to passages in the Law Books having relation to the terms:

(*a*) No intermarriage with the local non-Israelites ([30]): see Ex 34 [16] (J); Dt 7 [3].

(*b*) No trading with foreigners on the Sabbath and holy days ([31]): see Ex 31 [12-14], 34 [21] (J), 23 [12] (E); Dt 5 [12]; Lev 19 [30], etc.

(*c*) Due observance of the Sabbatical year, by leaving the land to lie fallow and remitting debts ([31]): Ex 23 [10, 11] (J); Lev 25 [1-5, 17-22]; Dt 15 [1-3].

(*d*) Payment of a third of a skekel annually to the Temple ([32, 33]): Ex 30 [13] (P).

(*e*) Periodical provision of wood for the Temple altar (34) (no reference available).

(*f*) The offering of firstfruits (Ex 23 19, 34 26; Dt 18 4, 26 2 ff.), and firstborn (35-37a) (Ex 22 29, 13 13, 34 20; Nu 18 15-17), and of tithes (37b) (Lev 27 30-33; Nu 18 21-24; Dt 14 22-27, 26 15).

31. See 13 15-22.

32. **made ordinances**—the words seem to indicate that there was no earlier law on the subject, but the people (or the authorities) make one. Ex 30 13 (P) is probably later than Ezra, when the ⅓ shekel has become ½ shekel.

34. **as it is written**—refers to the *burning* not the fetching of the wood: see Lev 6 12. This clause of the ordinances was intended to ensure a regular supply of wood in order to fulfil the *written* law.

36. **the firstborn of our sons**, no doubt in accordance with Ex 13 13; Nu 18 15 (cf. Ex 13 2), which modify Ex 22 29, a passage which *may* have seemed to sanction literal sacrifice of the firstborn (cf. Lk 2 23).

37*b*. **for they, the Levites**, etc., to 39a **singers** seem to break the context. They are of the nature of an inserted note, a rubric, explaining the method of procedure in the fulfilment of the ordinance. The ordinances conclude with 39b as a summary of the provisions mentioned before.

For the law of tithes the following passages may be studied: (*a*) Dt 12 17 f., 14 22-29, 26 12-15; (*b*) Lev 27 30-33; (*c*) Nu 18 25-31; (*d*) Am 4 4.

And the following points may be noted:

(1) Amos witnesses to the existence of the custom of paying tithe, but gives no details.

(2) Deuteronomy mentions tithe only of grain, wine and oil (14 22), and it is to be eaten by the worshipper at the Sanctuary, but the Levite in the worshipper's own town is not to be forgotten (14 27). Cf. 12 17-19, where the Levite is to share in the feast with the household of the worshipper. Every *third* year the tithe is to be given entirely (?) to the Levites and the local poor (26 12-15).

(3) In Leviticus both the produce of the land (27 30) *and* of the herds and flocks (32) are to be tithed and to be holy to Jehovah.

(4) In Numbers the Levite himself is tithed, having to pay $\frac{1}{10}$ of what he receives from worshippers as a tithe to Aaron the priest (18 26-28). And apparently only grain and fruit is tithed (27, 30).

In our present chapter (Neh 10) apparently only seed and fruit is tithed (37, 'the tithes of our ground'), as in (*a*) and (*c*) above; contrast (*b*). Apparently *all* the tithe goes to the Levites in the first instance (37). Notice the difference between this and the law of Deuteronomy in (2) above. In 38 we find an echo of (*c*) above. See (4), where the Levite himself pays tithes to Aaron. It would seem that in our present chapter we have a development of the practice described in Deuteronomy, with a more liberal treatment of the Levite; but later on came a still further development in favour of the priests as outlined in Lev 27 30-33, where 'holy to Jehovah' = given to the priests (cf. Nu 18 26, 28).

XI. **The peopling of Jerusalem.** Continues the Nehemiah narrative from the point reached in 7 4.

1. One-tenth of the country population is selected by lot to transfer to Jerusalem.

2. Apparently others, over and above the tenth selected by lot, volunteered to remove to the city.

3-24. A list of residents in Jerusalem.

25-36. Some account of residents in the country districts.

XII. 1-26. **Four lists of names of priests and Levites:**

(*a*) 1-9. Those who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel and Jeshua.

(*b*) 10-11. The House of Jeshua the high priest for five generations.

(*c*) 12-21. Priests in the days of Joiakim.

(*d*) 22-26. Scanty notes about Levitical records made at various stages of their history.

1. **with Zerubbabel**, etc.: cf. Ezr 2 2 (= Neh 7). But the lists show considerable variation.

10. **Jeshua** (see Ezr 2 2; Hag 1 1).

Eliashib (Ezr 10 6 *v.n.*). See Neh 13 28.

11. **Jonathan . . . Jaddua.** The latter was high priest as late as 333 B.C. (see Ezr 10 6).

22. **in the reign of**, or margin, **to the reign of.**

Darius the Persian, i.e. Darius III (Codomannus), 336-332 B.C., in whose day Jaddua was high priest (see 11).

27-43. **The dedication of the walls of Jerusalem.**

28. **the sons of the singers** = merely, *singers* (see on Neh 3 8).

30. **purified themselves**, i.e. by offering sin offerings (cf. 2 Ch 29 20-24, 31).

31-45. **Nehemiah marshals two processions to march round the walls in opposite directions and meet at a given point.**

31. **two great companies**, etc. The Hebrew is difficult, but it seems to mean that the singers and musicians were

divided into two bands to head two processions.

32. Hoshaiah leads the one procession, following immediately after the band of musicians (see [37]). We know nothing more of Hoshaiah.

33. Ezra—clearly not the great Ezra. **Judah—Benjamin**—i.e. representatives of, probably heads of houses.

36. Ezra the scribe, etc.—probably a late addition by an editor who supposed that Ezra was present and would therefore play a prominent part. But that part has already been assigned to Hoshaiah.

38. The second procession is headed by Nehemiah.

39, 40. The two companies now meet at the gate of the guard (perhaps = Hammiphkad, 3[31], E. of the city), where there was probably a large open space, used for the military muster.

44-47. Officers are appointed to superintend the payment of dues to Levites and priests.

44. on that day. Probably means only 'at that time'. (see 13[1]). It may have no reference to the previous context.

45. kept the ward, i.e. discharged their functions as ministers of God (cf. Zech 3[7]). **the ward of the purification,** i.e. their duties with regard to ceremonial purifications.

according to the commandment, etc., only found in 1 and 2 Chronicles (see 1 Ch 23-26 and 2 Ch 8[14]).

47. they sanctified, i.e. gave over (produce of the field, etc.) to the use of the holy ministers of God—as the Levites in turn gave over portions to the holy priests (see under 'tithes' in Neh 10[37b]).

[*Note.*—These verses ([44-47]) are thought by many to be a later addition by an editor of the school of the editors of *The Chronicles,* always jealous for the rights of the sacred ministers and anxious to show that the customs of his day were faithfully observed by earlier generations. Certainly [47] seems to be the work of one who looks back to the days of Nehemiah as a past period of history. Note also that [47b] seems to echo the (late) law of Nu 18[25-31]. The passage has certain similarities to 10[38-39] (*q.v.*): cf. 10[38] with [47b], where the sons of Aaron only are priests.]

XIII. **1-3. The separation from Israel of the mixed multitude.**

The verses seem to be an isolated fragment perhaps inserted here as an introduction to what follows, giving the general principle which governed the action of Nehemiah in a particular case ([4-9]). But see Introduction, § 9 (*b*).

1. On that day (cf. 12[44]).

1, 2. therein was found written (see Dt 23[3, 4, 5], and see notes on Ezr 8[1-15]).

for ever—more severe than Dt 23[3].

3. mixed multitude. The word used to describe the heterogeneous crowd that followed Israel out of Egypt (Ex 12[38]). Here it denotes the medley of 'foreigners' settled in and about Judah and fusing with the pure Israelites.

4-31. Nehemiah's drastic reforms—probably not in chronological sequence (see below).

4-9. The expulsion of Tobiah from the sacred precincts.

4. Eliashib (see Ezr 10[6]).

4, 5. chambers—the rooms surrounding the Temple area used both for storing the sacred vessels and treasures (Ezr 8[29]) and the tithes (Neh 10[37-39]), and also as lodgings for priests (Ezr 10[6]).

6. This act of Eliashib had happened during a temporary absence of Nehemiah. It appears that Nehemiah had returned to Babylon in the year 433, after twelve years' work in Jerusalem. We know nothing of the cause of his departure, and it is idle to speculate. It may not have been his first absence. Possibly his arrangements described in 7[2] were preparatory to a departure from the city. According to a possible interpretation of 2[6], his leave of absence was only for a short period, and he must have considerably overstayed his leave if he did not return for twelve years. But see on 2[6], and on 5[14].

7. Tobiah was not only not a priest or Levite, but was also even a foreigner (an Ammonite), and he had no right to have access to the Temple (see [1-4]).

8. household stuff, i.e. furniture, etc. There is nothing contemptuous in the word 'stuff.' It is merely an old English equivalent for property or goods.

9. cleansed, i.e. ceremonially (see under 12[30]).

10-14. Nehemiah insists on the payment of dues to the Levites.

The verses may not be in chronological sequence with what precedes or follows. Probably we have in this chapter just a selection from the reforming works of Nehemiah over a long period collected together and placed side by side.

10. the portions—see under 10[37] (cf. Mal 3[7-12]).

were fled—had taken to work on the land to earn a living. From 12[27-29] it appears that the Levites had country residences in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, in spite of Dt 18[1, 2].

11. forsaken (cf. 10[39]).

gathered them, i.e. the Levites, restored to their rightful place in Jerusalem.

14. Cf 5 [19] and [22, 29-31].

15-22. Strong measures to effect the due observance of the Sabbath.

15. Jews were guilty of bringing in market produce on the Sabbath day for sale after the Sabbath. When the market opened (on the day they sold victuals) on a working day, Nehemiah utters his protest.

16. Tyrians actually engage in marketing goods on the Sabbath—and the Jews buy.

and in Jerusalem. Omit *and* (as some versions).

19. The traffickers shut out on the Sabbath.

20. But only to set up a market outside the walls.

22. The assistance of the Levites is bespoken by their benefactor.

Remember me (cf. [14]).

23-29. Nehemiah deals with the mixed marriage question.

23. See under Ezr 9 [1-3].

28. Even the high priest's family is involved in guilt, being related to no less a person than the Samaritan Governor Sanballat (see 2 [10]). Even the priesthood was defiled (see [20]). 29. See 6 [14].

31. **wood offering,** etc. See 10 [34, 35, 37].

Remember me. See [14].

ESTHER

By John C. H. How

Introduction

(1) **Contents and Purpose.**—The book purports to record the events which led up to the institution of the Feast of Purim in the days of Xerxes the Persian emperor, 486-465 B.C. (LXX and Josephus wrongly Artaxerxes, 465-425 B.C.). Indeed, it may be said that the primary purpose of the book was to provide justification for the continued celebration of a festival which had no religious significance and no basis in 'the Law,' but which had become widely popular amongst Jews. It was to be understood as a yearly commemoration of a great deliverance of the Jews in Persia, from an intended general massacre by their enemies, through the instrumentality of two courageous patriots, Mordecai and Esther.

(2) **The Feast of Purim** (9 [26, 28, 29, 31, 32]). —Of this festival no other mention is made in the canonical books of the OT, nor is any allusion to it found in extant literature (except 2 Mac 15 [36]: see below) earlier than Josephus (*Ant.*, XI, vi, 13), A.D. 90. In 3 [7], 9 [24] the word *Pur* (singular form of plural *Purim*) is explained as meaning 'lot,' and is clearly understood to be a Persian word needing interpretation to the Jewish reader. No such word for 'lot' in Persian has been traced, but Streane (21) conjectured that it was the same word as Assyrian *puru*, 'a stone.' This conjecture is now known to be correct, as a tablet containing the word 'puru' in the phrase 'he shall cast his lot' has been discovered (*J.T.S.*, xxiii, 408). There is some doubt about the origin of the festival as indicated in Esther. It is thought by many that the festival was originally a pagan feast, Persian, or Babylonian, or Greek (of the New Year, or of the dead, or at vintage), which had been adopted by Jews and had become so firmly established that it could not be abolished. For the Jew it could have no clearly religious significance, but was rather of a merely social character, and was marked by much merrymaking and even excess. It was, however, given a patriotic and national character by being transformed into an annual commemoration of the great deliverance described in the Book of Esther which was ordered to be read at the feast. Some would maintain that Mordecai and Esther are really disguised forms of the names of the Babylonian deities Marduk and Ishtar, Mordecai's Day being originally Marduk's Day. Some old Babylonian myth had been transformed into a story of national heroes with a patriotic theme. Such suggestions are of great interest and some of great ingenuity, but they remain entirely in the realm of theory. If the origin of the feast as described in Esther is doubtful, no alternative theory so far produced is very convincing.

(3) **Historical Value.**—It will be seen from the last paragraph that considerable doubt has been thrown upon the historicity of Esther. Some would deny to the story any kind of historical background, and regard it merely as a transformed pagan myth; others would be prepared to main-

tain that there may be some real historical event underlying the story, but that it has been much embellished by the romantic imagination of the writer. Attempts have been made to defend its full historical accuracy, but they cannot be regarded as successful. It must be confessed that the book abounds in improbabilities and exaggerations, and bears the stamp of an imaginative romance. The writer probably knew Persia sufficiently well to give the story a thoroughly Persian colouring; but secular history knows nothing of his heroes Mordecai and Esther, nor of any queen of Xerxes named Vashti. If Mordecai was one of the exiles carried to Babylon in 597 B.C. (2 ^{6}), he must have been about 120 years old in the reign of Xerxes (486-465) when the story opens (1 ^{1}), and his cousin Esther, who charmed the king with her beauty, could not have been very much younger.

Space forbids any full enumeration of the many highly improbable elements in the story, but the unbiassed reader will see for himself that the book moves in an atmosphere not very dissimilar from that of the *Arabian Nights*. Whatever historical facts underlie the tale, in its present form it may be described as a popular romance.

(4) **Tone and Place in Canon.**—The tone of the book is patriotic rather than religious. The name of God is never mentioned (though 4 ^{14} may contain a veiled allusion to the Deity), nor is there any reference to prayer or worship or the Law. Fasting alone of religious acts appears (4 $^{3, 16}$). These deficiencies have been supplied in the Greek additions to Esther found in the Apocrypha (*q.v.*). It has been suggested that the Feast of Purim at which the book was read was of such an orgiastic type that mention of the most sacred Name was omitted through fear of irreverence.

At first the book was probably not regarded by the Jews as sacred Scripture, but from its connexion with the popular festival of Purim it easily won a permanent place in their affections. Josephus used it (though very freely and in the longer version with the Greek additions) in compiling his history (see *Ant.*, XI, vi); and at the Synod of Jamnia (*c.* A.D. 90) it appears to have been declared canonical. In later centuries it acquired increasing prestige amongst the Jews, and became known as '*The* Megillah,' i.e. '*The* Roll,' surpassing in excellence the other four 'Rolls' (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes), and being coupled with 'the Law' as supreme over all other Scripture.

From the Jewish Church it passed into the Christian, but it appears to have been almost entirely ignored by the early Christian Fathers. Melito (d. A.D. 175) excludes it from the sacred Scriptures, and Origen did not include it among historical books, but it was finally accepted as canonical at Carthage in A.D. 397.

(5) **Date.**—The book can hardly be earlier than the latter part of the 2nd century B.C. It is striking that no mention of Mordecai and Esther is made in the list of national heroes commemorated in Ecclus 44-50 (*c.* 170 B.C.). The first allusion of any kind to the heroes or events of 'Esther' is found in 2 Mac 15 ^{36} (*c.* 120 B.C. ?), where 'Mordecai's Day' is mentioned as following 'Nicanor's Day,' Adar 13th. Note that the earlier work 1 Maccabees makes no reference to Mordecai's Day (1 Mac 7 ^{49}). The writer clearly looks back to an age long past in 1 $^{1, 2}$; and we may be right in assigning the work to 'the period of worldliness and self-complacency that followed the attainment of national independence in 135 B.C.' (Paton). If 11 ^{1} (Ap., p. 63*b v.n.*) be reliable, a Greek translation was made about 114 B.C.

(6) **Value.**—It is not easy to defend its inclusion amongst the inspired books of the OT reverenced by the Christian Church. Luther declared he wished it did not exist, and Ewald felt that 'in it we fall as if from heaven to earth.' Certainly we see the vindictive spirit of the Jew at its worst (8 $^{7-14}$, 9 $^{13-16}$), but it cannot be said to be without parallel in the OT. It was one of the features in the character of the Jew that needed to be eradicated by the Spirit of the coming Christ. The characters of Esther and Mordecai are certainly not free from reproach when judged by Christian standards, but at least it may be said that their motive was love of their nation rather than self-interest, and Esther played her part at the risk of her life (4 ^{16}). The characters are sketched by the writer with considerable dramatic skill; and the strutting little peacock, Haman, with his inordinate vanity, malicious envy and cruelty, stands out as a masterpiece of literary portraiture. Stripped of his Oriental vesture, is he altogether a figure of the past? (5 $^{9, 11-13}$, 6 $^{6, 12, 13}$). Is patriotism, even in these days, always free from the vindictive spirit, or racial and social pride free from cruel contempt of 'lesser breeds'? This spirit would not and could not incarnate itself in such barbarous form in the modern civilized world, but its essential character may be

quite as evident to-day as among the Jews of old, and certainly among us deserves the rebuke, 'Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.'*

Bibliography

Streane (*C.B.*); Witton Davies (*Cent.B.*); Rawlinson (*Sp.*); Paton (*I.C.C.*); Adeney (*Exp.B.*); Duff (*Peake*); Kent (*Stud. O.T.*); Wildeboer (*K.H.C.*); Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*; *Jewish Encycl.*, art. 'Purim.'

Analysis and Short Notes

I. **Queen Vashti is deposed from her royal estate for refusing to obey the king's bidding at a royal banquet.**

1-4. The king makes a feast for the high officials.

5-8. Followed by one for the commoners of Susa.

9. The queen also entertains the ladies.

10-22. The queen refusing to answer the king's command to give a public display of her beauty before his guests is, at the suggestion of the king's counsellors, deposed by public decree.

---

1. **Ahasuerus**, i.e. Xerxes I, 486-465 B.C. (cf. Ezr 4 [6]). LXX and Josephus wrongly Artaxerxes.

3. **Shushan the palace**: better *Susa the fortress*. **third year**, i.e. 483.

9. **Vashti**: no queen of Xerxes with this name is known. It can hardly be a variation of Amestris, Xerxes' queen according to Herodotus.

13. **for so was the king's manner toward all**, etc.: better *for so were the king's affairs referred to all*, etc.

II. **How Esther became queen.**

1-4. The king agrees to a suggestion that a new queen be selected from fair women gathered from all parts of the kingdom.

5-7. Mordecai the Jew and Esther his cousin and ward are introduced to the reader.

8-11. Esther is amongst the candidates for the king's choice as queen, finding special favour with Hegai the eunuch in command of the women's quarters. But her nationality is not disclosed.

12-18. Esther is chosen by the king to be his queen.

19-23. Mordecai is instrumental in saving the king's life by informing him through Esther of a plot to assassinate him.

3, 9. **things for purification**, i.e. cosmetics for beautifying the person. See [12] for more details. The women were to undergo a year's course of treatment.

5. **Mordecai** was of the family of Saul (1 S 9 [1, 2]).

16. **Tebeth**: only here in OT. Babylonian name for tenth month—December-January.

seventh year, i.e. 479 B.C., four years after 1 [3] ff.

III. **The promotion of Haman, and his plot to exterminate the Jews.**

1, 2. Haman advanced to supreme office as grand vizier is refused the customary reverence by Mordecai.

3-6. Haman, hearing of it, plans to exterminate Mordecai's nation.

7-11. On a lucky day, discovered by casting lots, Haman obtains the king's consent for his project.

12-15. An edict under the royal seal is issued for the slaughter of the Jews.

---

1. **Agagite**: cf. 1 S 15 [8]. Was Haman an Amalekite? (see 6 [13]).

7. **the twelfth year**, i.e. 474.

Pur: see Introduction, § 2. Lots were cast to discover a propitious day.

to the twelfth month: EV implies that the process was continued for eleven months. MT is really unintelligible. Read as LXX *And the lot fell on the 14th of the month of Adar* (the twelfth month, February-March). A date eleven months ahead is indicated as the 'lucky' day. Some would read 13th day, as Old Latin (see under [13]).

10. **ring**: the sign of authority and the signet for sealing official documents in the king's name (see 8 [10]).

13. **thirteenth day of the twelfth month**, i.e. eleven months after the issue of the decree (see [12]), and a year less one day after Haman's lucky day, or just a year if the Old Latin be followed in [7] (see also 8 [12], 9 [1]).

IV. **Mordecai bids Esther intercede with the king. At first refusing, she consents to take the risk, after calling for a fast by the Jews on her behalf.**

1-3. Mordecai and the Jews fast and weep.

4-9. Esther enquires the meaning of it and receives information about the approaching massacre, and is bidden by Mordecai to approach the king.

10, 11. She refuses the perilous task.

12-17. But on further persuasion by Mordecai is prepared to risk her life. A solemn fast, in which she shares, is offered for the success of her venture.

---

* The divinest element in the book is perhaps to be found in the profound sense of the indestructibility of Israel, and the duty of an Israelite to maintain the cause of his people at whatever risk (see especially 4 [14]). It was this probably that caused its final inclusion in the OT Canon.—C. G.

14. **from another place.** Perhaps a veiled allusion to heaven or God.

16. Note that no mention of prayer is made, though the fasting is clearly a religious fast—a prayer in action—and is intercessory (for me).

V. **Esther's approach to the king is successful in its first stage, and he accepts her invitation to dinner. Haman plans the death of Mordecai.**

1-5. Favourably received by the king, Esther begs that he and Haman will attend a banquet that day.

6-8. And another on the next day, when she will have a request to make to the king.

9-13. Haman is delighted and flattered by the queen's attentions, but his happiness is marred by the sight of Mordecai, who still refuses to show him reverence.

14. His wife and friends suggest a practical way of relieving his feelings. Let him hang Mordecai.

---

4. Apparently her answer is prompted by tact. She will make a small request, the granting of which will afford her opportunity for the greater one to come.

8. Esther further delays her great request, perhaps in order that the king may be further infatuated by her charms at a second banquet.

14. **fifty cubits,** i.e. about 80 feet. No doubt Zeresh is speaking excitedly and exaggerates the height. There is no need to suppose that Haman ordered the gallows to be of this enormous height, though it was so reported in the court (see 7 [9]). Possibly it was on a tower top.

VI. **The exaltation of Mordecai.**

1-3. The king is reminded of the loyalty of Mordecai that saved his life.

4-12. The king decides to honour Mordecai appropriately. Haman happening to be in the court is summoned, and becomes the agent, at the king's command, of the honouring of the man he hated.

13. Haman utterly crushed finds little comfort from his wife and his counsellors. The Jew was destined to triumph in the end.

14. Haman is conducted to Esther's banquet.

---

8. AV is right, as against RVm. It is the horse that is decorated with a crown, marking it as the king's charger.

13. An echo of Dt 25 [17-19] (see 3 [1]). The descendant of the house of Saul will crush the descendant of the house of Agag (see 2 [5], 3 [1]; 1 S 15).

14. Cf. Lk 14 [17].

VII. **The second banquet. Esther makes her great request to the utter terror and confusion of Haman. Haman meets the death he had prepared for Mordecai.**

1-6. Esther pleads for her people, and denounces Haman to the king.

7, 8. The king in fury departs, and returns to find Haman prostrate on the queen's couch in supplication. The king misinterprets his attitude, and—

9, 10. Orders the execution of Haman.

4, 5. The queen discloses her nationality, which the king never seems to have suspected. We must suppose that the king, in authorizing Haman to proceed with the extermination of the lawless people (described but not named in 3 [8-11]), either did not know what people Haman had in mind, or if he knew, did not realize that it was the people to which his wife belonged. He does not seem to connect Esther's plea for her people with Haman's proposal to exterminate a certain lawless people.

4. **But if we had been sold . . . although the adversary,** etc. A very difficult verse. It may perhaps be paraphrased: 'If it had been a case of being sold into slavery (instead of being exterminated), I should not have been prepared to raise my voice in protest—though the price promised to the king by the enemy of my people (3 [9]) would be poor compensation for the loss (to him) of a free and active people.' Many other attempts have been made to produce sense from the passage, but the text may be corrupt.

8. **they covered,** i.e. the attendants in the queen's palace, preparatory to leading him out to death.

9. **in the house of Haman** must clearly mean not the actual house, but rather, as we might say, on the property of Haman—at Haman's 'place' (see under 5 [14]).

VIII. **Mordecai is promoted in place of Haman, and the decree for the extermination of the Jews is revoked.**

1, 2, 15. Haman's property is handed over to Esther, and Mordecai is promoted to his high office as grand vizier.

3-14. Haman's decree is revoked, and the Jews are empowered to offer violent resistance to any who might attempt to act on the former decree ([11]).

16, 17. The Jews keep high festival, and inspire others with such fear that many proselytes are made.

---

1. **what he was unto her,** i.e. her cousin and guardian, hitherto a secret.

2. the ring: see 3 [10].

9. Sivan: the third month, May-June (Babylonian name).

12. thirteenth day: 3 [13] *v.n.*

17. good day, i.e. festival, high day (cf. 9 [19, 22]).

IX. **The sequel to the decree issued by Mordecai—vengeful massacre of their enemies by the Jews, the institution of a feast in memory of the event.**

1-5. The Jews take vengeance in the provinces.

6-11. And in the fortress of Shushan, slaying Haman's ten sons.

12-15. Esther asks for an extension of the Jews' licence to slaughter for another day, and also for the hanging (i.e. impaling) of Haman's sons already dead. The king grants her request.

16-19. The massacres are followed by high festival on the 14th day in the provinces and on the 15th in Shushan.

20-32. In consequence an annual feast is instituted to be observed by the Jews on the two days of Adar 14th and 15th. The feast is called Purim ([26]). Cf. 2 Mac 15 [36], where the 14th is called Mordecai's Day.

19. The reference to the custom of the village dwellers leads us to expect a reference to that of the town dwellers contrasted with them as keeping the 15th and not the 14th day. In some LXX MSS. there is such a reference, but not in the Hebrew.

21. The divergent practice of the country and the towns is brought into a harmony of national custom by the observance of *both* days by all Jews as feasts.

23-32 appear to be an emphatic attempt to justify legally the keeping of what may have once been a rather questionable feast. It came about through the ordering of the national heroes Mordecai and Esther.

24, 26. Pur, Purim: see Introduction, § 2.

27. all such as joined themselves, i.e. converts or proselytes (cf. 8 [17]).

32. the book: better perhaps the *document* or *dispatch*, i.e. which Mordecai sent. Esther endorsed the decree.

X. **1.** A tribute imposed by Xerxes.

2, 3. The greatness of Mordecai.

---

1. Nothing more is known of this tribute or its purpose.

INTRODUCTION TO THE WISDOM LITERATURE

By E. J. Bicknell

All over the world there emerges a philosophy of life that expresses itself in proverbs and riddles and fables. These embody popular reflection upon the meaning and problems of the world. They are devices for handing on the accumulated experience of the past in a form that can be easily remembered and understood. A proverb has been defined as 'the wisdom of many and the wit of one.' The definition includes the two necessary conditions. There must be the common experience and the common judgement, and then the capacity on the part of some member of the community to sum them up in a pithy saying or an apt comparison, which lives because it commends itself to the general mind.

We should expect to find in the earliest literature of Israel traces of this mental activity. And we are not disappointed. In Jg 9 [8-15] Jotham expounds his warning and rebuke in a fable. 1 S 10 [12] and 19 [24] offer rival explanations of the origin of a familiar proverb. Jg 14 [12] witnesses to the custom of riddles. David quotes a 'proverb of the ancients' (1 S 24 [13]). Nathan employs a parable to convict David of his sin (2 S 12 [1-6]). In 2 S 14 [1-21] and 20 [16-22] we read of wise women who are skilled in devising methods of argument to forward a given policy.

But, though such wisdom flourished in Israel from early days, its golden age came to be associated with the name of Solomon. In 1 K 4 [29-34] he is said to have surpassed all the wise men not only of Israel but of the nations around. It is to be noticed that his wisdom is regarded as of the same kind as theirs, though superior. He is said to have spoken 'three thousand proverbs.' When 'he spake of trees . . . of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes,' we are not to imagine that he was a student of natural history. Rather these various objects afforded the material for fables like that of Jotham (cf. 2 K 14 [9, 10]). Nor was his wisdom learning in our sense of the term, but that practical shrewdness in judgement which is specially appreciated by the Oriental mind. The typical instance of its exercise is the verdict in the case of the two infants (1 K 3 [16-28]).

It found its full scope in his contest of riddles with the Queen of Sheba (10 [2, 3]). In essence fables and riddles and proverbs are closely akin. Their virtue resides in the power to perceive an apt comparison between some common incident of human life and some event in the external world of nature. Many proverbs could easily be put into the form of riddles. And many riddles and proverbs are fables in miniature. Solomon possessed an acute power of observation, a shrewd insight into human nature, and the ability to sum up in pointed sayings and apt illustrations the fruits of his reflection. No doubt a courtly audience did not fail to appreciate to the full the royal wit. The tradition of his excellence in this department did not diminish with the lapse of years. Just as all laws came to be assigned to Moses and psalms to David, so wise utterances were assigned to Solomon. The ascription vindicates their worth if not their authenticity.

The pre-exilic prophets allude to the existence of wise men. The most important passage (Jer 18 [18]) places them as a definite class side by side with the priests and the prophets. 'The law shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet.' The wise are recognized as having a place among the teachers of Israel. The priest gives direction or Torah. The prophet declares the word of Jehovah. The wise give counsel, that is apparently advice gained by keenness of observation, and reflection on the facts of life, rather than by any express revelation. If passages like Is 5 [21], 29 [14]; Jer 4 [22], 8 [8, 9], 9 [23] rebuke the false teaching of the wise, that does not necessarily prove that there was any inherent antagonism between the prophets and the wise men. Prophets equally rebuke bad priests and bad prophets. In the dark days before the fall of Jerusalem popular complaints against God's dealings with His people found expression in current proverbs (Jer 31 [29]; Ezek 12 [22], 18 [2]).

The so-called 'Wisdom literature' is the product of this class of wise men. Within the canon of the Old Testament it includes Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, certain Psalms, especially 1, 37, 49, 50, 73, 112, and portions of other psalms, as, for instance, 18 [20-26]. Outside the Palestinian canon, but among the books accepted in the Dispersion, it includes Ecclesiasticus, The Wisdom of Solomon, and we may add a passage like Baruch 3 [9-37].

When we go on to ask what is the relation of our present books to Solomon and the wise men of the period before the Exile, more than one answer has been given. According to the older critical view this literature as we now possess it is not the product of a single age, but the accumulated literary outcome of a long succession of wise men going back to Solomon himself, and continued by a more or less organized body of teachers. Thus the oldest parts of the Book of Proverbs are regarded as pre-exilic and containing a nucleus of sayings uttered by Solomon himself. The title in 25 [1] is accepted as giving sound historical information of a period of literary activity in the reign of Hezekiah, of which the following chapters are the fruit. Job is dated in the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, or at latest during the Exile, though no doubt it has received various later additions. Ecclesiastes is on all hands admitted to be quite late.

But the trend of recent criticism has been to assign all our existing 'wisdom' books, except Job, to a definite intellectual movement during a particular period of Jewish history. Ecclesiasticus, which is the work of a single author whose name we know, can be dated with reasonable certainty just after 200 B.C. Its similarity to Proverbs and Ecclesiastes suggests that they belong to the same age. Wisdom clearly is later, and is not Palestinian-Jewish at all, but comes from Alexandria. On this view the 'wise men' who compiled Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Ecclesiasticus were the successors of the earlier wise men, who developed their work on characteristically Jewish lines to meet a new situation. Their wisdom movement marks a distinct phase in the history of Judaism. The old fervour inspired by the reforms of Nehemiah and Ezra had died down. They had left a legacy of legalism and ecclesiasticism. The new fire of enthusiasm to be kindled by the Maccabæan struggle had not yet purged the nation from its lethargy. Foreign influences both before and, in increased measure, after the conquests of Alexander were moulding Jewish life and thought. As yet Hellenism was advancing by peaceful penetration. Its effect on morals and piety, especially among the younger generation and the wealthier classes of the towns, was becoming apparent. To meet the danger the wise attempted to set forth in an attractive form the true wisdom of Judaism as a prophylactic against the false wisdom of Hellenism. They opposed to the maxims of a decadent Greek philosophy the experience of sound religion. As we read Proverbs we are conscious that the wise are attacking

not mere stupidity or reluctance to learn, but a rival system of life. Over against the picture of Wisdom, inviting men to share her banquet, there stands the picture of Folly luring men into the ways of death. Those who have studied the baser side of Hellenism, especially as it showed itself in Syria and Palestine, must admit that there are ample grounds for the description. Much of this literature gains new point when we regard it as an attempt of Judaism to defend itself against the encroachments of Hellenistic laxity. On this theory, just as the age of Prophecy was succeeded by the age of Legalism, so the age of Legalism was in turn succeeded by one of Wisdom, and that in turn was followed by an age of Apocalyptic. That is not to say that these forms of literary activity are entirely limited to these ages. Prophecy, for instance, lasted down to a late date, and additions to the Law were made down to the 3rd century B.C. But these ages were marked by these forms of writing as their characteristic expression.

The Book of Job stands apart. It belongs in the truest sense to the Wisdom literature. Its purpose is to discuss the problem of life, and, in particular, to refute the popular idea that suffering is the proof of sin and great suffering of great sin. The story itself is a saga, as old as the folk-tales that underlie the early narratives of Genesis. But the traditional story has been rewritten so as to afford opportunity for the utterance of reflections about life and suffering. The use made by the later writer of the saga is closely parallel to that made by the Greek poet Euripides of the old folk-stories and legends of Greece. He deliberately retold them so as to make them the vehicle of expression of new thoughts and questionings. He puts into the mouth of his characters the most daring criticisms of the conduct of the gods and of conventional morality. He preserves the customary ending of the tale, but often takes a short cut towards its attainment by introducing a god, who solves the impasse by a speech of suitable piety and a reversal of the situation by an act of divine power. Again, there is a certain similarity to the ending of Job. The bulk of the book may be dated in post-exilic days. It belongs to a period when the problem of the sufferings of the righteous individual had long received full discussion. As it has come down to us it has received later additions, made for the purpose of inculcating views which did not seem to have received adequate expression.

The Books of Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus are more representative of the normal type of 'wisdom.' The former is obviously the work of many hands. Even if we hold that all the collections now traceable in it are post-exilic, it is possible that it preserves some genuine old proverbs, perhaps in a later dress. Some may even be Solomon's, but if so we have no possible means for discovering which they are. Quite conservative scholars admit that the literary form of the proverbs, even in the oldest portions of the book, shows that they are not popular creations, but demands a long period of previous practice. Ecclesiasticus is more of a unity, and bears the stamp of a single mind. It is later than Proverbs. The author compares himself to one who is gleaning after the grape-gatherers (33 [16]). He comes at the end of a series of such compilers. If we date Ecclesiasticus 190, we may date the composition of Proverbs and its several sections 350-200. Though these books owe their compilation to the battle against Hellenism, their contents agree well with this period in their positive nature. The growth of civilized life afforded at once greater opportunity and more abundant material for reflection. As the pressure of immediate and material needs was lightened, the individual had more leisure to be interested in himself. The type of life that these books imply as their background is that of advanced civilization.

Ecclesiastes springs likewise from the schools of the wise, but its unity has been seriously disputed. It is intensely academic, and may be simply a report of abstract debates in the assembly of the wise. It may be dated about 200.

Wisdom is perhaps best assigned to the 1st century B.C. It seems to be an attempt to meet in Alexandria the same kind of difficulty that the Palestinian books had endeavoured to meet in Judæa, the corruption of Jewish piety by worldliness and the temptations of Gentile civilization. To do this it borrows from the armoury of Greek philosophy. It owes almost as much to Plato as to the Old Testament. It is a blend of the loftiest thoughts both of Platonism and of Jewish revelation.

In considering the Wisdom literature as a whole, three points stand out.

First, wisdom does not claim to be confined to Israel. As we saw, Solomon is frankly compared to the wise men of other races. So, too, Edom was famed for wisdom (Ob [8]; Jer 49 [7]). Job himself was not a member of Israel, and the scene

of the book is laid outside Palestine. Life is regarded in general, not from the standpoint of the Jewish faith or the Jewish nation, but of humanity at large. Except in Ecclesiasticus, which is far the most Jewish of these books, the special ideas of the covenant-relation to Jehovah are almost entirely absent. There is no Messianic hope. Except for the use of the divine name, Proverbs might have originated among any Semitic people who had attained to monotheism and a high morality. By more than one commentator the wise men have been styled the 'humanists' of Israel. Further, in spite of their hostility to Gentile culture, its influence on our present writings can hardly be disputed. Few would deny the influence of Greek ideas in Proverbs, and even in Ecclesiasticus. Recent discoveries have proved that the section Prov 22 [17]-24 [22] comes direct from an Egyptian source, the proverbs of an Egyptian sage, Amen-em-ope (about 900 B.C.). Indeed, some modern scholars wish to elucidate an obscure reading in the Hebrew text by reference to an Egyptian original. Thus the Jewish author was not only familiar with Egyptian proverbs, which had long been suspected, but with the actual source. He, indeed, adjusted his material not only to Hebrew metre, but to Jewish beliefs. He omitted what he thought fit, but the significance of his borrowings is great. Unfortunately, the discovery affords no clue to the date of the present Book of Proverbs. Not only was there a tendency to recopy ancient compositions, but Egyptian influence in Palestine is possible at almost any date.

On the other hand, this kinship between Jewish and other wisdom must not blind us to its peculiar character. In contrast with Greek philosophy it deals solely with practical questions of life and conduct. The Jew possessed as little interest in or capacity for metaphysical problems as the ordinary Englishman. No doubt the observation of life leads to reflection on the problems that it presents, but the discussion always has a practical aim. Further, it always takes for granted the existence and sovereignty of God. Here we reach a second point in which Hebrew wisdom stands in contrast to philosophy. Philosophy assumes nothing, and exempts nothing that exists from criticism. Wisdom assumes the existence of Jehovah, and works downward from this truth of revelation to the facts of the world. Philosophy is, above all, a process of discovery. Starting from experience, it seeks to discern the principle of unity which lies behind the world of phenomena. Wisdom seeks rather to recognize the presence of the one God in all His works. To philosophy the knowledge of God is its supreme and latest achievement, which it has often failed to reach. To Wisdom God's self-revelation of Himself is its fundamental assumption. It seeks to view the universe with God indwelling in it. The wise men everywhere imply an energetic belief in Jehovah as the one living God. Again, when philosophy attained to a belief in a God behind the world, such a belief was often non-moral. Its God was rather a principle of unity than a personal God who made moral demands, and entered into fellowship with men. Jewish wisdom was preserved from this danger. There is no trace of a pantheism which finds God equally in good and bad alike. Rather the God of these books is the Jehovah of the prophets and of history who desires above all the response of practical holiness. He is a God who shows Himself in action on behalf of His faithful servants. The danger of intellectualism is to depersonalize God. To the wise men of Israel God is magnificently alive and supremely righteous in all His acts. In all this they are on a line with the rest of the Old Testament.

From this standpoint we must approach the personification of wisdom, which is first found in Prov 8 [22] ff. In the first instance wisdom is the knowledge of the principles of right living. To a Jew this was based on the fear of Jehovah. So, too, the orderly course of nature rested on the command of Jehovah. The wise man was able to discern His purpose in the lives of animals and plants. Granted that behind human life, lived as God intended it to be lived, and also behind the course of nature, animate and inanimate, there lay a single divine purpose, the command of the all-wise God, it was not difficult to treat of the wisdom of God thus exhibited as an attribute to be contemplated as it were in isolation. God possessed wisdom and acted according to it in creating the universe and forming man. Man's highest wisdom was to live according to the divine wisdom, which made and preserved all things. At this stage a poetical personification of wisdom was easy. In Prov 8 wisdom is depicted as existing almost side by side with God. But to go on and ask, as a Greek would, what is the precise relation between wisdom thus depicted and God Himself, is to do what no Jew would even desire to do. It is to pass from religious imagination to speculation for its own sake.

Even though some traces of a Logos doctrine may be found in early Babylonian hymns, we cannot but hold that for all its anti-Hellenism Proverbs owes this personification of Wisdom to the impact of Greek thought. But in the mind of the Jew its purpose was different. His interest was always primarily religious and ethical. The idea served to deepen the relation between God and His people. In Ecclus 24, and there alone, the momentous step is taken of identifying Wisdom with the Law of Moses, a step which had vast consequences in later Rabbinic thought. Otherwise, in Ecclesiasticus there is little development of the idea beyond Prov 8. In the Wisdom of Solomon, as we should expect, under Greek influence there is a considerable expansion of the idea of Wisdom. As there given, it comes to embrace all the divine attributes and to be the mediator between God and the world. As God came to be regarded as more and more transcendent and aloof from the world, Wisdom came to be viewed as the intermediary through which God sustained and acted in the universe. We are well on the way to the Logos of Philo, whose influence can be traced in the New Testament conception of Christ.* But in the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament such development still lies in the far distance.

To sum up, the Wisdom literature represents a distinct element in the religion of Israel. But in spite of its dominant interest in ethics and humanity, it remains both religious to the core and also aggressively Jewish. Its special contribution can only be understood when it is placed against the background of the prophets and the Law.

* We should prefer to say 'whose influence some scholars find in the New Testament conception of Christ, though to us it seems more probable that the Logos doctrine of St. John is directly derived from the Old Testament doctrine of Wisdom.'—Ed.

JOB

By A. Guillaume

The religious genius of the Hebrew people rises to its noblest height in Job. The book is unique in the whole range of Hebrew literature in that its poetry deals with one central theme; with consummate art the poet presents his subject again and again from another angle, only to arrive at the same point—the false doctrine of God against which he inveighs. It is unique too in that it is furnished with an introduction and a conclusion mainly in prose which explain the situation when the poem opens at 3^{2}. But its greatest value is in its indication of the road leading to a solution of the weightiest problem which oppresses the mind of the religious man—the problem of innocent suffering.

In general everyone may be said to be familiar with the outline of the book. A man whom God Himself regarded as a blameless servant is robbed of all that men value in life: children, wealth, dignity, worldly position, and lastly even health, are taken away. From what is said in the Prologue it would seem that these misfortunes were brought upon Job by the Satan. The Satan had denied Job's essential goodness, claiming that he behaved well towards God because God had blessed and protected him. He asks that Job may be put to the test of suffering, and cynically declares that he will then curse God to His face. To vindicate Job God allows the Satan to work his will on him. Though Job's wife actually instigates him to curse God, Job remains steadfast.

The scene is laid in 3^{2}: Job the once proud, happy, and generous chieftain of the desert is literally humbled to the dust. His miseries have so altered his appearance that his three friends, who have added the expression Job's comforters to our lexicon, when they come to 'comfort' do not recognize him.

It has been said that Satan is the hero of *Paradise Lost*. It is not less true—let it be said with all reverence—that Jehovah rather than Job is the hero of this book. It is Jehovah behind and through Job's suffering that dominates the writer's mind and finally evokes from him that masterpiece of human literature—Jehovah's speech from out the whirlwind. Jehovah in His heavenly council; Jehovah confident in the loyalty of His servant; Jehovah who let the blows fall unceasingly on the same trustful servant; Jehovah who marked all, heard all; Jehovah who finally vindicated His servant; Jehovah who created the earth and the mysterious wonderful

heavens; Jehovah whom truly to know may even be everlasting life is always before us as the absorbing interest of the several speakers.

Job's violent outbreaks are assertions (*a*) of his innocence of any great offence, his upright intention, and his many acts of piety and goodness; (*b*) of God's unjust and unjustifiable persecution of the innocent.

His three friends set themselves to the task of justifying God. But they never really touch the heart of the question. Their three cycles of speeches circle round the thesis (already ruled out of court in the Prologue) that suffering must be the punishment for antecedent sin. It is true that there is more than a hint of the disciplinary power of suffering, but, whatever the author may have thought of its value in the abstract, he cannot have wished us to suppose that *Job* needed such discipline: God's commendation in 1^8 surely forbids the assumption. The comforters in words of far more than popular eloquence are exponents of the popular theology, and until God Himself condemns them they remain unshaken in their belief. Their thesis was:

God is all-pure, all-powerful, and all-wise.
All suffering is God's punishment for antecedent sin.
God cannot punish unjustly.
∴ Your suffering is just punishment for your sin.

Job's anguish came from the fact that he admitted the first premiss, and (though he did not recognize it) sometimes went far towards admitting the second also. Thus Job and the comforters often went over the same ground in their speeches. Job admitted that God's ways were unsearchable, and that man could not hope to find them out, and at first sight it would seem that Jehovah's speech merely affirms magniloquently what Job had never denied. But this is not so. An only half-concealed dualism underlies the pain and the pleadings of Job—the dualism of mind and heart. Both alike told him that his friends could not be right: he had not sinned; his mind told him that God was unjust and had deceived him. His heart revolted against the logic of the situation, and with an upward leap he proclaimed his unshakable belief in God's ultimate vindication of His servant. It was a sure instinct of our forefathers which saw in Job the type of the Man of Sorrows. Job is a type of every righteous sufferer; but he belongs most intimately to that band of saints whose innocent sufferings are shown against the background of God's purposes —and that band in the literature of the Hebrews which has survived has no mean history, for it ranges from the Pentateuchal narrative to the Epistle to the Hebrews. Joseph (Gen 45^8), it is true, could say: 'It was not you that sent me hither, but God,' because like the Suffering Servant he could 'see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.' These suffered, one involuntarily, the other voluntarily, for a certain beneficent purpose. But of what use was Job's suffering? We are not told of anyone who profited by it, though, doubtless, if the Prologue were meant to be taken literally, we should expect to read that the Satan abandoned his cynicism and ceased to be man's false accuser. But the Satan was in no need of redemption. He had free access to God's presence, and the writer took no further interest in his fortunes.

The question: To what end was Job's suffering? is insistent. It cannot have been that God wanted to try him to see what he would do; for, as the Prologue plainly suggests, God knew. Jehovah's speech at first sight would seem to make the problem more difficult, for it justifies Job as against his friends. He *is* righteous. On the other hand, the speech condemns Job for criticizing God's ways 'not as they actually were, but as they would have been if the theory of suffering being always and merely penal were true; in other words, it is a condemnation of something that had taken place *after* the calamity had befallen Job, of something consequently that was not the cause of that suffering' (Gray, lx). When Jehovah calls on Job to explain the secrets and hidden forces of the universe he is bringing home to him his ignorance. Now theoretically Job had admitted that man could not understand God's ways; but practically he had denied it, for he had laid claim to the knowledge that God was not acting justly. It has often been urged that the author had no positive theory of innocent suffering to put forward; indeed it is probable that if he had one he would have hesitated to assert it, lest it should have baneful effects similar to those caused by the theory of current orthodoxy. But, on the other hand, if we have been right in seeing a dualism of mind and heart, there is an answer given: 'The deepest thing in our nature is this dumb region of the heart in which we dwell alone with our willingnesses and our unwillingnesses, our faiths, and our fears.' The mind re-

ceives a convincing answer; God is not punishing you; and the heart or soul of a Job is satisfied with the vision of God. We may not venture to speak with too much confidence of the meaning of one who shares to the full the capacity of genius for restraint (see Gray's illuminating remarks on what Jehovah's speech does *not* contain, lix), but many will remind themselves that the saints of all ages have felt themselves more than recompensed for life-long martyrdom by an incommunicable vision of the Deity. 'It is the overwhelming impression made on Job by the vision of God that leaves him at the end of the poem contrite and subdued.' (Peake). Job had preserved a faithful grateful service of his God amid a life of unusual prosperity, but would he ever have attained to the utterly unassailable position in which he ended his days had he not passed through a mist of suffering and tears?

> 'And methought that beauty and terror are only one, not two;
> And the world has room for love, and death, and thunder, and dew;
> And all the sinews of hell slumber in summer air;
> And the face of God is a rock, but the face of the rock is fair.
> Beneficent streams of tears flow at the finger of pain;
> And out of the cloud that smites, beneficent rivers of rain.'—R. L. S.

'I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear. But now my eye seeth thee; wherefore I abhor myself.' It is often profitable to see the Old Testament as the Jews see it; and the following passage from Maimonides (*Guide for the Perplexed*, 303, tr. M. Friedländer), who justly exercised a profound influence upon Jewish thought, is worthy of serious consideration: 'As there is a difference between works of nature and productions of human handicraft, so there is a difference between God's rule, providence, and intention, in reference to all natural forces, and our rule, providence, and intention in reference to things which are the objects of our rule, providence, and intention. This lesson is the principal object of the whole Book of Job; it lays down this principle of faith, and recommends us to derive a proof from nature, that we should not fall into the error of imagining His knowledge to be similar to ours, or His intention, providence, and rule similar to ours. When we know this we shall find everything that may befall us easy to bear; mishap will create no doubts in our hearts concerning God, whether He knows our affairs or not, whether He provides for us or abandons us. On the contrary, our fate will increase our love of God; as is said in the end of this prophecy: "Therefore I abhor myself," etc. (42 ^{6}), and as our sages say: "The pious do everything out of love, and rejoice in their afflictions."'

Job received no resolution of his intellectual difficulties. He is henceforward exalted to a sphere where speculation of this kind is not found. He has the peace of God which passeth all understanding.

Literary Problems.—There are several problems connected with the text which, though less in magnitude than those arising in many Old Testament books, have an important bearing on its interpretation.

(*a*) *Prologue and Epilogue.*—The theory (rejected by recent English commentators) that the *Prologue* is a later addition to the book need not engage us; for without the Prologue or some other explanation of what had happened to Job there would be no problem. Had it not been stated that Job's righteousness was divinely attested, that he had been a great and honoured man of wealth and substance, and that he was reduced to the condition of a diseased outcast, the artistically complete picture of the righteous man forsaken which we have now would be ruined. Further, it is possible that the Prologue hints at the author's view that suffering may be a test of genuine religion.

The reasons for rejecting the *Epilogue* are more weighty. First there is the obvious fact that Job's exaltation to a prosperity far in excess of that which he enjoyed before his trials seems to go back upon the main thesis of the writer. And our first thought is: Then after all the righteous *do* prosper. But this is not in itself a sufficient reason for rejecting the Epilogue. A modern tragedy would allow Job to die in his misery with or without divine consolation. But this book is not a tragedy, nor is Job its hero. The writer perhaps revolted against the unhappy ending—the remorseless logic of events. Like the Suffering Servant of the Old Testament and the New Testament Job was openly vindicated in the sight of men. And it is difficult to see how a generation whose hopes were bound up in this world could be content with anything less (or may it be said more?) than an earthly triumph. Thus the importance of Job in the history of revelation becomes apparent. The author has demonstrated that God allows terrible suffering to befall the righteous; he vindicates God's right-

eousness against the charge of cruelty or indifference, and then he is faced with the facts of life. A man of his intellect must have perceived that he was writing a conclusion which seriously undermined the rest of his work, and that he was implicitly proffering a suggestion that innocent suffering merited and gained great temporal advantages. He could not or did not, for reasons we are ignorant of, follow up his own inspired thought of a future life. But there it lay, and lies, with all its implications for future generations. No devout reader of Job can have failed to reflect that Job is a type. 'Whether Job existed or not, that which is related of him is an experience that frequently befalls mankind,' said Maimonides.

The writer, unless he could picture his Divine Hero welcoming his faithful servant into everlasting habitations, must of necessity show Him cognizant of Job's deserts by rewarding him here on earth. Thus the contradiction with all that has gone before is more apparent than real, because the writer's interest is centred in the character of God. And, moreover, Job had not asked for temporal prosperity, but for the vindication of his character.

Secondly, the Epilogue has been held to contain statements at variance with the poem as a whole. A clear case is $42^{7,8}$ as against 38^{2}. God has accused Job of rash and unjustifiable statements about Him. Here He says that Job has spoken rightly, and appoints him an intercessor for the sins of the comforters whom He commands to offer a burnt offering of many beasts. It has been suggested that here we have traces of an older form of the book, or at any rate of its prose portions. Ezekiel expressly asserts that Job could only save himself. This suggests the persistence of a tradition that he had saved someone else (though it may be an early form of the later belief in 'the merits of the Fathers'); and if the poem is as late as most scholars think, we must suppose that the author adopted his Epilogue ready-made, or that some interpolator rather spoiled his ending by underlining too liberally his master's points. This latter suggestion would seem to accord better with the author's care in developing his argument, and with what is generally agreed has happened elsewhere in the book.

(*b*) *The Speeches of Elihu.*—Some distinguished Old Testament scholars have accepted the speeches of Elihu as part of the original work: one or two modify this conclusion so far as to regard them as springing from the same author but inserted in the text later. But to the majority the following considerations seem to afford sufficient ground for regarding them as the work of a later hand:

(1) They can be removed not only without detriment to the scheme of the poem, but to its positive advantage. Job ends his last speech with his cry to Jehovah to come and answer him (31^{35}). Jehovah replies in 38^{2} with words which surely must apply to the last speaker: as this cannot have been Elihu, it is clear that Elihu's speeches have come between Job's appeal and Jehovah's answer.

(2) Elihu is ignored in Prologue and Epilogue. He has a prologue to himself —in itself a suspicious circumstance— and this may be held to dispense with a mention in the Prologue. But it is otherwise with the Epilogue. It is impossible to explain the silence except on the assumption that the writer of the Prologue and Epilogue knew nothing about him. On the merits of the case an impartial observer would agree that he deserved censure for sharing the opinions of the comforters.

(3) They mar the symmetry of the poem by recapitulating what has already been said and by anticipating much of Jehovah's speech. The disputants have reached a deadlock. The comforters have accused Job of hidden sins: Job has finally and unequivocally asserted the innocence of his life. Into this tense situation where the life of a soul is felt to be at stake the heavy sententious phrases of Elihu fall like the tedious words of the conventional bore. Of his four speeches no notice whatever is taken from first to last.

(4) Their style is pompous and studied, in strong contrast with the flowing eloquence of the other speakers, and there are marked peculiarities in the Hebrew (Gray, xliii ff.).

Doubtless Elihu is the creation of a writer who did not understand. He objected to Job's almost blasphemous language and to the Prologue, and he thought he had an answer to the problem himself. He emphasizes the value of suffering as a discipline and the reverence due to God; but he never really touches the heart of the problem.

Such are the principal questions which arise in the study of the structure of the book. Doubts as to the genuineness of Jehovah's second speech are indicated at $40^{4,5}$ *v.n.* Mere dislocations in the text itself are indicated in the notes.

Date.—It was once supposed that the

Book of Job was one of the earliest books of the Old Testament, probably because of the Talmudic tradition which said that Moses wrote it. But the idea has long been abandoned. Ezekiel's reference to the *person* Job is of course no proof that he knew of the *Book* of Job. It may be that when Ezekiel insists that Job the righteous could only save his own soul and not another's, he is combating a popular misconception to which the Semites have always been prone; but it does not follow that that misconception was what we have in Job 42 [8] *v.n.*, or that Job was more than a saint whose reputation for piety stood high among the people.

There is no external evidence of any real value in determining the date of the book. Ben Sirach (*c.* 180) quotes Job as mentioned by Ezekiel, which suggests that he did not know of the book, but this is most improbable. Therefore, as so often in Old Testament literary criticism, we are forced to rely on the evidence of the book itself. This is by no means as clear as might be desired, for the scene is laid outside the land of Israel, and considerable acquaintance is shown with the habits of nomads, or rather semi-nomads. The use of a number of words not found elsewhere in Hebrew, but only in Arabic, preserves the desert colouring. Job's position as a noble Arab Sheikh of great wealth and influence exercising a beneficent judgeship over his people is comparable with that of any of the great Arab chieftains to-day, such as Ibn Saud, the prince of Riyad, whose customs have varied little through countless centuries. It would perhaps be possible to deny that the civilized forensic customs presupposed in Job necessarily imply a late date. We cannot really say how Ibn Saud's remote predecessors arranged their disputes over land and slaves and crops. But it is hardly possible to deny that the archaic flavour which the author communicates to the book is imported. The prodigious length of Job's life, the mention of a coin only referred to in the Hexateuch, and Job's sacrifices without a ministering priest, taken together do suggest most strongly that the author has gone to Genesis for his background.

But we cannot judge the book by itself, for it plainly refers to other parts of the Old Testament, notably Ps 8 and Jer 20 [14-18]. And to bring it into its proper setting among the other sacred writings we are entitled to ask whether it shows traces of having occupied positions won for it by earlier writers. Its absolute monotheism would seem to show that the work of Deutero-Isaiah had been accomplished, while its developed doctrine of the individual irresistibly suggests that Ezekiel's great cry had been taken to heart. (This must not be overstressed, for nothing is said as to the fate of Job's unfortunate sons.) Again one fact stands out above all others, and that is that the doctrine of a future life was but just emerging. It is the glory of this book that it shows us a man in one supreme moment surpassing the religious achievements of the human race and opening to incredulous eyes new visions of new worlds. We conclude then that the writer could not have lived in or near the Maccabean age, nor is it likely that he could have preceded Ezekiel and the Deutero-Isaiah. The language of the original is not decisive; for though it contains many Aramaisms which generally (though not always) require a late date, on the other hand many features are characteristic of a comparatively early stage of classical Hebrew.

On the whole we incline to the date *c.* 450. As to the text, it may be said briefly that though the earliest form of the LXX omitted some four hundred lines of the Hebrew, it is not always safe to conclude that the omissions are not part of the original book (see further Gray, lxxi).

The 'Babylonian Job'

A somewhat parallel story has partially survived in some mutilated cuneiform tablets of the 7th century. These form part of what was evidently an extensive 'Wisdom Literature,' by which the Babylonians meant primarily magic and secondarily knowledge in its widest sense, yet tinged with an esoteric magic or mysticism. Professor Langdon (*Babylonian Wisdom*, 1923) holds that the Babylonian poem of the Righteous Sufferer 'was composed as a reply to the scepticism and pessimism which seem to have been prevalent at least from the 9th century B.C. to the end of the Babylonian Empire . . . possibly views which had already found expression in old Sumer itself.' The tablets narrate in rhythmical verse the sufferings of a righteous inhabitant of Nippur (not a king but clearly one in high authority) who was smitten with a sore disease, and felt himself the victim of the god's unjust anger.

Tabi-utul-Bel suffered from 'the frenzy of a companion,' so that his day was filled with sighing, his night with weeping:

his months were consumed in lamentation and his years in sorrow (cf. Job 7 [8] f.). He had reached life's allotted span and even passed it, but wherever he looked there was evil. Violence was multiplied, and justice nowhere to be seen (19 [7]) He cried unto god, but he would not listen nor show his face. His goddess and the enchanters afforded no help, though he sacrificed and enquired continually. Trouble pursued him like one who failed to make drink offerings or call on his goddess at meals; or one who had been irreverent in prayer or ceased to pray, who had withheld sacrifice and despised the oracles (?) of god. He was punished even as one who forgot god in his prosperity and took his name in vain; whereas his one thought was of prayer, supplication, and sacrifice. Divine worship was his joy, and he taught the people to reverence god.

But how little does one know how to please god! What would gratify a man is of little worth in god's sight. Who can understand the will of the gods? The counsel of god is full of knowledge: who can understand it (cf. Job *passim*). How transitory is man's life (4 [17]), alive at night, dead in the morning (34 [20], 27 [19], 4 [20]), always unstable, perishing with hunger or blasphemously arrogant when well fed and prosperous.

Then follows a particular account of his bodily ills, many of which are due to malignant demons. He was dumb in misery like Job; his sufferings are very similar to Job's. 'With a goad has he pricked me: fierce was the point. All the day long does the pursuer pursue me. In the night he suffers me not to breathe for a moment' (7 [13], 30 [17]). His limbs and joints are undone, and he wallows in his filth. The enchanters gave no aid, and god took him not by the hand. The grave was opened (17 [1, 13]), and lamentation as for a dead man already finished. His shame and disgrace was apparent to all, and his adversaries rejoiced. 'Heavy was his hand. I could not bear it' (23 [2]).

Unfortunately the tablets are broken here. But a hero appears in a dream in glorious raiment and cleanses him; his sins are taken away and he is restored. There follows a minute account of the healing of his organs, and the public recognition that Marduk has restored the dying man. The thankful man offers a multitude of sacrifices.

It would be impossible for anyone with the extant remains of the Babylonian story before him to imagine that the resemblances are accidental; but the differences are even more striking, and I concur in Gray's judgement that 'at present, at all events, it cannot be said that any Babylonian source of the Book of Job has been made out.' The sufferings of a righteous man are the subject of a didactic, and to a certain extent apologetic, poem both in Hebrew and in Babylonian. But the purpose and problem are different. Strictly, there is no problem in the latter, for the sufferer admits his sin, and the purpose of the Babylonian poem is not to show that there is no inseparable connexion between sin and suffering, but to discover how the sufferer has offended his god. Here, as often in Semitic literature, we find a tradition current among the peoples of the Arabian peninsula. From the same starting-point the Hebrew reaches a mark immeasurably in advance of his neighbours on every side.

Literature

Davidson, *C.B.*; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Job*, 1908; Peake, *Cent. B.*; Driver and Gray, *I.C.C.*; H. G. Wells, *The Undying Fire*.

Commentary

[*Everywhere the use of Driver's 'The Book of Job,' which shows when the RVm is to be read or disregarded, is assumed.*]

I.-II. **The Prologue** explains (*a*) the exemplary character and the great wealth of Job, and (*b*) the part that the Satan takes in Job's calamities.

I. 1-5. **Job's country, the land of Uz,** may have been Edom (Gen 36 [28]), Northern Mesopotamia (Gen 10 [23]), or the Hauran. The writer removes the debate from Jewish to neutral soil in order that discussion may be unhampered by Jewish institutions or Jewish legalism. **The land of Uz** might be a vague term for the range of a tribe, since Hebrew has no word equivalent to the Arabian *dira*—the area ranged by a Bedouin tribe. At the present day the great Anazah confederation of tribes pasture in the vast area comprised in the widely distant regions just named, and if a coincidence it is certainly remarkable that they trace their descent from an eponymous hero who worshipped the god *Aud* (=Hebrew *Uz*). Job may well have been the paramount chief of the great North Arabian tribe. The Edomite origin of Job's friends suggests that like certain sub-tribes of the Anaza his seat was near Teima. **perfect,** not without sin, but rather 'wholly sincere.'

3. **the sons of the east** are Arab nomads of Jer 49 [28]: famous for their wisdom (1 K 4 [30]).

4, 5. The tenses are frequentative: 'used to go.' **renounced**, rather *cursed*. MT actually says **blessed**, but this is either an ancient euphemism or a reverential emendation.

6-12. With this picture of the heavenly court must be compared 1 K 22 [19], where Jehovah sits on His throne surrounded by all the host of heaven.

6. **the sons of God** are (as LXX) *angels*: originally the words must have meant gods. (In Hebrew 'a son of' often means one who is of the same substance or possesses the essential attributes of the noun thus governed, e.g. 'sons of foreignness' = foreigners.) There was the less need to banish the phrase, because it lost its original meaning as a sense of the universal fatherhood of God and a belief in the divine origin of angels gained ground. The Hebrews with their imperishable belief in the Personality of God could not conceive of Him as dwelling eternally alone, and thus they believed that He communed with His angels.

Not **Satan**, but *the Satan*, the slanderer of man, *diabolos*. In Ps 38 [20] the verb 'to satan' is the opposite of 'to pursue good.' Here the Satan maliciously tries to withdraw God's approval from Job by attributing low motives to him. If he is not 'the tempter or instigator of men to act in opposition to God,' as Gray says, he is but little removed. By sheer brutality he tries to break down the resistance of the righteous; and the temptation he applies is awful in reality, though he remains unrecognized. Jehovah is proud of Job, and by beginning a discussion, provokes the Satan. 'His reason for calling his attention to Job is that He may cure him of his cynicism by pointing to so conspicuous a refutation of it' (Peake).

9-11. Jehovah beforehand more than confirms Job's assertion that he is righteous. But the Satan replies that Job's righteousness is merely payment for value received: withdraw his exceptional prosperity and he will curse God to His face.

12. 'Though the Satan had said "Put forth thine hand," Jehovah Himself will not smite. He permits the Satan to do it, but strictly limits his power' (Peake).

Those who are not content to glory in the Book of Job as a problem of life worked out with consummate thoroughness and eloquence with all the details subordinate to the great purpose of the writer will be driven to seek moral justification for Jehovah's abandonment of Job. We can say that Job may have suffered in order to convert an angel from his evil thoughts; but what of Job's children? If we treat the story in a dull pedantic spirit as anything but a story told for a certain self-defined purpose, their undeserved fate must be a lasting reproach on God's justice.

13-22. **Destruction of wealth and children.**

14. **The oxen were plowing.** Peaceful life is violently disrupted.

15. **with the edge of the sword.** Tr. always *without quarter*. The extraordinary severity of the calamities is heightened by the unusual conjunction of hostile forces from Sheba in South Arabia and from the Chaldeans who lived in Lower Babylonia.

20. Shaving the head was a rite of mourning: cf. Am 8 [10]. **fell down upon the ground**, not in the abandonment of grief, but in prayerful submission to God.

21. **thither** suggests that life after death is of the same unsubstantial character as embryonic life. Disaster so far has but revealed the depth of Job's faith and trust.

22. **foolishness** (*tiflah*), rather *unseemliness*—a loss of moral rectitude.

II. 1-10. **The Satan's second attack.** Here, as in 1, the dialogue between Jehovah and the Satan is in verse, prefaced by the same *mise-en-scène*.

3. **although.** Tr. *And so in vain hast thou incited me against him to consume him.*

4, 5. The Satan replies: 'If Job is made to suffer in his flesh he will yield.' The meaning of **skin for skin** (doubtless proverbial) has never been satisfactorily explained; but it is interesting to notice that the rest of the verse was probably in our Lord's mind when He said: 'What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?' Soul and life are often interchangeable terms.

6. Jehovah stipulates that Job's life must be spared.

7. It is abundantly clear that Job's sufferings come from the Satan, though God accepts ultimate responsibility.

8. Job was sitting in ashes as a sign of mourning for his children (cf. Is 58 [5]). The LXX adds 'outside the city.' In this unsavoury quarter, where the refuse of the town is burnt, the dogs and outcasts of the Eastern countryside forgather to this day.

9-10. Job's wife becomes the Satan's advocate. Both she and her husband speak in verse. Immediate death ensured by blasphemy, his wife asserts, is better than lingering suffering. Job's rebuke seems rather a pained and in-

credulous enquiry than an assertion: *As one of the impious women dost even thou speak!* Job's noble expression of resignation to the will of God of course refers to good and evil *fortune*. Nowhere in the Old Testament is it asserted that God is the author of moral evil. Cf. Am 3^6; Mic 1^{12}; Is 31^2, 45^7. **In *spite of* all this Job did not sin with his lips,** i.e. no blasphemous expression could be wrung from him.

11-13. The arrival of the comforters.

11. Teman was in the north of Edom, and **Shuah** not far away, though it is possible that a town on the Euphrates is meant. **Naamah** cannot be the place mentioned in Jos 15^{41}, and it too may have been in Edom. LXX describes Zophar as the king of the Mineans. This may have been what the poet intended to suggest. (I have known Arabs with no better means of transport than Job possessed who from time to time visit friends in places as distant as Damascus and Sanaa.)

to bemoan: to show grief.

12. The great grief manifested by the friends is described in order to predispose us to accept their utterances as the genuine opinions of really good people earnestly desirous of helping a friend in misfortune. Men of a proud race who humble themselves to the dust and sit in the place of the outcast with their unhappy friend may be trusted to speak from their hearts. Unlike the voluble peasants of the settled land they know how to maintain silence in the face of an overwhelming sorrow.

III. The First Debate.—Job curses the day that he was born, and demands to be told why men are given life when it holds but unhappiness and misery for them.

1-10. How great is the gulf between the happy praise-giving chieftain and the poor wretch who bewails that he had ever seen the light! Job is too miserable to notice outwardly the presence of his friends.

1. his day: plainly his birthday; Jn 8^{56} not so plainly. According to both Old Testament and New Testament the keeping of days has an importance: 'The days of the year had a kind of life of their own (Ps 19^3), and paid annually recurring visits to mankind' (Cheyne). This is a true saying which may well be read in the present tense by those who live in Christ through the Catholic year.

2. answered and said often means *began to say*, as here and frequently in the New Testament.

3. Fragments of primeval mythology and folklore appear here and there in this book borrowed from those heathen sources which the Hebrews both purified and beautified. For a judicious statement of the quasi-poetical use of mythology among cultured heathen who often knew the true explanation of the natural phenomena they personified see *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 33.

5. claim it. Darkness and gloom (RVm) are to assert their rights as the nearest relations (*goel*) of that funestral day. **all that maketh black:** read with an insignificant change of vowel *blacknesses*.

7. May no other be so unfortunate as to be born in that night!

8. Clearly mythological. **Leviathan** was the dragon which was supposed to swallow the sun when an eclipse was seen. It has been said that we only know of incantations to persuade the dragon to disgorge the sun. But such wizards would hardly be called **them that curse the day.** The poet appeals to the wizards to do what probably none had ever dared to do in order to make his day the terror and dread of the inhabited world.

9. the eyelids of the dawn (cf. 41^{18}), an exquisite simile of the first rays of the solar disc appearing in the eastern horizon. To realize its beauty one must have seen the first light of dawn in the clearness of an Arabian morning.

10. The day's unforgivable offence. **trouble** (*amal*) is an elusive word covering 'all the ills that flesh is heir to'; unremitting toil, the crafts and assaults of the wicked and the weariness resulting therefrom (**him that is in misery** [*amel*] in ^{20} is the person suffering from these woes).

11-26. Why was I born to such misery? Why could I not have gone straight to Sheol where all alike are at peace? Why is anyone born to wretchedness? My suffering is excruciating.

The present suffering has blotted out all memory of his former happiness, and Job can find no meaning in his anguish, nor—for a moment considering other unfortunates—in the unhappy lives of those who are weary of a life of misfortune. The description of Hades (*Sheol*) in $^{13-19}$ must be compared with 10^{21}. It is only desirable relatively.

12. The father who took him on his knees in token of paternal responsibility (Gen 50^{23}), and the mother who fed him, were the unhappy instruments of cruel fate.

13 f. Sheol at least can offer peace to great and small; the society of earth's greatest, wisest, and richest; there the turbulence of the wicked is stilled.

14. Which built up waste places for themselves, if correct, must mean *rebuilt* (cf. Mt 16 [18] *v.n.*), and is probably drawn from the practice of the later Babylonian kings whose pride it was to have restored the ancient glories of their kingdom. Some wish to substitute a word unknown in Hebrew and render 'pyramids,' suggesting 'impressively the placid sleep of those who lay buried in them' (*I.C.C.*). The text is to be preferred.

20-23 marks the beginning of the storm of indignation against God which is gathering in Job's heart. The Hebrew is *Why does he give light?* which can be translated impersonally as RV, but 6 [4] brings Job's real thought into the open. It is God he is thinking of.

22. RVm is right, and brings out the fierceness of the sufferer's desire for the death he is too ill to inflict upon himself.

23. The seat of the misery is the mental distress. He cannot understand why he suffers so, and God has shut out all access to further knowledge.

24-26. A more particular account of his own sufferings.

IV.-V. **Eliphaz** replies and endeavours to make six points: (*a*) 4 [2-5]. You once upheld the stumbler on life's path. How is it you cannot display that fortitude you prescribed to others? (*b*) 4 [6-11]. Put your trust in your religion and the righteousness of your life, for it is the wicked, not the righteous, who are cut off. (*c*) 4 [12-21]. Learn from a vision I once had that no man is really just and pure in God's sight, for even His angels are peccable. (*d*) 5 [1-5]. My experience has been that the wicked never take firm root: their children and their goods are an open prey. (*e*) 5 [6-16]. Man's heritage is loaded with travail: therefore resort unto God whose power to exalt and abase is infinite. (*f*) 5 [17-27]. Happy is the man whom God chasteneth. Be not discouraged: you will live to laugh at earth's perils and will enjoy a ripe old age.

Those who have suffered crushing losses and grave anxiety and endured the unsympathetic sympathy of the godly will inevitably feel that the speech of Eliphaz the Temanite has its place among the world's greatest writings. He is so well-meaning, and all that he says is so true: yet he utterly fails to console the man who has suffered the loss of all things. His concluding words are most unfortunate. Carried away by his eloquence he dares to affirm that his bereaved friend will live to see his numerous children enjoying a prosperity equal to his own. How hollow these words must have sounded in the ears of the man who had lost everything!

IV. **1-5.** Remember your ministrations to others.

2. Eliphaz opens tentatively. **grieved,** rather *irritated* (colloquially 'sick of'); lit. *wearied.*

4. A forceful figure for one in dire distress. Eliphaz hints that Job had ministered to others in misfortune as great as his own. He does not do justice to the fortitude Job had long displayed.

6-11. Only the wicked need despair.

6. of God is a correct gloss. The term is best expressed now by *religion.* Eliphaz is perfectly serious. As a religious man Job has nothing to fear. The innocent do not perish in misfortune. Hence it followed that if the facts of life often pointed to an opposite conclusion, the facts were deceptive and the man was a secret sinner. Here lay the sting.

8. iniquity (*aven*): lit. naughtiness. One of the ethical conceptions of the Hebrews was that of sin being nothingness, something which, though it could bring men to naught (Am 5 [5]), as it were, lay outside the kingdom of Jehovah. Thus it was peculiarly fitted to describe an idol (Is 66 [3]). **trouble** (3 [10] *v.n.*).

10-11. Wicked men are destroyed and dispersed like savage lions whose dens are raided. Lion hunting was a favourite sport of the Mesopotamian kings, as visitors to the British Museum can readily see from the many bas-reliefs representing the monarchs spearing and shooting savage lions.

12-21. Eliphaz's vision and its meaning. Lest Job should feel hurt by what he has said, Eliphaz begs him to remember 'the general imperfection of all created beings.' This was brought home to him by a vision which even now makes him thrill with its terror. Peake (*Cent. B.*) has an illuminating note on this passage.

13. thoughts: an unusual word here describing the uncontrolled vagaries of a trance-like vision, [14] which induced panic, [15] and *horribile dictu* became palpable.

16. It may be the **spirit** of [15], but there RVm **breath** is to be preferred, the wind which precedes a theophany. The *it* is the mysterious unnamable reality. The tenses are historic presents:

> It stands still! I cannot discern its appearance!
> A form before my eyes!
> Silence!—then I hear a voice.'

17. Most commentators abandon RV in favour of RVm on the ground that it is a commonplace. But (*a*) syntactically there is no *exact* parallel of the Hebrew *min* = before, and (*b*) Job's charge against

God necessarily involves the claim that he is more *in the right.* If RV is followed we must suppose that Eliphaz himself had once presumed to question God's providence, and then received this awe-inspiring vision.

18. The servants are the heavenly host. **he putteth no trust** is perhaps a little more than is meant. To confide oneself or one's cause, to believe in, these are the properties of man not of God.

19. Man's fate is to become dust, and that for ever.

21. He collapses like a tent without attaining wisdom, i.e. an understanding of the moral purpose in human existence.

V. 1-5. The folly of attempting to appeal against God to the angels, and the superficial nature of the bad man's prosperity.

1. holy ones, i.e. angels, holy not as to moral nature, but in that they to a certain extent share God's *separation* from man. Passages which deal with the intercession of angels are 33 [23]; Zech 1 [12]; Tob 12 [12]; En 9 [3, 10], and especially 15 [2].

2. vexation: properly chagrin. **jealousy,** better *passion.* Here we are in the same circle of ideas as are found in Proverbs (see p. 379*b*).

3. Cf. Ps 37 [35] f. **I cursed** seems unnatural, and it would be better to read *was cursed.*

5. Corrupt in [b] and [c]. Clearly it aims at describing the miseries of the bad man's children; but no confidence can be placed in any proposed rendering save that *snare* conceals the word thirsty || hungry in [a].

6-16. Man's woeful heritage.

6, 7. Though verbally plain are most difficult to interpret. Does Eliphaz mean that travail arises *spontaneously* **from the dust,** or does he mean that it comes from on high as Peake guardedly suggests? The latter is unlikely, because the order of words would probably have been different in Hebrew if the stress lay on the place of origin: yet unless we accept Peake's suggestion the logical connexion requires us to read 'For Man *begets* travail,' which on the whole seems best. **sparks:** lit. *sons of reshef,* i.e. tongues of fire, may possibly mean demons as the Targum asserts, though there is no evidence in support.

8. In contrast with [1].

11. Tr. *Who setteth up.*

12. Cf. the *Magnificat.* **enterprise** (*tushiyya*), another technical word of the Wisdom Literature (cf. Pr 2 [7]). It means wisdom in operation and result. Its etymology is obscure.

13. The only direct citation from Job in the New Testament (1 Cor 3 [19]). St. Paul does not quote the LXX. He gives the true rendering: the latter does not. One of the many interesting digressions in this book is the pungent criticism of Wisdom and the Wise (though here the shrewd and unscrupulous are meant). The author is in the number of the wise as his 'sophistic' vocabulary shows, but not of them.

15. Corrupt (RV) and devoid of sense. Emend: *But he saveth from their sword the fatherless and the needy,* etc.

16. Hebrew is practically identical with the familiar Prayer Book 'and the mouth of all wickedness shall be stopped.' (Ps 107 [42]). The incidental information about the contemporary society shows serious corruption. Administration of justice in the East has always depended on the character of the judges.

17-27. Temporary chastening will bring permanent happiness. All this is very beautiful, but to Job it seemed to make his load the harder to bear. He had not sinned, and could only believe that God tortured him without a cause or even for amusement.

17. A frequent thought (Pr 3 [11] = Heb 12 [5]; Ps 94 [12], etc.

18. Thus, though for some inscrutable reason we suffer, if so be we endure the Lord's chastening, we enjoy the comfort of His ministrations. This is a high peak on the mystic's road, but the greater Hebrews of old scaled it. In Christ the mystical sense of divine comfort is attainable by all.

19-23. In these verses the author in irony sets forth the thought of his day, only to show the weakness of it and its inability to answer the question which exercises him: Why do the righteous suffer? All these assurances were as those on which Job had vainly relied.

23. The stones agree not to invade his sown land.

24-27. The confident happiness of the godly.

25. Perhaps intended for a prophecy, but *v.s.*

26. cometh up to the threshing-floor when it is thoroughly mature and has fulfilled the object of its being.

27. We have arrived at this blessed conclusion as the result of prolonged experience. Endeavour to accept it yourself.

VI.-VII. Job's Reply to Eliphaz.—The friends have not fathomed the depth of his suffering. The animal creation does not complain without reason, much less rational man. God's venom has poisoned

the springs of his very soul. Why cannot He kill him outright? His friends, who should have been foremost in sympathetic understanding, have cruelly deceived him like a dried-up watercourse which lures the parched traveller to his doom. He did not ask for gifts to restore his vanished fortune, but only for human sympathy which would recognize how God had wronged him. Will they not accept the assurance of a lifelong friend, brought within sight of the grave he covets, that his life is innocent of offence? Then turning away from them Job speaks his real mind. O God, how canst thou treat me thus? If I have sinned, Thou that knowest all, why canst Thou not forgive me instead of watching me as though I were a dangerous beast? Nay, forgive me now ere it be too late and I pass to Sheol, and though Thou seek me I shall be no more.

VI. 1-7. Job justifies his complaint in 3.

2, 3. Wild though his words were, they were warranted by his unprecedented calamities.

4. The horror is that it is God Himself who has pierced him with His poisoned arrows.

6-7. Very difficult to interpret. Perhaps the *tertium comparationis* is Eliphaz's words. They are like a slimy plant, insipid to the palate, reminding Job of the loathing he feels for all food in his sickness. **white of an egg** rests upon Rabbinic exegesis, which is almost certainly wrong. Render *slime of purslain*, a plant producing an insipid jelly. Another possibility, that a watery exudation from a kind of curd is meant, is less likely. They would seem naturally to refer to the insipid food and the purslain just mentioned, though many prefer to connect the word with Job's sufferings (3 [24]). See further *I.C.C.*

8-13. Would that God would end his misery.

10. He would exult in the most excruciating pain if only death were its sequel. The last clause is almost certainly a gloss, and should be struck out.

11, 12. The pathetic cry of those condemned to die of wasting disease.

13. **effectual working** (5 [12] *v.n.*).

14-30. Job charges the friends with want of kindness and understanding.

14. It is hardly likely that Job at this point admitted that he had forsaken his religion, and we should follow Vulgate and Syriac and read *He that withholdeth kindness from his friend forsaketh the fear of the Almighty*. Job replies that it is they, not he, who have left the right path, and the following verses enlarge the theme.

15. **brook** (*nahal*): a comprehensive term for a valley and the torrents of water that flow down it: in winter abundant with water; in summer but hot glowing sand.

18. Read *Caravans divert their way. They go up*, i.e. climb the steep slopes of the wady to search for water elsewhere. Country answering to this description is found within easy walk of Cairo and on most of the ancient Arabian trade routes.

19. **Teima** is some 250 miles south-east of Edom.

21. Corrupt. With a slight change read *So have ye now become to me*, i.e. like this deceitful watercourse. **Ye see a terror, and are afraid**: they dare not side with him against God, although they must know how unjust He is proving.

24. If they will but demonstrate his mistake he will be silent.

25. **forcible.** A single Hebrew MS. preserves the true reading. *How sweet are words of uprightness* which Job would indeed welcome.

26. His friends concern themselves only with the cry of a desperate man, and neglect the issues of mercy and truth.

28. They dare not meet his eye.

29. Perhaps they were even on the point of getting up to leave him; more probably **Return** means from your hasty assumption.

30. He is innocent, and his power of moral discrimination is unimpaired.

VII. 1-6. **Man's miserable lot: Job's in particular.**

1. **warfare**: lit. conscript service. The conditions of compulsory military service, severance from family, loss of leisure and freedom, exposure to all weathers, wounds, and sickness, and the bending of one's bodily powers to a task repugnant to the religious man—a figure alike of Job's martyrdom and the miseries of Israel in exile (Is 40 [2]).

3. **vanity**: uselessness (cf. Ps 89 [47]). What possible good was there in the life he had to live?

7-10. A pathetic appeal to God. Life is so very short: so little time is left for him to enjoy anything. The grave never gives back its prey.

8 is not in LXX and is better omitted.

11-21. Job's indictment of God. Feeling that no response has been vouchsafed to his despairing appeal, Job demands that God shall explain why He so tortures him. The popular idea of the all-seeing Providence is a lying distortion of the facts. God watches, it is true, but His eyes

scrutinize (Ps 11 4) with unresting stare the unhappy sons of men. Can He not take His eye off him for one moment?

11. **Therefore.** Since God shows no consideration Job will not. At least he will give himself the bitter satisfaction of speaking his mind before he dies.

13, 14. Not even when he sleeps will God let him alone.

15. **bones**: emend *pains*.

16. **loathe**, rather *refuse* (9 21).

17, 18. 'A bitter parody of Ps 8 4: the Psalmist in adoring wonder at God's condescension; Job in disgust at God's suspicious pettiness.'

> 'God of our fathers, what is man!
> That Thou towards him with hand so various,
> Or might I say contrarious,
> Temper'st Thy providence through his short course...'—MILTON.

19. Contains a strong colloquialism (still current in Arabia) which illustrates Job's insolent freedom of speech.

20. **mark**, i.e. a butt not a target.

21. No confession of sin, but governed by the preceding hypothesis. 'Job still believes, in spite of all that he has said, that God is a God of love, who will one day seek earnestly to renew His former communion with His servant and visit him again with His favour, but he will have passed into Sheol and it will be too late.' (*I.C.C.*).

VIII. **Bildad Replies to Job.**—His is the mild speech of the orthodox religious man. He says (*a*) God cannot be unjust. (*b*) Job's children have perished because they were sinners. (*c*) If Job is really righteous God will abundantly increase his former prosperity. (*d*) Let Job learn from God's dealings with antiquity that He suddenly destroys the wicked and also rewards the righteous.

4. RVm is right. 'Bildad says *if*, from a desire to spare Job, but he means *because*' (*I.C.C.*). The allusion to the Prologue is unmistakable.

5. **thou** is emphatic. The fault lies with Job. In 9 Job shows how impossible it is to establish understanding communion with God who will not explain why he suffers so.

6. If thou *art* ... he *will*, i.e. you may count on His active intervention.

7. **should**, rather *shall*, a prophecy (cf. 42 12).

8-10. 'We cannot presume to draw a general inference from our fleeting observation, nor exalt our insignificant experience above the collective testimony of the whole human race.'

13. **paths**: emend to *end*. The fate of those who ignore God is to perish like the transient vegetation of the country.

17. **beholdeth**: dubious. Perhaps *pierceth* or *layeth hold of*. 19. Ironical.

20-22. Bildad applies the general principle to Job.

IX.-X. **Job's Reply to Bildad.**—(*a*) How can man establish his case with God? He will not answer, however many questions are put to Him. (*b*) Job admits His omnipotence and that creation is impotent before Him. (*c*) But this is not justice. It is impossible for man to arraign God. (*d*) He reasserts that God is not just. He slays innocent and wicked alike, and tolerates the awful miseries that the ungodly bring upon mankind. (*e*) Job cannot hope to vindicate his innocence against such an opponent. (*f*) What possible reason can God have for thus afflicting him? (*g*) Think how Thou didst frame and fashion me, and even protected and blessed me. (*h*) And it was only that Thou mightest persecute me in the end! (*i*) Why then didst Thou bring me into being at all? O let me alone that I may take comfort a little.

IX. 2-13 are remarkable in that they deal with the morality of omnipotence. The Semitic mind was singularly prone to assume that omnipotence was above criticism, as in Islam the long-drawn-out controversy on the subject of man's will and God's predestination well illustrates. Job dares to suggest that what is right is not necessarily right because God says so, for look what God is responsible for! In an age that tolerated no theory of secondary causes a grievous weight must have been thrown upon the conscience of the religious man.

1-2. Ironical. You are safe in asserting that God is just, because man, if he wished, would never have the chance of arraigning Him.

4. Irresistible might and all-embracing knowledge meet in Him, and none who opposed Him has ever lived to tell the tale.

5. **they know it not**, so quickly is it done. Syriac reads *he knows it not*, i.e. does not take cognizance of so trifling a detail.

9. Cf. 38 31; Am 5 8. **chambers of the south**: the new constellations appearing as the traveller went south along the trade route to Sheba.

11. 'Job knows that He has passed by the effect of His passage; like mountains overturned by the same cause, Job's life lies in ruins' (*I.C.C.*).

13. Mythological. Rahab's helpers were the lesser gods, who, when their

leader Tiâmat (p. 677*a*) was slain, were imprisoned by Marduk (Is 51 [9]). Jehovah, not Marduk, is Rahab's slayer.

14-21. Such a Being as this cannot be argued with. Job's bitter experience makes him assert that even if God answered his summons it would only be to overwhelm and silence him with greater terrors.

15. would I not *answer* (*because*) *I should* (*have to*) **make supplication,** etc. He would have to appeal for that which was his by right. **Adversary,** i.e. at law.

17. Render *For he would bruise,* etc.

18. *He would not,* etc.

19. *If* (*we speak*) *of the strength of the mighty, Here am I* (*saith he*). *And if of judgement* (*he saith*), *Who will appoint me a time?* God is always in a position to contest anything: none can summon Him.

20. *Would condemn me . . . I am perfect; and he declares me crooked.*

21. despise: better *refuse,* as 7 [16].

22-24. No moral order exists in the world. God connives at injustice and laughs at its victims.

22. Contradicting Bildad (8 [20]).

> 'Just or unjust alike seem miserable,
> For oft alike both come to evil end.'

23. A **scourge** which brings whole communities to ruin and disaster only moves God to mockery. **trial:** better *despair.*

24. Though we cannot deny that many comparatively innocent people perish by 'an act of God,' such as an earthquake or tempest, we can deny that Job is right in ascribing man's wickedness to God.

25-35. The hopelessness of contending with an adversary so powerful.

25 f. The inconsistency in bemoaning the brevity of life while professing a desire to quit it is extraordinarily true to human nature (cf. 21, 7 [6], and 7 [15]).

26. ships of reed: RVm is right.

27 f. Efforts to throw off depression are thwarted by a new access of suffering as though he were guilty. Notice that Job accepts here the friends' first premiss that suffering belongs to the guilty.

29. Render *I am to be guilty!*

33. 'The human heart yearns for a human God. The Christian answer is not at all in the poet's mind, but the need to which it responds was his deepest craving' (*Cent. B.*). At the same time it must be remembered that the sequel shows Job satisfied with God mystically apprehended but ever transcendent: his co-religionists have never advanced from that view.

35. I am not so in myself. Left to himself without the burden of pain he has nothing to fear from a God who is just.

X. 1-7. Job asks again the reason of his suffering.

3 f. tentatively suggest possible reasons for God's conduct.

4 f. Is God's justice as corrupt as man's, or His life so short that He must act like an inexperienced mortal? Job only troubles to refute the last suggestion: the absurdity of the other is self-evident.

8-12. A pathetic appeal to God that He will reflect upon His labour which will have gone for naught if Job's life is prematurely broken. The embryonic shapelessness given a definite form by the divine hand; the gradual building up of the human frame with its wonderful complexities; and above all the sense of God's favour manifested hitherto in His preservation of His handiwork—to what end were they?

8. Together round about is odd. Read with LXX *Afterwards thou turnest and destroyest me!*

10, 11. His birth was controlled by God. 'The human body is the noble workmanship of God: behind and in the human functions of procreation and gestation lies the activity of God' (*I.C.C.*). Quran, Sura 23 [12] f., teaches similarly.

12. Till now God's visitation (again cf. Ps 8 [4]) had been to bless and preserve.

13-22. A terrible suspicion now occurs to Job. Perhaps all this apparent care was only to put him off his guard so that when God smote him he would be crushed beneath the blow. So why need he have been born?

14-17 are probably hypothetical—part of God's secret plan: *If I sinned, that thou wouldest,* etc.

15. looking upon: better *sated with.*

16*b*. A sneer—God's marvellous power shown in persecuting helpless man!

17. thy witnesses. Job's 'sufferings regarded as so many proofs of his guilt' (Driver). LXX suggests *blows*: [e] read with *I.C.C.*, *And bring fresh hosts upon me.*

18. Cf. 3 [11]: *I ought to have given up the ghost.*

21 f. God was always felt to dwell in light and to be light. Thus Sheol, from which He withdrew His presence (cf. Ps 139 [7]), was unrelieved gloom.

XI. Zophar's Reply.—The third speaker is much less considerate than his predecessors. To Zophar Job has become an irresponsible prater meriting the stern rebuke he proceeds to administer. He has little to add to what has been said save that he presses the point that Job

has no right to claim to be righteous when God obviously does not so regard him. Let him repent ere he share the fate of the wicked.

2-6. Would that God would answer. You would then find the truth of what you deny. 2. A general rebuke.

3. A particular rebuke.

4 probably continues the interrogation. For **doctrine** LXX and Syriac have, probably correctly, *my walk*, i.e. way of life; Job had never claimed purity of doctrine, but rather of life. **thine eyes**, i.e. in God's sight.

6. **manifold.** The Hebrew means 'double,' which gives no good sense. Read *For they are marvellous in result* (cf. 5^{12}). The secrets hidden in the divine wisdom are seen to be marvels when their purpose is finally disclosed. [e] more exactly: 'God causeth to be forgotten unto thee some of thine iniquity.'

7-12. God's mysterious perfection is incomprehensible. It is folly to attempt to criticize His actions.

7. Render *Canst thou discover the unexplored things of God? Canst thou attain unto the perfection of the Almighty?* The same verb has a different nuance in the two halves of the distich (cf. Aramaic usage). **perfection** means *completeness*. Zophar disdains Job's inferences from finite piecemeal knowledge.

8. Alter to *It is higher than heaven.* Cheyne, 'Heights of heaven!' (cf. RVm.).

10. Replying to Job in 9^{11-12}. If he does pass through inflicting imprisonment, it is not, as you say, arbitrarily, but because he knows the sinner and punishes him.

12. Difficult. RVm may be right. Lit. 'A hollow man getteth a heart (the seat of understanding). And a wild ass's colt is born a man' (see *I.C.C.*).

13-20. If Job will make his peace with God he will yet enjoy renewed happiness. Zophar, like the others, promises the conventional happiness that ought to belong to the just. For all his harshness he is no more practical than his predecessors in the debate.

13. **thou** is emphatic. Even you have a chance of divine forgiveness.

14-15. Job's heinous sin is now an *idée fixe* with the 'comforters.'

17. **thy life**, not in its fullest aspect, but as to its duration (*heled*). *Though it be dark* (*now*) *it will become like morning* (*light*), in answer to Job's lament in 10^{21}.

20. A hard blow at Job who had vehemently expressed this melancholy hope.

XII.-XIV. **Job's Reply to Zophar and his Friends.**—In this, the final speech in the first round, Job is exacerbated by the false accusation made against him. He claims that the friends have contributed nothing to knowledge in general or helpful to him in particular. They have merely uttered platitudes known to the very beasts. All know that God rules. But the point is that He does not rule justly. He can be seen tearing down existing institutions and pouring ridicule upon the stately. To pretend, as do the friends, that all this arbitrary violence is righteousness in action, and to dare to justify God, is contemptible servility. Let them not think that it will profit them with such a God. He has no need of their puny support, whose right is His might. With a bolder upward flight Job determines to challenge God, and since the wicked cannot stand in His presence this itself is a guarantee of his innocence. But first let God cease to terrify him. Job then appeals directly to God to tell him why He persecutes a weak defenceless man. In any case man has but a fleeting shadowy existence. Cannot God in pity at least let man live out life's little day? When he lieth down it is for ever. Oh that there were a secret hiding-place, be it even Sheol, where he could bide till God's wrath had passed, and that then He would recall him to life! But man is doomed to lie in hopeless ignorance of the fate of his kin, his flesh and blood alive on earth. The only thing of which he is conscious is the painful degradation of his decaying flesh and of an ineradicable and indefinable sadness.

XII. 2-12. The sequence of thought is not always clear in this chapter, and some commentators prefer to strike out most of it. Possibly corruption and dislocation have occurred, but only those who have convinced themselves that the poet intended Job to marshal his arguments in strict sequence without digression need eliminate, or regard with suspicion, more than a few lines. Job sneers at his friends' wisdom. ([4] and [5] are obscure and probably corrupt.)

2. **the people.** The Hebrew has no article; emend *they that know.*

4. It is best to render *I am to be as one*, etc., and regard the verse as an indignant exclamation ending *The perfect man is to be a laughing-stock!*

5 is probably corrupt, but no emendation yet proposed commands confidence.

6*c*. *s.v.l.*, the RVm is probably right (cf. Hab 1^{11}; see *I.C.C.*).

8. **speak to the earth.** Tr. *the plants of the earth*, or emend to *the crawling things of the earth.*

9. RVm *by* = by observation of creation. RV = what animal does not know that God is almighty? A third possibility is that the preposition means 'about.' Who does not know about all these (facts) that God's power has wrought them? The connexion with [11] is then less elusive. All observe but all do not exercise critical judgement.

12. Since Job's whole purpose is to expose the hollowness of traditional orthodoxy, it is hardly likely that he said the aged were wise. We must insert **ye say** with RVm.

13-25. Job adduces instances of God's power and wisdom in which no moral purpose is to be discerned.

13. **With him** is emphatic, not with aged men.

16. **deceived and deceiver**, like 'bond and free,' is merely a proverbial expression for everyone.

17*a* has been influenced by [19], and can hardly be original.

18. He undoes the chains which kings have placed on others, and sends them away in the garb of a captive. Perhaps there is an allusion to contemporary or recent history in this verse.

19. **mighty** means the old-established families.

23. **and bringeth them in**, rather *abandoneth them* (reading different vowels). It will be seen that to the ancients God was held responsible for the folly, the wickedness, and the tyranny of man. The sudden change of fortune brought by war upon nation or ruler was attributed to Him, as was a man's deviation from his general course of conduct. Thus the problem of human suffering was much more difficult (*v.s.*).

XIII. 1-3. Job has nothing to learn from those who utter the obvious. His desire is to argue with God. Job, who has consistently impugned God's justice, paradoxically asserts that God will punish this iniquity.

4-13. His friends in their desire to justify God pervert the truth.

4. **forgers**: lit. plasterers, those who cover over rather than remove causes of offence, and so **physicians of no value.**

5. A silent fool may pass for wise (Pr 17 [28]).

8. **respect his person**, i.e. show partiality to, and especially in legal issues, to pervert justice.

12. **memorable sayings** are the traditional, uncritical commonplaces of the vulgar. Job says they are as dry as dust and as cheap as dirt.

14-22. Come what may, Job will defy God and demand to know the reason of his sufferings. He still maintains his righteousness.

14. Delete **Wherefore** (dittography) and read *I will take.*

15. The beautiful renderings of AV and its timid follower RV must be abandoned. They express the precise opposite of Job's mind at this stage. Render *Behold, he will slay me, I have no hope!* or, less well, with Hebrew margin, *I hope for it*, i.e. the death-blow. The verb is always associated with expectant, hopeful waiting. The second rendering can only be justified because Job has said before that he hopes for death.

16. Job says that his desire to come into God's presence to plead his case is an argument for his innocence,

19*a*. Cf. Is 50 [8].

20. Job turns to God and again appeals for a fair trial unharassed by disease and suffering.

22. Let God be plaintiff or defendant.

23-28. Job again asks that he may be told his offence. Why does God so torture him?

25. Will God deign to put out His irresistible powers against a fallen leaf which is carried along helplessly by the lightest wind?

27*b*. The limits of his daily walk are closely circumscribed.

XIV. 1-12. The sadness and littleness of man's life should move God to pity him and give him a respite.

1-2. No rendering can surpass the haunting music of these lines in the AV. But to be exact in rendering the original we ought to read *Man, born of woman, of few days and full of trouble, cometh forth*, etc. 'Man's frailty is partly accounted for by his origin; he is born of woman "the weaker vessel"' (*Cent. B*).

4. RVm is right, and unless the verse is a gloss (as is probable) the meaning is that 'original sin' prevents all from attaining absolute righteousness, and therefore God owes forbearance to all.

5. **Seeing** should be *If.*

6. **that he may rest.** Read *and forbear.*

10. **wasteth away**: a doubtful word meaning to be weak. LXX *is gone* probably rightly.

13-22. Job revolts from the woeful picture of man's annihilation. Wistfully he calls up from his imagination a respite in the grim darkness of Sheol whence God might recall him to renewed communion on earth. But the stern realities of life forbid such speculation, and he returns sorrowfully to the thought of God's persistent persecution and the wasting

horror of the second death in Sheol, where the slow corruption of the flesh can be felt.

16*a*. **But** should be *for*. [b]. Read with LXX *Thou dost not pass over my sin.*

18. **And surely**: *But.* Nature's hardest substances perish: what hope then has man of survival?

21. **they are brought low.** Better *they come to dishonour* (cf. Jer 30 [19]).

22. Knowledge does not survive death: but feeling does. 'Cf. Jdth 16 [17]: "they shall weep at feeling," viz. the fire and worm sent into their decaying flesh' (*I.C.C.*).

The Second Cycle of Speeches

The controversy now enters on a new stage. The friends are convinced by the violence of Job's language that he is a blasphemer whose wicked opinions are subversive of religion. Their belief in a mechanical retribution has only been strengthened. Job, too, believed that suffering was only sent for sin, and knowing that he had not sinned, under the force of his theory he was bound to accuse God of arbitrariness and injustice. Yet he alternates between the God of affectionate memory and the monster of his later imagination.

XV. **Eliphaz's Second Speech** differs rather in tone and emphasis than matter. He no longer treats Job with consideration, but accuses him of heinous crimes, and seeks to terrify him into submission.

1-16. A tirade upon Job's conceit and blasphemy.

2. **a wise man** such as Job claimed to be.

4. **fear**, i.e. religion **restrainest**: better *lessenest.* If Job was right then none would worship God.

5-6. Job, therefore, is both wicked and insincere.

7-10. Biting sarcasm. To know so much Job, forsooth, must be the oldest man alive, indeed the first of all to be born!

12*b*. Perhaps we should emend *And why are thine eyes lofty?* (cf. Pr 30 [13]).

13. **spirit** = the hot breath of angry passion.

14-16. Cf. 4 [17], 9 [2], 25 [4].

17-35. Eliphaz paints in darkest colours the fate of the wicked. They are never allowed to enjoy their wealth; they never have peace of mind; God's hostility destroys the foundation of their prosperity and they are overwhelmed in disaster.

18-19. There is a genuine Arabian flavour here. Eliphaz claims that in the good old days when his countrymen were uncontaminated by outside influences wisdom was correspondingly pure. It is unlikely that the land of Israel is in question.

21. The specious prosperity of the wicked which Job so envies masks a life of hidden terror.

22-24. The text is corrupt and it is best with *I.C.C.* to read: [22] *He believeth not that he will avoid the darkness.* [23b]. *He knoweth that his calamity is ready.* [23a]. *He wandereth about for bread* (*saying*) *Where is it?* [22b]. *And he is reserved for the sword.* [24]. *The day of darkness affrighteth him. Distress and anguish prevail against him.*

27. In the Old Testament **fatness** is associated with (*a*) prosperity, (*b*) worldliness, sensuality, and insolence towards God.

28. **inhabited**: better *ought to inhabit.* The Semites often regarded ruined cities as places destroyed by God: cf. Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament and in the Quran (wrongly) the ancient tombs at Madain Salih. **ready to**: better *destined to become.*

30*a*. Probably from [22a].

30*c*. Read partly with LXX *his fruit is swept away by the wind.*

32 presents no parallelism: perhaps emend *His palm branch shall wither before its time.*

XVI.-XVII. **Job asserts** that his friends have no sympathetic understanding of the feelings of a man in his hopeless plight. He has to contend with incessant suffering and is worn out. He accuses God of cruelty, and in pathetic words appeals to God against God. His only hope is the grave.

XVI. 1-5. Let us have no more platitudes!

5. We have no right with RV to supply an object. Read with LXX *And not restrain the solace of my lips.*

6-17. God has spared no effort to reduce him to misery.

6. Whether he uses self-control or gives way to his feelings his pain is the same.

7-8*a* are corrupt. Read . . . *and made me desolate: all my evil fortune hath laid fast hold on me. It has become a witness and riseth up*, etc.

9. **and persecuted me.** The LXX suggests a reading 'dropped me'; the figure then being that of a cruel feline beast letting its victim drop from its mouth only to play with it and mock its frantic efforts to escape.

10-11. Unless we delete, these verses should be transposed, otherwise the description of God's attack is broken up. The 'gaping' men are then God's jackals.

12. **by the neck**: a wild beast shaking the life out of its victim.

12*b*. Now, like an archer, God sets him up as a target, and after shooting all round him (RVm) transfixes his vitals.

15. **laid my horn in the dust** like a noble beast done to death. In *I.C.C.* it is suggested that horn stands for the forelock which was worn long in early Israel, and is still by Bedouin.

16. **foul**: better read RVm.

17. Again Job asserts his innocence in language probably borrowed from Is 53 [9].

18-22. Job appeals to Mother Earth to cry for vengeance on his innocent blood, and to God to aid him against his friends. The alternation and want of consistency are tragically true to man's conflict with the problem of life's pain and the existence of a just God. It is to be noticed that the possibility that there was no God never suggested itself to Job.

18. From Genesis to Revelation the blood of those who have been wrongfully slain is represented as claiming and obtaining the vengeance of heaven (cf. Is 26 [21] and *Cent. B.*).

19. This verse marks a stage in the way to belief in a future life half-way between 14 [14] and 19 [25]. After Job's death vindication will come. It is not at all clear how: for it is God who has slain and God who must avenge the blood. The only fact or theory which suggests an answer to the enigma is the Sacrifice of Jesus, the Son of God, Himself the Victim and Himself the Priest.

20 is clear. The LXX reads 'May my prayer come unto God. Before him my eye droppeth (tears),' which may be original.

21. Job does not perceive the paradox because he appeals to God's 'better self' against His own severity. Still, it is difficult to believe that this great writer has not intentionally portrayed the dual conception of God. He must have been aware of contemporary belief in the eternal and unchanging character of God.

XVII. 1-10. He continues his appeal to God and bitterly reproaches his friends.

3. Continuing the dual conception of 16 [20-22]. **strike hands** in ratifying a pledge (Pr. 6 [1]).

4. **their heart**: the mind of his friends.

5 is corrupt and cannot be satisfactorily explained.

6. **an open abhorring**: more exactly 'one before whom men spit in disgust' (not as RVm): but probably Versions 'a portent before them I am become' are right.

7. Vexation at unmerited suffering (6 [2]).

8-9 are regarded with suspicion by many as interrupting the flow of Job's lament and as contradicting Job's assertion that his sufferings make him abhorrent to the righteous. Still, the outstanding feature of this poem is the way in which the speaker leaps suddenly forward to a higher point whence he denies his earlier doubts. A slight change in one vowel would smooth away many of the difficulties urged against the integrity of these verses. *Let upright men*, etc. (reading the verbs as jussives). Job's great spirit desires that the moral indignation of good men will be roused against the world's wickedness and injustice, and that they will hold fast (as he does) to the right way.

10. From the imaginary Job turns to the real audience to say that he expects no such discernment among them.

11-16. His only hope is the grave.

12 is unintelligible and is best omitted.

13 f. Job passionately shows how hollow are the hopes his friends hold out. RVm does more justice to the vehement language of the original.

14. **corruption** is wrong: *the pit*.

15*b*. **my hope**: read *my prosperity* with LXX.

16 must be emended to agree with LXX. *Will they* (the promised hope and prosperity) *go down with me to Sheol, or shall we descend together into the dust?* In Hebrew the alteration is trifling.

XVIII. **Bildad's Second Speech.**

1-4. Bildad is indignant with Job because of his contemptuous references to the friends, and asks if he expects the order of the universe to be upset for his benefit.

2. **ye lay snares**: 'ye' cannot be right, and the idea that Job hunted or set traps *for words* is fanciful. If ever words were unstudied and spontaneous Job's were. MT must be abandoned, and we must read with LXX *When at last will you cease (to talk)? Leave off that we may speak!* The rudeness marks Bildad's anger at misfortune he is unable to alleviate. Those who are perfectly comfortable hate to be made to look upon hopeless misery.

3. **unclean**: probably 'stupid in *thy* sight.'

4*a*. To give the lie to 16 [9], 'He hath torn me in his wrath.' Bildad says Job has brought his sufferings on himself (of course by sin), and is a universal law to be broken in order to vindicate his alleged righteousness?

5-21. A description of the overthrow of the wicked designed to combat Job's assertion that the wicked prosper. The debate never really advances from its first positions, since the disputants cannot agree

upon the conclusions to be drawn from experience.

5. The tenses should be present in English. Bildad is stating what he thinks are facts of experience, he is not prophesying. 'The world is full of traps to catch the feet that stray from the right path' (*Cent. B.*).

13*a*. Lit. 'it eateth the members of his skin.' There is no authority for rendering **body**. With an insignificant change read *His skin is eaten by disease.* **The firstborn of death** is a fatal disease.

15. **that which is none of his** can hardly mean weeds (*I.C.G.*). It must conceal a word (? coals) parallel in meaning to brimstone.

17. **street**: better *Arabian steppes*.

19. Here the customary fate of the wicked exactly coincides with Job's plight.

20. Instead of 'ancients' and the 'moderns' referred to here many would follow RVm.

XIX. **Job's Reply.**—He protests against his friends' assumption of his guilt, and says that his miseries, which have been aggravated by the hostility of his wife and his friends and by the insolent behaviour of his servants, are due to God's malignant persecution. Cannot his friends find it in their hearts to pity him? He yearns vehemently for a perpetual memorial of his words. He cannot bear that the injustice which has doomed him to death shall go down to generations yet unborn as the just sentence of a righteous God. If only his words were recorded, none would dare to blaspheme against the truth! But—and the thought comes with the impact of revelation—he *knows* that his vindicator is alive. *He* may, and will, be dead, but the Eternal will arise above the dust and he will see Him. God will be on his side, and his heart faints with longing for the sight of God. Following as this passage does on the bitter language Job has used against God, it shows a profound knowledge of the depths of the human heart. Job's hope of vindication hereafter flashes out from time to time. He does not dwell on it. There is an *increasing* hope (cf. the stages 14^{14}, 16^{19}, 19^{25}); but belief in a future life is not the solution of Job's problem which the author wished to put forward.

1-6. Job again accuses the friends of harshness and unfair judgement. God, not he, is the culprit.

4. **erred**: a mild word, technically (though hardly here) used of inadvertent sins. Job admits that he may have committed venial sins, but they are not the business of the friends, for none dare argue that they deserved the overwhelming punishment he suffered. Some prefer to read the exclamation as a question. In that case [5] must also be thus read.

7-20. God ignores his cries, humiliates him, and removes his relations and friends afar off. Amid the dejection born of physical pain he has to endure the insults of servants and urchins.

7. *I cry out Violence! but I am not answered* (cf. Jer 20^{8}; Hab 1^{2}).

8. No escape.

12. Job is like a city besieged by innumerable foes. Probably [c] should be omitted, as a tent is not assaulted from prepared siege works.

13. **For he hath put**: LXX *My brethren have gone far.*

14-15 are wrongly divided. Read:

My kinsfolk and my familiar friends have failed;
They that sojourn in my house have forgotten me.

So low had he fallen that those who originally entered his household to seek his protection (*ger*) affect ignorance of his existence, and the slave women ignore his orders.

17. RVm *I am loathsome* is right.

18. 'The very children laugh at the grotesque figure he cuts when he tries to get up and hobble about' (*Cent. B.*). Contrast with $29^{8\text{-}10,\ 21\text{-}25}$.

20. **with the skin of my teeth.** This phrase has become proverbial in English, but it is meaningless. Deleting **and to my flesh** from [a] many read *with my flesh in my teeth* (cf. 13^{14}), where it is ‖ deadly peril.

21-24. Job appeals to his friends' pity. Would that his innocence were recorded indelibly. 'From God he turns to man in his desperation, but man fails him; and in a burst of sublime confidence he returns from man to God' (*Cent. B.*).

21. **touched**: *smitten* as in Is 53^{4}.

22. They are no better than God in their cruelty! **And are not satisfied with my flesh**, i.e. never tire of slandering me. In Syriac the *diabolos* is rendered 'the eater of the morsels,' and cf. Quran, Sura 49^{12}.

23. **my words**: all the foregoing declarations of his innocence **in a book.**

24. Engraved **in lead** with an **iron** stylus (Jer 17^{1} and Cooke, *N.S.I.*, No. 50). **graven in the rock**, the climax.

25-27. The thrilling words of AV must be held to be an unlawful paraphrase of the Hebrew, but it is remarkable that only in one particular do they depart from the general sense, viz. when Job says that

'away from' or 'out of' his flesh (not *in* it) will he see God. No argument for *resurrectio carnis* can be drawn from this passage (as in the Vulgate); but it expresses Job's conviction that—

(*a*) God will vindicate his innocence though he be dead.

(*b*) He will see God with his own eyes, though his flesh has perished.

Here, as in Is 53, attempts have been made to explain away all reference to a vindication after death. But they ignore the parallel passage $16^{18, 19}$ where Job is advancing to the height he has now attained. There he begs earth not to cover his blood, but to leave it pleading vengeance from heaven. Here he feels the certainty that he will see this vindication and his eternal Vindicator. Job's conviction is based on the reality of religious experience. Though he may not have thought out the truth that fellowship with the Eternal confers eternal life (Jn 17^{3}), yet he knows that he will see God; with the overpowering yearning for the Beatific Vision he obtains a temporary respite from suffering and the sense of disgrace.

25. my redeemer. If there is a word in English better suited to convey the meaning of the Hebrew *goel*, can it be that it is Vindicator? The *goel* was one whose duty it was to *redeem* a kinsman sold into bondage; to *redeem* the lands of a kinsman; to avenge his blood. These duties in practice devolved upon his next-of-kin. Thus, though it can be argued that Job looked to God as his *goel* to *vindicate* his innocence against false accusers and to avenge his blood, it leaves us with an impoverished sense of what Job felt. His sons (his natural *goels*) were dead, and his brethren, under the belief which he himself shared, that his sufferings had a supernatural origin, refused to help him. Obviously no man was guilty of his death, and he, now childless, needed no property. What he needed was the *vindication* of his character and the *restoration* of fellowship with God. The yearning of his bowels is the inarticulate expression of this latter longing for the triumphant appearance of his divine kinsman. If *redeemer* with its Christian associations implies more than is implicit in Job's ecstatic desire, *vindicator* implies less. **liveth**, in opposition to Job, soon to die. **at the last**: better *The Last* (cf. Is 44^{6}), where the divine *goel* is paralleled with *The Last*. **upon the earth**: *dust*. RVm is more probable as referring to Job's grave.

26*a* unfortunately is uncertain. The order of words is abnormal. Lit. *and after my skin they have struck off this.* RV perhaps conveys the sense. For an adverse criticism (justly) on all proposed emendations see *I.C.C.* **from my flesh** is ambiguous. *Away from*, i.e. *without my flesh*, is much more probable in the context.

27. Whom I shall see for myself. 'The pronoun is emphatic—*I*, of whom this might be deemed incredible' (Driver). **for myself**: RVm is equally good. **and not another**: *I.C.C. unestranged*, excellently. **My reins** (*renes*, kidneys, the seat of intense feeling) **are consumed**: better *fail with longing* as in Ps 84^{2}.

28-29. Descending from the heights, but still full of the conviction that he will be vindicated ultimately, Job warns his friends of the danger of provoking the wrath of heaven by their cruel injustice towards him.

XX. Zophar's Second Speech.—The approaching deadlock is near. Zophar has little if anything to add to the substance of the debate, though his forceful distichs paint a dreadful picture of the transitory prosperity of the wicked whom God punishes in this world and forces to disgorge their gains. **2***a*. RVm is right.

3. *The reproof which putteth me to shame must I hear?* (answering Job in 19^{3}, where the verb is the same). *And with wind void of understanding dost thou answer me?* (cf. LXX and 8^{2}; 15^{2}).

4. There is no need to insert a *not*. The question is a mocking one.

7. doth perish. For the rest of the chapter the verbs should be understood as statements of observed facts of life: thus best rendered by the English present tense.

8. 'They fly forgotten as a dream dies at the opening day.'

10. RVm is possible, but the text is better. Read *their* hands.

11. of his youth: AV *of the sin of his youth*, though not to be understood of premature death through debauchery, has some justification in Arabic (a language which alone explains many words in this book), where it is used of unbridled lust.

12 f. The darling sins.

16. This, like the next verse, is best read as an imprecation.

17. May he never behold the channels of *oil*, the streams, etc., with a slight change.

18*b*. **According to.** *In*, the slightest possible change, would agree better with sense and syntax.

19*b*. **shall not build it up**, i.e. enjoy its possession.

20. Quietness in his belly: the seat of his gluttony is ever clamorous.

20*b*. He doth not escape with his choicest possessions.

22. He is destroyed by those he plundered.

23*a*. Not in the original LXX. A tristich is comparatively rare in Job, and may indicate that the text is corrupted. Here a mention of God is desiderated, and I suggest reading 'yehelmehu el betubho': *God smites him down in his prosperity.*

26. A fire not blown, i.e. either mysterious spontaneous combustion, or, more probably, lightning, 'the fire of God' (cf. 1 [16]).

27. 'A reference to 16 [18], 19 [25] f. is far from certain' (*I.C.C.*). If there *is* a reference, this is the cruellest thing the friends can say.

28 and 27 ought probably to be transposed. They begin with the same consonants, and [27] must surely be the climax. **depart:** better *goeth into exile.*

28*b*. RV bad. Tr. *As things washed away* (or *poured out*) *in the day of his wrath.*

XXI. **Job's Reply.**—With this speech the second cycle ends on a lower level than Job had reached. He ceases to reflect on his personal relation to God, and is concerned with the *fate* of men in general. He gives a flat denial to Zophar's statement. The wicked live to a ripe old age, and though doubtless some suffer calamities, how often does that happen? As for the punishment of the children, how can that affect the wicked when he is dead? How vain is that comfort which is directly contrary to observed facts!

2-6. Job asks that the friends will make an effort to grasp the problem.

2. Cf. 15 [11]. **4. Of man:** RV.

6. Job is appalled at the lack of justice in God's government of the world.

7-21. The problem: why do the wicked live happily and die quickly and easily. They even openly repudiate God and still prosper. It does not injure them if their children happen to suffer.

8 f. A picture of pastoral happiness in contrast with the patent contempt of God.

16. Difficult. RV means the prosperity of the wicked is not in their own power but God's. RVm makes the words an objection of the friends quoted by Job. But we cannot feel any confidence in a rendering which supplies the crucial words. It is best to insert a letter, and read *Is not their prosperity*, etc., in harmony with the context.

16*b*. occurs in 22 [18]. Job disclaims any desire to prosper by such means.

17. How oft. It may sometimes happen but rarely (cf. Bildad in 18 [5, 12]).

17*c*. is probably the corrupt remains of a distich. Disregard RVm.

19. Ye say labours under the same objection as [16] RVm. Read *Let him not lay up his iniquity for his children!* This gives a much more vigorous sense, and comes to the rescue of the syntax. In common with Jeremiah and Ezekiel the writer emphasizes personal as against family or communal responsibility for sin.

22-26. To represent the facts of life as other than they are is to presume to teach God. Men die comfortably or miserably, and no universal law by which their fate is governed is to be discerned.

27-34. Job is not ignorant of the drift of their thoughts. But any traveller could have told them that there are numerous instances of the wicked prospering, and they do not lack imitators.

27. wrongfully imagine: a word implying violent treatment.

28. They imagined that they cou'd point to the ruined dwellings of the godless of earlier generations.

29. tokens, i.e. typical illustrations.

30. RVm must be right.

31. The wicked escape the rebuke of men as well as the punishment of God.

32. keep watch, either as sentient himself, or, perhaps **watch is kept.**

34. As RVm.

The Third Cycle

XXII. **Eliphaz's Third Speech** is curiously illogical. He seems to deny that God cares whether Job is righteous or not. This is contrary to Old Testament teaching, which constantly affirms God's loving interest in those who seek to do His will. Probably it is an instance of over-emphasis. God cannot profit by man's righteousness, nor can He suffer loss by his sin. Nevertheless He does care in that He rewards the former and punishes the latter. Eliphaz then accuses Job of hard-hearted cruelty towards the helpless, and attributes his sufferings to his past iniquities. Job has imagined, like sinners in all ages, that God has not noticed his wrongdoing. Let him repent and turn to God, who will yet restore him to favour.

2-5. The old axiom: Suffering is due to sin. God is impartial and aloof.

2. It is man who gains by righteousness, not God.

4-5. Since God does not punish the religious man, it is obvious that Job must be an outrageous sinner.

6-14. Job's sins and impiety.

8. 'The third person to make the

words more exasperating' (*Cent. B.*: cf. Is 22 [16]). **10.** The logical result.

11*a*. Follow LXX *Thy light is darkened.*

12 f. Eliphaz has asserted that God was unaffected by human action; he now warns Job against the error of the wicked, who suppose that He does not see what is going on in earth so far below (cf. Ps 14 [2] and 10 [4]).

13 f. Job had not denied that God could see and judge, but only that He did not judge.

15-20. History proves that the wicked perish mid the scorn of the righteous.

17, 18. 'An elaborate retort in Job's own words to Job's assertion' (*I.C.C.*). Many scholars regard these verses as a later addition. They do not assist the context.

21-30. The only hope is repentance and amendment: cf. Eliphaz's first speech.

21*a*. Acquaint, i.e. adjust thyself to the recognition of God's ways and laws. The two imperatives make a conditional sentence.

22. the law: not, of course, the law of Moses, but direction from God's accredited ministers: Eliphaz in 4 [12] f. would seem to regard himself as one.

23. built up: read with LXX *and humble thyself.*

24. I.e. throw it away as worthless because it was ill-gotten. Job's money would be all that was left to him. If Eliphaz was sincere he was calling for an immense venture of faith from a man who had so grievously suffered.

25. precious is a guess; but as increasing knowledge of the metallurgical terms of the ancients has confirmed the Hebrew text elsewhere, it seems premature to emend here.

27*b*. The thankoffering vowed if the prayer were granted.

29*a*. Hebrew is untranslatable. Emend *God casteth down pride.*

30 contains a fine thought which is obviously alien to the context unless it is a prophecy of 42 [8] (which is unlikely). Perhaps read *He delivereth the innocent man, and thou shalt be delivered,* etc.

XXIII.-XXIV. Job's Reply to Eliphaz.—Job reiterates his innocence and his confidence that God would have to acquit him could Job only compel Him to appear. As He will not confront him, Job feels there is no escape. He will be overwhelmed in misery and darkness. This indeed is the lot of many others. God takes no notice of the suffering caused by the wicked. Job longs to find God, but He is not to be found. The text is in great disorder in some places, and passages which seem to point to the unhappiness and punishment of the wicked are probably glosses.

XXIII. 2-7. If he could only get at God to reason with Him!

2*a*. to-day, as much as yesterday—there has been no respite to his suffering.

2*b*. Read *His hand is heavy upon my groaning.*

6. The amazing thing is that when God answers He does contend with Job in the greatness of His power, and yet in answering at all He gives heed to Job.

7. The upright is Job.

8-17. God is nowhere to be found. His ways are inscrutable, and none can influence Him.

8-9. forward . . . right hand. These terms might equally well mean the points of the compass. God sees all Job's futile movements while He Himself is terribly and mysteriously invisible. **when he doth work:** no doubt Syriac *I seek him* is right, as also *I turn myself* for *he hideth.*

10. But: better RVm *For,* giving the reason why God hides Himself. He does not want to be reasoned with and forced to alter His actions. Some scholars regard [8] and [9] ([8] is not in LXX) as an addition. If so, RV is right, and this verse gives the ground of Job's confidence. God will justify Job if He meets him face to face.

11. It is unconsciously assumed by Job that God's way is right. This unconscious equation of God and righteousness is witness of the writer's profound conviction that God *is* right.

12. more than my necessary food: Hebrew *hoq* (cf. Pr 30 [8] and 31 [15]); cf. RVm. Read *in my bosom* with LXX and Vulgate. The alteration in Hebrew is very slight.

13. he is in one mind. RVm is better, but we hardly have the right to read unity of will and purpose into the words of one who dares to accuse God of arbitrary and capricious conduct. Emend *He hath chosen.*

14. A somewhat obscure statement of predestination. God will fill up the measure of his predetermined sufferings. Many such are in His mind.

17. Most difficult. Driver and others explain: Job is not overwhelmed by the darkness of calamity, but by the unjust providence to which it seems due. This is improbable, and it seems best to strike out the negatives and render:

Because I am cut off before the darkness,
And thick darkness covereth my face.

XXIV. 1. This chapter is more of a soliloquy than an argument. Job ranges

the world of his day to furnish examples of human misery whether due to the harshness of nature or the cruelty of man. Why does not God fix certain days (in different epochs) in which to right all these anomalies? The 'days' of the ancient Arabs were days of victory over enemies. Here, perhaps, days of judgement are meant. The enemies of God are—or ought to be, Job asserts—the wicked. He owes these days of retribution to his friends as well as his enemies.

2-4. The abominable cruelty of the ungodly.

2. Supply the subject *wicked men* from LXX. After [3] it is best to insert [9].

5-12. The hard lot of the poor. There is no apparent connexion between this and the preceding class of unfortunates.

5. These are the poorest and most wretched of nomads, whose existence is one long struggle against the sterility of the Arabian steppe-land.

5*b* is lit. *The steppes are his as food for the children* (*sc.* and we know how little that is).

6. **provender**: the word means the mixed fodder of cattle, but probably read *They reap in the field by night, And from the vineyard of the rich they glean the late ripe fruit.* Only at night dare they appear, and that when the ingathering is over.

8. **showers of the mountains** are no gentle rain, but devastating winter torrents which swirl through hundreds of miles of country carrying all before them (cf. Mt 7 [27]).

10, 11 are confused. [10a] looks like a doublet of [7a]; [10b] and [11b] evidently go together, but refer to oppressed labourers or slaves. [11a] is possibly a variant of [6a].

12. The text could be read *From out the city the dying groan*—a better parallelism.

12*c*. The addition of one letter gives: *While God heareth not their prayer!*

13-17. The murderer, the thief, and the adulterer. 14. Read *Before the light.*

14*c* is corrupt. Emend *And in the night the thief goeth about*, and put after [15].

16. Cf. Mt 6 [20]. The mud walls of poorer houses can easily be dug through.

16*b*. RVm is possible, but against parallelism. Insert *all of them* here from [17].

17. *Their morning is the deepest darkness,*
For they recognize the terror of darkness.

18-21. Unusually corrupt and unintelligible. RVm by attributing the words to Job's friends tries to avoid the inherent difficulty in that Job is asserting that the wicked are punished. But there is no authority in the text for this assumption. Possibly the verses are misplaced and belong to Bildad's speech in 25.

21. **devoureth**: perhaps *wrongeth.*

22-23. RVm is right. The words are indubitably Job's. God, as it were, goes out of His way to favour tyrants by allowing them to recover from serious illness.

24 is a gloss, unless it means that the wicked die swiftly and easily in a ripe old age. For as all other LXX has 'like mallows,' which is almost certainly right.

XXV. **Bildad's Third Speech.**—At this point the measured order of the book receives a check. Hitherto each friend has spoken at length and Job has answered him. There are two such cycles, and this, the third, has begun normally: Eliphaz has spoken and been answered. Now Bildad offers a few sentences, some of them borrowed, and Zophar does not speak at all. We could acquiesce in the older view that the poet wished to convey that the friends' case was exhausted were it not that (*a*) most of 27 contradicts Job's previous utterances, and (*b*) a title is prefixed to it ascribing it to Job, when, *as it stands*, it is one uninterrupted speech of his. But if we assume that a leaf or two of the original text has been lost, and that the remainder has become dislocated, it is easy to recognize in the words of Job which do violence to his whole argument the remnants of Bildad's (or Zophar's) third speech. The rearrangement suggested is: Bildad 25, 26 [5-14]; Job 26 [1-4], 27 [1-6]; Zophar 27 [7-23]; Job 29-31.

1 f. Bildad echoes what Eliphaz has said (4 [7] f., 15 [14] f.). God, whose might is manifested in conflicts in the heavens, is irresistible on earth. What folly, then, for man to oppose His verdict or to criticize His actions!

2 may refer to war in heaven: God's primeval conflict with the powers of chaos, or to a Miltonic battle with rebellious angels. The former is more probable.

3. Peake's proposal to make 26 [5-14] the sequel to this verse is most attractive.

4-6 probably belong to a lost context of 4 [17] f., 15 [14] f.

XXVI. **Job's Reply to Bildad (?).**—Some have thought that [2-4] are a part of Bildad's speech, but language and thought are in keeping with the ascription in the text. The speaker is sarcastic in praising his friend for the comfort received from his last speech: such helpful words must have been inspired! [5-14]. A magnificent poem on God's almighty acts. The poet,

by using earlier and already discredited mythology, evokes both awe and wonder at God's greatness—felt to the full by a people who saw God's operation in every change of wind or sky. By ascribing these verses to Bildad the sequence of thought is much clearer.

2-4. plentifully: if 25 [1-6] is really all that Bildad said, this word is doubly sarcastic.

5-14. Continuing Bildad's speech in 25 [3]. God who makes peace in heaven above can inspire terror in Sheol beneath.

5. Read RVm **the shades.** 'To the author of Is 14 [9] f. it denoted . . . the weak and feeble survivals of once lusty beings of flesh and blood' (*I.C.C.*). The 'giants' of the versions are apparently due to Dt 2 [11,20]. **the waters** under the earth. **the north,** either the northern heavens or the mountainous region of the earth. Since the heavens are constantly spoken of as being *stretched* out in the contemporary Deutero-Isaiah, it is probable that the former is the meaning. The wonder was how this covering was held up in the middle. At the horizon it had the mountains (see [11]). **hangeth the earth upon nothing** means that nothing is above it from which to hang it. **over nothing,** i.e. nothing supports it from beneath.

8. The clouds full of water do not burst.

9. The throne of God was above the firmament of the heavens (as in Ezek 1 [26]). Men could not see its face because of this solid firmament and the clouds which so often intervened.

10. Render *He hath marked out a circle,* i.e. the horizon of the waters surrounding the earth. **Unto the confines of light and darkness,** or, *as far as.* Here we have one of the most ancient of ideas—the separate existence of light and darkness, the central dogma of Zoroastrianism. Chaos below and away from the earth was to the Hebrew the realm of outer darkness, as terrifying as our concept of 'spatial infinity.'

11. The pillars of heaven are the supporting mountains which quake at God's anger.

12. An allusion to a purified and idealized myth now familiar to us in its cruder Babylonian form (see p. 41*a*). It may seem strange that the Hebrew is susceptible of opposite meanings: 'stilleth' or 'stirreth up.' But both can be paralleled in the Old Testament (cf. 9 [13] *v.n.*; Is 51 [9]; Ps 89 [10]).

13*a*. By His wind the heavens become serene. [b] is generally taken to mean the serpent that swallowed the sun at an eclipse. But LXX 'the bars of heaven shuddered at him' may contain an allusion to a forgotten mythology.

14. The indistinct whisper which reaches us should remind us that we stand at the furthest extremity. How can we hope to understand the power which might well annihilate us could we approach the Presence!

XXVII. As we have seen, Job has already answered the preceding in 26 [2-4] to the effect that Bildad's words are obvious and have no bearing on the controversy. Now he renews his assertion of his integrity. Clearly there is much in this chapter which will not fit in with Job's consistent utterances, and doubtless scholars are right in claiming such passages as fragments of Zophar's third speech.

1-6. Job swears by God that he has not sinned.

1. A later insertion.

2. God is the oppressor, and [3] while Job lives he will not cease to proclaim the fact.

5. justify, i.e. admit you to be right.

6. RVm is preferable.

7-10. The Third Speech of Zophar (?)—With [13-23] these verses preach orthodox doctrine of the miseries of the wicked. They cannot form part of Job's speech (cf. 21 [7] ff., [29-33]!), and every scholar ascribes them to one of the friends, preferably Zophar, whose last speech is missing as the text stands.

7. The point is: The wicked are so harassed and punished that I only hope my worst enemy may meet a wicked man's fate.

8*a*. The last clause should be deleted as a gloss.

8*b*. Some tr. 'when God requireth his soul' (cf. Lk 12 [20]). As we have seen, the hope of a future life was only now dawning, and it is difficult to see how any distinction could be made between saint and sinner in the hour of death. Possibly, however, the speaker is hinting that God may relent, as in Hezekiah's case, and restore the righteous sufferer to life and health, whereas the wicked can hope for no reprieve.

11-12 must be part of Job's speech because of the second person plural pronouns. It is thought that they were originally the prelude to an unrestrained attack upon God's dealings with man which later orthodoxy suppressed.

13-23. More of Zophar's Third Speech.—The miseries of the wicked.

13. Cf. 20 [29], where Zophar uses much the same words.

14. Cf. the fate of Job's sons!

19. Follow the hint in RVm.

XXVIII. **A Poem on Wisdom.**—On exegetical and linguistic grounds it may be asserted that this beautiful poem is not an integral part of our book. Like Elihu's speeches it anticipates Jehovah's speeches (cf. ^{26} with 38^{25}). Its purpose is to affirm that the Divine Wisdom is unattainable by man, and it is probably a Hebrew polemic directed against the Hellenizing party in Palestine who would fain exalt the 'wisdom' of Greek philosophy above the prophetic conception of 'the knowledge of God,' i.e. life ruled in accordance with a revelation of the Divine Will communicated to Israel. Wisdom, says the writer, is Divine; and being Divine is unattainable by man. Man, it is true, possesses knowledge by which he achieves and discovers things unknown to the rest of creation, but this is not Wisdom. The fundamental principles governing the conduct of the universe are unknown to man; in fact the dead, who retain some consciousness of a wider experience and another state, only lay claim to having heard a rumour thereof. But, as a concession to those who would pretend that wisdom can in some measure be found by man, the writer ends with the consoling note that 'the fear of the Lord is Wisdom.' This is as much as to affirm that, though it is vain to attempt to discover Wisdom through the philosophical schools, the traditional religion of Israel contains a Wisdom which God has communicated to man and by which he can live (cf. Pr 1-7 *v.n.*). It has been revealed to Israel that true intellectual distinction (Hebrew *bînah*) is to depart from moral evil. Here is a wonderful affirmation that *sophia* is religious, moral, and ethical: as necessary and important for the writer's age as Amos's assertion that religion is inseparable from morality.

(Those who desire to believe that this poem really belongs to the Book of Job will find a valuable statement for and against the possibility in *L.O.T.*^{9}, 423. But it cannot be too emphatically said that questions of authorship are entirely secondary to, and apart from, questions of doctrine and religious truth. The inspiration of the Old Testament writers was not confined to the original authors of the various books. It can belong as well to their editors or revisers. And literary criticism, while helping the scholar to visualize a development consonant with known historical conditions within the sacred writings, in no way invalidates the authority of Holy Scripture. We must not add to 'This passage is late' the thought 'and therefore discredited.' To post-date Old Testament oracles is to bring them nearer in time and sometimes in thought to the teaching of our Lord.)

1-11. **What man can search out.** In his puny sphere man has displayed amazing ingenuity in laying bare the hidden secrets of the earth. How wonderful are his mines and subterranean galleries!

Surely: RVm *For* gives the natural meaning, and this obviously requires the assumption that some words preceded this verse. Duhm suggested that words like 'Whence cometh Wisdom' (cf. ^{12} and ^{20}) had dropped out. This deserves consideration. **mine:** nothing is known of mines in Palestine proper (though Dt 8^{9} implies that mining was practised there); probably the writer had the mines of neighbouring countries in mind. **refine:** better *wash* (cf. Mal 3^{3}; Ps 12^{6}; and *I.C.C.*).

3. The deep gloom of the mine is lightened by shaft and lantern.

4. RV probably gives the general sense: man's skill and daring. But the Hebrew is unusually difficult.

5. Man forces the earth to enrich him from above and below; while the farmer ploughs his land the miner below digs out the ore.

10*a* and 11*a* and 10*b* and 11*b* are excellent parallels, and should probably be read in that order.

12-19. **What man cannot search out nor acquire.**

12. **But . . . wisdom:** the order of words is emphatic to put wisdom in marked opposition to man's discoveries.

13. **price:** better with LXX *way to it*. Wisdom is not to be found in this life at all, thus ^{14} the primeval abyss is interrogated without result.

15. **gold.** The true meaning, *ingots*, of the rare word *segor* (cf. 1 K 6^{20}) has only recently been discovered (cf. *J.R.A.S.*, January, 1923).

17. **glass** was of great value among the ancients.

20-28. **Wisdom is known to God alone.**

22. It would be interesting to know whether the writer's interrogation of hell is more than poetic. Did he or his readers expect a wider, calmer conception of Wisdom in Abaddon, the Underworld, or was the rumour thereof but the same faint report of a great unknown and incomprehensible principle? Peake is probably right in saying that 'Death and the underworld know as much and as little as the rest of creation.'

23. Wisdom is hypostatized. It is not itself infinite: it has a 'place.' God Himself comprehends it in that He comprehends all creation.

27. The meaning of this verse is elusive, and further intensive study of the period is needed before clear light can come. Obviously we have philosophy as well as poetry here. Wisdom is an *idea* which the Semitic mind was forced to visualize as a concrete object. Was it existent only in the mind of God, in the natural world, or as an entity in a realm inaccessible to man? The writer implies that it was premundane; it has no place in the natural world. But God's relation to it is one of complete superiority. He *saw* it, and He gave evidence of His complete grasp of it by *recounting* it. Since man was not created, either He recounted it *in abstracto* or else to the angels. But angels are nowhere mentioned as partakers of Wisdom. The existence of a diametrically opposite conception of Wisdom as attainable by man in Pr 8 and the discussion in the Wisdom of Solomon show how real and active was the interest in abstract thought kindled by the introduction of Greek studies into Palestine. In the end the controversy took two lines: the Christian assertion of the identity of creative Wisdom with the pre-existent Christ, and the assertion of certain Jewish and Muhammadan schools that Wisdom was but one of God's attributes or qualities. The opinion of Maimonides (Friedländer, 73) is: 'The attributes found in Holy Scripture are either qualifications of God's actions, without any reference to His essence, or indicate absolute perfection, but do not imply that the essence of God is a compound of various elements.'

28. Obviously Wisdom here is governed by **unto man,** and **the fear of the Lord** is not really the same wisdom as that which God creatively manifested. The writer must be using *hokmah* in its sense of 'wise conduct in the affairs of life.'

> 'If thought can reach to Heaven,
> On Heaven let it dwell,
> For fear thy thought be given
> Like power to reach to Hell.
> For fear the desolation
> And darkness of thy mind
> Perplex an habitation,
> Which thou hast left behind.'
> (*The Rabbi's Song.*)

Many commentators regard this verse as a later addition; but it seems more probable that it is original. What is man to do in the face of the unattainable wisdom of God but to make use of the substitute which God Himself has given him? It is worth noting that where an impasse has been reached in Jewish and Arabic theological treatises, a short sentence often expressing dislike of philosophical subtleties and urging submission to the will of God is a common feature.

XXIX.-XXXI. **Job's Final Review.**—Job sums up. In 29 he goes wistfully over his happy past when he was secure under God's protection and favour, surrounded by his children, and living the life of a powerful and beneficent chieftain. His position in society was so well established that the first seat was his by right. Venerable sheikhs stood up in respectful silence as he entered the assembly or passed the houses outside which they sat in the cool of the day, and his every utterance was greeted with restrained applause. The general esteem in which he was held rested not so much on his exalted position as on his character as a public benefactor. The fatherless and widow, the stranger, the cripple and the blind and the obscure and insignificant all turned naturally to him for aid. Nor was his goodness merely passive. He did not shrink from punishing the powerful oppressors of the poor. Therefore he had every confidence that he would die in an honoured old age.

But now (30) all is changed. The very outcasts, the contemptible, the dirty and the vile mock and spit at him. His shame and humiliation is intensified by contact with such human vileness as he had never suspected, and this too while his body afflicts him with excruciating pain. Worst of all, God, unmindful of Job's solicitude for all that were in distress, will not hear his voice.

Consciously and of deliberate purpose (31) had he ruled his life in accordance with God's moral laws: one by one he goes through all the sins which he could possibly have committed, and denies that he has been guilty of any. Finally, he declares his longing to confront God and hear His charge against him.

XXIX. **4.** **secret** means 'intimate friendly conversation,' a beautiful thought, though it does not accord well with the syntax. Follow some versions and read *make a hedge about.*

6. 'The allusion is, probably, partly to the fact that the olive flourishes in rocky soil, partly to the fact that the presses in which the oil was extracted from the olive were commonly cavities hewn out in the rock' (Driver).

10. After this verse Budde proposed to read [21-25], which continue to describe the reverence Job inspired in the assembly of the elders. It is highly probable that

this was the original order, but we cannot be certain; but notice how forcible the contrast would then be.

12. Precisely the character of the ideal ruler in Ps 72 [12] and an answer to Eliphaz in 22 [6-9].

18. **sand.** RVm phœnix less well. A most interesting account of this fable is in *I.C.C.*

20. **glory,** i.e. reputation. **bow,** as in Gen 49 [24].

24. RVm is best. Job's presence always inspired confidence; he was never affected by the depression of others.

25. **their way,** i.e. the line they should take.

25*c* belongs to some other context.

XXX. 1-8. Some scholars have felt a difficulty about these verses. Why is the abject poverty of these wretches treated as a fault? Accordingly they attach the verses to 24 [5] f., the helpless sharers in earth's misery. Still the tone of disdain in [1] is not unnatural. There are unemployables, hopelessly decadent through sin, neglect, or misfortune, and they might well be found furtively lurking in the dust-heaps of the city.

3. **gloom** is an indefensible rendering. Emend *a land of*.

7. **Bray,** in the same sense as Jer 5 [8]. **gathered together:** tr. *misbegotten*. They have no natural decency. Hence they are [8] children of godless men and of nameless parents.

9. If [1-8] be transposed Job is of course referring to the elders. But the loss of [1-8] would mar and impoverish this moving description of his sufferings.

11-15 are unfortunately in such textual disorder that no certain interpretation is possible. RV implies that men are still his tormentors, but it is, perhaps, more probable that it is God of whom Job is complaining.

20. **thou lookest:** add *not* with one MS. Job all along complains that God will not consider his case.

23. **bring me** (*back*) **to death:** so Hebrew, because a similarity was felt between prenatal life and death—a sort of 'between-state,' neither existence nor non-existence: the comparison is between the unself-conscious, visible life of all men in the womb and the invisible, self-conscious life of Sheol.

24. RVm is a creditable attempt to extract a meaning from a corrupt text.

XXXI. 3. The belief that calamity was the portion of the unrighteous only was held by Job before experience taught him this could not be so.

7. **any spot:** perhaps read *anything*, a reference to bribery and corruption.

10. As in [8] the punishment was to fit the crime. Let Job's wife be ravished if he had committed adultery. Many have boggled at the only meaning which parallelism can support, on the ground that it was not right that Job's wife should suffer for his presumed sin in which she had no share. But the writer is thinking only of the shame and anguish brought upon the husband.

12. **it** means the crime of adultery.

13-15. **Job's Kindness to Inferiors.**—All men and women are to be treated with scrupulous fairness because of their common humanity, and because they are equally the objects of God's care in the womb and *a fortiori* afterwards. This attitude is far loftier than the law of Ex 21 [1-11].

18. It stretches poetic fancy too far to suppose that Job supported and guided widows from infancy. Therefore read with slight changes *He* (i.e. *God*) *brought me up as a father and led me*, etc.

26-27 convey the thrill and attraction of the old worship of the heavenly bodies. Job had to make an effort to refrain from saluting them, as men had done from remotest antiquity.

29. A high standard which has not been reached by many who call themselves Christians. The Targum suggests *shouted for joy* for **lifted up myself.** This must be right.

33. **like Adam** is pointless, as Adam did not conceal his sin from other men. RVm is not much better, as it is not the writer's habit to depreciate human conduct in general; 'from men' and 'among men' have been suggested as improvements.

34. **families,** i.e. tribal clans.

35. **one:** either God or a friend. **Mark:** RVm is literally *Taw*, hence some have supposed it means 'my omega' or 'ending.' This is improbable, though it contains a germ of truth in that a mark or signature here *poetically* conceived as ending a plaint is intended.

36. So confident is Job in his innocence that he would wear his indictment or 'summons' as an honourable decoration.

37. The end of Job's speech [38-40] should follow [34].

XXXII.-XXXVII. **The Speeches of Elihu.**—Reasons for excluding these chapters from the original scheme of the book have been given in the Introduction. Elihu is an anticlimax.

XXXII. 1-6*a* are in prose.

1. **the Buzite,** and therefore (Gen 22 [21]) of a kindred tribe to Job.

3. **and yet had condemned Job.** The

phrase has an interesting history. There is an early tradition of the scribes that the original reading was '*because they had not found an answer and had condemned God.*' There is a good deal to be said for this, as it must have been the feeling of this early interpolator and creator of Elihu. Job unrefuted meant God condemned. Thus Elihu would be God's champion: the MT rather favours the interpretation that he appears to put Job in the wrong for his own good, though it could mean '*because . . . they did not condemn Job.*' Considerable vacillation occurs in the versions.

6-22. Wisdom is not necessarily the fruit of years, but a divine gift. The speaker bombastically proclaims his right to be heard. If it were at all possible to fit the long speech of Elihu anywhere in the book, it would be a masterly satire on the earnest, inexperienced, and conceited young man.

9. For great read *aged*.

12. **convinced**: 'an archaism for *convicted*' (cf. Jn 16 [8]).

13. There is no necessity to call in God to refute Job, for I am about to do so. Here is all but proof that the interpolator knew of Jehovah's speech and intended to replace it by his own.

14*b*. Unfortunately Elihu does, not once nor twice.

17. **my part**, i.e. *allotted* me by God.

19. His message strains for outlet like highly fermented wine which threatens to burst even new wine-skins (cf. Mt 9 [17]).

21. I am a 'plain-spoken man.'

XXXIII. 1-7. Let us go into the matter as man to man.

3. Better:

My heart overflows with words of knowledge,
My lips speak that which is pure.

6. **toward**, i.e. in relation to.

I also am formed out of the clay: Hebrew *qoraṣti*. The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic uses this phrase: 'she pinched off clay' of the creation of Engidu.

8-13. You are wrong in saying that God is your enemy and does not answer you.

9. Job had not denied that he had sinned. What he had said was that he had striven with all his might against every form of iniquity, and was not conscious of any offence.

12. **just**, i.e. in the right.

12*b* begs the question. LXX has a different but hardly probable text.

13*b*. Emend: (saying) 'He answereth none of my words.'

14-28. God does answer men: e.g. by dreams and visions; by sickness and by restoration to health.

16*b*. Ambiguous; **seal** perhaps means confirms or imparts secretly. LXX suggests 'terrifies them with what they see' (cf. 7 [14]).

18. **sword**: lit. missiles; God's retributive arrows.

19. Job had had midnight visions and had not profited by them. Another message—sickness—he was even now neglecting.

22. **the slayers** are probably the angels of death (cf. Ex 12 [23]; 1 Cor 10 [10]; and note in *I.C.C.*).

23. **with him**: Hebrew 'over him' perhaps means 'set over' him, i.e. appointed by God to examine the man's case.

an interpreter one of a thousand: cf. 5 [1]; Dan 7 [10]. There are thousands of angels to interpret God's ways to men. In Is 43 [27] such interpreters are the prophets.

24. **Deliver him.** The words are probably addressed to the angel of death who was about to bear the man off. **ransom**: the Hebrew means the price paid instead of forfeiting life (Ex 21 [30]), and probably it consists in the man's repentance and amendment of life, though this is implied rather than stated.

25. **than a child's**: better *than in youth*.

26. The man sees God's face, i.e. visits the temple (cf. Ex 23 [15] and Is 1 [12]). The language strongly suggests the cultus. **joy** is probably the *shout* (*teru'a*) or loud singing of the temple services. Driver interprets as of admission in a spiritual sense to God's presence (cf. Ps 11 [7]). That is less probable.

XXXIV. 1-12. How can you say God has wronged you? Surely this is contrary to all we know of God.

6. **a liar**: perhaps emend *in pain*.

9. Cf. Mal 3 [13, 14].

11. The same tiresome reiteration of the friends' platitudes.

13-20. God is supreme; all live and die by His will.

14. MT is: 'If he were to set his heart (i.e. mind) upon him (i.e. Himself) all flesh would expire together': the thought is attractive. Were God to withdraw His providential care from the world and centre His regard upon Himself all life would instantly cease. (This is the view of later Semitic philosophy.) But a rival Hebrew reading (deleting the redundant *libbo*) gives a good parallelism: *If he were to cause his spirit to return to himself.*

17. Better *can* one. Another question-

begging point. The point to be proved is that injustice is incompatible with God's sovereignty.

20. The people: emend *the rich.*

21-37. God punishes the evildoer as every sensible man knows!

23. further: emend *he appointeth not a set time,* therefore Job must not be impatient. God can deal with the wicked when He pleases.

29. Peake is undoubtedly right in rendering *If He remain quiet, who can condemn?* The hardest thing to bear is God's inactivity or 'quietness' amid the horrors of war or the desolating sorrows of life.

30-33 are extremely obscure (see *I.C.C.*).

XXXV. **1-8.** You must not think that righteousness does not pay. True, it cannot profit God. Elihu's argument is feeble. He gives no reason why righteousness does profit a man, and his assertion that man's conduct is a matter of indifference to God undermines the whole basis of prophetic teaching. We believe that God loveth righteousness and hateth iniquity. Contrast the attitude of ^{6,7} = $22^{2,3}$ (still firmly rooted in orthodox Islam) with Jn 3^{16}.

2. this refers to ^{3}. **more than**: 4^{17} *v.n.*

8. No reason is given why this should be so.

9-16. It is useless for sufferers to complain unless they complain to God in the right spirit. This argument has but a limited application. It contains a truth; but it only bears on suffering caused by man's oppression. The problem has been evaded. Why do the *righteous* suffer?

10. This is singularly untrue of Job.

13. God will only hearken to the man who consistently trusts Him. There is no reason why He should listen to one who only appeals to Him because he is in difficulties.

14. RV = He will not answer a complaining suppliant. RVm = Have patience.

15. Either tr. is possible. I suggest reading *be'ed poshe'a* (cf. versions and 18^{12}, 21^{17}, etc.).

> *And now because his anger visiteth not,*
> *And he taketh no knowledge of the calamity of the transgressor.*

This has the merit of dealing with part of Job's complaint, and requires but little change in the text.

XXXVI. **1-15.** God is just. Sufferings are admonitions from Him. The godless perish.

6. Against 21^{7}. **12. sword**: 33^{18} *v.n.*

14. The early death of sodomites hateful to God and man.

15. The positive value of suffering.

16-21. Accept your sufferings as a discipline and turn from your sin.

16-20. RV perhaps gives the sense of a passage which is full of difficulties, but possibly the verses are an indictment of Job who was led away by prosperity (cf. *I.C.C.*).

18*b* seems to contain the figure of *redemptive* suffering.

22-33. Think of God's greatness and praise Him.

27. Render *For he withdraweth,* i.e. from the sea (which should probably be read here). Duhm points out that the knowledge that clouds are formed by evaporation came later, probably through Greek influence, and replaced the ancient Semitic conception of celestial storehouses of rain. **from his vapour**: better *at the time of his mist* (Gen 2^{6}).

30. RV is hardly intelligible. Read:

> *He spreadeth his mist about him,*
> *And covereth therewith the tops of the mountains.*

31. judgeth is strange: read *nurtureth.*

33. The cattle, etc. Changing only the vowels read: *Jealous with anger against unrighteousness.*

XXXVII. Fear God in nature. You cannot understand. How then dare you presume to criticize? Be humble and submit.

1. moved: better *leapeth* (cf. Lev 11^{21}).

2. noise (*rogez,* supposed to be contained in the compound *Boanerges*), the rumbling of thunder which was God's *voice* (Ps 18^{13}, 29^{3-9}).

7. sealeth up in winter when field work must cease. *7b.* Here AV is right.

9. north: lit. 'scatterers,' which some assume means 'north winds.' Vulgate Arcturus. Perhaps we should read 'storehouses' as in Ps 144^{13}.

13. Read either 'for a rod for his earth' or 'for a rod and a curse.'

15. Here follow more anticipations of Jehovah's speech.

17. You who are prostrated by the desert wind, how can you understand God's ways?

18. spread out: properly *beat out* as an 'inverted bowl.'

20. wish: lit. 'say,' i.e. *purpose* his own destruction by venturing to criticize God.

21. bright may mean the opposite 'obscure.' This gives an equally good sense.

24. wise of heart, i.e. in their own conceit.

XXXVIII.-XL. **2. Jehovah's Speech out of the Whirlwind.**—As has been said, God's answer should immediately follow

Job's last appeal in 31. In this product of an inspired genius there is no positive theory of suffering; but the great truth is implicit that Job was satisfied by renewed communion with God. To-day the problem lurks unsolved and insoluble on the intellectual plane, but it is *relatively* unimportant to those who are conscious of the Divine Presence as Job was. At first sight it would appear that Jehovah attempts to crush Job by displaying His omnipotence, yet as the sequel shows—

> . . . God a means hath found,
> Though faith and hope have vanished
> And even love grows dim,
> A means whereby His banished
> Be not expelled from Him.'
> *Ibid.*

It is important to observe that the poet pictures Job reconciled to God while still in his miserable privations, and that Jehovah nowhere accuses Job of sin. It is therefore to be understood that there is no *necessary* connexion between a man's own sin and his suffering. Most (but not all) of men's sufferings to-day could be removed by the co-operation of intelligence and goodwill.

XXXVIII. **2-3.** Jehovah takes up Job's challenge in 13^{22}.

2. counsel, i.e. *plan* or *purpose*. By implication it would appear that God's plan is clear, but that Job represents it as obscure; as the sequel shows, it is clear only to God.

4-18. The wonders of inanimate nature.

4-7. The earth is one vast majestic building whose foundation was greeted by the jubilant shout of the heavenly host.

> **7.** 'As the world's first morning broke,
> The stars still shining sang their song of praise.'

8-11. The ocean confined within set boundaries.

12-15. The wonder of the morning light.

13. 'The earth is pictured as a vast coverlet; and the dawn, which darts in a moment from east to west, seizes this by its extremities, brings to light the wicked upon it, and shakes them off it like dust' (Driver).

14. And all things stand forth: a very slight change gives us *and is dyed like a garment.*

15. their light is darkness (cf. 24^{17}).

16-30. The unseen regions of the universe.

19. Light and darkness, separate mysterious entities to the Eastern mind.

20. take it, i.e. back to its proper place. **discern:** emend *bring it to.*

24. light has been mentioned in ^{19}, and parallelism demands *wind.* Cf. En 41^{4}, 60^{12}, where the chamber of the winds is disclosed to the seer by an angel.

25. channel, down which the waters run from the celestial store.

27. Transfer two letters and read *And to make the thirsty land sprout with young grass.*

30. It is better to transpose the verbs and render:

> *The waters are frozen* (lit. cohere) *like a stone,*
> *And the face of the deep is hidden.*

31-38. Celestial phenomena.

31. Canst thou: the context seems to require *Dost thou.* **cluster:** if Pleiades be right this may be accepted. The 'sweet influences' of AV are a real loss, but we cannot retain the rendering. It rests on the authority of Jewish interpreters. In spring the Pleiades were visible just before sunrise as the setting of Orion marked the advent of winter. The sweet influences were thus seen in the bourgeoning of spring.

32. Mazzaroth and **Bear** are enigmas.

36. inward parts . . . mind: the words cannot be satisfactorily explained. Obviously RVm must be a better guess.

38. *I.C.C. When the soil becometh hard as metal:* the meaning then would be that rain is sent when the earth is parched. RV implies that the rain turns the dry dust into cakes of mud.

39-XXXIX. 30. The wonders of animate nature.

XXXIX. **10.** Read *Dost thou bind him to the furrow with cords?*

12. Read *that he would return, And gather thy seed to the threshing-floor?*

13-18. LXX omit, though whether because they were not in their Hebrew exemplar or because they are unusually difficult to translate, and ^{17} seemed objectionable, cannot be determined.

17 may safely be rejected as it mentions God in Jehovah's own speech.

18. The figure is of the bird scourging itself into flight by the beating of its wings which lift it from the ground.

XL. **1.** LXX omit rightly.

2. The challenge. Will one who has dared to reprove God give an answer to this display of God's power?

4-5. Job's Reply to Jehovah.—This is simply a confession that he has nothing to say. And though we recognize the appropriateness of the feeling of dumb dismay, it is with relief that we read in 42^{2-6} Job's withdrawal of all that he had said. As the text stands 42^{1-6} is the sequel to a second speech of Jehovah's. Now it is æsthetically wrong that God should have to reveal Himself a second time to Job,

and the only justification for such a favour would be that a fresh and indispensable message had to be given. Is this the case? The arguments of scholars against the present arrangement of the text are unanswerable. Jehovah's second speech ignores Job's confession and continues to rebuke him. The hippopotamus and crocodile are described at great length unlike the word-pictures of the first speech. In 40 [8] Jehovah refers to Job's criticism of His doings among men, a point with which He does not deal. If Jehovah's second speech is genuine it must almost certainly have formed a part of one speech; but it is very difficult to see how it should fit in. Probably it is either the first draft or a rival composition. 41 [12] could not have been written by the author of 38-40 [2]. It is intolerable.

After 40 [5] should be read 42 [2-5], and thus the poem ends with the patriarch repenting his rashness, forgetting his sufferings, and rejoicing in renewed communion with God.

As the text stands there are two speeches of Jehovah, viz. (*a*) 38 [1]-40 [2]; (*b*) 40 [6]-41 [34]; and two speeches of Job, viz. (*a*) 40 [3-5]; (*b*) 42 [1-6]. But originally the poem ended with one speech of Jehovah, viz. 38 [1]-40 [2] (omitting 40 [1]), and one speech of Job, viz. 40 [3-5], 42 [2-6] (omitting 42 [1]).

6-XLI. 34. Jehovah's Second Speech.

7-14. Jehovah sarcastically invites Job to act as God. 7 = 38 [3].

8. disannul my judgement means deny that My government of the world is just.

15-24. Can Job control the hippopotamus? This and the following passage describe in detail the habits and bodily parts of animals known in Egypt but not in Palestine (it is just possible that they *may* have existed there, though the evidence is untrustworthy).

15. behemoth: an intensive plural form meaning a huge beast.

19*b* is literally 'Let him that made him bring near his sword.' Apparently the meaning is Let Job approach him if he is equal to God the Creator of the monster. The following **For** then gives the ground of the ironical invitation. But LXX has a widely different text, and it must be confessed that parallelism is not maintained.

21-23 form a charming picture of a placid good-natured beast allowing smaller creatures their gambols. He is calmly aloof from noisy triflers, and remains unmoved by the storms which overwhelm lesser creatures with terror.

23. Jordan probably means no more than 'flowing water' (cf. the Mandæans' use). These beasts are not found in the Jordan.

XLI. **1-34.** Or the crocodile?

9. hope of him, i.e. of the assailant.

11 is very rough. Probably both here and in [10] *him* should be read:

Whoever confronted him and prospered
Under the whole heaven not one!

13. bridle: LXX *coat of mail* is much better.

15*a*. Read *His back is courses of shields.*

18. eyelids of the dawn. 'The allusion is apparently to the reddish eyes of the crocodile which appear gleaming through the water before the head appears above the surface. In the Egyptian hieroglyphics the dawn is denoted by the crocodile's eyes' (*I.C.C.*).

19. The spray expelled from the saurian's mouth gleams in the sunlight.

30. Allusions to the tracks left in the mud by the monster's scaly belly.

31. *Ointment pan:* the vessel in which the ingredients used boiled and foamed before settling down to a greasy unguent.

34*a* is weak, and a slight change gives *Everything that is high feareth him.*

XLII. **1-6. Job's Complete Retraction.**

3*a* is either a gloss from 38 [2], or must be understood by an implicit 'Well didst thou say.'

4*b* = 38 [3], and the verse is probably a gloss.

5. Here is the supreme lesson of the book. Job 'knows that God is righteous; he knows that, though he suffers, he is righteous also. How these apparent contradictions can be intellectually reconciled he does not know. But he and God are again at one, a deeper fellowship is possible, untroubled by misgivings as to God's moral integrity. . . . He knows that all is well, he and his sufferings have their place in God's inscrutable design; why should he seek to understand it? in childlike reverence he acknowledges it to be far beyond him' (Peake, cf. also Pederson, *Israel*, Eng. trans., 372 f.).

6. I repudiate my words, as RVm.

7-17. Epilogue.

7-9. God commends Job and censures the three friends. It would seem that when he had brought his great poem to an end the writer added the happy ending of the well-known story. There is considerable difference in treatment and looseness of composition (cf. [7*b*] and [8*b*]).

10-17. Job's former prosperity is exactly doubled.

THE PSALMS

By A. H. McNeile

Introduction.—Among Old Testament writings the Psalter, from the Christian point of view, stands by itself because of the place that it occupies in our worship. The following study of it omits much that is ordinarily expected in a commentary. The titles are not discussed; they are no part of the original, and sometimes represent different traditions in the Hebrew and the Greek. The matter is only of archæological interest, and is dealt with in all commentaries, among which widely different opinions exist. The present book, compiled for use in the second Temple, was made up of earlier collections, which can be partially traced with the help of the titles and other indications. The present division into five books is an artificial arrangement, in which many psalms are separated from their original collections, apparently in imitation of the five books of the Pentateuch. At the end of each book (Ps 41, 72, 89, 106, 150) a doxology is added, as the Christian Church now adds the *Gloria* to a psalm. A large part of commentaries is generally occupied with attempts to give the exact sense of the Hebrew, and to emend the text with the guidance of the versions or simply by conjecture. Very little notice is here taken of different readings, the Revised Version being the basis throughout; but it is earnestly hoped that, for purposes of literary study, the reader will compare it with the Authorized and Prayer Book Versions, and with the Douai Version, which adheres still more closely to the Vulgate. The following pages have two main objects: (1) The Psalms were selected, no doubt from a host of others, as expressing the religious conceptions, and the national consciousness and hopes and ideals, of the times when they were written. They belong to different ages, and reveal some differences of spiritual development, but not such as prevented congregations after the Exile from singing them all, mostly as the liturgical accompaniment of sacrifice and other ritual. And it is necessary first to determine, entirely apart from Christianity, what they meant to the people who wrote and sang them—their conceptions of God and of His government of the world, the nature of His worship, their ideas of His moral requirements, their attitude towards their enemies, and their hopes for the future in this life and the next. (2) Since the Jews read and sang these utterances from an earlier stage of religious development long before Christ came, it is necessary to determine what they can mean for us in the light of what He is, and has done for us. The original thoughts of the writers are transfigured for us in the brightness of Christianity. The drawing of this distinction between the Jewish and the Christian points of view was not what interested the early and mediæval commentators. They treated every sentence allegorically and mystically, as though the Psalmists' inspiration was of such a kind that it enabled them, under cover of contemporary language and ideas, to speak directly of Christ and His Church. A good English example of such treatment in modern times is the commentary of John Mason Neale, who has some very instructive pages on the way in which the Psalms have been employed in Christian worship, and on the value of antiphons. But in the short space that can be allotted to these notes this mystical treatment is impossible; they aim simply at suggesting quite briefly how the Jews expressed their own ideas in their Psalms, and the attitude that we, as Christians, can take to those ideas as we sing the words.

(1) **The Speaker.**—In one respect the Psalms present a difficult problem. Many of them are written in the first person singular, 'I' and 'me' expressing what appear to be the thoughts of an individual. Some have the first person plural throughout, 'we' and 'us' clearly referring to a community. Again, in some cases the singular and plural alternate in the same psalm. It is often uncertain whether an individual speaks for himself, or (which is frequent in the OT) the nation is represented as speaking as one man. In a large number of Psalms, especially in the first half of the Psalter, the writer seems to pray and hope either as a member of the nation, or more often, probably, of the small group of faithful Jews whose thoughts he voices, or whom he addresses with comfort or encouragement. These were mostly poor and despised; those who remained obedient to God's commands, and in communion with Him. They were conscious of their isolation in the midst of the worldliness and irreligion of rich Jews and foreigners by whom

they were often scorned and persecuted. Once more, Welch (*The Psalter*, 69) suggests that 'some leader of praise, a priest or even a prophet, may be there speaking as the official representative of the community.' Or an individual might be paying a vow, or performing an act of thanksgiving in the presence of a congregation.

(2) **The conception of God** which appears in the Psalms is, necessarily, inferior to the Christian's. He is transcendent, but there is no thought of His immanence (unless the conviction of His omnipresence in 139 is an approach to that conception). God is a majestic Individual, all-powerful, just, and gracious to His people; but of the New Testament thought, 'we in Him and He in us,' with all that that involves, there is not a trace. He is the Creator, and Sustainer of life. He judges and punishes all who oppose and disobey Him, whether His own people or foreigners. His loved ones, who obey Him, He protects and rescues and avenges. He dwells in the heavens 'among the clouds,' with other beings who are called 'sons of *elim*' ('the mighty'), or *elohim* ('gods'), or angels. He 'comes' or 'sends down from on high' to help His people, but at the same time He is present on earth in the temple at Zion. Some of the Psalmists reach a high level of spirituality in the thought of being the guests of God, abiding in communion with Him which is a feast and a joy; and one of them (139) definitely expresses the truth of the universality of His presence or Spirit.

(3) **His government of the world** presented to some minds a problem of desperate difficulty. The shortness and futility of human life necessarily weighed as a heavy burden on those who knew nothing of a life with God beyond the grave. And even heavier was the weight of difficulty caused by the sufferings of the righteous—either of God's chosen people at the hands of foreign nations, or of the class of poor and pious Jews at the hands of their rich and worldly fellow-countrymen. Many, indeed, were able to suppress the mental difficulty; they were able, with a sublime optimism, to remain confident that some day, *in this life*, 'on this side of time' (Welch), the wicked would receive their deserts and the righteous would be rewarded, part of the reward being to 'see their desire upon their enemies.' This confidence was rendered easier by the conception of the solidarity of the nation and the family: since a man lived on in his children he could be rewarded, and the wicked punished, not necessarily in this short life, but in posterity (see 37^{28} f., 37 f., 69^{36}, 102^{28}). Some managed to reach this confidence only after painful struggles with self (see 73), of which the climax is depicted in the defiance of Job, and in the scepticism of the writer of Ecclesiastes. None of the Psalmists goes to this length, but as long as the Christian hope was absent, the problem could be met only by endurance.

(4) **His Worship.**—The Psalmists were at one in their thoughts of God's greatness and glory and loving-kindness. Nothing can exceed the depth and beauty of their language of praise. The Hebrew title of the Psalter is 'Praises.' The Christian Church has never found words which more perfectly express sheer adoration. It is difficult to realize the fervour with which they must have been sung liturgically in the temple courts. The Hebrews may be called the inventors of the religious lyric; and the rhythmical outbursts of the Psalms embodied the literary genius of the nation. But beside their psalmody, which they traditionally traced to David (see Am 6^{5}), and which probably originated long before that (see *The Psalmists*, 8-10, ed. D. C. Simpson), were their sacrifices, to which songs had been a frequent accompaniment. On this appears a difference of opinion. The prophets had realized clearly enough that the formal act of sacrifice, without true morality of heart, was not acceptable to God. And their protest sometimes took the form of a declaration that God did not want sacrifices at all (see Am 5^{25}; Jer 7^{22}). And some of the Psalmists take the same attitude (see 40^{6}, 50^{7-13}, 51^{16} f., 69^{31}). But it is a remarkable fact that these words were sung in the second Temple, where the full array of sacrifices and other priestly ritual was still going on. They must have been understood in the moral sense of the prophets that mere sacrifice apart from moral goodness was worthless. The same is true of the Christian sacraments, to which the animal offerings were the nearest approach that the Hebrews could make. But they could not dispense with the sacramental principle; they were compelled to seek atonement in the only way they knew. And, generally speaking, the priestly system is recognized in the Psalter. It consists to a large extent of 'cult-hymns,' hymns in an official collection, from which the priests selected one or more for a congregation or an individual to recite, the former often in their regular worship, and both on special occasions.

(5) **His moral requirements** were never thought of as beyond the power of man, though the Psalmists constantly recognize that they have transgressed them, and express a sense of sin and deep penitence. They also connected this sense of sin, in many cases, with sickness or persecution or some other trouble which had befallen them, it being assumed, as was customary in Hebrew thought, that suffering was always the punishment of some sin, known or unknown (a view which was opposed by our Lord, Lk 13 [2-5]; Jn 9 [2, 3]). This was the traditional view put forward by Job's friends, while Job, on the other hand, was sure that it was not so, and felt that God was unfair in permitting him undeserved suffering. The same acute difficulty, from a national point of view, is expressed in Ps 44 [18-22]. The character that God wanted, the character of the *ḥasid*, the pious man, His well-beloved, consists, to a great extent, of obedience to His will in matters of social life; the Psalmists, in various ways, illustrate the principle 'thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' A few show a deep devotion to that will as laid down in the written Law (see 1 [2], 19 [7-11], 119). They frequently express their loyalty to the one and only God, and their repudiation of idolatry, with which many of them were surrounded. But the chief spiritual value of the Psalter lies in the profound tone of devotion which pervades it, arising from the heartfelt communion of the writers with God.

(6) **Their Attitude towards their Enemies.**—It is very difficult for us to enter into the feelings of those who were free from our modern Western individualism, which is largely a product of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Israel was a tiny people in the midst of hostile nations. It had been expressly chosen out by God to be His own, and to be taught His commandments. 'He hath not dealt so with any nation; neither have the heathen knowledge of his laws.' And so long as Israel worshipped Him alone, and as a whole adhered to His laws, it was unthinkable that He would forsake them or allow them to come to harm. Feeling this, they inevitably made a sharp distinction between themselves and other nations who did not adhere to His laws, and to whom they had not, in fact, been given. And in the period after the Exile, when Jews increasingly tended to mix with foreigners and to become worldly and irreligious, the faithful few, spoken of as 'the meek' some forty times in the Psalter, in like manner were acutely conscious of being, in their faithfulness and integrity, separated from the mass. And when this nation, or this little group of *ḥasidim*, suffered at the hands of their enemies, they were oppressed by the problem that their own God was allowing them to suffer in spite of their faithfulness to Him. If a religiously minded individual suffered in the same way, it was only a particular instance of the general problem. Suffering was always a punishment for some sin. How, then, could suffering be explained when they knew that they had been true to God and their enemies had not? (see especially 89). If the Psalms be read with this problem in mind (which for Christians is no problem), what is often criticized as the 'self-righteousness' of the Psalmists is accounted for. They were able, indeed, to cling to their certainty that in this life—in the days of their posterity if not in their own—the wicked would be punished and the righteous rewarded; but their prayers are a continuous 'Lord, how long?' This will also help to explain the vindictiveness of their language. God's interests were identified with those of His faithful ones; an injury to them, or to any one of them, was an injury to Him. And when a holy God is in contact with sin or opposition, there must be a divine reaction—that is, He must punish. Christians have been led to understand His punishment in the light of the Atonement that He has wrought for all men to reconcile them to Himself. But since to the Hebrew punishment was an exact requital, a 'paying out' of the nature of 'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' God's justice and righteousness, God's own dignity and honour, could not be vindicated until He had 'rewarded the proud after their deserving.' So that they could say 'in the name of the Lord will I destroy them,' and could pray that God would destroy them in the fiercest pre-Christian language, not in the spirit of mere unreasoning vengeance, but with the desire for God's vindication of His own honour and of that of His faithful servants as one and the same thing, to be brought about in the same way. Christians, of course, cannot make this language their own. They never have any need to pray to God to punish sin at all. He will do so, He is always doing so, without fail. The effects of sin, temporal and spiritual, are its punishment, in a world in which 'cause and effect' are the working of a God 'with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.' And to pray that there may be a reaction when divine

holiness is met by sin is superfluous. When we read the imprecations in the Psalms we must go behind them, and treat them as figurative expressions of our horror of sin, especially our own.

(7) But Israel's attitude to foreign nations had, for some writers, another side to it, which may be called the **Missionary attitude.** The Christian missionary goes out with the message that God loves every human being equally, and has provided for his salvation in Christ. And He therefore lays upon the Church the self-evident duty of leading all men to a knowledge of His grace and faith in Him. No Hebrew, naturally, could reach the Christian conception; and verses like 79[6] and 110[6] are poles asunder from it. The time when the wicked would be punished and the righteous rewarded would finally come when Israel was an ideally perfect people, supreme in the world, and it would be recognized by all nations that 'God is the King of all the earth.' Then all nations would bow to His rule, and keep His laws, and praise Him for His mercies to Israel (102[15] f., [21] f., 138[4] f.). This is sometimes spoken of as the involuntary result of defeat (47[1-3], 68[29-31], 72[8-11], 83[15-18]), and in 2[10-12] the advice is given to worship God in order to avoid His anger. But at times the Psalmists are inspired with a wider universalism, the nations joining in Israel's praise of God for what He is (67, 86[9] f., 100[1], 117, 145[21], 148[11], 150[6]). The highest point is reached in 87, where one nation and another is recognized by God as having in Zion its spiritual birth. Cf. LXX, where *Meter Seion* (Mother Sion) is the cry of men of all nations. This is the ground of Gal 4[26]. And if Zion be taken as a type of the Christian Church, this can be used as expressing our highest missionary aim.

(8) But the ideas of reward and punishment, and the ideal of the inclusion of foreign nations, are bound up with Israel's **hopes for the future.** Zion would one day be supreme, and the posterity of God's loyal servants would be rewarded, and those of His enemies would be punished. No Hebrew thought of this individualistically; it was a national event; it was the final answer to all their longing petitions for judgment and deliverance. And the seat and centre of this national glorification would be Zion, 'the joy of the whole earth,' the capital of God's people who would be, as Isaiah said, 'all righteous.' Israel would be first and foremost a theocracy, as it had ideally always been. The Kingship of their God, as the Psalmists delighted to proclaim, had been from the beginning and would continue for ever. But David who had 'ruled them prudently with all his power,' and his descendants who had succeeded him in his dynasty, had been God's regents on earth. And because David continued to live in his posterity the entire dynasty could be personified as 'David' or 'the king,' and he and his seed could be thought of as the recipients of God's perpetual mercy (18[50], 61[6] f., 72[1], 144[10]). The might and prosperity of his seed were his 'horn' and his 'lamp' (132[17]; cf. 2 S 21[17]); and each successor in turn was the Lord's 'anointed' (20[6], 28[8], 84[9], 89[51], 132[10]), whence the later title 'Messiah.' Prayers for blessing and help and victory were poured out in behalf of the reigning sovereign (21, 45, 72; cf. 63[11]). These hopes in the king were based upon God's covenant with David, related in 2 S 7 (89[3] f., [19-37, 49], 132[10-12]). But the time came when God seemed to have broken His covenant, which was the final horror to a nation whose politics and religion were one (89[38-45]). But the Psalmists still held fast to the 'hope of Israel' that the perfect king of David's line would be born, to rule with unending justice and victory over an ideally perfect Israel in Zion. Whether it would take place before the Exile or after it, when David's crown was cast down to the ground and Jerusalem was destroyed, this wonderful picture of the future never wholly faded from the minds of the Psalmists. The king was enthroned in Zion, being that day constituted officially God's 'son' (2[6] f.). And when this was true of the ideal king, and his ideal dynasty, God would give him world-wide dominion (2[8], 72[8-11], 89[25]), and he, i.e. the royal line, would continue for ever (21[4], 61[6] f., 72[7, 17], 89[28] f., [36] f., 132[12]). One Psalm is unique (110) in expressing the expectation of a king who is also a priest, not of Aaron's line, but possessing a royal priesthood which could be compared with that of Melchizedek; and he would fiercely slaughter his enemies.

Such were the Jewish hopes. And they failed. No earthly king, not to speak of his dynasty, ruled over a perfect Israel in Zion. And this was borne in upon many minds after the time of the Old Testament, with the result that they began to expect that the Anointed for whom they hoped must come from heaven—an apocalyptic idea of which there is no trace in the Psalter. But both the Old Testament hopes and the apocalyptic developments were only gropings in the

dark, which reached the reality in none but Christ, whose kingdom was not of this world. Some of the words which embody the Jewish hopes cannot be used by Christians, who know more of the truth as it is in Jesus (e.g. 2^{9}, 21^{9} f., 72^{9}, 110^{6}). Such passages led Marcion to say that the Messiah of the Jews was the Son of a different God from the Messiah of the Christians. We know that He is the Son of the same God, but a God who is more rightly understood. Much of the language, on the other hand, applies directly to Christ when interpreted with its highest spiritual meaning.

(9) Finally, it must be noted that **hopes of a future life**, a real life beyond the grave, are almost, if not quite, non-existent in the Psalter. Modern study is tending more and more to the refusal of a date as late as the Maccabean period for any of the Psalms. And the earlier they are placed, the less probable any expectation of a future life becomes. The nation was everything; the individual, as such, was nothing. And the immortality of the soul could play no part in the national hope of an endless Davidic dynasty in Jerusalem. The hopelessness of the future of the individual is seen in 6^{5}, 28^{1}, $30^{3,9}$, 31^{12}, 39^{13}, 69^{15}, 88^{4} f., $^{10-12}$, 115^{17}, 143^{3}, and the Christian can only thank God that He has taught him otherwise. There are, however, a few passages, speaking of a close communion with God, so worded that, from the Christian point of view, they *imply* a future life, in which the individual soul can alone receive complete satisfaction. These are discussed in the notes.

Commentary

Book I.—Psalms I.-XLI.

I. In several early Christian and Rabbinic writers, and a few Hebrew and Greek MSS., this is combined with 2 as one. Bede repeats the ancient Jewish comment that it begins and ends with a beatitude. And in Ac 13^{32} 'the first' for 'the second' is a variant found in 'Western' authorities, and noted as early as Tertullian. The Psalm appears to have been added as a preface to the whole Psalter after it was complete as it stands.

2. This breathes the spirit of 19^{7-11}, 119. The strength of Israel's piety lay not in a grudging but in a delighted obedience to God's will. The second clause is an allusion to Jos 1^{8}. To meditate day and night has its counterpart in St. Paul's 'pray without ceasing.'

3, 4. With regard to the problem of a recompense to righteous and wicked the same untroubled optimism is shown as e.g. in 37 (see Introduction, § 3).

5, 6. To stand in the judgment is to 'stand their ground,' 'pass muster'; and those who do so are constituted the **congregation of the righteous.** The Jewish Church (as the Christian Church in the NT) is considered potentially to have reached its ideal; but to reach it actually, it must pass through the winnowing process of divine judgment (cf. Mt 3^{12}), i.e. the present, continuous judgment of Him who 'knoweth,' takes notice of, overrules, cares about (cf. Am 3^{2}), the daily moral path of the righteous.

II. Of the collections of Psalms which existed before they were combined in the present whole, one was known as the 'David' collection, the Psalms in it often bearing the title 'to David.' This Psalm was the preface to the collection, setting forth the expectation of the King of whom David was the type and symbol (see Introduction, § 8). The nations are pictured as plotting against the Lord and His anointed one ($^{1-3}$). The Lord mocks at them, and declares the installation of His king ($^{4-6}$). The king cites the pronouncement of the Lord constituting him His Son, and promising him world-wide dominion ($^{7-9}$). He advises the kings of the earth to submit and serve the Lord ($^{10-12}$). The hopes of an ideal King could be satisfied (though the Psalmist could not know it) only in Christ. But it is important to notice that the Christian interpretation cannot necessarily extend to everything that the Psalmist wrote. It is Jewish, and not Christian, to think of God as indulging in derisive laughter at His enemies; and of the King as shepherding them with violence, as a rod of iron smashes pottery. What is Christian is the installation of Christ as King when He 'sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.' St. Paul understood that the covenanted sonship of Israel, of David, and of his dynasty (based on $2\,S\,7^{11b-16}$) was fulfilled at the Resurrection (Ac 13^{33}; cf. Rom 1^{4}). Hence the appropriateness of the Psalm on Easter Day. From that moment the world-wide inheritance (^{8}) went forward towards accomplishment. But the words 'Thou art My Son' could be applied in two other ways. Christ was proleptically invested with the Messianic office at His Baptism; hence the reading (which was not necessarily heretical) in some 'Western' texts in Lk 3^{22} of these words for the ordinary

reading, 'Thou art My Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased.' But, further, His installation was possible only because His Sonship was that of eternal and essential Divinity. The passage is used in this connexion in Heb 1 [5]; and for the same reason He could be a High Priest, not according to the hereditary order of Aaron (5 [5]).

1, 2. Quoted in Ac 4 [25] f.

8, 9. Alluded to in Rev 2 [26] f., 12 [5], 19 [15].

12. **Kiss the Son** is an impossible rendering: there is no article, and the word *bar* is not Hebrew but Aramaic (while the Hebrew *ben* occurs in [7]). With Aquila, Symmachus, and Jerome render *Kiss in purity*, i.e. pay sincere homage (to God).

III. A morning Psalm; the opening (after the preface) of the Davidic collection. The writer is quelling an attack or insurrection, and has just risen from sleep, in perfect trust in God who has, in the past, smitten all his enemies arrayed against him.

2. **My soul**, i.e. 'I,' my whole self, including the natural life which animates the body. With various shades of meaning the word occurs some 130 times in the Psalter.

8. **Salvation** in the OT was primarily 'victory' over earthly enemies. Its full spiritual meaning belongs to the glory of Christianity.

IV. An evening Psalm follows, naturally adopted by the Church for Compline. A *ḥasid*, one of the pious and faithful, suffers from religious hatred and persecution. Helped before, he prays for mercy again ([1]). He exhorts his enemies to 'stand in awe' before God, and to still their hostile thoughts by communing in their beds at night ([2-5]). He speaks to God again in utter trust ([6-8]).

4. **Stand in awe.** The Hebrew word can also mean 'be angry,' as in the LXX, which is echoed in Eph 4 [26]; but that meaning is not possible here.

6. Many sufferers despaired of help from any quarter, but he prays confidently to God. He echoes in his prayer the priestly blessing in Nu 6 [26] (cf. 31 [16], 44 [3], 67 [1], 80 [3, 7, 19]), and expects light, gladness, and peace.

7. God-given gladness is greater than the joy of harvest.

8. 'makest me dwell *alone* in safety' is the true meaning, if the text is correct. The Christian can bid his own sinful heart commune with itself at night, and then in spiritual, interior 'solitude' he can sleep in peace.

V. Another morning Psalm of the faithful lover of God, who, unlike the wicked, can freely approach His presence. It is used at Lauds on Monday.

3. At the morning hour of prayer (cf. 55 [17]) I will **order** or 'arrange' what I have to offer Thee, and will **watch** to receive Thine answer. The former metaphor may be that of arranging a sacrifice (cf. 141 [2]). The Christian's prayer may be not the less real because it is carefully articulated and arranged in an Office.

4. *Thou art not a deity* (*el*) such as the heathen acknowledge, **that hath pleasure in wickedness.** Not for an evil man is a continual **sojourn** as God's guest, i.e. the close communion with Him which was the deepest experience of Hebrew devotion (cf. 15 [1], 23 [5], 24 [3], 27 [4], 52 [8], 61 [4], 65 [4], 84 [4], 91 [1], 140 [13]).

9*b*. Quoted by St. Paul in Rom 3 [13] in the string of passages which has found its way into Ps 14 in the PBV (see note there).

VI. The first of the penitential Psalms, appointed for Ash Wednesday. The expression of physical suffering as bound up with mental, is in accordance with Hebrew temperament and feeling. The enmity of wicked oppressors brought the writer with groans and tears nigh unto death. When sung in public in the Temple these details would be as metaphorical as they are to a European congregation to-day. And, as then, a nation or the Church can use the Psalm with deep meaning in time of disaster or opposition. The reality with which an individual can use it of the oppression of his sins depends on the depth of his penitence. On the relation between sin and suffering see Introduction, § 5.

2. **my bones.** The corresponding assurance is expressed in 34 [20], and the glad satisfaction in 35 [10].

5. The despair of those who expected no remembrance of God in the grave, or thanks to Him in Sheol (Greek *Hades*, the condition of the departed), is mercifully not Christian (see Introduction, § 9).

8*a*. Quoted in slightly different forms in Mt 7 [23], Lk 13 [27].

VII. A persecuted man prays for deliverance, protests his innocence of charges which his enemies bring against him, and, like a greater Sufferer, commits himself to Him that judgeth righteously.

4. *Nay* would be better than **Yea.**

5. On **glory** see 30 [12].

6. God has determined to judge the peoples of the earth for their hostility to Israel.

7. They gather round His judgment-seat. **Return thou on high**, if the reading is correct, expresses the bold figure of

God going up into heaven, to which He returns after the judgment is over. But since the next verse pictures it as still in progress, we should probably read *sit Thou on high*, i.e. on Thy judgment-seat.

VIII. A hymn of praise to God the Creator. Man is the climax of His creation, and it belongs to him to have dominion over the world. At present he has not; the ideal is reached only in the Representative Man, a thought which is drawn out in Heb 2^{6-8}, where the Psalm is quoted. It is therefore appointed for the Feast of the Ascension, when we commemorate His final triumph. A choice poem, with Gen 1^{28} as its theme.

1. The best emendation of the corrupt Hebrew means *Who hast put Thy glory upon the heavens*, i.e. surrounded them with it as with a mantle (cf. the converse simile in $104^{1.2}$).

2. By the words of even the feeblest of mankind *hast Thou founded strength* for maintaining Thy cause against those that oppose Thee, and tyrannize over mankind; the heavens, clothed with Thy glory, could not do it; only man is superior to Nature. The thought of the divine strength as an attribute worthy of praise led to LXX, *Thou hast perfected praise*, which is quoted of the praises of the children in Mt 21^{16}; and cf. the thought in 1 Cor $1^{27.28}$.

5. According to the Hebrew and Greek the first word should be **And**, i.e. *and yet*; in spite of appearances man was given the highest conceivable dignity. *Thou madest him to lack but little of divinity* (*elohim*). LXX and Vulgate have 'angels,' which enters into the argument of Heb 2. This thought of a plurality of beings arose from the fact that *elohim* is plural in form, and could denote any manifestations of the divine power, even earthly authorities (cf. $82^{1.6}$). But the Hebrews could use it as a plural of majesty; cf. 'Let us make man,' etc. (Gen 1^{26}).

6. **under his feet**: see the allusion in 1 Cor $15^{25.27}$; Eph 1^{22}.

IX., X. Originally one, as they are reckoned in LXX and Vulgate; they were divided probably for liturgical purposes, 10 being left without a title. The combined Psalm was written as an acrostic (as 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145), the letters of the Hebrew alphabet in order forming the initials of every second verse. But this was disarranged by hymn-book editors and scribal corruption, two letters being lost in 9, and only five preserved in 10. The division was made at the natural dividing-point of the subject-matter. In 9 is expressed thankful praise for divine help and victory in the past. This justifies the confidence at the end of 10, following an agonized prayer to God, who seems to be standing aloof, to punish wicked enemies and deliver the righteous poor.

IX. 13. **liftest me up**, i.e. 'rescuest me,' 'keepest me alive,' when I have been brought near to death. It is true, of course, of rescue from spiritual as well as human enemies.

14. His preservation from death will enable him to praise God in the public worship.

16*b*. The supreme instance of this was seen when God made the Cross to be an instrument of Life.

17. *The wicked* [i.e. whole nations, parallel with the second clause] *shall turn back to Sheol*, the verb being the same as in ^{3}; they shall come, that is, to attack Israel, but will be put to flight and slaughtered.

X. 3*b*. AV and PBV should be corrected by the RV; cf. 'contemn God' $(^{13})$.

7*a*. Quoted by St. Paul in Rom 3^{14} in the string of passages which has found its way into Ps 14 in the PBV (see note there).

10. The reading of RVm is probably right.

15. Render *seek his wickedness, and Thou shalt find none*, because the wicked nation will all have been destroyed.

18. **which is of the earth** in Christian language would mean 'earthly,' 'human'; but the Psalmist probably meant 'from the land,' i.e. having been destroyed from off the land, referring to ^{16}.

XI. In the face of faint-hearted counsel $(^{1-3})$ the Psalmist retains his firm trust in God $(^{4-7})$.

1. *flee to the mountain as a bird*: **your mountain** is the rendering of a corrupt reading; RVm may be disregarded. The hill country was frequently a place of escape for the persecuted, as it was a hiding-place for the 'little bird' (as the word means) from its enemy the bird of prey.

3. Render *What hath the righteous wrought?* All the efforts of the righteous have been useless (so the faint-hearted complain) in the face of the destruction of the foundations of society, the law and order of the community (cf. 75^{3}, 82^{5}).

6. Read, with Symmachus, *He shall rain coals of fire*; snares cannot be rained. **burning wind** is the sirocco from the desert.

7*b*. It is very doubtful if any Psalmist knew of a future life (see Introduction, § 9), and it is unnecessary to assume that meaning here. The NT equivalent is 'the

pure in heart shall see God' (cf. 17 [15]; 27 [4], 63 [2]).

XII. The Psalmist feels himself alone amid universal hypocrisy and loud, overbearing oppression. His lament ([1-4]) is met by the answer of God ([5]) inspiring him with trust ([6-8]).

3. *May Jehovah cut off* is a burning wish.

6. The words of men are deceitful, but the words of God (in this case the words in [5]) are as sincere as refined silver. The text in the second clause is corrupt.

7. this generation is the class or type of man now found generally on the earth (cf. 24 [6]; Lk 17 [25]).

XIII. Hope deferred ([1, 2]). Prayer for help ([3, 4]). Joyful confidence ([5, 6]).

1, 2. The cry **How long?** is heard in every age; it is echoed by the martyr-souls beneath the Altar (Rev 6 [10]), and the answer is always 'Yet for a little season.' 'It is no small advantage to have a feeling that God is forgetting us. . . . Many suffer this, and neither know it nor lament it' (Chrysostom). The word rendered **for ever**, which is scarcely possible after the question, should be *continually*, without cessation or relief (79 [5], 89 [46]).

6. PBV follows LXX and Vulgate in adding the words of 7 [17]: 'Yea, I will praise the name of the Lord most High.'

XIV. This Psalm had an interesting textual history. The MS. on which it was first written appears to have suffered from age or accident, so that [5, 6] became nearly obliterated. And a hymn-book editor reconstructed them as best he could, adhering where possible to the remains of the words that were still visible. In his amended form it was included in the hymn-book as Ps 53. The Psalmist speaks of the universal depravity of men, workers of iniquity devouring Israel and defying God ([1-4]). He points to some event in the past when God threw His enemies into a panic and destroyed them ([5]); and longs for the time when He will work for His people again ([6]).

4. Probably means *By devouring my people they have made their bread*, i.e. their living, their wealth (cf. Am 7 [12]).

6. A much slighter emendation is possible than that adopted in 53. All that is wanted is a correction that will make the first half of the verse parallel to 'There were they in great fear.' At present it is difficult to see either connexion or meaning. But a very small change gives *At the counsel of the poor they were ashamed.*

7. The words may, but do not necessarily, imply that Israel was in captivity. The phrase is occasionally used more generally for 'restoreth the fortunes of,' bring out of any kind of trouble (cf. especially 126 [1, 4]; Job 42 [10]).

As sung in the Prayer Book the Psalm has suffered another curious fate. St. Paul, after quoting words from the first three verses in Rom 3 [10-12], continues with a string of quotations from Ps 5 [9], 140 [3], 10 [7], Is 59 [7, 8]; Ps 36 [1]. These were inserted by a Christian in the margin of some ancient MS. of LXX, and were copied into the text of the oldest MS. of LXX that we possess, and hence into the Old Latin and Jerome's 'Roman' Psalter. Origen, in his Greek Old Testament, marked them as no true part of the Psalm, and Jerome similarly in his 'Gallican' Psalter; but the marks disappeared when the Vulgate was copied. The verses then found their way into Coverdale's Bible, thence into Matthew's (Roger's) and the 'Great Bible' (Cranmer's). The Psalter of the last is that of the Prayer Book, so that a string of passages put together by St. Paul is sung by the Church as part of this Psalm.

XV. The character of the man who is fit to dwell as God's guest in His 'tent,' i.e. as a citizen of Zion in communion with Him (see on 5 [4]). The Psalm is sung on the Feast of the Ascension as a memorial of the Perfect Man who passed into the Dwelling of God. The Hebrew writer aimed at social morality; Christianity places before us a much higher ideal, though most Christians fail to recognize it.

4. PBV, 'unto his neighbour . . . though it were to his own hindrance' is a duplicate, combining the Gk. and the Heb. readings, of which the former is perhaps the more probable.

XVI. Goes further than the last, making a near approach to the Christian spirit of joyous satisfaction in God as man's supreme good. It is a 'michtam,' separated from the collection in 56-60. The word has been thought to mean 'jewel,' but at any rate the poem is one of the purest gems in the Psalter.

2*b*. The soul that had reached this point before the full beauty of God was revealed in the Incarnate Christ, had advanced a long way on the path of holiness.

3 is corrupt. LXX suggests 'for the saints that are in the land *He maketh glorious His delight in them.*' Man's satisfaction in God is met by His satisfaction in man; it is the give and take of love.

4-8. He wants no foreign gods; God is his utter satisfaction, his Adviser, his Protector. 'Let others choose for themselves portions, earthly and temporal, to enjoy;

the portion of the saints is the Lord eternal. Let others drink of deadly pleasures, the portion of my cup is the Lord' (Augustine, quoted by Briggs).

9-11. One of the passages in which it is exceedingly important to distinguish between the meaning which the words originally had for the Hebrew writer and that which they have for Christians. With St. Peter who quotes [8-10], and St. Paul who quotes [10] (Ac 2 [25-28], 13 [35]), Christians can understand them as fulfilled in Christ's Resurrection, which gives us the sure and certain hope of our own. But the Christian meaning can be drawn more easily from LXX than from Heb: 'rest in hope' and **see corruption** suggest it more clearly than **dwell in safety** and 'see the pit.' And '*at* Thy right hand' can carry our thoughts to the Ascension. For the Catholic Church the verses contain all the volume of meaning that she has found in them. But that meaning was not visible to the Psalmist. He knew himself to be a *hasid*, rendered **Thy holy one** in [10], or better, as in RVm, *godly* or *beloved*. And the Hebrew seems originally to have had the plural, which was afterwards changed to the singular. He is confident of two things: firstly, that God will protect His saints, and not suffer them to be killed, himself among them: his heart, therefore, and glory (see on 30 [12]) rejoice; 'my flesh also shall dwell *confidently* [i.e. in safety in this life], for Thou shalt not leave my life [*nephesh*, the natural life or psyche shared with the lower animals] *to* Sheol, neither wilt Thou suffer Thy beloved one[s] to see the *pit*'; secondly, that God would lead him ever further along the path of the life that is really life, the life lived now in the presence of God, which is fulness of joy; and God has endless pleasure in His right hand, ready to bestow. Without a definite expectation of a future life the writer expresses longings which cannot receive their full satisfaction without it.

XVII. There are several points of resemblance with 16; but in this case the writer is in danger, and communes with God in his bed at night ([3, 15]). He appeals to God to hear his prayer, asserting his innocence of character ([1-5]). He prays Him, of His loving-kindness, to save him from the machinations of proud enemies, and to defeat them and defend him ([6-14a]). They are enriched with things of sense, while he is utterly satisfied with his spiritual sight of God ([14b, 15]). The text contains corruptions, especially in [14] (to 'life').

3. **I am purposed** should probably be vocalized as a substantive belonging to the previous clause: 'and findest *no evil purpose in me*; my mouth,' etc. The divine test at night reveals nothing wrong either in thought or secret word.

4. **by the word** means 'in accordance with the word.'

7. Better, *them that trust in Thy right hand against them that raise themselves up*. 8. 'Thy wings': see on 57 [1].

13. 'by' is not in Heb. With RVm, 'the wicked *which is* Thy sword' (cf. Is 10 [5]); wicked enemies are God's instrument for punishing Israel. But the word seems to be part of the corruption of the next verse.

14*a*. From the Christian standpoint **men of the world** ('this world' PBV) would mean 'worldly men'; but there is no such use of the word in the OT. The first half of the verse stands literally, 'from men Thy hand Yahweh from men the world their portion in life,' a corruption which has invited various corrections from commentators.

14*b*. On the problem of the prosperity of the wicked see Introd., § 3. Its growing acuteness gradually drove the devoted fearers of God, at a later time, to a belief in a future life.

15. All that the Psalmist wants is to 'see' God; *let me behold Thy face . . . let me be satisfied with Thy form when I awake*. Close communion with God made him feel as though He were visibly, or tangibly, present, a mystical experience which many saints have reached. The same word 'form' is used in Nu 12 [8]. The position is the same as in 16: to a Christian the words point to the other life; but when the Psalmist has prayed to be delivered from death ([8, 9]), the prospect of it does not enter into his prayer. He is communing at night ([3]), and prays that each morning, when he awakes, he may be satisfied with God's close presence (cf. 139 [18]).

XVIII. The Psalm is given as David's in 2 S 22, the first verse of that chapter being the basis of the title here. He says in effect, 'By the grace of God I am what I am,' a king with wide dominions, delivered from desperate perils, and all his enemies overcome. In 2 S the Psalm seems to be in an earlier form, which was smoothed and corrected for Temple use; so that the two recensions should be studied side by side.

4, 5. For **cords** (the first clause of [4] is repeated in 116 [3a]) in the two verses 2 S has 'breakers' and 'cords.' The Psalmist speaks of rescue from imminent

peril of death (cf. 16[10]). But LXX has 'pangs,' hence the renderings of Vulg., AV, PBV; and this is adopted by St. Peter (Ac 2[24]) in reference to Christ's release from death by Resurrection. It is an instance of the Christian meaning transcending that of the Hebrew with the help of the LXX.

7-15. Ever since the experience at Sinai a terrific storm remained a constant metaphor of Hebrew writers to represent an appearance of God on earth; 'the fires that rushed on Sinai down' (cf. 50[3], 97[2-5], 144[5-7]).

12. *From the brightness before Him* [i.e. surrounding His presence] *there passed through hail and coals of fire:* i.e. His hidden brightness pierces the clouds as a storm of hail and lightning, the thunder being spoken of in the next verse. ('His thick clouds' must be omitted; the letters are an accidental doublet of the almost identical letters of 'passed through.')

14. Cf. 144[6].

25, 26. The character of each man necessarily determines what God means to him; the effect is as though God came to meet perverseness and gave way to it (cf. 78[29] f., 106[15]; Rom 1[24, 26, 28]).

35. We know 'the meekness and gentleness of Christ'; the writer attributes the same to God, so that God treated him as a 'great' person to be greatly cared for. LXX adopts another pointing, 'Thy discipline'; and PBV combines them, 'Thy loving correction.'

49. Quoted in Rom 15[9].

XIX. The hymn-book editors seem to have combined an early Psalm on Nature ([1-6]) with a later one on the Law ([7-14]). The effect was to emphasize the truth that Nature and the Law are alike the work of God; that is, that the Creator, whom all nations reverenced in their various ways, was the personal God who revealed His will to Israel. To the Christian both these aspects are represented in the Logos, God's Agent in creation, and also the revelation of His Being and Character. The Psalm consequently gains a volume of meaning by its use on Christmas Day.

2. Each day and night, as though alive, hands on to the next the praises of God in an endless chain.

3. They utter songs without words.

4. The quotation of the words in Rom 10[18] led to the thought that the heavens symbolized the apostles or the evangelists 'in whom God dwells as in the heavens' (Augustine).

5 was widely interpreted of the Bridegroom of the Church, who came forth from the womb of the B.V. Mary.

6. He proceeded from the Father, and returned to Him (cf. Jn 16[28]).

12, 13. For accidental errors and secret faults, things that he could not remember and others that he knew not of, there was atonement in the Jewish Law; but for presumptuous sins, committed 'with a high hand,' there was none (Nu 15[30] f.). He asks, therefore, to be cleansed from the former, but kept back from the latter. The Christian rejoices in the fact that Christ bore not only the former but both; so that divine absolution is possible even for the 'great offence.'

XX. This and 21 are similar in substance and structure, and probably belonged to the same occasion, when prayer was offered for a king before battle. Refrains or responses in the first person occur at 20[5, 9] and 21[13], and one seems to have fallen out after 21[7]. The two Psalms take on a deep meaning if adapted as the Church's prayer for the triumph of Christ over the hearts of men.

1. on high: out of the reach of enemies (cf. 27[6], 61[2], 91[14]).

3. Perhaps a sacrifice was being offered as they sang (see Introd., § 4).

5. set up our banners, if the text is right, seems to mean 'wave' them in triumph.

9. RVm is probably right. The transition to the thought of the divine King, with no indication that the word has changed its force, is very abrupt. PBV 'O King of heaven' boldly paraphrases it.

XXI. See on 20.

4. In the deepest meaning of the words, as of much else in the Psalm, this found its literal fulfilment in Christ alone. Mediæval commentators delighted to refer **He asked life of Thee** to the prayer in Gethsemane, 'Let this cup pass from me'; and the **long** life which He gained through death was the answer to the prayer. As applied to the earthly king **for ever and ever** meant a long reign of uninterrupted prosperity; cf. the phrase 'O king, live for ever' (Dan 6[21]).

9. 'Thy *presence*,' as in RVm; i.e. when Thou appearest in person to punish them.

XXII. The most remarkable instance in the Psalter of revulsion from the deeps of agony to the calmness of assured confidence in God. The first part consists of well-defined stanzas. The Psalmist feels forsaken of God, though He had always helped the fathers of old ([1-5]). His enemies despise and deride him for his trust in God since his birth ([6-10]). They surround him like bulls and lions, and he is *in extremis* ([11-15]). They surround him like dogs, maltreating him, and robbing and parting his garments

(16-18). He prays to be delivered from the sword, the lion, and the wild-ox (19-21). In the second half: He will offer praise in the public worship for God's mercy to the afflicted (22-26). All nations shall submit and serve God (27-29). The future seed of Israel shall serve and praise Him (30, 31). These contents are expressed as though they depicted the experiences and hopes of an individual. But the inclusion of Part II, which some have thought to have been taken from another Psalm, was possible only if the sufferings were symbolic, and the writer felt himself to be in some way representative of the nation. The Psalm portrays the persecution of a faithful nucleus, idealized in a personified form (according to a very common Hebrew way of thinking), whose sufferings were to lead to national praise, world-wide enlargement, and a posterity which would continue to acknowledge God's work. This hope is repeated even more clearly in Is 52 13-15, 53, but, like all Israel's hopes, could never be attained till they found fulfilment in Christ—sometimes in Christ the King, here in Christ the representative Sufferer. The Psalm was not a *prediction* of Him, any more than all the other Psalms to which mystical interpretations can be given, but a poet's expression of a supreme ideal, which none but He could embody. His actual physical sufferings correspond, to a large extent, with those in the Psalmist's description; but the Church's strongest reason for choosing it as a Passion Psalm, and appointing it for Good Friday, was the application of the first clause to Himself by our Lord. It is also used on Friday at Prime.

1*a*. Our Lord quoted it in Aramaic, which is best represented in Mk 15 34.

1*b* is difficult, as the italics of RV show. Omitting one letter read 'and art far from my *cry*, the words of my roaring.'

3. RVm gives the literal meaning. The praises of Israel, as they rise from the Temple, bear God as it were upon a throne.

7. 'Wagging their heads' (cf. 109 25). Mt 27 39 and Mk 15 29 recall the passage.

8. **Commit**: lit. 'roll' (see 37 5). The words are echoed in Mt 27 43; cf. Wisd 2 16 ff.

16. **They pierced.** The meaning is probably 'dug,' as LXX, Vulgate, Syr. The **dogs** ('the unclean, cowardly, worrying rabble,' Kirkp.) dug their teeth into my hands and feet, i.e. brutally attacked me. There is no NT reference to this passage; that in Jn 19 37, Rev 1 7 is to Zech 12 10.

18. Jn 19 24. The quotation in Mt 27 35 is absent from the best MSS.

19. **my darling**: lit. 'my only one,' i.e. my life (parallel with 'soul'), supremely precious to me (cf. 35 17).

21. **Wild oxen** (cf. 29 6, 92 10) are two-horned, not 'unicorn' (LXX, Vulg). St. Paul's 'I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion' (2 Tim 4 17) may be a reminiscence of the first clause.

22. Used mystically in Heb 2 12 as said by Christ, showing that He is Brother to men.

26. **shall eat**, *sc.* the flesh of the thank-offering. So the thank-offering of the Holy Eucharist is in consequence of the perfect sufferings of Christ.

29. Rich and poor alike shall eat.

XXIII. Every word reaches its fullest depth of meaning in the Christian's peace and trust in the Good Shepherd. It has often been used as a funeral Psalm, but it applies as much to this life as to the next.

4. **shadow of death** is a rendering due to what is probably a misreading of a single word, '*gloom*,' by dividing it into two. It can be applied either to death or to the troubles of this life. Aug. (with the old rendering) says that this life *is* the shadow of death.

5. The metaphor changes to that of a bounteous host. There is a rich table (at which he can defy all his enemies, because to eat at the host's table means to be under his protection). There is oil for festal anointing ('Ye have an unction from the Holy One'). And the guest dwells for an endless sojourn in the house of God (spiritual nearness to Him both now and hereafter); see on 5 4.

XXIV. **Part I.**—The transcendent majesty of the one and only God, taught by the prophets, is seen in Nature (1, 2). But if He is Creator and Ruler of all the earth, the behaviour of all men is equally of concern to Him. Man, therefore, to dwell as His guest (see on 4) must be moral (3-6). The latter verses find a parallel in 15, but 1, 2 suggest a larger thought.

Part II.—God Himself (not the moral man) enters into the holy place (7-10). This is a much earlier thought, dating from the time when David carried the ark to Zion. The two parts are on different planes, and it is probable that two Psalms have been put together. For Christians they are, of course, one, in suggesting a still greater truth. The Psalm, like 15, is chosen for the Feast of the Ascension. The Creator, who took to Himself the perfect Man, enters in triumph into the Holy Place. It is by the juxtaposition of the two parts that the Psalm can most completely prefigure the Incarnate Christ.

1. Quoted, in its Greek form, by St. Paul (1 Cor 10 [26]) to support the teaching that all foods are lawful for a Christian.

3, 4. The sixth Beatitude (Mt 5 [8]) is based on the thought.

6. **generation** (cf. 12 [7]). **seek**, normally, as a habit; the verb is frequentative. Jacob cannot be understood as a name of God. RV adds 'God of' with LXX, Vulgate, Syr.

7. The **everlasting doors** are the gates of Zion of immemorial antiquity, and expected to last for an indefinite period. It is Christianity that gives to the word its fullest spiritual meaning.

XXV. An alphabetical Psalm (see on 9-10), nearly intact; a whole verse, however, is lost with the sixth letter between [5] and [6]. The acrostic is complete without the last verse, which was evidently added (as in 34) for liturgical purposes. The Psalm divides itself into three: in the middle ([8-15]) the writer speaks of God's character in His attitude towards those who fear and obey Him. Before and after this, petitions for protection, pardon, and guidance stream forth with no arrangement from a full heart.

16-19. The writer closely connects suffering and sin. The idea that the former was always the punishment of the latter is opposed by our Lord (see Introduction, § 5).

22. **Redeem** (see on 26 [11]).

XXVI. The Psalmist asserts his integrity, asking God to examine him ([1-5]). Pure from wrong he will take part in the service of the sanctuary which he loves ([6-8]). He prays to be preserved from the sudden death that is visited upon sinners ([9-11]). He stands safe, and will bless the Lord in the services of the Church ([12]). The Psalm is used at Prime on Wednesday; and it naturally lends itself for the purpose of preparation for the Holy Sacrament.

5. **sit with the wicked** (cf. 1 [1]).

6. Cf. 73 [13]. For hand-washing as an assertion of innocence see Dt 21 [6]; Mt 27 [24]; there may also be an allusion to the ceremonial purity of the priests obtained by washing (Ex 30 [17-21]). The words probably suggested the rite of Lavabo. There is not enough liturgical evidence to determine whether **compass** means march round with music and song while the priests were offering sacrifice, or 'surround,' i.e. form one of the ring of worshippers standing round the altar, though the former is the more probable.

9. **Gather not**: take not away in death (cf. 104 [29]; and see Ec 12 [7]).

11. **Redeem** in the OT often means no more than 'deliver' (PBV) or 'rescue'; cf. 25 [22], 31 [5], 44 [26], 49 [7] f., the meaning being necessarily confined to this life. Its spiritual value is derived from Christianity.

12*a*. A metaphor from mountain climbing (cf. 18 [36]). The word for **even place** also means 'righteousness.' It is used in 27 [11] ('plain path'), 143 [10] ('uprightness').

XXVII. Commentators are mostly agreed that two Psalms have been placed together. **Part I**: The Psalmist looks back with triumphant joy to a victory over enemies ([1-3]), and forward to a safeguarding by God in His 'tent,' and sacrifices of thanksgiving ([4-6]). **Part II**: A plaintive prayer for help, ending with a note of encouragement ([7-14]).

4. Cf. 23 [6], and see 5 [4] (note). To **inquire** is to get guidance and encouragement from God. This he would obtain in the Temple (cf. 73 [17]).

5*a*. The divine presence in the Temple was itself a safeguard to the city against enemies (cf. 31 [20]). And the same is true when the Temple is the heart of man.

5*b*, 6*a*. See on 20 [1]. 10. Cf. Is 49 [15].

11. 'plain path': see on 26 [12].

13. There is no justification for **I had fainted**, and Heb. scribes mark **unless** as doubtful. It is a plain statement, **I have believed to see**, etc. To a Hebrew writer **the land of the living** meant 'this earth on which people are alive' (cf. 52 [5], 116 [9], 142 [5]; Jer 11 [19]; Ezek 26 [20]; and see 56 [13]). To a Christian it means the land of everlasting life.

XXVIII. A cry of the Psalmist to God to hear him ([1, 2]). A prayer that he may not share the fate of the wicked, and that they may receive their deserts ([3-5]). Then the tone suddenly changes: a thanksgiving ([6, 7]). Confidence that God will help the king ([7]). A prayer for the people ([8]). The two parts may be Psalms by the same writer before and after a deliverance.

2. **oracle** would mean 'the place where God speaks'; but that is due to a wrong derivation. It should be simply 'shrine,' the innermost sanctuary of the Temple, afterwards called the Holy of Holies.

3. **Draw me not away**, i.e. to death. It is like 'gather' (26 [9]).

5. **the operation of His hands**. What He does is contrasted with what they do ([4]).

9*b*. The Shepherd not only feeds His flock, but 'gathers the lambs with His arm.' The clause is quoted in the *Te Deum* from the Vulgate.

XXIX. The display of God's power in nature shows what He has always been able to do, and will do, for His people. The angels are called upon to worship

God (1, 2). His power displayed in a thunderstorm (3-9). Enthroned at the Deluge He is King for ever, and will give His people strength and peace (10, 11). In ancient Jewish worship the Psalm was sung at Pentecost and other festivals.

1. **sons of the mighty**: lit. 'sons of *elim*,' i.e. beings supernatural in origin, 'heavenly powers' (Welch). So 89 6. PBV 'bring young rams unto the Lord' (from LXX) is an accidental repetition of the former clause, with *eylim*, 'rams,' for *elim*, 'mighty.'

2. RVm is right; the angels are arrayed in splendour, as the priests in their beautiful vestments. The word occurs only in 96 9; 1 Ch 16 29; 2 Ch 20 21.

6. 'wild-ox' (see on 22 21).

7. God's voice causes forked lightning to flash. Mystical writers think of the fire upon the disciples at Pentecost. And they compare the seven thunders in the Psalm with Rev 10 4.

10. Lit. *The Lord sat at the Deluge*, a word found only in the account in Gen 6-11.

11. '*Gloria in Excelsis* is the beginning, and *pax in terra* the end' (Delitzsch).

XXX. The Psalmist nearly died, and thanks God for healing. Individual, apparently, in origin, the Psalm must have been used with a national significance when sung in the Temple. Perhaps the reference was to the narrow escape from extinction at the Exile.

3. Some Fathers refer to Christ's return from Hades at the Resurrection.

5. The vivid metaphor of RVm is right. For the morning cf. 49 14, 90 14.

9. **the dust** is the grave, as in 22 15, 29. The Christian, on the other hand, can thank God that the grave is a 'bed of hope.'

12. **my glory**: the noblest part of my being, the soul, heart, rational life; capable of praising God (16 9, 57 8 = 108 1); parallel with 'soul' (see on 3 2). PBV 'every good man' seems to be a curious guess.

XXXI. The trustful prayer of one in trouble (1-8). His affliction described again in far more troubled language (9-13). A renewed expression of trust (14-18). A blessing of God for His help to the troubled (19-24). The use of 1-5 as a Compline Psalm is due to 5, where the soul is in union with Christ in commending itself to the Father.

5. Our Lord's close familiarity with the Psalm is shown by His use of the first clause of this verse in the last seconds of His earthly life (Lk 23 46). The remaining words prohibit the idea of some mystical writers that if Christ quoted anything in a Psalm in reference to Himself, the whole Psalm must apply to Him. On 'redeem' see 26 11. The Psalmist commends himself trustfully to God *in this life* because He has delivered him in the past. Redemption is an aspect of the Atonement which obviously could not have been known before Christ died, but the Christian can now use the words in that sense.

11. **without**, in the streets, they publicly shunned him.

15. **My times**: my experiences, the vicissitudes of my life. Cf. 1 Ch 29 30. See on 4 6. 20. See on 27 5.

XXXII. A penitential Psalm, appointed for Ash Wednesday, and used at Prime on Ferias in Lent. The remembrance of penitence and the blessedness of forgiveness in the past (1-5). God is a refuge for the godly and for the Psalmist himself (6, 7). God (probably) is represented as speaking, saying that He will guide and counsel (8, 9). The Psalmist rejoices in His mercy (10, 11). Some have thought that 6-11 are from a different Psalm from 1-5, dealing with rescue from enemies instead of penitence; the tone is felt to be hortatory rather than reminiscent, 8, 9, being thought to contain words addressed by the Psalmist to those whom he is teaching. But no sure conclusions can be drawn because the text of the last clause of each of the verses 4, 6, 8, 9 is corrupt, various emendations being proposed which must be studied in commentaries.

1, 2*a*. Quoted by St. Paul (Rom 4 7 f.) in connexion with his doctrine of justification by faith.

4. Mental misery expressed itself in physical misery, the punishment continuing to burden him so long as he kept silence and would not acknowledge his guilt. The unburdening of conscience is often a relief to the body as well as the soul.

XXXIII. A beautiful Psalm with no great difficulties, apparently occasioned by some victory, for which the congregation gives thanks. Praise to God for His faithfulness and mercy (1-5). The divine word had power in the Creation (6-9). He has power, with His everlasting counsel and thoughts, to frustrate the counsel and thoughts of the nations, so that His chosen people can praise Him (10-12). He looketh at all nations; material strength is of no help, but His look is a safeguard to them that trust in Him (13-19). Israel has trusted Him, and rejoices (20-22).

13. The look is for a different purpose from that in 14 2. 16-18. Cf. 147 10, 11.

XXXIV. An alphabetical Psalm (see on 9, 10); as in 25 the sixth letter is missing,

and the last verse is additional after the end of the acrostic. On account of [8] it was used as a Eucharistic Psalm in the early Church.

7. The angel of the Lord (only 35[5, 6] in the Psalter) is not an angelic minister inferior to God, but God Himself manifested as the Guardian of His people (cf. Ex 23[20] ff.). He commands the host which encamps round them (cf. 2 K 6[17]; Zech 9[8]; and see 91[11]).

8. Everything that is true of God is true of Christ as Lord; hence the use of the words in 1 P 2[3].

11. *Come, sons:* cf. 'Hear, sons' (Pr 4[1]). The word in the mouth of a teacher is characteristic of Pr 1-8, and **the fear of the Lord** of the Wisdom literature generally.

13-16*a*. Quoted in 1 P 3[10-12].

22. On **redeem** see 26[11].

XXXV. The Psalmist calls upon God to defend him (i.e. the community of godly men whom he represents) against cruel and treacherous enemies. There are three stanzas: Prayer against them ([1-8]). Their gratuitous treachery ([11-17]). Renewed prayer against them ([19-27])—each stanza being followed by a vow of praise ([9] f., [18, 28]).

5, 6. the angel of the Lord: cf. 34[7].

8. at unawares: better 'which he knoweth not,' an echo of Is 47[11*a*], where the word for **destruction** is rendered 'desolation' in the RV and AV. For 'with destruction' in the last clause read *the pit that he had digged*, an echo of 9[15].

11. They demand of me retribution for wrongs of which my conscience is innocent.

13. He used, before they showed themselves to be enemies, to fast, pray, and mourn when they were sick, and this is their return (cf. 109[4]). **And my prayer returned,** etc., perhaps means 'my prayer, having failed to bring a blessing to them, reacts with blessing upon myself' (cf. Lk 10[6]).

15. *smiters* (RVm) is right. **I knew not** seems to mean either 'I knew not why' or 'for things that I knew not,' the latter echoing[11].

16. The first clause is corrupt; see commentaries. **17. darling:** cf. 22[20].

19. The last words (cf. 69[4]) appear in Jn 15[25].

20. quiet in the land: i.e. Israel as the peaceful worshippers of God.

26. An echo of [4]. With [25-27] compare the similar 40[14-16] = 70[2-4].

XXXVI. The blatant wickedness of one who fears not God nor His punishments ([1-4]). On the other hand, the character of God ([5-7]) is as a flowing stream of satisfaction to them that recognize Him ([8, 9]). A confident prayer of the righteous persecuted by the wicked ([10-12]). In [5-9] there is a large, world-wide conception of God's kindness to men and beasts which has seemed to some to be on a different plane from the rest of the Psalm. But at any rate it forms a fine answer to the practical atheist.

1. *his heart* (RVm and Vss.) must be right. Transgression is personified and pictured as speaking to the wicked, though no words are given. Lit. 'there is an oracular utterance of the transgression of the wicked within his heart.'

2. Render, *For it* [i.e. transgression] *speaks smooth things to him in his eyes, with regard to the finding out of his sin and hating it.* It tells him that God does not search out sin for punishment, or hate it. A striking description of self-deceit.

6, 7. They are as far-reaching as the heavens (cf. 103[11]), and as profound as the great deeps of water beneath the earth.

8. God's blessings are as a feast (cf. 23[5], 63[5]) and a river; a spiritual foretaste of the Eucharistic Feast, 'the torrent of pleasure, the richness of the house of God.'

9. 'Golden sayings like this anticipate the revelation of the Gospel' (Kirkp.).

11. drive me away, as a fugitive exile.

XXXVII. An alphabetical Psalm (see on 9, 10). In face of the problem of the prosperity of the wicked some (as in this Psalm) were able, with an unshakable optimism, to retain their simple, old-world confidence that the wicked rich could not be permanently prosperous, and that the pious poor must, in this world, be compensated. For others this was difficult, if not impossible (see Introduction, § 3). The Christian, who knows that the blessedness of the righteous is not in temporal things but in the eternal, may —and must—read this thought into the Psalm, with thanksgiving that he has been led to the full truth that the Psalmist had not reached. The style and tone are didactic, as in Proverbs, and in other exhortations of the 'wise men' of Israel.

5. Hebrew poets did not avoid mixed metaphors: **thy way,** thy plan of life in the midst of difficulties, is a burden which thou must *roll* (RVm) upon the Lord. Cf. 22[8] (if the text is right), 1 P 5[7].

7. *Silence* (RVm) before Him in the deepest stillness is the deepest prayer (cf. 62[1, 5]).

11. From this verse our Lord drew the third Beatitude (Mt 5[5]). Those who inherit are differently described in [9, 11, 22, 29, 34]. The Psalmist understood

the land to refer to future temporal prosperity; to Christ 'the earth' was the most general term for this world, but viewed ideally in the light of the 'regeneration.'

20. RV and RVm are both possible renderings of the first clause as it stands; but it is probably corrupt. Some would read *as the kindling of ovens* (cf. Mt 6 [30]).

28. **they are preserved for ever.** The necessary 16th letter is restored by reading, *evil men shall be destroyed for ever* ('evil men,' having the same consonants as 'for ever,' was accidentally omitted).

37, 38. The latter clause of each should be rendered, *There is posterity to the man of peace . . . the posterity of the wicked shall be cut off* (cf. [28], and see Introduction, § 3).

XXXVIII. The Psalmist confesses sin which has resulted in physical sufferings, abandonment by friends, and the cruelty of crafty enemies. At three stages ([9. 15. 21] f.) he addresses God in hope and trust. It is a penitential Psalm, appointed for Ash Wednesday, and said at Terce on Ferias in Lent, in using which the Christian remembers, as often, that we have been freed from the Jewish idea that suffering is necessarily the result of sin (see Introduction, § 5). In liturgical use it could be sung as a description of the nation (cf. Is 1 [5-7]).

13. Like One whose sufferings were the result of others' sin he opened not his mouth (Is 53 [7]).

XXXIX. The Psalmist tries to keep silence in the face of opposition of enemies, but cannot ([1-3]). His physical sufferings have brought him near to death, and he pours out a pitiful complaint on the transitoriness of life ([4-6]). He assumes (see 38) that the sufferings are the result of sin, and with a brave Old Testament faith he hopes in God that He will heal and forgive him, and spare him a little longer from death when he will 'no more be.' But there is not a ray of hope of any life beyond. It is used in the Church as a funeral Psalm; but the Christian, as he reads it, has to supplement it by the sure and certain hope (see Introduction, § 9).

6. Render, *Surely as a* (mere) *semblance doth man walk to and fro; surely as a vapour do they make a turmoil.* 'Semblance' (lit. 'image') is something as unsubstantial as, e.g., a reflexion in a mirror. 'Vapour' (usually rendered 'vanity') is the word which is used with such sadness in Ecclesiastes. So transitory and unabiding is man as he walks and bustles about. **He heapeth up,** etc.: there is the same mournful complaint in Ec 6 [2].

11. **like a moth:** PBV adds 'fretting a garment,' which is a correct explanation, but is not in the Hebrew.

12. I am a stranger and a sojourner, because I can be **with Thee** only in this short life (cf. Gen 47 [9]). The words are transformed by the Christian hope in 1 P 2 [11]; cf. Heb 11 [13].

XL. The literary history of the Psalm does not affect its value from the point of view of Christianity. As a Hebrew composition it consists of what were clearly two Psalms put together.

Part I: 1-11. God is praised for delivering the Psalmist from the depths of peril and misery ([1-3]). Happy is he who has not turned to arrogant apostates ([4]). The wondrous deeds and words of God are beyond description ([5]). The Psalmist would offer sacrifices if He desired them; but what he will do is to live according to His written law ([6-8]), and teach it to others ([9. 10]). And so God will pour out His mercy upon him, and continually preserve him ([11]).

Part II: 12-17. He closely connects the evils that compass him about with his iniquities that have overtaken him ([12]). These evils are the persecution that he suffers from his enemies, against whom he prays ([13-15]). On the other hand, he utters confidence in God and a prayer for help ([16. 17]). The second part is connected with the first by the word 'for' in [12]. But there seems to be no real connexion of thought, and [13-17] is repeated as a whole Psalm in 70. It is possible, as some have thought, that [12] was added by the hymn-book editor who placed the two together.

In its Christian use it is a Psalm for Good Friday, and is used at Prime on Friday; and its application to Jesus Christ is supported by the quotation of [6-8], in their LXX form, in Heb 10 [5-7]. It is impossible, however, for the whole Psalm to be applied to Him, especially [12] ('mine iniquities'; cf. 69 [5]), but the Christian can use it of himself, because God has delivered mankind potentially, and will deliver every man actually, in virtue of Christ's death.

6. On the attitude of the Psalmists towards sacrifice see Introduction, § 4. The ear is in the form of a hole or opening; and so God has **opened** (RVm, 'digged' or 'pierced') it; He has made ears for man, which implies the necessity of obedient listening to His commands. The LXX (perhaps through a misreading) has 'a *body* hast Thou prepared for me'; but this lent itself more readily to a mystical interpretation, and could be quoted with

truth as referring to the Incarnation. 'The possession of a body implies the duty of service, in the same way that the possession of ears implies the duty of obedience' (Kirkp.).

7*a*. **Lo, I am come.** When the servant realized that sacrifices were not wanted—in themselves, indeed, they were useless, since they atoned only for unwitting transgressions—then he appeared before God ready for active obedience. In LXX the word for **I delight** is placed after **to do Thy will**; and by its omission Heb 10 [7] has 'Lo I am come to do Thy will' as a continuous sentence, the intervening words being a parenthesis.

7*b*. The Psalmist says that in the Mosaic Law obedience is *prescribed to* him; but when the Greek was taken as referring to the Messiah, it was understood to mean that His earthly obedience was foretold in prophecy, in the roll of the book it hath been written of me.

14-16 (=70 [2-4]). Compare the similar 35 [25-27].

XLI. God helps the sick and afflicted ([1-3]), and the Psalmist, sick and afflicted ([4-9]), prays to Him with confidence ([10-12]).

1*a*. The meaning is probably *Blessed is the prudent weak man.* 'Prudent' implies the wisdom of moral integrity, such as the teachers of Israel after the Exile loved to inculcate; and 'weak' is a wide term covering 'sick,' 'poor,' and 'afflicted.'

3*b*. The words mean 'Thou changest all his lying down in his sickness,' i.e. changest it into health.

4. **my soul** (see on [32]) is my whole Self in its natural life, in the Hebrew value of the word; for the Christian it is something greater, in which, however, the natural, bodily life is included. The clause occurs in the Ferial Petitions in the Offices of Terce, Sext, and None; and the word can always be given its widest significance.

6. If he visits me he utters false professions of sympathy, but his mind gathers fresh material for mischief, which he repeats abroad.

8. *A base thing* (cf. 101 [3]) *is poured upon him:* a vile disease was inseparable in thought from its necessary cause, a vile sin (see Introduction, § 5).

9. Cf. 55 [13] f., [20] f. This treachery found its supreme embodiment in Judas (Jn 13 [18]; cf. Mk 14 [18]); and see our Lord's reference to Scripture in Jn 17 [12], and St. Peter's allusion in Ac 1 [16].

10. We are thankful that requital was not the purpose of our Lord's raising up.

13. As the Christian Church adds the 'Gloria' to each Psalm, so the Jewish Church added one at the end of each Book (see Introduction).

Book II.—Ps XLII.-LXXII.

In this and the next Book, with very few exceptions, which were probably due to scribes, the personal name Jehovah is avoided, Elohim being substituted; this may have been due to the predilection of an editor, or of certain classes of society. Hence it is often called the Elohistic collection.

XLII., XLIII. These Psalms, of which the second is explained by the first, were one (43 thus having no title). They consist of three stanzas, each ending with the same refrain. An individual, a priest or Levite, speaks as the mouthpiece of all the exiles who longed for restoration to the Temple-worship, in which he used to take a leading part. It is a yearning expression of 'the zeal of Thy house.' 43 is said at Lauds on Tuesday, and lends itself naturally to be used by a priest on his approach to the Altar.

XLII. 5. The Greek has 'Why art thou *sorrowful*' (and in 43 [5]), the word used by our Lord in Mt 26 [38]; Mk 14 [34].

6. **cast down:** the same Greek verb is used by our Lord in Jn 12 [27]. He is banished from home in the region of the Hermon range, where the Jordan rises, of which Mizar (otherwise unknown) was evidently the name of one of the hills.

7. *cataracts* (RVm) is right. The falls of the Jordan symbolize to him the trouble with which he is overwhelmed (cf. 69 [1] f., 124 [4]).

8. **Loving-kindness** is almost personified (cf. 43 [3], 57 [3], 85 [10] f., 89 [14]).

10. The enemy taunt him with the apparent failure of his God to protect His people—one of the most agonizing problems that Israel knew, and often to those who know too little of the Nature of God an agonizing problem still.

XLIV. Confidence in the future because of God's dealings with the nation in the past ([1-8]). A stricken cry that His present dealings are in awful contrast with those ([9-22]). A well-nigh desperate prayer for help ([23-26]).

3. **the light of Thy countenance** (see on 4 [6]).

19. National trouble might be expected to be the punishment of national apostasy, but of this there has been none (see Introduction, § 6).

22. '*Nay*, for Thy sake,' etc.: so far from apostatizing, we are actually being martyred. St. Paul quotes the verse in

Rom 8 [36] to prepare his readers for the possibility of Christian martyrdom.

26. redeem (see on 26 [11]).

XLV. The Psalmist 'speaks the things that he has made [i.e. composed] for a king' at his marriage ([1]). To the king ([2-9]). To the bride ([10-12]). Concerning the bride ([13-15]). To the king ([16, 17]). It is clear from [16], and from the Oriental details in [8] f., [13-14], that the Psalm deals with an actual situation, and is not only prophecy. But as addressed to a human king the words are exaggerated and rhetorical, the courtly poet feeling sure that the king (whoever he was) would prefer the language of high ideal. But for that reason it is really applicable only to Him who fulfilled it to the highest. In the Gregorian use the Psalm was appointed for the Feast of the Annunciation; but in the Anglican, Sarum, and Roman uses the marriage of the King is the unity betwixt Christ and His Church, and the Psalm is, therefore, sung on Christmas Day, when that unity potentially began.

2. Because the Spirit of the Lord was upon Him (Lk 4 [18]), grace was poured upon His lips (*ib.* [22]); therefore God has blessed Him for ever.

3-5. The poet calls upon the king to use his might for right.

6. As addressed to an earthly king the words of the first clause, both translation and text, have been much disputed. The Psalmist cannot have addressed it to God Himself, since he speaks of God, thy God directly afterwards. It must be studied in commentaries. But as applied to Christ it causes no difficulty.

6, 7 are quoted in Heb 1 [8, 9] to uphold the essential difference between Christ and the angels.

10. This self-surrender and detachment are demanded from each member of the Church (Lk 14 [26]).

11. He is fairer than the children of men ([2]), but He desires in them a beauty corresponding to His. With Vulgate and PBV the Christian can boldly add 'God' after 'Lord,' though it is not in the Hebrew.

12. 'The kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honour into it' (cf. 68 [29], 72 [10]).

16. The poet's wish for the earthly king: 'as thou hast succeeded to thine ancestors on the throne, so may thy posterity not fail to succeed thee.'

XLVI. Confidence in the safety of God's protection ([1-3]). His presence in Zion is its protection ([4-7]). His mighty doings for Israel's protection ([8-11]). The refrain ([7, 11]) has very likely been lost from the end of the first stanza. In the Roman use the Psalm is sung at the consecration of a church or altar. It finds its true fulfilment in the Catholic Church, unmoved in its security through all the upheaving crises of its history. Luther's well-known hymn 'Ein feste Burg' is based on it.

4. Cf. Is 8 [6], 33 [21], written on the occasion to which many have thought that the Psalm belongs.

XLVII. The victory of the great King over all the earth, so that foreign nations will come under his rule (see Introduction, § 7). The Psalm is used on the Feast of the Ascension as proclaiming His heavenly sovereignty after His victory on earth.

5. Having come down to win His victory God returns to heaven (cf. 68 [18]). The trumpet was suggested by the triumphal procession when the ark was carried to Zion.

9. In the second line, *with* was accidentally omitted before the people of, the consonants being the same. The shields are the rulers (cf. 84 [9], 89 [18]).

XLVIII. The presence of God has protected Zion from a foreign attack ([1-8]). His name and praise are celebrated in the Temple and to the ends of the earth ([9, 10]). See she is unscathed ([11-14]). The Psalm is sung on Whitsun Day, the birthday of the Church, which will remain for ever secure.

2. Beautiful in elevation: the Church is 'a city set on a hill, that cannot be hid.' the joy of the whole earth (cf. Lam 2 [15]). the city of the great King (cf. Mt 5 [35]).

7. The enemy are wrecked like ships of Tarshish, or they are themselves the ships, as in Is 33 [21].

11. the daughters of Judah are the villages in the surrounding country.

14. even unto death at the end of a national Psalm is quite improbable; the Heb. means *upon death*. The text is corrupt; see commentaries.

XLIX. An Introduction to the poem ([1-4]). The wickedness of the rich should not cause fear, since rich and poor, brutish and wise, die alike ([5-12]). Those who trust in riches will go to the realm of Sheol, while the righteous will be supreme when the 'morning' of vindication dawns ([13-20]). [12, 20] are a refrain concluding the two stanzas. On the certainty of the punishment of the wicked the Psalm is parallel with 1, 37, and many passages throughout the Psalter. But the thought that death is the equal fate of all men alike approaches the sadness of Ecclesiastes. The Jew knew only of

a life with God now; the Christian can go further, and read the whole Psalm in the light of the Resurrection (see Introduction, § 9).

7. On the Jewish meaning of **redeem** see 26^{11}.

8. To preserve the life of a fellow-man from death, so that he should not *see the pit*, is **costly**, it demands more than man can give; it is utterly beyond his powers, so that for all time it is useless for him to make the attempt.

14. On 'the morning' see 30^{5}, 90^{14}.

L. God approaches in storm and tempest for judgment ($^{1-6}$). He tells Israel that He desires not sacrifices but praise and prayer ($^{7-15}$). He rebukes the wicked for stealing, adultery, and false witness ($^{16-22}$). His conclusion ($^{22, 23}$).

2. **The perfection of beauty** (cf. Lam 2^{15}). 3. See on 18^{7-15}.

8. God has no fault to find with the regularity and correctness of their ritual. But they were offering Him only what was His already. What He wanted was the thanksgiving which really came from themselves (see Introduction, § 4).

18-20. God speaks of three of the fundamental laws of social morality in the Decalogue.

23. **to him that ordereth his conversation** ('aright' is not in the Heb.) represents two corrupt words, which need emendation.

LI. The *Miserere* is the penitential Psalm *par excellence*, used incessantly by Christians as the supreme expression of sorrow for sin. It is said in the Comination Service on Ash Wednesday, and many use it at every hour-Office on Ferias in Lent.

4. **be justified**, etc.: be shown to be in the right when Thou givest sentence, and be proved clear of wrong when Thou passest judgment. The last word in LXX may have the same meaning, but in Rom 3^{4} St. Paul quotes it as a passive, which his context requires; and this is followed in Vulg and PBV in the Psalm. St. Paul's word 'overcome,' from LXX, is the Aramaic meaning of the Hebrew verb for 'be clear.' To have sinned *in order that* God might be justified would have been to do evil that good may come, a formal result of strict logic which St. Paul repudiates in the following verses in Romans. A *culpa* can be *felix* in effect but not in purpose, though it seems to man as though they must be one to the foreknowledge of God. Some understand such words as 'I confess this' to be implied before **that thou mightest**, etc.

5. The doctrine of original sin had not been reached in the Psalmist's time. But he confesses racial evil, in which every human being is involved from the first.

14. He does not ask to be kept from bloodshed; the guilt of it was lying upon him, and he asks to be released from it—which is what divine absolution does. The guilt of blood may stand, for the Christian, for the guilt of any mortal sin, that is fatal, in its nature, to himself if not to another.

18, 19. This conclusion evidently belongs to a later time, when the walls of Jerusalem had been destroyed, and God was expected to be pleased with animal sacrifices, contrary to the spirit of ^{16} (see Introduction, § 4). The Christian can use the words with the thought that when the heart has been 'built up' after penitence, God will be pleased with sacramental offerings.

LII. The destruction of those that trust in riches (cf. 49), and the safety of the godly.

5. **the land of the living** (cf. 27^{13}).

8. Cf. 92^{12} f., which makes it probable that trees grew in the Temple courts, where the soil was thought of ideally as being very fertile. The verse is a good instance of the use of the 1st person sing. when the Psalmist speaks as the representative of a class. On dwelling in the house of God, of which this is a simile, see 5^{4}. The wicked **trusted in the abundance of his riches**, but **I trust in the mercy of God.**

LIII. A revised form of Ps 14.

LIV. A prayer for help against enemies ($^{1-3}$). Confidence that God will destroy the enemies and deliver the Psalmist ($^{4-7}$). Used on Good Friday, and every day at Prime, with the thought of the deliverance of Jesus Christ, and of every Christian, from his enemies.

6. *With voluntariness*, gladly, willingly, **will I sacrifice** (see Introduction, § 4). PBV makes less clear the sacramental aspect of the worship.

7*b*. The Christian cannot use the words, except of the overthrow of his spiritual enemies; he has learnt to say, 'Father, forgive them.'

LV. The Psalmist's prayer in distress ($^{1-8}$). His indignation against his enemies, especially against a treacherous friend ($^{9-15}$). Assured trust in God ($^{16-23}$).

9. **divide their tongue**: let their counsel be divided against itself, as in the case of the builders of Babel.

13, 14, 20, 21. It was natural for the Church, from an early date, to think of Judas (cf. 41^{9}).

15. On the vindictive language to be

found in some of the Psalms see Introduction, § 6.

19. who have no changes: i.e. either 'who are unchanging in their godlessness' or 'who are unchanging in their prosperity' and therefore self-complacent and godless. 'Changes' cannot mean 'repentance' as PBV implies.

22. Alluded to in 1 P 5 [7] with 'care' (LXX) for **burden**, the meaning and reading of which are doubtful in the Hebrew.

LVI. From enemies that seek his destruction ([1, 2]), and that are malicious and underhand ([5-8]), the Psalmist is confident that God will deliver him ([3] f., [9-11]). Thanksgiving ([12, 13]).

8. 'The tears of penitents are the wine of angels' (St. Bernard, quoted by Kirkp.). **11.** Cf. 118 [6].

13. the light of the living, like 'the land of the living' (see 27 [13]), was confined to this life for the Psalmist; the Christian has been taught more.

LVII. A confident prayer for help against enemies ([1-4]). This confidence leads the Psalmist to burst into praise ([6-10]). [3] and [11] are a refrain at the end of each stanza. Written as an evening Psalm. No higher confidence is possible than that which leads to praise before the deliverance comes. In the Christian it is at its highest because he praises the risen Christ through whom the deliverance comes. Hence the choice of this Psalm for Easter Day, with the further thought of the deliverance of Christ from His enemies.

1. Thy wings is here probably a figure from the cherubim whose wings spread over the ark; it is the brooding, protecting presence of God, afterwards called by the Jews 'the Shekinah' (cf. 17 [8], 61 [4], 91 [4]). The thought of a mother bird with her nestlings also suggests itself (Mt 23 [37]).

3. Mercy and truth are **sent forth** as though personified. See on 42 [8].

4. I lie, etc. The verse seems to be partially corrupt, but the Hebrew has *Let me lie*, expressing the self-abandonment of confidence in God.

7-11 form the beginning of the composite Ps 108: see 60 [5-12].

8. On **glory** see 30 [12].

LVIII. A description of the wicked, and among them especially wicked judges ([1-5]). Their destruction, at which the righteous will rejoice ([6-11]). The general sense is clear, but the language, which appears to be early and rugged, is obscure and corrupt. A variety of emendations, especially in [1, 8, 9], have been proposed.

10. 'In the OT that joy took a concrete form which is repugnant to us, who have learned to distinguish between the sinner and his sin: it is not the spirit of the Gospel: but we may well beware lest the right feeling of moral indignation, not only against wrong in the abstract but against the wrong-doer, should be weakened' (Kirkp.).

LIX. A prayer against enemies ([1, 2]), with a description of their low intrigues and violent language ([3-7]), and with the certainty of God's punishment ([8]). This first stanza is largely echoed in the second ([10-16]), but with joyful praise. They end with slightly varied refrains ([9, 17]). The Psalm is national, picturing the sufferings of Israel at the hands of the small surrounding nations.

11, 13. Slay them not by a sudden stroke of vengeance, but scatter and reduce and gradually consume them, that they may be an object-lesson—a petition which no Christian could offer against an earthly foe.

17. In the first refrain ([9]) he **waits**, watching for God's help; in the second he sings with joy at the certainty of deliverance.

LX. Israel has been defeated and ruined because of God's displeasure ([1-4]). God is reminded of His promise to divide the land among the tribes ([5-8]). Prayer for victory ([9-12]). The Psalm is applicable at any time of disaster or division in the Church, whose ultimate victory has been promised. [5-12] form the second part of the composite Ps 108: see 57 [7-11].

4. RVm is probably right; a bitter touch of irony ends the description of the disasters (cf. 78 [9]).

6. The towns represent the land to be divided on the west and east of Jordan.

7. It is given to **Gilead** and **Manasseh** on the east, and to **Ephraim** and **Judah** on the west. Ephraim is the **defence of my head** because, as the warrior tribe, it is the chief defence of the nation. Judah is **my sceptre** (or 'ruler's staff,' Gen 49 [10]) because it is the tribe to which the royal dynasty of David belongs.

8. Surrounding nations are reduced to servile degradation. The words to **Philistia** must be emended as in 108.

9. The reading of RVm is right.

LXI. Prayer for divine protection ([1-4]). Confidence that God will safeguard the monarchy ([5-8]). The writer is far distant from Zion, but he prays for the royal house of the land that he loves.

2. that is higher: i.e. too high for me to reach by myself. The Christian can adapt the words: he cannot reach his Rock of refuge, the 'Rock of Ages,' without the preventing grace of God. When

led there, he is above the reach of his enemies (27^{5} f.; cf. 20^{1}, 91^{14}).

4. See on 5^{4} and 57^{1}.

5. For heritage read *request*, as in 21^{2}; and omit me, which is not in Heb.

6, 7. The prayer for the royal dynasty that it would last for many generations is fulfilled in Christ the eternal King (see Introduction, § 8).

LXII. Only God is the Psalmist's refuge against enemies ($^{1-4}$). So he calls upon the people to trust in Him ($^{5-8}$). Man and his wealth are worthless; God has power and mercy ($^{9-12}$).

1, 5. Heb. *is silent*, 'be silent' (see on 37^{7}).

11. once, twice refer to power and mercy; 'the sense will be the same if we render, One thing hath God spoken, two things there are that I have heard; cf. Pr 6^{16}, 30^{15}' (Kirkp.). Both are shown in the absolute justice with which He rewards every man according to his work.

LXIII. Probably composed of two Psalms: **Part I**: The hungry soul longs for, and delights in, spiritual communion with God ($^{1-8}$). **Part II**: Those that attack the king shall be slain and eaten by wild beasts, while he and his supporters shall rejoice and boast in God ($^{9-11}$). The deep spirituality of Part I has been the reason for its daily use in the Church from before the time of Chrysostom; and it is still always said at Lauds.

2. On seeing God cf. 11^{7}. So seems to mean 'as one thirsts for water in a dry land.'

4. So here means 'as Him whose loving-kindness is better than life.'

5. Cf. 36^{8}. 7. Thy wings: see on 57^{1}.

10. *jackals* is right; animals that devour dead bodies.

LXIV. Prayer against enemies, who persuade themselves that there is no God to punish them ($^{1-6}$). But God shall suddenly bring them down, and the righteous shall rejoice ($^{7-10}$).

7. God's arrow is the recompense for their arrows.

LXV. A Psalm in prospect of a rich harvest. Praise to God in the Temple ($^{1-4}$). His awe-inspiring power in Nature ($^{5-8}$). His bounty in harvest and flocks ($^{9-13}$). It is used at Lauds on Wednesday.

1. waiteth: read *is fitting; te decet hymnus*.

2. With a universalism rare in the Psalter this looks forward to the worship of the Gentiles (see Introduction, § 6).

3. Even at a thanksgiving in the Temple sin must be acknowledged, but it is purged.

4. See on 5^{4}.

8. To the confines of the earth, East and West, men rejoice.

9. God's river or stream is the rain.

11. RVm is right; an abundant year ends with a crowning blessing, in that His tracks, as He comes to bless, drip with fattening showers. We must remember that rain, which the Hebrews knew was God's gift alone, was by far the most important factor in the life of Palestine. We can take the stanza as a symbol of the lavish blessing with which a soul can be satiated (cf. 36^{8}, 63^{5}).

LXVI. A composite Psalm. **Part I** (with 1st person plural pronouns): All nations are called to praise God ($^{1-4}$), to submit to His everlasting power which He showed for Israel at the Red Sea and Jordan ($^{5-7}$), to bless Him who has delivered Israel from the depths of suffering ($^{8-12}$). **Part II** (with 1st person singular pronouns): The Psalmist enters the Temple to offer sacrifices in fulfilment of a vow which he made when in trouble ($^{13-20}$).

9. *Which placed our soul in life:* set it in a firm position when it was in peril.

LXVII. All nations are called to praise God because He blesses Israel, as the rich harvest shows. Christianity carries the joy and universalism (see Introduction, § 7) of the Psalm to their highest point. It is the latter thought that touches the *Nunc Dimittis*, for which the Psalm is an alternative at Evensong. It is also said on Sundays at Lauds, and at Sext on Ferias in Lent.

1. An echo of the priestly blessing. See on 4^{6}.

LXVIII. Let God conquer His enemies, and bring back His people to His holy place ($^{1-6}$). As of old from Sinai, He brought them, in the time of plentiful rain, victoriously from Bashan ($^{7-23}$). The triumphal march ($^{24-27}$). Foreigners shall submit, and praise Him ($^{28-35}$). On the occasion of this Psalm, and its use in the Jewish Church for Pentecost, see Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures, 1920), 57-60. This historical victory and march can be read as a foretaste and symbol of the triumph of Christ, when He 'ascended up on high, and led captive His band of captives' whom He had purchased and conquered by death. It was easy for the Christian Church to follow Jewish practice in appointing the Psalm for Whitsun Day.

1. Based on the words used when the ark, where the presence of God was, started on its journeys (Nu 10^{35}).

4. Cast up, etc. The call to prepare for God's approach imitates that of the

prophet (Is 40 3) at the return from Babylon. But it was reserved for John the Baptist truly to 'prepare the way of the Lord' (Mk 1 2. 3). PBV 'upon the heavens' was a Rabbinic interpretation; and 'as it were upon an horse' was a gloss of a 15th century Latin translator.

11. God has only to command, and the victories published by the women follow at once.

13. Very uncertain. The first clause seems to allude to Jg 5 16 (cf. Gen 49 14). A line or more may be lost before the next clause.

14. A pell-mell rout like snowflakes in a driving wind.

15. The massive hills of Bashan are bidden not to be jealous of the hill where God pleases to dwell with His people.

17b. The text is corrupt; see commentaries.

18. He ascends leading His captives in triumph (cf. 2 Cor 2 14), having received the gifts of homage from the vanquished. Quoted in Eph 4 8; but St. Paul, influenced by a Rabbinic interpretation, has the form 'gave gifts unto men,' which he explained of the outpouring of the gifts of the Spirit sent by Christ after His Ascension. AV and PBV 'received gifts *for* men' adopt St. Paul's thought.

20. the issues: the ways out, the means of escape from the perils of death.

22. The object of I will bring again is not expressed, but it seems most naturally to be God's enemies spoken of in the preceding verse; from the hills of Bashan, and even the depths of the sea (cf. Am 9 2. 3) He will bring them for punishment.

27. The Northern tribes are coupled with the Southern as the ideal unity of the future Israel.

29. Cf. 45 12, 72 10.

30. The hippopotamus, bulls, and calves (if the text is right) are Egypt, other strong nations, and the smaller tributary peoples respectively. The next clause, trampling, etc., is corrupt.

35. The Greek has 'Wonderful is God in His sacred ones,' probably echoed in 2 Thes 1 10.

LXIX. The Psalmist, with his nation, is in exile. He is in the depths of misery from enemies (1-18). Unpitied by all he utters curses on them (19-28). But he is joyfully assured of freedom and deliverance, and of the restoration of Zion and Judah (29-36). Like much of Jeremiah in style and feeling, the Psalm presents to us a typical sufferer. It was natural, therefore, for the Church to see the divine Sufferer foreshadowed in him; hence the use of the Psalm on Good Friday.

4. The first words (cf. 35 19) appear in Jn 15 25.

5. But because certain words point to Him, it is not necessarily the case with the whole Psalm. The mind of the Christian here passes from Christ to himself (cf. 40 12).

9. The Psalmist's zeal was for the house of God which was lying waste; Christ's for the house of God which was desecrated (Jn 2 17). Or thy house may be Israel generally; cf. the thought of 119 139. The reproaches, etc. They reproached God, which was a grief to his soul, and they reproached him as God's servant. So it was with Christ, as St. Paul said (Rom 15 3).

21. The very metaphors with which he describes his persecutions are related as literally fulfilled in the case of Christ (see Mt 27 34. 48; Mk 15 36; Lk 23 36); and in Jn 19 28 the thirst was suffered 'that the Scripture might be accomplished.'

22. The first clause, with additional words, and 23 are quoted in Rom 11 9 f.

25. The curse is quoted in connexion with Judas (Ac 1 20), either by St. Peter or, as a note, by St. Luke.

28. Let their names be removed from the register of those who are alive on this earth (Ex 32 32; Is 4 3; Dan 12 1), and let them not be recognized as Israelites. It is not the more terrible curse of their souls' damnation, as it would be if the book of life bore its Christian sense (Phil 4 3; Rev 3 5, 13 8, 17 8, 20 12).

33. See on 79 11.

LXX. This is the second part of 40.

LXXI. A prayer for rescue, combined with confidence and praise (increasing towards the end) inspired by past mercies during a long life, the Psalmist speaking as the representative of his nation (20). It is mostly composed of fragments and reminiscences of earlier Psalms. Appointed for the Office of the Visitation of the Sick.

16. 'I will come with the mighty acts' as my theme.

20. Plural pronouns; the nation speaks *de profundis*.

LXXII. An endless succession of perfect rulers reigning in Jerusalem was the ideal of those who hoped for the future of Israel. The Psalmist prays that the king, and his son after him (i.e. the dynasty), may be equipped with justice, that their righteous rule may bring unending blessing to the nation (1-7), and bring foreign nations throughout the world to render tribute and homage (8-15). There will be fertility and a great population, and the royal name shall be perpetuated in the

dynasty and universally blessed for ever (16, 17). This was an ideal which found fulfilment only in the spiritual reign of Christ (see Introduction, § 8).

3. The hills and uplands, which represent the whole country, afford peace as their natural product.

8. **the River** is the Euphrates; the verse pictures dominion extended without limit (cf. 89 25). 10. Cf. 45 12, 68 29.

14. **precious**: cf. 116 15.

15. The Psalmist clearly did not contemplate a divine Messiah, if men could pray for him, i.e. pray that God would help and bless him. PBV '*unto* him' is an alteration making the words more suitable to Christ.

16. Cornfields stretching up to the top, and rustling like trees in the Lebanon forests.

18, 19. A Doxology added at the end of Book II (see Introduction).

20. A note by the compiler of this collection, who did not know the eighteen Psalms ascribed to David in the remaining Books.

Book III.—Ps LXXIII.-LXXXIX.

Eleven, with Ps 50, are connected with the musical guild of Asaph, and four with that of the 'sons of Korah.' The Book is composed largely of national Psalms, the former group inculcating the moral teaching of the prophets, often by drawing out the lessons of history.

LXXIII. The prosperity of the wicked was a problem almost beyond the strength of the Psalmist's faith (1-14). But in the Temple he realized how wrong his thoughts had been, and recovered the certainty that the worldly rich will be destroyed (15-22), while he (speaking as a representative of the godly poor) will find all he needs in God his sole desire (23-28). On the problem, and this attitude to it, see Introduction, § 3.

1. With regard to the problem, which pressed upon the whole nation, this was the conclusion which the writer reached through hard trial.

2. He had almost fallen down the stark precipice of despair and unbelief (cf. 94 18).

10. Corrupt; see commentaries.

13. See 26 6.

15. To formulate his doubts would have been to be treacherous to the divine sonship of the nation.

22. He confesses that he allowed himself to drop to the level of ignorant beasts.

24. To the Christian this is the consolation of the future life, but Israel had not yet learnt that. Render (if the text is right) *take me with honour*, after the wicked rich have been punished and our poverty and trial have come to an end.

25. Many Christians are shamed by this faith of one to whom God was everything, although he knew nothing of the life beyond.

28. 'in the gates of the daughter of Zion' (PBV) is from LXX and Vulgate.

LXXIV. A cry of despair at the havoc wrought by the enemy in the sanctuary (1-11). But God subdued Nature for His people in the past, and governs Nature now (12-17). A prayer to Him to vindicate His cause (18-23). The problem of the date must be studied in commentaries. The words can be used by the Church with sure hope, at any time of catastrophe or persecution.

1. In this group of Psalms God is often thought of as a Shepherd: 77 20, 78 52, 79 13, 80 1 (see also 95 7); and His earthly regent was the same (78 70-72).

3. March, come to us from heaven, to avenge the ruins of Thy sanctuary.

4. They have set up in the Temple their own foreign banners or symbols, all the marks of the Jewish religion—fasts, festivals, sacrifices, etc.—being swept away (9).

8. If **synagogues** is right, the Psalm is very late; but the text is doubtful.

13, 14. The sea monsters mean Egypt; the dead bodies of Pharaoh's army were food for the wild beasts (whom the present text calls 'the people') inhabiting the wilderness.

19. **thy turtle-dove**: Thy harmless and defenceless people.

LXXV. A thanksgiving to God, who says that in His own good time He is bringing the confusion of the world to order (1-4). The Psalmist warns the proud and wicked enemies of the nation that God is the Judge (5-8). Israel sings praises in confidence that right will prevail (9, 10).

1. **thy name**—Thy Person revealed in power—**is near** to help (cf. Is 30 27).

2. **the set time**: cf. 102 13.

3. Though all the earth is in moral confusion, I (God) have arranged for the establishment of order in it (cf. the same sense of 'foundations' in 11 3, 82 5).

5. They lift up their **horn** like animals proudly tossing their heads. A metaphor of strength (cf. 89 17, 24, 92 10, 132 17, 148 14).

6. The general sense of a corrupt passage seems to be that from no direction on the earth can vindication be sought, but from God only.

LXXVI. God, who dwelleth in Zion, has wrought terrible destruction on Israel's enemies.

4. With LXX and Vulgate should prob-

ably be read *from the everlasting hills*, i.e. from Zion.

5*b*. *none of the men of might have been able to use their strength* (cf. Jos 8 [20]), because, like Sennacherib's army, they have been suddenly killed by a divine stroke.

10. The meaning seems to be that God can turn man's wrath to His good purposes; but the text is corrupt. See Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 71.

LXXVII. The Psalmist is in the depths of misery, and cannot sleep ([1-4]). He ponders at night on Israel's past, and asks if God can finally have rejected His people ([5-9]). God's great doings, especially at the Exodus, give him escape from his doubts ([19-20]).

7-9. The questions are like that of St. Paul in Rom 11 [1, 7].

10. The beginning of his change of mind; but the text is corrupt.

17, 18. Meditation on the Exodus leads the poet to heighten the scene with tempest and earthquake.

20. See 74 [1]. The Psalm illustrates the fact that 'the study of history is the best cordial for drooping spirits.'

LXXVIII. This study of history, on the other hand, is for warning and instruction Time after time Israel had forgotten God's great doings for them, and had rebelled ([1-64]). But He ended by blessing them in the kingdom of David ([65-72]). 'Now these things,' as St. Paul said, 'were our examples'; repeated rebellions and constant forgiveness end in the government of our life by the divine King.

2. Quoted in Mt 13 [35].

9. The Heb. text is obscure, and probably corrupt. But the English words can picture the tragedy of many lives—spiritual failure in spite of spiritual equipment.

24, 25. **the mighty** probably means 'angels,' as LXX explains it (cf. Wisd 16 [20]). The manna, **the corn of heaven**, is a type of the Eucharist (Jn 6 [31]), and the Heb. phrase 'the Bread of Angels' is adopted in W. C. Dix's hymn, 'Alleluia, sing to Jesus.'

29, 30. See on 18 [25] f.

49. **God's anger . . . trouble** are personified as His messengers of woe (cf. 42 [8]).

52. See on 74 [1].

61. He did this at the capture of the ark (1 S 4).

66. **he smote his adversaries backward** in the victories under Samuel and Saul, making ready for the establishment of the Temple, and of David's kingdom in Jerusalem.

67. The ark was in the tent at Shiloh in Ephraim.

LXXIX. The subject and tone are very similar to those of the first and third parts of 74.

5. **for ever**: see on 13 [1].

6. **the heathen** (as in [1]) are the particular nations then attacking Jerusalem, who knew not God.

8. Inherited guilt, as Israel thought (Ex 20 [5]; Lam 5 [7]), was part of the reason for the Exile.

11. Cf. 102 [20], 107 [10-16], 146 [7]. Since God sent the punishment of the Exile, they are called **his prisoners** in 69 [33].

13. See on 74 [1].

LXXX. Shepherd of Israel, save! ([1-3]). In Thy wrath Thou hast abandoned us to our enemies ([4-7]). After caring for the luxuriant vine of Israel Thou hast left it to the wild beasts ([8-14]). Help Israel whom Thou didst make strong, and we will be true to Thee ([14b-19]). The refrain, which occurs three times, probably stood also in its complete form in [14], but some displacement and corruption has confused the text. With 74 and 79 the Psalm can be used for the healing of the sores of the Catholic Church.

1. See on 74 [1].

2. These tribes, like 'Joseph,' stand, properly speaking, for the Northern kingdom; but in the ideal of the prophets that was always one with Judah. In the divine ideal the Church is always a unity, of which 're-union' will be the accomplishment on earth.

3. See on 4 [6]. 11. See on 72 [8].

15. *the son* (RVm) is right, as in [17], referring to Israel, God's son. Displacement has connected the clause with the vine, causing 'son' to be explained as 'branch.'

17. **The son of man** is the weak, human man (cf. 8 [4]) whom God had strengthened, i.e. Israel. Rabbinic writers, regardless of the context, explained it of King Messiah.

LXXXI. This was the Jewish Psalm for New Year's day, i.e. the Feast of Trumpets (the new moon of the seventh month), for the Feast of Tabernacles (the full moon of the same month), and for Thursday. On the second of these the Law, which is referred to in [4, 9], was read every seventh year (Dt 31 [10]). A call to keep the festival with trumpet and song ([1-4]). The Law was given at Sinai at the time of the Exodus, followed by the testing of Israel when God gave water at Meribah ([6, 7]). Israel has one God only, but they rebelled ([8-12]). If they had been obedient they would have received every blessing ([13-16]).

5. **Joseph** stands for the whole nation (see on 80 [1]). **God went out over** [or

' against '] **the land of Egypt** when He sent the plagues. But PBV (with LXX and Vulgate) ' out of the land ' is perhaps right, referring to the fact of the Exodus. The next clause is probably corrupt.

6. **Baskets** were for carrying the bricks as a burden on the shoulder.

7. **Meribah**: see Ex 17 [1-7]; Nu 20 [1-13] (cf. 95 [8], 106 [32]).

12. The punishment of sin is the tendency to more sin (cf. Rom 1 [24, 26, 28]; and see 18 [25] f.).

LXXXII. God is dramatically pictured as judging earthly judges who afflict the pious poor.

1. **the congregation of God** is Israel. **The gods** (*elohim*) are the judges (cf. [6]). Others think that they are the gods, or guardian angels, of the nations (Welch, *The Psalter*, 41 f.).

5. The judges are ignorant and blind, and the whole moral and social order is shaken (cf. 11 [3], 75 [3]).

6. Quoted as an *a fortiori* argument for Christ's Divinity in Jn 10 [34]; if earthly authorities shared in the nature of God, much more the Incarnate Logos.

LXXXIII. A prayer for the destruction of foreign nations who are confederate against Israel.

5. In binding themselves against Israel, it was against God Himself.

6-8. On the names of the nations, and the occasions on which they were arrayed against Israel, see commentaries.

9-11. The victories related in Jg 4 f., 7 f.

16. That the heathen should seek God's name because they are filled with terror and confusion is not the desire of the Christian (see Introduction, § 7).

LXXXIV. A pilgrim Psalm similar to those in the group 120-134. The writer's love of the sanctuary is as deep as that expressed in 42, 43, and may be by the same author at a time when he was no longer unable to journey to Jerusalem. Nothing in the Psalter is nearer to the spirit of Christian devotion. 4. See on 5 [4].

6. **Baca** ('balsam') was the name of some valley on the way to the city. Weeping can be made an abundant blessing to the pilgrim soul on the way to its spiritual home. He must pass through the ' vale of tears ' (*vallis lacrymarum*, Vulgate) as through the vale of gloom (23 [4]).

7. **from strength to strength**: the text is uncertain, but spiritually the words may be compared with Jn 1 [16]; 2 Cor 3 [18].

9. **O God** should be followed by a comma, **our shield** being the king, as in 89 [18]; cf. 47 [9].

10. *Yea* or *Surely* is better than **For**. RVm is better, the meaning being ' I had rather stay in the humblest position by the door.'

11. The Christian can wish no higher blessing than **grace and glory** in their deepest spiritual sense (cf. 85 [9]).

LXXXV. Lord, Thou hast forgiven and restored Thy people in the past ([1-3]). Forgive us now ([4-7]). He will abundantly bless His people if they turn not to folly ([8-13]). The ideal expressed in [9-11] caused the Psalm to be appointed for Christmas Day.

9. **glory** is the abiding presence of God, afterwards called by the Jews the ' Shekinah.' It was in the Incarnation that the hope was fulfilled.

10. **Truth** (faithfulness) which guarantees the blessings which **mercy** (love) desires to bestow. **Righteousness** (the divine vindication of Israel) with the blessings of **peace** (prosperity) are the result. They are personified as God's messengers (see on 42 [8]), and sent to Palestine. The New Testament puts higher meanings into all of them.

11. The faithfulness which springs up on earth, and the righteousness which looks down from heaven, are one and the same; only in the Incarnation are heaven and earth thus united, because the Christ is ' on earth as it is in heaven.'

12. To a Jew outward and inward well-being were one thought; that the facts of life often severed the identity became one of his acutest problems (see Introduction, § 3).

13. The intention to vindicate and save His people shall be His herald, and (if the text is right) shall prepare His way before Him. But a slight change gives for the second clause *and peace in the way of His footsteps*.

LXXXVI. A prayer for hearing and help, because of what the Psalmist is and what God is. Composed, like Bishop Andrewes' Devotions, largely of clauses from other Psalms and passages of Scripture, which the reader will find helpful to trace and identify.

9, 10. See Introduction, § 7.

15. See on 103 [8].

16. To the Christian the **handmaid** can be the Church, ' our mother ' RV (Gal 4 [26]).

LXXXVII. Zion is the spiritual birthplace of foreign nations. No passage in the Old Testament (the nearest parallel is Is 19 [24] f.) comes nearer to the Christian missionary spirit (see Introduction, § 7); cf. Eph 2 [12-19]. The ideal is that every nation on earth should become a son of ' the Mother of us all.' Notice the LXX *Meter Seion* (Mother Sion).

1. **His** (not *her*) **foundation** is that which the Lord has founded.

4. **Rahab**, as often, is Egypt.

4-6. The Christian can go further, and say of individual souls that 'this one and that one' was born to a spiritual sonship, receiving baptismal regeneration.

7. The present Hebrew seems to mean that all the citizens, singers and dancers alike, will acknowledge her as the fountain of all life and joy. But the text is probably corrupt; see commentaries.

LXXXVIII. Dark despair is placed side by side with the warm hope of the last Psalm. But the despair is not so deep that the sufferer cannot pray (13). The whole Psalm is a cry of 'Why hast Thou forsaken me?'

4, 5, 10-12. The horror of the Hebrew idea of the Grave must be contrasted, as always, with the Christian sure and certain hope (see Introduction, § 9).

LXXXIX. God's love is sure, and His faithfulness to His covenant to David and his seed (1-4). His might shown for His people in Nature and in history (5-18). The covenant (19-37). But He has abhorred the covenant, and ruined Israel (38-45). A cry to Him to remember the covenant, and the dishonouring of the kingship (38-51). On the whole Psalm see Introduction, § 8.

2. The invincible Israelite faith in God's faithfulness, though it has, to all appearance, failed, shines more brightly in the Psalms than anywhere else.

5-7. **The holy ones** as well as the 'sons of the mighty' are angels. For the former see Job 5^1, 15^{15}; Dan 8^{13}; for the latter Ps 29^1.

10. The breaking of **Rahab** (beside the thought of Egypt) was the conquest of chaos, by which the ordered world was created (cf. Job 26^{12} f.).

14. For the personification see on 42^8.

17. **our horn**: cf. ^{24}, 75^4 f. (note).

18. **our shield** is the king (cf. 84^9 and 47^9).

19 ff. The covenant with David (2 S 7) is poetically expounded (cf. 132 ^{11,12}). Time after time Israel, by their own sins, made the attainment of the ideal impossible, as depicted in $^{38-45}$; the true fulfilment was found only in the perfect King. The Christian should meditate on $^{19-37}$ as true of Him. See the reminiscence of ^{20}, combined with 1 S 13^{14}, in Ac 13^{22}.

25. See on 72^8.

37. **the moon**: cf. 72^5. On the second clause see commentaries.

46. Adapted from 79^5; on 'for ever' see note there.

52. The Doxology added at the end of Book III (see Introduction).

Book IV.—Ps XC.-CVI.

In this and the next Book the word Elohim, for the proper name, does not occur, except in 108 (which is composed of two passages from the Elohistic collection) and 144^9. The Psalms which compose it are drawn from a variety of sources, many of them having no indication that they belonged to any collection.

XC. God is everlasting, man the creature of a day (1-6). During our brief life we are under His wrath for our sins (7-12). O relent, and give Israel prosperity after exile (13-17). The eternity of God, the transitoriness of life, the faith that endures through trouble, and the confidence of final blessing, find their deepest meaning at a Christian funeral, at which the Psalm is used. It is also said at Lauds on Thursday. It inspired the classical hymn 'O God our help in ages past.'

3. **Return**: i.e. to dust (Gen 3^{19}).

4. The comparison appears in 2 P 3^8.

11. Who fears Thy wrath as he ought to fear it?

12. Clearer knowledge of the shortness of life will lead us to deeper wisdom.

14. **in the morning**: i.e. when the bright day of vindication dawns; but the Christian's thoughts are led beyond the night of death. AV 'early,' and PBV 'and that soon' are inadequate. For the thought of the 'morning' cf. 30^5, 49^{14}.

16, 17. For the Psalmist this meant the restoration of Israel; for the Christian it is the 'consecration of effort' both before and after the death of the body (cf. 1 Cor 15^{58}).

XCI. The Psalmist's certainty (1-13). The divine endorsement (14-16). Perhaps an assurance to the nation in the troubles of the Exile; but it can be an assurance to anyone in trouble who loves God. The use of the Psalm at Compline helps to restfulness of spirit.

1. See on 5^4.

2. The words of the man described in ^{1}, who is then addressed in $^{2-13}$.

4. See on 57^1.

5-8. The wicked in thousands shall suffer from these divine punishments, but not thou.

11 f. Whether spoken to an individual or to Israel, our Lord was tempted to presume on them (Mt 4^6; Lk $4^{10,11}$), as though they were a promise of physical and not spiritual safety.

13. Our Lord in Lk 10^{19} may have been thinking of the words.

14. **on high**: cf. 20^1, 27^6, 61^2.

XCII. It is good to sing praises to God

(1-5). The brutish man does not know that the wicked flourish only to perish (6-9). The righteous shall flourish, rejoicing at the destruction of the wicked (10-15). The Psalm is said at Lauds on Saturday.

10. See on 75 5. And for the **wild-ox** see on 22 21. **12.** Cf. 1 3.

13. See on 52 8.

XCIII. Connected in subject-matter with 95-100, a group on the Kingship of God. God, the eternal Sovereign, can conquer foreign enemies that have attacked Israel as the wild waves of the sea. The conquest is still going on, and 'He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet.' The Psalm is used at Lauds on Sunday.

XCIV. A prayer against enemies (1-7). Addressed to those who will not understand that God sees and hears and disciplines (8-11). Addressed to the upright whom He chastens and delivers (12-15). An expression of trust addressed to Him (16-21). He will destroy the wicked (21, 23).

7. Jacob's God will do nothing to defend His people (cf. 10 11, 13, 59 7).

11. Quoted in 1 Cor 3 20. **18.** Cf. 73 2.

20. Wicked men, who sit on the seat of judgment, make iniquitous laws, under which they shelter themselves

XCV. An invitatory Psalm, calling men to worship. It is said at Matins, and before the Nocturn Psalms for the day, following very ancient usage. Some think that 7e ('To-day,' etc.) to 11 was originally a separate Psalm, or part of one. Those verses are quoted entire in Heb 3 7-11, and a few words in 4 3, 5, 7, as a warning to Christians lest unbelief should lose them the promised rest, to which Israel had failed to attain.

7. sheep: see on 74 1. **8.** See on 81 7.

XCVI. Let all nations praise God, for He is supreme (1-6). Let all nations worship Him, for as King He will judge the world (7-10). Let Nature rejoice, for He will judge the world righteously (11-13). 'The liturgical use of such Psalms as this served to keep alive the Messianic hope in Israel, and to prepare the way for the advent of God in Christ' (Kirkp.). The Psalm is quoted in 1 Ch 16 23-33 as part of the composite Psalm which is related to have been sung when the ark was brought to Zion. **9.** See on 29 2.

10. In Justin, Tertullian, and later Latin Fathers, is found the famous early Christian gloss, 'The Lord reigneth *from the Tree*'; and Ep. Barn 8 says, 'the reign of Jesus is on the Tree.' It is introduced into the well-known hymn, *Vexilla Regis prodeunt*, transl. by Neale, 'The royal banners forward go.' To Justin (who accuses the Jews of deleting the words) and Tertullian the Psalm was a prophecy of the glory of Christ after His crucifixion.

11-13. The thought is parallel with that of 98 7-9; Nature 'sympathizes' with man (cf. Rom 8 20-22).

XCVII. Let the earth rejoice, because God the King appears in terrible majesty (1-6). Let pagans be ashamed, but Zion is glad for His blessings to the righteous (7-12).

2-5. God's arrival to judge is pictured as at Sinai (cf. 18 7-15).

11. sown, a difficult metaphor, should probably be *sprung up*, as LXX, Vulgate, followed by PBV.

XCVIII. God hath wrought salvation (1-3). Sing to Him with music (4-6). Let Nature rejoice, for He shall judge the world righteously (7-9). The salvation of Israel from their enemies is to the Christian a symbol of the salvation of mankind from sin. In this respect the Psalm touches the *Magnificat*, for which it is an alternative at Evensong, and in which 3 is echoed (Lk 1 54).

7-9. The joy of Nature is parallel with that in 96 11-13. See note.

XCIX. God the King is supreme (1-3). He judges righteously (4-6). His dealings with intercessors in the past, and with the nation (6-9). The refrain in 3, 5, 9 declares that He is holy, 9 being a close echo of 5.

6, 7. For **Samuel** as an intercessor see 1 S 7 8, 12 23. He answered the intercessors by revealing Himself to the whole people, and they were obedient.

8. He answered the intercessors by forgiving the whole people, and yet punishing them when they were disobedient.

C. An invitatory Psalm, closely echoing some parts of 95. There is no affinity with the *Benedictus*, for which it is an alternative at Matins. It is used also at Lauds on Sunday. The hymn known as 'the Old Hundredth' is said to have been written by William Kethe, a Marian refugee.

5*a*. Akin to the liturgical versicle and response which became common in later Psalms, the earliest instance of which is, perhaps, Jer 33 11.

CI. The Psalmist prays God to come to him, and is determined to walk uprightly (1, 2), that when He comes He may find in his house and country 'nothing that defileth' (3-8). He was a ruler who had the power to destroy the wicked day by day out of the land and city of the Lord. It offers a picture of the Christian, who is ruler of his own heart, purging out what is wicked by penitence and absolution.

CII. Representing Israel the Psalmist figuratively describes the utter misery of the Exile (1-11). But God will build up Zion, and the heathen will worship Him (12-22). He prays that he—and Israel—may not be cut off in the prime of life (23, 24a). God's eternal changelessness (24b-27) is the guarantee for the permanence of Israel (28). A penitential Psalm, appointed for Evensong on Ash Wednesday, and said at None on Ferias in Lent. Some have thought that 23-28 are from another Psalm.

5. They cleave to my flesh owing to the dryness caused by deep sorrow.

10. The misery is God's punishment for sin.

11. The close of life is like the sunset, when the shadows are 'stretched out' (RVm); cf. 109 23.

13. the set time: cf. 75 2.

15, 16. Render, *The nations shall fear . . . when Yahweh hath built up Zion* (see Introduction, § 7).

18. Words in the *Magnificat* are closely similar (Lk 1 50).

25, 27. The eternity of God, who is called upon to save, is the eternity of His Son, who came as the Saviour; hence the quotation in Heb 1 10-12 (with 'fold them up' from LXX, instead of 'change').

CIII. Representing the nation, as in 102, the Psalmist blesses God for healing, saving, and prospering it (1-5), in accordance with His revelation to Moses (6-10). His forgiving pity and tender love are infinite to His children who fear and obey Him (11-18). A call to all the universe to bless Him (19-22). It is a Psalm for the Christian to use especially after penitence and absolution.

8. The revelation to Moses (see Ex 34 6; cf. 86 15, 111 4, 145 8).

21. ministers: see on 104 4.

CIV. Nature is the manifold work of God, wholly dependent for its life upon His breath (1-32). Concluding praise (33-35). The Psalm is remarkable for its treatment of Nature. Others, e.g. 8, 29, and 145, are anthropocentric: God's power is exercised in Nature simply on behalf of man. Here man is only one of His creatures, a part of Nature. The Hebrew also was remote from the mysticism which finds God immanent in things material; they are His creative work, used only for His purposes. It is the Christian who can combine the thought of immanence with that of transcendence; and hence the Psalm is appointed for Whitsun Day.

1, 2. Cf. the converse simile in 8 1.

4. RV means that He uses natural objects as His servants, which is in keeping with the thought of the whole Psalm. But the words can mean, 'He causes His messengers and servants to assume the form of wind and fire.' In Heb 1 7, where the verse is quoted from the LXX, the latter is probably the meaning (the words can also mean 'spirits,' but this affords no parallel to the 'flame of fire'): contrasted with the eternity of the Son is the working out of God's purposes 'through His servants under the forms of elemental action' (Westcott).

7, 8. RVm is probably right; the verses are a poetical equivalent of Gen 1 7.

26. leviathan stands for all monsters that play in the sea that God has made.

29. He *gathers* (RVm) the life-breath to Himself (cf. 26 9; Ec 12 7).

30. In spring the life-breath renews the earth.

35. Sin must cease that the Lord may rejoice perfectly in His works. The closing 'Hallelujah,' of which this is the first occurrence, is a liturgical call to praise confined to the Psalter. In the LXX it is always (except in certain MSS. in Ps 150) placed more suitably at the beginning of a Psalm.

CV., CVI. Some think that these two Psalms were originally one. 105 (1-15 quoted in 1 Ch 16 8-22; see on 96) is a thanksgiving for God's dealings with His people till the Exodus, finishing summarily with the wanderings and the entrance into Canaan. 106 (after praise, and a prayer that the Psalmist may see the renewed prosperity of Israel, 1-5) recounts their sins from the Red Sea till God began to renew them under Samuel, Saul, and David (6-46). But as He relented then, the Psalmist prays, so may He bring us back from our exile among the heathen (47). 106 should be compared with 78.

CV. 8, 9 seem to be echoed in the *Benedictus* (Lk 1 72 f.).

12. The patriarchal families were a very small clan in a strange land. Christians can be described in the same way.

13. A reference to such events as those of Gen 12 10-20, 20, 26.

15. Both anointed ones and prophets are the patriarchs.

CVI. 15. See on 18 25 f.

32. Meribah: see on 95 8.

48. The Doxology closing Book IV; some think that it was an original part of the Psalm, which was, on that account, placed last in the Book. 'And let all the people say, Amen, Hallelujah' is a liturgical direction.

Book V.—Ps CVII.-CL.

CVII. The exiles, brought back to their homes, are called upon to give thanks (1-3). God's goodness in delivering travellers in the desert (4-9); prisoners (10-16), and the sick (17-22), both of whom are suffering the punishment of their sins; and sailors (23-32). Each of these stanzas has a refrain. Then follow general punishments and blessings (33-43). Interpreted spiritually as well as physically the Psalm has a universal appeal.

9*b*. The words in the Greek are almost identical in the *Magnificat* (Lk 1 53).

CVIII. See 57 7-11 and 60 5-12.

CIX. A prayer against enemies who return evil for good (1-5). Curses on the wicked man (6-20). A piteous prayer for help, and confidence of deliverance (21-31). For the problems raised by the Psalmist's attitude towards his enemies see Introduction, § 6. It is an extreme instance of the Hebrew identification of punishment and requital. The vindictiveness of the curses has caused such difficulty to some minds that it has actually been suggested (in spite of 20) that 6-19 are the words of his enemies, an expression of the evil and hatred (5) with which they have rewarded him. But such a suggestion could arise only from the feeling that nothing that a Psalmist says can be criticized. It is safer to recognize that the Psalmist could not write on the plane of those who have been taught 'love your enemies.'

4. Better *but I was prayer*; i.e. my heart was wholly filled with prayer for them. The meaning is similar to that in 35 13; he used to show love to them, but when they returned evil for good he began to pray against them.

6. The adversary is a human accuser, not Satan. Contrast Zech 3 1.

7. Let his remorseful prayer, when he is found guilty, be counted as extra sin.

8*b*. Quoted in Ac 1 20 (see on 69 25).

12-15. The Hebrew idea of family solidarity made these words possible.

23. On the shadow see 102 11. The locust is helplessly driven by the wind.

25. This suffering from the scorn of man (cf. 22 7) was fulfilled in the Representative Sufferer (Mt 27 39; Mk 15 29).

31. his soul: the whole of his natural self that is not his body, equivalent to 'him' (cf. 3 2, 16 10).

CX. This Psalm is used at Evensong and Second Vespers on Christmas Day, because, as always in 'Messianic' passages in the Old Testament, 'God through His Spirit so speaks in the Psalmist that words not directly addressed to Christ find their fulfilment in Him' (Westcott). The Christian interpretation is seen in the references in the New Testament to 1 and 4. It must be remembered that, in the actual thoughts of the writer, David and his dynasty and the ideal king of the future were all one, according to the Hebrew principle of family solidarity. And either a court-poet speaks of this three-fold unity as 'my lord,' or David himself is represented as so speaking of his dynasty and the ideal king. God had promised him (or the ideal king as their consummation) both kingship and priesthood, the latter not in Aaron's line, but an ideal priesthood inherent (as it was in early days) in the kingship, the kind of priesthood held by Melchizedek. God's promise of kingship to 'my lord' (1). He will make the king's rule perfectly successful (2. 3). His promise of priesthood (4). He will help the king to smite his enemies (5-7). Israel was for ever disappointed in the expectation of such a priest-king; the only fulfilment was in Christ, and in the 'royal priesthood' of the Catholic Church which is His Body (cf. 1 P 2 9; Rev 1 6, 5 10; see Introduction, § 8).

1. Quoted by Jesus Christ in Mk 12 36 (=Mt 22 44; Lk 20 42 f.) to show that my lord really pointed to a Being greater than anyone that could be born of David's line. He did not thereby deny His Davidic descent according to the flesh, as has often been thought, but argued (meeting the Jews on their own ground) that something higher than Davidic descent was involved. This something more than Davidic is shown (Mk 14 62 =Mt 26 64; Lk 22 69) in His allusion to Dan 7 13, to which He adds the still higher thought from the Psalm, 'seated at the right hand of God.' His Messiahship was not only more than Davidic, it was more than that of the heavenly Man of Daniel's vision. The words are quoted also by St. Peter in Ac 2 34 f. with reference to Christ's exaltation to heaven; and in Heb 1 13, to contrast words said to Christ the Supreme with words said to the angels. The Session at the Right Hand is alluded to in Mk 16 19; Ac 5 31, 7 55 f.; Rom 8 34; Eph 1 20; Col 3 1; Heb 1 3, 8 1, 12 2; 1 P 3 22; Rev 3 21; the subduing of enemies under His feet in 1 Cor 15 25. 27 (where there is the profoundly suggestive coupling with Ps 8 6); and both parts of the sentence in Heb 10 12 f.

2. God shall make Thy kingly authority proceed from Zion; i.e. in the Christian interpretation, proceed from heaven, and from the Church in which He dwells on earth.

3. **in the day of thy power.** Render, *in the day of* [the mustering of] *Thy force.* The next words are an echo of Jg 5 2, 9; the meaning is that the people are willing 'manfully to fight under His banner.' The word for **beauties** is unique in the plural, and the meaning is difficult. With a slight alteration of a single letter read *mountains*, with Symmachus and Jerome; the 'mountains of holiness' or 'holy mountains' (the words are the same in 87 1) are the heights of Zion. As the dew-drops on the mountains, born of the dawn, innumerable and radiant, so is the army of Thy people's youth. LXX, with a different text, has 'from the womb before the day-star I begat thee,' which lent itself to early comments on the eternal generation of the Son of God.

4. The historical **Melchizedek** was a king-priest independent of Aaron's line, and such a person supplied a wonderful type of Christ. The words are quoted in Heb 5 6, 7 17, 21; and cf. 5 10, 6 20. The first passage, with its quotation from Ps 2 7 in 5, gives the double thought of King and Priest.

5-7. Unlike the preceding verses, these can be interpreted, in figure, of the true Messiah only if the thought of divine punishment is distinguished from the Jewish idea of requital, so that the figurative words lose all their fierce spirit of vengeance.

7. In chasing his enemies he stops, thirsty, to drink from a brook, and then continues to pursue them till he lifts high his head in victory.

CXI. This and the next Psalm (after the opening Hallelujah) are alphabetical (see on 9, 10) and complementary, the former extolling the character of God, the latter of the man who fears Him. Both are used at Second Vespers on Christmas Day.

2. **Sought out by all who delight in them:** the word 'delight' is repeated in 112 1 (cf. 1 2).

3*b*. The words here used of God are twice used of the godly man in 112 3, 9. In the deeper, Christian meaning the righteousness of God in Christ *is* the righteousness of men who are in Christ (2 Cor 5 21).

4. Similarly, **gracious and full of compassion** (cf. 103 8) is said of both (112 4). In character we are to reflect the character of God. And as His 'wonderful works' are 'to be remembered,' so is the righteous man everlastingly (112 6); cf. Pr 10 7.

9. *Holy and to be feared is His name* (i.e. His Person as exhibited in His character). This leads to **the fear of the Lord** (10). The **wisdom** of Israel was based on this truth; cf. Pr 9 10 (the exact phrase), 1 7; Job 28 28; Ecclus 1 20.

CXII. See on 111.

9. Quoted in 2 Cor 9 9.

CXIII.-CXVIII. These 'form the *Hallel*, or Hymn of Praise, which according to Jewish liturgical use is sung at the three great Festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, at the Festival of the Dedication, and at the New Moons (with the exception of the New Year). At the domestic celebration of the Passover, Ps 113, 114 are sung before the meal, Ps 115-118 after it, when the fourth cup has been filled. It is probably the hymn sung by our Lord and His disciples before they left the upper chamber (Mt 26 30; Mk 14 26)' (Kirkp.).

CXIII. Praise to God throughout the world for His greatness (1-4). He humbles Himself in condescension (5, 6), that He may exalt the poor and the barren woman (7-9). In the Christian Church it is used in three different connexions: because it was attached to the Passover it is sung at Evensong on Easter Day. The condescension of God and the fruitfulness of the childless woman are thoughts which cause it to be used at First Vespers on Christmas Day. (It is 'a connecting link between the Song of Hannah and the Magnificat of the Virgin': Perowne, quoted by Kirkp.) And 6, 7 make it suitable for the Common of the Apostles.

CXIV. Part of the *Hallel*; see note before 113. At the Exodus from Egypt, the sea, the river Jordan, and the mountains were awestruck at the presence of God. The Exodus being a type of the passing of Christ—and with Him His people—from bondage and death to newness of life, the Psalm is used at Evensong on Easter Day.

8. The incidents of Ex 17 6; Nu 20 8 ff. are types of the power of God to turn afflictions and adverse circumstances into streams of blessing.

CXV. Part of the *Hallel*; see note before 113. In the LXX and Vulgate the Psalm is joined with 114. May God uphold His own glory, for He is supreme (1-3). Idols are nothingness (4-8). Trust in God that He will bless Israel (9-15). We will bless Him (16-18).

9-11. **Israel, Aaron,** and **the fearers of God** (cf. 118 2-4, 135 19 f.). The relation of the last to the first is variously explained; but for us, the three classes can stand for the whole Church, the Priesthood, and those in any religion who fear God according to their lights.

CXVI. Part of the *Hallel*; see note before 113. The Psalmist has been restored from the verge of death (1-9). He will pay

his vows of thanksgiving (10-19). In the LXX and Vulgate these two parts form separate Psalms.

3. Cf. 18 4.

8, 9. Adapted from 56 13. On the land of the living see 27 13.

10. St. Paul quotes from the LXX, 'I believed, therefore I spoke,' in 2 Cor 4 13. But the Hebrew (if the text is right) may mean *I believe, though I used to speak* despondent words such as those in 11. Owing to deliverance he now realizes how faithless his words were.

13. The cup of the drink-offering in thanksgiving for salvation. In the spiritual life the words can be taken as standing for all the human experiences with the help of which God works out our salvation. In this sense the ingredients of the cup are both bitter (Mk 10 38 f.) and sweet (Ps 23 5), and include the 'Communion of the Blood of Christ.'

15. For the Psalmist this means 'So precious is their life that He will not suffer it to be lost in death' (cf. 72 14). In the spiritual life the death of martyrdom or of mortification is itself precious.

CXVII. Part of the *Hallel*; see note before 113. This short summons to all nations to praise (see Introduction, § 7) is quoted by St. Paul (Rom 15 11) to show the Old Testament sanction for the universality of Christianity. This thought underlies its use at the First Vespers of Christmas.

CXVIII. Part of the *Hallel*; see note before 113. Israel give thanks for deliverance from enemies (1-13). God's victory makes them rejoice in a renewal of life (14-18). Responsive strain between the procession of worshippers who are entering the Temple and the priests within (19-27). Concluding thanksgiving (28, 29). The connexion of the *Hallel* with the Passover, the thought of victory (10-13, 22), and the words 'This is the day which the Lord hath made' (24), all caused the Psalm to be appointed for Evensong on Easter Day. It is used also at Prime on Sunday.

2-4. **Israel, Aaron, and the fearers of the Lord** (see on 115 9-11).

6. An echo of 56 11, and quoted from the LXX in Heb 13 6.

14. From the Song of Moses (Ex 15 2).

20. The response of the priests: 'Nought that defileth shall ever enter in' (cf. 15 1 ff., 24 3 ff.).

22. **the head of the corner:** i.e. the extremity (not the 'top') of the corner, which is the most important stone in the foundation, binding the walls together. This is Zion (Is 28 16), in which is summed up the Kingdom of God. 'The Messianic application of the passage is due to the fact that the person of the Messiah bears the same relation to a kingdom of living persons that Zion, the capital of the kingdom, does to the kingdom' (Briggs). Thus it is quoted of Christ in Mk 12 10 f. (=Mt 21 42; Lk 20 17); Ac 4 11; 1 P 2 7 (in connexion with Is *l.c.*); cf. Eph 2 20.

24. The Psalmist refers to the day on which the victory is being celebrated.

25. **Save now:** Hebrew *hoshia-na*, of which *hosanna* is a shorter Aramaic form.

26. A response of the priests blessing the approaching procession: 'Blessed in the Name of the Lord is he that cometh' (see 129 8 RV and Dt 21 5; and cf. Nu 6 27). The words, together with 'Hosanna,' were used at our Lord's Entry into Jerusalem (Mk 11 9 = Mt 21 9; Jn 12 13); without 'Hosanna' in Lk 19 38. The Psalm had no doubt gained a Messianic force since the time that it was written, and the crowd so used it. Our Lord predicted that this sentence would be used of Him; but in Lk 13 35 His prediction is given before the incident, and referring to it, in Mt 23 39 it is after it, referring to His welcome as Messiah at His future Advent. The use of palms in escorting Him to the city was connected with the custom, when the Psalm was sung liturgically, of carrying palms in procession round the altar (see next note), and of waving them at the word 'Hosanna.'

27. The Hebrew text is corrupt, but the preceding verse probably explains the meaning. The LXX suggests, 'Order the festival procession with boughs, even unto the horns of the altar,' which is the rendering in a translation of the Old Testament issued by the Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1917 (see Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 75 f.).

CXIX. An alphabetical Psalm (see on 9, 10), every verse in a stanza beginning with the same Hebrew letter. It 'represents the religious ideas of Deuteronomy developed in the communion of a devout soul with God' (Kirkp.). 'Law,' and the cognate words that are used in it in almost every verse (some think that where they are absent the text has suffered), are in most cases something larger than the Pentateuchal Law, and lead one to think of the countless ways by which God reveals His will; but the written Word is, of course, paramount in the writer's mind. Each stanza seems to strike a particular note which is sounded, in most cases, in the opening verse. The best commentary is a deepening familiarity from constant devotional use, which can be gained by those who read the Psalm daily in the Hour Offices.

83. Disfigured by suffering as a wine-skin hanging in a room is blackened by smoke.

96. *I have seen a limit to all completeness*, i.e. every earthly thing, however perfect it may seem to be, has its limits, but the revelation of Thy will is limitless. The Christian equivalent is given in Eph 3^{18} f.

139. **My zeal:** see on 69^{9}.

160. Notice the RV, **The sum of Thy words is truth** (cf. Jn 17^{17}).

164. A Hebrew way of saying 'countless times,' or 'that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto Thee.' But throughout the ages it has contributed to the Church's life that a sevenfold Office should be said daily.

165. Amid the evils of the world, and the anomalies of life, their peace is not injured by any cause of stumbling.

176. The spiritual life of all who love God is summed up by a confession coupled with an expression of devotion.

CXX.-CXXXIV. Each of these Psalms is entitled 'A Song of Ascents'; i.e. they formed a collection of the Psalms sung by pilgrims when they were going up to Zion for the feasts (cf. 84). 'A Song of Degrees' (AV) conceals their true nature. They are sung among the Vesper Psalms for the week, except 134, which belongs to Compline.

CXX. The Psalmist's lament at the bitter words of his foes ($^{1-4}$). Lament at having to live among them ($^{5-7}$).

4. Their tongues are sharp as a warrior's arrows (cf. 64^{3}), and as hot as charcoal made from burning broom (cf. Jas 3^{6}).

5. Caspian and Arabian tribes are named in order to denote figuratively the ungodly Jews among whom he dwelt.

CXXI. To confidence in God's help ($^{1, 2}$) comes the responsive assurance that the Keeper, who slumbers not, always keeps ($^{3-8}$).

1. The mountains of Zion, which the pilgrims are approaching, are the dwelling-place of the divine Helper. The meaning is the same as 'my help is from Yahweh' (^{2}).

6. Belief in the evil power of the moon, a relic of which is preserved in the word 'lunatic,' was widespread.

CXXII. The pilgrim's joy at visiting Jerusalem ($^{1, 2}$). Admiration of its structure and dignity ($^{3-5}$). Good wishes for its prosperity ($^{6-9}$).

2. 'How wonderful it is that we are [or were; see RVm] actually there!' The pilgrims either have just arrived, or are thinking of the wonder of it afterwards.

3. After its destruction the city was built up as a compact whole. For Christians it is a picture of the ideal unity of the Church, for which every true pilgrim prays and works (cf. 133^{1}).

5. It is the seat of justice and the seat of royalty.

CXXIII. The Psalmist speaks as the representative of an insignificant community almost in despair amid the surrounding contempt of the rich and proud. Whatever the historical situation was, that of the early Church was just the same when Christians, surrounded by the blatant wickedness of society in the Roman Empire, were for the most part poor.

2. We look to Thee with the attitude of slaves, who are wholly dependent upon the power of their owners, who rule and provide for the household.

CXXIV. If the Lord had not fought for us the foe would have destroyed us ($^{1-5}$). Blessed be the Lord our Helper for our deliverance ($^{6-8}$). The Psalm has a pant in it, as of the bird that has narrowly escaped. To the soul that has been saved from committing sin, or absolved from sin committed, the Psalm means more in proportion as he realizes the depth of the ruin from which he has been delivered.

1. **Let Israel now say:** so 129^{1}. The two Psalms are probably by the same author.

CXXV. God will protect them that trust in Him as the hills protect Jerusalem ($^{1, 2}$). This will be evident, for the dominion of wicked, foreign nations shall not permanently lie upon the land which has been given as a lot to the righteous, i.e. Israel, lest in despair they join hands in their wickedness (^{3}). A prayer for the righteous (^{4}). The renegades who join in the wickedness of foreigners shall be punished with them; but may Israel have peace (^{5}).

1. Their confidence is as unshaken as Zion itself.

2. Jerusalem is surrounded by a girdle of hills higher than itself.

3. 'the rod': the sceptre, i.e. the dominion. The lot of the righteous is the land marked out for them by God from all other lands on the earth. Spiritually it is used of God Himself in 16^{5}.

CXXVI. A remembrance of the amazed joy at the restoration of Israel in the past, which seemed too good to be real, and the wonder of which even the foreign nations recognized ($^{1-3}$). Prayer to God to go on increasing their prosperity like rivers in the parched South country (^{4}). Efforts apparently helpless, and begun in tears, shall reap a great harvest ($^{5, 6}$).

1. Cf. the thought of 85[1]. For the expression, here and [4], **turn the captivity**, see on 14[7].

4. **The South**, the Negeb, was a sandy, parched district stretching away into the desert (Is 35[7], 43[19] f.). The Psalm can be a picture of the soul released in the past, but in a state of spiritual barrenness which needs the Holy Spirit's restoration.

5, 6. The words are true of the Christian's efforts for his own soul or for the souls of others. The Hebrew cannot mean 'precious seed' (AV), 'good seed' (PBV).

CXXVII. Man's labour is vain unless the Lord help him ([1, 2]). God's reward is a goodly family of sons, who will support their father ([3-5]). Many have thought that these two parts are so devoid of connexion that they must have belonged to different Psalms.

1, 2. The warning against self-tormenting care is no more an inducement to sloth than our Lord's teaching in Mt 6[25-34]; and cf. Pr 10[22].

4. **the children of youth**, i.e. of young parents, tend to be the strongest.

5. **the gate** is the place of civil debate and judgment, and also of parleys before battle. The latter is the more probable, since the 'mighty man,' with his quiver, is an armed soldier.

CXXVIII. The prosperity of the godly man ([1, 2]). His domestic happiness ([3, 4]). He will see the prosperity of Jerusalem, and the birth of his grandchildren ([5, 6]). It stands in the marriage service, where it is in strong opposition to the avoidance of parenthood frequent in the present day, chiefly by those whose children would be of the type that the prosperity of the country most requires. 'olive-plants': the young independent shoots (cf. 144[12]); the familiar 'olive-branches' does not represent the Hebrew.

CXXIX. Often in the past has God rescued Israel from enemies ([1-4]). May their plans against Zion be as short-lived as corn whose seeds have been blown on to the roof, which no reapers can gather ([5-8]).

1. **Let Israel now say**: see on 124[1].

3. A figure of brutal maltreatment (cf. Am 1[3]; Is 51[23]); the **plowing** of Zion means the same (Mic 3[12]).

4. **the cords** (cf. 2[3]); in 124[7] the corresponding figure is the breaking of a bird-trap.

6. The same figure is used in Is 37[27]. Grass is a general term including corn.

8. There are no reapers to whom the passers-by can give the usual good wishes (cf. Ru 2[4]).

CXXX. From the depths of suffering, which is a punishment of sin, the Psalmist, in Israel's name, cries to God ([1-3]). But He is a God of forgiveness; therefore Israel can hope and trust ([4-8]). A penitential Psalm, appointed for Ash Wednesday, and said at Ferial Vespers in Lent.

1. **Out of the deep.** 'Those who cry out of the deep are not wholly in the deep, for the cry itself raiseth them' (Augustine).

4. **That thou mayest be feared.** With a slight change some versions have 'for the sake of Thy law'; the meaning in either case is that God forgives sins in order that men may fear Him and obey His will in the future. The same is the purpose of all His kindnesses (105[45]).

6. Contrast PBV with RV.

CXXXI. The peace reached through the discipline of true humility. The Psalmist probably speaks as echoing the thoughts of the best portion of Israel, the devoted *hasidim*. 'The prophets had seemed to promise great and wonderful triumphs for Israel in the Restoration, and what was the actual condition of Israel? Did it not demand the sternest self-discipline alike for the individual and for the community to enable them to fling away ambition, and accept, with cheerful faith, the lowly, despised position, which was so different from the glowing pictures of Jeremiah and the later Isaiah? It is a "humility not natural to Israel, but born of penitence," and so the Psalm is a fitting sequel to Ps 130' (Kirkp.). But a childlike humility (cf. Mt 18[4]), in the individual as in the nation, brings peace.

CXXXII. God is prayed to remember the affliction which David suffered when he tried to move the ark from Kirjath-jearim, and his continued determination to bring it to Jerusalem ([1-5]). The people recall the finding of it, their going for worship to the sanctuary where it was placed ([6-8]), and their prayer to God to occupy the resting-place prepared for the ark, i.e. for Himself, and to bless the priests, the nation, and the king ([9, 10]). The words of the people are met by the divine response ([11]), God uttering the terms of His covenant with David ([11a, 12]). He has chosen Zion as His dwelling-place ([13]). His utterance states this, and promises blessing on the people, the priests, and the royal dynasty ([14-18]). The Psalm received its rightful interpretation by being appointed for Christmas Day, when God came to earth to dwell in the Temple of His Body. On the Messianic hopes in the Psalter see Introduction, § 8.

1. David's affliction is related in 2 S

6^{1-10}, and his continued determination in $^{12-15}$.

5. The wording is echoed in Ac 7^{46}.

6. The ark (which is called it because the meaning is clear from the preceding verses) had been for twenty years at Kirjath-jearim ('the town of woods'); see 1 S $7^{1,2}$. The house of Obed-edom, to which it was carried when the catastrophe occurred, was apparently so close that the Psalmist could consider it the same place, and call it 'the field of the wood.' In parallelism with this is Ephrathah, evidently a second name denoting the same place or district, otherwise unknown.

10. **thine anointed**: the reigning king of David's line. See Introduction, § 8.

11, 12. The poet's rendering of the terms of the covenant (cf. 89^{19} ff.). **Of the fruit**, etc. (cf. Ac 2^{30}).

14. The words are true of Christ's Body the Church, and of the heart of every member of it.

16. **salvation** explains the meaning of **righteousness** in ^{9}; it is God's vindication of them against their enemies. If the priests are delivered from their enemies they can so help to uplift the people that they can shout with joy.

17. The **horn** (see 75^{5}) and **lamp** (see 18^{28}) are the might and the prosperity of the dynasty. The root of the word rendered 'to bud,' i.e. 'to sprout,' is the same as that of the Sprout or Shoot (EVv 'Branch') of Jer 23^{5}, 33^{15}; Zech 3^{8}, 6^{12}, and may hint at the actual person of the Messiah who was to come of David's line.

18. Another metaphor for the continued success of the dynasty; the flourishing, or 'blooming,' of the crown, as though it were alive, corresponds to the sprouting of the horn.

CXXXIII. How beautiful is the union of pilgrims gathered in Zion! The Christian uses the Psalm with a sigh, as he longs for the re-union of divided Christendom.

2. It is as sweet as the sacred and expensive oil which overflows to the *collar* (not 'skirt') of the High Priest's robe.

3. **the dew of Hermon** is dew that is specially rich and copious, 'Hermon-like dew.' Such abundance of life-giving and fertilizing dew was upon Zion in the form of the unity of the pilgrims gathered within it. **Life for evermore** is, for the Jew, the perpetual prosperity of Zion; only for the Christian are the words literal.

CXXXIV. The worshipper addresses the priests and Levites who bless God in the Temple courts at night (^{1,2}). The priests in response pronounce a blessing on the worshipper (^{3}). The Psalm can be applied to all who worship God at night, including the sick and their doctors and nurses. For those who tend the sick it is often true that 'to work is to pray.' The Psalm is said at Compline, when they can all be remembered.

CXXXV. The worshipper addresses the priests and Levites who praise God in the Temple courts (^{1,2}). Praise Him for making Israel His chosen people (^{3,4}), for His supremacy over all gods (^{5}), for His power in Nature (^{6,7}), for His work for His people from Egypt to Canaan ($^{8-12}$). The Lord's name, or memorial, is everlasting (^{13}). He will vindicate His people who are in affliction (^{14}). The nothingness of idols ($^{15-18}$). All Israel is called upon to bless God ($^{19-21}$).

15-20, with the addition of Levi, are adapted from 115^{4-13}, and the whole Psalm is 'little more than a mosaic of fragments and reminiscences from Law, Prophets, and other Psalms' (Kirkp.), but they make up a poem of beauty and value.

CXXXVI. A Psalm of praise with a liturgical response. Ezra 3^{11} relates the fact of such a response being used.

17-22 are based upon 135^{10-12}.

CXXXVII. Israel recall their mournings in Exile, when their captors asked them to sing their sacred songs, which was unthinkable ($^{1-6}$). A curse on Edom, who rejoiced in the fall of Jerusalem (^{7}). A curse on Babylon, who had sacked Jerusalem (^{8,9}). A marked instance of the Jewish confusion between punishment and retaliation (see Introduction, § 6). The Christian can, and always must as long as he is in this life, sing the songs of Zion in a strange land, in which he often feels himself in mournful captivity; and he can use ^{5,6} as an expression of loyalty to heaven where his citizenship is.

7. The prophets constantly denounced Edom for their cruel hatred of their kinsmen the Israelites (see Ob $^{11-13}$, the whole of that short prophecy being directed solely against them).

9. An exact requital for what Babylon had done to Judah.

CXXXVIII. Thanksgiving for God's mercy, and faithfulness to His promise ($^{1-3}$). Foreign nations will thank Him for the exaltation of Israel ($^{4-6}$). Through future troubles He will not fail His people, but will fulfil His purposes (^{7,8}).

1. The Psalmist defies all the gods of the heathen with their present worldly might. He did not, of course, believe in their existence, but the heathen did (cf. 95^{3}, 96^{4} f.).

2. **above all thy name is corrupt.**

'Thou hast magnified Thy word' means 'Thou hast proved the greatness and security of Thy promises.'

4, 5. See Introduction, § 7.

8. Abandon not the mighty purposes (the 'works') which Thou hast undertaken for Israel (cf. 90 [16]). Christians can apply the words to His 'eternal purpose' for the world (Eph 3 [10, 11]) and for the Church (Eph 2 [10]).

CXXXIX. The climax of Old Testament thought on God's omnipresence and foreknowledge. God knows every thought, word, and deed ([1-6]). His Spirit is a universal and unescapable Presence ([7-12]). His foreknowledge is shown in His predetermination of the Psalmist's bodily frame, and of the days which will make up his life ([13-16]). Precious to him are God's infinite thoughts in his continuous meditation ([17, 18]). God will slay the wicked, whom the Psalmist hates ([19-22]). And he speaks in the assurance of his own integrity when he prays Him to test him with His searching scrutiny ([23, 24]). [19-22] are so different in thought and contents from the preceding verses that some have thought them to be from another Psalm.

5. **beset me**, besieged me, hemmed me in; 'fashioned' (PBV) follows the LXX, Vulgate, and other versions.

9. **take the wings of the morning**: fly as swiftly as morning light moves from the East.

13. RVm is right.

15. The poetical idea that the body was framed in the secret places of the underworld, 'mother earth.'

16. RVm is right; 'my members' is not in the Hebrew. The predetermination of his life is pictured as the writing of his *days* in God's book, and the forming of them before they began. The Psalmist, naturally, had not begun to think out the problem of the relation of man's free-will to this predetermination.

18. **When I awake** (cf. 17 [15]). The Hebrew did not know that hereafter he could be 'with Christ, which is far better.'

22. On this hatred see Introduction, § 6.

24. **the way everlasting.** To the Christian this means, of course, the way of eternal life. The Hebrew thought is difficult to express in a word or two: 'the way' was a constant expression for the godly life, and the Psalmist prays to be led in the way that, *throughout the whole course of the world*, always has been, and always will be, the right manner of life.

CXL. This and the next three Psalms are cries of anguish from persecution by enemies, of the same style and feeling as many others chiefly to be found in Books I, II.

Prayer for deliverance from the wicked ([1-3]). The same renewed ([4, 5]). Prayer that they achieve not their evil purposes ([6-8]). Prayer for their destruction, and the thankful communion of the upright with God ([9-14]). The mention of war ([2, 7]), and the plurals 'the righteous' and 'the upright' ([13]), show that the Psalm is national not individual.

3. Quoted by St. Paul in Rom 3 [13], in the string of passages which has found its way into Ps 14 in the PBV; see note there.

13. See on 5 [4].

CXLI. The Psalmist asks that his evening prayer may be accepted as a sacrifice ([1, 2]), and that he may be guarded from evil in word and thought, and in his actions among wicked men ([3, 4]). He welcomes rebuke from the righteous ([5]). A confident prayer for deliverance from the wicked ([8-10]). But the text and meaning of [5] are very doubtful, and [6, 7] appear to be quite corrupt. On account of [2] the Psalm was used as an evening prayer in the early Church.

2. See on 5 [3].

4*b*. He prays that he may avoid the luxurious feasts of the wicked.

7. With the change of one word the meaning may be: 'Let the righteous smite me in kindness and reprove me; the oil of the wicked [i.e. the oil poured on the head of guests at their feasts], let it not anoint my head.'

6, 7 must be studied in commentaries.

CXLII. The Psalmist will cry to God in his misery ([1, 2]). God knows and will regard his peril and loneliness ([3, 4]). He prays Him to hear his cry and to bring him out again into prosperity ([5-7]).

5. **the land of the living**: see on 27 [13].

7. **prison**: see on 79 [11]. The writer may literally have been in prison, or the nation may be speaking in Exile. But the Psalm can be used by anyone who feels that he is 'tied and bound with the chain of his sins.' The meaning of 'compass me about' is doubtful, and the word is probably corrupt.

CXLIII. Hear me, O God, in Thy righteousness, and punish me not, for no man before Thee can have righteousness ([1, 2]). For Thy punishment is that the enemy persecutes me ([3, 4]). A remembrance of Thy past works makes me yearn for Thy help now ([5, 6]). Answer me ([7]), and show me Thy mercy, guide me ([8]), deliver me ([9]), teach me ([10]), quicken me ([11]), and destroy mine enemies ([12]). A penitential Psalm, appointed for Ash Wednesday, and said at Lauds on Friday. The writer

is conscious of his faithfulness as God's servant (2, 12), so that his punishment by means of persecuting enemies is a problem of grievous difficulty. His vindictiveness also in 12 is explained from the same cause; see Introduction, § 6.

2. Cf. Rom 3 20; Gal 2 16.

10. RVm 'a plain country' is right; see on 26 12.

CXLIV. Blessed be God my Helper (1, 2). What is man that Thou regardest him, a being transitory as a breath or a shadow (3, 4). Come with terrors from heaven to rescue and deliver me from the hand of wicked foreigners (5-8). Praise to God in confidence that He will help the king (9, 10). Rescue and deliver me from the hand of wicked foreigners (11). A forecast of the ideal prosperity of the nation in the Golden Age to come (12-15). All except the last section is compiled or adapted from Ps 18, 8, 39, 104, 33, and it is instructive to trace the parallels. The last section, drawn by the writer from an unknown source, the style and vocabulary of which are different, affords a vivid picture of the Utopian conditions in which Israel expected to live on earth. Something similar is described in Zech 8 4 f., 12; cf. Dt 28 2 ff. A less worthy imagination could conjure up the material Paradise of the Moslem. Christians can apply it to portray, not bodily luxury, but the spiritual health and wealth of the City of God.

5-7. See on 18 7-15.

9. Only here, and in the composite Ps 108, does the word Elohim occur in Books IV, V, for the proper name.

12. **corner stones.** The writer thinks rather of stones exquisitely carved, as Orientals alone can do it, which are placed in the corners of a building for beauty.

CXLV. Praise for 'the kingdom and the power and the glory' of God (1-7; cf. 11 f.). In His kingdom He extends universal goodness to 'every living thing' (8-16; akin to 104 14-28), especially to those that pray to and love Him (17-21). An alphabetical Psalm (see on 9, 10). Since the satisfaction of all life, both natural and spiritual, is the work of the Holy Spirit of God, the Psalm (with 104) is used in its deepest Christian meaning on Whitsun Day.

8. See on 103 8.

13. The verse beginning with the 14th letter has fallen out after this verse; but the LXX preserves one, which may very likely have been original; 'Faithful is the Lord in all His words, and holy in all His works'; of which 17 is an echo.

15, 16. Based on 104 27 f. The spiritual interpretation of this caused the Psalm to be used at the Communion Office in the days of Chrysostom; and its literal interpretation is seen in several forms of the Latin Grace said at meals in colleges.

CXLVI. Praise the Lord (1, 2), who alone can help (3-5), the Creator (6), who performs works of kindness on all who are in need (6b-9a), and destroys the wicked (9b). He is King for ever (10).

7. **the prisoners:** see on 79 11. This and 8 are akin to Is 61 1, which our Lord said was fulfilled in Himself (Lk 4 18).

CXLVII. Three stanzas: (*a*) Praise the Lord (1, 2), who restores Jerusalem, and brings back and comforts His outcast people (2, 3), who rules the universe in His power and wisdom, who rewards the meek and destroys the wicked (6). (*b*) Sing to the Lord (7), whose providence is over all the earth (8, 9), and delights not in physical strength but in them that fear and hope in Him (10, 11). (*c*) Praise the Lord, O Zion (12), who strengthens thee, and blesses thy children with peace and plenty (13, 14), and to Israel alone has given His Law (19, 20). In all three stanzas are noted His work in the material world and in the moral world, and in the first and third His work in restoring His people.

10, 11 are based on 33 16-18.

CXLVIII. Praise the Lord 'every heavenly thing and every heavenly body' (Kirkp.) (1-6), the material world with all its living creatures, animal and vegetable (7-10), and all mankind (11, 12), for His greatness (13), and for restoring Israel (14). The last three Psalms in the Psalter are used at Lauds on Sunday.

11. On the universalism see Introduction, § 7; contrast 147.

14. **horn:** see on 75 5. The words mean that the exalted strength of His people is that which all His saints praise.

CXLIX. Praise the Lord for His restoration of Israel (1-6a). They will execute vengeance on their enemies (6b-9). Every word of the first part can be echoed by the Christian, to whom the 'assembly of the saints' (1) is the Church, and who can give the fullest spiritual meaning to 4: 'He will beautify the meek with victorious vindication against their enemies.' But the second part has the vindictive bitterness which is Jewish and not Christian (see Introduction, § 6).

4*a*. Cf. 132 13, 14.

4*b*. It is by their victorious salvation that the meek can inherit the earth (37 11).

CL. This unique song of praise, addressed to the whole of living creation (see Introduction, § 7), is placed at the end of the Psalter as being a Doxology in itself. Kirkp. fitly quotes Rev 5 13.

QUOTATIONS AND ALLUSIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

2 1, 2. Ac 4 25, 26
2 7. Ac 13 33; Heb 1 5, 5 5; cf. 7 28 (Lk 3 22)
2 8, 9. Rev 2 26, 27, 12 5, 19 15
4 4. Eph 4 26
5 9. Rom 3 13
6 8. Mt 7 23; Lk 13 27
8 2. Mt 21 16
8 4-6. Heb. 2 6-8
8 6. 1 Cor 15 27; Eph 1 22
10 7. Rom 3 14
14 1-3. Rom 3 10-12
16 8-11. Ac 2 25-28
16 10. Ac 2 31, 13 35
18 49. Rom 15 9
19 4. Rom 10 18
22 1. Mt 27 46; Mk 15 34
22 7. Mt 27 39-43; Mk 15 29-32
22 8. Mt 27 43
22 18. Jn 19 24
22 21. 2 Tim 4 17
22 22. Heb 2 12
24 1. 1 Cor 10 26
24 4. Mt 5 8
31 5. Lk 23 46
32 1, 2. Rom 4 7, 8
34 8. 1 P 2 3
34 12-16. 1 P 3 10-12
35 19. Jn 15 25
36 1. Rom 3 18
37 11. Mt 5 5
39 12. 1 P 2 11; Heb 11 13
40 6-8. Heb 10 5-9
41 9. Jn 13 18; Mk 14 18
42 5. Mt 26 38; Mk 14 34
42 6. Jn 12 27
44 22. Rom 8 36
45 6, 7. Heb 1 8, 9
48 2. Mt 5 35
51 4. Rom 3 4
55 22. 1 P 5 7
68 18. Eph 4 8
68 35. 2 Th 1 10
69 4. Jn 15 25
69 9. Jn 2 17; Rom 15 3
69 21. Mt 27 34, 48; Mk 15 36; Lk 23 36; Jn 19 28, 29
69 22 f. Rom 11 9, 10
69 25. Ac 1 20
78 2. Mt 13 35
78 24. Jn 6 31
82 6. Jn 10 34
87 5. cf. Gal 4 26
89 20. Ac 13 22
90 4. 2 P 3 8
91 11, 12. Mt 4 6; Lk 4 10, 11
91 13. Lk 10 19
94 11. 1 Cor 3 20
95 7-11. Heb 3 7-11, etc.
98 3. Lk 1 54
102 25-27. Heb 1 10-12
103 17. Lk 1 50
104 4. Heb 1 7
105 8, 9. Lk 1 72, 73
107 9. Lk 1 53
109 8. Ac 1 20
109 25. Mt 27 39; Mk 15 29
110 1. Mt 22 44, 26 64; Mk 12 36, 14 62, 16 19; Lk 20 42, 43, 22 69; Ac 2 34, 35, 5 31; cf. 7 56; Rom 8 34; 1 Cor 15 25, 27; Eph 1 20; Col 3 1; Heb 1 3, 13, 8 1, 10 12, 13, 12 2; 1 P 3 22; Rev 3 21
110 4. Heb 5 6, 10, 6 20, 7 17, 21
112 9. 2 Cor 9 9
116 10. 2 Cor 4 13
117 1. Rom 15 11
118 6. Heb 13 6
118 22, 23. Mt 21 42; Mk 12 10, 11
118 22. Lk 20 17; Ac 4 11; 1 P 2 4, 7
118 25, 26. Mt 21 9; Mk 11 9, 10; Jn 12 13
118 26. Mt 23 39; Lk 13 35, 19 38
132 5. Ac 7 46
132 11. Ac 2 30
140 3. Rom 3 13
143 2. Rom 3 20; Gal 2 16

THE PROVERBS

By A. E. Morris

Introduction

This book belongs to Israel's 'Wisdom Literature.' It comprises the following collections:

Part I.—1-9, anonymous, and concerned with Wisdom.

Part II.—10 1-22 16, assigned to Solomon, and consisting of short miscellaneous maxims.

Part III.—22 17-24 22, assigned, as the text stands, to the 'wise men,' and differing in style and arrangement from Part II.

Part IV.—24 23-34, an appendix to Part III., also assigned to the 'wise men,' and probably having the same origin.

Part V.—25-29, said to be a collection of Solomon's proverbs made by Hezekiah's men.

Part VI.—30-31, an appendix, in part assigned to Agur and Lemuel, the rest anonymous.

The book itself testifies to the diverse origin of these collections, and in part leaves open the question of their date.

(1) **Titles and Dates.**—1 ^{1} can only cover the whole book very loosely, for other authors are mentioned in 1 ^{6}, 22 ^{17}, 24 ^{23}, 30 ^{1}, and 31 ^{1}. It does not necessarily refer to Part I. at all, and in fact modern scholars regard Part I. (including 1 $^{1\text{-}6}$) as an introduction furnished by the last editor of Parts II.-V. We should therefore expect Part II. to be the oldest collection, and on this scholars are generally agreed. It is assigned to Solomon (10 ^{1}), but this editorial note cannot settle the question, as similar suggestions of authorship (e.g. in the titles of many psalms) are notoriously untrustworthy. There is, of course, no reason why Solomon should not have composed proverbs. Other Oriental nations had their proverbial lore before his time, and the tradition in 1 K 4 $^{29\text{-}34}$ must be accounted for. Still, many of the sayings in Part II. cannot appropriately be regarded as the work of the Solomon whose character is depicted in the historical books. The proverbs about the king in Part II. (14 $^{28.\ 35}$, 16 $^{10.\ 14.\ 15}$, 20 $^{2.\ 8.\ 26.\ 28}$, 21 ^{1}, 22 ^{11}) would not come naturally from him, nor would sayings like 11 ^{28} and 16 ^{8}. Again, the monogamy implied in 14 ^{1}, 18 ^{22}, 19 ^{13} f., 21 $^{9.\ 19}$ scarcely suits the polygamous Solomon. Possibly the emphasis upon the exaltation of morality over ritual in 15 ^{8}, 16 ^{6}, 21 $^{3.\ 27}$ presupposes the work of Hosea and Amos. Similar arguments apply to Part V., though here one element in the title is more definite. True, the reference to Hezekiah's men in the third person, and the words 'These also' (related to 10 ^{1}), suggest that the title is not their work but that of a later editor. Still, this title may be fairly regarded as more reliable than certain equally definite titles to some of the psalms, for the latter are merely the products of a vague tradition combined with clumsy deductions from internal evidence, while here, although the reference to Solomon is doubtless due only to his traditional reputation for wisdom, there is nothing in the collection itself to account for the reference to Hezekiah. The title must have been based on something which the editor found in his source. Perowne quotes with approval Sayce's opinion that Hezekiah 'emulated the patronage of literature shown by the Assyrian kings, and although there is no supporting evidence, it seems arbitrary to set this title aside.

It is interesting to note that by the time of Hezekiah an archaistic revival had also begun in Egypt. This manifested itself partly in the copying and studying of earlier writings, and partly in the production of new works in imitation of them, written in Middle Egyptian, which was the classical language. It is because of this that we now possess copies of old Egyptian writings. There is nothing improbable in the suggestion that a similar movement set in in Palestine during Hezekiah's reign.

Toy's arguments for the post-exilic date of the whole book are not convincing as regards Parts II. and V. The 'tacit assumption of monotheism' is found equally in Hosea, Amos, and Isaiah, and the absence of reference to idolatry, temple, covenant, priest, and prophet would be equally surprising *after* the Exile. The meaning given to the word tōrāh accords better with a pre-exilic than a post-exilic date (see note on 28 ^{4}). Toy's remarks about the social background and the philosophical conceptions of Proverbs have no force as regards Parts II. and V. E.g., he says that the philosophical use of ḥokmāh (Wisdom) is post-exilic. This is true of Part I., but not of Parts II. and V. Thus in 29 ^{15} we read that 'The rod and reproof give wisdom!' The international tone proves nothing, for this is usual in gnomic literature. Finally, the 'marked unity in the Wisdom literature' is exaggerated. Proverbs itself shows marked diversity, compatible with widely differing dates. We conclude that there is no compelling reason for regarding Parts II. and V. in the main as later than Hezekiah's time, though they have been handled by subsequent editors.

Parts III. and IV. resemble Parts II. and V. in subject-matter but not in form. There is no obvious reason for putting them at a later date (see Intro., 7). Israel had knowledge of wise men in Egypt and Edom (cf. Gen 41 ^{8}; Ex 7 ^{11}; Jer 49 ^{7}; Obad ^{8}). Joseph was promoted because of his wisdom (Gen 41 ^{38} f., E). Joab (2 S 14 ^{2}; cf. 20 $^{16\text{-}22}$) knew of a 'wise woman' at Tekoa, the home of Amos, whose literary style shows that he was no stranger to literature. Wisdom probably had to free itself from dubious companions (e.g. magic and divination: cf. Gen 44 ^{5}, J) before it could worthily serve Jehovah. But just as false and true prophecy flourished together, so doubtless false and true wisdom flourished contemporaneously. This argument bears upon the origin of the teaching of the 8th century prophets, but space forbids

further discussion here. Suffice it to say that the general agreement of Parts II.-V. with the 8th-century prophets in doctrine and moral teaching, and the paucity or absence of allusions to the Temple-cultus, the Law, and the Messianic Hope, agree as readily with a pre-Hezekian as with a post-exilic date.

Part I., on the other hand, is late. Its affinity with Greek thought, and with a late book like Wisdom, sufficiently proves this. It is really an elaborate introduction, intended to give the right approach to the maxims proper.

Part VI. appears to be material added later, some of it probably from foreign sources (see notes on $30^{1.15}$ f., 31^{1}). We know that Proverbs was not admitted to the Canon without dispute, and this agrees with the view that in its final form it is a very late book. It is generally agreed that the sayings are literary, not popular, in origin, but this need not rule out the possibility that some of them are as old as the period of Solomon. They borrow their forms from Hebrew poetry, which is indisputably older than the time of Solomon. We have Egyptian gnomic works much older than this (see further Intro., 7). Thus Proverbs, though one of the latest books in the Old Testament, probably preserves some of the oldest material.

(2) **Literary Form.**—A separate introduction to each part is given in the Commentary. Here a general survey is given. The proverbs exhibit the various forms of parallelism found in Hebrew poetry. We have:

(*a*) Synonymous or cognate distichs—the second line repeating the first in a slightly different form to draw out the full meaning: e.g. 14^{19}, 16^{18}.

(*b*) Antithetic distichs—in which the truth of the first line is illustrated by its opposite in the second line: e.g. 10^{2}.

(*c*) Synthetic or integral distichs—in which two different yet related propositions are made, the second supplementing the first; or in which the first line needs to be completed by the second: e.g. 10^{22}, 11^{31}, 16^{4}, 20^{12}.

(*d*) Parabolic distichs—in which a comparison is made between a natural object or common experience and a moral idea. The comparison may be expressed, as in 26^{1}; or the two statements may be set side by side, with or without 'and,' the comparison suggesting itself, as in 26^{3}, 25^{14}.

The same relations often hold good between verses when the saying extends over two or more; for (*a*) see 23^{15} f.; (*b*) is not found; for (*c*) see 30^{5} f.; for (*d*) see 25^{4} f., 26^{18} f. We find also several short poems (6^{6-11}, 24^{30-34}, 27^{23-27}), and a complete acrostic poem (31^{10-31}). On the numerical sayings in 6^{16-19} and 30 see 30^{7} *n*. Occasional attempts at grouping can be detected, but on the whole the arrangement is haphazard. Not only do parallel sayings occur in different parts, especially in Parts II. and V., but repetitions (identical or nearly so) occur within the parts themselves, sometimes within a few verses. Thus 25^{24} (Part V.) = 21^{9} (Part II.), and $19^{5} = 19^{9}$, $14^{12} = 16^{25}$ (all Part II.). It seems likely that some of the parts, especially II. and V., are really groups of minor collections of sayings.

(3) **Text.**—The Hebrew text has suffered greatly. Sometimes RV is obtained by forcing the grammar or by pure guesswork, and the ancient versions do not always help us. When these fail, emendations possess only the authority of those who adopt them, and in many instances it is better not to attempt a translation. The LXX has numerous additions to, and a few omissions from, the Hebrew, besides some remarkable differences in order. Thus between Parts III. and IV. LXX inserts 30^{1-14}, and puts 30^{15}-31^{9} between Parts IV. and V. Cheyne notes that 'The treatment of the headings in the LXX. is also remarkable, and seems arbitrary; e.g. it looks as if the translator had expunged all those peculiarities in the superscriptions which suggested a variety of authorship. The proper names in 30 and 31 have been explained away, and the heading of 10^{1}, which limits the Solomonic authorship too much for the translator, has been actually omitted.'

(4) **The Sages, their Teaching, and their Pupils.**—(*a*) In spite of the titles ascribing the bulk of Proverbs to Solomon, it is certain that the book contains the work of many teachers. These were professional sages, who taught wisdom publicly in the form of sententious sayings or short discourses. We gather from Proverbs that the training of the young was largely in their hands. Their 'schools' formed 'incipient universities,' giving what was intended to be a complete moral and intellectual training for life. The sages were 'the humanists of Israel.' Whether they received fees from their pupils is uncertain, though 17^{16} seems to show that they did. Proverbs preserves some of their teaching.

Wisdom itself denotes skill, knowledge, or understanding, either in a particular direction (cf. Is 10[13], 29[14]; Ex 28[3]; Ps 107[27] [RVm]), or regarding life in general. The latter is the meaning in Proverbs. In a few passages in the Old Testament wisdom seems to be not of God (Is 10[13], 29[14]; Jer 8[9], 9[23]; Ezek 28[4] ff.; Is 47[10]; cf. Mt 11[25]; 1 Cor 1[20], 2[6], 3[18] f.), and its possession is once almost deprecated (Ec 1[18]; but cf. 2[13, 26], etc.). Elsewhere wisdom is a gift from God (cf. Gen 41[38] f.; Is 11[2]; 1 K 4[29]; Job 11[6], 28[20-28]; Ps 51[6]; Pr 2[6], etc.). It is not confined to Israel (cf. Jer 49[7]). That of Solomon differed only in degree from that of foreigners (1 K 4[30] f.). Thus the outlook in Proverbs transcends race, and the name Israel does not occur in the book. All knowledge of how to live is classed as wisdom, but this knowledge of course may be on varying planes. At its highest it means moral insight into the character of God, and the wise man is he who knows how to act in harmony with the moral Governor of the world. In Proverbs, therefore, Wisdom sometimes means a body of knowledge (e.g. 1[2], 14[6]); sometimes a principle residing in man (e.g. 2[10], 14[33]); and sometimes is personified though not hypostatized (e.g. 1[20] ff., 8[1] ff., 9[1-6]). If men do not possess it they are blameworthy, for wisdom offers herself to all (cf. Pr 1[20] ff., 8[1] ff., 9[1-6]), and men are free to welcome or reject her (but see [*b*] *infra*). The offer thus poetically described is identified with instruction, whether of parents (1[8], 6[20]) or of the sages. This was the outcome of reflection. Whereas prophetic inspiration seemed to come from without as a 'word of Jehovah,' wisdom came through ordinary intellectual processes. Again, just as true prophecy was distinguished from false by the justice of its moral judgments, so the true wisdom was distinguished from mere worldly shrewdness by its moral superiority. Yet the sages urged the pursuit of wisdom, not because 'righteousness is the secret of blessedness,' but because wisdom brings material prosperity and a long life in which to enjoy it, whereas the wicked meet with disaster and premature death. Hence the exhortations of the sages seem to be mere appeals to self-interest. But we must remember two things: their outlook was bounded by this life (see Intro., 5); and they were quite unconscious of any distinction between sacred and secular. Material blessings were to them spiritual blessings (as they should be to us). Still, we must recognize the limitation of Old Testament ethics. Proverbs never appeals to the love of God as a motive of conduct. There is no thought of advancing His Kingdom, nor of the joy of doing His will simply because it is His will. Nevertheless, though the sages lacked the idealism and forward outlook of the prophets, they were not unworthy co-workers in the cause of righteousness, and when prophecy ceased their importance increased.

(*b*) The process of instruction is called *mûsār* (RV usually 'instruction' or 'correction'). The word occurs thirty times in Proverbs, and it might be rendered 'discipline' in nearly every instance. To undergo it requires a strength of mind which the foolish (1[7], 15[5], 24[7]), the scorner (9[7] f., 15[12]), and the wicked (5[23]) do not possess. He who profits from this discipline becomes wise, prudent, a man of understanding, etc. Some fail to profit by it because they are *hăsăr-lēb* (RV 'void of understanding,' RVm 'heart'). The use of the term 'heart' in this connexion requires elucidation. In English it suggests 'emotion' only, which is misleading. The Hebrew term denotes 'the whole inward perceptive nature' (Toy). The heart is 'the centre of the threefold life of man' (Delitzsch). The brain, which is not mentioned in the Old Testament, was not thought of as having intellectual significance. In Part I. 'heart' means only the intellectual nature, but in other parts it covers the emotional life as well (cf. 13[12], 15[13], 23[17], 24[17], 25[20]). The phrase 'lacking heart' (6[32]) occurs in every Part except the last, but we are nowhere told how a man comes to be in this state. A man proves himself to be so in various ways (cf. 6[32], 11[12], 12[11], 15[21], 17[18], 28[16]). Such men are equated with the 'simple ones' in 7[7], 9[4,16], with the 'foolish' in 10[21], and with the 'slothful' in 24[30]. In 9[4] (cf. 10[13]) it is implied that they are not unteachable, and 19[8] (see RVm) even implies that 'heart' can be acquired. But, in general, those who are *hăsăr-lēb* are regarded as simpletons.

(*c*) A study of the terms used to describe the various classes in Proverbs is interesting. Prior to their having received instruction men are called *pēthi* (RV 'simple'). A better translation would be 'inexperienced.' They believe all they hear (14[15]), fall victims to evil (22[3] = 27[12]), and their natural inheritance is folly (14[18]). They may be taught either good or evil, and both wisdom and folly appeal to them (8[5], 9[4, 6, 16]). Sound teaching gives them 'prudence' (1[4]), or they may learn it by seeing the corporal punishment

of the scorner (19 25 = 21 11). However, their 'turning away' from instruction will slay them (1 32).

Three terms are used for those who fail to profit from the discipline of the sages. First there is the 'scorner.' It is useless to 'discipline' or reprove him (9 7 f.). He avoids rebuke (13 1, 15 12). Even if he seeks wisdom he cannot find it (14 6), doubtless because he lacks the proper character. Only in 1 22 is there the possibility of a hint that he can be reformed, but as we are told in 3 34 that Jehovah scorns the scorners, and in 19 29 (*si v. lect.*) that judgements are prepared for them, it is doubtful whether such a hope is really entertained. Two other terms which occur are not distinguishable in RV—*kĕsil* and *'ĕwil*. The former occurs forty-nine times, and is rendered 'fool' except in 10 1, 14 7, 15 20, 17 25, and 19 13, where it is rendered 'foolish.' The latter occurs nineteen times, and is also translated 'fool,' except in 1 7, 10 14, 21, 11 29, 12 15, 14 3, 9, where it is translated 'foolish.' Cognate with the latter is *'iwwĕlĕth*, rendered 'folly' or 'foolishness.' In 22 15 this folly is said to be innate in every child, but it can be removed by the rod! The use of the rod is enjoined also in 10 13, 13 24, 19 18, 20 30, 23 13 f., and 29 15, but its limitations are recognized in 19 25 and 21 11. Curiously enough, *'iwwĕlĕth* is only connected with the cognate *'ĕwil* in 16 22 and 27 22, and then perhaps only for the sake of alliteration. But it is often connected with *kĕsil* (e.g. 12 23, 13 16). *Kĕsil* means a stupid, dull fellow. He hates knowledge (1 22), delights not in understanding (18 2), and cannot acquire wisdom because he 'lacks heart' (17 16). It is useless to send him with a message (26 6), and he can make no use of a 'parable' (26 7). Neither fine living (19 10) nor honour (26 1, 8) is seemly for him. Stripes are his portion (19 29 = 26 3), though they have little effect on him (17 10). The appeal of wisdom to the *kĕsil* in 8 5 implies a possibility of his reformation, but in 17 16, 26 12, and 29 20 this possibility is practically ruled out (cf. 23 9, 26 4 f.). Similar teaching is given about the *'ĕwil*. He despises wisdom (1 7), which is too high for him (24 7). Controversy with him is undesirable (29 9). He is quite incurable (27 22,—7 22 is corrupt), and will die through 'lack of heart' (10 21). These fools and scorners are potentially, if not actually, wicked. Thus the *'ĕwil* is opposed to the righteous in 10 21; to the prudent in 12 23; to the wise in 10 8, 12 15, and 14 3; and to the upright in 14 9. The *kĕsil* in 10 23 is said to take sport in wickedness, and in 13 19 to abhor the departure from evil. The worst that is said of the scorner is that Jehovah scorns him (3 34). In 24 9 the thought of folly (*'iwwĕlĕth*) is said to be sin. Another class, the sluggards, is everywhere condemned, but never actually called wicked. Only in the stray passage 6 6-11 does the sluggard appear to come under the instruction of the sage.

It seems clear from the above discussion that the following educational ideas prevailed in Israel. All children needed training to rid them of their inexperience and their innate folly. The discipline consisted of teaching, with a liberal use of the rod (on the teaching of children cf. also Dt 6 7, 20 ff.; Ps 78 3-8). Those who profited from it became wise, prudent, righteous. Some failed to benefit by it because they 'lacked heart' or 'sense,' i.e. were congenital simpletons. Out of this class sprang the *kĕsil* (17 16) and the *'ĕwil* (10 21). Others—the 'scorners'—rejected the teaching because they lacked the moral qualities to which it appealed. Except in Part I., where a slightly more liberal view prevails, all these classes are fixed characters. The period of discipline is regarded as a testing-time which reveals once for all what a man's character is. Any future change only consists in a deepening of the character already revealed. Thus in Proverbs we miss any zeal for the conversion of sinners, or any recognition of the fact that character and motives are always mixed and changeable, so that even a good man may fall. The germs of Pharisaism are easily discoverable.

(5) **Retribution in Proverbs.**—Except perhaps in 3 11 f. Proverbs everywhere assumes the prevailing Old Testament view that the righteous are materially rewarded and the wicked punished in this life. Individual thinkers questioned it (cf. Ps 37, 49, and 73), or even denied it outright (cf. Jer 31 29 f.; Ezek 14 12 ff., 18, and Job), yet the doctrine lingered on even to New Testament times. But it had become a burden by the time of Ben-Sirach (*c.* 180 B.C.), for he had to bolster it up with the assertion that what really matters is a man's last end (Ecclus 11 21-28). Later on, the doctrine of a future life relieved the problem of suffering. In Wisdom, e.g., it is roundly declared that 'God made not death' (1 13), that 'God created man for incorruption,' and that 'by the envy of the devil death entered into the world' (2 23 f.). It is admitted that the righteous often suffer on earth, but it is asserted that after death

'their souls are in the hand of God,' and that 'having borne a little chastening they shall receive great good' (Wisd $3^{1.5}$). It has been thought that a similar hope appears in Proverbs, especially in 10^{25}, 11^{4}, 14^{32}, 23^{18} (cf. 24^{14}), and 24^{20}. Of these passages, 10^{25} and 11^{4} need only mean that the righteous live out their full span, whereas the wicked die prematurely. 14^{32} seems more definite, but the true text is doubtful. LXX and Syriac read 'in his integrity' for 'in his death' thus bringing the verse into line with the prevailing doctrine. As to the other passages, we must first consider the meaning of *'ăḥĕrith* (RV 'reward'). Elsewhere in Proverbs the word is rendered 'latter end' ($5^{4.11}$, 19^{20}); 'at the last' (23^{32}, 29^{21}); and 'end' (14^{12} f., 16^{25}, 20^{21}, 25^{8}). In all these passages the idea of *consequence* is present. One's 'latter end' is not merely the closing period of life, but it is the time when the harvest of earlier deeds is reaped. As we have seen, the sages assume that the wicked meet with an early death, regarded as a direct judgement of God. On this view, the wicked do not experience that mellow period of leisurely decline which is the 'latter end' of the righteous, but are suddenly cut off. In one sense, therefore, they do not experience a 'latter end,' while in another sense their 'latter end' is their sudden destruction. This reconciles the apparent contradiction between Pr 24^{20}, which says that 'there will be no reward (or "latter end") to the evil man,' and Ps 73^{17}, which relates how the Psalmist considered the 'latter end' of the ungodly. Another way of reconciling these passages is to translate *'ăḥĕrith* in Pr 24^{20} by 'posterity,' with LXX and Ps 109^{13}, but both Ps 37^{38} and Pr 23^{18} support the former explanation. Thus it seems that the sages distinguished three stages in a man's life: (*a*) The period of training; (*b*) the period of testing; (*c*) the period of reaping. The wicked, however, were practically cut off from the last stage. If this is so, there is not in the passages under discussion any hint of the doctrine of a future life, nor even any room for it. 14^{32} thus stands by itself, and the text rendered in RV must give way to that of the LXX, in face of the general argument that, had the sages attained to the hope of a life after death, they would have made more unmistakable use of a doctrine which so readily solves an urgent problem, and which would have provided them with so strong a backing for their moral teaching. 'It is an easy thing in the sight of the Lord,' says Ben-Sirach, 'to reward a man in the day of death according to his ways' (i.e. the balance is adjusted on the death-bed). 'The affliction of an hour causeth forgetfulness of delight,' and so we should 'call no man blessed before his death.' Now Ben-Sirach is the heir of the sages. If they had reached the doctrine of retribution in another life, would it not have appeared in Ecclesiasticus instead of this rather forced attempt to retain the older doctrine? As for the phrases 'fountain of life' in 10^{11}, 13^{14}, 14^{27}, 16^{22}, and 'tree of life' in 3^{18}, 11^{30}, 13^{12}, 15^{4}, Cheyne (*Job and Solomon*, 123) says that they are 'phrases certainly borrowed from some traditional story of Paradise analogous to that in Gen 2,' but adds, 'It is a singular fact, however, that in all these passages (even, I think, in 3^{18}), these expressions are simply figurative synonyms for "refreshment."' There is, we conclude, no doctrine of a future life in Proverbs. The popular theory of retribution in this life prevails throughout. This view of God's distribution of rewards and punishments seems to us crude and materialistic, but it sprang from a passionate belief in God's justice, and the epithet 'materialistic' would have implied no censure to men who knew no false distinction between material and spiritual blessings.

(6) **The Religious Value of Proverbs.**—Proverbs contains comparatively few directly religious proverbs (cf. 2^{6} f., 3^{5-12}, 8^{13}, 10^{27-29}, 12^{2}, 14^{2}, 15^{3}, $20^{12.24}$, $21^{1-3.30}$ f., $22^{2.4}$), and, as Cheyne remarks, their tone 'falls short of enthusiasm.' But the whole book is profoundly religious at bottom. Just as the various codes of laws are efforts to reduce prophetic ideals to practice, so Proverbs preserves attempts to popularize prophetic teaching.* Moreover, the book provides a healthy check to extreme other-worldliness and contempt for 'secular' affairs. It insists that the whole of life must be consecrated to God, and that God's hand is in all phenomena. Judged by contemporary standards, the moral ideals of Proverbs are lofty. The teaching about one's enemies is hardly transcended even in the New Testament, and is in advance of the attitude of even so spiritual a man as Jeremiah (see notes on 25^{21} f.). Again, the tendency of prophetic teaching, consummated in the New Testament, was to break through racial barriers. Yet the internationalism even of Jonah does not surpass that of

* We should prefer to say 'It shows the influence of the religious teaching of the prophets as distinctly as do the Codes of the Law.'—Ed.

Proverbs, where only the name Jehovah preserves any of the national exclusiveness of Israel. There are direct quotations and allusions in the New Testament. Our Lord Himself perhaps based a parable on Pr 25 [6] f. (cf. Lk 14 [7-11]), and it seems probable that one of St. Paul's greatest Christological passages is inspired by a study of Pr 8 [22] ff. (see Commentary). Nevertheless, the book as a whole falls far below the religious level of the New Testament, and does not rise above that of certain Egyptian gnomic literature of a still earlier age. We should therefore be careful to see Proverbs in the mirror of the New Testament when appealing to it for ethical guidance.

(7) **Egyptian Influence in Proverbs.**—Recent discoveries have brought to light Egyptian gnomic writings and religious poems undoubtedly older than those in the Old Testament, and the strong resemblance between passages in these writings and in Proverbs and Psalms suggests that the Egyptian writings have influenced these books. As regards the Psalter, the Egyptian influence on a few psalms seems indisputable. This influence could easily have come in during the reigns of Solomon, Jeroboam I, or Hezekiah. This establishes the possibility of Egyptian influence in Proverbs, a possibility which becomes almost a certainty as regards one Egyptian writing, *The Teaching of Amenophis* (Amen-em-ope), a work dated *c.* 1000 B.C. A few parallels with this work have been noticed in Proverbs in every part except the last, but in Part III. its influence is most marked. In the first third of Part III. the sayings nearly all have parallels in *The Teaching*, mostly in the same relative order, though the form in the latter seems to be the more original. Sometimes the Egyptian work clears up obscurities in the Hebrew, notably in Pr 22 [20]. The word there rendered 'excellent things' is very obscure (see RVm), but seems to be connected with the Hebrew word for 'thirty.' Now at the end of the Egyptian work, which is divided into thirty chapters, we read: 'See for thyself these thirty chapters. They please, they educate.' Apparently the Hebrew writer borrowed this idea, and composed a work of thirty sayings (Pr 22 [22]-24 [22]). It is true that the present arrangement of the text gives more than thirty, but the suggestions in the Commentary show how easily this number can be restored. The 'chapters' in the Egyptian book are sometimes fairly lengthy. The Hebrew writer has given us mostly quatrains, with a few couplets and one poem of seventeen lines (23 [29-35]). *The Teaching of Amenophis* will bear comparison with Part III. In fact, apart from references to Egyptian deities, the religious tone of the Egyptian work is at least equal to that of Proverbs, and its ethical value is certainly not less. We find, e.g. religious sayings such as: 'The tongue of a man is the rudder of a boat, but the Universal Lord is its pilot'; 'God loveth the happiness of the humble, more than that the noble be honoured'; 'Better is a bushel that God giveth thee, than five thousand obtained by force'; 'Better is poverty at the hand of God, than riches in the storehouse.' Specially interesting is a reference to death: 'How happy is he who hath reached the West, when he is safe in the hand of God.' On the ethical side Amenophis teaches kindness (even to the wicked), justice, honesty, prudence, respect for the aged, and other virtues. His ideal is 'tranquillity,' and his great aversion is the 'passionate man.' Some other notable passages are cited in the Commentary. The discovery of this work, and the fact of its influence upon Proverbs, renders it easier to defend an early date for the greater part of the book (see Intro., 1). There is strong probability that the Egyptian book was known in Palestine by the time of Hezekiah, especially when we remember the international character of the wisdom of the sages. Arguments from internal evidence for a late date as regards Parts II.-V. fall to the ground, for exactly the same arguments would have to be applied to the Egyptian book, which is undoubtedly older than any date claimed for these parts. A special difficulty regarding 23 [13] f. is dealt with in the Commentary. The Egyptian works referred to above are also interesting examples of the inspiration by which God 'left not Himself without witness' in the world outside the Chosen People.

(8) **Bibliography.**—The Commentaries by Perowne (*Cam. Bib.*, 1899), Toy (*I.C.C.*, 1899), and Martin (*Cent. Bib.*, 1908) have individual merits. That by Zöckler (in Lange—E.T., 1872) has very full grammatical, exegetical, and homiletic notes. Malan, *Notes on Proverbs*, gives abundant illustrative material, while Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, and Davison, *Wisd. Lit. of the Old Testament*, are both useful. On Egyptian influence see Essays by Gressmann and Blackman in *The Psalmists* (Ed. D. C. Simpson), and for a translation of *The Teaching of Amenophis*, and a comparison of it with Proverbs, see

articles by Griffith and D. C. Simpson in the *Journal of Egyptian Archæology*, vol. xii (October, 1926), and *The Wisdom of Egypt and the O.T.*, by W. O. E. Oesterley.

Commentary

Part I. (1-9). This consists of a long introductory sentence (1 1-6), a motto (1 7), and a number of separate exhortations and discourses. These bear the impress of a single mind, and differ markedly in tone and style from the rest of the book. Certain passages in Part I., however, appear to be interpolations. These are 3 27-30 (or 35), 6 1-19, and 9 7-12. They are not in the style of Part I., and their aphoristic character marks them as stray fragments from other parts. Omitting these, Part I. consists of fourteen sections. All except the second and the last two appear to be addressed to the sage's pupil. Driver thought that the address, 'My son,' was a literary fiction, but the personal tone of the exhortations favours the view that they are really pages from the sage's lecture-book. There has been no systematic attempt at arrangement. E.g. in 1 we have an invitation by Wisdom, and another in 8. We have warnings against sexual sin both in 2 and in 5-7. The last two sections (8 and 9), however, appear to have been written specially for the sage's introduction to the various collections of proverbs which follow. We have in 1-7 samples of the exhortations addressed by the sages to their pupils. They emphasize the value of the sage's teaching, but nowhere define what this was. But undoubtedly we are to infer that the aphorisms of the rest of the book are specimens of that teaching. The exhortations in Part I. are of late date, but it seems likely that similar exhortations were always made by the sages to their pupils. These would be followed by the communication of a number of aphorisms, which the pupils would be expected to memorize. The exhortations would lend themselves to a certain philosophical treatment. Those in Part I. for the most part merely state the traditional theory of retribution, but one (3 11-20) passes from this to a deeply philosophical view of Wisdom's relation to the Universe, and this thought is developed at length in 8. The background presupposed in Part I., however, is startling. The sage assumes that the seeker after Wisdom will, of course, have to face two great temptations, viz. robbery with murder, and illicit sexual intercourse. More than one-third of Part I. is taken up with this latter subject. The most important passage is 8 22 ff., which has figured prominently in Christological discussions. See notes.

1. 1-7. Title, Introduction, and Motto.—Intended by the author of Part I. as an introduction to the whole book. The title refers, of course, not to Part I. but to the rest of the book, most of which is assigned to Solomon. It furnishes a handy but inexact title to the whole collection. 5 breaks the construction. Place it after 6 and render 'Let the wise man hear,' etc. The word rendered proverb (*māshāl*) can cover even more than the varied contents of this book. Its root idea is representation or comparison, but any form of words with a deep and allusive significance can be called a *māshāl* (cf. 1 S 10 12; Is 14 4; Mic 2 4; Jer 24 9; Ezek 17 2, 20 49; Nu 23 7; Ps 49 4; Job 29 1). 7a is found again in 9 10; Ps 111 10, and Ecclus 1 14, but 7b differs in each instance (cf. also Job 28 28).

8-19. Section 1: Exhortation against Robbery with Murder.—The pupil is warned not to throw in his lot with those who live by murder and robbery. It is wrong to suppose that gangs of desperados could only exist when a weak king was on the throne. Robbery and murder are found throughout Israel's history (cf. Ex 22 1-4; Hos 4 1-2, 6 9; Am 3 10; Is 1 23, 10 1-2; Mic 3 1-10; Jer 7 9; Ezek 18 10-14; Nu 35 16-31; Zech 5 3). Even the Romans could not stamp out these evils (cf. Lk 10 30; Ac 23 12-22).

8. law is wrong. See RVm, and note on 28 4. From this verse, 4 3 ff., and 6 20 we gather that the sage's instructions were supplementary to those given by parents. On instruction (*mūsār*) see Intro., 4 (*b*). A reference to Dt 6 7, 20 ff. and Ps 78 3-8 suggests that the teaching given by parents concerned the national history and traditions, that of the sages being confined to the imparting of wisdom.

17. Meaning fixed by 18. As the attraction of the bait blinds birds to the danger of the net, so lust for plunder blinds murderers to the inevitable result of their course. They really destroy themselves. 'The end of every fox is the furrier's shop.'

20-33. Section 2: Wisdom's Judgement.—Wisdom is personified. As the text stands, she invites the 'simple,' 'scorners,' and 'fools' to change their character, promising to help them (22 f.). Then abruptly she denounces them (24-33). Scorners are everywhere else regarded as irreformable, while only in 8 5 is there a hint that the fool (*kĕsil*) might reform:

see Intro., 4 (*c*). Yet, as the following verses suggest, there comes a time when 'the day of grace is past and gone' (28). Wisdom's sentence (31) is just. The note of exultation and mockery may be felt to be less than Christian, but we should remember Butler's solemn use of the passage, *Anal.*, pt. I, c. ii.

32. backsliding is scarcely accurate. *refusal* or *turning away* is better. We must, of course, suppose that between 23 and 24 there has been a refusal of Wisdom's invitation, or rather, for the sake of the warning, the sage proceeds as though there had been a refusal. If we take 33 as the real point of the address its dark tones seem less discordant.

II. **Section 3: The Fruits of Wisdom.**—A high note is struck in this section. It is recognized that wisdom is God's gift (6 f.), but found only by those who seek it (4 f.). Its blessings are described positively as knowledge of God (5) and spiritual insight (9 f.), and negatively as preservation from evil company (12-19). Long life sums up the idea of blessedness (21), but there is no emphasis upon material advantages. The sage regards himself as the vehicle of a divine revelation (1-5), but we miss the 'Thus saith the Lord' of the prophets.

8. saints. The word is cognate with the word rendered 'mercy' or 'loving-kindness,' and seems to have become popular after Hosea. *Pious* would be better. In Maccabæan times the term was applied to the strict party (1 Mac 2 42), which later became known as the Pharisees. Many passages in Psalms suggest that 'the pious' became a recognized class in later Judaism. The word occurs only here in Proverbs.

10. This conception of Wisdom as an indwelling power transforming the character is a notable approach to New Testament doctrine. We have only to identify Wisdom with Christ (1 Cor 1 24) to make it fully Christian.

16-19. Warnings against sexual vice are prominent in Part I. (see Intro. to Part I.). The adoption of monogamy in later Judaism, and closer contact with the heathen world, favoured its growth (cf. Ecclus 9 3-9, 19 2, 23 16-26, 25 16-26, 26 8-12, 42 9-14). In earlier times prostitution was practised under religious auspices, but no such excuse can here be made. 17 shows that marriage was regarded as a divine institution.

18*a*. RVm renders the Hebrew, but slight changes give a better line, 'Her house is a pit of deep gloom.' See note on 5 5.

III. **1-10. Section 4: Blessings of Obedience and Trust in God.**—The conduct enjoined is high, but the motive is self-centred. A long, peaceful, and prosperous life is the goal of religious effort. We miss the thought of goodness as an end in itself, and of zeal for 'leaving the world better than one found it.' God seems to be only a dispenser of awards. But perhaps the sage does himself less than justice. Toy says truly that 'most men need the bait of concrete rewards, at least to begin with.' Christians realize that goodness brings a blessedness which is better than material wealth.

1. law. See note on 28 4.

5. A recognition that man is more than intellect, and that the whole personality must engage in the search for truth.

11-20. Section 5: The Worth of Wisdom.—There is a loftier note in this section. Wisdom herself is the highest good. Happy is he who finds and retains her. Yet the sage cannot leave the thought of material blessings behind (16).

11 f. chastening or 'discipline.' See Intro., 4 (*b*), and cf. Is 53 5; Heb 12 5 f. Some scholars suspect these verses to be an insertion to correct the previous verses, but Perowne says that the contradiction here, as in life, is only on the surface. The pathway of Wisdom, in spite of temporary appearances to the contrary, *is* the path of peace. He adds that 'Christian teaching itself has no better solution to give than this of the mystery of suffering.' This teaching is found only here in Proverbs (see Intro., 5). There is a hint of it in Am 4 6-11, and Isaiah was not far from it. It is the solution offered by Eliphaz and Elihu (Job 5 17 f., 33), but rejected by Job. The doctrine could make little headway while man's horizon was bounded by this life. In 12*b* for 'a father' LXX suggests another pointing = 'afflicts' (cf. Job 5 18 and Heb 12 6). God is nowhere called 'Father' in Proverbs.

14 f. Cf. Mt 13 44 f.

18. tree of life means 'source of long life' (see Intro., 5).

19 f. The sage is carried on to reveal the reason why Wisdom is so fruitful a source of blessing. By Wisdom, i.e. by possessing Wisdom and using her as an instrument, Jehovah was able to create the Universe. Wisdom is thus the principle of the Universe (cf. Ecclus 1 1-20, and see further on 8 22 ff.). Toy says, 'The cosmical conception, which dwells on the order of the world for its own sake, belongs to the post-prophetic period and indicates an influence of Greek thought.'

21-35. Section 6: Wisdom gives Security.

—The thought of security dominates the passage, which is strongly reminiscent of Ps 91. [27] ff. add the thought that it is a duty to pass on security to others.

21. Apart from the address, the lines appear to have become inverted, for them has no antecedent.

24. Contrast 4 [16].

27. **them to whom it is due** is wrong. Lit. 'its owners' or 'masters.' Text probably corrupt. A slight change in Hebrew gives *thy neighbours*, which suits the following verses.

30 illustrates the limitations of Old Testament ethics.

32. See RVm. Something like moral communion with God is implied, but chiefly for the material blessings resulting therefrom.

34. On **scorners** see notes on 1 [20-33] and Intro., 4 (*c*). **the lowly**: two terms, *'ānāw* and *'ānî*, are frequently confused in Hebrew MSS. The former appears to be active, and to mean 'meek,' 'submissive,' especially to God (cf. Nu 12 [3]). The latter is passive, and signifies the condition to which the world often reduces the 'meek,' viz. 'poor,' 'afflicted.' So in Lk 6 [20] the blessing is pronounced on those who become poor through submission to God's will, not through carelessness, etc. Mt 5 [3] is thus an accurate paraphrase.

35*b*. **promotion** is difficult. The parallel suggests an easy emendation, 'Fools shall gain shame.'

IV. 1-9. **Section 7: The Sage's Testimony.**—Horton (*Exp. B.*) calls this 'a charming little piece of autobiography.' Martin says: 'It gives us a beautiful picture of the pious households of the period.'

1. The plural address 'sons' recurs in 5 [7] and 7 [24], both in error, so read *my son* here.

7. Not in LXX. RV is just possible, but an easy emendation gives 'In the beginning of thy strength get wisdom' (cf. 1 K 3 [4-14]).

10-19. **Section 8: The Two Ways.**

12. Wisdom's path is broad and smooth, i.e. Wisdom gives tranquillity. Contrast Mt 7 [13] f., and see Intro., 7.

14-17. The wicked in Proverbs are always thoroughly bad.

18 f. Some would transpose these verses. [18] is difficult in Hebrew, but the general sense is clear. The righteous man begins his journey through life in the light, and that light increases until it reaches the highest degree possible. 'His sun standeth still in the heavens, and hasteth not to go down for the whole everlasting day' (Perowne; cf. Rev 21 [11, 23-25], 22 [5]).

20-27. **Section 9: Exhortation to Constancy.**

23. Zöckler renders: 'Above all that is to be guarded keep thy heart.' Horton says: 'It was after all but a new emphasis on the old teaching of Proverbs when Jesus taught the necessity of heart-purity, and when He showed that out of the heart came forth evil thoughts and all the things which defile a man' (Mt 15 [19]). On the meaning of 'heart' see Intro., 4 (*b*).

27. Here there are two 'wrong turnings.'

V. **Section 10: Against Sexual Vice.**—'The subject of this chapter is one throughout. Against the unholy passion to be shunned ([1-14]) is set the holy love to be cherished' ([15-23]) (Perowne). See on 2 [16-19] and Intro. to Part I. It is interesting to note that the pupil addressed appears to be married, unless the warning is proleptic.

2. Toy reads: 'That discretion may watch over thee, that knowledge may preserve thee' (cf. 2 [11]).

3. For what is meant see 7 [14-20]. Note the contrast: 'sweet and smooth' ([3]), 'bitter and sharp' ([4]). Wormwood is both noxious and bitter, and doubtless allusion is made to its poisonous quality (cf. Am 5 [7]; Jer 9 [15]; Dt 29 [18]; Rev 8 [11]).

5. In Proverbs all sin brings premature death, but adultery is a particularly 'mortal' sin (cf. 2 [18]).

6. Text uncertain. Zöckler renders: 'The path of life she never heedeth: her steps stray, she knoweth not whither' (cf. 4 [26] [RVm]).

7. **sons** should be singular, as the following verses are in the singular.

9-14. Poverty and remorse follow this sin. [14] is difficult. Many take it to refer to a narrow escape from official trial and sentence (cf. Dt 22 [23]; Ezek 16 [38-40]; Ecclus 23 [21]; Jn 8 [3]). Perowne suggests that the point of the sinner's remorse is the thought that adultery had led him into 'well-nigh all evil' in spite of the good influences surrounding him ('in the midst of the congregation,' etc.).

15-20. 'The remedy against sin is to be found in the holy estate which God has enjoined' (Perowne: cf. 1 Cor 7 [1-5, 9]).

16. Difficult. See RVm. But [17] supports RV. Toy takes **springs** to mean 'sources of pleasure.' But perhaps the meaning is, 'Withhold not the marriage-debt (1 Cor 7 [3]) from your wife ([15]) lest *she* be tempted to sin' ([16-17]). This introduces another motive for conjugal fidelity.

18. For blessed LXX reads 'thine own,' which agrees well with the interpretation offered for 15-17. The low view of marriage here is due to preoccupation with a single problem, as in 1 Cor 7.

23. instruction. Render *discipline*.

VI. 1-19. Three Interpolated Illustrations of Folly, and a Stray Numerical Saying.

1-5. Against Suretyship.—Similar warnings appear in 11 15, 17 18, 20 16, 22 26, 27 13. Many scholars suppose that the practice grew up in post-exilic times, but Gen 43 9 (J) shows that it is early. The sage's opposition to it is based on selfish grounds, but Ecclus 8 13 and 29 14-20 give a guarded approval of the practice. The proverbs of many lands utter warnings on the subject (see Malan).

1. Striking hands was a way of sealing a bargain (cf. Is 2 6; Job 17 3).

6-11. Against Sloth (cf. 24 30-34).—Malan quotes references to ants from many lands. He says (i, 292) that the Chinese word for ant means 'I am a good insect.'

9 is missing from the passage in 24, but is clearly original.

10. The sluggard's characteristic saying. On 'sluggards' see note on 26 13-16.

11. robber: lit. 'wayfarer' or 'roadster.' Here in bad sense, almost 'highwayman.'

12-15. The Scandal-monger.

12. worthless person: lit. 'man of Belial,' which is thought to be a compound word meaning 'without profit,' though others suppose that Belial was a deity of the underworld (cf. Ps 18 4 RVm). A good paraphrase would thus be 'Satan's man' (cf. Jg 19 22; 2 Cor 6 15; Asc. Is 3 23-4 13).

13. Describes how the scandal-monger does his mischief by veiled suggestions and innuendoes.

15. We are not told *how* the mischief-maker meets his deserts, but society itself often administers the appropriate punishment.

16-19. Seven Things Hateful to God.—On the numerical sequence see note on 30 7-33. The seven deadly sins of Christian thought differ considerably from this list. Perowne points out that the five parts of the body mentioned in 12-15 are also mentioned in 16-19. The phrase 'soweth discord' also occurs in both passages.

20-35. Section 11: Against Adultery.—See notes on 2 16-19, 5, 7, and 9 13-18, and Intro. to Part I.

20. See note on 4 1 ff.

22. The change to singular it suggests that a line has fallen out.

23. On law see note on 28 4.

24. For evil woman LXX by change of pointing suggests 'neighbour's wife.' It is clear from later verses that adultery is in question.

26. It is uncertain whether the harlot of *a* is the same as the adulteress of *b*. The versions, 7 10, and the fact that the other verses have synonymous lines, support their identity (so RV). Toy, however, renders thus: 'For the price of a harlot is a loaf of bread, but the adulteress hunts the precious life,' i.e. adultery is far more deadly than mere intercourse with a harlot. Toy says: 'That concubinage did not bring great social discredit among the Jews of the 3rd century B.C. may be inferred from the story in Joseph., *Ant.*, xii, 4, 6.' A slight change in Hebrew improves line *a*: 'For the harlot hunts a loaf of bread,' i.e. a livelihood. it is the woman who tempts, as in 7.

30-35. The different fates of the hungry thief and the adulterer are contrasted. The hunger of the thief is contrasted with the lust of the adulterer, and the point is that desire, though it will excuse some actions, will not excuse adultery. The hungry thief is not disgraced, but has to pay; the adulterer is both disgraced, and pays perhaps with his life.

VII. Section 12: Also against Adultery.—This time we are given a more detailed account of the wiles of the adulteress. With great artistic skill the writer carries us from the scene of sinful luxury to the miserable fate of the sinner.

3. Possibly a reference to the prayer-bands or phylacteries otherwise first mentioned in Mt 23 5, their use being based on Ex 13 16 (J); Dt 6 8, 11 18. In 1 9, 3 3, and 6 21 the reference appears to be to a seal-ring either carried on a chain round the neck or worn on the finger.

7. simple ones: see Intro., 4 (*c*).

8 f. Perowne says: 'A few graphic touches draw the picture of the victim. He is not yet positively vicious; but his feeble moral character (7), his thoughtless running into danger (8), and the perilous hour he chooses (9), conspire to render him an easy prey.' In 8b the meaning is 'Taking the road where her house stood,' not 'Seeking her house.'

10. Not simply met him, but 'came to meet him.' For the harlot's dress cf. Gen 38 14 f.; Ezek 16 16, 25.

14. See RVm. The point is this: The sacrifice of peace offering was shared between the priest and the offerer, and had to be eaten by the next day or burnt (Lev 7 11-21). 14 therefore means: 'I have plenty of food that must be eaten. Come and share it.' Martin says: 'It is a

terrible irony in the statement that this woman turns the religious ceremony into the elements of a sinful orgy.' The irony is increased when we note that the Law decreed death for an unclean person partaking of a peace offering.

22*c*. Hebrew clearly corrupt. LXX has 'as a dog to the chain,' but Toy's conjecture, 'like a calf that is led to the stall,' gives a good parallel, the stalled ox being kept for slaughter (Am 6^4; 1 S 28^{24}; Pr 15^{17}).

26 f. See on 5^5.

VIII. **Section 13: Wisdom's Appeal.**—This is one of the most attractive chapters in the Old Testament. Here we get a full statement of the grounds upon which Wisdom is commended (cf. 3^{19} f.; Job 28; Ecclus 1^{1-20}, 24^{1-22}, and Wisd, especially 6^{12}-9^{18}). The chapter is well constructed: $^{1-3}$ introduce Wisdom; $^{4-36}$ give her address, consisting of a statement of her present duties ($^{4-21}$), based upon her origin and intrinsic dignity ($^{22-31}$), with a winning exhortation to seek blessedness in following her ($^{32-36}$).

6-9. Though all are invited, only those who love truth and righteousness can appreciate the message.

10 f. The same comparative contempt for material riches is shown in 3^{13-18} (cf. also 1^{33}, 2^{10-22}, $4^{5, 13}$, 16^{16}, and see note on 10^{15}. A more materialistic view appears in 3^{8-10}. On the whole, there is an advance towards the view that 'a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth' (Lk 12^{15}).

12-16. Wisdom's supremacy. ^{12} is doubtful. Pesh. and Targ. have 'I, Wisdom, possess (or "create") subtilty.' This word **subtilty** is always used in a good sense in Proverbs, as in ^{5}. 'Shrewdness' would be a good rendering. ^{13} is perhaps an editorial insertion.

15 f. Note the friendly attitude towards rulers, and compare it with passages in Prophets and Psalms.

17. 'Wisdom is as accessible as she is desirable' (Perowne). Cf. Jn 3^{19}, 5^{40}.

19. See note on 10^1 f.

22-31. **Wisdom's Origin, and her Function in Creation.**—This passage has figured prominently in Christological discussions (see Burney, *J.T.S.*, January, 1926, 160 ff.). Two problems arise: Is Wisdom regarded as a 'creature'? Is she definitely personal? The crux is ^{22}. Zöckler, Toy, Martin, Hooke, and others prefer RVm to RV. The rendering **possessed** agrees with Vulgate, but LXX has 'created'—a possible meaning of the word. Both Toy and Burney insist that the exact meaning of *kānāh* (RV 'possessed') must be fixed by reference to the verbs in $^{23-25}$, but arrive at opposite conclusions. ^{24} f. speak of Wisdom's being brought to the birth. Burney condemns the rendering 'set up' (^{23}) as a hysteron-proteron, and derives the word from a verb meaning 'to knit together.' Thus ^{23} really refers to the growth of the embryo (cf. Job 10^{11}; Ps 139^{13}), and ^{22} refers naturally to the first stage of the threefold process of birth, viz. the act of begetting. Render ^{22} therefore with Burney:

> 'The Lord begat me as the beginning of His way,
> The antecedent of His works, of old.'

Kānāh has this meaning in Gen 4^1; Dt 32^6. The Arians made use of the LXX rendering 'created me,' and the later common reply of the orthodox that 'possessed me' is the true rendering misses the real point. It is difficult to see how 'created me' could be right, for Wisdom must be an eternal attribute of God, and therefore cannot have been created. Our passage asserts simply that Wisdom was *begotten* by God prior to Creation, almost anticipating Origen's idea of 'eternal generation.' Christian theology, which identifies Wisdom with Christ (1 Cor $1^{24, 30}$; Col 2^2 f.), can accept the passage whole-heartedly. Burney argues convincingly that St. Paul has based Col 1^{15-18} on a combination of this passage and Gen 1^1. Rev 3^{14} and 21^6 are also probably based on ^{22}. Obviously the passage is metaphorical. We have here not a definite hypostatization of Wisdom, but mere personification—a preparation for, but not an actual anticipation of, the Christian doctrine of God. Many scholars see in the passage the influence of Greek cosmic philosophy, but this is unnecessary. Jehovah could not have created the Universe otherwise than 'in wisdom' (3^{19}; Ps 104^{24}), which must therefore be both the antecedent and the principle of the Universe. The ethical use of this truth easily suggests itself.

30. 'master-workman' is supported by Wisd 7^{22} and Jer 52^{15} RVm. The point is that at the Creation Wisdom delighted in men more than in other creatures, and this is the ground of her appeal in ^{32} ff.

36. **sinneth** should be 'misseth' (RVm), in contrast with 'findeth' (^{35}).

IX. **Section 14 (i.e. 1-6+13-18): The Choice between Wisdom and Folly.**—The sage concludes his introduction to the proverbs with companion pictures of Wisdom and Folly as hosts. The second picture is a caricature of the first. Unfortunately the sharp contrast is marred by the interpolated aphorisms in $^{7-12}$.

1. **seven pillars.** The number invites mystical treatment (e.g. seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, seven Sacraments), but probably originally it only signified completeness.

3. Cf. Mt 22 1-10; Lk 14 16-24.

5. A foreshadowing of the Eucharistic invitation. On wine see note on 20 1.

6*a*. Read *Forsake Folly and live.*

7-12. The general teaching is that it is useless to correct the wilful. Thus we have three classes—the wise, regarded as 'saved'; the 'scorners' or 'wicked,' past redemption; and the 'simple,' the raw material of the other two classes: see Intro., 4 (*c*). There are many parallels in Part II.

9. The **wise** and the **righteous** are identical. This 'righteousness' is far removed from that of the scribes and Pharisees.

12. Toy says that this, which has no parallel in Proverbs, generalizes the idea of Ezek 18 4, teaching 'the impossibility of vicariousness in the moral life.' LXX, apparently dissatisfied with this, reads 'If thou art wise for thyself, thou shalt be wise for thy neighbours also.' The truth is that both our good and bad deeds affect others (1 Cor 12 26; Rom 14 7).

13-18. **Madam Folly.**

13 is corrupt. Toy, from hints in the ancient versions, reads: 'Folly is loud and seductive, she knows no shame.'

16. Both Wisdom and Folly offer experience to the inexperienced.

17. Cf. 5 15. Undoubtedly the temptation is to sexual sin, which in Part I. is regarded as the chief obstacle to a life of Wisdom. In fact, except in the interpolated passages, this and robbery with bloodshed are the only sins mentioned in Part I.

18. 'In 2 18, 5 5, 7 27 it is said that the licentious woman's ways lead to death; here, in sharper phrase, her house is identified with the underworld—it is already in effect in the depths, and its inmates, though they have the semblance of life, are doomed and as good as dead' (Toy).

Part II. (10 1-22 16).—This is probably the oldest collection in the book. It consists of distichal sayings, with antithetic parallelism almost throughout (19 7, the only three-line proverb, is doubtless corrupt). Certain proverbs are either wholly or partially repeated in the collection (e.g. 14 12 = 16 25). Perhaps this indicates that Part II. is made up of smaller collections. There are some religious proverbs (e.g. 12 22, 15 3, 11, 16 2). The king is often alluded to, always with appreciation (e.g. 16 10-15), suggesting that the sages were on the side of the government. There is little or no attempt at arrangement, and no indication of the way in which the collection came to be made. The title (10 1) of course refers only to this collection, but is untrustworthy (see Intro., 1).

X. 2 f. This needs faith (cf. Ps 37, 49, 73). **From death,** as elsewhere in Proverbs, means 'from premature death.' Long life is throughout the Old Testament regarded as a special blessing.

8. There is no specific reference to the precepts of the Law. Since 'sin is lawlessness' (1 Jn 3 4), its opposite involves submission to law.

9*b*. For **shall be known** read *shall suffer.*

10*b* = 8*b*, probably by a copyist's error. LXX may preserve the original: 'But he that rebuketh openly maketh peace,' i.e. wrong-doing must be rebuked for the sake of the offender and of society.

11. The parallel shows that the meaning is that the wicked produce violence.

12. **covereth**: the same word as in 11 and 18, but here = 'forgiveth,' as in Ps 32 1 (cf. 1 Cor 13 7; 1 P 4 8; Jas 5 20).

13 apparently means that the wise man, having a guiding principle, can be left to take care of himself, whereas the fool must be coerced. Plumptre quotes an Egyptian saying: 'A youth hath a back that he may attend to his teacher.'

15. Toy is probably right when he says: 'There is probably no ethical thought in the proverb. . . . It seems to be simply a recognition of the value of money.' The moral danger of poverty is noticed in 30 9 (cf. 19 22), while the danger of wealth is recognized in 11 4, 13 8, 15 16, 23 5, 28 6, 11. See also on 8 10 f.

16 modifies 15 by showing that wealth is not of necessity a blessing (cf. 22).

18*a*. LXX has 'Righteous lips hide (i.e. forgive) hatred,' which is probably original.

22. See on 15 f. The implication is that remorse mars the enjoyment of ill-gotten wealth.

23. A frank recognition that sin is often pleasant in the doing. But the pleasures of sin are only for a season, whereas the righteous man is established for ever (24 f.).

25. **an everlasting foundation** does not of course indicate a belief in a future life. 'For ever' in the Old Testament commonly means simply 'a long time.'

27-30. The usual teaching that long life and premature death are the respective portions of the righteous and wicked.

Experience must often have given the lie to this belief. Cf. 'The good die young,' and see Intro., 5.

XI. 1. Commercial dishonesty was an old sin in Israel (cf. Am 8 5; Hos 12 7). Similar proverbs are found in 16 11, 20 10, 23. The Law also deals with this subject (Dt 25 13-15; Lev 19 35 f.). 2 S 14 26 suggests that David had regulated weights. Martin says that 'A curious comment on the passage is to be found in the Hanseatic Museum at Bergen, where the visitor will see the buying and selling weights of the old traders. It is unnecessary to say which set is the heavier!' There are numerous references in Amenophis to cheating with weights and measures. Cf., e.g., 'Make not for thyself a bushel-measure of two capacities.' 'Conspire not with the corn-measurer, nor play the game of "Arranging the Interior" ' (i.e. of the measures).

2. Cf. 'then thou begin with shame to take the lowest room,' and our 'Pride goes before a fall.'

3-8. Six proverbs teaching that righteousness is the best policy. The general thought as elsewhere is that wickedness leads to untimely death. 7a is unrhythmical, and 7b provides no antithesis. LXX reads: 'When the righteous man dieth hope does not perish, but the boasting of the impious perishes,' which indirectly suggests the idea of a future life. The original, however, probably resembled 10 28. See Intro., 5.

8. in his stead means not 'on his behalf,' but 'into his place,' i.e. the righteous escapes trouble, but the wicked cannot.

10 f. The social value of righteousness.

12. Cf. 'Judge not, lest ye be judged.'

15. See on 6 1-5.

16. 'The contrast here is between the quiet victories of a beautiful character, which consist in general honour and approval, and the rude victories of brute force, which at the best only consist in amassing and holding wealth' (Martin).

18-21. Another group dealing with the rewards of vice and virtue. 18 admits that the wicked may sometimes appear to prosper, but affirms that the prosperity is delusive (cf. Ps 37 35 f., 73 12-20).

22. Beauty which is only skin-deep is offensive. without discretion is lit. 'turned aside from taste' or 'discrimination.' This emphasizes the comparison with the swine.

24-26. Cf. Ec 11 1, and the Parable of the Talents. 26 is the only reference in the Old Testament to the practice of 'cornering the market.'

29 means that he who manages his affairs foolishly will become a slave (cf. Neh 5 1-5).

30*b* is corrupt. Lit. 'But a wise man takes lives.' Elsewhere this phrase means 'destroys lives.' LXX has 'But violence destroys lives.' This gives the required antithesis.

31. A rare example of progressive parallelism. In view of *b*, for recompensed render *punished*. This gives a much-needed recognition of the possibility of a righteous man's sinning. See on 21 18. 1 P 4 18 quotes the LXX.

XII. 1. A man shows his character by his attitude towards 'discipline.' The verse hints that 'reproof' formed a prominent part of the sage's teachings.

4. Here and in 31 10 virtuous woman is lit. 'woman of power' or 'capacity.'

9. Cf. Ecclus 10 27.

10. tender mercies makes no sense. Render *feelings*. Cruelty readily accompanies other forms of wickedness.

12. Corrupt. Rhythm of *a* is improved by omitting 'evil men.' Render: *The wicked desires the prey, but the root of the righteous gives.* The antithesis is between unscrupulous selfishness and generous unselfishness. Or render with Zöckler: 'The wicked desireth the spoil of evil-doers, but the root of the righteous is made sure,' i.e. while wicked men rob each other of peace, the righteous man enjoys security.

14. Probably with good is a gloss. Words and deeds come home to roost.

16. Toy: 'A fool's anger is displayed on the spot, but a sensible man ignores an affront.'

18. Some words are blows, others balm.

19. 'Magna est veritas, et prævalet' (1 Esd 4 41).

21*a*. Cf. Ps 91. But experience did not confirm the general conclusion.

23. concealeth knowledge perhaps means 'stores up knowledge' (cf. 10 14), or else 'displays caution and reserve,' like our 'Fools rush in where angels fear to tread.' Cf. Amenophis: 'Better is a man that hides his report within himself, than he who tells a thing to disadvantage.'

26*a* is corrupt. Toy by slight changes gets: 'The righteous man turns aside from the evil.' Others emend to 'spies out his pasture.'

27*b*. Better *But there is precious substance to the diligent man.*

28*b*. Corrupt. The original doubtless asserted that the opposite way leads to death.

XIII. 2*a*. Render: *A good man eats of the fruit of his mouth.*

5. **is loathsome**: lit. 'causes to stink,' as in Ec 10[1]. Render *acts odiously*.

7. RVm is preferable. Perhaps the saying condemns social shams, or else gives the warning: 'Judge not by appearances.'

8 may be an ironical comparison of the respective advantages of wealth and poverty (cf. 'Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator').

11. **by vanity**: see RVm, and cf. 'Easy come, easy go.' **by labour**: again see RVm. Meaning is 'gradually.'

13. **the word**. Some see here a reference to the divine Law (cf. 16[20]), but LXX saw this in neither passage.

15. Render: *Kindly wisdom produces favour* (Zöckler). **rugged** is wrong. LXX suggests 'is their destruction.' Meaning is that goodness begets good-will, which makes for security.

17. For **falleth** read *makes* (his sender) *to fall*.

19. The lines seem to be unrelated (cf. 12 and 29[27]).

22*b*. Not only was the sinner thought to meet an untimely death, but it was sometimes taught that his children also fared similarly (cf. Ps 21[10], 109[13]; Job 27[14]). His wealth then passed to the righteous (Job 27[16] f.; Ec 2[26]).

23. **tillage** should be *newly ploughed land*, i.e. land cultivated with difficulty. For **there is** we may render *substance*, and the meaning may be: 'Even a poor man can get food enough, but all prosperity may be ruined by injustice.' But text may be corrupt. The change of a single letter gives a good rendering: 'The fallow ground of the wicked may yield much food, but substance is destroyed by injustice,' i.e. the wicked man destroys his possible source of prosperity.

24. Cf. 3[11] f., 19[18], 22[15], 23[13], and our 'Spare the rod, spoil the child.' See further Intro., 4 (*c*).

XIV. 1. Hebrew corrupt. One omission and a slight change of pointing give: *Wisdom builds her house, but Folly with her hands tears it down*.

3. For **rod** perhaps read *shoot* (as in Is 11[1]). Every word of a fool is a fresh shoot from the old stock of self-conceit. But 'rod for his pride' (RVm, cf. 10[13]) is possible, and gives an antithesis.

4. RV apparently means: 'No animals, no trouble—but also no gain.' But a slight change gives: 'Where no oxen are, there is no corn'—oxen being used in ploughing.

6. Wisdom can be found if sought rightly. On **scorner** see Intro., 4 (*c*).

7. Seems to mean: 'From a fool expect only folly,' but text is uncertain.

9. RVm gives literal rendering. Meaning apparently is that conscience destroys the 'pleasures of sin.' But text uncertain.

10. Cf. Keble, *Christian Year*: 'Each in his hidden sphere of joy or woe, our hermit spirits dwell and range apart.'

13. Cf. Shelley: 'Our sincerest laughter with some pain is fraught; our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought.' Except in Gen 21[6]; Job 8[21]; Ps 126[2], and Ec 10[19], laughter is not appreciated in Scripture (cf. Ec 2[2], 7[3]; Lk 6[25]; Jas 4[9]).

14*b*. For **from himself** read (by a slight change in Hebrew) *from his deeds*.

17. **wicked devices** is simply 'devices' or 'thoughts.' The omission of a single letter (with LXX) gives a good antithesis: *But a thoughtful man endures*.

24. **RV** seems to mean that wisdom is crowned by gaining riches (3[16], 8[18]), but that folly gets nothing but folly. But better read (following LXX): *Intelligence is the crown of the wise, but the chaplet of fools is folly*.

28. **want of people** means 'lack of population.'

30. **Envy** (or 'jealousy') destroys its subject (Job 5[2]; cf. 27[4]; Ex 20[5]).

31. Contempt for the Maker's work is contempt for the Maker. This is thoroughly Christian.

32. For **in his death** read (by transposing two letters, with LXX, Syriac) *in his integrity*. See further Intro., 5.

33*b*. Lit. 'But in the midst of fools it is made known,' i.e. wisdom is seen by contrast with folly. But text is uncertain.

XV. 3. Cf. Jer 32[19]. For the opposite notion cf. Is 5[19]; Zeph 1[12]; Ezek 8[12]; Ps 14[1]; Mal 2[17], 3[14] f.

4. Cf. 12[18].

6*b*. Slight changes give: *But the revenue of the wicked is cut off*.

8. This condemnation of religious observance divorced from morality is in line with the teaching of the prophets (cf. 21[3, 27]; Am 5[21-24]; Hos 6[6]; Is 1[11]; Mic 6[6] ff.; Jer 7[22] f.; Ecclus 34[18-26], 35[6] f.).

11. **Abaddon** in the Old Testament is a synonym of **Sheol** (cf. 27[20]; Job 26[6]; Ps 88[11]). In Rev 9[11] it is the angel in charge of Sheol. Sheol was earlier regarded as out of Jehovah's sphere (Ps 6[5], 115[17]; Is 38[18]). The higher view is found in Ps 139[8].

13. See note on 17[22].

16 f. See notes on 10[15] and 7[22]. Cf. Amenophis: 'Better is poverty at the

hand of God, than riches in the storehouse. Better is bread with happy heart, than riches with vexation.'

21. Understanding is regarded as necessary to salvation.

23. Good advice pleases giver and receiver. Vulgate happily: 'Sermo opportunus est optimus.'

24. Means simply that the wise live out their allotted span. Yet the words are true in a deeper sense.

25. The widow is typical of the oppressed, as in Is 1 [17, 23].

26*b*. Slight changes give: 'But the words of the pure are His delight.'

27. **gifts**, i.e. *bribes*, as in 18 [16], 21 [14]; Ec 7 [7]. See on 17 [8].

28. The speech of the righteous is restrained by considerations of truth and love.

30. **light of the eyes** means 'a friendly look' (Zöckler, cf. 16 [15]). This makes a good parallel with 'good tidings.'

33. Wisdom confers honour (3 [16], 8 [18]), but the only path to Wisdom is humility, i.e. submission to 'discipline.'

33*b*. recurs in 18 [12*b*].

XVI. 1. Some think that our Lord had this verse in mind when deprecating anxiety about the defence His disciples should make (Mt 10 [19] f.). The idea is a common one. Cf. Amenophis: 'The words which men say are one thing. The things which God doeth are another.'

2. In general this is true. We display astonishing ingenuity in justifying our conduct.

4. Perowne well says: 'It is not said that God makes a man wicked, for He "made man upright" (Ec 7 [29]; Gen 1 [26. 27, 31]), but that being wicked by his own choice he comes under the irrevocable law which dooms him to "the day of evil."' Cf. Ecclus 15 [12].

6. This 'represents the highest level of Hebrew thought on the subject of moral purification' (Toy). See on 15 [8].

7. Experience more often disproves than corroborates this—witness our Lord Himself. 9. See on [1].

10-15. Toy (following Graetz) reads 'the king's' for 'the Lord's' in [11], thus getting six proverbs dealing with kings. The representation is ideal. Kings figure very frequently in these maxims (see 8 [15], 14 [28. 35], 19 [12], 20 [2, 8, 26, 28], 21 [1], 22 [11, 29], 24 [21], 29 [4. 14], 30 [27] f., [31], 31 [3] f.).

16. See on 8 [10] f. 19. See on 3 [34].

20. See on 13 [13].

21. The word rendered **learning** here and in [23] is translated 'fair speech' in 7 [21]. Here 'teaching-power' brings out the sense.

22. 'As wisdom is its own reward, so folly is its own punishment' (Perowne).

25 = 14 [12].

26. Meaning is that appetite drives men to labour.

31 is beautiful, but not necessarily true. The saying is based on the mistaken belief that long life was always the reward of righteousness. This notion disappears before the New Testament is reached (cf. Wisd 4 [7-16]).

32. A splendid saying, with parallels in many languages.

33. The casting of lots to ascertain the divine will persisted into New Testament times (Ac 1 [26]).

XVII. 1. Cf. 15 [17].

2. Toy more neatly: 'A wise slave shall rule over a profligate son' (cf. Ec 10 [7]; Ecclus 10 [25]).

3. Cf. Jer 17 [9-10]. 5. See on 14 [31].

7. The word **fool** here is *nābāl* (1 S 25 [25]), and denotes one lacking in moral discernment (Ps 14 [1]; Is 32 [5] f.). The cognate *nābālāh* describes the wanton deeds of Gen 34 [(7)]; Jg 19 [(23, 20 6)]; and 2 S 13 [(12] f.).

8. **gift** = *bribe*. The same word is used in [23], 6 [35]; Is 1 [23] *et al*. See also on 15 [27], where another word is used. **him that hath it** more naturally denotes the briber than the bribed. **precious stone** is lit. 'stone of favour,' and is metaphorical. Meaning is 'Bribery brings success.' Toy says: 'The sage states, without comment, a fact of experience.' Bribery is implicitly condemned in [23], and openly in 28 [21], but appears to be condoned in 18 [16] and 21 [14].

10. This suggests that the punishment should fit the criminal, not the crime.

11. RVm is better. Meaning is that rebels deserve a sharp lesson.

13. Cf. 25 [21] f. for the still nobler ideal of returning good for evil.

16. Apparently implies that the sages charged fees for their teaching. **Fool** here is *kĕsil*. See Intro., 4 (*c*).

18. See on 6 [1-5].

19. **raiseth high his gate**, i.e. is proud. But a small change gives an easier phrase, *makes high his mouth*, i.e. 'uses proud talk' (cf. Ps 101 [5]).

22. **broken spirit**. The same Hebrew phrase as in 15 [13], 18 [14], but another word is used in Ps 51 [17].

23. See on [8].

24. Meaning is that the understanding man has a definite goal—wisdom—while the fool has no set purpose.

26. **also** is similarly used in 19 [2], 20 [11] (Hebrew), and perhaps indicates that the saying has come from another

collection. But possibly the verse originally followed 18 [5]. **for their uprightness**: better *contrary to right*. **punish** is *fine* (RVm), and **smite** means *scourge*. The verse deprecates the perversion of justice.

27 f. The sages knew that silence is often golden (cf. 10 [14, 19], 11 [12], 13 [3], 15 [2, 28], 21 [23], 29 [11]; Ec 3 [7], and the *Words of Ahikar*, 96-99).

XVIII. **1.** Corrupt. For **his own desire** read *pretexts* or *occasions* (of quarrel). A true picture of the unsocial person.

4. RVm correctly renders the Hebrew, but meaning is obscure. Dr. Melville Scott emends to 'The words of an oracle (*māssā*) are a deep pool,' which may imply a disparagement of prophecy, though 20 [5] makes this interpretation doubtful. The mysterious depths of prophecy and the limpid shallows of wisdom may be contrasted without either being disparaged. **5.** See note on 17 [26].

8 = 26 [22]. The word rendered **dainty morsels** occurs only in these passages, and the meaning is uncertain. AV 'wounds.' Zöckler renders 'words of sport,' i.e. though the slanderer is not in earnest, his words do grievous damage.

9. A powerful condemnation of laziness.

10 f. The collocation suggests a comparison between the two refuges.

14. broken spirit. See note on 17 [22].

16. See on 17 [8].

17. A warning to 'hear the other side.'

19. Corrupt.

20 f. The latter suggests the meaning of the former. Words must be eaten, so it behoves one to be careful in speech (cf. Mt 12 [37]; Jas 3 [5-12], and see note on 17 [27 f.]).

22. Cf. 19 [14]. LXX and Vulgate have 'good wife' (cf. Ecclus 26 [1-3]), but this is unnecessary. In proverbs exceptions are commonly ignored.

24*a*. Lit. 'A man of friends must be broken' (or 'must prove base'), a warning against easy-going friendships. But slight changes give: 'There are friends who (merely) seek society,' which is better.

XIX. **1.** The antithesis, and the parallel in 28 [6], suggest *rich* for **fool**.

2. See on 17 [26]. Text doubtful, but RVm is possible. '"Holy desires" must be directed by "good counsels," if they are to issue in "just works"' (Perowne).

3. Toy's rendering is good: 'A man's folly ruins his affairs, and then he is angry with God.'

7. The only three-line proverb in Part II. The last line is very corrupt, is unconnected with the preceding, and is doubtless a fragment of another saying.

8. Cf. RVm, and see Intro., 4 (*b*).

9. Almost = [5].

10. Meaning is that just as luxury develops the bad qualities of a fool (*kĕsil*), so political power ill-becomes a slave. This is only true if 'slave' means 'one who has a servile spirit.' Those who have learnt to obey are often most fitted to rule (cf. 17 [2]). **11.** Cf. 17 [9].

13. continual dropping refers to a leaking roof. Toy mentions an Arabic proverb which says that three things make a man's house intolerable: *tak* (leaking through of rain); *nak* (a wife's nagging); and *bak* (bugs).

14 is curious. Cf. 'True marriages are made in heaven.'

17. The idea that charity done to the poor is really done to God is approved by our Lord (Mt 25 [31-46]). In our Lord's parable, however, the charity commended was not given with hope of reward.

18. See on 13 [24]. **21.** Cf. 16 [1].

22. It is difficult to see a connexion between the lines. RV means that generosity is measured by the will to give (cf. Mk 12 [43] f.), so that a poor man who would give if he could is better than a liar who breaks his promises. But this has to be read into the text, which is probably corrupt.

23. This is a two-line proverb in Hebrew, but needs emendation. Add 'to a man' to *a*, improving sense and rhythm. Render: *The fear of Jehovah is life to a man; he dwells satisfied, unvisited of evil.*

24. Cf. 26 [15].

25. The **scorner** will not profit by being chastised (see Intro., 4 [*c*]), but it affords an object-lesson to the inexperienced (cf. 21 [11]), while a mere reproof is sufficient for the man of understanding (17 [10]).

27. This can hardly be right. Elsewhere **instruction** or 'discipline' leads to wisdom, and a bad sense would require a qualifying word. **As my son** occurs only here in Part II. it should doubtless be omitted. With an easy change *b* reads: *And thou wilt wander from words of knowledge.* The imperative **Cease** is conditional (='If thou cease': cf. Gen 42 [18]).

29. Judgements. The form occurs only here in Proverbs. We may point 'Judges,' or omit a letter (with LXX) and read 'Whips.'

XX. **1***a* apparently means, not that wine mocks men, but that it makes men

mockers. For **erreth** read *reeleth* (RVm). Not the use, but the abuse, of wine is condemned, as in 21 17, 23 20 f., 29 f. Its use, however, is entirely forbidden in 23 31 ff., while 31 4 disallows its use by kings. Yet 31 6 f. recognize its value as a drug. In Part I. its use is approved (3 10, 9 2, 5). Except by Nazirites (Am 2 12; Jg 13 4 f.; cf. Lk 1 15) and Rechabites (Jer 35) wine was freely used by all in pre-exilic times, even at religious festivals (1 S 1 24; Hos 9 1-5; Dt 14 22-26). Ezekiel restricted its use by priests (44 21), and the restriction was incorporated in the Law (Lev 10 9), although wine was still offered in sacrifice (Ex 29 40 f. (P); Lev 23 13). Our Lord approved its use (Lk 7 34, 22 17 ff.; Jn 2 2-10). Its use by Christian ministers is restricted (1 Tim 3 3, 8; Tit 1 7, 2 3), but not entirely forbidden (1 Tim 5 23). Drunkenness is of course everywhere condemned.

2. Cf. 16 10-15.

4. For **by reason of the winter** read *in autumn*, and for *b* read RVm.

5. Cf. 18 4.

8. Cf. 16 10-15.

9. This is the only formal statement of the kind in Proverbs (cf. Ps 51 5, 130 3).

10. Almost = 23. See note on 11 1.

14. Toy's rendering is better: *Bad! Bad!* says *the buyer; but when he is gone, then he boasts.* Martin quotes an Italian proverb: 'If he finds fault he means to buy.'

15. For **jewel** read *receptacle*.

16. See note on 6 1-5.

20. Cf. 30 17. The Law punished this offence with death (Ex 21 17; Lev 20 9), and *b* may be a poetic phrase for death (cf. 13 9); but if the legal penalty were regularly imposed the fact would hardly give rise to a proverb. Social eclipse is probably meant.

22 (cf. Mt 5 39). Rom 12 19 exhorts men to forgo vengeance because it belongs to God (so Dt 32 35). Here it is not said that He avenges, but that He saves, though the former may be implied. It does not follow that God's 'vengeance' is analogous to human retaliation. The abolition of private vengeance is necessary to civilization. There is a remarkable parallel in Amenophis: 'Say not, "Find me a redeemer [avenger], for a man who hateth me hath injured me."' Verily thou knowest not the design of God, thou canst not realize (?) the morrow. Sit thee down at the hands of God; thy tranquillity will overthrow them.' See further notes on 25 21 f.

23. See 10.

24. Cf. 16 9; Jer 10 23. Since we are in the hands of God, the ultimate meaning of life cannot be apprehended by us.

25. This apparently deprecates rashness in dedicating property to sacred uses (cf. Ec 5 4-6).

27. The word rendered spirit is that rendered 'breath' in Gen 2 7. It was believed that a higher life from God animated every man and acted as God's witness and searchlight, so 'spirit' here practically means 'conscience' (cf. 1 Cor 2 11). 28. See note on 16 10-15.

30. Text uncertain, but the idea is that chastisement effects moral improvement: see Intro., 4 (*c*).

XXI. 1. **watercourses**, i.e. canals. On kings see note on 16 10-15.

2. Almost = 16 2.

3. A proverbial crystallization of prophetic teaching. See note on 15 8.

4. As pointed in MT, the word rendered **lamp** is 'fallow ground' (13 23), the meaning apparently being that as the source is sinful only a harvest of sin is to be expected. But the lines seem to be unrelated.

6. Read RVm (with LXX). Cf. 20 17.

8. The word rendered **him that is laden with guilt** occurs only here, and is probably corrupt. Hooke suggests 'insolent.'

9. See 19 13. 11. See note on 19 25.

12. Render: *The Righteous One considers the wicked man's house; He overturns wicked men to ruin.*

14. See on 17 8.

15. Render: *It is joy to the just to do justice, but terror to workers of iniquity.*

18. Cf. 11 8. For this sense of **ransom** see Is 43 3 f. Apparently the meaning is that 'the divine wrath turns from him who is comparatively righteous to fall upon the head of the evil-doer' (Zöckler). Cf. 11 31. 19. See 9.

20. Meaning is that the wise man is thrifty, the fool wasteful.

22. Brain is superior to brawn.

25. **desire**: i.e. 'appetite.'

26*a*. Dittography has produced a corrupt text. Read: *All day long the wicked has desire.*

27. Cf. 3, and see note on 15 8. For *b* RVm is better.

28*b*. Lit. 'The man who hears shall speak for ever,' which, remarks Martin, 'does not seem either intelligible or desirable.' The line is corrupt.

30 f. 'Nothing avails against God, nothing avails without Him' (Plumptre).

XXII. 2. Cf. 29 13.

3 = 27 12. **evil** means 'misfortune.'

6. As RVm shows, this does not mean 'Train a child in the principles of

morality,' but 'Train him for his destined manner of life.' But of course the principle holds good in some degree of moral training.

8*b*. For **rod of his wrath** we should probably read 'produce of his work.'

11. The Hebrew is confused and unintelligible. Toy by free changes gets: 'The king loves the pure in heart, and grace of lips is his delight.'

12*a* is difficult, but a slight change gives: 'The eyes of Jehovah observe wickedness.'

13. A specimen of humorous sarcasm. Cf. 26 [13-16].

14. The mouth is mentioned because thereby the adulteress enticed her victims (7 [21]).

Part III. (22 [17]-24 [22]).—This part is marked off from Part II. by the introduction ([17-21]), by its hortatory form (see note on 19 [27]), and by being arranged mainly in strophes (chiefly quatrains) instead of couplets. It differs from Part I. in the variety of topics handled, and most nearly resembles Ecclesiasticus. The sayings consist chiefly of prohibitions, followed by the reasons for the advice given. The introduction at first sight appears to be the work of a mere editor, but the phrase 'the wise' (plural) in [17] should probably be omitted. This improves the rhythm, and by reading 'my words' (by a slight change of pointing) we get a good parallel. It now appears that the introduction is the work of the *composer* of Part III. If so, Part III., like Part I., would appear to be a sample of the work of an individual sage. In this connexion it is interesting to note that, while single lines recur in the collection, or have parallels in other collections, no complete saying is repeated (24 [14. b, c], which nearly = 23 [18], is corrupt). This view fits in readily with the recent theory that in Part III. the influence of the Egyptian *Teaching of Amenophis* (*c.* 1000 B.C.) is strongly marked (see Intro., 7). An Egyptian sage could more easily influence the work of a single Hebrew sage than that of a group of sages.

17-21. The author's introduction (see above). Amenophis also has a charge to the pupil, of which this seems to be a close imitation.

18. For **together**, a slight change, suggested by Amenophis, gives 'as a peg.'

19*b*. LXX, with hint from A, suggests: 'I have made known to thee to-day thy path.'

20. See RVm. But the right rendering seems to be: *Have I not written unto thee thirty sayings, consisting of counsels and knowledge?* (see Intro., 7). The 'thirty sayings' are presumably contained in 22 [22]-24 [22], though if so the text has fallen into some disorder. Doubtless the introduction was written last.

21. Text corrupt. Read: *That thou mayest make the truth known to him that speaketh; that thou mayest carry back words to him that sent thee* (Simpson—cf. A: 'Knowledge how to answer a statement to its pronouncer, and return a report to one that has sent him').

22-29. All except [26] f. is closely paralleled in A. [28] is probably a stray variant of 23 [10] f., while [29c] is possibly a prosaic gloss. Omitting these, we get as the first four 'sayings' three quatrains and a couplet.

26 f. See on 6 [1-5]. In [27b] omit **Why** and render *Thy bed will be taken*, etc.

29. Cf. A: 'As to a scribe who is experienced in his office, he will find himself worthy to be a courtier.'

XXIII. 1 f. The fifth saying. A has a longer saying of similar tenor. In [1b] read RVm. Evidently Eastern rulers tolerated self-indulgence only in themselves.

3*a* = [6b], and [3b] belongs to [7].

4 f. The sixth saying. The text is very corrupt. The passage in A is much longer. We may restore the quatrain thus: 'Weary not thyself to become rich; cease to establish oppression. Will not thy wealth take wings and vanish (lit. "and it is not"), like an eagle that flieth toward heaven?' The thought is that ill-gotten gain brings no permanent satisfaction, exactly as in A.

6-8 and 3*b*. The seventh saying, a double quatrain, very similar to a longer passage in A. [3b] should be read either after [7a] or [7c]. **evil eye** in [6] occurs elsewhere only in 28 [22]. Probably it means 'ill-natured,' 'grudging,' 'ungenerous' (cf. 'good of eye' in 22 [9], and see Mt 6 [23], 20 [15]). In *Pirke Aboth*, v, 19, the evil-eyed is either 'he who is willing to give, but not that others should give,' or 'that others should give and he should not give.' [7a] is untranslatable as it stands, but a slight transposition and omission give: 'For in himself he is like a wicked man.'

For **words** read *things* in [8b] (no change in Hebrew). Cf. A: 'The too great mouthful of bread, thou swallowest it and vomitest it: thou art emptied of thy good.'

9. The eighth saying, with a close parallel in A.

10 f. The ninth saying. This appears to be a free condensation of two passages in A. With [11] cf. A: 'Beware of throwing

down the boundaries of the sown, lest a terror carry thee away.' 'Redeemer' (*gôʾēl*) was the nearest blood-relation whose duty it was to avenge a murdered kinsman (Nu 35 19-28; Dt 19 11-13), and to redeem land which had passed out of the family's possession (Lev 25 25; Ru 4 1-9). Here the 'Redeemer' is God, the 'Father of the fatherless' (Ps 68 5). There are no more clear coincidences in Part III. with A, except 24 11.

12. The tenth saying, may be joined with 23 to form a quatrain. Or 23 may be omitted. It is not in LXX.

13 f. The eleventh saying. There is a similar passage in *The Words of Aḥiḳar*, 81 f., rendered: 'Withhold not thy son from the rod, if thou canst not keep him from wickedness. If I smite thee, my son, thou wilt not die, and if I leave thee to thine own heart thou wilt not live.' This work cannot be earlier than the latter half of the 7th century B.C. Cowley would put its origin *c.* 550 B.C., so that if Part III. is dependent on Aḥiḳar it must be post-exilic. However, it is not necessary to suppose this, for there is no proof that Pr 23 13 f. depends on Aḥiḳar. If direct borrowing took place it would probably extend to more than a single saying. Cowley says that the occasional resemblance of Proverbs (and Ben Sirach) 'is not due to direct borrowing on either side. They are part of that common stock of popular "wisdom" so abundant in the East, which was collected, revised, and enlarged over and over again by successive authors of "wisdom literature."' On 13 f. see Intro., 4 (*c*). Both 13b and 14 seem to mean that corporal punishment will save a child from the untimely fate of an evil-doer.

15-21. The twelfth and thirteenth sayings, both quatrains introduced by an address. 15 f. shows that the sage took more than a professional interest in his pupils (cf. 28).

18*a*. Read with LXX: *For if thou keep it there is a reaping-time*, and see Intro., 5.

20 f. See note on 20 1.

22. The fourteenth saying, should probably be joined with 25 to form a quatrain. The sages everywhere stress the duty of filial obedience. 23. See on 12.

24. The fifteenth saying, one of the few couplets in Part III.

26-28. An address and quatrain, forming the sixteenth saying. On heart see Intro., 4 (*b*). There is no reference in A to the sin mentioned in 27 f., on which see Intro. to Part I.

29-35. The seventeenth saying, a poem against drunkenness (see note on 20 1). Its physical effects, described in picturesque language, are regarded as sufficient to condemn the habit. in the midst of the sea (34) means 'out at sea,' and sea-sickness is meant. 34b is corrupt. mast occurs only here, and the rendering is a guess. LXX has 'Or as a pilot in a heavy sea,' i.e. unable to exercise control.

XXIV. 1-6. The next three sayings, all quatrains. Toy's rendering of 5 f. is excellent: 'A wise man is better than a warrior, and he who has knowledge than he who has strength; for war is conducted by wise guidance, and victory lies in counsellors.'

7-10. The next four sayings, all couplets. 10 is probably defective. 7a is literally 'Wisdom is corals to a fool,' which is evidently not original.

11 f. The twenty-fifth saying, a sextet, as perhaps in A. With 11 cf. the latter: 'Cry not "crime" at a man; hide the manner of a fugitive's flight.' Another passage in A, cited in the notes on 25 21 f., counsels the giving of assistance to the bad man. But the connexion with 12 is not clear, and it is possible that 10 and 11 should be joined to form a quatrain, which would apparently be an exhortation to behave manfully in the day of defeat and to rescue the prisoners. This would leave 12 as a separate quatrain, warning that "Ignorance is no excuse," without upsetting the scheme of thirty sayings.

13 f. The twenty-sixth saying. This should be a quatrain, as 14b, c is corrupt, the defective line having been filled up from 23 18. RV suggests that eating honey will lead to the possession of wisdom, which is surely wrong. Toy thinks it possible that 'honey' is a metaphor for wisdom (cf. 16 24; Ps 119 103), but this is dubious. Read in 14a, *So know* (i.e. 'get to know') *wisdom for thy soul*, the meaning being that as honey is to the palate, so is wisdom to the soul.

15-22. Four more quatrains, completing the 'thirty sayings.'

15 f. Only a very disorderly society could have originated such a saying (see Intro. to 1 8-19). Job 5 19 speaks of the righteous being preserved through 'seven troubles.' This shows a modification of the common doctrine of retribution (see Intro., 5).

17 f. Cf. this with New Testament teaching. Here only the negative side is expressed, and the motive is of dubious ethical character. Cf. Ps 35, and notes on 28 f. and 25 21 f.

19 f. Cf. Ps 37 1, and on reward see Intro., 5.

21 f. A warning against political dis-

affection. **them both** requires that we should understand 'calamity' and 'destruction' as inflicted by Jehovah and the king.

Part IV. (24 23-34).—This has much in common with Part III., but the arrangement is rather more varied. That these two parts were distinct in origin is shown not only by the editorial note in 23, but by the arrangement of Part III. into thirty sayings, and the insertion by the LXX of 30 1-14 between these parts. With 30-34 cf. 6 6-11. The structure of these two passages is similar, and the last two verses in each are identical. This suggests that both come originally from the same work. There is a close parallel with A in 29.

23*b*. has lost its other line (cf. 28 21).

24 f. appear to refer to judicial decisions.

26. kisseth with the lips (RVm), i.e. shows true regard. RVm is preferable, because the Old Testament nowhere explicitly mentions kissing *on* the lips.

27. This should probably be a quatrain. Toy reads the second half thus: 'Then thou mayest take a wife, and build thee up a house.' The meaning is: 'Be able to support a wife before taking one.'

28 f. The *lex talionis* is found in all the codes of laws (Ex 21 23-25; Dt 19 21; Lev 24 19 f.—but contrast Ex 23 4 f.; Lev 19 18). Here we see it superseded by an ideal approaching that of the 'Golden Rule' (Mt 7 12). See Intro., 6, and notes on 25 21 f., where a remarkable passage from A is cited.

30-34. See above. Such poems, couched in personal terms, would be easily memorized and very effective. On 'sluggards' see note on 26 13-16.

Part V. (25-29).—The contents of this part are not uniform, 25-27 more nearly resemble Parts III. and IV., while 28-29 recall Part II. In 25-27 quatrains are fairly common, and, as in Parts III. and IV., a longer poem appears (27 23-27). But in these chapters the commonest form is the comparative (e.g. 25 14. 25), a form found only twice in Part II., and not at all in Parts III. and IV. The address 'My son,' common in Part I., and found five times in Part III., occurs only once (27 11). In 28-29 the antithetic distich prevails, as in Part II. Throughout are found proverbs wholly or mainly identical with sayings in Part II., but not with any in Part III. These facts suggest that Part V. is a collection made up from two sources, the latter of which is akin to, and perhaps identical with, the source of Part II. Apart from this, however, no two parts can be assigned to the same author. The Solomonic authorship suggested in 25 1 cannot be accepted; but almost certainly the association of this part with Hezekiah is not a guess, but is based on something which the editor found in his materials. It must therefore be allowed due weight. See further Intro., 1.

XXV. **2-7.** Three quatrains on kings. See note on 16 10-15. In Part V. there is more attempt at the grouping of sayings (cf. 26 3-12, 13-16, 17-28).

4*b*. Read, with LXX, *And it will be altogether pure*, which makes a good parallel with 5*b*.

6 f. Cf. Lk 14 8-11. 7*c* belongs to 8, completing a parallel quatrain with 9 f. By slight changes Toy reads 7*c* and 8 thus: 'What thine eyes have seen, report not hastily in public; for what wilt thou do in the end, when thy neighbour puts thee to the blush?' As in 9 f., the meaning is: 'Do not blab about your neighbour's affairs, lest you become known as a tittle-tattler.'

11 f. Doubtless a quatrain on the beauty of wise speech. Unfortunately, the words rendered 'fitly,' 'apples,' and 'baskets' are all of doubtful meaning, but the general import is clear. Apt speech is comparable with a beautiful work of art.

13. Hooke explains this as a reference to the refreshing coolness of a snow-fed mountain stream. Omit *c* as an explanatory gloss.

15*a*. Toy remarks that forbearance may belong to a prince, but is not shown to him, so he reads: 'By forbearance is anger pacified.' *b* is a remarkable expression of the power of persistent persuasion.

16*b*. For **filled** read *sated*, and so also in 17*b* for 'weary of thee' (the word is the same).

19. RV hides the real meaning. What a false man trusts in plays him false in the day of trouble.

20. This should probably begin with 'Vinegar.' The consonants of the preceding words are very similar to those of 19*b*, and should be omitted as corrupt dittography. LXX has 'As vinegar is hurtful to a wound,' which is probably nearer to the original. For the thought cf. Ec 3 4; Rom 12 15.

21 f. See notes on 24 17. 28 f. We have here a notable advance upon the attitude towards enemies found e.g. in Ps 109. Contrast that shown in Ecclus 12, especially 10 ff. 22*a* is not easy. **coals of fire** seems to imply punishment (cf. Ps 120 4, 140 10). Some understand the meaning

to be: 'Thou shalt give him a sharp pain and so produce in him contrition,' but this seems to be strained. The meaning rather seems to be: 'Show kindness to your enemy, and in this way you will satisfy your natural craving for vengeance, and also secure Jehovah's favour.' It is a fact that this answering of enmity with love quenches the impulse to seek vengeance by crowding it out (cf. Rom 12 [21]). But note the selfish motive, omitted by St. Paul (Rom 12 [20]). Cf. also 20 [22]; Ecclus 28 [1-7], and Mt 5 [44]. The striking passage in A should be studied. It runs: 'Steer that we may carry the bad man over, for we will not do as he hath done. Lift him up, give him thy hand, commit him to the arms of God. Fill his belly with bread of thine, that he may be satisfied and understand'(?).

24 = 21 [9].

26. **giveth way** may refer to either a moral or a material fall. Cf. Bacon's comment (Essay *Of Judicature*): 'One foul sentence doeth more hurt than many foul examples; for these do but corrupt the stream, the other corrupteth the fountain.'

27. The lines are unrelated, and *b* is very corrupt.

XXVI. 1-12 (except [2]) form a 'Book of Fools.'

2. Primitive peoples commonly believed that blessings and curses had magical power (cf. Gen 27 [33]; Nu 23 [11, 25], 24 [10]; Jg 17 [2]). Here the power of an *unmerited* curse is denied, which implies a belief in the power of a merited curse (cf. 30 [10]; Rom 12 [14]). Mal 2 [2] declares that Jehovah can 'curse blessings.'

3. It is no use appealing to a fool's reason. Hit him and make him go!

4 f. This apparently contradictory advice was one cause of the Rabbis' hesitation to admit Proverbs to the canon. Toy remarks that 'Such juxtaposition of contradictories belongs to the nature of gnomic teaching.' [4] means 'Don't answer a fool foolishly'; [5] means, 'Answer a fool as his folly deserves.'

8. Text uncertain, though RVm extracts an intelligible sense. A fool cannot use honour if one gives it to him.

9*a*. Probably corrupt. Toy proposes: 'Like a thorn-stick in the hands of a drunken man.' The comparison suggests that even a wise maxim may be misused.

10. Text corrupt (cf. RVm). By slight changes Beer gets: 'As an archer who wounds every passer-by, so is he who hires a fool or a drunkard.' The sole point of the comparison is the folly of both actions.

11. Cf. 2 P 2 [22].

12. Cf. 29 [20]. As elsewhere, except in Part I., the fool is regarded as incurable, it follows that this is only a strong way of saying that the man who is blind to his own defects is lost.

13-16. About sluggards. 'Whenever the sluggard is introduced into the Proverbs we are immediately in an atmosphere of humorous portraiture' (Martin).

13. Cf. 22 [13].

14. Movement without progress.

15. Cf. 19 [24].

16. Meaning apparently is that the sluggard is satisfied with his manner of life, but cannot justify it.

17-28. Against the misuse of speech. In [17] RVm is better. LXX has *tail* for **ears**, which is probably original.

18 f. A strong condemnation of hurtful smartness and subtlety in speech, while [20-22] condemns malicious gossip. [22] = 18 [8]. [23-28] are all directed against hypocrisy in speech. In [23], for **fervent**, which is only used in the literal sense ('burning'), LXX reads *smooth*, which is better. **dross** is probably a mistaken gloss.

27. **rolleth a stone** may refer to the practice of 'removing a neighbour's landmark.'

28*a*. Text doubtful. Toy reads: 'A false tongue brings about destruction,' which offers a good parallel.

XXVII. 1. Cf. A: 'Verily thou knowest not the design of God, thou canst not realize [?] the to-morrow.'

3. In the similar sayings in Ecclus 22 [14] f. the fool himself is the burden, so some omit 'vexation' here, but rhythm requires it.

4. For **jealousy** see 6 [34] and note on 14 [30].

5. Perhaps we should read 'love that conceals' (*sc.* the merited rebuke). This improves the parallel, gives a deeper meaning, and connects with [6].

6*b*. **profuse** is doubtful. Vulgate, AV, and Toy read 'deceitful.'

7. 'Hunger is the best cook.'

9*b*. Text corrupt. LXX has 'But the soul is torn by misfortunes,' which involves small consonantal change in Hebrew.

10. The lines seem to be unconnected, and the text is uncertain. It appears to exalt friendship over kinship (cf. 17 [17]).

11. Apparently the teacher was held responsible for the faults of his pupils. **My son** occurs only here in Part V.

12. Cf. 22 [3]. 13. Cf. 20 [16].

14. Apparently a condemnation of fulsome but insincere praise. But *a* is

much too long, and we must suspect deep textual corruption. A passage in A runs thus: 'Do not salute thy passionate (opponent), forcing thyself.' Possibly with a loud voice is an echo of 'forcing thyself,' while a slight change in Hebrew gives *an evil man* for **his friend.** rising early in the morning is a gloss of interpretation.

15. Cf. 19^{13}.

16 is probably corrupt. Cf. LXX.

19. RVm suggests that we judge others by what is in our own hearts, which is partly true. But perhaps we should omit in water (a slight change in Hebrew), and so leave it doubtful whether the point is the likeness or unlikeness of faces and hearts.

20. Abaddon (cf. 15^{11}).

21. Meaning may be either 'Praise tests a man's character,' or 'What a man praises proves what he is.'

22. Omit with . . . corn as rhythmically superfluous. The *'ĕwil* is regarded as incurable. See Intro., 4 (*c*).

23-27. A poem enjoining economy in the pastoral life. 24^{25} probably read: 'And wealth is not for generation after generation,' i.e. continual effort is needed to conserve one's position.

25. Seems to refer to the hay harvest, the aftermath, and the rough harvest from the hills. Beer by slight changes gives the verse a different turn: 'The grass is used up, and the new growth is grazed, and the herbage of the hills is gathered,' i.e. in good farming everything is turned to use. ^{26} f. show how other things may be wisely used. Others regard $^{23-27}$ simply as a poem praising the pastoral life (cf Ecclus 7^{15}), but the above explanation better suits Proverbs.

XXVIII. 2. Text extremely uncertain. LXX has: *By the sin of ungodly men disputes arise, but a man of understanding quenches them.* This requires small changes in Hebrew, and is probably original.

3. needy man cannot be right. The word occurs fourteen times elsewhere in Proverbs, never with a bad reference. In fact, in 29^{13} the 'poor man' (same word) is *opposed* to the oppressor (cf. also 17^{5}). LXX suggests 'A wicked man who.'

4. the law (*tōrāh*) certainly means parent's or sage's instruction in 1^{8}, 3^{1}, 4^{2}, 6^{20}, 7^{2}, 13^{14}, and probably also in 6^{23} and 28^{7}. It is difficult to decide for or against a reference to the Pentateuchal Law here and in ^{9} and 29^{18}. The word may be used as in Am 2^{4}; Hos 4^{6}; Is 1^{10}, etc., and there is no need to see indications of the late origin of these sayings.

5. 'Blind unbelief is sure to err' (cf. Jn 7^{17}). 6. Cf. 19^{1}.

7. Line *b* seems to shows that the father's instruction is meant (cf. ^{4})

8. Usury is opposed to kindness to the poor. Each of the law codes forbids the taking of usury: Ex 22^{25}; Dt 23^{19} f.; Lev 25^{35-37}; cf. also Jer 15^{10}; Ezek $18^{8,13,17}$, 22^{12}; Neh 5^{1-13}; Ps 15^{5}. Some of these passages show that the objection was not to the modern practice of lending money out at interest for business purposes for *mutual* benefit, but to the taking advantage of distress. As this verse shows, the opposite of the practice was kindness to the unfortunate. This was not understood, and at the beginning of modern industrialism, as the practice of lending money at interest could not be given up, the meaning of 'usury' changed from that of taking interest for money lent to that of exacting exorbitant interest.

9. Cf. ^{4} and 15^{8}.

11. Implies that ability to amass wealth is not an infallible mark of superior intelligence.

13. Sin was very real to the author of this. covereth is used differently in 10^{12}, 17^{9}; Ps 32^{1}, 85^{2}.

14. feareth or 'dreadeth' (*sc.* sin).

16*a* has been glossed. Read: *An oppressor is void of understanding,* not realizing that he will not live to enjoy his ill-gotten wealth.

17. Probably we should omit to the pit and render *Let him flee,* i.e. to a city of refuge. Some think 'the pit' means 'the grave.'

18. For at once read (by changing a consonant) *into the pit.*

21*b*. See RVm and 17^{8}.

22. evil eye (cf. 23^{6}). 23. See 27^{5}.

24. Apparently this means that a robber of parents is fit for any crime.

XXIX. 2. RVm is better. So ^{16}.

3. Licentiousness, the opposite of Wisdom. See Intro. to Part I. The verse recalls the Parable of the Prodigal Son.

4. he that exacteth gifts, lit. 'man of contributions.' Elsewhere in the Old Testament the word means 'contributions for sacred purposes.' These were always in the nature of taxes (cf. Ex 25^{2}; Dt 12^{6}; Lev 7^{14}; Mal 3^{8}, etc.), and possibly the word was commonly used in this sense. But it is better to point the word differently and render *man of deceit.*

6*a*. Better (with Syriac) *By his sin a bad man is snared.*

9*b*. Perhaps the fool is the subject. But better by a slight emendation to

read, *He rageth and laugheth and is not scared.*

10*b*. Lit. 'And the upright seek his life,' which must be wrong. For upright emend to *wicked* (slight changes in Hebrew).

12. Cf. Ecclus 10 [2]. 13. Cf. 22 [2].

15. See Intro., 4 (*c*). 16. See [2].

18. **vision** means 'prophetic revelation,' and **law** is probably synonymous with, not antithetic to it, i.e. the reference is to the prophetic *tōrāh*, and perhaps to that of the sages, who were also 'men of vision.' See on 28 [4].

19. It is implied that a slave, like a son ([15]), must be corrected by the rod (cf. Ecclus 33 [24-29]).

21. Doubtful: LXX has: 'He who is pampered from boyhood will be a servant, and in the end he will suffer on his own account.'

24. The **adjuration** is the oath administered to a witness (Lev 5 [1]), or a curse uttered against the unknown thief (Jg 17 [2]), in the effect of which his 'partner' shares by concealing the crime. **partner** means 'one who shares the spoil,' i.e. becomes accessory after the fact.

Part VI. (30-31).—An appendix of diverse materials, yet all differing markedly in tone from other parts. The numerical sayings in 30, to which the stray fragment of 6 [16-19] probably belongs, are paralleled in Ecclus 25 and 26 (see further on [7-33]), while the acrostic poem 31 [10-31] recalls the acrostic Psalms (e.g. 119), which seem to be of late date. Part VI. is doubtless of later origin than Parts II.-V., but it is impossible to assign it an exact date.

XXX. 1*a*. It is impossible to decide how much this superscription covers. Agur and Jakeh are otherwise unknown, while the word rendered 'oracle' (*māssā*), both here and in 31 [1], should perhaps be regarded as the name of a country, as in Gen 25 [14]; 1 Ch 1 [30]; or else deleted as a gloss upon the following word, here rendered 'saith,' but usually confined to prophetic utterances. *b* is very puzzling. RVm is possible, and connects with [3]. Margoliouth, who takes *māssā* to be the name of a country, suggests that this verse may be partly in the original dialect, which is unknown. The localization of Massa is also unknown, though the evidence points to an Arab tribe.

2-4. A passage reminiscent of Job and Ps 73. **brutish**: the same word in Ps 73 [22] (cf. Ps 49 [20]). Accepting RVm for 1*b*, then [2-4] must mean that the speaker has discovered his ignorance after an effort to understand divine things.

5 f. Some regard these as a reply to the foregoing. [5] quotes Ps 18 [30], and [6] recalls Dt 4 [2], 12 [32]. They are probably an editorial reminder that God has sufficiently revealed His secrets.

7-33. The numerical arrangement prevails, and it seems likely that the verses which stand outside the numerical scheme are not original. The curious sequence 'three . . . four' in [15, 18, 21, 29] (cf. 6 [16]) arises from a desire to preserve the form of parallelism, the number next before the one that matters being introduced to make a distich. Other ways of preserving the parallelism appear in [7] and [24] (cf. Am 1 [3], etc.). The numerical form is said to be common in Arabic and Persian gnomic literature, and an example occurs in the *Words of Aḥikar*, 92.

7-9. The sage, who desires a safe life, sees that both riches and poverty have their dangers (see on 10 [15]).

10 f. **curse.** See on 26 [2].

17. Probably belongs to [11-14].

18 f. The point may be the absence of trace left (as in Wisd 5 [8-14]). The fourth is not certainly against this (as Toy thinks), for the act of procreation (this is what is meant) at first appears to have left no trace. This is the point of the gloss in [20]. But perhaps the interest is simply in the 'wonder' of the things mentioned. There is no ethical interest.

24-28 and 29-31. Four little and four majestic things. See on [18-20].

24. Possibly this originally ran more like [29]. The four little things exemplify foresight ([25]), shrewdness ([26]), discipline ([27]), and adaptability ([28]).

26. **conies**: not rabbits, but the cliff-badger. 28*a*. Read RVm.

31. Corrupt. See RVm.

32 f. The text of [32] is uncertain, but the meaning appears to be: 'If you have made a start in wrong-doing, check yourself at once, for continuance (**pressing**—see RVm) brings forth undesirable results.'

33*a*. **butter** is better rendered *curds*.

XXXI. 1-9. **Maternal advice to a royal son.** According to Toy, the Aramaizing diction suggests a date not before the 2nd century B.C.

1. The first rendering of RVm is preferable. Massa in Gen 25 [14] is associated with Dumah (i.e. Edom), which was a noted home of wisdom (see on 30 [1]).

3*b*. Read RVm. 4-6. See on 20 [1].

5. **law** is not the *Tōrāh* (see RVm). **judgement** means 'cause' or 'plea.'

6-9. The unfortunate are the special care of the king. 8*b* **such as are left desolate** apparently means 'orphans' (so Zöckler—see RVm). But the phrase is

peculiar, and an easy change gives *sons of sickness*.

10-31. A poem of twenty-two verses, each commencing with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet, in order. Toy calls it 'The ABC of the Perfect Wife,' and it gives us a picture, presumably complete, of what was regarded as the ideal wife. From it we learn that a Jewish wife might have much freedom, and complete control of domestic affairs. In fact she is depicted here as engaged in agriculture and commerce, while her husband in lordly ease takes part in local politics (23). Her own interests are bounded by her family duties. Her part in the training of the children is perhaps hinted at in 26, but the original probably made no formal mention of religion (see on 30b).

10. See on 12 4.

15. The only three-line verse. Either *a* or *c* should be deleted as a gloss.

18*b*. It is said to be an Eastern custom to keep a lamp burning all night. Benzinger states that the Bedawin to this day use the expression 'He sleeps in the darkness' as an equivalent for poverty. Cf. 13 9; Jer 25 10; Job 18 6.

21. **For clothed with scarlet** LXX and Vulgate (by a change of pointing) read *doubly-clothed*: a better sense.

23. **is known** means 'is notable.' **the gates**, i.e. the place where public business was managed. The husband appears to have no other duties.

25*b*. She has provided for the future.

26. *v. sup.*

30*a*. The only reference to the woman's personal appearance. It is realized that beauty is only skin-deep. In 30b LXX reads: *A woman of understanding*, which is probably original. The present text is an improvement by a pious scribe.

ECCLESIASTES, OR THE PREACHER

By S. N. Sedgwick

The title 'Ecclesiastes' is from the LXX, and represents the nearest term the translators of that version could find to the Hebrew *Qoheleth*, a difficult word occurring nowhere else in Old Testament literature (a feminine part of the Qal. conj.). Its most probable meaning is 'one who convenes an assembly,' or 'one who holds office as teacher or lecturer.' Hence the not very happy 'Preacher' of AV.

Place in Old Testament.—In the Hebrew Bible, Ecclesiastes stands in the third division of the canon—the *Kethubim*—and is one of the five *Megilloth*, or Rolls which, alone out of the *Kethubim*, were read publicly on the Jewish Feasts, its day being the Feast of Tabernacles. Like Esther and Song of Songs, it was included in the canon, after a long period of discussion, at the Jewish Council of Jamnia *c.* A.D. 100. It was undoubtedly known to the author of Ecclesiasticus (185-175 B.C.), and to the author of Wisdom, whose condemnation of it (2 1-9) proves that in his day (1st century B.C.) it was not yet Scripture. Though not quoted definitely in the New Testament there are possible allusions (Rom 8 20; Jas 4 14). (Haupt suggests that Lk 12 18 is parallel with Ec 2 4, and Lk 12 20b with Ec 2 18b.)

The school of Hillel favoured its inclusion, in opposition to the school of Shammai, and down to the end of the 1st century A.D. it was obviously among the 'antilegomena,' but probably won its place at last because it had the Hillel school behind it, and also because it passed under the great name of Solomon.

Its canonicity was soon accepted by Christians. Hermas, Justin Martyr, Clem. Alex., Tertullian and Origen all use it, though the only direct quotation in the Apostolic Fathers is in the Shepherd of Hermas (Ec 12 13).

Of these, Origen makes most use of the book, e.g. he presumes (1 16) it to have given rise to Celsus's contemptuous remark about Christians talking of 'circles upon circles.' Ec 1 9 confirms his view that other worlds existed before the present one, and others will continue after it has passed away. 4 2 is interpreted of those crucified with Christ as contrasted with those living after the flesh.

Early Interpretation.—The Jewish Midrashim (dating in part perhaps from the 1st century) represent the earliest known commentaries; these assume that Solomon wrote the book in his old age, when, disillusioned, he sought to show the emptiness of worldly pursuits, and the attainment of true happiness in fearing God. They allegorize with the greatest freedom in their effort to find orthodoxy in plainly impossible passages. E.g. 5 18 is para-

phrased by the Targum of Qoheleth thus: 'Good is it for the children of men . . . to work in this world, that they may eat and drink from their labour, so as not to stretch out a hand in violence or plunder, but to keep the words of the Law and to be merciful to the poor, in order to see good in their labour in this world under the sun.'

The early Christians used similar methods of interpretation. The earliest Christian commentator is Gregory Thaumaturgus (A.D. 270). In his view Solomon was a prophet, showing the vanity of all human pursuits in order to lead men to contemplate heavenly things. His *Metaphrasis in Ecclesiantem Solomonis* is simple throughout and free from strained mystical interpretations. E.g. 12^{1-6} is taken to represent the approach of a terrifying storm (see Plumptre).

Gregory of Nyssa and Jerome wrote similar commentaries; the former allegorizes freely in his eight Homilies which deal with the first three chapters only. The title suggests to him the work and life of the Church of Christ, who is the true Ecclesiastes, and he finds little difficulty in tracing connexions with Christian faith and practice.

St. Jerome's is a more systematic exposition, written from a scholar's point of view, the allegorical method being deliberately employed to induce Blæsilla, a Roman lady who was one of his pupils, to enter the monastic life—the utter vanity of every earthly enjoyment proving the necessity of adopting an ascetic life.

Augustine quotes freely, and is apt at finding allegorical meanings. E.g. 11^{2}, the 'portion to seven and also to eight,' signifies the two Testaments, the one resting on the Sabbath, the other 'on the eighth day which is also the first, the day of the Lord's Resurrection.' In $10^{16, 17}$ he finds the 'dux civitatis' which forms the subject of his *City of God*.

Ambrose, following Jerome, finds in 4^{15} Christ as the second Adam, and the doctrine of the Trinity in 4^{12}. Other references to the Fathers will be found in the notes. Martin Luther was the first to realize that Solomon could not have been the author. 'It was produced by Sirach at the time of the Maccabees . . . a sort of Talmud, compiled from many books, probably from the library of King Ptolemy Euergetes of Egypt' (*Table Talk*).

Contents and Characteristics.—'The Canticles of Scepticism' (Heine), 'The Canticles of the Fear of God' (Delitzsch), 'The only charming book written by a Jew' (Renan), 'A true mirror of princes' (Frederick the Great)—such comments show the divergent views in which Ecclesiastes has been held; more modern minds will be reminded of parallels with Omar Khayyám or Tennyson's *The Two Voices*, etc. The book presents an enigma with its unsolved mysteries of life and its unanswered questions. It therefore strikes a responsive chord in the mind of the modern thinker. The Preacher's outlook is sombre; his theme that life is an illusion he illustrates from history and experience. Existence is as a revolving wheel, fruitless and purposeless, or, if there be a purpose (and God seems to have a plan, since everything has its time and season), it is beyond the wit of man and hidden from him by God. Man is therefore not master of his fate. To say that righteousness meets with happiness or prosperity is futile; life is surrounded by pitfalls, and beyond it lies the darkness of Sheol, engulfing good and evil alike. There is no goal to strive for, and the result of the author's observation and experience is the following working philosophy: Do the best you can for yourself (*Carpe diem*). But exercise moderation; keep the happy mean. Excess will only bring its own revenge.

As for God, the Preacher never uses the name Jehovah, but Elohim, the omnipotent Ruler in a remote heaven (5^{2}), whose direction of the course of history is incomprehensible, and who is the austere and passionless Deity, from whom one may look neither for favour nor forbearance. There is no sense of personal relationship, such as the Psalms show. Q's belief is 'a species of natural religion with fatalism and altruism among its ingredients' (McNeile).

The possible influence of Greek thought is a vexed question. Tyler, Plumptre, Haupt, and others have attempted to prove that Ecclesiastes was influenced by the Stoics (e.g. 3^{1-9}) on the one hand, and Epicureans on the other. There are many undoubted parallels, but on the whole it is best to conclude that, while it must have been impossible for a Jew of Q's time to escape the influence of current Greek thought, there is nothing to show that he had definitely adopted any of its philosophy, and when we bear in mind that Zeno, the Phœnician, founder of Stoicism, was of Semitic stock, we may account for the similarities in thought as springing, like two branches, from the same origin. Such parallels as may be cited between Ecclesiastes and Greek thought (and Buddhistic teaching also) are in all

probability due to independent development of thought. Ecclesiastes, then, represents a genuine and original expression of the Hebrew mind. The author stands as a forerunner of Sadduceeism. He has no Messianic expectation, no real belief in a future life worth having, and certainly no idea of a resurrection or the possibility of a New Heaven and New Earth. His outlook is that of many modern popular thinkers and writers; hence the many modern quotations that could be cited: e.g. W. E. Henley's—

> 'Life is a smoke that curls—
> . . . .
> A figment thin and vain
> Into the vast Inane.
> One end for hut and hall!
> One end for cell and stall!
> Burned in one common flame
> Are wisdoms and inanities.
> For this alone we came:
> "O vanity of vanities!"'

For this reason, the guidance of God's hand is to be seen in the inclusion of Ecclesiastes in the Canon of Scripture. The problems of life which it discusses are extraordinarily modern. Ecclesiastes asked the very questions 2,000 years ago which vex the mind to-day. The book points, in a manner unique in the Old Testament, to the need of the Incarnation, and of that revelation of God's Will and Purpose for man of which the Catholic Church is the inheritor and witness. For obviously the main thought of the book stands in the Bible only to be challenged and refuted.

Date and Authorship.—No modern scholar would attempt to ascribe the book to Solomon, who is introduced in a literary figure. The Hebrew Wisdom literature attached itself to his name as the Psalms did to that of David. The conquest of Alexander is probably the *terminus a quo* for its compilation, and a *terminus ad quem* is found in Ecclesiasticus, 180-176 B.C. If we fix 200 B.C. as an approximate date, we have a fitting background for the book. After the death of Alexander, Palestine was possessed by the Ptolemies and claimed by the Seleucidæ. It had at first to pay taxes to both, and then towards the close of the 3rd century became the buffer state between the two powerful neighbours.

Ground down by tax-collectors (e.g. Joseph, son of Tobias, who grew rich and founded a powerful house), suffering from the ravages of war, oppressed in the later years of the century by the drunken favourite of a king who was a helpless child, the Palestine of that epoch provides an appropriate setting for such a book as Ecclesiastes.

The author gives several valuable references to the story of his times (see 3^{16}, 4^{1}, 5^{8}, $10^{5\text{-}7,\ 20}$, 10^{16}). He was evidently a Jew, no longer young, living near the Temple at Jerusalem (5^{1}), apparently alone in the world (4). He was obviously well-to-do and of good family, but his life had been embittered by an unhappy marriage ($7^{26,\ 28}$). Some infer from 11^{1} that he was a corn-merchant with a home in Alexandria, Haupt that he was a physician ($12^{3\text{-}7}$), others that he was of the high priestly family and a religious official. The title Qoheleth may itself be a pseudonym of his office, and if true this would account for the care with which the book was adapted and preserved in spite of its heterodoxy. In his general outlook he belonged to that sceptical and aristocratic school from which the Sadducees of the New Testament arose.

Integrity of the Book.—Most diverse views exist on this point. The fact that the book speaks in varied and sometimes entirely opposed voices points to the conclusion, now generally accepted, that at least two interpolators have worked over the original. 2^{26}, e.g., gives the orthodox Jewish doctrine of rewards and punishments, and is directly contrary to the thought which precedes it (see also $3^{14b,\ 17}$, $5^{1\text{-}7}$, $7^{18b,\ 26b,\ 29}$, $8^{2b,\ 3a,\ 5,\ 6a,\ 11\text{-}13}$, 11^{9b}; $12^{1a,\ 13}$ ff.). Here we appear to have the interjections of a Jewish orthodox glossator of the school of the Pharisees, who, shocked by Q's conclusions, feels it his duty to counteract them by sound and standard remarks on the fear of God and the duty of remembering God's judgements. These interpolations have a real value in themselves, if only as indicating the old, stalwart, unswerving belief in the ultimate purpose and vindication of God.

In addition, the book has been edited by another writer with leanings towards the Jewish Wisdom literature. He has inserted sundry proverbial sayings, some of which, it will be noticed, unmistakably interrupt the argument of the book (e.g. $4^{5,\ 9\text{-}12}$, $6^{7\text{-}9}$, $7^{1a,\ 4\text{-}12,\ 19}$, 8^{1}, 9^{17} f., $10^{1\text{-}3,\ 8\text{-}14a,\ 15,\ 18}$ f., 12^{11} f.).

Bibliography

Commentaries accessible to most students are: Barton (*I.C.C.*), Martin (*Cent. B.*), Plumptre (*C.B.*, *H.D.B.*), McNeile's *Introduction to Ecclesiastes*. Verse translation by Burkitt (S.P.C.K.).

I. 1. Title, prefixed by the editor. **King**, in apposition to Preacher, assumed by the editor to be Solomon.

2-11. Author's Introduction, a Summary of his Conclusions.—Life and Nature's processes are an unceasing and purposeless repetition—vanity. This word, the key-word, occurs forty times. (Hebrew 'breath,' 'vapour,' and so 'nothingness'; cf. Jas 4 [14]; Ps 90 [3-10].) [2-8] are poetical in form.

2. vanity of vanities. Hebrew superlative—'utter vanity.' St. Paul (Rom 8 [20]) uses the LXX word 'vanity,' and places the fact which Ecclesiastes deplores in its right relation to the future hope of the universe. The connexion with Romans is noted by Origen (*De Princ.*, i, 7). Augustine (*De Ver. Rel.*, iv, 41), using the old Latin Version *vanitas vanitantium*, explains that it is only for the *vanitantes*, the men without God, that this world is vanity.

4. the earth continues, but man is short-lived.

5. The sun goes an endless round without accomplishing anything. **hasteth**: 'panteth,' from weariness, or eagerness to start again. The metaphor is that of a chariot (cf. 2 K 23 [11]).

6. The wind also goes in a wearisome circle.

7. The streams, swiftly running into the sea, also accomplish nothing. (So Aristophanes and Lucretius comment.)

8. Everything is equally weary of this unceasing round. No language can express the sadness of it. Eye and ear find no satisfaction in their endless tasks of observing and hearing. *Fessus satiate videndi* (Lucretius).

9. All things move in unvarying cycles; there is never any novelty; it is only because men are incapable of remembering the past that they do not see this. 'Posthumous fame is but oblivion' (Marc. Aurel.).

12-II. 26. Q's Investigations in the Role of Solomon.—Under this disguise, Q describes his search for satisfaction: first, in pursuit of wisdom ([12-18]), then in material and sensual pleasures (2 [1-11]), then in the cynical observation of human nature, wise and foolish (2 [12-17]); and, lastly, concludes that as all efforts and aims fail to satisfy, the best thing for men to do is to get what material pleasure they can out of life, even though this, too, is vanity (2 [18-25]).

12. Israel in Jerusalem. The absence of any reference to a northern kingdom sufficiently indicates Solomon.

13. applied my heart, heart being the seat of intellect as well as of affections. The whole phrase indicates exhaustive exploration of the problem.

13*b*. Though God has given men the desire to investigate, it is hard and profitless.

14. striving after wind, or **feeding upon,** or desire for (cf. Hos 12 [2]). Peculiar to Ecclesiastes, where it occurs seven times.

15*a*. Probably a familiar proverb quoted by Ecclesiastes.

15*b*. A deficit cannot be made up, the blank remains, i.e. life is incomplete.

16. Strictly *over*, not in Jerusalem. An anachronism, as Solomon had only one predecessor.

17. Q studied life from opposite poles (*Contrariis contraria intelliguntur*). For **madness and folly,** however, LXX reads 'parables and science,' but ([18]) with ever-increasing perplexity. Cf. Gen 3 [7], the only result of eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

II. **1.** The attempt to find satisfaction in material pleasures also fails. Many parallels from Omar Khayyám may be found.

3. mine heart yet guiding me, i.e. he retained a self-possession and power of critical observation in the midst of his revelry.

4-5. A country gentleman's healthy occupations were tried.

5. parks, only here and in Ca 4 [13]; Neh 2 [8]—the Persian word 'Paradise' (cf. Lk 23 [43]; 2 Cor 12 [4]). Probably the fame of Solomon's court lies behind the whole section.

7. all that were before me (see [16]).

8. treasures: revenue derived from taxation. **provinces:** a late Hebrew word. **concubines:** the Hebrew word is of unknown meaning (see margin). AV, following Luther, 'musical instrument'; LXX 'cupbearers'; others suggest 'bath,' 'palanquin,' 'male and female demons,' but RV is to be preferred. In picturing the life of such a king the harem would not be omitted.

10. Though able to gratify every desire, and though a real enjoyment was thus obtained (**portion** = advantage or gain; cf. Lk 16 [25]), yet when he turned to consider (**looked,** [11]) Q found it all vanity (cf. Mt 16 [26]).

12-17. Q's cynical comparison of wisdom and folly.

12*b*. Text corrupt; possibly this half verse came immediately after [11], and formed a fitting conclusion to the section. The general sense is: If such a king as Solomon failed to find satisfaction, what chance has a lesser man? (see margin).

13. It is better to face the facts than to be blind to them. Light is better than darkness, even if it only reveals a path that leads to nothingness. Cf. Homer, *Il.*,

xvii, 647: 'And if our fate be death, give light and let us die.'

14. It is at least an advantage to see, even if the same fate awaits both wise and foolish.

16. See Wisd 1 [14]. Note the absence of any confident hope of immortality and contrast Ps 112 [6].

18-23. Q hated not only life, but also all his laborious efforts spent in obtaining property. It was bitter to think that what he had gained with effort and shrewdness might pass to another, and that other a fool, or one who has not worked for it at all (Ps 39 [6]; Lk 12 [20]).

24-26. Q's conclusion: Get what pleasure you can from material things, for, after all, this is part of God's appointment ([24b], **from the hand of God**), and no one can enjoy food or pleasure apart from Him (see margin). But even then there is no real satisfaction; it is like the rest, vanity.

26*a* is a gloss of the orthodox annotator, and plainly contradicts the context.

III. 1-15. Man's helplessness. He is the creature of times and seasons, but one of the 'helpless pieces of the game he plays upon this chequer-board of nights and days.' Though there is that within him that craves to understand, his ignorance is so complete that his best policy is to find what enjoyment he can within these limits. The section is akin to Stoic teaching, such as is found in the striking parallel in Marc. Aurel., iv, 32. [2-8] in Hebrew are parallel columns, a table of contrasts such as was known to the Greeks.

1. **purpose,** better *business*. There is a divinely appointed time for all human activities. Cf. Arabic proverb: 'Everything has its proper time'; but there is nothing in the section to warrant the lesson frequently drawn from it: 'Seize the opportunity' (e.g., [2a], the list begins with events which are involuntary: birth and death). Human life thus has its parallel in that of plants.

2. Greg. Nyssa (**a time to plant**) refers to the field of which the Father is the husbandman.

3*a*. The antithesis is illustrated in time of war.

3*b*. Cf. Jer 1 [10]; 2 K 5 [26]; Gal 2 [18].

4. In illustration cf. Mt 2 [16-19], 9 [14, 15], 12 [10]; Lk 6 [21]; Jn 16 [20]. Greg. Nyssa recalls Mt 5 [4] and 11 [16, 17].

5*b*. See margin. Cf. 2 K 3 [19, 25]; Is 5 [2]; but Plumptre suggests the Jewish practice (out of which the Church's custom has arisen) of throwing earth or stones into the grave at burial.

5*c*. Cf. 1 Cor 7 [29-31], which sufficiently illustrates the meaning of **embrace**.

6. Illustrated by Mt 13 [45, 46], 16 [25].

7. **rend,** a sign of mourning; **sew,** i.e. restore after grief is over. Plumptre suggests rending a garment as sign of schism (1 K 11 [30]; cf. Mt 10 [34, 35]).

7*c*. Greg. Nyssa (**keep silence**) reminds his hearers of 1 Cor 14 [34].

8*b*. **time for war.** Greg. Nyssa quotes Eph 6 [13].

11. **beautiful,** or appropriate. Everything fits in with its season, but God's way is so inscrutable that man cannot discover its meaning or goal.

he hath set the world in their heart (margin, **eternity**; Hebrew *'olam*, for ever). If correct, this suggests man has an instinctive yearning for a larger life.

12. **to do good** (see margin). It may be questioned whether the Hebrew can bear this ethical meaning. Throughout Ecclesiastes it means 'enjoy life.'

13. **the gift of God** (cf. 2 [24]). This earthly, natural enjoyment is God's one gift to man.

14 appears to be a note from the pious annotator expressing the inspiring view that God's changeless purpose is the foundation for man's trust. Cf. the prayer: 'That we fatigued by the changes and chances of this mortal life may rest upon Thy eternal changelessness.'

15. Man is bound upon the wheel, endlessly revolving (cf. Kipling's lama in *Kim*).

that which is passed away. The Fathers allegorize this as referring to the Good Shepherd and the lost sheep. But the picture is that of events moving round and round in an endless circle.

16-22. Man's injustice proves him to be no better than the other animals.

16. The corruption of justice in his times forces Ecclesiastes to conclude that men are but brutes.

17. Another corrective insertion of the glossator's.

19. Note margin and cf. 'Man is altogether a chance' (Solon, quoted by Herodotus) (cf. Ps 49 [12-20]).

20. **one place,** the earth, not Sheol.

21. Q in his pessimism here questions the contemporary view that the breath (*spirit*) of man returns to God, though in 12 [7] he shows that he really believes it. This mental self-contradiction is true to life. The discussions of the time as to the immortality of the soul resulted in the opposing school of Sadducee and Pharisee familiar in the New Testament.

22. **works** includes all man's occupations, sensual or otherwise. 'Make the

most of life's interests, for that is all the destiny you have.'

IV. 1-12. The oppressions of men by men arouse Q's pity; equally he deplores the harm of rivalry and competition, and, on the other hand, the tragedy of loneliness, against which he sets the advantage of companionship.

1. tears. Note Ecclesiastes' deep sympathy with the lower classes.

2. praised, i.e. congratulated. With this transitory mood, however, cf. 9 [4], his more settled opinions.

3. For similar sentiments cf. Job 3 [13-16].

4. Competition (see margin) is as inhuman as oppression. Q suggests this as the motive for toil and the arts.

5. And idleness is equally bad (cf. Pr 6 [10], etc.). But this verse appears to be one of the proverbs scattered through the remainder of the book by the editor, and the thought of [4] is carried on by [6].

6. handful—the hollowed palm; **two handfuls**—both hands curved to hold as much as possible. Q means that the wiser man is content with a little and avoids the evil of competition.

7, 8. The bitter picture of a man without kith and kin—the sudden use of *oratio recta* in [8] may indicate a personal experience—who none the less is driven by the urge of work, or it may be avarice, to go on working and amassing wealth. To St. Jerome the **one that is alone** is Christ the one Mediator.

9-12. Current proverbs on the benefits of companionship, whether inserted by the editor, or by Q himself. The picture is that of a journey and its dangers from bad roads, cold nights or robbers. [11], the reference is not to husband and wife, but fellow-travellers. [12], **a man,** i.e. a robber. [12b]. If two are better than one, three are better still. The Christian Fathers naturally saw in this passage a reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, or the union of Faith, Hope, and Charity in the Christian life. Jerome applies it to Christ as the Friend who rescues us when we fall, and warms us to everlasting life when cold in the grave. The section forms a 'parable on friendship': cf. Lk 10 [1], our Lord's sanction of the principle here asserted.

13-16. The vanity of the popularity of certain unnamed young kings.

This section has some definite historical allusion, but none is certain. Many theories have been put forth, e.g. Joseph and Pharaoh, David and Saul (as the Midrash suggests), Antiochus Epiphanes and Alexander Balas (Haupt), but the date points most distinctly to Ptolemy V, who in 205 B.C. succeeded his aged father, Ptolemy IV, at the age of five.

14. out of prison. Barton 'house of the rebellious,' explaining the phrase as referring to Ptolemy IV's persecution of the Jews (see 3 Mac.). The Jews hoped for better treatment from the 'poor and wise' Ptolemy V, but he had bad advisers, and when Antiochus III of Syria (the 'second youth,' if 'second' is genuine) succeeded him, and annexed Palestine to Syria, he was warmly welcomed. 10 [16, 17] probably refers to the years after Ptolemy V had begun to reign, when Agathoclea and her brother were favourites; revelry ruled the court, and Antiochus III at the height of his power was welcomed by the country.

17. See Jos., *Ant.*, xii, 3. Whatever the actual historical reference, the moral is the same: 'Popularity is fickle and short-lived.'

V. 1-7. The need of reality in religion. [1] in Hebrew, LXX, and Vg. forms the conclusion of 4. The EV is obviously right in thus transferring it.

In acts of worship and the payment of vows, the only wise plan is to keep the fear of God before one's eyes.

1. keep thy foot. Cf. the Oriental practice (Ex 3 [5]). Do not go thoughtlessly, but consider the purpose of thy going.

house of God, either Temple, as in 2 S 12 [20], etc., or Synagogue.

to hear, etc. Cf. 1 S 15 [22]; Am 5 [24, 25], etc.

that they do evil. Perhaps 'except to do evil.' They go from worshipping with an easy conscience to do evil again.

2 refers to vows (cf. [4]), but it may also refer to prayer (cf. Mt 6 [7]). The aloofness of God was characteristic of late Jewish thought. The gap between God and man was filled by angels ([6]?) or abstractions like the Word, Glory, etc., of God. This feature of Jewish thought was in itself a preparation for the Incarnation.

3 is usually taken as a gloss by the editor, but the assumption is unnecessary if the meaning is: As a mind worried with business occasions dreams, so a thoughtless fool utters verbal prayers, devoid of sincerity or reality.

4. Cf. Dt 23 [21] from which it is derived. Hasty vows and evasions of vows were not uncommon in later Judaism (cf. Jg 11 [30]; Jos., *B.J.*, ii, 15; Mk 7 [11]).

5. Ecclesiastes insists on honesty in religious profession (cf. Ac 5 [4]).

6. thy flesh = thyself. **the angel:** (1) a late way of alluding reverently to God;

(2) a representative of God, either prophet or priest (cf. Mal 2 [7], 3 [1]); (3) a messenger, i.e. a temple official who recorded the vows and collected the dues. **Error** = mistake or inadvertence.

7*a*. See margin. Another interpolated proverb. **but fear thou God** concludes [6].

8-20. Loosely connected reflections on oppression, despotism, and wealth. The oppression of the poor is no matter for wonder in a country where grade upon grade of officials only seek to enrich themselves.

one higher, etc. 'One high officer is watching another, and there are still higher ones above them'; this includes, possibly, a reference to the king.

9. Very difficult (see margin). On the whole, a king is an advantage to a country if he encourages and protects agriculture.

10. The greed of the officials of [8] may suggest this reflection on the vanity of riches. The avaricious man is always poor, because he never has enough. The richer he is the greater his cares and expenditure. His nights are sleepless. It is the hard-working, simple-living labourer whose sleep is sweet.

13. to his hurt, i.e. at the expense of worry and loss of sleep.

13-17. An unlucky accident or a blow of misfortune may deprive a man of his riches, so that his heir is left penniless, and he himself dies in poverty and sorrow (cf. Job 1 [21], 21 [25]; 1 Tim 6 [6-9]).

17. in darkness. He who is bent on accumulating wealth lives a dark and miserably anxious life.

18. Far better is it to enjoy life day by day, as it comes, than to be penurious or money-grubbing; and this is God's ordained plan for man (1 Tim 6 [17]), and if a man finds enjoyment thus, and is content with such delights as God gives him, he will not grow morbid over the brevity of life.

20. answereth him, occupieth him.

VI. Equally bitter is the lot of the man who, having been successful and become wealthy, finds his cherished desires unrealized, through his being without a son, or without the power to enjoy life, or comes to a dishonoured grave.

2. to eat, i.e. to enjoy. Cf. Is 3 [10], etc.

3. A large family was regarded by the Jews as a great blessing, e.g. Ps 127 [3-5]. **hundred,** a round number. There may be allusion here to Greek story: (*a*) Artaxerxes Mnemon (404 B.C.) had 100 children, and died of grief at the age of 100, caused by the evil conduct of his sons. (*b*) His son Artaxerxes Ochus, murdered by one of his favourites, was devoured by cats. For the shame of dishonoured burial, see 2 K 9 [35]; Jer 22 [19], and compare the plot of Sophocles' *Antigone*.

3*c*. It is better to be still-born (cf. Job 3 [16]; Ps 58 [8]). Origen (*Hom.* vii in *Num.*) interprets of Christ, in whom sin was 'still-born,' i.e. never came to life.

6. do not all go. Both the prematurely born and the man of long life go to Sheol, and the former by a shorter and less painful way.

8*a*. A repetition of 2 [15].

8*b*. What advantage has the poor man who has 'got on' by knowing how to walk prudently and successfully before his fellow-men? (McNeile), *or*, Do not think that even the contented poor are any better off than the rich. All meet the same fate.

9. Better to enjoy what one has, **the sight of the eyes,** than long for what is unattainable. Cf. the fable of the Dog and his Shadow.

10-12. Man's powerlessness against fate.

10. man. A play on the word *Adam* (see margin). Man's name (and therefore his destiny) has been fixed from long ago. To **name** a thing is at once to settle its character and fate, and to know a name is to get its bearer into one's power. See Frazer's *Golden Bough* and cf. Gen 2 [19], 32 [29].

mightier than he, i.e. man's Creator (cf. Rom 9 [20]).

11. things, or 'words'—fruitless discussions of the philosophers (perhaps Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes) as to fate's control of man's actions. All are purposeless; life flits by as a shadow, the future is utterly uncertain.

VII. **1-14. A series of loosely connected proverbs,** several of which ([1*a*, 3, 5-9, 11-12]) are considered to be insertions by one of the annotators; in many cases their thought is foreign to Ecclesiastes. Generally speaking, the section may be said to offer advice as to how to endure, and so soften life's difficulties.

1*a*. In Hebrew a play on **name** (*shem*) and ointment (*shemen*); the proverb is out of connexion with the context. Ointment is prized in hot climates. Cf. Mk 14 [3] and parallels. 1*b* is in keeping with 6 [4] ff.

2. Jewish **mourning** lasted seven days, sometimes thirty. Cf. Jn 11 [19, 31]; Ps. 90 [12].

3. glad, rather *better*—'to suffer is to learn.' **4.** Like attracts like.

6. Another play on words—thorns (*sirim*), and pot (*sir*), 'nettles and kettles.' Thorns in a fire produce noise, but only transitory heat.

7. Surely, lit. 'for,' showing that the first half of the verse (similar to Pr 16 [8]) is lost. **foolish,** i.e. maddened or enraged. **understanding,** i.e. the moral nature.

10. It is foolish to praise 'the good old days.'

11. See margin. Riches alone may be harmful, but coupled with wisdom may prove a beneficial combination.

12. defence, lit. 'shade' (cf. Is 32 [2]).

13 follows [10], and shows that Ecclesiastes, pessimist as he is, has not given up belief in God.

14. side by side, i.e. to balance each other. God has so counterposed good and evil that man cannot foresee the future.

15-22. In cynical praise of the happy mean. [18b] and [19] are glosses.

15 combats the orthodox Jewish belief in the prosperity of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked.

16 attacks the extreme legalism of the sect that developed later into the Pharisees (see 2 Mac 14 [6]). It injured the national tranquillity.

destroy thyself—ruin thyself. The world sends the 'unco' guid' and the 'Solomons' to Coventry, and makes mock of them.

17. Ecclesiastes seems to imply that one may sin to a moderate degree. This is out of keeping with his general outlook, but he realizes that debauchery leads to early death.

18*a*. Lay hold of both these pieces of advice—avoid extremes.

18*b* is the orthodox annotator's. **come forth** = be quit in regard to both.

19. Another interpolation. **ten** is a round number, though Delitzsch suggests a reference to the ten archons of Athens. Cf. the Mishna: 'Every city is great in which there are ten men of leisure.'

20. Surely, lit. 'for'; the verse is connected to [18a], and is a quotation from 1 K 8 [16].

21. Pay no attention to idle words; listeners hear no good of themselves.

23-29. Ecclesiastes' severe opinion of women. [26b] and [29] are glosses. Ecclesiastes has tested the foregoing maxims, but has found it impossible to become wise.

24. The true reality behind all life is beyond his grasp, but one thing he has learnt, that wickedness is folly, and folly madness, and a seductive woman more bitter than death (cf. Pr 5 [4, 22, 23] *et al.*).

27. His methods of investigation had been painstaking and thorough. **laying one thing to another,** i.e. adding one to one to find the sum (Barton).

28. And even now he is still searching; but the only conclusion he has reached is that while a true man is very scarce a true woman does not exist. Q reflects the usual Oriental view about women, but there may be an allusion to Agathoclea, mistress to Ptolemy V (see on 4 [13] ff.), and at any rate to a real experience of his own. Cf. Chrysostom (*Hom. ad Cor.*, 28), quoted by Barton, as representing the Oriental view: 'Satan left Job his wife, thinking she would further his purpose.'

29. The glossator insists on acquitting God of being responsible for man's wickedness, referring to Gen 1 [31]. Man's inventive power (*inventions* = contrivances), i.e. his love of discovery, curiosity, and his skill in making new things are the cause of his being led astray. Cf. Gen 4 [21] ff., and Soph., *Antigone*, 332-5:

> '. . . With all this skill
> Wise and inventive still
> Beyond hope's dream
> Man now to good inclines
> And now to ill.'

inventions. A rare word, only here and in 2 Ch 26 [15]. Augustine's comment is: '*Mane apud unum, Noli ire in multo, Ibi beatitudo.*'

VIII. 1-9. Sundry reflections on kings and governments. [1, 2b, 3a, 5], and [6a] are glosses by one or more annotators.

1. hardness, better *coarseness*. Wisdom refines the face (cf. Ecclus 13 [25]; Lk 9 [29]). 'Prayer makes fine lines' (Henry James).

2. Obey a king, for what he will he does—this is Q's original sentence. The interpolations may be taken in two ways: (1) Honour the king on account of his Divine appointment and the oath of allegiance when he was crowned; do not rashly leave his service, or persist in disloyalty; or (2) coupling [2b] with [3a] as LXX: Obey the king, but where an oath to God is in question, do not hurry to obey him; leave his presence and refuse to continue an evil thing, i.e. God's commands come first. **4. hath power**—is supreme.

5. commandment. Though this verse seems to refer to the king's commandment of [2], and, if so, inculcates prudence, yet the two words are distinct in Hebrew, and that of [5] (*mitzvah*) is usually employed of commands of God; [5] and [6a] are more probably interpolations, and [6b] connects with [4], 'misery' being the evil of despotic oppression.

7. No one knows what an irresponsible ruler will do, nor when.

8. spirit. The margin wind suggests that Q is giving an illustration of man's powerlessness in other respects. As he

cannot control the wind, nor delay death, nor escape from forced service in war, so no wickedness (such as rebellion or treason) can effect an escape for its perpetrator from the oppression of a tyrant.

discharge—furlough. Foreign mercenaries (notably under Persian rule) could not obtain a discharge, though Jewish Law was more humane (see Dt 20 [5-8]).

10-15. Righteous and unrighteous meet the same fate in the end. It is best to enjoy life as we find it. [11-13] are orthodox interpolations.

(These repeated 'corrections' on the part of the pious annotator, who maintained his orthodoxy in face of the same problems of life which Q found insoluble, show a courage and resoluteness of faith which make them of great value in themselves.)

10 is exceedingly difficult, the text probably corrupt. RV means: I have seen the wicked receive honourable burial, but the righteous excluded from the holy city, and forgotten. But another emendation suggested is: I have seen wicked men buried with honour, carried out from the sanctuary (where they had passed their lives as officials), and they used to be actually praised, as they went about, because they had acted thus (referring to [9b]), viz. ruled over others to their hurt.

12 contains the doctrine of the final justice of God, and the germ of a belief in a resurrection.

16-IX. 6. Ecclesiastes had made a ceaseless effort, without rest day or night, to obtain knowledge—but in vain.

IX. 1. Q recognizes God's sovereignty over all human affairs, but whether He looks upon man with love or hate, none can tell, for life's happenings do not correspond with character. **all is before them**—all before them is vanity. See LXX, taking the first word ([2]) with change of one letter. **one event**, i.e. death.

3. an evil in all: 'the greatest evil of all.' **full of evil**, i.e. of unsatisfied desire. **madness**, i.e. vain strivings. **and after that**—**to the dead.** Note the dramatic Hebrew.

4. There is hope while a man lives—hope of some enjoyment to be got out of life; death reduces the lion to a level beneath that of a live dog, despicable to the Eastern mind. The living at least know one thing—that they will die, but death blots out everything, even remembrance and the strongest passions.

7-16. Ecclesiastes repeats his philosophy of life.

7. Enjoy the sunshine while it lasts, for this seems to be of God's ordaining, and is therefore approved by Him.

7*a* to Augustine pointed to the symbols of the Eucharist, as also 8 [15].

7-9, according to Barton, show the influence of the Gilgamesh epic found on one of the Hammurabi tablets, dated 2000 B.C. He suggests that the Babylonian philosophy of life came to Ecclesiastes through the influence of the powerful Jewish colony, the *Galutha* in Babylonia (see Edersheim, *Life of Christ*, i, ch. 1), and that Ecclesiastes actually translates part of the original: 'Since the gods created man, Death they ordained for man. Life in their hands they hold. Thou, O Gilgamesh, fill indeed thy belly. . . . Let thy garments be bright. Thy head purify. . . . A wife enjoy in thy bosom,' etc.

10. Note margin. Though often quoted with reference to 'perseverance,' the verse refers primarily to seeking methods of enjoyment, but the words seem to be behind our Lord's thought in Jn 9 [4]. **the grave, Sheol**, only here in Ecclesiastes (cf. Is 14 [9-11]).

11. The rewards of this life are not given in accordance with desert, or effort, or wisdom; men are creatures of time and chance.

13-16. The historical allusion is uncertain. The siege of Dor (1 Mac 15) is suggested by some, or Bethsura (1 Mac 6), but that of Abel-Beth-Maacah (2 S 20 [15-22]) is much closer.

17-X. 3 are interpolations by the proverb-loving glossator.

17. Follow margin. The restrained but assured voice of wisdom is contrasted with the noisy pretence of sham.

18. sinner, lit. one who 'misses,' thoughtless. 'Evil is wrought by want of thought,' etc.

X. 1. Cf. 1 Cor 5 [6]. As dead (or deadly) flies spoil ointment, so a little folly (perhaps a 'slip') will spoil a man's good reputation and character, or completely cancel a wise man's advice (cf. 2 S 17 [1] ff.). Augustine's explanation is that 'dead flies' are the post-baptismal sins which taint the good fame of professing Christians. Jerome refers to Beelzebub—the Lord of flies—and so defines them as the evil thoughts which do the devil's work.

2. right and **left** are synonyms in many languages for good and bad, wise and unwise, fortunate or unfortunate. Cf. 'sinister.'

3. If **to everyone** is right, it means that a fool gives himself away; if margin of is correct, it means that he thinks everybody else is wrong.

4-20. Q continues his advice as to

prudent relations with rulers. Many interpolations, the genuine portions being 10 4-7, 14b, 16, 17, and 20.

4. The sagacious courtier will bend to the storm. **leave thy place**—resign thy post. For the general tenor, see Pr 15 1, and for the Christian equivalent, Mt 5 5. **spirit of ruler.** Origen interprets of the 'Prince of this world' (*De Princ.*, iii, 2).

5. Q exhibits some of the toleration he enjoins; a ruler's mistakes, he says, are not always intentional.

5, 6. History contains many examples of this fault. Plumptre suggests a possible allusion here to Agathoclea and her brother, favourites of Ptolemy V. **rich** = the nobility.

7. **horses.** In early Israel, ass or mule was the royal beast of burden. See also Pr 19 10.

8. Cf. Ps 7 15, etc. **he who breaks through a fence** (better *wall*) = robber, or a wanton destroyer, or a would-be reformer, hindered by spiteful opponents. **serpent** (see Am 5 19).

9. The quarry-worker and wood-cutter must exercise caution in their work. Barton suggests the same proverb may underlie the 'saying' of our Lord: 'Raise the stone and there thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood and there am I.'

10. The wise woodman does not tire himself out, when sharpening his blade will ease his work. So wisdom is useful in helping man to achieve success (11), as it teaches a snake-charmer to charm the reptile before it can bite.

12. **are gracious**—win favour.

15. Very obscure. (*a*) He who asks a fool the way to town will be muddled by his verbosity, and tired out before he gets there; or (*b*), the fool who does not know the way to town (a proverbial expression like 'not knowing enough to come in when it rains,' so Barton) is sure to find life full of labour and weariness.

16. Follows naturally 10 5, a possible reference to Ptolemy Epiphanes, who was five years old when he became King of Egypt, 205 B.C. (Margin **servant** would point to one of ignoble birth, as, in after years, Herod the Great.) See also Is 5 11; Ac 2 15.

17. **son of nobles,** i.e. well born. Ecclesiastes may have been praising Antiochus III, who won Palestine in 198 B.C. and was welcomed by the Jews.

18. When princes give themselves to revelry, the fabric of the state falls into ruins.

19 appears to hark back to the thought of 16, referring to the luxury of irresponsible princes. Lit. 'For revelry they (indefinite) prepare bread and wine which rejoices life, and money answereth all things.' Money (unjust taxation or public funds) is forthcoming to meet such requirements.

20. The real Ecclesiastes appears again. Be careful; treason will out; walls have ears.

XI. 1.-XII. **Ecclesiastes' closing advice.** 11 9b and 12 1 probably glosses from the orthodox annotator, plainly interrupting the sequence.

Ecclesiastes' recipe for life is to be kind-hearted and industrious, to take pleasure as it comes, before old age can put an end to such opportunity.

XI. 1. Among many suggested interpretations are: (*a*) Commit your goods to the sea, and wait patiently for your returns, when the ship comes home. (*b*) Give freely, and unstintingly wherever you find need, and some day you will be rewarded.

2. If (*a*) is correct, then the meaning here may be: 'Divide your merchandise in several ships, in case of disaster'—not all the eggs in one basket. If (*b*) is correct, then: 'Give generously to as many as possible, and so ensure yourselves friends in time of trouble' (cf. Lk 16 9).

3. Man is as powerless to avert fate as (3a) to alter weather, or (3b) to prevent a tree falling. But **tree** may be 'wood, or stick,' with a reference to divining by means of tossing sticks into the air (cf. Hos 4 12).

4. The man who waits till conditions are all favourable will never get anything done.

5. Man's ignorance of the mysteries of the wind, and of birth, shows the impossibility of understanding God's ways (cf. Jn 3 8; Ps 139 13-16).

6. 'Do your work and leave the rest,' and meet fortune or misfortune philosophically. **morning** and **evening** may also mean youth and old age; the sentiment is the same.

7. 'Oh, the joy of mere living'—even though one remembers the shadows that must come—the days in Sheol (cf. Ps 88 12, 143 3; Job 10 21, 22). The future that is coming there is unsubstantial and dark.

8. Therefore make the most of your prime (cf. 1 Cor 15 32).

9*b*. The orthodox point of view is interpolated by the glossator.

10. 'Gather ye rosebuds while ye may.' **evil**—not 'wickedness,' but 'unpleasantness.'

XII. 1*a*. Though this is another gloss, we rightly value its teaching. To know God in youth is a safeguard through the whole of life. 1*b* connects with 11 10.

2-6. An allegory of the approach of old age; very variously interpreted. (1) The failing of an old man's physical powers described in figures; (2) the approach of death in old age pictured as the gathering and bursting of a storm. But the truth is that the writer has not kept consistently to one picture: with Oriental imagination he mixes his metaphors.

2. Either failing eyesight or the lessening of the brightness, i.e. enjoyment of life, when 'after rain there is no return of sunlight, but only of more clouds.' Youth's power of rebounding has gone.

3. It is unnecessary to attempt to press the details, but the **keepers** may be arms, **strong men** legs, **grinders** (lit. grinding women; cf. Mt 24 [41]) teeth, **those that look out** eyes.

4. doors, lips or other bodily functions. **sound of the grinding,** weakened mastication.

4*b*. The old man sleeps badly, the least thing wakes him (or, his voice approaches a childish treble), his hearing is too dull to appreciate music (cf. 2 S 19 [35]).

5. To climb a hill or go a journey is difficult, owing to stiffness and short breath.

5*b*. His hair turns white like the almond blossom, at first pink, but soon tipped with white. (**blossom** may be rendered 'despised,' i.e. the almond is rejected, appetite fails.) Jerome connects the almond-tree with Jer 1 [11], where it is used as a symbol of 'early waking,' and so understands it here of an old man's wakefulness. **grasshopper**—the smallest thing (Is 40 [22]; Nu 13 [33]) becomes a burden, or (see margin), the insect that once leapt now drags itself along, an allusion to the slow steps of old age. **caper-berry,** used as a stimulant or aphrodisiac.

Gregory Thaum., making the whole section a picture of the Final Judgement, paraphrases: 'The most bitter . . . of all times hangs over them (the wicked) like a blossoming almond, and . . . they are cast out of the way like a black and despicable caper-berry.' **mourners:** 7 [2] *v.n.* Cf. Mk 5 [38].

6. silver cord—the imagery is borrowed from Zech 4 [2, 3], and pictures the fall of a gold lamp, when the silver chain snaps. The light is extinguished, the water spilt, the union of body and spirit dissolved.

7. A definite reference to Gen 2 [7]; it affords a glimpse of the most that Q could say he believed about the after-life. Greg. Thaum: 'For men who be on earth there is but one salvation, that their souls acknowledge and wing their way to Him by whom they have been made.'

8. Q's concluding sentence—an echo of the opening sentences. **saith the Preacher,** an insertion by the editor, to distinguish the original book from the remaining notes.

9-12. An editorial note in praise of Ecclesiastes and of the Hebrew Wisdom he represents, to which the orthodox glossator adds his final gloss in [13] and [14].

Barton points out that the general tenor of the passage is unlike anything in the book, and sounds like a still later editorial comment. Ecclesiastes is identified as Solomon, and probably [9] is a reference to our Book of Proverbs.

acceptable, i.e. pleasant, elegant phrases —literary style.

uprightly, i.e. he never sacrificed matter to form.

11. The stimulating effect of a good teacher, his words 'sting' like those of Pericles, or the 'Athenian gad-fly' (Socrates)

nails well fastened. The sentence may run: 'Like well-driven nails are collections of sayings made by a master-collector'; or, 'utterances that have been embodied in a collection of sayings.'

shepherd—in Old Testament often an epithet of God. If so here, the thought is of Inspiration.

12. furthermore. See margin. 'Beyond such books beware of unedifying heathen (or possibly unorthodox Jewish) literature.' Do not dissipate energy over useless reading. Not the least of the precepts of Ecclesiastes with a singularly modern aptness.

13*a* possibly once formed the end of the book.

13*b*, the orthodox glossator's ending. Lit. 'this is everyman,' i.e. what every man should be devoted to and characterized by.

14. with: note margin *concerning*, i.e. the judgement of God will be a revelation of the secrets of life. Note that the standpoint of this ancient Jewish editor or commentator of the original Ecclesiastes was that the book had its value for those of the old faith of Israel. The Christian, reading it to-day with all its notes and interpolations, realizes how Ecclesiastes' search for Truth, and the gradual progress of Jewish knowledge of the Will and Purpose of God for man, lead fittingly to the thought of the concluding verses. Amid all problems and perplexities, one light shines clear: the thread that leads man safely through the maze of life is loyal obedience to the Eternal Commandment. 'If any man will do His Will, he shall know of the doctrine . . .' (Jn 7 [17]).

THE SONG OF SOLOMON (CANTICLES)

By D. S. Margoliouth

(1) **Authorship and Date.**—The author of 1 K 4 [32] records that the 'songs' of King Solomon were 1,005, some of which Josephus (*Ant.*, VIII, ii, 5) supposes to mean 'books about odes and lays,' though the numeral more probably refers to single odes or single verses. The number of verses in Canticles is only 117, and if repetitions were omitted would be considerably less: whence, even if all these verses were ascribed to Solomon in the historian's time, they would be a small fraction of his poetic compositions. It is, however, a marvel that any pre-exilic literature should have survived the forcible transplantation of the Israelites from their homes, if we realize the destruction of life and property which such procedure involves; this has been recently illustrated by the conduct of the Turks in the Great War. In 2 Mac 2 [13] it is asserted that such material was collected by Nehemiah after the Return, and such a task must indeed have been undertaken, though the ascription of it to Nehemiah may have been conjectural. The troubles connected with the Maccabæan rising, according to the same authority, brought about a fresh dispersion of the national literature, which was again collected after the successful termination of that rising by Judas Maccabæus. Of one of these Bibles—according to the usual opinion the pre-Maccabæan—the work called Ecclesiasticus professes itself a cento (24 [30]), and among the books whence it borrows is Canticles, most clearly perhaps in 14 [23] where *he that prieth in at her windows* reproduces Ca 2 [9], *he prieth in through the windows*, followed by *and will listen at her doors*, which is likely to represent the remainder of the verse of Canticles, the difficult *mēsīs* being interpreted from the Aramaic *aṣīth* 'to listen.' Similarly in the description of a good woman (26 [18]) *golden pillars upon a socket of silver* comes from Ca 5 [15] (of a man), *pillars of marble set upon sockets of fine gold*. Further, the account which Wisdom gives of herself in 24 [13-19] corresponds fairly closely with what is said of the heroine of Canticles by herself or others. It is likely, then, that when this author (44 [17]) enumerates King Solomon's works as 'odes, proverbs, and parables,' he is thinking of Canticles in the first category.

If, then, the date of Ecclesiasticus be in the neighbourhood of 200 B.C., this work was at that time canonical and regarded as a production of Solomon. The ascription may have been either traditional or due to the fact that Solomon is mentioned in it, and sometimes appears to be speaking in person. This would seem to be the case in 1 [9], *my steed in Pharaoh's chariots*, and in 6 [8, 9] he alone would be able to compare the charms of the other occupants of the harem with the heroine's. In one place (8 [12]) he is addressed by name. Since the relative pronoun used in the title is not the same as that employed in the book itself, it has been justly argued that the title is by a different hand. Probably, then, the ascription is based on inference.

How much earlier the book is than 200 B.C. must be settled, if at all, by internal evidence, which is either linguistic or archæological. The former indicates that the work in its present form is not earlier than the 3rd century B.C. For the word *appiryōn* in 3 [9], meaning 'palanquin' or 'bedstead' is very clearly the Greek *phoreion*, first found in Dinarchus, a contemporary of Demosthenes, who regards it as an article of luxury. The type mentioned in Canticles (with silver pillars) corresponds with one in use at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (Polyb., XXXI, iii, § 18). The word cannot well have got into Hebrew before the time of Alexander's successors. Attempts that have been made to shake this reasoning are special pleading. Further, the word *pardēs*, used for 'orchard' or 'plantation' in 4 [13], is clearly identical with the Greek *paradeisos* used first by Xenophon of a Persian deer-park or forest, which is the sense that the Hebrew word has in Nehemiah 2 [8]. Greek grammarians assert that it is of Persian origin, and Photius (A.D. 850) professes to give the Persian original as *phardaithi*. This word has not been identified in Persian, the modern dialect of which uses the form *firdaus*, said by Arabic grammarians to be Greek.

The language in some respects resembles that of the Mishnah, though Grätz may have somewhat overstated this matter. Our knowledge of old Aramaic is indeed fragmentary, whence Aramaisms may not necessarily be modernisms; yet the fact that *ḥarakayyā*

is used in the Targums as the equivalent of the Hebrew *ḥallōn* makes the employment of the former word Hebraized as a parallel to the latter in 2^{9}, an almost certain sign of late date. There is some likelihood that this word also is Greek, since *charax* is borrowed by Armenian (*Kharak*) in the sense of trellis, which is meant here. The same inference is to be drawn from other cases in which Targumic words are employed in lieu of Hebrew words.

Hence the linguistic phenomena point to some period later than the conquest of Alexander, when the Hellenization of the Near East commenced.

The archæological evidence led several Hebraists of the first rank, though of widely divergent views, to make the work contemporary with, or little later than, Solomon. They based their view chiefly on the mention of Tirzah (6^{4}) as comparable with Jerusalem; the former city was the metropolis of the Northern kingdom after the separation, but seems to have been obscure both before and shortly after that period. Hence they argued that the work must belong to the short period when Tirzah was of importance. The argument is not free from difficulty, since we know of no reason why Tirzah should be given this honourable mention in Solomon's time, whereas in the period immediately following the split we should not expect the rival capitals to be co-ordinated by one who belonged to either kingdom. The suggestion of Grätz, that Tirzah is named in lieu of Samaria because of the hostility felt by Jews to Samaritans, seems to furnish a solution of this problem. The geography of the work assumes the unity of the Solomonic empire, as it refers to many places in the Northern kingdom and Damascus, while most frequently mentioning Jerusalem, where the scene (so far as there is one) is located. But its geography is somewhat fanciful. In 4^{8} the beloved is asked to come from Lebanon, from the summit of Amanah, from the summit of Senir and Hermon. According to Dt 3^{9} Senir is the Amorite name for Hermon; and Amanah is said to be the Assyrian name for the same mountain. Probably, however, Grätz is right in identifying it with Amanus, which divides Syria from Cilicia. In 4^{6} the speaker says that he is going for part of the day to 'the mountain of ointment, the hill of incense.' Amanus was celebrated for the ointment called *styrax* (Pliny, *N.H.*, xii, 125), whereas 'Syria nearest Judæa produces it about Gabala, Marathus, and Casius, the mountain of Seleucia.' The mountain of ointment is then either Amanus or Casius. In 2^{17} there is a reference to the gambols of beasts on the mountains of Bether, which may be identical with a range called Butr in Central Arabia.

This somewhat extensive geographical knowledge perhaps points to a period considerably later than the age of Solomon.

Two other proper names furnish clues which correspond with the late date that is inferred from the language. In 1^{5} the heroine says *I am black, but comely, as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Shlmh.* The last word was read *Shlomoh*, i.e. Solomon. This king furnishes no proper antithesis to the tribe Kedar, and his 'curtains,' which are likely to have been marvels of splendour, are not appropriately co-ordinated with the tents of nomads. Now the name Shalmaah or Salmaah is found in the Targums as the equivalent of the Biblical Kenite, whence it is likely that the name in the text is that of this tribe, whether it should be read Shalmah or otherwise. The mention of it in lieu of Kain would point to a post-exilian period.

In 4^{4} we read, *Thy neck is like the tower of David, built to* (or *for*) *Talpioth.* This word is transliterated by the LXX, whereas other versions guess at its meaning. The geographer Yaqut (13th century A.D.) has two names evidently connected with this: *Talfita, a village of Sannir among the dependencies of Damascus; Talfiatha, a village of the Ghutah of Damascus.* In 7^{4} we read of a 'tower of Lebanon looking towards Damascus.' The names of the two villages in Syriac would mean 'Mound of the Belle' and 'Mound of the Belles' respectively. These names bear some resemblance to the Greek *Charitōn Lophos*, 'Hill of the Graces,' and may well show traces of the Greek cult. The author is clearly thinking of a tower of minaret shape, decorated with shields; since it is stated in 2 S 8^{6} that David put 'garrisons,' or according to a possible rendering 'pillars,' in Syria of Damascus, the author may have been acquainted with such a pillar at Talfiatha and have supposed it to be a memorial of David's occupation of the country. But this sort of combination, which seems to be found also in the case of 'my mare in the chariots of Pharaōh' (1^{9}), implies a late date.

Grätz has collected several other indications of the diadochi period. The 'triclinium' of the King in 1^{12} is not only represented by a Rabbinic name, but is an institution derived from the Greeks.

The crown of the bridegroom (3 11) was a Greek institution (Schol. Aristophanes, *Birds*, 161), but is not known to have been a custom of the ancient Hebrews. The city police of 3 3 and 5 7, who deal drastically with suspicious characters, may well be, as he suggests, a Hellenic innovation. The rich vocabulary of names for fruits, scents, and flowers, some of them clearly foreign words, may indeed be explained by Solomon's foreign trade; but it is more likely that they indicate a period later than Alexander, when the relations between East and West had become closer; some of these names appear in Greek for the first time about this period.

Finally, attention has often been called to certain parallels with the Alexandrian poet Theocritus, e.g. the comparison of a belle to a horse (1 9, Theocr. 18 30), the sun-burned belle (1 6, Theocr. 10 25), the foxes that spoil the grapes (2 15, Theocr. 1 48), and some others. The pastoral poetry of both hovers between the splendours of the court and the simplicity of the country; and this artificial form of poetry is more likely to have been borrowed from than by the Greek writer. Further, erotic poetry (to which some find an allusion in Ezek 33 31) is unrepresented in the other parts of the Old Testament, though odes of a non-religious character are occasionally inserted in the biographies of eminent men. Had such verse existed, there would have been occasion for reference to, or quotation from, it in the case of persons like Jacob, Moses, Samson, and David, whose amatory concerns occupy paragraphs; in an Arabic chronicle we should almost certainly find verses produced in reference to them. It does not, of course, follow that the Hebrews were deficient in the passion itself; but the celebration of it in verse may have been an introduction from Hellenism.

So far then as internal evidence furnishes the means of dating the work, we should probably accept the view of Grätz, according to whom it belongs to the period when Joseph, son of Tobias, was in charge of Palestine and Syria for Ptolemy Euergetes I (246-221 B.C.), if his namesake (*Ant.*, XII, iv) is to be believed. It appears that this person made Jerusalem his headquarters, was himself addicted to the tender passion, to wine, and to watching dancing, to which there may be an allusion in 6 13. The historian credits him with having restored the fortunes of the Jews from poverty to more brilliant sources of livelihood. It is unfortunate that we have no means of checking this writer's statements; if they are true in this case, the period was, like that portrayed in Canticles, one of peace and prosperity, and even of glory.

Those who have assigned the work this late date have probably hesitated long before arriving at that conclusion. For the freshness and charm of the language and at times of the thought, the depth of the passion and the naiveté of the enjoyment, are quite unlike the formalistic Judaism which we associate with this age. Doubtless its incongruity with such a puritan community as the Jews led critics who maintained its high antiquity to locate it in the Northern kingdom, in spite of the fact that the scene is laid in Jerusalem, and that Solomon is mentioned with pride and affection. A certain amount of this difficulty disappears in the face of the character which Josephus assigns his namesake, who may have set an example of laxity which others followed. Some of it may be solved by the consideration that the literature of the Israelites which has come down to us is almost exclusively religious in character, but we are not justified in inferring that even the later Israelites were exclusively occupied with religion and had no other sides of their life represented in literature. The main difficulties of the work itself are not really affected by the question of date. The difficulty occasioned by its use in Ecclesiasticus is also found in the case of Ecclesiastes, which exhibits Greek influence, and even in that of Daniel, which must be regarded as the source of some verses in the same Apocryphal work, though that should be somewhat earlier than the Biblical book; the fact that the literary history of the Jews has, for want of records, to be guessed, is the cause of this perplexity.

(2) Structure.—The title Song of Songs doubtless means Best of Songs, and, if given by the author, is comparable to such titles as The Perfect with which Arabic authors label their books. The phrase *which is by Solomon* in lieu of the simple *by Solomon* may conceivably indicate that other works had the same title. Since continuity of thought is rarely found in Semitic poetry, such a title neither implies nor excludes unity. The songs collected in Dalman's *Palästinischer Diwan*, which vary greatly in length, would, if printed continuously, exhibit an appearance not very different from that of Canticles. Since, however, parts of Canticles are in dialogue, in some cases (e.g. 5 8-6 2) continuous, and both the first and the second person are frequently used the idea that the work is a drama

naturally suggests itself, and indeed in some Greek MSS. there is an assignation of parts such as Origen attempts. In the Armenian Bible both the speakers and the persons addressed are indicated in fairly lengthy stage directions; and many modern translators do the like. This theory has still supporters, though it was vehemently assailed by Grätz and more recently by Jastrow. It has some serious difficulties. A drama, however elementary, should have some plot or story; but this is so far from being obvious in the case of Canticles that different interpreters have thought out very different plots. According to some Solomon endeavours to win the affection of some country lass, who rejects his advances and remains true to her rural lover. According to others there is no rural lover, and the girl, whose name is the Shulamite (6^{13}), becomes Solomon's queen. It has also been suggested that there is a double plot with two sets of lovers. Some are clear that a marriage takes place, others no less certain that it does not. With the various conceptions of the plot the number of characters introduced naturally varies; M. Renan, who distinguished ten *dramatis personæ*, probably furnishes a record in this matter. The number of acts and scenes also varies with the different theories; according to any division they must be abnormally short. This seems a more serious objection to the dramatic theory than either the *a priori* assertion that the Jews had no drama, or what Grätz regarded as particularly destructive, the occurrence of narrative portions in the piece. It must be added that if the heroine's name be the Shulamite, we should certainly have expected that she would be named at the beginning rather than near the end of the play. Similarly, if there were a rural lover, we should expect that he would be named; and this would be the more necessary since Solomon's name is not concealed.

Further, just as there is no intelligible plot, so there are no *characters*, in the sense of groups of qualities presented by those who take part in the dialogue. There are not even stock characters, such as some poorly constructed plays contain. The liberal use made of the fancy by Ewald and others has not remedied this defect. Nor is anything gained from the suggestion that the play was not intended to be acted.

Hence it has been held that there is no unity, and the work consists of songs casually collected, possibly belonging to different authors and periods; and a modern Syrian custom, in accordance with which the bridegroom is styled *king*, has been utilized for the explanation of the odes as *epithalamia* chanted during the seven days of these wedding festivities; and the descriptions of the bride and bridegroom, which offend European taste in some respects, are compared with similar performances said to be employed at these Syrian weddings. Grätz argues against the 'fragmentary' theory also chiefly on the ground of the uniformity of both thought and language, the general charm of which is commonly recognized The analogy of the Syrian wedding seems to have been satisfactorily disposed of by Mr. Cannon. Indeed, the analogy seems to be very slight. It is not even clear that the supposed bridegroom of Canticles is called king, and the bride is nowhere called queen. Jerusalem, which furnishes the scene of Canticles, is not a village. And though there is a great deal about love, there is very little about weddings in the book.

A phenomenon of which account should be taken in any theory of the structure is the recurrence of the same verses in different parts, occasionally extending to paragraphs. One of these recurrent verses, the adjuration to the daughters of Jerusalem not to disturb the sleeping Love (Aphrodite?), which is found in 2^{7}, 3^{5}, and 8^{4}, is regarded by some as a refrain, marking off scenes or acts. This theory will scarcely serve in other cases; thus $4^{1, 2, 3}$ are repeated with slight variations in 6^{5-7}; 2^{16} recurs 6^{3}; 2^{6} recurs 8^{3}; 2^{17} is made up of 4^{6} and 8^{14}; 4^{5} recurs 7^{3}; 2^{5} recurs 5^{8}. It is scarcely credible that an author would repeat himself to this extent in so short a piece; moreover, in the first of these cases it is clear that we have the same passage with varieties of reading in the Hebrew, whereas in the LXX the two are identical. What this phenomenon suggests is that the matter has been *collected* from different sources, oral or written, and that owing to defective recollection the same verse or group of verses was reproduced in different contexts. A collector who desires to make his collection as large as possible is inclined in such cases to admit repetitions. It is not, however, easy to determine whether the fragments belong to an original unit or come from different pieces. In some cases it would be possible to combine fragments into something continuous, e.g. the scene 3^{1-4} with $5\text{-}6^{2}$, on the supposition that the speaker, after rough treatment from the police, obtained the

help of the daughters of Jerusalem in the search after her lover, whom she ultimately found; and 1 5, 6 with 8 11, 12, since both passages deal with vine-keeping.

Possibly the dramatic and the fragmentary theory may be combined thus. We have before us a collection of fragments from various compositions, some of which resembled the Greek mimes in form, and, in one or more of these, scenes from the life of Solomon formed the subject. We are not entitled to identify the characters who are mentioned in different parts of the book, e.g. the woman who speaks in 1 6 with the Shulamite of 6 13, and the prince's daughter of 7 1.

The brethren of 8 8 are unlikely to be the same as those of 1 6. The heroine who lives in an ordinary house in 2 9 can scarcely be the same as she who dwells in the clefts of the rock in 2 14. Still, if these are fragments of the same work, much might be explained by the difference of the context. On the whole, it would seem to have been the collector's principle to put together similar matter. Thus, in 3 7-11, there would appear to be three fragments about Solomon, and the opening verses 1 2-4 give the appearance of being similar rather than continuous matter.

Of one or more of the mimes we may say that the daughters of Jerusalem must have figured therein somewhat as a chorus. On one occasion at least (5 9 and 6 13) they take a part in the dialogue similar to that sometimes taken by the Greek chorus; the repeated request to them not to disturb the sleeping Love suggests that some of the matter is uttered by Love in her sleep. It is not clear who addresses the request to them, or who addresses them in 3 11. In the erotic poetry of the Arabic classical period both the lover and the beloved are fictitious; and some of the fragments found in Canticles may come from lyrics of this type. Some of the odes were clearly what are called *amœbæan*, being expressions of affection interchanged between lovers (1 13, 14, 15, 16, 2 2, 3).

(3) **Interpretation.**—It is now fairly generally agreed that the love which forms the main subject of the Poem is the passion celebrated by poets and romancers; indeed, the antithesis between love and jealousy in 8 6 leaves no doubt on this matter. The other subjects are sensual delights, wine, scent, flowers and fruit, the glories of town and country. To marriage there is little allusion; the clearest cases are where the heroine is called *My sister, bride*, and the notice of Solomon's wedding-day. The absence of religious allusions is noticeable, and attracted attention early. The only divine name* found in the work which was also employed by Israelitish monotheists is *Sabaoth*, whereby the daughters of Jerusalem are adjured in 2 7 and 3 5. The Targum has no doubt that this is the same name as is found elsewhere attached to the Tetragrammaton or to the word Elohim, and even used in apposition with them. The LXX of Canticles renders this word by *forces*, which sometimes serves as a translation of Sabaoth elsewhere. Even this concession to religion was removed in the Hebrew text by the interpretation *or the hinds of the fields* (2 7 and 3 5), telling the reader to connect the word Sabaoth with the Hebrew for *roe*; a hint which the LXX declined to take, since it renders the word for *hinds* by *powers*, making the whole mean 'rural deities.' In 8 4 it preserves the gloss, though, like the Hebrew, it omits the word glossed. Since the daughters of Jerusalem were city ladies, to adjure them by roes or even by rural deities would be inappropriate. The process which we are able to trace in this case indicates that the absence of religious allusions may be due to expurgation.

Yet a pagan divine name seems to be found in this adjuration, viz. *Love*, whom the daughters of Jerusalem are not to wake or disturb till she chooses. Further, the Love inlaid by them in some portion of the bed (3 10) may be the word *Love*, but is more likely to have been a figure. *Love* herself is addressed in 7 6. It is also clear that the feats demanded in 4 8, *Thou shalt come with me from Lebanon, thou shalt leap from the peak of Amanus, from the peak of Senir and Hermon*, imply that the person addressed is divine; no human bride could do these things. Similarly no human lover could go for part of the day to the mountain of myrrh (4 6). For these and some other reasons it has been held that the poem belongs to the fertility cult, which was common to many ancient nations, and endeavours have been made to work this out in detail. There are some fairly obvious parallels to the content in the *Adoniazusæ* of Theocritus. If Love (Aphrodite) must not be waked, she must be represented as sleeping; and in the idyll Aphrodite has a bed beside that of Adonis (128). This bed corresponds in certain features with that of Solomon (3 10); there is the gold and the purple; the silver and (in lieu of cedar-wood) ebony. In 8 5 we

* The introduction of *Jah* into 8 6 rests on a false reading.

read *Under the apple-tree I have aroused thee; there did thy mother travail with thee.* Leto gave birth to Apollo under a palm-tree; Adonis is said to have sprung from a tree. The apple, as Grätz observes, is connected with the worship of Aphrodite. It is said that in the festival of Adonis, which was a woman's festival, the first day was given over to joy, and the second to weeping. In one of the myths Adonis falls a victim to the big game which he is hunting; this might appear to be suggested in the recommendation to the hero of the poem to resemble a roe or a young hart on the mountains of Bether. It may further be noticed that according to some authorities the Adonia were celebrated in the spring, which is the time of year described in 2 [11-13]; and that one ceremony of the festival was the *zetesis* or search for Adonis, to which there is something analogous in the scenes of Canticles where there is a search for the beloved, who in one of these scenes disappears when found.

Ezek 8 [14] records with indignation how the women of Jerusalem bewailed Tammuz, who is identical with Adonis; though such worship may well have been obsolete in the 3rd century B.C. in Palestine, it would not follow that the story might not be used in a poetical performance intended for entertainment. And since the love with which the odes deal displays no connexion with morality, it is more likely to have been associated with a pagan than with a monotheistic cult. Some of the odes of which we have fragments may well have been non-religious in character, and have resembled those Arabic productions which are best represented in the Diwan of Omar, son of Abu Rabi'ah. In these the fragrance of the perfumes used by the beloved, and the nocturnal visits of the lover, are described somewhat as in Canticles.

If the Old Testament had been regarded as the national literature of the Israelites, there would be nothing surprising in its containing non-religious or even pagan matter. It came, however, to be regarded as a sacred book, of purely religious content, whence the Canticles had to be fitted into that scheme. In Ecclesiasticus, which cannot be separated from Canticles by many generations, we already find the allegorical interpretation. The heroine wooed by Solomon is *Wisdom*, whom in the Wisdom which bears his name he chooses for a bride. To Wisdom are assigned the perfumes which grace the beloved of Canticles (Ecclus 24 [15]; Ca 4 [10, 11, 14]). Wisdom is like the latter compared to various trees producing noble fruits (Ecclus 24 [13, 14, 16-18]; Ca 4 [13, 16], 7 [8, 9]). There are passages in the Canticles which make this interpretation plausible. One is 6 [8, 9], where the inmates of the harem are enumerated, and the beloved declared superior to all. The view that this being is ideal, not human, removes some of the objections which have been found to the taste of the passage, and explains how the sentiment which she excites among the queens, etc. is not jealousy but admiration. Perhaps the passage 8 [8] f. is intended as an enigma, and this would justify allegorical interpretation elsewhere.

The interpretation of the work as the wooing of Wisdom was taken on by the Gnostics, and in one of their hymns, preserved in the *Acts of Thomas*, the description of Wisdom or Achamuth plainly borrows various features from those of the heroine in Canticles. 'On her head is seated the King' (*Acts*, ed. Bonnet, 8, [5]) comes from Ca 7 [5], 'a king is bound in the tresses of' thy head. 'Whose neck is set upon her after the style of steps' ([8, 9]) represents 4 [4], where *talpioth* was rendered by Symmachus *in heights*, and Delitzsch's *gebaut in Terrassen* is not very different.

The allegorical interpretation in the Jewish and Catholic Christian communities followed other lines. In various passages of the Prophets the Israelitish nation is thought of as the bride of God; Ezekiel elaborates this thought in a lengthy homily (16). This was made the basis of the Rabbinic interpretation, which we find in detail in the Targum and Midrash.

Somewhat similarly in passages of the New Testament the Church is designated the bride of Christ. This furnished a foundation for the Christian allegorization, of which Origen is the foremost representative. It appears in the headings of our AV, e.g. in 1. *The Church's love unto Christ: She confesseth her deformity, and prayeth to be directed to his flock. Christ directeth her to the shepherds' tents, and showeth his love to her, giveth her gracious promises; the Church and Christ congratulate one another.*

In both these communities other allegorizations were at times adopted. With the growth of the cult of the Virgin she was identified with the bride. As the Jews took over various forms of philosophy and mysticism from the Arabs, some regarded the meaning of the work as the union of the soul with the Universal Reason or the like.

In the Christian community the first

writer who accepted the literal interpretation appears to have been Theodore of Mopsuestia, who supposed that Solomon composed the work to celebrate and to excuse his marriage with an Egyptian princess (ed. Migne, lxvi, 699). He calls attention to the absence of the name of God from the work, and supposes it to have been the model for other epithalamia. Not long after the Reformation similar views were expressed by Protestant divines, and, though the allegorical interpretation is still maintained by some, this view may now be regarded as exceptional.

The employment of the language of love and its frequent accompaniment, wine, with mystical meaning is most familiar in Mohammedan mysticism, where it is not always clear whether the literal or some more recondite sense is intended. In some cases, e.g. that of the odes of Ibn al-Fārid, there is no real doubt that the mystical interpretation is the true one; the longest and best known of these is rightly regarded as a compendium of Sufi doctrine. Mr. Wilberforce Clarke has appended to his rendering of the odes of the Persian poet Hāfiz a commentary wherein the symbolism of each verse is unveiled. It is likely that the interpretation of Canticles started this form of mysticism, though the work itself is little known among Moslems.

(4) **The Text.**—The variants recorded on the margin of the Hebrew Bible are grammatical or orthographical in character. The LXX can rarely be used to correct the text; such improvements as the ancient versions suggest are more likely to be emendations than variants.

Bibliography

Commentaries which appeared before 1871 are enumerated by H. Grätz. Commentaries of later date, which either have some permanent value or have attracted considerable attention, are those by Delitzsch, 1875; Stickel, 1888; Budde (*K.H.C.*), 1898; Siegfried (*H.K.*), 1898; Cannon, 1913; Jastrow, 1921. A collection of essays bearing on this book was edited by Schoff, Philadelphia, 1924.

Notes

I. 1-4. **Fragments of love-songs.**

2. **Let him kiss me:** perhaps the reading *Let him give me to drink* is to be preferred.

3. **Thy name is as ointment poured forth:** this rendering is not possible grammatically. If the text be correct, the words should be rendered: **Thy name is ointment** *of Turak*, whereby probably storax is meant. It is likely that for **thy** name we should read *thy ointment*.

Therefore do the virgins love thee (cf. Ps 45 [9]).

4. **Rightly do they love thee:** these words are likely to be corrupt. The last are rightly emended in Syr. *thy love*, whereas for **rightly** some phrase like *than sweet wine* should be restored.

5, 6. Fragment of a dialogue of which another part appears to be preserved in 8 [11, 12].

mine own vineyard have I not kept: i.e. it was not an occupation in which she would naturally have been engaged.

7, 8. Fragment of a dialogue in which the speaker is a goatherd.

As one that is veiled: the word in the text is difficult, and the emendation of Syr., *a vagrant*, probably gives the sense intended.

The answer is evidently not made by the beloved, and seems to deal with a different question.

9. **To a steed:** lit. *to my mare*. Perhaps we should further render *amongst the Pharaonic mounts*, i.e. the other horses imported from Egypt (2 Ch 1 [16]). The speaker would seem to be Solomon, who would doubtless secure the best of these mounts for himself.

10. **with plaits of hair:** more probably some ornament of metal is intended.

12. **my nard:** the speaker intended is uncertain. The words are likely to mean the nard supplied by me.

17. **our rafters:** the word is obscure, but seems to be similar to one used in Arabic for the first course of bricks in a wall.

II. 7. Probably the original adjuration was **by Sabaoth** only. See p. 415*b*.

8-13. **An independent ode, apparently intact.**

14. Another ode, somewhat similar in character.

15. A rustic song.

16, 17. Fragments inserted also in other parts of the collection.

17. **Until the day be cool** probably means until nightfall.

III. 1-4. **Fragment of a mime.**

6. The reply to this question is missing. The same is the case in 6 [10] and 8 [5].

7. **it is:** this should be omitted, as this verse is not the reply to the last.

litter should rather be *bed*.

10. **The bottom:** more probably *the rail*.

paved with love: rather *inlaid with Love*, i.e. having a figure of Love embroidered thereon. **from:** rather *by*.

IV. 1-5. **A description** (Arabic *wasf*)

similar and in part identical with those which occur in 6 [4-8] and 7 [1-7].

1. That lie along the side: the word rendered *lie* is obscure. Its Arabic analogue means *sit*: perhaps it means *leap*.

bereaved: rather *without a lamb*.

4. For an armoury: perhaps *looking towards Talpioth*.

8. Look: rather *thou shalt leap*, the Aramaic sense of the verb.

13. Thy shoots: i.e. what grows on thy banks.

V. **9. more than another beloved:** rather *for a beloved*.

VI. **12. My soul set me among the chariots of my princely people:** both meaning and import of this verse are obscure. The LXX for **my princely people** has the proper name Aminadab. This name is found in the LXX of 2 S 6 [4] for Abinadab; and his chariot is doubtless the cart which carried the Ark and whose driver was slain when he tried to steady it. It would seem then that *my soul has made me an Aminadab's chariot* means 'I dare not check the current of my utterances.'

13. As upon the dance of Mahanaim: apparently the type of some spectacle that attracted attention, but the expression is obscure. The marginal rendering is more likely to be right, but its import is no clearer.

VII. **1. joints:** rather *curves*.

jewels: rather *ornaments*.

2. Some of the indelicacy of this passage is lessened if we suppose the description to be that of some work of art depicting a goddess.

a round goblet: more probably *the bowl of the moon*, i.e. the receptacle into which the moon, when eclipsed, retires (Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*).

5. The king is held captive in the tresses thereof: more literally *a king bound with . . .* These words seem to be intended as an explanation of the preceding *argaman*, ordinarily rendered *purple*, which seems unsuitable, and taken as *Ergamenes*, the name of an Ethiopian king of the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who first violated the conditions whereby he was bound. If this be so, the word rendered **tresses** is the Greek word for *conditions*. See Diod. Sic., iii, 6. The sense will be that her locks admit of no restraint, just as that king could not be bound by the conditions under which he reigned.

VIII. **7. He would utterly be contemned:** i.e. the attempt to buy off the tender passion would prove useless.

8-10. Apparently a riddle, the solution of which depends on the identification of the little sister. The expedients of [9] are evidently the substitutes for 'breasts,' whence it is not clear that the words 'wall' and 'door' stand for 'steady' and 'frail' respectively, as is ordinarily supposed. In either case something which will serve in lieu of breasts is to be added; and it would seem that [9b] should be rendered *we will carve upon her a tablet of cedar*.

The Psalm which is most akin to Canticles both in thought and expression is Ps 45, which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (1 [8]) supposes to be addressed to the Son of God. If we had the rest of his gloss on this Psalm, clearly we should find a mystic sense attached to the queen and the virgins her companions. Modern critics suppose that ode to have originally celebrated the wedding of some human king; even if this be correct, the spiritual interpretation would seem to be more in accordance with the poet's strain. Possibly in this case the author of the Epistle would not have admitted any other; but such allegories as St. Paul (and before him Philo) find in the story of Sarah and Hagar do not exclude the literal sense of the passage: they would not deny that Sarah and Hagar were historical personages, though they found in the narrative a lesson which does not lie on the surface. Perhaps typification is a more accurate name for this process than allegorization. The justice of utilizing the poetry of Canticles to typify the Divine Love, which forms so vital a part of the Christian message, is not open to question; and it may be doubted whether even such an allegorist as St. Bernard aimed at anything more than this; for, as the editors of his select works point out,* within the compass of a few pages he gives quite divergent applications of the same passage—procedure which is reasonable if typification be intended, but not if the purpose be solution of an enigma. Such a commentator can display spiritual insight even where he fails to understand the text with which he is dealing. Yet the use of this book for devotional purposes has not been without its dangers in the Christian Church;† and the Jews, fearing the like, showed some reluctance about retaining it in their Canon, and when its sanctity was established, held that it should be kept out of the reach of those who were not of quite mature years.

* *Select Treatises of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, by W. W. Williams and B. R. V. Mills.

† See W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, Appendix D.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL

By F. C. Burkitt

The Books of the Prophets constitute the most original and influential contribution of Israel to religion. At the highest point, in Jeremiah, we find personal religion, consciously articulate and not dependent on national cult, yet this personal relation of the individual to God did not issue in the decay of national worship: it was used to purify and strengthen that worship. The nation itself adopted the utterances of the Prophets, and as Matthew Arnold so justly said: 'instead of remaining literature and philosophy, isolated voices of sublime poets and reforming free-thinkers, these glorifications of righteousness became Jewish religion, matters to be read in the synagogue every Sabbath day' (*God and the Bible*, iii, 4).

But the fully developed ethical theology of Jeremiah and his successors was the culmination of a long process, in which, to use the entirely appropriate words of St. Paul, 'that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual' (1 Cor 15 [46]). The object of the following pages is to trace the main stages through which Israelite prophecy passed, from a stage in which the Prophet is almost indistinguishable from the Dervish of Mohammedan lands to that stage which Christians can hardly dare to regard as inferior in its ideals to their own. The three great collections of the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are here only cursorily taken into consideration, except so far as either marks a new stage in the general conception of the function of the Prophet. On the other hand, the various writings in the Book of the Twelve Prophets (the so-called Minor Prophets) come within our scope, together with the relevant notices of Prophets and Prophecy in the historical books.

It is in the days of Saul, in the midst of the struggle of the Israelites for national existence against the Philistine domination, that the Prophets come before us as figures in contemporary history. 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' was a proverbial phrase, which suggests not only surprise that Saul should be among them, but that prophets themselves were something of a novelty. Two mutually inconsistent tales are given in explanation of the phrase (1 S 10 [12], 19 [24]): though these tales may not be historical they may fairly be taken to illustrate the nature of the earliest Israelite prophecy. What we see at the first glance is wild religious frenzy, but when we look closer the frenzy is seen to be rooted in patriotism. The figure of Saul in 1 S 19 [23. 24] is exactly that of the 'howling Dervish': he had been engaged in a private vendetta, but as he comes into the neighbourhood of the devotees he is caught by their enthusiasm, and we see him with the rest, naked and shouting, till he falls exhausted at Samuel's feet.

The other passage (1 S 10 [10-13]) merely tells us that one day Saul met a band of prophets, and that then 'the spirit' came upon him too. What is meant by 'the spirit' becomes clear in the sequel. When the doleful tale of Jabesh-gilead came to Gibeah (11 [4] ff.), the people wept, and that was all they could do. But to Saul, upon whom the spirit of God had come, it was a call to action. He summoned the countryside to follow him to the rescue of the men of Jabesh from the Ammonite raiders, and so Israel discovered in the hour of need that it had a resourceful and courageous leader.

Two further points deserve notice in these old stories, because they are significant of later developments. The inspired patriotism of Saul is not privately vindictive: when the people would have killed those who had been opposed to his assumption of authority, Saul says: 'There shall not any man be put to death this day, for to-day Jehovah hath wrought salvation in Israel.' And in the other story, though we are shown the prophets 'prophesying' and Saul among them, all filled with the religious fanaticism that from time to time turns the grave and dignified Asiatic into a raving madman, there is also Samuel standing over them (1 S 19 [20]), clothed and in his right mind. Samuel, as we learn from the curious note in 1 S 9 [9], was not a 'Prophet' (*nābī'*) but a 'Seer' (*ro'e*), the wise man who is believed to have what is called in Scotland 'second sight.' But from Samuel's time onward the two rôles tended to coalesce. The essential element of the Nabi is his enthusiasm, the quality that corresponds with what St. Paul calls 'speaking with tongues': what Samuel seems to have done is to impregnate this undirected enthusiasm with shrewdness, reasonableness, insight, very much as St. Paul did afterwards with his excitable converts at Corinth.

The various unnamed prophets, who appear from time to time in the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, need not be noticed here. They appear to be little more than mouthpieces for the views of the compilers of these books, and so reflect the figure of the prophets of later times, of the age to whom Amos and Hosea are already classical. Deborah 'the Prophetess' is no doubt a historical personage, and the Song of Deborah is comparable to the Oracles of Balaam, discussed below, not only in its vigour but also in what may be called its unmoralized patriotism. It should be noted that Jg 5 (the Song) seems to be the source of Jg 4. The Song is not by Deborah (see ^{12} and ^{15}); in ^{7}, translate 'thou' for 'I' (*bis*). Of Nathan, the friend of David, I wish we knew more. It is characteristic of the earlier prophets, like Amos and Isaiah, that Nathan opposes the elaboration of worship at the royal City (2 S $7^{6.7}$); he is also the champion of private rights against the king, as Elijah was the champion of Naboth. But we only hear of Nathan through the historian of the monarchy, and not enough is told us to make him really a living figure.

The longest and most characteristic monument of the earliest Israelite prophecy, after it became articulate, is to be found in the Oracles of Balaam. The tale of how Balaam's ass spoke is not really different in kind from many another wonder-tale in the Old Testament, and no one feels it to be ridiculous when the horses of Achilles in the Iliad turn and foretell their master's death. But the old Protestant orthodoxy regarded the Bible as everywhere literally true in contradistinction to the fables of the heathen and of mediæval Catholicism; on the other hand, that Balaam's ass should speak became incredible to English people generally, long before they realized the rigid sequence of all physical phenomena. So the tale became first a weapon for rationalists, and ultimately a subject for ribaldry. That the first chapter of Genesis is not geologically true is now generally recognized by good churchmen as well as unorthodox scientists, yet both alike are prepared to appreciate the dignity of its conception. But 'Balaam and his Ass' at once provokes a smile in an English audience: it is difficult to explain to them that the story of Balaam is really one of the masterpieces of Hebrew literature.

The date of the tale as we have it (Nu 22-24) seems to be the prosperous days of David and Solomon. There is no hint of a divided nation; all are united, under a king. Only at the end, in 24^{22-24}, where in any case the text is faulty, there are puzzling references to Assyria and to 'ships of Chittim,' i.e. Cyprus: this really fits nothing but the wars of Alexander the Great, which is impossible except as an explanatory gloss. In any case, 'ships of Cyprus afflicting Assyria' is a wholly non-natural way of intimating that the Macedonian hero will conquer the Persian Empire! It is to be noted that even in these verses there is no hint that 'Asshur' will carry away *Israel* into captivity.

It has become customary to divide up the Old Testament legends wherever possible into separate 'sources,' but very little is gained here by ascribing 22^{5-20} to E and 22^{21-35} to J. The point is everywhere the same: Balaam, the foreign soothsayer, must be brought to Balak the king of Moab with the full knowledge that he will displease his employer. Balak does not know what is in store for him and his nation, so he offers a sumptuous holocaust, and we see him standing by it in state with all his princes as Balaam comes back from his secret enchantments (Nu 23^{3}: two letters have fallen out of the transmitted text). And when he 'takes up his parable' the English reader must remember that what Balaam utters is no rustic rhyme, but the most artistic poetry in the whole Old Testament, lines hardly to be surpassed in the most brilliant passages of the Book of Job. To the underlying thought we shall come later; what he says is this (23^{7b-10}):

'From the Syrian land does Balak bring me,
the King of Moab, from the hills of the East:
"Come and curse for me Jacob,
and come and rage against Israel."
How shall I damn whom God hath not damned,
and how shall I rage when Jahweh doth not?
From the top of the rocks I see them,
and from mountain peaks I view them—
It is a people that dwells alone
and among the nations it is not reckoned—
Yet who can count the dust of Jacob,
or number a quarter of Israel?
If I die, let me die with the truth on my lips,
and my end be the end of the just!'

For the purpose of this present study the second Oracle is yet more instructive (23^{18b-23}):

'Rise up, Balak, and hear,
listen to me, thou son of Sippor!
God is not man that He should lie,
or human that He should repent.
Hath He said, and will He not do it?
or spoken, and will not confirm it?
To bless is the word that I have received,
He will bless and I cannot reverse it;
He hath not seen any guilt in Jacob,
or cause of trouble in Israel.

Jahweh their God is with them,
and the shout of a king among them,
A God who brings them forth from Egypt,
Horned, like the horns of a buffalo!
For there is no spell against Jacob,
nor any enchantment for Israel—
You will hear men say, "For Jacob's sake
and for Israel's sake how God hath wrought!"'

Of course, we know that it is all put into the mouth of a heathen seer, but no non-Israelite could ever have written these stirring Hebrew lines. It is inspiring to read such full-throated patriotic verse, but when we look, as we do elsewhere in the Bible, for the moral lesson, it simply is not there. 'God Himself has chosen Israel: we shall always be victorious'; this, and little more than this, is the message of the Oracles of Balaam.

I have treated Balaam at some length, because it is the starting-point. On very much the same plane is the 'Blessing of Moses' (Dt 33), though that evidently dates from after the revolt of Jeroboam (7). A new note begins to be sounded in the 'Song of Moses' (Dt 32 1-43). This comes from a time when victory is no longer with Israel, and the moral is drawn that it is because of the worship of new strange gods and the neglect of Jehovah. It is therefore Jehovah Himself who has delivered them into the hands of their enemies, for 'how should one chase a thousand Israelites, except their Rock (i.e. Jehovah) had sold them' (30). But this is only for a time. Soon the Lord will judge His people (36), i.e. He will avenge the blood of His servants and be merciful to His land (43). It is all quite irrevocable: Jehovah, the God of Israel, is bound in the end to defend His land and the people whom He put there. This is not so very far removed from the faith of the king of Moab in Chemosh, and the faith of the Assyrians in the god Asshur.*

Here is the best place to notice the contrasted figures of Elijah and Elisha. Elijah is the Prophet in opposition: Elisha has the less heroic, if really more difficult, part of the Prophet whose side is in office. Both are fiercely patriotic, and uncompromisingly hostile to foreign cults (1 K 18 40, 19 17; 2 K 3 13, 19, 5 26, 9 7, 10 18-28, 13 19; also 1 K 20 42); both are champions of private rights against the king (1 K 21 19; 2 K 8 f., 9 26), in this they are comparable to Nathan as well as to Amos. There is also in Elijah some of the old physical enthusiasm, like the Dervish type with which we started (1 K 18 46, 19 8). But Elijah is always self-possessed, and in the great story of his meeting Jehovah in Horeb, the mount of God, Jehovah comes to the Prophet neither in the tempest nor the earthquake nor the fire, but in 'the sound of quiet stillness' (1 K 19 12). The message, as in the Vision of 2 S 22 8-16 = Ps 18 7-15, was one of ruthless vengeance, but it is a mental advance that the presence of God should be felt rather in quiet reflection than in the noise of the thunderstorm.

Elijah and Elisha were successful in their main object. Foreign worship was rejected: the House of Ahab was exterminated, and the Tyrian god whom Jezebel worshipped was once for all rejected by high and low in Israel. Jehovah, He is the God henceforth for Israel. But there remains yet the most important question of all. If Jehovah's Name is really to be hallowed, Israel must realize Jehovah's Will and must offer to Him appropriate worship. It is with this that Amos and the Prophets that followed him were occupied.

A few words must first be said about the literary collection which we commonly call 'the Minor Prophets.' The written remains of Israelite Prophecy are collected into four books. The Books of Ezekiel and Jeremiah are at least predominantly the work of the Prophets whose names they bear; the Book of Isaiah is more mixed with Oracles of later date. The rest of the Prophets is frankly a collection, arranged under twelve names. Amos lived somewhere about 750 B.C., Malachi after 400 B.C. Very likely the Book of Jonah and parts of Zechariah may be later still. An inferior limit is set by Ecclus 49 10, which mentions 'The Twelve Prophets' collectively. The Minor Prophets were therefore edited at least a generation before 200 B.C. But in any case the collection covers writings differing in age by at least three centuries and a half. Even if the editor were contemporary with the latest Prophet, he would be separated from Amos and Hosea by an interval equal to that which separates Pope from Chaucer or ourselves from Shakespeare. It is therefore necessary to ask what sort of guarantee we have that we possess even approximately the true text of the earlier members of the series.

The answer to this, so far as it can be given at all, must come from the internal evidence of style. As a matter of fact, the twelve 'Prophecies' are singularly different in every literary quality. In Amos and Hosea there is nothing sug-

* Save that the faith of Israel in its own indestructibility proved to have substance in it. —C. G.

gested by the historical Exile or the post-exilic period. There are many obscurities in detail, but the whole way of writing is different from that of Joel, which appears to be a post-exilic work written in imitation of the ancient manner. Further, the books of Amos and Hosea have been put together on quite different plans. 'Amos' is the record of a single discourse, or what was practically such. The discourse extends from Am 1 [2]-7 [9]; 7 [10-17] gives us the story of how it came to be spoken, while the remainder of the book (8, 9) is a sort of supplement to the main text. Of course, 1 [2]-7 [9] is not a report like a modern stenographic transcript. Attentive analysis of its contents, verse by verse, has shown several gaps and inconsequences, not to speak of actual errors of transmission in this ancient writing. But the tone of the whole is quite uniform, it is all pitched in the same key, the only exception being the last five verses of the book, predicting a restoration of the glories of the Davidic kingdom. 'Hosea,' on the other hand, reads like a collection of scattered notes, heads of speeches or sermons to be delivered at different times in different circumstances; it is quite inconceivable that anyone should have actually spoken *verbatim* such disjointed utterances as the chapters of 'Hosea.' Further, the biographical section (1-3) is very different from that in Amos 7. In Hosea it is the foundation and text from which all depends: by his own experiences with his unfaithful wife the Prophet had learnt how the Lord regarded Israel. This great difference of style and treatment justifies us in regarding the books of Amos and Hosea as genuine monuments of the pre-exilic period. Such marks of editing and revision as may be detected in them are likely to have been contemporary, or nearly so, with the Prophets themselves.

AMOS

It is a guarantee of genuineness and antiquity that the 'words of Amos' are dated 'two years before the earthquake' (1 [1]). That was sufficient for contemporaries, but it does not give us much chronological help. There is little doubt, however, that the dating in the days of Uzziah of Judah and Jeroboam II of Israel (which is likely to be that of the final editor) is correct, and it is also confirmed by 7 [9-11]. It was a period of momentary prosperity for Israel, so we must suppose that Jeroboam's conquests (2 K 14 [25]) had already taken place: a likely date is between 760 and 750 B.C.

From 7 [12, 13] we learn that Amos came from Judah, not from Jerusalem but from Tekoa, south of Bethlehem (1 [1]). It is quite a mistake to regard him as an uncultivated rustic. The word translated 'herdman' in 7 [14] means 'one who has to do with oxen,' and therefore is something more than a shepherd. More probably, however, it should be emended into the same word as in 1 [1] (*nokēd*), which also is used to describe Mesha king of Moab, a very wealthy sheep-owner. In any case there is nothing in Amos's answer to suggest social inferiority: it is the answer of a country gentleman to an official who has mistaken him for a professional agitator.

Amos, no doubt, went back to Judah and recorded what he remembered having said. I venture to think, notwithstanding weighty opinions to the contrary (see e.g. *Encyclopædia Biblica*, art. 'Amos,' §§ 7-15), that 1 [2]-7 [9] is the record of a single speech, or a closely connected series of speeches, really delivered at some festival at Beth-el. The whole object of 1 [2]-2 [5] is to gain a hearing: Amos does not really care about Edom or Ammon, or even about Judah. Though he comes from the south, Israel to him is the kingdom of Jeroboam. Jehovah has sent him with a message to His people, and they live in Samaria and worship at Beth-el and at Gilgal. We can imagine the delight of the crowds as they heard the orator announcing the bitter vengeance of Jehovah on all the enemies of Israel one after the other—and then the thrill of horror when he whom they had accepted as the mouthpiece of the LORD began to foretell even a worse fate for Israel itself. 'You only hath Jehovah known of all the families of the earth,' and therefore, said Amos, He will punish you all the more for your misdeeds. The only thing the LORD is bound to is His own character; in practice Amos means social justice, as opposed to the heaping up of wealth or the elaboration of sacrificial worship.

One passage demands special notice here. It has been held in recent times that the greater Prophets, especially Amos and Jeremiah, were opposed to sacrificial worship as such. 'Did ye bring me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?' (5 [25]) is a question which obviously implies an answer in the negative. What follows about star-worship is obscure: 'Chiun' (pronounce *Kaiwān*) is Saturn and the word

translated 'tabernacle' is not that used for the 'Tabernacle' in the wilderness. But the general meaning of the passage, apart from details, must be that the Israelites offered no sacrifices in the forty years' wandering in the desert, yet it was a time when the providence of God for them was specially manifest. The first and most obvious deduction is that Amos did not know anything about the Priestly Code (P), according to which Aaron and his sons did offer the sacrifices daily in the Tabernacle. But, leaving this late and totally unhistorical presentation out of consideration, does it imply that Amos believed the primitive religion of Israel to have been non-sacrificial? I think not: I think Amos's words imply a state of things represented in our documents by Jos 5 [2-12], according to which the Israelites cannot practise their sacrificial worship till they are on Jehovah's Holy Land. For various reasons Gilgal (Jos 5 [9]), Bethel (Gen 28 [16]), and other places are 'holy,' but the wilderness is as Egypt or Damascus or Assyria (Ex 5 [3]; 2 K 5 [17]; Hos 9 [3, 4]). Amos in 5 [25] does not refer to a period when Israel had a religion in which sacrifices were not contemplated, but to a period when, owing to special circumstances, they were not in a position to offer them. What he is concerned to assert, what he was perhaps the first so definitely to insist upon, is that no worship or ritual, however legitimate and however splendid, will avail with Jehovah to atone for moral shortcomings and social wrong-doing. This is now a commonplace of religion: to the contemporaries of Amos it seems to have been a paradox.

We do not hear that Amos was martyred; no doubt, as was suggested above, he returned to Judæa, and there his protests and anticipations were written down. It has been noticed that his words seem to have influenced Isaiah of Jerusalem, while no echo of them is found in the book of Hosea the Northerner. We may suppose, therefore, that they first circulated in the kingdom of Judah. There, no doubt, recollections of the great days of the united monarchy must always have survived, so that it is no surprise to find the book of Amos conclude with a picture of the restoration of the Davidic glories. It is notable how modest the anticipation is: the throne of David is to recover the suzerainty over Edom and the other peoples where Jehovah had once been proclaimed Overlord (9 [12]). This modesty of anticipation, so different from the world-wide pictures of the later apocalyptic style, is a guarantee that the passage really belongs to Amos and his times. The 'Septuagint,' i.e. the old Greek translation, by a change or misreading of two letters, instead of 'that they (i.e. David's heirs) might possess the remnant of Edom' (9 [12]), renders the clause thus: 'that the remnant of men might seek,' some MSS. adding 'the Lord' at the end. There can be little doubt that this is a mere translator's error, and that the true text is as it stands in our Old Testament. But the Book of Acts, as throughout the Lucan writings, follows the Septuagint, so that in Ac 15 [17] we find the passage quoted and applied in accordance with the Septuagintal rendering.

HOSEA

THE book of Hosea stands first in the collection of the Twelve Prophets, but in chronological order it comes a few years later than Amos. Hosea's life-history goes back to the prosperous days of Jeroboam II (about 750), but his utterances belong to the anarchy in Israel which followed Jeroboam's death (743 B.C.). There is no allusion to the invasion of Judah by Israel and Syria in 734, which was followed at once by the Assyrian intervention and the collapse both of Damascus and the Northern Kingdom.

As stated above, the book falls into two parts: 1-3 is semi-biographical in form, while 4-14 consists of detached utterances about Israel and Judah, and their religious and social condition. Besides being disjointed in style there are many allusions to contemporary events (5 [1], 10 [14], 12 [1]); the result is that a great deal is most obscure to us, who do not know anything about the events alluded to. But it is evident, in any case, that the Prophet is living in a time of unrest and anarchy, that he foresees certain ruin for his people, but that he views the relations of Jehovah and Israel in the light of his own unhappy and yet affectionate relations with his own erring wife, whose story is told in 1-3. It is these introductory chapters that give us Hosea's message in the clearest form: the chief value of 4-14, apart from occasional telling phrases—e.g. 'I desired mercy and not sacrifice' (6 [6]), quoted by our Lord (Mt 9 [13], 12 [7]), and by Johanan ben Zakkai when he heard of the destruction of Jerusalem—is that it *is* concerned with obscure contemporary history. It does not seem to have been much amended and altered to suit later times and so, wherever we are able to understand the text, we get in it glimpses of the thought and feeling of a Prophet who lived in

northern Israel before the Assyrian came down and brought the national existence to an end.

The first three chapters are disfigured by an unfortunate accident of transmission. It has long been recognized that 3 is out of place, and that it ought to come between 1^{9} and 1^{10}; see e.g. Hastings' *D.B.*, art. 'Hosea,' by A. B. Davidson: 'Ch. 3 attaches itself to ch. 1^{1-9}' (col. 421*a*, end), and 'ch. 1^{10}-2^{1} . . . its right place seems after 3^{5}' (col. 425*a*, near end). This view has lately been upheld in an attractive form by Dr. Melville Scott, who points out that the end of 2 is really the conclusion of this whole section: by transposing 3 to follow 1^{9}, coherence is restored. Yet something more than this simple transposition is needed. The last word of 1^{9} is missing in the Hebrew, and we ought to hear how Gomer was actually rejected and sold as a slave before Hosea forgives her and buys her back again. This should come between 1^{9} and 3^{1-5}. On the other hand, 1^{10} follows logically without a break on 3^{5} (of course, 1^{10} should begin with 'And,' not with 'Yet'). With this correction the general tenor of the three chapters is fairly clear. Hosea had married a wife named Gomer, who was unfaithful, she was sold as a slave, but Hosea found that he still loved her, and he bought her back. He brought her to his home again, but on trial; she was to give up longing for her old loves, in the hope that in the end her desire would return for her first husband, and Hosea could take her back as his wife. The Prophet tells this story, because his own emotions have revealed to him how Jehovah regards Israel. Israel is like the unfaithful wife, for the nation has deserted the true religion of Jehovah. It has no true knowledge of God, and the worship at the national shrine is mere nature-worship ($2^{5,8}$). Jehovah will punish them by exile in a foreign land ($9^{3,4}$), where there will be no national life and no worship at all (3^{4}). But He still has affection for His apostate people: in exile their hearts will return to Him, and He will restore them to unity and prosperity, as in the glorious days of David.

It should be pointed out that 1^{2} and 3^{1} do not mean more than that Hosea came to recognize God's guidance both in his original choice of a wife, and afterwards in his forgiveness of her faults and his efforts to reclaim her: it does not mean that he was commanded to take a woman he already knew to be unchaste, any more than 'take . . . children of whoredoms' (1^{2b}) means 'adopt children already born.' There are good remarks on the Marriage of Hosea in Davidson's art. in Hastings' *D.B.* (col. 421*b*), already referred to. Some scholars have thought that Gomer's 'unfaithfulness' consisted in living as a *Kedēshah* at the public festivals (see Gen 38), but this seems to the present writer improbable and unnecessarily prosaic.

When we ask what exactly are the tendencies and the conduct that Hosea regards as 'unfaithfulness' to Jehovah it is not easy to give a definite answer. Undoubtedly he was opposed to religious prostitution (4^{14}, 7^{14}), to manufactured idols (8^{6}, 11^{2}, 13^{2}), even to 'temples' (8^{14}). He was evidently a believer in the good old times, i.e. he believed that the old times were good. Ever since Israel came up out of Egypt God had chosen them, finding them in the wilderness (9^{10}, 13^{5}), then it was well with them, but now they have become rich and civilized they do not know God any more. Hosea's ideal appears to be a return to desert life: no alliances (5^{13}, etc.), no luxury ($10^{1,2}$), no houses (12^{9}). Right sentiments are the best sacrifices (14^{2}). It is most noteworthy that the one crime denounced by him, of which we do know something of the circumstances, is the massacre of Ahab's family by Jehu (1^{4}), an event which the editor of the Book of Kings represents as done by the professed partisans of Jehovah and His worship ($2\ K\ 10^{30}$).

Hosea was not a constructive political thinker, but his heart told him that the temper which holds human society together is what he calls *hésed* (4^{1}, 6^{6}, 12^{6}, 14^{3}). It is not so much 'mercy' as 'kindliness,' loyalty to a friend ($2\ S\ 16^{17}$), the opposite of the blood-feud ($1\ K\ 20^{31}$), the mutual forbearance of an attached family. And, fanciful as may have been his idyllic pictures of the early days of Israel, he is surely right in regarding the religion of Jehovah, the religion that tradition traced back to Moses, as essentially a social discipline, common to the tribes of Israel and binding them together, rather than as a nature-cultus, the ultimate root and purpose of which was to secure good harvests by traditional ritual. What Hosea calls the 'Baalim' does mean a nature-cultus of this kind.

JOEL

THE book of Joel, unlike those of Amos and Hosea, gives no direct evidence of its date. In the Greek version it comes fourth

(after Micah), in the Hebrew it is put second, before Amos. It is indeed generally agreed that it must either be very early, before the Assyrians came on the scene, or very late in the Persian period after the Exile. The view here adopted is that it is very late, and in style an imitation of the old Hebrew writing.

The occasion of the book is a destructive invasion of locusts during a drought: all the crops have been destroyed, and even the daily offering in the Temple has been suspended for want of material (1 [9, 13], 2 [14]). The Prophet exhorts the priests and elders to call a fast and entreat the LORD to spare His people. In the second part (2 [18] ff.) we learn that the plagues were removed, both the locusts and the drought; Joel promises a good time in the immediate future, and afterwards the LORD's spirit will descend upon all, even the slaves and slave-girls (2 [29]), and then will come the great and terrible day in which Jehovah will gather all the nations to the Valley of Jehoshaphat below Jerusalem, and will recompense them for all the evils they have done to the people of Judah (3 [4]), especially the Tyrians who have sold Jews as slaves to the Ionian Greeks (3 [6]). The book concludes with a further picture of this great day of judgement upon the enemies of Zion.

The chief reasons for considering the book as late appear even from this short summary. The king and his ministers are not mentioned: the heads of the community appear to be the elders and the priests. The nation itself is treated as a religious community, almost as a parish, but there is no reference to idolatry or any of the semi-heathen practices which we know went on in Jerusalem till Josiah's time (contrast Zeph 1 [4-6]). The mere phrase 'bring again the captivity of Judah' (3 [1]) does not necessarily imply a post-exilic date, for it means little more than 'reverse the calamity' (see Am 9 [14]; Hos 6 [11]; Job 42 [10]), but when we read in 3 [2] of God's heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and that they parted His land and cast lots for His people, we are surely transported into post-exilic days.

The apocalyptic anticipations of Joel will come again before us in conjunction with the kindred Oracle at the end of Zechariah, but it seemed best to give the indications of date at this point, in order to emphasize the contrast between Joel and the really antique style of Amos and Hosea.

MICAH

SAMARIA fell in 721. The victorious Assyrians carried away the bulk of the people to the other side of the Tigris, and set colonists from Mesopotamia in their place. Northern Israel ceased to be a nation, but the national life went on in the little kingdom of Judah. The next great Prophet was Isaiah of Jerusalem, whose public career extends from 'the year that King Uzziah died' (Is 6 [1]), till after the death of Hezekiah. Until quite the end of this period the very existence of Judah was threatened by the vast and ruthless Assyrian Empire. The kings of Judah vacillated between desperate resistance and submission to Assyria under ruinous conditions. Isaiah was steadily for a policy of peace and the avoidance of coalitions and alliances; when at last the Assyrians proved implacable, and a siege of Jerusalem became inevitable, he encouraged the resistance. It was a cornerstone of his belief that Zion would never be taken if the people mended their ways and turned to Jehovah, and the event justified his confidence. Jerusalem was not taken by Sennacherib, and the Kingdom of Judah was given more than a century of respite.

Micah was a younger contemporary of Isaiah, but unlike him he was not a Jerusalemite. We can tell, too, what was felt by the men of his own time to be his most characteristic utterance, for he is quoted by name in the book of Jeremiah (26 [18]) as saying, 'Zion shall be ploughed like a field and Jerusalem become heaps,' words which are still to be found in our book (Mic 3 [12]).

The special interest of this book (i.e. 1-5) is that it is written from the point of view of the countryman, not of that of the inhabitant of the capital. David, as to all Judæans, is the national hero, but it is David of Beth-lehem, the guerilla warrior, the shepherd (5 [5]), the outlaw in the Cave of Adullam (1 [15]), not the established king in Jerusalem, a city which to Micah is the home of tyrannous and extortionate nobles (2 [2], 3 [1-3, 9-11]). If deliverance from the Assyrians is to come, says Micah, it will come from the countryside: that is the plain meaning of 5.

It is not likely that 6 and 7 are the work of the same writer. The style is different, and the Prophet's tone is more despondent. It has been pointed out (e.g. by Driver, *L.O.T.*, 5th ed., 313) that the mention of Assyria (and *not* Babylon) in 7 [12], together with the use in the same verse of a word for Egypt otherwise only

found in Isaiah, are indications that these chapters are earlier than the Babylonian Exile. If the conjecture be not too bold, I would suggest that these two chapters which have come to be appended to the book of Micah are the work of a Northerner, a younger contemporary of Hosea, writing after the best part of Israel had been carried away captive by the Assyrians. This would explain the reference to the statutes of Omri and the counsels of Ahab (6 [16]), the interest in Bashan and Gilead (7 [14]), and the favourable mention of Gilgal (6 [5]).

But whatever his date or place may have been, it is to this anonymous Prophet that we owe the noblest summary of the Prophetic message; not piacular sacrifices of however costly or dreadful a kind is what Jehovah requires, but the doing of justice and the love of kindliness and reverence for God (6 [8]). If this was really the swan-song of northern Israelite prophecy it was a noble note to end on. To Judah was reserved some measure of inclination and power to obey the message, to turn the Prophetic ideal into a working Code of national behaviour.

NAHUM

THE next group of Prophets—Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah—are all concerned with the Fall of Nineveh and the Reformation under Josiah, two nearly contemporary events. The most likely date for Josiah's Reformation is 621 B.C.; Nineveh fell, as we now know, in 612: see the account of a newly discovered Tablet read before the British Academy by C. J. Gadd, July 11, 1923.

The book of Nahum—possibly a returned exile, whose parents had been carried away to Elkosh, near Mosul—is wholly occupied with an exultant anticipation of the approaching destruction of Nineveh. It refers to the sack of Thebes in 663 (3 [8]), but the reference to the Judæan Feasts in 1 [15] makes it likely that Nahum wrote after 621.

The subject and style make Nahum less attractive to the Christian student than most of the other books of the Old Testament, but it is a standing testimony to the terror and hate which Assyria inspired that a whole book of the Bible is devoted to exulting over its downfall. One point may be noted in passing. The first dozen verses describe in glowing words the coming of the LORD in vengeance; Nineveh is not definitely in view till 1 [13]. [3] to [7] show an alphabetic arrangement, like so many of the Psalms. The alphabetic series is broken in several places, and only goes through half the alphabet, but this does not appear to be the result of textual corruption. We must, therefore, suppose that Nahum has adapted an already existing alphabetic hymn for his exordium. These alphabetic verses must therefore be older than Nahum; their presence here is the best proof that acrostic writing was practised by the Jews before the Exile.

HABAKKUK

THE book of Habakkuk mentions the Chaldæans (1 [6]), but it is not said that they will carry away Judah captive. 'Because thou hast spoiled many nations, every remnant of peoples shall spoil thee' (2 [8]): this fits Assyria better than the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar. For these and similar reasons the book may be placed about the same time as Nahum, i.e. just before the fall of Nineveh in 612. It is written in rather an obscure style, and it may be conjectured that the 'Prophecy' (i.e. 1 and 2) owes its preservation to having been written by the author of the notable 'Prayer' in 3, a highly poetical ode. Here, again, much is obscure in detail, but the general meaning can be made out. The first part (3 [1-16]) describes how God came from His seat in Sinai—Mount Paran is a poetical synonym for Sinai; see Dt 33 [2]—in power and wrath for the salvation of His people (3 [13]), when He settled them in their land. In the second part (3 [17-19]) the singer declares that though the harvest and the crops may fail yet he will rejoice in the LORD. Thus, as I have ventured to paraphrase it (*J.T.S.*, xvi, 65), the Psalm of Habakkuk says: 'O God, we have heard with our ears and our fathers have declared unto us the noble works that Thou didst in their days and in the old time before them; however bad the year may be, we will hold our Harvest Festival all the same.' This is a very curious theme, implying special conditions, but a date soon after 621 actually supplies them.

What was the Reformation effected in the 18th year of Josiah? It was, in effect, the adoption of the Book of the Covenant as the basis of religious observance (2 K 23 [21]), supplemented by the 'Deuteronomic' principle, so acceptable to king and priests at Jerusalem, that the temple on Mount Moriah was the only legitimate place of worship for Jehovah's people. But it was more than this. The regulation of public worship by the Book of the Covenant in itself implied the connexion of the Feasts with

what God had done for Israel in the olden time, when He first met with His people at Sinai and gave them His Law, rather than with the time of year when the corn or the fruits are ripe, as had been immemorially the case in Palestine.

We must remember that Passover is the beginning of the corn harvest (Dt 16 [9]), and Pentecost is harvest-home, while Tabernacles is the ingathering of fruits and the vintage (Ex 23 [16], 34 [22]). But, as generally presented in the Pentateuch, Passover is the commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt, while Pentecost is the giving of the Law. Tabernacles (end of September, beginning of October) seems to have been too closely connected with the vintage to be detached from the agricultural year. It is at least noteworthy that it is the two feasts which were so detached that have become Christian feasts.

Now from very early times the Psalm of Habakkuk has been read or sung by the Jews at Pentecost. Dr. Thackeray has carried back this use to 200 B.C., to a time when the first Greek versions of passages from the Prophets were being made (*J.T.S.*, xii, 212). But when we ask why this Psalm was selected, I venture to think the answer must be that the Psalm is too appropriate for Pentecost not to have been originally composed for that Festival, according to the ideas about it which prevailed at Josiah's Reformation. For that great liturgical revolution was not only an enforcement of the law of a single shrine for sacrifice: one chief element of it was to enforce the theory that the religion of Israel was no nature-worship like that of the peoples round about, but a special cult designed to remind the Chosen People of the special relation in which they stand to their Covenant God and of the great deliverance which He wrought for them in the past.

A curious mistranslation of the Greek version in 3 [2], corresponding to 'in the midst of the years make known,' led Tertullian and Augustine to see in the verse a prophecy of the Transfiguration and a reference to Moses and Elijah. The view of the Psalm set forth here is an even more fateful meeting together of 'Moses' and 'Elijah,' of Law and Prophet. Hitherto we have seen the Prophet in opposition to the prevailing practice of worship in Israel. Speaking generally, the Prophet and the Priest, the champions of the knowledge of God and of the worship of God, have been in opposition. With Josiah's Reformation they tend to come together and to work for the same end, for a public worship which shall be moral, and for a state which shall be religious. And of this new condition of things the Psalm of Habakkuk, a hymn written for the reformed worship, is the oldest surviving monument.

ZEPHANIAH

THE date of Zephaniah, like that of Nahum and Habakkuk, is the reign of Josiah, and, according to 1 [1], he was Josiah's second cousin once removed. He was not a courtier—at least, he threatens those of his cousins whom he considers to practise heathen habits (1 [8])—and his whole message is as severely ethical as that of Amos (1 [9b], 2 [3], 3 [3, 4]). But he is clearly not a great genius, not one of those who bring something new into man's conception of God or His service. For this very reason certain sides of his work are of particular interest: he seems not to have been so very greatly exalted in thought above the ordinary man of his age, and therefore we can gather from his words what the ideas of his age were better in some ways than we can from the words of a man of the calibre of Amos or of Jeremiah.

Zephaniah's book is dominated by the thought of the Day of the LORD (it is worth while to point out in passing that the opening words of the most famous of mediæval hymns, the *Dies iræ*, used in the Office for the Dead, are adapted from the Latin Vulgate text of 1 [15, 16]). This, of course, was no new conception: Amos had to warn his countrymen that the Day would be darkness for them and not light (Am 5 [18]), but in Zephaniah the main thought is Jehovah's vengeance upon the nations, the enemies of Israel. They are enumerated in 2, ending with Assyria. Then, after a few verses denouncing the sinners in Israel, we have the grandiose picture of a general assembly of all kingdoms, gathered together to receive from Jehovah the due punishment for their offences, and then the tale of the Tower of Babel will be reversed: all the nations will speak Hebrew and bring offerings to Jehovah's Temple, even from beyond the rivers of Ethiopa (3 [8-10]).

Here we have, clearly stated in the work of a pre-exilic Prophet, the apocalyptic Hope of a general Assize for all the world, which will put all wrongs right and inaugurate a new Golden Age, in which Israel, the LORD's people, will be 'a name and a praise among all people of the earth.'

OBADIAH

THE short prophecy of Obadiah is directed against the Edomites, who had seen in the destruction of Jerusalem by the foreigner an opportunity for enriching themselves: they captured the fugitives and sold them to their enemies (11-14). This uncousinly conduct was never forgotten, and the enmity which it inspired finds utterance in one of the best known of all the Psalms (Ps 137 7).

The chief literary interest in Obadiah is its relation to Jer 49, also a prophecy against Edom, but apparently dating from before the fall of Jerusalem (the correspondences are: Ob 2-4 = Jer 49 15, 16; Ob 5-6 = Jer 49 9-10a; Ob 8 = Jer 49 7). It does not seem that either borrowed from the other, but each used an old poem of defiance and threat such as Arab tribes used to one another. Similarly, Lissauer's *Hymn of Hate* against the English was a recast of a song of Arndt's against the French.

The hatred of the Jews for Edom was centuries later transferred to Rome; consequently in Jewish documents such as the Targums words of vengeance addressed to Edom are regularly interpreted as intended for imperial Rome.

HAGGAI AND THE RETURN

WITH Haggai we come to the second year of Darius, the great king whose portrait, with the story of his conquests, may still be seen on the cliffs of Behistun in his native Persia. It is therefore the year 521 B.C., just two centuries after the fall of Samaria and one century since Josiah's Reformation. What immense changes have taken place in those two centuries in the political condition and in the religious outlook of those who, nevertheless, still feel themselves to be the people of the LORD of Hosts (1 2, 2 4-9, 23)! The Northern Kingdom, which as long as it was in existence *was* Israel, has disappeared from the face of the earth. The Ten Tribes have ceased to be political facts. Some of their descendants must have been living in the districts beyond where Mosul now stands, but so far as the evidence goes they had forgotten their ancestral language and religion. In what was once their land is a mixed race, practising a mixed religion. All that survives is a relic of the Kingdom of Judah: Israelite has become synonymous with 'Jew.'

And the Jews in Jerusalem and the country round about are not a real nation any more. It would be more accurate to call them a Church. When the Babylonian Empire fell, some seventeen years before the date we have come to, the Kingdom of David was not revived. But the Persian system was a less centralized scheme of administration than the Chaldean. It did nothing or little for the subject peoples, but it left them alone if they were quiet. Besides, when Cyrus conquered Babylon it was only 48 years since the Destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar (this spelling, which is found in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, is nearer the true form than Nebuchadnezzar: the Babylonian form is Nabukudurriuṣur). The fall of the Babylon Empire was received by faithful Jews with delight. Jehovah was once again showing Himself as the Champion of His people (Is 47 4), and one great Prophet actually hailed Cyrus as the LORD's Messiah (Is 45 1)! Others, among whom was Haggai, hoped that the Chosen of Jehovah was the Persian Governor of Judah, one Zerubbabel, a scion of the old royal house who had been born in Babylonia. It is curious to read the glowing words of Haggai (2 21-23) and of Zechariah (4 6-10), and then to find that neither Zerubbabel nor his ancient house play any part in the subsequent history. The temple was restored, but the 'tabernacle of David' was not to be built up as in the days of old.

The real development and progress of Israel was in a different sphere. The period of the Exile is very obscure: many efforts towards finding a religion suited to the changed conditions may have taken place, which have left little or no trace in our documents. We now know that in far-away Elephantine, near Assuan, on the southern outpost of Egypt, there was a colony of Jews who had a temple erected to their God, at which actual sacrifices were offered till it was destroyed in a riot by Egyptians in the year 408: on these occurrences see the book by Professor A. van Hoonacker of Louvain (*Une communauté Judéo-Araméenne*, Schweich Lectures, 1914). But that which was destined to survive and influence the world was the community of returned exiles at Jerusalem.

Perhaps the most significant thing of all is that there were any returned exiles at Jerusalem. True, it had been their home, but it had lost its old character. It was no longer independent, and if it was for religion that they returned, their temple was nothing but a ruined site. What, then, was the attraction that brought them back? I think we may distinguish two main tendencies, which

we may call by the great names of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Jeremiah had seen as clearly as Hosea did the impending ruin of his people, but all through his career he was conscious of a personal vocation, of personal intercourse with the LORD (see especially Jer 1 [4-10], 20 [7-11]), which was independent of national worship and organization. And so we see him after the destruction of Jerusalem and the ruin of his nation still confident that his mission was from Jehovah and that Jehovah was all the while pursuing His mighty plan. Notwithstanding all that had happened Israel would yet serve the LORD their God, and David their king He will raise up for them (Jer 30 [9]). Jeremiah had a vision of the future in which the LORD would make a new Covenant with His people, when every one of them would have the will of God in their hearts from the least to the greatest (see Jer 31 [31-34], quoted also in Heb 8 [8-12]).

Jeremiah was himself of a priestly family, but he had been in opposition to much that was practised by the Jerusalemite hierarchy of his own day. His sketch of the happy future includes this, that God will 'satiate the soul of the priests with fatness' (Jer 31 [14]), i.e. there will be plenty of fat cattle for the sacrifices, but he does not seem to have been interested in the details of an ideal worship. Very different was his younger contemporary Ezekiel, also a priest, and not inferior to Jeremiah in moral earnestness. He had been among the first batch of exiles (2 K 24 [12-16]), and it was when he was living in captivity that Jerusalem was taken (Ezek 33 [21] ff.). Like Jeremiah, Ezekiel did not lose heart. He was confident that in the LORD's good time He would bring back His scattered people, both Israel and Judah, and that they would yet dwell in their own land in obedience without idolatry (Ezek 37 [21] ff.). But Ezekiel was ready with more. He was ready with a complete plan for a restored temple and restored worship (Ezek 40-48), a temple where the LORD would be as in the days of old, but where there would be no room for idolatry and superstition (43 [4-9]). This was to be the place of worship for a restored community, in which the old prophetical ideals of civil justice and uprightness should be realized (45 [9-12]).

So in the darkest days of the Captivity was the hope of the future conceived. There was to be union between priest and prophet, between sacrificial worship and moral earnestness. In the stress of exile the best minds of Israel had found God, had found that the sacrifices of God are a contrite heart: God would accept them again, now that they had a right spirit. He would yet be favourable and gracious to Zion and would build the wall of Jerusalem again—and then once again they will offer young bullocks upon His Altar. I quote the familiar words of Ps 51, because undoubtedly this is their setting. The last verse is no interpolation. The religious progress of Israel was not from a ritualistic to a 'spiritual' (i.e. an emotional) worship, but from a ritualistic worship, that was magical and idolatrous in intention and mixed with practices that were heartless and immoral, to a ritualistic worship, not so very different in its outward form, which nevertheless was in intention the service of the One God, whose Name and Law denoted to the Jew everything that was holy and just and good.

This was the magnificent conception, but when the opportunity arrived it seemed that 'the children had come to the birth and there was not strength to bring forth.' To the struggling community at Jerusalem it hardly seemed worth while. They had 'looked for much, and lo, it came to little' (Hag 1 [9]). Here came in the message of Haggai, who himself seems to have always remained among the poor folk left in Palestine. The essential element of the Prophet is his enthusiasm, as we said at the beginning (p. 419): Haggai was not afraid to speak in Jehovah's name, to be regarded as the angel of the LORD (1 [13]), such as had come to the men of old. He encouraged Zerubbabel and the people to set the regular worship going once more, and so the Second Temple was launched on its eventful course.

In Hag 2 [9] there is a well-known mistranslation in the Authorized Version, which has been set right in the Revised Version. What Haggai announced was that the latter glory of the new House would be greater than its first, i.e. its present inglorious beginning. But if we may for once use the old familiar mistranslation, there is a sense in which the glory of the Second Temple was greater than that of Solomon's, for the worship in it, though often no doubt unintelligent and formal, was free from nature-worship, from heathen magic, and from immoral customs.

ZECHARIAH

ZECHARIAH was a younger contemporary of Haggai. His time was still 'the day of small things' (4 [10]), the day when it

was still hoped that for Zerubbabel a great future was prepared.

The book of Zechariah falls into two portions: 1-8 is the work of Zechariah, and is concerned with the rebuilding of the Temple in 521. 9-14 are written in quite a different style, and are much later: they belong to the period after Alexander the Great (see 9 [13]), and reflect a political situation dominated by the rivalry of the Ptolemies and Seleucids, here called 'Egypt' and 'Assyria.' It is not clear that this latter portion is all by the same hand: 9-11, 12-13, 14, are probably three separate Oracles, and from what is said in 13 [2] ff. it is likely that they were anonymous from the beginning.

Zech 1-8 gives us, more intimately than Haggai, a picture of the hopes and fears of the pious Jews at the moment when their national life was starting on its second course. It shows us also the decay of prophecy as a literary form. There is something artificial and laboured in the Visions of Zechariah, quite unlike the spontaneousness and directness of Amos or Hosea. The Prophets, in fact, had almost done their work: the danger now was that the claim to inspiration would sink into a trade. But though Zechariah is prosy, he is true to the prophetic social morality: like 'the former prophets' (7 [12]), he sees that the great offence of Israel in the past was the oppression of the helpless and imagining evil each against his brother. And it was reserved for Zechariah to formulate in plain prose that which after all has been the achievement of Israel—that out of all languages of the nations there shall be men who will come to the Jew and say, 'We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you' (8 [23]).

The second part of the book of Zechariah bristles with obscurities, partly due to the intentionally allusive style. Two points need notice here. In 13 [2-6] prophets are classed with idols and unclean spirits, as social nuisances. The 'prophet,' when this passage was written, had evidently sunk into the same disrepute as the fortune-teller or the self-styled clairvoyant. The other point is concerned with the Apocalypse of 14, as it may fairly be called.

Zech 14 is pernaps the latest chapter in the books of the Prophets; in any case, it exhibits the Apocalyptic scheme fully developed. The details of the picture differ from one Apocalypse to another, but the essential structure is always the same: in the words of the Gospel, 'they thought that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear' (Lk 19 [11]). This present state of things was not always to continue, for God would assert His righteous dominion by a world-wide event, just when things were becoming unbearable. Then He would save His people and a Golden Age would be ushered in. Here we are told that the nations who had oppressed Israel would be destroyed and those that remained would worship the LORD and go up year by year for at least the Feast of Tabernacles to the Temple at Jerusalem. All Jerusalem would be ritually holy: it would be a public triumph for God's Sacred Law.

This picture in Zech 14 is the most concrete and uncompromising of its kind, but the picture drawn in Joel 3 is essentially similar. In Zeph 3 [8] ff. we have a pre-exilic sketch of the same sort of expectation. What are Christians to make of these pictures? They certainly were not realized: Zech 14 in any case is not a picture of the triumph of the Christian Church. Two things can at least be said. The ultimate doctrine that they imply is that the Judge of all the earth will do right in the end, that History has a meaning and moves towards a pre-determined goal. And further, it is salutary for those who are studying the Gospel to remember that this was the dress in which the Jews of our Lord's time had clothed their belief in the justice of God and the triumph of His Will. When we bear this in mind it is less disconcerting to find that the form in which the Gospel depicts the future is so strikingly similar.

One further point. In Zephaniah, in Ezekiel, in Joel, in Zechariah, we are shown the triumph of God and the happy future of the Chosen People, but what about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? What about those who have gone to their long home before the blissful consummation came to pass? They are simply left out; 'the grave cannot praise thee; the living, the living, he shall praise Thee, as I do this day,' says Hezekiah when granted a few years longer life (Is 38 [18, 19]). It was the struggle with Antiochus Epiphanes, the cruelty of the persecutors, and above all the constancy of the martyrs, who died then for their God and His Law without hope of reward, that convinced faithful Jews that 'many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt' (Dan 12 [2]). And here also the decisive factor was not a philosophic doctrine, but an unshakable conviction that the Judge of all the earth would 'do right' (Gen 18 [25]).

MALACHI

THE last of the Prophets on the roll occupies a niche that is all his own. It is difficult to fix his date: the returned community is established in Jerusalem and the Temple-worship regularized, just as in Joel. No outstanding external event is mentioned, unless 3^{11} be a reference to the same plague of locusts with which Joel is concerned. What distinguishes Malachi is his moral earnestness, which is every whit as great as that of Amos ($3^{5-6, 18}$, 4^{1}). But besides this, like Haggai, he is anxious that the Temple-dues shall be fully paid (1^{14}, 3^{8}). Like Zephaniah and the Apocalyptists, he makes much of the coming Day of Judgement (3^{1}, 4^{1}). What is new is the conviction that the nation, though reformed, is not really worthy: their worship is hardly more acceptable than that of the Gentiles (1^{11}, but *v.n.*). Elijah must come again to turn Israel back to serve their God rightly, as he did of old on Mount Carmel (4^{5-6}). There is in Malachi a real anticipation of the warnings of John the Baptist.

One outstanding difference between Malachi and Amos demands a passing notice at the end. Malachi's exhortations assume 'the law of Moses with the statutes and judgements,' i.e. the Pentateuch (4^{4}). For better or worse the knowledge of God had become the knowledge of a written Code and its interpretation. The age of the Prophets was drawing to a close. As in the days before Samuel, with whom we started, it would soon be said that there was no open vision.

JONAH

THE book of Jonah is different from all the others in that it is wholly a tale *about* a Prophet. Except for words in reported conversations and a Prayer of Jonah (2^{2-9}), which looks as if it were a Psalm adapted for the occasion, it is all in the third person.

As in the case of the Psalm of Habakkuk, a masoretic Note at the beginning and end of the Hebrew text gives us, I believe, the clue to the composition. The book of Jonah is appointed to be read on the Day of Atonement, and I venture to think it is best considered as a pious tale composed for that very purpose. The ritual of the Day of Atonement is described at length in the book of Leviticus (16): the object of the ceremonies was a sort of general Absolution, whereby the sins of Israel in the past year were put away, and they were enabled to make a fresh start with God: the Day of Atonement comes five days before the joyful Feast of Tabernacles, which falls about Michaelmas. On the Day of Atonement the Jews fast and put on their praying-shawls and confess their sins. While the Temple stood there were strange piacular sacrifices, and the 'guilt' of the community was ritually transferred to a goat, called the 'scape-goat,' which was led off to die in the wilderness. But that was a matter for the priests. For the people the note of the day's services was that God will forgive those who fast and pray and confess their sins.

With this theme the book of Jonah is in complete harmony. It tells the Jews that God will forgive even the wicked Assyrians, the enemies of the Chosen People, if they too will repent and fast and pray (3^{5-10}). And God is determined to give them the opportunity for repentance. Jonah is unwilling to deliver his message (1^{3}), for, naturally, he hates Nineveh, and he foresees that they will be forgiven (4^{1-3}). But he cannot escape, though he sails off to the far West, is thrown into the sea, is swallowed by a fish. He is 'vomited out' after three days, alive and well, and has to go to Nineveh after all, where his warnings are, to his mind, all too successful.

Of course, there is no atom of history in all this. The detail of the great fish is not more impossible than to find in the chronicles of Nineveh a real repentance of the king and people of Assyria at the bidding of a Hebrew prophet. In these days 'Jonah and the Whale' has become, like 'Balaam and his Ass,' a subject for ribaldry, but that is only because of the modern reverence for mere fact, itself a sort of by-product of the doctrine that the course of events has an ultimate meaning.

What ought rather to strike us when we read the story of Jonah is its universalism, its 'liberalism.' The Israelite prophet hates the Ninevites, but Jehovah does not. He accepts the certainly non-Levitical vows and sacrifices of the seamen (1^{16}), and the repentance of the heathen and wicked Assyrians. When we accuse post-exilic Judaism of sectarian narrowness and nationalistic fanaticism we shall do well to remember the Book of Jonah.

The story of the rise and the decay of Prophecy in Israel is that of a remarkable and strange development, as remarkable and strange as that of the Ionian philosophers. The latest Prophets are not

the greatest: Zephaniah is not so great in conception as the unknown seer whose utterance is preserved in Micah 6, and the post-exilic Prophets do not rise, either in conception or expression, to the great men who wrote during the Exile itself. But, on the other hand, there is a steady progress, as we go down the centuries, towards the mental atmosphere implied by the Gospels, so that for the Christian student Malachi and Zechariah are as instructive as Amos.

As for the ultimate causes that produced this wonderful burst of religious evolution, that turned the social customs of an insignificant people of Western Asia into an ethical system fitted to resist the absorbing power of Hellenic syncretism, and develop ultimately into the religion of the civilized world, what are we to say? It could hardly have been foreseen: we can say little more than that it was Destiny. Or, rather, let us recur to the Oracle with which we started:

'Hath He said, and will He not do it?
or spoken, and will not confirm it?
You will hear men say, "For Jacob's sake
and for Israel's sake how God hath wrought!"'

ISAIAH (I.-XXXIX.)

By L. Elliott Binns

The Book of Isaiah is the first in the Prophetic Canon, and it holds the highest place amongst the Prophets in the regard of Church-people. This is due in part to the loftiness both of language and ideas which marks it—a loftiness which has been recognized and proclaimed by great musicians—in part to the fact that Isaiah is the best known of the Prophets. From this book are taken many of the lessons for the great festivals of the Christian year, and four of the portions of Scripture appointed for the Epistles.

Recent scholarship, however, has proved, beyond all reasonable doubt, that 'Isaiah' is not a unity; that it comes from various writers and from very different periods of the history of the Jewish people. The book has been divided up into two portions, 1-39 and 40-66, the latter of which belongs to the post-exilic time. Even in 1-39 there is much which is not from Isaiah, e.g. 11-14, 21^{1-12}, 24-27, 33-35, and the appendix (36-39) from 2 Kings. It will thus be seen that some of 'Isaiah's' reputation rests upon passages which do not come from the prophet of that name. Enough, however, and more than enough, remains to prove his right to a place in the very foremost rank of the Prophets.

In order to understand Isaiah's activities, some knowledge of the political background of his life is necessary. During the reign of Jeroboam II. the Assyrians were too busy with domestic difficulties to meddle with the affairs of Syria, hence that monarch's flourishing reign, but within a short time their steady westward advance was renewed. The one hope of the small states seemed to lie in Egypt, and Egypt was only too ready to encourage them to sacrifice themselves in her interests. In 735 a combination of Palestinian states, which included Pekah of Israel and Rezin of Damascus, was formed to war against Assyria; Judah stood out, to their annoyance, and they moved down against Jerusalem (Is 7^{1}). Before they had the opportunity of doing much damage, however, the allies were scattered by the sudden arrival of the Assyrian armies. Another revolt of Israel some years later led to the capture of Samaria by Sargon (722) and the deportation of many of its inhabitants to Assyria.

Judah apparently remained quiet at this time, and though Sargon warred successfully against Gaza and defeated the Egyptians at Raphia in 720, he seem, to have left Jerusalem alone. But in 711 Hezekiah allied himself with Ashdods Edom, and Moab, and rebelled against Assyria, Egypt as usual being the instigator. His efforts were, however, futile and the revolt collapsed. A further revolt arose in 705 when Sennacherib succeeded Sargon as King of Assyria. In 701 the Assyrians invaded Palestine once more and did immense damage, Jerusalem alone escaping for the time on payment of a tribute. A further threat was brought to an end by the sudden retirement of the invaders.

For the life of the man himself we are dependent upon the incidental notices contained in the book, supplemented by traditions of somewhat doubtful nature. The earliest incident which has been recorded is the vision in the temple 'in

the year King Uzziah died' (739 B.C). Further, we know that the prophet was married, and that he called his wife the prophetess (8 3), perhaps because she possessed gifts similar to his own, or more probably as sharing the husband's position, just as the wife of a bishop in the Frankish Church was known as *episcopa*. Two sons at least were born to him, and both were given significant names: Shear-jashub (7 3) and Maher-shalal-hash-baz (8 1-4). The prophet's life was a long one, as he was probably born *c.* 760, and lived on into the reign of Hezekiah (720-692), and possibly even into that of his successor Manasseh (692-638). Tradition tells us that he was sawn asunder by the latter's orders (cf. Heb 11 37). Isaiah possessed a good deal of political power in the state: notice how, though the schemes of the pro-Egyptian party were concealed from him (29 15, 30 1), his opposition was strong enough to cause the removal of Shebna (22 15 ff.; cf. 36 3). This power may have come to him on account of his rank, if, as some think, he was of high birth, but such a supposition is by no means necessary to account for his influence: a man, even of mean birth, possessing the talents and energy of Isaiah, would inevitably have gathered to himself a following in a time of crisis: history furnishes us with many examples of such.

Isaiah was a far-seeing patriot and statesman, and he was fortunate enough to serve under monarchs who were, for the most part, willing to co-operate with him; his task was thus easier than that of Jeremiah, and of the prophets in northern Israel who, with few exceptions, found themselves compelled to denounce their sovereigns and to act in opposition to them. When, however, we speak of Isaiah as a statesman, we are not to imagine that, as T. H. Robinson says, 'he sat down carefully to consider the geographical situation of his people amidst the nations of the world, that he appreciated the historical significance of the movements of armies and of the ambitions of monarchs, and that he based his "political" utterances on cold calculations of population, man-power, or economic resources' (*Prophecy and the Prophets*, 94). It was the belief in Jehovah as a *living* God, the faith which was the basis of his personal religious life, which also inspired his public utterances. It was Jehovah who controlled courts and used the great world-empires for the working out of His plans (10 5 f.). Thus Isaiah rose above the limited outlook of his predecessors to a wider vision. This width of vision and the sure confidence in Jehovah which possessed him gave to the prophet a profound contempt for the petty shifts and futile conspiracies to which the ungodly policy of his contemporaries had reduced them. Salvation for Zion would not come from Egypt, it would come from one source only—from Zion's King Jehovah.

Alongside of his belief in Jehovah as the living God must be placed his conception of Him as Great and Holy. Holiness originally had the meaning of 'set apart' or 'appropriated': Isaiah developed the idea, not only in connexion with 'religious' duties, but extended it to the whole of life; in other words, he gave to it a moral content. He had learned this great lesson in the vision which was the starting-point of his ministry, and he never forgot it. To him Jehovah was high and lifted up, away from all the defilements, as well as the weaknesses, of earth, and nothing unclean could dwell in His presence. The worshippers of Jehovah must therefore be holy as He is holy—they must also be just. Because Isaiah believed in God's justice his indignation burned like fire against all injustice in man, and especially in the people of God. Hence he continually denounced the social sins which disfigured the national life—above all, the greed and avarice of the great landowners, supported as it was by a corrupt administration which denied to the poor and helpless all legal protection, and left them at the mercy of their oppressors. The prophet denounced as freely the senseless luxury of the women which, no doubt, was one of the causes of the rapacity of their lords.

For the nation, since it would not accept his teaching and remain in quiet and peace, Isaiah foresaw inevitable, though not complete, disaster. But out of the fire of calamity a purified remnant will emerge—so at least his later teaching ran, for at first the doctrine of the remnant was a threat and not a hope—and the nation will be reborn, and under the revived rule of a Davidic king again find prosperity and usefulness. The picture of a Davidic king—although it hardly needed more than an earthly monarch to satisfy it—yet seems to point on to some greater conception; and the Church has seen in the figure of Messiah the first dim groping after the Christ who was to come, not indeed to restore the Kingdom to Israel, but to be the divine founder of a new Israel, a people of God which should know no limits either of country or of race.

Bibliography

Commentaries: Wade, *West. C.*; Skinner, *C.B.*; Gray, *I.C.C.* (1-27); Cheyne, *Prophs. of Isaiah*; G. A. Smith, *Ex. B.*; Delitzsch, Duhm, Marti, Condamin. **Studies:** Driver, *Isaiah: his Life and Times*; Kennett, *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah* (Schweich Lectures); Box, *The Book of Isaiah* (translation with notes).

I. Judah's Trial and Condemnation.—This chapter has been called by Ewald 'The Great Arraignment.' In it Judah and Jerusalem are brought before God's judgement-seat and accused of disloyalty and of social injustice. The plea in defence, that of elaborate and costly offerings, is brushed aside; since sacrifice and prayer from impenitent hearts are a sign, not of true worship, but of superstition. The chapter consists of a number of different sections which originally were distinct, and come from different periods. The main portion (2-17), however, seems to belong to the time of Sennacherib's invasion (701 B.C.), when the land suffered desperately.

1. The title belongs to 1-12 and is editorial.

2-9. Heaven and earth are appealed to against an ungrateful people. The ox and the ass know their master (cf. Lk 2 7, 12), but God's people are less intelligent than the brute creation (cf. Jer 8 7). The prophet tries to arouse them to realize the consequences, present and future, of such folly. But for the loving-kindness of God their destruction would have been equal to that of Sodom and Gomorrah.

2. **they.** Emphatic, *even they.*

3. Lack of thought and meditation produce sin.

4. **seed.** Not 'descendants of evil doers' (cf. 21), but 'an evil generation.'

5. **Why.** Some critics render *on what* (Vulgate), as if all parts of the body were stricken (cf. 6).

6. The different types of wound and different treatment.

7. **your cities.** Sennacherib claims to have captured forty-six cities of Judah.

as overthrown by strangers. The word overthrown is always used of Sodom, render *as the overthrow of Sodom* (cf. margin).

8. Jerusalem alone escaped destruction in Sennacherib's invasion. The images of loneliness are striking.

9. **remnant.** Not Isaiah's usual word for the ideal remnant.

10-17. This second address is different in poetical form from 2-8, but 9 forms a suitable link. This is the only passage of Isaiah which has come down to us containing denunciations of the sacrificial system (cf. Am 5 21 ff.; Hos 6 6; Mic 6 6 ff.). We can hardly doubt that he condemned the practices of Ahaz (see 2 K 16 6 ff.), and helped to promote the reforms of Hezekiah (2 K 17 4). The immoral lives of those who sacrificed led some of the prophets it would seem to denounce the whole system. None the less experience teaches that acts of worship may both kindle and express true religion.

10. **law.** Read *teaching* with margin. The reference is not to a code, but to the prophet's utterance.

11. 'One of the greatest dangers to the Church of God, whether Jewish or Christian, is unreality. We cannot escape this grave peril by adopting a ritual, nor by dispensing with ritual, but only by the most persistent and strenuous moral efforts' (Batten, *The Heb. Prophet*, 292).

12. **trample.** Like the sacrificial oxen.

13. **incense.** An ambiguous word in Hebrew. Perhaps it here means the smell of the sacrifices. Incense probably did not come in till a later time, as Jer 6 20 is the first clear example of its use.

15. **your hands.** The uplifting of the hands in prayer is very early, as can be proved by the fact that the Sumerian word for prayer itself (*Shu-il*) means hand-lifting.

many prayers. Cf. Mt 6 7.

18-20. A detached oracle which seems to have preceded the spoiling of the land described in 7. The people are given the choice—obedience and prosperity, or disobedience and destruction. Notice the close connexion between good works and material blessings. 'Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament, adversity of the New.'

18. RV takes this verse as an invitation, but a better sense is given by regarding it as an indignant question, a rebuke to the people for lightly regarding their sins: *If your sins be as scarlet, are they to be counted as white as snow?*

21-26. This short elegy is complete in itself, but the contents give no certain clue to its date. It is a lament over the moral decline of Jerusalem, pictured under the figures of an unfaithful wife, of debased silver, and of adulterated wine. A judgement from God is about to purify the city and to restore it to righteousness.

21. **an harlot.** The vivid metaphor made famous in Hos 1-3. Most commonly it is applied to idolatry (as in

Jer 2 [20]) rather than to offences against society.

22. Mixed. Lit. circumcised. Wade quotes in illustration Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, xix, 19, *vina saccis castrari*.

24. Notice the accumulation of divine titles. The intention is to lend impressiveness to the threat of judgement.

the Lord of Hosts. So called either because leader of the armies of Israel, or, more probably, the controller of the stars.

27 f. appear to be insertions; brief generalizations, the language of which suggests a late date.

27. redeemed. In a temporal, not a religious sense. It is doubtful whether Isaiah ever used the term.

her converts. Her 'penitents' rather than her 'captives,' as in LXX and Syriac.

29-31. These verses show a change of metre, and in substance resemble 65 [3, 12], 66 [3, 17]. The worship of trees, however, is an old custom as well as a persistent one, and its persistence gives no clue to the date of the oracle. The growth of a tree suggested that it had some kind of natural life within it, and was perhaps the home of a divine being.

29. ashamed. That is, *disappointed*.

oaks. Better *terebinths*, as margin.

30. The objects in which they trust have no real stability and soon pass away.

garden . . . no water. There may here be a reference to the gardens of Tammuz (see on 17 [10]), though the parallelism suggests a garden whose spring has failed. There was in Athens a special cult of Aphrodite in the Gardens (Harrison, *Proleg. to Gk. Rel.*, 132).

31. 'The product of sin will become the means of the sinner's destruction' (Skinner).

II.-IV. This section of the book contains six short oracles which, with certain exceptions noted below, probably come from the earliest days of the prophet's ministry.

II. 1-4. Zion as the Religious Capital of the Earth.—This oracle is almost identical with Mic 4 [1-3]. It is possible that it is original in neither place. Some critics regard the exaltation of Zion and the imagery in general as signs of post-exilic date. Whatever may be its date the poem shows the only way which can lead to universal peace—the acceptance of God both as teacher ([3]) and as arbitrator ([4]).

1. An editorial title.

2. in the latter days. The Messianic age.

in the top. This thought occurs elsewhere only in Ezek 40 [2] and Zech 14 [10].

3. many peoples (cf. Jer 3 [17]; Zech 14 [16] ff.). A prophecy which was not fulfilled before the coming of the Christ.

he will teach us. Jehovah Himself.

4. The converse appears in Jl 3 [10].

5-22. The Day of the Lord.—This passage contains a number of verses of a poem which in course of transmission have been displaced. Each stanza of the original probably began with a refrain similar to that preserved in [10, 19, 21], and perhaps ending with that in [9, 11, 17]. Gray reconstructs, after a number of textual emendations, the order as follows: (1) [19, 6-8, 11 (=9)]; (2) [10, 12-18]. The introductory verse ([5]) is outside the poem, and the closing verse ([22]) is the reflection of a pious reader, and was evidently unknown to LXX which does not contain it.

The poem describes the coming of Jehovah in judgement. Like a great storm the Day of the Lord gathers force in the north, and comes sweeping down till it reaches the sea. In its wake all high and lofty things, from the cedars of Lebanon to the tall ships of Tarshish, lie crushed and broken. Man's pride and sin will in like manner be humiliated and punished.

6. *with customs* **from the East.** This guess of RV is not convincing. In Hebrew **from the East** is much like *sorcerers*, and probably this latter word has fallen out, hence the gap. Read *sorcerers from the East*.

Philistines. Cf. 1 S 6 [2]; 2 K 1 [2].

strike hands. That is, in making bargains.

7 f. Prosperity, military preparations, and idolatry are in the eyes of the prophet all calculated to come between the soul of the nation and its God.

16. ships of Tarshish. Large ships, such as those which make the long voyage to Tarshish (probably Tartessus in Spain).

pleasant imagery. Both words are difficult in the original, and many emendations have been suggested; perhaps the best, based on Jon 1 [5], gives the reading *costly barks*.

20. Idols alone are denounced, not the local sanctuaries or high-places.

III. 1-15. Anarchy the Punishment of Oppression.—This prophecy depicts the disorder which will come upon Judah when the leaders have been removed from it, either by war or by internal revolution. Those of age and of rank will no longer receive marks of respect, and anarchy will prevail. In their desire for more stable conditions the people will search in vain for rulers. This state of affairs will be the result of sin against God, and in

particular of the oppressions and greed of the nobles.

The date of this passage is not quite certain, though it fits in well with the early days of Isaiah. Many scholars, following Duhm, regard 13^{13-15} as an independent utterance.

1. the whole stay . . . water. This phrase seems to be an addition, possibly suggested by ^{7}. It misinterprets the figures **stay** and **staff** which refer, not to material provision, but to the leaders of the people, the pillars of the community.

4. children. The rule of the inexperienced often brings disaster, as Florence discovered in the days of Savonarola: see Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, iv, 215, who quotes the speech of Piero Capponi which gave the city its motto: 'It is time to have done with the government of children, and to recover our liberty.'

6. brother. Not of relationship, any fellow-man is meant.

clothing. Possibly a mantle or robe of office showing that the holder had previously been a ruler.

8. their tongue. They were a people of unclean lips (6^{5}).

10 f. Probably the comment of a later generation.

12. women. The position of women in the royal court was sometimes important, especially that of the queen-mother: cf. Jer 13^{18}, with my note (*West. Comm.*).

13. plead. Not 'entreaty,' but in judgement.

the peoples. This should be singular as in the versions.

the vineyard. Cf. 5^{1} ff.

15. Cf. similar language in Am 4^{1}; Mic 3^{2} f.

III. 16-IV. 1. The Doom of the Fashionable Ladies of Jerusalem.—From the grievous condition of the poor (^{14} f.) Isaiah turns with righteous indignation to the luxury and wantonness of their oppressors (cf. Am 4^{1}). Abject poverty side by side with haughty extravagance can never be accepted as rightful by God's prophets. The picture of the fashionable ladies of Jerusalem is decidedly an unpleasant one, and yet it could be illustrated in almost every modern country. More unpleasant still is the description of the future of these spoiled dames, when disease and slavery are their portion. Their attitude of careless gaiety, alongside the suffering masses, finds a parallel in the conduct of the French *noblesse* on the eve of the Revolution—as does their subsequent fate.

16. a tinkling. The sound of the anklets (^{18}) with their connecting chains (^{20}).

18-23. For explanations of the various items in the catalogue see Gray (*I.C.C.*), or Wade (*West. Comm.*).

20. perfume boxes is lit. 'houses of the soul.' Frazer suggests that these were 'amulets in which the soul of the wearer was supposed to lodge': in *Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Taylor*, 148.

25 f. We have here a sudden change from the daughters of Zion to Jerusalem itself figured as a woman lamenting the slaughter of her menfolk.

IV. 1. The male population has been so diminished that the women are unable to obtain husbands for themselves.

called by thy name, i.e. under Thy protection in a time of disorder and anarchy.

our reproach. To be unmarried and childless was considered to be a reproach (Gen 30^{23}; Jg 11^{38}, etc.).

2-6. The Glories of the Redeemed.—The ideas which underlie this poem are such as were common in the post-exilic time and a little before it. The emphasis on the holiness of the dwellers in Zion, the interest in Jerusalem itself, the promise of luxuriant vegetation all seem to point to a late date. On the other hand, much that is similar to the thought of Isaiah, e.g. the escape of the few and the purifying judgement, can also be found in it. The style on the whole favours the later time.

The passage looks forward to an age when the divine judgement will have purified Zion from all uncleanness. In that day, as at the time of the Exodus, God's presence will be known by a cloud by day and by a pillar of fire by night.

2. branch of the Lord. A non-Messianic use (cf. Zech 3^{8}, 6^{12}) which favours an early date. **Branch,** since it means something shooting up from the ground, is better rendered *shoot* or *sprout*.

4. washed . . . burning. Fire is a more searching cleanser than water.

5 f. The text is in some confusion, but the sense is clear. LXX seems to have preserved better readings.

V. 1-7. The Parable of the Vineyard.—The use of parables to enforce a lesson is a common expedient amongst Orientals, and the Jewish people made a frequent use of them in both Old (e.g. Jg 9^{7} ff.; 2 S 12^{1} ff.; Ezek 17^{3} ff., etc.) and New Testaments.

The use of the vineyard to represent Israel is first found in 3^{14}, but it may have been older than Isaiah. From his

day, however, it became a popular figure: cf. Jer 2 [21], 12 [10] f.; Ps 80 [8] ff.; Mt 20 [1] ff., 21 [33] ff., etc.

The song of the vineyard may well have been delivered at a vintage festival when the country people would have flocked into Jerusalem. The subject was well suited to win their sympathies, and as Isaiah described the care lavished by his friend upon his vineyard, no doubt approving murmurs came from his auditors. The story was so framed that unwittingly they had passed judgement before realizing that they themselves were being condemned (cf. 2 S 12 [5] f.; Mt 21 [41]). When the secret is actually revealed, a change in rhythm and the use of assonance gives tremendous force to it. The whole poem from a literary and artistic point of view is admirable.

2. a tower. Not a mere booth (1 [8]).

a winepress. Better a *vat* (cf. margin). This would be hewn out of the rock.

5. eaten up. 'Much of the present treeless character of Palestine is due to the grazing off of unprotected shoots by goats' (Gray).

6. the clouds. This must have made the hearers begin to see the inner significance of the poem. Peake compares David's ban upon Gilboa (2 S 1 [21]) as evidence that God need not necessarily have been suggested; but the parallel is not exact, for David's words were no command, but a mere rhetorical wish.

7. Wade attempts to produce the assonances of the original by rendering: *he looked for rule, and behold misrule: for redress, and behold distress.*

8-24. Denunciations of Evil-doers.—This passage consists of a series of woes pronounced against various offenders, all members of the wealthy classes. Originally they existed independently, and no doubt were uttered at different periods, before being collected together here.

The two greatest evils centre round the appropriation of the soil and indulgence in strong drink, the twin forms in which the desire for wealth and the desire for pleasure are continually expressing themselves (cf. G. A. Smith).

8-10. The grasping landowners are denounced who wish to extend their estates at the expense of the smaller holders. The loss of land in Judah almost involved the loss of civil rights, and tended to reduce the free citizen to the position of a serf. The punishment of those who desire to be alone in the midst of their possessions will be the loneliness of desolation and ruin.

10. acres. About half the measure of an English acre.

bath. About 8 gallons.

ephah. A tenth of a homer (Ezek 45 [11]).

11-17. The first part of this section is a denunciation of the drunken revellers of Jerusalem, who are so engrossed in earthly and sensual pleasure that the operations of God are meaningless to them; by their conduct the nation is being brought to ruin ([11-13]). Something seems to be needed before [14], perhaps a denunciation of the pride of Jerusalem, which promises utter destruction to the city. There is in [15] f. a reminiscence of the refrain in 2 [11], etc.

11. early. To be drunken in the morning was a rare offence amongst the Jews (cf. Ec 10 [16] f.; Ac 2 [15]).

14. their glory, etc. The Hebrew reads *her* **glory,** etc.: the reference is, not to the revellers, but to Jerusalem.

17. shall . . . feed. After the desolation of the country it will become pasturage.

strangers. Better *fatlings* (Duhm) or, by a slight change, *kids*.

18 f. A denunciation of the proud scoffers who jeer at the delay in God's judgements. Their very actions are like cords drawing the consequences of sin upon them. 'This figure of sinners jeering at the approach of a calamity while they actually wear the harness of its carriage is very striking' (G. A. Smith).

20. The fourth denunciation is directed against those who deliberately perverted moral distinctions by their sophistry.

21. The fifth denunciation exposes the folly of the self-confident. Isaiah here had in mind, no doubt, those who relied on political sagacity rather than trust in God; who put, as politicians in all ages have done, expediency before principle.

22 f. A denunciation of drunkenness and corruption in those who administer justice. Since drunkenness in general has already been denounced ([11]), its reappearance must be for condemnation as a root of injustice.

24. The conclusion to the whole series of woes. For the figures used cf. 14 [29], 37 [31]; Am 2 [9]; Job 18 [16], etc.

25-30. The Anger of the Lord.—In the English version these verses follow [24] fairly smoothly; a different Hebrew word, however, is used for **Therefore** than that in [24], and if these verses follow **Therefore** itself is unnecessary. Most recent critics think that they should follow 10 [4] (note the refrain of 9 [12, 17, 21]).

The passage consists of an account,

vivid and horrible, of the approach of an invading army. The enemy flow on with irresistible might, and their roaring is like that of a lion. The final prospect is that of 'a desolate land by the sound of a hungry sea.' The invader is not named, but Assyria is obviously suggested (cf. Am 6 14).

25. did tremble. Probably through an earthquake, a rare event in Palestine.

26. nations. Better *nation* (LXX): the rest of the verse is singular (cf. margin).

28. hoofs. In ancient times horses were seldom shod.

30. The meaning of this verse is uncertain owing to the corrupt state of the text.

VI. **Isaiah's Call.**—Older commentators regarded the call as the renewal, not the commencement, of Isaiah's ministry. To anyone who looked upon the contents of a prophetical book as arranged in chronological order such a conclusion was inevitable. We now know that chronological order was not the most important consideration in the arranging of the book, and are free to regard this story as the actual beginning of the prophet's career. The vision is dated in the year King Uzziah died (1), that is, about 740 B.C., but the contents of the chapter suggest that it was not committed to writing until some time had elapsed.

The experience which befell Isaiah was no imaginary one; he really saw, though not with the eyes of the body, the things which he describes. First there came the impression of God, high and exalted, surrounded by His adoring court; then a realization of his own unworthiness, both as an individual and as a member of a wicked people. There followed a symbolical act by which the prophet's lips were cleansed, and so he was made ready to respond to the divine invitation to service. But his commission to the people was accompanied by a twofold warning of its consequences—the people will become hardened under his preaching, and punishment will be inflicted upon the nation so that only a 'remnant' will be left. Most preachers begin their ministry with high hopes of success: Isaiah was conscious from the first that he must fail—except in the case of the few.

Cheyne thinks that the immediate object of the vision was to set before Isaiah the ideal of prophecy as a life-work, and thus to correct the primitive view which made it depend upon isolated moments of ecstasy.

1. In the year, etc. After the Exile the death of the High Priest marked the epoch: cf. Nu 35 28 (P).

king Uzziah died. G. A. Smith thinks that the miserable end of Uzziah turned Isaiah from relying upon an earthly monarch to seek the heavenly King. The vision coincided with 'the passing away of the young man's hero-worship and the dawn of his faith.'

2. seraphim. Here only as members of the divine court. In other passages the word is applied to serpents (14 29, 30 6; Nu 21 6; Dt 8 15); its real meaning, however, is 'fiery ones.' There may be a possible reference to the serpent afterwards destroyed by Hezekiah (2 K 18 4). Cheyne thinks that just as the cherubim are the clouds (cf. Ps 18 10 f.; Ezek 28 14), so the seraphim are the serpent-like lightning.

six wings. The various uses to which the wings are put teach us the several lessons of reverence, humility, and activity.

3. Holy, holy, holy. The threefold repetition of a word adds emphasis to it (cf. Jer 7 4, 22 29; Ezek 21 27). In this case 'it gains special appropriateness from the Christian doctrine of the Trinity' (Wade).

6. a live coal. Better *a glowing stone*, the ordinary means of conveying heat. For fire as purifier, cf. Nu 31 22 f.; Mal 3 2; Mt 3 11.

7. thy lips. Pure lips are necessary in those who serve the Lord (Zeph 3 9).

iniquity . . . sin. 'It is not merely sin, it is iniquity that is removed from him. . . . Every religion recognizes sin; it is that which is displeasing to the object of worship, or which interferes with the realization of the religious ideal. But in most religions, including that of early Israel, it has no moral content. A thing may be sin which does not affect the conscience in the least. Thus to the strict Hindu a breach of caste regulations is sin, though the act in itself may be harmless or even beneficial. On the other hand, iniquity, i.e. acts which a man's conscience recognizes as morally wrong, may not offend the god at all, and are therefore altogether outside the pale of religion' (T. H. Robinson, *Clar. Bib.*, iii. 145).

8. for us. The heavenly court (cf. Job 1 6, 38 7, etc.).

I said. The volunteering of a prophet is not very common: contrast Moses (Ex 3 11 ff., etc.) and Jeremiah (Jer 1 4 ff.).

10. fat. That is, coarse and dull.

13. so the holy seed . . . thereof. Not in LXX, and evidently a late gloss. Its omission makes the call one to entire condemnation.

VII. 1-9. The Threat from Syria and Ephraim.—At the beginning of the reign of Ahaz (*c.* 735 B.C.) an attempt was made by Syria and Israel to bring Judah into subjection. Ahaz, in alarm, prepared Jerusalem for a siege. Isaiah thereupon gave him a first message of encouragement: Syria and Ephraim were like smoking fire-brands, annoying but having no flame which could do real damage, and would both perish within a few years.

1. This verse comes from 2 K 16 5.

could not prevail. The approach of Assyria prevented any serious attack.

2. **is confederate with:** lit. resteth upon. Perhaps intended to describe the presence of Syrian troops in Ephraimite territory.

3. **Shear-jashub:** that is *A remnant shall return.* The child illustrated his father's teaching (see 4 3, 6 13, 10 22).

conduit, etc. This site has not been identified; it was afterwards memorable for the speech of Rabshakeh (36 2).

6. **Tabeel.** A Syrian name; he was possibly the father of Rezin.

8. **within threescore, etc.** The reference is obscure, and the statement seems out of place here. Some scholars connect it with Assyrian schemes for colonizing Samaria with aliens (Ezr 4 2. 10; 2 K 17 24).

10-16. The Sign of Immanuel.—We do not know what happened between the giving of the two signs. Perhaps Ahaz, distrusting the divine promise of security, had already called in the Assyrians. When a second sign is offered by Isaiah, Ahaz refuses 'to tempt the Lord,' a mere excuse for keeping to the line of policy which he had already decided upon. The prophet in anger promises a sign which God will give unasked: some Jewish damsel will have a son, to be called 'God-is-with-us,' and before he is old enough to choose between good and evil Syria and Ephraim will have been overrun by the Assyrians. The prophecy is of interest to Christians because of the use made of it in Mt 1 23 in connexion with our Lord's birth. As delivered by Isaiah, its only reference was to the immediate future, and amongst the Jews it was never connected with the Messiah: see Gore, *Dissertations*, 289 f.

14. **a virgin.** The Hebrew word (*'almah*) means 'a young woman,' and if emphasis on virginity had been required another word (*bethulah*) would have been used. LXX renders *parthenos*, which does mean *virgin*, but there is no evidence that any significance was attached to it before our Lord's birth. This is an important point, since hostile critics hold that the Christian doctrine of the Virgin Birth was suggested by this amongst other passages. The exact contrary seems to be true: our Lord was born of a Virgin, and in consequence the passage applied to Him. The Jewish commentators were undecided as to whether the prophet is referring to his own wife or the wife of Ahaz.

Butter and honey. Rather *Curds and wild honey*, nourishment suggesting a desolated land.

Immanuel. The mother gave to her child a name which showed her trust in God's presence with His people—the lesson which Ahaz refused to learn. The name 'God-is-with-us' received a new meaning when our Lord was born: in itself it would not suggest the Incarnation.

17-25. The Coming Ruin of Judah.—This passage is not addressed to Ahaz, and it may be perhaps later than 1-16. A time is coming upon Judah such as has not been equalled since the separation. Both Egypt and Assyria (but see note on 18) are being summoned by Jehovah; they will occupy the land, even the caves and thickets (presumably to give battle to one another). The whole country will be spoiled, and those of the inhabitants who escape will return to a pastoral life, for agriculture and the cultivation of the vine will be impossible, since briars and thorns will be everywhere.

18. The descriptions following **fly** and **bee** are probably glosses. Egypt did not advance into Judah, and the mention of it was perhaps suggested by 18 1.

20. **hired.** Ahaz had bribed Assyria (2 K 16 7f).

24. **arrows.** Weapons would be necessary because of the increase of wild beasts.

VIII. 1-4. The Twofold Sign of Warning.—This sign refers to the same event, the fall of Damascus, as did those in the previous chapter. As Damascus fell in 732 B.C. the passage may well be dated 734 B.C. Isaiah is bidden to prepare a large notice-board and on it to write 'For Maher-shalal-hash-baz,' that is 'Swift [is] spoil, speedy [is] prey.' This sign was intended, not for the king, but for the people at large, and its significance would be obvious. A further opportunity of declaring the same message was furnished by the birth of a son, to whom the prophet gave the same ominous name.

1. **with the pen of a man.** RVm in common characters gives the sense. The ability to read was evidently widespread.

4. Samaria survived Damascus for ten years until 722 B.C.

5-18. Various Autobiographical Fragments.

5-8. Since the people have rejected the soft-flowing waters of Shiloah (symbolizing God's gentle governance), the Lord is about to bring upon them the fierce waters of the Euphrates (i.e. the might of the Assyrian army). This prophecy must come from 735 B.C. when Ahaz had determined to rely upon Tiglath-pileser (2 K 16 [7]).

6. The waters of Shiloah. The same as the pool of Siloam. The waters flowed along a channel of easy gradient, and so went softly or smoothly.

rejoice in. The text seems to be corrupt, as Judah did not rejoice in Rezin. A slight change in the original gives the reading *despond because of.*

7. the River, that is Euphrates.

9 f. This short oracle with its challenging appeal to distant nations seems to belong to a time later than that of Isaiah.

10. God is with us. A reference to Immanuel (see on 7 [14]), which suggests that already He has special significance.

11-15. This oracle belongs to the period before the downfall of Israel. The prophet exhorts his disciples to trust in Jehovah, and not to join in the popular panic.

11. strong hand. Cf. Jer 15 [17]; Ezek 1 [3], 3 [14], etc.

12. A conspiracy. This is a reference to the alliance of Syria and Israel against Judah. A slight emendation gives the reading 'A holy thing,' and so connects with [13], but this is hardly necessary.

14. stone . . . rock. Jehovah was the real defence of His people, and to those who ignore or defy Him He becomes a stone of stumbling (cf. Rom 9 [33]; 1 P 2 [8]).

16-18. This passage suggests that Isaiah's public ministry has been a failure and his message rejected. He now determines to entrust it to a small band of disciples in order that, when the punishments which he has foretold come upon the nation, his reputation as a prophet may be vindicated. In the meantime he and his children with their symbolical names will remain as warnings.

16. my disciples. The mention of Isaiah's personal followers is very interesting and important. It must be remembered, however, that LXX and Syriac evidently had a text which omitted them.

18. in mount Zion. We have here the first foreshadowing of the doctrine which became so prominent in Isaiah's teaching—the inviolability of Jerusalem.

19-22. Further Detached Oracles.—This passage is made up of a number of detached fragments. The whole is obscure and the text probably corrupt. Whilst these fragments may be Isaiah's, any certain clue to date or even to authorship is lacking.

The opening fragment ([19] f.) contains a warning against what is now called Spiritualism, that is having recourse to wizards and sorcerers—a practice common enough in times of panic and danger, when the normal practice of religion seems to require an abnormal supplement.

The following verses ([21] f.) represent the desperate state of famished men seeking everywhere for sustenance and finding none. In their agony they curse king and God alike, and pass away into gloom and darkness.

19. familiar spirits . . . wizards. The reference is to the spirits of the dead who were supposed by the Semites, as by other ancient peoples, to have knowledge and power greater than those of the living.

their god. God (*Elohim*) may here mean spirits, as in 1 S 28 [13], and the final clauses must then be read as a continuation of the sentiments of the first, not as a protest against them.

20. the law and the testimony (cf. [16]). In the revelation of Jehovah sufficient knowledge is contained to satisfy all reasonable needs.

21. through it. Some such word as 'land' needs to be supplied: the verse is out of its context.

by their king, etc. The reading of RVm, which is based on Vulgate, should be followed: **curse their king and their God.** To curse the king was blasphemy (1 K 21 [9-13]), but the reference here is probably to some deity adopted in place of Jehovah (cf. Am 5 [26]).

IX. 1-7. **The Coming Messiah.**—The date of this prophecy has been much disputed. It may belong to the time of the fall of the northern kingdom, to Sennacherib's invasion of Judah in 701 B.C. (notice **throne of David** in [7]), to the period of the Exile, or it may be as late as the Maccabæan age (see *J. Th. S.*, vii, 321 ff.). Probably an early date is demanded by the absence of any mention of returning exiles. The theory that a passage is late because it is Messianic or eschatological must now be abandoned, since such anticipations cannot be limited to the most advanced stages of religion.

[1] is a prose link with the passage immediately preceding. The poem itself is one tremendous burst of rejoicing, the fruit of a sudden and unexpected change of fortune. The power of the oppressor is

shattered, and a child has been born to sit upon the throne of David who will combine in his single person the insight of the statesman, the valour of the warrior, the loving care of a father, and the power which will enable him to keep his enemies in subjection.

In the prophecy itself the child is already born. But it was the habit of the prophets to speak of things yet to be as actually present to them. The combination of qualities in the coming ruler obviously points forward to the Messiah, whose victorious career fills the soul of the prophet with ecstasy. The Church has connected this passage with the Divine Child born on Christmas Day, One whose victories were to be of a far different quality.

1. in the former time. Tiglath-pileser carried away many of the inhabitants in 734 B.C. (2 K 15 ^{29}).

Zebulon . . . Naphtali. Tribes to the west and north-west of the Sea of Chinnereth or Galilee.

2. The writer of the 1st Gospel saw in the sojourn of our Blessed Lord at Capernaum a fulfilment of the prophecy of this and the previous verse (Mt 4 ^{15} f.).

4. the day of Midian. A reference to Gideon's victory (Jg 6-8, and cf. Ps 83 ^{11}).

5. all the armour, etc. Read *every boot of him that tramps noisily.*

6. Mighty God. Better *Divine Warrior.*

Everlasting Father. One whose fatherhood over his people will never come to an end.

IX. 8-X. 4. **Jehovah's Anger against Ephraim.**—This passage is amongst the earliest of the prophecies of Isaiah, for according to 9 ^{11} f. Syria is opposed to Ephraim, and therefore the coalition of 735 B.C. has not yet taken place. The prophecy most probably refers to events still to come, and is not a mere reading back of lessons in the past. The poem consists of three, and possibly four, strophes with a refrain; another strophe is probably to be found in 5 $^{25-30}$.

IX. 8-12. The pride of Ephraim is about to be brought low by the agency of the neighbouring peoples. The boastful self-confidence of the men of Israel, which saw in disaster only the opportunity for renewed splendour, will prove a deception.

10. stone . . . cedar. These materials are still rare in Palestine, and represent luxurious building (cf. Am 5 ^{11}; Jer 22 ^{14} f.). Large building operations were a feature of the middle years of the 8th century (see Mic 3 ^{10}, etc.).

11. the adversaries of Rezin. The text is obscure, since the Syrians, Rezin's own people, seem to be meant: read *his adversary Rezin,* or with LXX *the adversary of Mount Zion.*

13-17. Jehovah's insatiable anger against Ephraim, the product of the nation's continued defiance, will be manifested in a disaster which will affect all classes of the people.

14. palm-branch and rush. The lofty and the lowly.

17. fatherless and widows. The inclusion of these classes amongst the victims is a testimony to the corruption which has aroused so severe a judgement.

18-21. Like a forest fire, which begins in the undergrowth and then spreads to the trees, wickedness has gone through the nation. The people in their distress behave like cannibals.

20. his own arm. A slight change in the Hebrew gives the reading *his neighbour* (cf. Jer 19 ^{9}).

X. 1-4. This section is a protest against a crime which was all too common, the denial of justice to the poor and friendless. Punishment and vengeance are coming upon those who are guilty.

4. This seems to be corrupt in text. For **They shall . . . prisoners** Lagarde conjectures *Beltis boweth down, Osiris is broken.* Beltis could be used as a fem. of Baal, and would represent Isis, who, like Osiris, was an Egyptian deity.

5-34. A Judgement upon Assyria.—This prophecy passes judgement upon the great world-power of Isaiah's day, and shows that Jehovah is supreme over even these proud boasters. A number of insertions have been made into the passage, but as a whole it seems to be by Isaiah and to come from the period between the capture of Carchemish by Assyria (^{9}), in 717 B.C., and an Assyrian invasion, probably that of Sennacherib in 701.

5-15. Assyria is Jehovah's weapon against an ungodly people, but in blind self-boasting the Assyrian regards his divine office only as an opportunity for plunder and cruel conquest. The gods of the heathen have not defended their cities against him; shall Jerusalem be protected by Jehovah? The prophet foretells a fitting punishment for all this insolence which he goes on to describe. The Assyrian has obliterated national boundaries, seized the treasures of other people, and has so overawed the earth that none dare resist him. None the less he is but an instrument in the hands of God, and for the instrument to resist its owner is madness.

5. Omit **in whose hand is** (possibly borrowed from ^{24}) and insert *of.*

8. he saith. The king speaking in the name of the nation.

9. Calno. Probably the Calneh of Am 6 [2]. A district named **Kullani** was subdued by Tiglath-pileser in 738.

Carchemish. One of the chief cities of the Hittites. Taken by Sargon in 717. The modern town is called Jerabis, and stands on the right bank of the Euphrates some fifty miles north-east of Kullani.

Hamath. The Greek Epiphaneia and the modern Hamah, a city on the Orontes. It fell to Tiglath-pileser in 740, but rebelling it was recaptured by Sargon in 720.

Samaria fell to Sargon in 722.

Damascus, the famous Syrian capital, was captured in 732.

Arpad was captured in 740. The modern site is Tell Erpad, near Aleppo.

10. idols. The original word means nonentities.

16-19 are obscure in form, though the meaning is plain. The Assyrians are to be destroyed by adversity, and possibly sickness, just as a forest is burnt by fire.

17. the light of Israel is Jehovah (cf. 2 [5]).

18. standardbearer fainteth. This is a striking figure for the ruin of an army, but the context (cf. [16a]) favours the reading of margin, **sick man pineth away.**

20-23 can hardly be in the right place, since their omission would make [24] follow naturally on [19]. The teaching is that of Isaiah: Israel is to learn the folly of trusting in an earthly power, but only a remnant will return of all the multitudes of the nation.

20. that smote him. That is Assyria.

22. Quoted in Rom 9 [27] as fulfilled in the failure of the majority of Jews to accept the Christ.

24-27. The inhabitants of Zion are encouraged to be patient in their trials. God's indignation will soon have passed, and then the Assyrians shall be destroyed as were the Midianites by Gideon or the Egyptians at the Red Sea. The burden and the yoke shall be removed.

24. the manner of Egypt. See Ex 2 [11], 5 [14].

26. Midian. See Jg 7 [25].

his rod. Probably a reference to the rod of Moses (Ex 14 [26] f.); the text is obscure, and something seems to have fallen out.

27. and the yoke . . . anointing. This sentence is quite obscure. The present text suggests the figure of an ox which becomes so fat and lusty (**anointing** is better rendered *fatness*) as to break its yoke. Duhm ingeniously conjectures that under the obscurity lies a geographical name which he connects with [28]: *He is ascended from Pené Rimmon.*

28-34. The advance of the Assyrian army is graphically described as in Mic 1. The description is imaginative since the route of Sennacherib's army was from Philistia, and the places named here are all to the north of Jerusalem. The lesson of the poem is the certainty of the Assyrian advance, the utter weakness of Jerusalem, and God's willingness and ability to defend it.

28. Aiath is probably Ai, now Tell-el-Ḥajar, 9 miles north-north-east of Jerusalem.

Migron, now Makrun, near Michmash.

Michmash is the modern Muḥmas, seven miles from Jerusalem.

his baggage. This was left behind in order to cross the Wâdy-es-Suwênit more easily.

29. Geba is five miles north of Jerusalem, and **Ramah** two miles to its west. **Gibeah** is not certainly known.

30. Anathoth, the home of Jeremiah.

32. Nob was the home of a body of priests in David's time (1 S 22 [19]).

33 f. The city seems to be at the mercy of Assyria, when God suddenly intervenes and saves it.

XI. 1-9. The Messiah, His Equipment and Kingdom.—The connexion between this passage and 9 [1-7] is exceedingly close, for both put forward a similar conception of the attributes and functions of the coming Messiah. There is one notable difference, however, in the manner in which the conception is delineated. The earlier passage describes the Messianic age in 'its broadest and most general features . . . and only at the end centres itself in the person of the Wonderful Child who is born to ascend the throne' (Skinner). The present passage begins with the Messiah, and then goes on to describe his work.

There is no sufficient reason for doubting Isaiah's authorship of the passage, for the implied statement that the Davidic monarchy had been overthrown ([1]) might quite well be written before that event.

The Messiah, like another, is to spring from the root of Jesse; to Him God will give His spirit in its sixfold manifestation. By means of this equipment the Messiah will inaugurate a new era of justice and peace, the benefits of which will extend even to the animal world.

2. the spirit of the Lord, etc. The six attributes of the Divine Spirit divide up into three pairs, which belong respectively to the intellectual, the practical, and the moral or religious spheres.

6. The loss by animals of their blood-thirsty habits is regarded by more than one writer as a mark of the Golden Age: cf. Virgil, *Eclogue*, iv, 21 f., 24 f.; Horace, *Epodes*, xvi, 51 f., and see additional note in Wade, 85.

the wolf . . . lamb . . . lion. These appear in a similar passage in 65 [25].

9. This verse appears to be copied in 65 [25] and Hab 2 [14], though some scholars think that it is itself a compilation from them.

10-16. A Prophecy of Return and of Victory.—The contents of this prophecy are against its being attributed to Isaiah. (*a*) The wide dispersion of the people [(11)] suggests the exilic period, since before that time captives had been taken to Assyria for the most part (2 K 15 [29], 17 [6]). (*b*) The conception of Israel as the supreme teacher of the Gentiles [(10)] was scarcely formulated so early as the time of Isaiah.

In the future age Jehovah will gather the remnant of His people from Israel as well as from Judah. The hatred between the two families will cease, and in victorious alliance they will fall upon the neighbouring peoples. As the Red Sea was dried up before the generation of the Exodus, so will it be again, and in addition the mighty Euphrates will be split up into channels so that men may cross over them.

10. root of Jesse. Cf. [1].

ensign. To direct the travellers.

11. a second time. This suggests that one return from exile has already taken place; at the same time it *may* refer to the Exodus.

Pathros is Upper Egypt, and **Cush** is Ethiopia.

Elam. The country east of the Tigris and north-east of the Persian Gulf.

Shinar is Babylonia.

islands of the sea. Here and in 24 [15] and Esth 10 [1]. The **sea** is the Mediterranean, and **islands** must be taken in a wide sense as coasts.

13. Cf. Hos 1 [11], 3 [5].

15. the River is the Euphrates.

16. an high way. Cf. 35 [8].

XII. Two Hymns of Thanksgiving.—This burst of praise closes the first section of the Book of Isaiah. The two hymns which go to make it up can scarcely come from the prophet himself, since they appear to be for the most part copied from later passages; close affinities can be discovered, for example, with Ex 15, Ps 105, and also with 24-27 of the present book (upon which see notes).

The dividing point between the two songs is [3], which should probably be connected with the previous verse rather than with what follows. (*a*) The singer, speaking in the name of the whole people, praises God for turning His anger into comfort. In Jehovah is the nation's abiding trust [(1-3)]. (*b*) The people are exhorted to declare God's praises amongst all nations [(4-6)].

2. the Lord, etc. Cf. Ex 15 [2].

3. wells of salvation. A forceful metaphor to an Eastern people.

4. Cf. Ps 105 [1] f.; 148 [13].

XIII. 1-XIV. 23. The Overthrow of Babylon.—This oracle can hardly belong to the days of Isaiah, for at that time Babylon was on friendly terms with Judah, and had not yet recovered its independence from Assyria. The poem, moreover, looks back upon a period during which Israel has been held captive by Babylonian oppressors [(14 [2])]. 'The prophecy, therefore, must have been unintelligible to the contemporaries of Isaiah; and on the principle that the prophet always addresses himself primarily to the circumstances of his own time, we must assign these chapters to the closing years of the Babylonian captivity' (Skinner).

XIII. 1-8. An ensign is to be set up as a rallying point for the warriors whom Jehovah is gathering together from all quarters. So fierce will these warriors be that their enemies will be seized with terror and panic at the mere sight of them.

1. This verse is an editorial addition.

burden is better rendered *oracle*, as in margin.

2. of the nobles. A reference to the Babylonians as the ruling race.

3. consecrated ones. War was a holy undertaking, and those engaged in it were therefore under various restrictions.

4. the mountains. The Medes who were to destroy Babylon mustered in the Zagros range beyond the Tigris.

6. Cf. Joel 1 [15].

8. faces of flame. Burning with excitement or with shame.

9-13. The day of the Lord is coming in fierceness and suffering. Various convulsions of nature will accompany it, and the wicked and the arrogant will receive special punishment. So severe will be the visitation that men will be rarer than precious metal. Heaven and earth alike will quake in the fierceness of the divine anger.

10. Darkness as a terrifying feature of the day of the Lord is common: see 5 [30], 8 [22]; Mic 3 [6], and in the New Testament Mk 13 [24]; Mt 24 [29].

12. Ophir. Probably a district in

south-east Arabia (cf. Gen 10 [29]). Other suggested places are south-east Africa and even the west coast of India.

14-22. Babylon no doubt was in the prophet's mind when he denounced the arrogant in [11]; in this closing passage the condemnation becomes quite definite. The foreign population will flee away, otherwise they will share in the dreadful fate of the natives. The Medes will sack Babylon and show no pity. So great will be the fall of the glorious city that no recovery can be hoped for; not even the wandering Bedouin will pitch their tents on its site, but it will be left for the wild beasts and doleful creatures of the desert.

The first part of the prophecy was not fulfilled, since Babylon saved itself from the atrocities which befall a captured city by a voluntary surrender in 538. The forecast of speedy desolation was also avoided. Babylon was partly abandoned after the lapse of several centuries, but its site has, unlike Nineveh, never been entirely without inhabitants. See note on 'The Fate of Babylon' in my *Jeremiah* (*West. Comm.*), 373 ff.

14. Babylon had a large foreign population attracted thither by its importance as a centre of trade.

17. the Medes were a nation of mountaineers dwelling south-west of the Caspian Sea. They marched upon Babylon under Cyrus in conjunction with his Persian troops.

19. the Chaldeans' pride. The Chaldeans first established their power over Babylon under Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadrezzar, in 625 B.C. They originally dwelt in south-east Babylonia.

21. satyrs. LXX *daimonia*. Some kind of supernatural creature is evidently meant, such as, according to the Semites, haunted desert places.

XIV. **1-23.** This passage consists of an introduction ([1-4a]) which connects it with what has gone before, a taunt-song over the King of Babylon ([4b-21]), and an epilogue ([22] f.) which comes most probably from an editor.

The introduction foretells the coming mercy of the Lord, who will not only restore Jacob, but will also draw other nations to Him as proselytes and as servants. In that day of relief from sorrow and fear a taunt-song will be sung against the King of Babylon.

The song itself, one of the most spirited of all Hebrew poems, falls into five strophes. In the first ([4b-8]) the author describes the fall of the oppressor who once overawed the nations. In consequence all is now at rest, and even the earth and the trees rejoice because the cause of tumult and destruction has been removed. The second and third strophes ([9-15]) give an account of the reception which meets the disturber in Sheol. The shades of ancient kings speak from their thrones in amazement that the great monarch is reduced to their own low estate. Like a bright star descending suddenly into darkness all his power is gone; he who seemed worthy of aspiring to divine honours now lies in the lowest depths of the pit. The last two strophes ([16-21]) describe the corpse of the dead king lying unburied on the battlefield. This dreadful fate will come upon him because he has not only ravaged foreign lands, but been the destroyer of his own people in addition. The end of the last strophe is missing, and the text is in much confusion.

The epilogue describes the ruin of Babylon in terms which suggest the influence of 13 [20] ff.

1. strangers. The reference here is to the *sojourner* temporarily resident with the tribe and living under its protection. The word seems here to have the late meaning of 'proselyte.'

4. parable. Better *taunt-song*, as in Nu 21 [27] (where see my note in *West. Comm.*). The poem is written in the Qinah or elegiac metre.

the king of Babylon. Cf. the elegy on Pharaoh in Ezek 32 [18] ff.

the golden city. Read *the insolent one*.

8. Cf. Hab 2 [17], 'the violence done to Lebanon.'

9. the dead. Hebrew *Rephaim* or *shades*.

chief ones. Hebrew *he-goats* or *bell-wethers*, a term used by a chronicler to describe the leaders of a revolt in Exeter: see Freeman, *Exeter*, 117.

11. the worm. His fate seems to be more degraded than that of the other kings.

12. day star. AV Lucifer following Vulgate, which gives the literal meaning *radiant one*. The planet Venus was worshipped by the Babylonians under the name Ishtar.

13 ff. Cf. Ezek 28 [2] ff. for a similar ambition on the part of the prince of Tyre. Our Lord's language in condemnation of Capernaum seems to have been suggested by these verses (Mt 11 [23]; Lk 10 [15]).

13. the north. Many peoples locate the home of their gods on a northern mountain.

19. Amongst ancient peoples the suitable disposal of the corpse was exceedingly important, and one of the most horrible threats against an offender was that his

body should remain without burial: cf. my note on Jer 22 [19] (*West. Comm.*).

23. porcupine. *Owl*, of the Syriac, would be a better rendering. In Zeph 2 [14] the creature is associated with the pelican.

pools. Any failure to keep up the irrigation system of Babylon would result in floods.

24-27. The Destruction of Assyria.—There are no good reasons for denying the Isaianic authorship of this short oracle; the style is that of Isaiah, and the message, such as he was continually proclaiming (cf. 10 [5] ff., 17 [12] ff., 30 [27] ff., 31 [8] f.). Those who deny the genuineness of the fragment do so mainly on the ground that the prophet's outlook was not sufficiently wide to take in all the nations ([26]), an arbitrary and unnecessary assumption.

Jehovah is about to destroy the Assyrians, and to do it upon the mountains of His own land. The destruction of Assyria which He purposes will have a world-wide effect, and is certain of accomplishment.

25. my land. The punishment of the nations before Jerusalem is common in apocalyptic literature (cf. Joel 3, etc.).

28-32. The Doom of Exulting Philistia.—This prophecy may also be attributed to Isaiah, although the heading probably comes from a later hand. So far as we know Ahaz did not oppress the Philistines, and therefore exultation over his death would hardly be called for.* The real oppressors of the Philistines in this period were the kings of Assyria, and the death of an Assyrian monarch was frequently followed by the throwing off of the Assyrian yoke by the small subject nations. On two occasions during the lifetime of Isaiah, Philistia actually rebelled in such circumstances, in 720 soon after the accession of Sargon, and again when Sennacherib had in turn succeeded to him. Duhm rejects the early date, and refers the poem to the triumph of Alexander over Darius at Issus in 333 B.C.

The Philistines rejoicing over the fall of their oppressor are warned that another, more terrible, will take his place. Out of the threatening north (cf. Jer 1 [14]) the tyrant will come to bring to an end all untimely hopes. Judah is in a far different case, because Judah relies on Jehovah, the divine founder of Zion.

28. In the year, etc. Cf. 6 [1], 20 [1].

29. the rod. A frequent symbol of oppression.

* But we only know of Hezekiah's drastic treatment of Padi, King of Ekron, from *cuneiform* sources.—A. G.

basilisk. See on 11 [8].

30. the firstborn of the poor shall feed. The reading should perhaps be *the poor shall feed on my mountains.* If **firstborn** is retained it means *the very poorest.*

poor . . . needy. The impoverished inhabitants of Judah.

32. the messengers. The Philistines on more than one occasion sent ambassadors to Judah in order to form an alliance against Assyria. In 705 Hezekiah actually received the King of Ekron from his revolted subjects, whom he had displeased by his pro-Assyrian policy.

XV., XVI. An Oracle on Moab.—The present passage has evidently a long literary history behind it. The original oracle, which was probably an elegy on Moab, consists of 15 [1-9a], 16 [7-11]. This oracle has been broken up by a prophecy (15 [9b]-16 [6-12]) from the hand of a different writer. Finally, a still later writer has added an epilogue (16 [13] f.) reaffirming the truth of the older prophecy and announcing its speedy fulfilment. Much of the prophecy has been interwoven into the oracle against Moab contained in Jer 48, though with many changes, especially in the order.

Many scholars think that the prophecy referred in the first instance to the recovery of Moab by Jeroboam II, implied in 2 K 14 [25]. If the oracle in its final form was put forth by Isaiah, the occasion would doubtless be the threat to Moab from Sargon's campaign in Palestine in 711.

XV. 1-9. A sudden disaster has come upon the chief strongholds of Moab. The whole land in consequence is given up to mourning and terror. The tide of invasion moves up towards the north, and the fugitives seek refuge in Zoar and Eglath-shelishiyah. Some carry their possessions over the brook of the willows into the neighbouring territory of Edom But even the remnant who are left will be exposed to the attacks of a further foe.

1. Ar on the Arnon (Nu 21 [15, 28]), the earlier capital of Moab.

Kir is probably the modern Kerak, about seventeen miles south of the Arnon. It seems identical with Kir-hareseth or Kir Heres (16 [7, 11]; 2 K 3 [25]).

2. He is gone up, etc. Margin *Bayith and Dibon are gone up* should be followed, and a slight emendation made reading *Bath = the daughter of* for *Bayith.*

over Nebo . . . Medeba. For **over** read *upon* with margin; now Jebel Nebā and Mādebā. Mountains were favourite places for lamentation.

4. Jahaz. Nu 21 [23].

5. Zoar (Gen 19 [22]). Near south-east

corner of Dead Sea, probably Khirbet-es-Sāfia.

6. Nimrim. Probably the Wady Numēre, not far from Khirbet-es-Sāfia.

9. Dimon seems to be the same as *Dibon*, the spelling here adopted being intended to give a play upon **blood** (*dām*).

XVI. **1-6.** The scene shifts to the Edomite city of Sela where the fugitive Moabites are gathered. They appeal to the people of Judah for their protection, since Judah is under a righteous government. The plea is rejected on account of the arrogance and double-dealing of Moab.

1. the lambs. Such a tribute was once paid to Israel (2 K 3 [4]).

Sela (2 K 14 [7]) is generally taken to be Petra (cf. margin), but a situation so far south seems unsuitable here. The word means *rock*, and may be used here in this sense and not as the name of a town.

5. a throne, etc. The Moabites promise submission to the Davidic line in return for the kindness which it is asked to exhibit.

6. the pride of Moab (cf. 25 [11]; Zeph 2 [10]; Jer 48 [29]). On each occasion the pride is turned to shame.

7-12. Moab once more turns to lamentation, bewailing the desolate state of her country, the raisin-cakes of Kir-hareseth, the vineyards of Heshbon, and the vine of Sibmah. All the vineyards are spoiled, and the joyous shout of the grape-treaders is hushed. Even the prayers of Moab will be in vain.

7. raisin-cakes. A favourite dainty (Cant 2 [5]) and also a form of religious offering (2 S 6 [19]; Hos 3 [1]).

8. vine of Sibmah. Now called Sūmia, not far from **Heshbon.** Ruined wine-presses have been found there. Milton referred to it as 'The flowing dale of Sibmah clad with vines' (*Par. Lost*, i, 410).

13 f. To the prophecy an epilogue has been added proclaiming the certainty of Moab's downfall and fixing three years as the period within which it will take place.

14. the years of a hireling. A fixed and definite time.

XVII. **1-11. The Fate of Damascus and of Israel.**—Damascus and Israel are here joined together, no doubt on account of the alliance between them against Judah. The prophecy must therefore come approximately from 735 B.C.

Damascus is still the most important town in Syria, and has perhaps the longest record of any city in the world. Its situation in the midst of a wide plain, surrounded by mountains and watered by numerous streams, is very beautiful. The streams make it fertile, but the surrounding hills are an advantage to an attacking force. After its fall in 732 B.C., here foretold, Damascus lapsed into comparative unimportance until the Persian period.

Damascus is to become a ruin, and all its glory shall fade. Israel too must endure a like destiny, for only a tiny remnant shall be left. [The misfortunes of the nation, however, will make men turn to God and desert their idols.] The fortresses shall be forsaken, and all because God, their real stronghold, has been forgotten and trust placed in foreign help.

2. cities of Aroer. The **Aroer** in Gad (Jos 13 [25]) is perhaps meant (cf. 2 K 15 [29]). The suggested reading *cities of Aram* (i.e. Syria) is attractive.

3. The fortress . . . Ephraim. 'Probably . . . Damascus, which appeared to be a bulwark to Ephraim against the Assyrians' (Wade).

5. valley of Rephaim. A valley south-west of Jerusalem, evidently a fertile spot.

6. shaking. Since olive trees were beaten with rods (cf. 24 [13]; Dt 24 [20]), margin **beating** should be followed.

7 f. These verses of consolation are probably not original.

8. Asherim. Jg 6 [25] *v.n.*

sun-images. Associated with Asherim in 27 [9]. They were perhaps some kind of obelisk in honour of a sun-god.

10. pleasant plants. The margin **plantings of Adonis** suggests the so-called gardens of Adonis referred to by Plato (*Phædrus*, 276 B), which were shallow vessels containing plants; on account of the lack of depth the plants grew up quickly and then faded. They were used in connexion with heathen rites. In the recent excavations at Beth-Shan copies of such 'gardens' have been found coming from a very early date: S. A. Cook, *Expos. Times*, 1926, 490. Adonis is the Babylonian god Tammuz.

12-14. The Fate of Assyria.—This short oracle describes the noisy gathering together of the nations with a roar like that of the sea (cf. Jer 6 [23]). God will rebuke them and disperse them with a sudden exhibition of His power.

The situation which best fits the oracle is the threat to Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 B.C.

12. many peoples. The subject peoples who supplied contingents to the Assyrian army.

13. chaff of the mountains (cf. 29 [5], 41 [15]). Threshing-floors were situated

if possible on high ground as being thus more exposed to the wind.

XVIII. **The Ethiopian Ambassadors.**—At the end of the 8th century B.C. Egypt was ruled by an Ethiopian dynasty, and the envoys here described as from Cush probably represented the Egyptian Government, which in 705-702 endeavoured to conclude an alliance with Judah against Assyria.

The oracle, though short and compact, is remarkable for the dignity and vividness of its language. Isaiah pictures the envoys coming from their own country, a land where the silence is continually broken by the buzz of insects' wings, in swift vessels of papyrus down the Nile. In courteous tones he bids them return to their own strong and ancient people, and there await the Lord's signal. The course of events is slowly working out the divine purposes, just as the sun and the dew ripen the fruit for the harvest. When the time is come He will suddenly intervene. The effect of His intervention will be known when the slain of Assyria are spread over the mountains and fields, a prey for birds and beasts. In recognition of the divine power Ethiopia will bring tribute to Jehovah in Zion.

2. the sea. That is, the Nile.

papyrus (cf. Ex 2 [3]). Such vessels would be swift and light, the latter quality being very valuable on a river like the Nile, which was in many places not navigable.

saying. Omit; the prophet is speaking, not Ethiopia.

7 is probably post-exilic (cf. 45 [14], 60 [6] f.).

XIX. **Oracle on Egypt.**—This chapter consists of two sections: (*a*) [1-15], which seems to have been originally poetical in structure and in the main the work of Isaiah; and (*b*) [16-25], a number of prose utterances each beginning with the phrase 'In that day'; these appear to belong to a period long subsequent to the times of Isaiah. There is considerable difference in tone between the two sections, (*a*) being marked by irony and denunciation, whereas (*b*) shows, with the exception of [16] f., a sympathy and toleration of foreigners rare in the Old Testament.

It is difficult to date (*a*), whether we regard it as Isaianic or not. If by Isaiah it foretells the conquest of Egypt by a cruel tyrant ([4]), who is presumably an Assyrian; the reference may be to the expeditions of Sargon in 720 (when he defeated the Egyptian forces at Raphia), or in 711, or to that of Sennacherib in 701. Wade puts the passage late and refers it to the time of Pharaoh Necho, the harsh tone of the utterance being due to the hate which he aroused in Judah. Other scholars place the passage in the Persian period, and it must be admitted that Cambyses (529-522) would be a striking fulfilment of the 'cruel lord' prophecy. The second part (*b*) is probably all post-exilic, and may indeed partly belong to so late a date as 160 B.C. (see note on [18]).

1-15. Jehovah is about to execute justice upon Egypt and her gods, and His punishment will include the stirring up of civil war. In despair of wise counsel Egypt will seek the advice of fortune-tellers, but they will not save her from becoming the prey of a fierce ruler. Furthermore, her natural resources will be cut off, the rivers drying up and the vegetation withering; as a result there will be sorrow for the fisher and those who work in flax. In sarcastic tones the prophet pours scorn on the wisdom of the princes and advisers of Pharaoh, and attributes their folly to the overruling of Jehovah, who has deliberately made them go astray. We cannot, of course, believe that God would act in an arbitrary manner; the prophet isolates the sovereignty of God, and at least for the moment ignores the freedom of man to choose his own way: see further Driver, *Exodus*, 53 f.; Gore, *Romans*, 38.

1. upon a . . . cloud. Cf. Ps 18 [10], 104 [3].

2. Egypt consisted of a number of provinces: these were continually breaking out against one another. The situation fits the early years of the 7th century before Psammetichus (663-610) subdued his rivals.

4. a cruel lord. Psammetichus can hardly be meant, but a foreign tyrant.

6 ff. The prosperity of Egypt then, as now, depended on the Nile.

11. Zoan is Tanis, an ancient city (Nu 13 [22]) once the capital of Egypt. Its site is in the north-east of the delta.

13. Noph is Memphis, which lay on the left bank of the Nile, ten miles south of the modern Cairo; it was a most important city.

15. head or tail, palm-branch or rush. Cf. 9 [14] (note).

17-25. In that day Egypt will be afraid before Judah's God. Five cities in Egypt will speak Hebrew, and swear to Jehovah. An altar and a pillar will be erected in Egypt to Jehovah, and He will deliver Egypt from her foes. When He smites Egypt it will be for her healing. A great high-road will connect Egypt and Assyria, and so foster mutual intercourse and even

common worship. Not only Israel but Egypt and Assyria also will be recognized by Jehovah as His people.

17. a terror. The word is Aramaic, which suggests that the passage is late.

18. five cities. Not many amongst the thousands in Egypt.

language of Canaan. That is Hebrew. In actual fact the Jews in Egypt themselves soon forgot their native speech, and the Old Testament had to be translated into Greek for their use.

city of destruction. Some Hebrew MSS. and LXX read *city of the sun*, that is On or Heliopolis. The word for **destruction** may be translated *lion*, and some see in it a reference to Leontopolis (i.e. lion-city), where Onias IV built a Jewish temple in 160 B.C. Josephus tells us that in appealing to Ptolemy Philometer for permission to build he referred to this prophecy.

19. an altar. The prophet does not intend to limit sacrifice to Jerusalem, thus ignoring the Deuteronomic law of the one sanctuary.

a pillar. This may be merely for a monument, and so would hardly infringe the prohibition of Dt 16 [22].

20. a saviour. Possibly a reference to Ptolemy Lagi (322-285), surnamed Soter (=*saviour*), who seized Egypt after the death of Alexander.

23. Assyria. In later times this meant Syria (originally named Aram).

XX. **The Sign of Egypt's Captivity.**—For three years before the fall of Ashdod Isaiah had gone about unclad and barefoot—the garb of the captive—to symbolize the coming fate of Egypt and Ethiopia at the hand of the Assyrians. Their fate will fill with despair and dismay those who had placed their hopes for deliverance on such feeble helpers.

1. In the year. Ashdod fell in 711 after only a short resistance.

2. This verse does not agree with [3], which presupposes three years already to have elapsed.

naked. This is not exact; the prophet still retained his inner garment.

4. Sargon did not actually fulfil this prophecy.

6. this coastland. The whole of Palestine including Judah and the various other small nations.

XXI. **1-10. The Fall of Babylon.**—This oracle contains a description of the fall of Babylon before the assaults of the Elamites and Medes. The obvious reference is to its capture by Cyrus in 538, in which case Isaiah cannot have been the author. Babylon was actually captured several times during the active period of Isaiah's ministry, but by the Assyrians—who are not mentioned in this passage—and not by the Medes. The style is obscure and abrupt, and not like that normally employed by Isaiah.

The invaders come up like a whirlwind from the desert, and in a vision the prophet sees the horrors which will befall Babylon. The defenders spend their time in feasting, from which they are suddenly called to arms. The prophet is bidden to set a watchman who will give the alarm when he sees the approach of hostile horsemen. At length he announces the coming of the Persians, and in the same breath the fall of Babylon. The prophet assures his downtrodden countrymen that his message comes from Jehovah Himself.

1. the wilderness of the sea. The title is obscure, and no satisfactory explanation can be given. LXX omits **of the sea.**

3. The prophet's sympathy with Babylon is unusual and also needless, for when the city was taken by Cyrus there was apparently no fighting.

5. set a watch. Better with margin **spread the carpets,** upon which the guests would recline.

6. set a watchman. Perhaps, as Peake thinks, 'the prophet himself in his trance condition.' More probably the figure of the watchman is used in order to make the message more vivid.

9. Babylon is fallen. Quoted in Rev 14 [8], 18 [2].

10. my threshing. The Jews are so addressed because of all their humiliations in Babylon.

11 f. Oracle on Edom.—This oracle is as short as it well can be, and consists of a single question and the prophet's answer to it. The occasion and authorship are alike unknown, though the style seems to demand a date later than that of Isaiah. Cheyne suggests 593 B.C. when Edom and Judah were on friendly terms (Jer 27 [3]). Others bring it down much later, in spite of the difficulty of assigning a prophecy so friendly in tone to a time subsequent to the fall of Jerusalem and the taunts of Edom, which seem never to have been forgotten (cf. Ps 137 [7]).

A voice comes to the prophet in his office of watchman and asks if the night is yet gone. The reply is ambiguous—the morning of relief will come, but behind it is night once more.

11. Dumah. Neither of the places of this name in the Old Testament is connected with Edom. The heading may come from a later editor and represent the silence (*Dumah*) of death.

watchman. Hebrew means guardian, a different word from that in [6].

13-17. Oracles on Arab Tribes.—Two tribes are addressed, the Dedanites ([13-15]) and the men of Kedar ([16] f.). The former are addressed with sympathy, the latter in more formal terms. In the time of Isaiah some of the Arab tribes were subdued by Assyria, and this oracle may refer to that process. It is better, however, to date it with the preceding sections. The last two verses may be older and have become attached to [13-15] owing to similarity of subject-matter.

The caravans of the Dedanites have to take refuge in the forest (better *bush*) in order to avoid their enemies. They are thus cut off from the oasis, and the men of Tema are bidden (so margin) to succour them. The prophet then turns to Kedar, foretelling disaster to it within a year in spite of its famous archers.

13. Dedanites, mentioned in Jer 49 [8]; Ezek 25 [13], etc. They were a nomadic tribe living south-east of Edom.

14. Tema—a neighbouring tribe.

16. Kedar was noted for its flocks (Jer 49 [28] f.; Ezek 27 [21]).

XXII. **1-14. The Levity of Jerusalem.**—On the genuineness of this prophecy there is no difference of opinion: it is accepted by all as Isaianic. The situation is clear. Jerusalem is face to face with grave danger, and her children spend the time in feasting and debauchery. The occasion may be the raising of the siege by Sennacherib (see 2 K 18 [14]), or it may be as Wade suggests, 'the moment when Hezekiah first asserted his independence of Assyria, and when the citizens of Jerusalem went wild with excitement at the outbreak of hostilities, which they confronted with a confidence and light-heartedness which Isaiah knew to be ill-justified.'

The prophet with his outward eye sees a joyous city, and the people crowding on the housetops. With his inward eye he sees something far different: men dead from famine or disease, and the nation's leaders in flight or captivity. He cannot partake in the feverish exultation of the people, for a day of disaster is at hand. In his vision the city is surrounded by foemen; archers, chariots, and horsemen fill the valleys; the defenders are looking to their feeble armaments and gazing in dismay at the gaps in their walls. Efforts are made to repair the fortifications and to increase the water-supply, but none thinks of turning to Jehovah. Jehovah calls to weeping and mourning, but the people, either in hardness of heart or sheer desperation, persist in followng after riotous pleasures. The prophet delivers Jehovah's judgement—such conduct can only be expiated by the death of all the offenders.

1. valley of vision. From [5].

6. Elam . . . quiver. The Elamites were famous archers (Jer 49 [35]).

Kir. The home of the Syrians of Damascus (Am 9 [7]).

10. houses . . . wall. 'The graphic picture of the ramparts allowed to fall into decay, with Oriental *insouciance*, and of the houses of the citizens being feverishly torn down to provide the most easily accessible material for immediate repair in a sudden emergency, is a side-light on ancient Jerusalem life of much value' (R. A. S. Macalister).

11. a reservoir. The pool now called El-Birket el-Hamra.

between the two walls. This phrase seems to be a regular description of the lower part of the Tyropœon valley. It lay outside the city, but the ramparts of the two ridges formed its boundaries.

13. let us eat, etc. Quoted by St. Paul in 1 Cor 15 [32].

15-25. The Denunciation of Shebna.—Shebna seems to have been a foreigner (cf. [16]), which may have added bitterness to Isaiah's denunciation. His successor Eliakim is held up by the prophet as a model of virtue, and it is exceedingly unlikely that [24] f. came from him. No doubt they represent the facts of the case, for in all ages the East has been the home, though not exclusively, of corrupt administration. In 36 [3] Eliakim is 'over the household,' and a certain Shebna is scribe; it is by no means clear that the latter is the person of that name who is condemned here.

The prophet's indignation is aroused by Shebna's having prepared a magnificent tomb for himself. He foretells that Jehovah will wind Shebna round and round like a ball, and toss him into a far country, where he will die, and all his pomp and glory come to naught. Into his office of steward will be promoted Eliakim, one who will be a father to the nation. He will possess the key of David with an absolute power of opening and shutting, and like a nail securely driven into a wall he will remain firmly fixed in his office. A later writer has added an ironical conclusion which records how the nail had so many things hung upon it that at last it gave way.

In connexion with this condemnation of Shebna it is interesting to remember that denunciations of individuals are not

common in the prophetic literature. It was, as a rule, the whole nation of which the prophets despaired; individual sinners were merely isolated examples of a general depravity.

15. Shebna. The name is Aramaic in form and suggests that Shebna was a Syrian.

16. whom hast thou here? Shebna as a foreigner, or perhaps a man of low rank—the name of his father is not given—had no right to make a sepulchre amongst the great men.

18. chariots were a mark of ostentation.

22. the key. Cf. Rev 3 [7]; Mt 16 [19].

XXIII. **The Fall and Revival of Tyre.**—This oracle consists of two parts, for [15-18], which predicts the revival of Tyre, is best taken as a post-exilic addition. The rest of the oracle is of doubtful authorship, and most probably refers to the famous siege of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar in 585-577 B.C. If it is a genuine prophecy of Isaiah the occasion will be the siege by Shalmaneser, *c.* 727-722 (if Josephus is here a trustworthy authority), or the threat of Sennacherib's invasion in 701.

Phœnician ships on their way home are warned of the disaster which has befallen Tyre. The dwellers on the coastland are bidden to be silent. Tyre was a great port, the market of the nations, to which came the corn of Egypt; now she has fallen. Zidon too will be ashamed, for the ocean itself no longer recognizes her children. The fall of Tyre brings dismay to Egypt, and the Phœnicians themselves are advised to seek refuge in distant Tarshish, and to leave their own ancient and once flourishing city. The prophet then enquires for the source of Tyre's downfall, and finds it in the purpose of Jehovah. He has taken account of her dependencies, and her fortresses are to be destroyed. Zidon is bidden to fly to Cyprus in a vain search for rest. In after years Tyre will once more rejoice and recover her old trade and world-wide influence. But the profits of her merchandise will then be devoted to Jehovah.

1. Kittim. That is Cyprus.

3. Shihor. The Nile (Jer 2 [18]).

8. the crowning city. Some of the Phœnician colonies became monarchies: e.g. Carthage.

11. Canaan is here only in the Old Testament used as an equivalent for Phœnicia. It was so used by the Phœnicians themselves.

13 is very obscure. Possibly **Chaldeans** should be emended to *Kittim* or *Canaanites*.

15. seventy years. The period of Judah's captivity also (Jer 25 [11], 29 [10]).

according . . . one king. Not to be taken literally; the phrase means continuously and without change.

17. her hire. 'There is not throughout history a more perfect incarnation of the mercenary spirit than the Phœnician nation' (G. A. Smith).

18. holiness to the Lord. Cf. Zech 14 [20].

XXIV.-XXVII. **Judgement for the Nations and Release for Israel.**—These chapters, although originally not a unity, now form a complete whole, apocalyptic in character and seemingly of a date much later than the time of Isaiah. The late date is inferred from the presence in the passage of many ideas not found in genuine utterances of the prophet. Such are, amongst others, the forecast of the abolition of death, the representation of the world-empires under the figures of great monsters, the existence of celestial enemies and their alliance with earthly kings, and, in general, the vastness of the convulsions which are to afflict the earth. Apart from these novel ideas the style alone suggests that Isaiah is not the author of the passage as a whole. Points of contact with his usual manner are not indeed wanting, Driver thinks, by the borrowing of expressions from him, but reminiscences from other prophets are also found. The style is laboured and artificial, synonymous terms are grouped together for the sake of emphasis, alliteration is much sought after, and there is a decided fondness for novel expressions and obscure images.

The city whose doom is foretold is probably Babylon, but as Driver says: 'The lineaments of the city . . . are so indistinct and unsubstantial that the picture seems rather to be an ideal one: Babylon becomes a type of the powers of heathenism . . . destined in God's good time to be overthrown.'

The prophecy, from its very vagueness, is difficult to date. In its final form it has been applied to the break-up of the Persian Empire before the onslaughts of Alexander the Great (334-331 B.C.), but its tone suggests the overthrow of some power from whom Judah had received treatment harsher and more vindictive than from the successors of Cyrus. On the whole, it is wiser not to attempt too precise a dating. The object before the writer or writers was to encourage a faint-hearted people by the reminder that the might of God was equal to any emergency, even if their opponents were not only 'flesh and blood,' but also 'spiritual

powers in the heavenly places'; and this is a reminder which is needed in almost every age of the Church's life.

XXIV. **A Forecast of World-wide Catastrophe.**—A great catastrophe is coming upon the earth, and in it all classes will alike be involved. The earth has been contaminated by those who dwell in it, therefore all feasting and merriment will cease. Every city lies desolate because mirth and joy have been cut off. Various forms of tribulation threaten the inhabitants of the earth, and those who escape one will fall under the other. Floods and earthquakes are amongst the afflictions. But man is not to suffer alone; the heavenly powers of evil are to be punished along with earthly kings, and shut up in a sure dungeon. Jehovah will then reign in glory, having subdued all His enemies.

2. the priest. In the late period the priesthood was all-powerful.

5. the everlasting covenant is that made with Noah (Gen 9^{5} ff.).

10. city of confusion. There is perhaps a reference to false gods. LXX reads *every city*.

14-16. These verses are obscure and do not fit the context.

18. windows on high. Cf. Gen 7^{11}.

21. high ones. Cf. Eph 2^{2}; Rom 8^{38} f.

22. shut up. Cf. Enoch 10^{12} f., 18^{13} ff.; 2 P 2^{4}; Jude ^{6}.

XXV. **1-5. Thanksgiving after Deliverance.**—This short poem of thanksgiving seems to have been interpolated into a context which consists of predictions. The date of the passage is a matter for conjecture; Wade suggests that it 'may have been evoked by some decisive success obtained by Alexander.'

The Lord is praised because He has overthrown a hostile city. The strong people will therefore honour Him. He has been a refuge for the poor and distressed in the time of their oppression. Just as the clouds put a limit to the sun's heat, so the attacks of the terrible ones have been terminated.

2. a city. LXX has *cities* as in $24^{10, 12}$.

palace, better *fortress*.

4. a storm against the wall. A small change gives the reading *a winter storm*.

6-8. Felicity for all Peoples in Zion.—The predictions are now resumed after the break caused by the last section.

The Lord is about to make a great feast in Zion, not for Israel only, but for all peoples. He will bring their sorrows to an end, so that they will no more need to wear the mourner's veil. Death will be abolished and all tears and sorrow

6. wines on the lees are old wines of full flavour.

7. the face of the covering is the outer surface of the veil (cf. Job 41^{13}, margin).

8. swallowed up death. Quoted 1 Cor 15^{54}. The reference is not to the resurrection of those already dead, but to the abolition of death itself.

will wipe away, etc. Quoted Rev 7^{17}, 21^{4}.

9-12. The Downfall of Moab.—The occasion of this song is quite unknown, and the special enmity against Moab, perhaps here a type of all Israel's enemies (Cheyne), cannot be accounted for (but see note below).

The people have waited for the Lord, and He has saved them. The fate of Moab is to be far different, for the Lord will press him down like straw in a dungpit, and all his frantic efforts to save himself will prove abortive.

10. Moab. Moabites joined with the Babylonians in spoiling Judah (2 K 24^{2}).

XXVI. **1-19. Anticipations and Laments.**—This poem throws an interesting sidelight on the mind of the Jewish people. On the one side they trusted in the sure promises of Jehovah, on the other the present distress was deep enough to shake the strongest faith. Each of these factors plays its part in the present passage.

Jerusalem is a secure stronghold and the faithful people are called to enter into it. The Lord will keep in peace those who trust in Him. And, indeed, He is worthy of trust like a 'rock of ages.' The proud have been humbled to the ground, but the just find safety and guidance. Jehovah's people long for Him and for the vindication of His justice. But the unrighteous will not be moved by such a manifestation nor look to the Lord. Others have ruled over God's people, but in His name alone will they trust, for He has destroyed the very memory of the former tyrants. The nation is enlarged and its frontiers extended. But now the people are few, and the pains which the nation endures, though as intense as birth-pangs, yet bring no increase to the people. The Lord will restore to them the faithful dead, and so will the nation be enlarged.

1. salvation. God's protection is more than strong walls.

5. the lofty city. Again there is a reference, as in 24^{10}, 25^{2}, to the destruction of an unnamed city. Cheyne sees in the present passage a reference to the fall of Tyre in 332.

8. thy name. The name represents Jehovah's revealed power and goodness.

13. other lords. Their various heathen oppressors.

19 seems to teach a resurrection of the righteous. Some scholars, however, explain it away as a figurative reference to the exiles (cf. Ezek 37).

20-XXVII. 1. The Coming Judgement.—The Lord's judgement is about to come upon the world, yet the faithful remain under shelter. In that day He will punish the nations, here symbolized by various monsters.

21. her blood. Cf. Gen 4^{11}.

XXVII. **1.** The monsters are mythological in origin, and are best taken as symbolizing world-powers, the dragon representing Egypt and the two serpents either Assyria and Babylon, or Babylon and Persia. For other proposed explanations see Wade *ad loc.*

2-6. Jehovah's Vineyard.—The conception of Israel as a vineyard goes back at least as far as the time of Isaiah. In 5^{1-7} the vineyard is ungrateful and meriting destruction; here, on the contrary, the Lord will water it and keep it continually. In days to come this vine will fill the world with its fruit.

3. lest any hurt it. The original text is defective. A slight emendation gives the reading *lest its leafage be missing* (cf. Jer 17^{8}).

4. Fury. That is against Israel.

7-11. Israel's Hopeful Future.—Israel may have confidence since her oppressors have received much severer punishment than herself. At the same time idolatry is still a crime, and must be given up. A description follows of the ruined state of the unnamed city, the stronghold of Israel's oppressors.

This section fits badly into its context, and is not without internal difficulties. The reference of ^{10} f. is obscure, but the hopeful tone of the previous verses seems to preclude any thought of Jerusalem as the ruined city, as Cheyne suggests: the passage, however, may not be a unity.

8. east wind. The violent and destructive sirocco.

9. Asherim and the sun-images. Cf. 17^{18}; Jg 6^{25} *v.n.*

12 f. The Close of the Apocalypse.—The people of Jehovah are to be recalled from the lands where they are dispersed by the sounding of a great trumpet. The opening verse is obscure.

13. Assyria here represents Persia.

XXVIII. **1-6. The Fate of Samaria.**—This prophecy must come from a time anterior to 722 B.C. when it was fulfilled. Its presence in a collection of prophecies dealing with the fate of Judah may be intended to warn the people of the southern kingdom of the similarity of their offences and the certainty of their punishment.

The city upon which the drunken people of Samaria prided themselves will become like a fading garland, or like the first-ripe fig which is plucked and eaten as soon as it has been perceived. But the Lord will be a crown to the remnant of His people (? Judah), and the inspirer of judge and warrior alike.

1. the crown. Samaria's situation on a hill-top no doubt suggested the comparison. Its glory would fade like the garlands on the heads of the drunken revellers.

4. the first-ripe fig. These began to ripen in June, whereas the season for figs was August.

5 f. are probably a later appendix written concerning Judah.

7-22. The Fate of Judah.—But it is not Ephraim alone which is being led astray by strong drink; in Judah the priest and the prophet are under its influence, and so give wrong guidance. The prophet is mocked by the revellers, who liken him to an instructor of children with his continual repetitions. The stern reply is flung back that if they reject the prophet's simple teaching they will have to learn their lesson from people of a foreign tongue. They have refused their true rest, and now a message of destruction is coming upon them. The leaders of the people imagine that they have made a treaty with death and hell, so that no harm can come their way. But their trust is in a vain thing; the only sure foundation is the stone which the Lord Himself will lay in Zion. The refuge of the people will be swept away and their agreement with death prove a delusion, for their enemies will give them no rest, and in their terror they will come to see the truth of the divine message and the inadequacy of their own careful plans. The Lord will reveal Himself in action, and His actions will confirm the prophet's words.

8. the tables, etc. To understand the prophet's abhorrence we must remember that these tables were to hold the sacrificial meal in which the drunkards were probably taking part.

10. precept . . . line. It is doubtful whether the Hebrew words are intended to have any meaning; they may be mere jingling nonsense.

12. Isaiah's foreign policy was 'Trust

in Jehovah, and do not meddle with matters which do not directly concern you.'

16. a stone. This must mean the divine protection, if not Jehovah Himself (cf. 1 P 2 [6]), where the same figure is used of our Lord and His Church.

shall not make haste. LXX *shall not be put to shame.*

21. A reference to David's victory over the Philistines recorded in 2 S 5 [20, 25], where **Baal Perazim** and **Geba** are the places named.

23-29. A Parable of Judgement.—The ploughman does not plough for ever, but when the ground is ready he puts in the seed, each kind of seed in the appointed place. So in threshing different methods are adopted for different kinds of grain. This kind of wisdom comes from the Lord, and shall not the Lord—so the prophet expects his hearers to continue—adapt His own treatment to the requirements of His people?

The argument derives much of its force from the ancient belief that agricultural operations were carried on according to traditional rules and with appropriate rites: to ignore these would be to court disaster.

25. cast abroad. In ancient times the seed was scattered over the field, not sown in rows.

fitches, better *vetches* or *black cummin* (as margin).

27. a sharp . . . instrument. A sledge with spikes on the underside.

XXIX. **The Humiliation of Ariel.**—The greater part of this chapter seems to be the genuine work of Isaiah; various insertions, however, have been made into it, including probably the whole of [17-24]. The prophet's utterances were aroused by attempts on the part of the pro-Egyptian faction in Judah to guard themselves from the approach of Sennacherib somewhere in the years 705-701 B.C.

1-8. Ariel, the city which David once besieged, is threatened with disaster. Armies of aliens, directed by Jehovah Himself, will now encircle her, and her glory will be brought low. From her humiliation, however, the Lord will rescue her by a sudden intervention, and all her foes will be scattered like dust or chaff before a strong wind. The memory of the besieging host will be only a nightmare, but for the foes themselves it will be as a tantalizing dream when awakening robs the sleeper of some great pleasure.

1. Ariel probably = *Altar-hearth*; it is used of Jerusalem as the centre of the worship of Jehovah.

4. out of the dust. A posture of humiliation, and also the place from which the wizard, by ventriloquism, makes the voice of the dead proceed.

9-12. The Lord has caused a supernatural slumber to come upon the leaders of the people, so that they stagger like drunken men. None can understand the signs of the times, which are like a sealed book to the learned and like an impossible task for the unlearned.

10. Quoted in Rom 11 [8].

the prophets . . . the seers. Delete as glosses.

13-14. The Lord will bring to naught the designs of those whose worship is merely formal and traditional.

13. a commandment of men. A mere form with nothing spiritual about it.

14. wisdom, etc. A reference to the political devices by which the leaders thought salvation would be won.

15-24. This oracle begins with a condemnation of those who seek to hide their plans from the Lord—the reference is probably to some secret treaty with Egypt. They forget that the potter moulds the clay, not the clay the potter, that the Creator is wiser and more powerful than the creature. Then there follows a passage ([17-24]) promising a glorious transformation of nature, much in the manner of later prophecy, and a golden age for the poor and oppressed. Jacob will be free and will worship truly, and even the perverse will begin to understand.

16. the potter. A common figure (cf. 45 [9], 64 [8]; Jer 18 [4, 6]; Rom 9 [20]).

18. This verse seems to provide for the needs of those mentioned in [9] f.

19. The meek . . . the poor. These terms suggest the post-exilic period.

22. redeemed Abraham. The Old Testament contains no reference to a redemption of Abraham, but Rabbinic tradition records his rescue from a fiery furnace.

XXX. **1-17. The Folly of Trust in Egypt.**—This section develops the situation recorded in 29 [15], and comes from about the same date. There is no reason for questioning its genuineness. It consists of two utterances, [1-5] and [6-17].

1-5. A further denunciation of those who trust in their own political intrigues for safety instead of relying upon Jehovah and seeking counsel from His prophets. Egypt upon whom they rely will be a source of bitter disappointment.

1. cover, etc. The meaning is obscure. The actual Hebrew means *weave a web* (so margin), and may refer to the involved intrigues conducted by the pro-Egyptian

party. Robinson (*Clar. Bib.*) accepts the meaning *pour out a drink offering*, and refers it to religious rites, perhaps connected with the ratification of a treaty.

2. Pharaoh. The Egyptian monarch here referred to was probably Sabako. The towns mentioned represent the wide extent of his dominions.

4. Hanes. An important city in the Nile valley, south of Memphis, later known as Heracleopolis Magna.

6-17. This oracle has the heading 'Burden of the beasts of the Southland.' Duhm suggests that it stood originally among the oracles with titles in 13-23. The message of the passage is similar to the message of that which precedes it—the folly of trust in Egypt. The ambassadors of Judah carry down their treasures, through the unknown terrors of the desert, to a people who cannot be of any real help to them. The prophet is bidden to write down his message (cf. 8^{1}) so that when it is confirmed by the actual event the record will be available. The people are disobedient and seekers after false security. They despise the message of God and trust in force and duplicity. They will suddenly crash down like a cracking wall, and so great will be their ruin that it can be likened to the shivering of a piece of crockery. The only wise policy, quiet trust in God's protection, had been rejected, and in consequence the horses of which they were so proud would be used only for flight. Panic and disaster are foretold, so great that the host will be split up into a number of units as isolated as a flag-staff on a hill-top.

6. burden: oracle (margin). See on 13^{1}.

beasts of the South. The animals referred to in the latter part of the verse.

viper . . . serpent. Cf. Nu 21^{6}; Dt 8^{15}.

7. Rahab is used of Egypt in Ps 87^{4} (cf. Ezek 29^{3}), but elsewhere is an impersonation of chaos (51^{9}; Job 9^{13}, 26^{12}). The word seems to mean *bluster* or *arrogance*.

13. as a breach. A small crack gradually widens until the whole wall comes down.

17. beacon. Better *flag-staff* or *mast* (so margin).

18-26. A Promise of Restoration.—This oracle, containing hopes of a blessed future for the nation, is very similar to 29^{17-24}, and probably belongs to a later period than that of Isaiah, since Judah seems already to have lost its independence.

The Lord is waiting to show mercy to His people and to comfort them in their affliction. Even in times of adversity and necessity divine guidance will not be lacking. Realizing God's goodness, the people will cast away their useless idols. The work of the agriculturist will be blessed, so that an ample supply of food, not only for man but also for beast, will be available. In the day of the Lord's vengeance on His enemies rivers will break out in the high ground and the light of the moon will be as bright as that of the sun, the sun itself becoming seven times brighter.

20. teachers. Read *teacher* in each case as margin.

22. the overlaying. Cf. 40^{19}; Jer 10^{3} f.

24. savoury provender. The original *salted* should be retained (cf. Virgil, *Georg.*, iii, 394).

26. sevenfold. To give the same rate of increase as in the case of the moon, whose light was said to be a seventh of that of the sun (Enoch 73^{3}).

27-33. The Overthrow of Assyria.—This oracle may well be the genuine work of Isaiah in spite of criticisms, both of style and contents, which have been directed against it.

The Lord comes like a dark storm-cloud full of threatenings. The rumbling of the thunder and the sudden dart of the lightning are the outward expressions of His wrath, as is the blast of wind which goes before it. The nations will be tested and destroyed, but God's people will rejoice as those who keep a great religious festival, or as those who ascend the Temple hill. The bursting of the storm throws the Assyrians into confusion, and they flee, sustaining such terrible losses that vast funeral pyres become necessary to destroy the corpses.

27. the name: that is Jehovah Himself as revealed.

28. an overflowing stream, such as suddenly fills the *wadis* and carries all before it.

32. This verse makes no sense: see further Wade.

33. Topheth, which was the name of part of the valley of Hinnom, probably means *fire-place*.

the king. A better rendering is *Molech*, which originally = the (divine) king.

XXXI. **The Lord, and not Egypt, will Save Zion.**—This chapter is a very difficult one, and has evidently suffered not a little from interpolations. As it stands Jehovah is represented both as attacking and as defending Jerusalem (^{4} f.). Probably ^{6} f. are to be rejected, and ^{8} will then be a natural sequel to ^{5}.

Woe to those who trust in the cavalry and chariots of Egypt rather than in the Lord. He too has wisdom, and, what is quite as important, power as well. The Egyptians, after all, are only human, and together with those whom they vainly seek to help will meet with ruin. Jehovah cares as little for man as a lion cares for a crowd of shepherds. He will protect Zion. Let the Israelites turn again to Him and cast aside their idols. The Assyrian will then be discomfited by supernatural means, fleeing away in terror.

1. chariots. The Egyptian chariots were noted at the time of the Exodus (Ex 15 [4]).

3. flesh . . . spirit. The contrast is between what is human and therefore perishable, and what is divine and enduring.

4. upon mount Zion. Better with margin *against.*

9. his rock. The source of his confidence, here apparently the king according to the parallelism. The text may not be quite reliable.

fire . . . Zion. Cf. 29 [1].

XXXII. **1-8. The Blessedness of the Messianic Age.**—The first part of this oracle, in spite of some peculiarities of language, may be attributed to Isaiah; but [6-8] seem to be an addition in the style of the later Wisdom literature.

In the coming age a just government will be set up and protection will be extended to all who need it. The powers of insight of mankind will be quickened and their follies and impediments removed. The fool will no longer be called noble, nor the rogue generous. Men's inward characters will be revealed by their outward acts, the good doing worthy deeds, and the wicked evil.

1. a king. No specific person is meant.

2. the shadow, etc. A vivid figure for the protection of a just and strong government.

9-20. Devastation, then Peace.—This prophecy, like that in 3 [16-24], is called forth by the luxury and indifference of the women of Jerusalem. Although the authorship has been questioned, in the main it seems to come from Isaiah.

The wealthy ladies of Jerusalem are warned that the vintage of the coming year will be a failure, and they are advised to lament and mourn. The country will be neglected, and even in the towns weeds will come up in the deserted houses. In the end, however, the spirit will be poured down upon them, and the wilderness itself will bring forth fruit. As a result of a righteous and just administration peace and confidence will be restored, and the people will once more carry on their agricultural and pastoral operations without fear of molestation.

10. the vintage. The prophecy may have been delivered at a vintage festival.

14. palace . . . city. If this forecast comes from Isaiah (as seems probable), it belongs to the early part of his ministry: later he promised safety to Zion.

15-20. Some critics reject these verses as out of harmony with their context. In any case [19] seems to be an insertion.

XXXIII. **Jehovah will Deliver Zion from a Treacherous Enemy.**—In 701 B.C. Hezekiah tried to induce Sennacherib to leave Jerusalem in safety by the payment of a large tribute. Later the Assyrians demanded the surrender of the city (2 K 18 [14] ff.). To the Jews this must have seemed to be an act of treachery, and allusions in the present chapter may point to this event: e.g. [8] (agreement broken), [18] (payment of tribute), and possibly [7] (ambassadors weeping—over the breach of faith ?). Against this suggested dating of the prophecy it is argued by many scholars that ideas and language are found which belong to the late post-exilic period; these phenomena appear especially in [15] f. and [20-24]. Perhaps the facts are best accounted for by supposing that an original prophecy by Isaiah has been amplified to meet a later situation. Kennett thinks that the whole chapter belongs to the time of the Maccabæan deliverance, when ecstatic joy burst forth in Jerusalem and Judah on the banishment of the foreigners. The prophecy falls into three sections: [1-6, 7-12, 13-24].

1-6. Woe to the enemy for his unprovoked and treacherous attack; retribution will come upon him. May Jehovah daily renew His help. When the Lord arises the nations fly in panic, and their goods can be spoiled without hindrance. Jehovah rules on high, and He hath established justice in Zion. True stability is based on the fear of God.

2. their arm. Read *our arm* with Vulgate and Syriac.

4. caterpillar. Really some species of locust.

6. The text is uncertain.

7-12. The envoys return weeping, for the land is wasted and no treaties will restrain the enemy. Nature shares in the desolation. But the final issue lies with Jehovah who is about to intervene. The schemes of the foe will prove abortive; disappointment and fury await them.

7. valiant ones. Hebrew *Ariels* perhaps = *lions of God.*

8. high ways. Cf. Jg 5 [6].

cities. A slight emendation gives **witnesses.**

9. Lebanon . . . Carmel . . . Sharon recur in 35 [2].

13-24. Jehovah calls upon all men to consider His might as exhibited in the salvation of Zion. Jehovah's presence is a source of terror to the ungodly, but to the upright He brings security and peace. The sight of a king in royal splendour and of wide dominions is promised, and the past with its horrors will have become a mere memory. No longer will alien officials come amongst them, nor a strange tongue be spoken in their midst. Zion will be as secure as a carefully pitched tent, and around Jerusalem will be the protecting power of the Lord, a surer guarantee of safety than the broad rivers upon which other cities prided themselves, or a fleet of war-galleys. If any hostile ship should approach it would meet with disaster, and be a prey to the people whom it had despised. Sickness and sin shall both alike be banished.

14. devouring fire. Fire consumes the ungodly (cf. 4 [4], 6 [13]), but purifies the penitent (6 [6] f.).

15 f. Much of these verses is parallel to Psalms (e.g. 15 [2-5], 18 [2], 24 [3] f.), and may be borrowed.

17. the king in his beauty. Perhaps in contrast to Hezekiah in robes of mourning (37 [1]).

18. muse on the terror. 'In future men would . . . scarcely believe their eyes when they saw no more evidence of the presence of those who had exacted the tribute paid to the foreign oppressor' (Kennett, *Schweich Lect.*, 70).

counted the towers. In order to see which should be destroyed.

19. a deep speech. An unknown tongue was a source of dislike and suspicion (cf. Jer 5 [15]).

20-24. These verses on point of style are probably late. In parts they are obscure, and [23] seems unsuited to its context.

XXXIV. **The Desolation of Edom.**—The fierce hatred of Edom, characteristic of the post-exilic Jews (Obad [10-16]; Ezek 35 [5] f.; Jer 49 [7-12]), was aroused by the Edomite rejoicing over the fall of Jerusalem in 586. This prophecy from its tone (cf. 63 [1-7]) must come from an age much later than that of Isaiah; a late date is further supported by the standpoint of the chapter—that of exiles encouraged by a promise of restoration—as well as by features in it which suggest a connexion with apocalyptic literature.

1-4. The nations are called together to hear their sentence, for Jehovah's anger is aroused against them. The dead bodies of the slain will be so numerous that their smell will ascend on high, and the mountains be deluged with their blood. The heavens will be rolled up like a scroll, and the stars will fall like leaves in autumn.

1. utterly destroyed. Placed under a ban.

4. all their host. Cf. Mk 13 [25]; Rev 6 [13] f.

5-17. From the picture of a universal judgement the prophet turns aside to describe the awful fate of Edom in particular. The sword of the Lord, full of divine wrath, will descend upon the luckless nation to execute the ban upon its people. A great sacrifice is to be offered up to Jehovah at Bozrah, but not of fatlings. The day of recompense has come, and the wrongs of Zion are not forgotten by Zion's God. Edom itself will become like a land destroyed by a great conflagration: its streams will be molten tar, its very dust brimstone, and the land burning pitch. Strange birds and beasts will make it their home, and through lack of human inhabitants weeds will spring up in the palaces and strongholds. The reader is challenged to verify the accuracy of this prediction by comparing the state of Edom with written prophecies foretelling its fate.

6. Bozrah, in Edom, is distinct from the city of the same name in Moab (Jer 48 [24]).

7. wild-oxen. An extinct species of powerful oxen, perhaps the *urus* of Cæsar (*de Bell. Gall.*, vi, 28): see further my note on Nu 23 [22] (*West. Comm.*). AV 'unicorns' is a guess.

10. smoke thereof (cf. Gen 19 [28]). The whole description seems suggested by the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, cities on the borders of Edom.

11. pelican . . . porcupine. See on 14 [23].

confusion . . . emptiness: *tōhū* and *bōhū*—the words of Gen 1 [2], 'waste and void.' A return to primitive chaos is suggested (cf. Jer 4 [23]).

14. satyr. See on 13 [21].

the night-monster. Hebrew *Lilith* (Vulgate *Lamia*), a female demon in Babylonian folklore. The Rabbis say that she was Adam's first wife.

16. the book of the Lord. Some written prophecy is referred to.

XXXV. **The Fertility of Judah.**—This beautiful prophecy probably comes from the same writer as 34, and is intended as a companion picture to it; in that chapter the awful fate of God's enemies

is described, here the felicity of His chosen. Many parallels to the later part of Isaiah can be found in it.

The desolate wilderness will become as beautiful and fragrant as the noted districts of Lebanon, Carmel, and Sharon. No cause for fear need vex the trembling heart, for the Lord is at hand to punish the wicked and to restore those who are afflicted. The desert itself will be full of refreshing streams, and the haunts of wild beasts will become fertile fields. Further, to help the returning pilgrims, a great high-road is to be constructed from which the unclean and every evil beast will be excluded. The prophecy concludes with an ecstatic outburst describing the joy of those whom the Lord hath redeemed.

1. the rose. Better, with margin, *autumn crocus*.

7. glowing sand: 'The rendering "mirage" (margin) is very attractive. The phantom lake which deceives the traveller in the desert will be replaced by real pools of water. But it forms no good parallel to thirsty ground, and is not suitable in 49 [10]' (Peake).

8. way of holiness. That is for holy people.

fools, shall not err therein. EVV are apt to mislead. The meaning is that fools (i.e. the irreligious) will not be allowed to wander about on it.

XXXVI.-XXXIX. The whole of this section, with the exception of the Psalm of Hezekiah (38 [9-20]), comes from 2 K 18 [13]-20 [19]. The reader is therefore referred to the notes on those chapters.

XXXVIII. 9-20. **The Psalm of Hezekiah.**—This song is lacking in the parallel narrative in 2 Kings, and was evidently placed here by a late editor. Like many of the psalms attributed to David and others, it is a composition representing the feelings suitable to the person, whose name it bears as a title, in the special circumstances to which the poem refers.

What Hezekiah wrote on recovering from sickness: I thought that in the prime of my life I should pass the gates of death and lose the remaining years. No more would I see the Lord, nor my fellow-men. Like the moving tent of the shepherd my life will come to an end, or like the threads cut off from the loom. All day long I cry in pain, even as a twittering swallow or a plaintive dove; only enough strength is left to look up to the Lord. The Lord has done it, how can I appeal to Him? I shall toss about all the hours of sleep because of the anguish of my soul. O Lord, let me live. I admit that my suffering has been for my own profit, and now Thou hast saved me from the grave because of Thy love for me, and hast forgiven my sins. In the grave man is cut off from God, and can praise Him no longer. It is those who still have life who can do this—and I am doing it this very day—and hand on to their children the record of the Lord's goodness. The Lord's song will be sung for ever in the house of the Lord.

10. noontide is literally 'quiet' or 'pause.' The idea may be that Hezekiah fell ill suddenly when no anxieties warned him of approaching evil, or it may mean in the prime of his life.

14. or a crane. Omit as an insertion from Jer 8 [7].

my surety. The Lord is Himself implored to be His debtor's surety (cf. Job 17 [3], 19 [25]).

15 cannot be interpreted satisfactorily as it stands. Duhm's emendations have been followed.

18. the grave. For the idea that man was there cut off from God, see Ps 6 [5], 30 [9], 88 [5, 10] f., 115 [17].

ISAIAH (XL.-LXVI.)

By A. Guillaume

Authorship.—Everyone who reads the prophecies of Isaiah must be conscious of having entered a new world at ch. 40. The old Judah of courts and kings, of baals and false prophets, has passed away: we read of the ruins and 'old waste places' of the holy land which the Second (Deutero) Isaiah calls upon his people to repair.

The theme is first the coming deliverance, its divinely ordered and its human means; and then the problems which confront the pioneers of the Return. Obviously more than a generation has elapsed since the Captivity, and at least a century and a half since Isaiah encouraged his people to resist the Syro-Ephraimite invasion or to stand firm against the all-powerful Assyrian. The enemy is no longer Assyria, but Babylon.

It ought not to be necessary at the

present day to advance more reasons for claiming a *Second* Isaiah as the author of most of the concluding chapters of this book. The question is not whether Isaiah *could* have prophesied with so much detail of events in the distant future; but rather whether his words would have been intelligible to the men of his own time, and whether they would have preserved them as a sort of 'Joanna Southcott's Box.' Chapters 40-66 have been attached to 1-39 merely for convenience. They were too long to be placed among the Minor Prophets, so a place was found for them at the end of 'Isaiah.'

The tremendous tension, the agony of men still living, can be felt in Isaiah's words. Fugitives fleeing to Jerusalem bring fresh stories of Assyrian barbarities: from hour to hour Isaiah wrestles in prayer with Jehovah, emerging to utter words charged with faith and promise.

In the utterances of his great successor a similar tension can be felt. There is a growing feeling of confidence as the power of Cyrus waxes greater; the hidden treasures of Crœsus, king of Lydia, are delivered into his hand by Jehovah; he is led to undertake the capture of Babylon; he is Jehovah's anointed who will accomplish His purpose, which is to let the people go and to restore the splendour of Zion. It is impossible not to feel that the writer lived and moved among the men whom he tries to stir up to cross the Syrian desert to their former home.

The conclusion that the authors of the First and Second Parts of 'Isaiah' must be different men of a different age is confirmed by the differences in style and language (which must be studied in a commentary on the Hebrew). Further, as Driver says, 'there is no analogy for the case of a prophet, transported in spirit to a future age, and predicting *from that standpoint* a future remoter still.'

Date.—The prophet began his ministry some years before the fall of Babylon in 538. The references he makes to the 'north' and the 'east' in 41 [25] suggest a date after the junction between the Persians in the east and the Medes in the north. This junction was effected in 549; it is fairly safe to deduct at least a year from each terminus, and so we can date the opening prophecies between the years 548 and 539. Probably the upper date can be reduced by four or five years.

But it is clear that the whole of 40-66 does not date from the Exile: there are allusions to the Temple which plainly imply that it is standing; to a community whose social conditions are not those of the Exile, but of the Return; and to the nucleus of the returned exiles themselves. Again, there are passages which mourn the unfulfilled promises of a glowing future which had been made by Deutero-Isaiah; and others which inveigh against the contamination wrought by certain Israelites or Samaritans, who are repellent to the orthodox party. Many of these passages require us to postulate a third author, who is often designated Trito-Isaiah.

It has been customary to divide the book into three parts: (*a*) 40-48, the coming deliverance; (*b*) 49-55, the deliverance imminent; and (*c*) 56-66, the condition of the restored remnant, the first two parts being substantially the work of the Deutero- and the last of the Trito-Isaiah. This arrangement is adopted here, save that the two concluding chapters 65 and 66 are attributed to the Deutero-Isaiah. The last book published on Isaiah (Eduard König, *Das Buch Jesaja*, Gutersloh, 1926) preserves the threefold arrangement thus: (*a*) 40-48, political freedom; (*b*) 49-55, spiritual (*geistliche*) redemption; and (*c*) 56-66, gratitude to be expressed to God by obedience to His law. The conclusion is reached that 40-66 is a unity, and was written during the Exile. But no notice has been taken therein of an illuminating book on the exegesis of Deutero-Isaiah (*Early Judaism*, by L. E. Browne) which, as will be seen, often explains some of the inconsistent policies and conflicting aspirations which are found within this book; and, further, the author hardly does justice to the theories he discards.

Theology.—Deutero-Isaiah teaches in majestic language the transcendence of God. It is very probable that the language used by the Babylonians in their prayers and praises influenced to some extent the author's mind. Parallels have been adduced which certainly suggest that there was direct influence. But the influence acted as a stimulus to the prophet's imagination: it did not compel him to slavish imitation. F. Stümmer in *J.B.L.*, xlv, 171 (*Einige keilschriftliche Parallelen zu Jes.* 40-66) shows how Marduk was addressed as 'He who passeth through the heavens, who poureth out the earth, who measureth the water of the sea.' The prophet was impressed neither by the stately ceremonial of the Babylonian temples nor by the language of the more learned of Marduk's worshippers: for his own God was so inconceivably great that, so far from 'passing

through' the heavens, he used as it were *one hand* to measure them; while as for the waters of the ocean they would not overflow from the palm of his hand!

Jehovah is above all; without beginning and without end; unchanging, incomprehensible. Yet He is not out of touch with men, for He works His own purposes, deliberately chooses men and nations as His instruments, and never allows His purpose to be thwarted. Jehovah is a personal God, a perfect personality, to be worshipped and obeyed. He requires from men justice and righteousness.

Again and again the prophet emphasizes the omnipotence of God. Monotheism, which was more or less implicit in the religion of pre-exilic Israel, is now stated with a clearness which calls for no amplification. Jehovah is alone, the First and the Last; there is no God beside Him; He is the Creator and Sustainer of the universe; only in Him are righteousness and strength; He alone can predict the future and know the past; He it is who controls the march of events. This was the True Religion which Israel was to proclaim to the world. G. A. Smith thus summarizes the four points upon which this religion offers itself: 'First, it is the force of the character and grace of a personal God; second, it speaks with a high intellectual confidence, whereof its scorn is here the chief mark; third, it is intensely moral, making man's sin its chief concern; and fourth, it claims the control of history, and history has justified the claim.'

Righteousness, human and divine, is a frequent theme in this prophecy. Jehovah's righteousness is an absolute quality of His nature. He speaks and acts and wills in righteousness. He is the very principle of Right; and all that He wills is a perfect harmony of moral and intellectual consistency. God thus acts 'for the sake of His righteousness,' and the result of His acts is that righteousness springs forth from the earth. Despite the prophet's insistence upon the transcendence of God, his sense of His personality is marked by anthropomorphisms, particularly when he desires to stress the love of God. Thus Jehovah is like a shepherd who gathers the lambs to His bosom; He comforts His people as a mother comforteth her son. Jehovah's love and tenderness are the working and expression of His unchanging righteousness.

The doctrine of divine election is strongly developed, and is a necessary corollary from God's character as revealed in history past and present. Israel had been chosen by God to do His work in the world, and its sufferings were the result of its disobedience. The nations had abused their powers, and Israel had suffered double. Now a golden age of temporal and spiritual happiness was to dawn. The ancient covenant was to be renewed when Israel came out from bondage a second time. This time the covenant is to be everlasting. Israel must now be a shining light to the world of heathen darkness. The prophet sees the Gentiles eagerly waiting for the dawn of religious hope and universal righteousness. At last all men will be at one under the sway of the God of all the earth.

The Suffering Servant.—The hope of world-wide peace and holiness gave birth to the sublime picture of 'The Servant of the Lord,' whose innocent suffering, borne at God's command for the guilty, has always been read by Christians as 'typical' or prophetic of our Lord's life, death, and resurrection. There is much to be said for this interpretation. It need not mean that the prophet consciously prophesied of a person in the far-distant future, who would suffer, endure, and conquer. It need not be that he even thought of a person at all (but of the nation, as most modern commentators think). In the history of revealed religion it is a commonplace that inspired writings are of all time; and often the full apprehension and 'the fulfilment' are delayed through spiritual blindness or sin. Thus, though the prophet may have thought that the Servant of the Lord would be the Israel of the renewed covenant, the nation's unfitness for this great function made this impossible. Israel's sufferings had to be undergone a second time by the Man of Sorrows.

The problem as to the identity of the Servant has evoked an enormous literature, and the flood shows no sign of abating. The early view that the prophet simply prophesied of the coming Christ has few supporters nowadays, owing (*a*) to the numerous passages in the first two sections of the book where the Servant is called Jacob or Israel, and is obviously meant to be the nation under some aspect; and (*b*) to the modern view of prophecy which tends to exclude the probability of such a detailed prefigurement of a character who was not to appear till half a millennium had passed. Nevertheless, interesting and complicated as are the literary and exegetical problems raised by the Servant Poems (42^{1-4}, 49^{1-6}, 50^{4-9}, and 52^{13}-53^{12}) in their relation to the Deutero-Isaiah and to the subsequent

religious development of Israel, they do not affect the Church's first conviction that Jehovah's suffering Servant was Jesus. That our Lord consciously identified Himself with the suffering Servant is now the opinion of almost all New Testament scholars. I have tried to show elsewhere (*Expository Times*, xxxvii, 392) that the idea of the *fulfilment* of Scripture among the Jews of the first and following centuries was not the filling up of what was hitherto incomplete; but the *confirming and ratifying* of that which was written. (Cf. Ru 4 [7]: 'to confirm every matter a man used to draw off his shoe and give it to his neighbour.' *Confirm* [Hebrew *qayyem*] is the word which was used in our Lord's time and afterwards in the formula, 'then was fulfilled,' e.g. Mt 2 [17], or rather 'was confirmed.')

Thus our Lord certified by His life that the portrait of God's ideal Servant painted by Deutero-Isaiah was a true one; He did not say 'Observe how meticulously accurate were the earlier prognostications of My earthly life.' Nor was the Deutero-Isaiah's description of the Servant true of Him in one important particular. He did not Himself preach to the Gentiles: this work was reserved for the new Israel who may be said to have fulfilled the missionary prophecy of 66 [19] f.

Many scholars have denied that the Servant is the creation of Deutero-Isaiah on the ground that the four poems can be separated from the rest of the book without impairing its message, and that they are composed in a different rhythm. A more serious objection is that they reflect a tender concern for the Gentiles, and contemplate their peaceful conversion to the religion of Jehovah, while many passages in the book contemplate their forcible subjugation to the rule of Israel, and even their partial extermination. It is a fairly obvious inference that a different writer is at work, and that there has been interpolation. If so, which is the earlier document? Some have felt that the Servant poems are the work of a prophet who inspired Deutero-Isaiah to stir his nation to answer the call of God, and that Deutero-Isaiah's work is sometimes a commentary thereon. But lastly there has always been the difficulty of giving an answer to the question 'Of whom speaketh the prophet?'

A new turn to the discussion has been given by Browne, who asks the pertinent question in view of 49 [5-6], Who were Israel? There the Servant's mission is to restore Israel. All previous attempts to explain (or by excision to explain away) the difficulty lack cogency. It is obviously some actually existing Israel which 'the Servant' is to restore. But 'the Servant' is himself Israel (41 [2], etc.), and Israel could not be given a mission to itself. Dr. Browne makes the suggestion that Israel, who is the Servant, means 'all or most of the Jews in Babylon and a goodly proportion of the Jews in Palestine. This was the actual Israel, but it was called to the restoration of a greater Israel which should include also such of the half-castes as at present worshipped heathen deities—for by their Hebrew blood they were bound already in covenant to Yahweh, even if they were ignorant of it—and then to the further work, extending beyond any blood-relationship, of being the missionary to the whole world.' This theory removes one great stumbling-block in the way of the hypothesis that the Servant is Israel; and the presence of a harsh and bitter temper towards the Gentiles at once becomes secondary. As this temper was accentuated in the generation of the Return and after, it is in some cases fairly safe to regard passages which glory in the humiliation of the heathen as the work of a later writer who may be called Trito-Isaiah. (This cannot be said of 43 [1-4].) Nevertheless it is well to bear in mind that human resentment at unmerited cruelty such as was meted out to many of the Jews is apt to count on divine resentment as well as on divine sympathy. It may well have been felt that Jehovah's anger was aroused on behalf of His people.

In a problem so complex as this it seems best to state the facts as fully as space allows, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusion. We can only agree with the Rabbi who wrote: 'I have never in my life either seen or heard of the exposition of a clear or fluent commentator in which my own judgement or that of others who have pondered on the same subject might completely acquiesce.' The most complete summary and discussion of theories as to the identity of the Servant will be found in the Appendix to Skinner's commentary.

In trying to come to a conclusion on this complicated problem, S. A. Cook's admirable study in *C.A.H.*, iii, 490 deserves careful reading. He writes (492): 'It is generally agreed that no ordinary Israelite or nucleus of Israel is meant. It has therefore been held that there has been some idealization, perhaps a fusion of types, or the personification of a conception: ideals have been welded together,

they have been incarnated in a personality; the Servant is an abstract conception, a permanent type, an ideal to be realized—like the relatively modern conception of "humanity." At all events, it soon becomes obvious that a purely literal exegesis would be quite out of place.' Further (495), 'The Servant in his fourfold office of prophet, priest, missionary, and intercessor, is a semi-divine being.'

The Suffering Servant is the picture of a man who voluntarily set himself to carry out the mission entrusted to him by Jehovah through misunderstanding, persecution, and death; who was regarded as an object of man's aversion and God's wrath, and who after his death was realized to have been bearing in loneliness of soul the punishment of sins which he had no part in and whom God vindicated before the eyes of men. It is the most impressive picture in the whole of the Old Testament, and in the course of the commentary the elements of the picture will become more distinct and the conditions of its solution more evident.

Bibliography

Driver, *Isaiah: His Life and Times*, 1893; Skinner in *C.B.*, 1917; Whitehouse in *Cent. B.*, 1908; L. E. Browne, *Early Judaism*, 1920; E. König, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1926; S. A. Cook in *C.A.H.*, iii, 408-415 and 488-500; G. A. Smith, *Ex. B.*, 1927; Peake, *Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*, 1904.

XL. **1-11. Divine Consolation for the Exiles.**—A mysterious voice commands that God's way through the desert be made ready for the second Exodus. Jehovah comes to perform His word. He comes in might, yet with the tenderness of a shepherd. It has been well said that 'As we enter the Gospel history from the Old Testament we feel at once that Isaiah is in the air.' In this section John Baptist and the Good Shepherd meet.

2. time of service. RVm is right (Job 7^1 *v.n.*). **iniquity is pardoned:** better *guilt is paid for.*

3. voice. Many prefer to render *Hark! one crying* for the familiar *vox clamantis.* The gain is small. Cf. Mk 1^3, etc., and notice the different division of words in RV.

5. glory of the Lord. As in the Exodus from Egypt, a glorious and mysterious indication of God's presence will accompany His people.

9. Those in Judæa are bidden to ascend the high ground to witness the triumphant return of the people who are accompanied by their God.

12-26. The omnipotence and omniscience of Jehovah.

12. *v.s.* p. 459*a*.

13. directed: better *measured.* The LXX (quoted in 1 Cor 2^{16}) reads like a guess or a paraphrase. The word is the same as that used in ^{12}.

15 f. The insignificance of earth and all that is therein. **a drop of a bucket,** i.e. a drop which hangs and then falls from the bottom of a bucket, unheeded and unperceived. **small dust,** so small that an Oriental purchaser can ignore it. **the isles.** The term includes most (if not all) of the Mediterranean littoral.

16. So great is Jehovah that all the beasts of the forest of Lebanon would not make Him a burnt offering. But why *wild* animals? These were not permitted in the Israelite cultus. Probably Stümmer (*loc. cit.*) is right in seeing in this passage an attack on the Marduk liturgy in which such sacrifices were made. This certainly gives point to ^{17}, where **all nations** would especially include idolatrous Babylon.

18-20 are certainly connected with 41^{6-7}, but whether the latter should be transposed here, or whether both passages were originally connected with 44^{9-20} is uncertain. An exposure of the futility of idolatry would not be out of place here, though it interrupts the prophet's attempt to make his audience realize God's greatness. On the other hand, it is characteristic of this author to pursue a subordinate line of thought to its end before resuming his main theme, thus creating a series of parentheses. ^{24} is such a one. This trick of style, and the heaping up of interjectional epithets as in ^{22} (delete the *it* is of EV), is reminiscent of St. Paul's writing.

19. impoverished . . . oblation. No satisfactory explanation of these words has been found.

21. *Do ye not know,* etc. Do the people not realize from the glories of nature and the fact of creation itself that any man-made likeness of God is impious folly?

22. *so that* **the inhabitants,** etc. **gauze** as RVm is best.

24. A parenthesis, to be read as RVm.

26. created: the same word as in Gen 1^1; but it cannot be fairly said that the Hebrew verb necessarily carries the sense that God created the universe out of nothing. **and for that.** Changing the vowels read *through inexhaustible power and mighty strength.*

27-31. The Practical Application of the Foregoing.—God's omnipotence ought to encourage Israel to reflect that he need not be dismayed by the strong of this world; for all men are insignificant compared with Jehovah, who will help the weak.

27. In the Exile the religious felt that God did not care. Probably it was the younger generation which was conscious of being in the right as against their Babylonian oppressors.

28. As RVm.

30. Hebrew *And let youths faint,* i.e. Though youths faint, etc.

31. wings: probably the direct object of **mount,** and so *raise their wings on high.* Some prefer the LXX interpretation, 'cause pinions to grow,' 'a description . . . of the new kind of life which comes to him who waits on the Lord' (Skinner).

XLI. The Rise of Cyrus.—This promise of help for Israel is to be dated some few years before the fall of Babylon, which still lies in the future. The far-off countries are summoned to listen to Jehovah's declaration that it is He who is at work in and behind the victorious career of a monarch from the east who is not yet named. Next, Israel is comforted by the assurance that he has nought to fear from the new power, for Jehovah is preparing a glorious future for His people. Then the (Babylonian) gods are asked to foretell the future course of events, which they cannot do.

1-4. The Gentiles are asked, Who is responsible for the rise of a new world-power?

1. before me: better *attending unto me.* **renew their strength:** the words are a dittograph from the preceding verse. Some such sense as 'wait for my words' is required. **judgement,** i.e. as in a court of justice.

2. raised up, not the ordinary word, but *stirred up, impelled.* **whom he calleth in righteousness:** the second margin gives the best sense. *Ṣedeq* ought to mean *right,* and perhaps has acquired the sense of *victory* or *success,* as being the result of right. It is a characteristic word of our author (cf. 10^{b}, 42^{21}, $45^{13, 19}$, 51^{5}). **as the dust to his sword** gives a poor sense, as a sword is not used for cleaving dust. Probably emend *He maketh their sword as dust, their bow as driven stubble.*

3. Render *He treadeth not the path with his feet,* i.e. he 'flies' over the ground.

4. Not **I am he,** but *I am,* 'which is, and which was, and which is to come.'

5-7 as they stand describe the nations as feverishly setting to work to construct new idols to avert the invasion of Cyrus. But this seems unlikely, and as we have seen, $^{6, 7}$ should be read with $40^{19, 20}$.

5 then describes the nations answering Jehovah's summons in terror and alarm. They are kept waiting till ^{25} for His message.

8-20. Israel, now addressed as Jehovah's servant, is the object of God's calling, which is 'without repentance.' The divine election is a guarantee of divine help. Israel's enemies will pass away and be no more, while the poorest Israelite will be the object of God's care. The desert will blossom as the rose, and all will know that it is the Lord's doing.

9. not cast thee away. The Exile must not be understood as a sign of God's rejection of His people.

10. right hand: render *my righteous right hand* (cf. ^{2}).

11 f. do not necessarily imply a forcible conquest of Israel's enemies. The feeling of **shame** implies rather a moral victory.

14. redeemer: Job 19^{25} *v.n.*

16. Happiness, temporal and spiritual, is to be the lot of God's chosen.

21-24 address the heathen gods. Produce your arguments; say what predictions of yours have been fulfilled; give some proof of your existence! They are silent, and judgement goes by default.

22*b*. Transpose the two clauses.

25-29 resume the theme of $^{1-4}$.

XLII. The Call of the Servant. The Universal Religion of Jehovah. Israel's present Humiliation.—There is a certain superficial unity about this chapter, though it must remain in doubt whether it is the unity of an anthology or of the original writer.

1-4. The First Servant Poem.—(The other three are 49^{1-6}, 50^{4-9}, and 52^{13}-53^{12}). This first poem is marked off from the next oracle by the words (^{5}) **Thus saith God the Lord.** The characteristics of God's chosen Servant are that he is quiet and restrained; no loud proclamations herald his activity, his work goes on till he has filled the earth with the knowledge of the Lord. His personal dealings with men are marked by gentleness towards the weak and oppressed.

1. my servant. A king's servant (*ebhed*) *par excellence* was an officer of high rank. One of the best Hebrew seals which have been unearthed belonged to a certain Shema, Jeroboam's 'servant.' **in whom my soul delighteth:** cf. Mt 3^{17}. It is interesting to observe that LXX adds 'Jacob' to ^{a} and 'Israel' to ^{b}, thus witnessing to the early identification of Israel with the Servant, and the tendency to insist upon it by textual interpolation.

judgement here means 'the knowledge of how to worship,' and so *religion*. The Servant's primary object was the evangelization of the heathen world.

2. Full of the Spirit, his voice is like the voice of God, a 'still small voice' (1 K 19 12).

3. RVm is right.

4. shall wait: more probably *are waiting*. The prophet sees the heathen world longing for knowledge of the true God. **law:** not the Mosaic Law, but the earlier and literal meaning of *torah*, i.e. *direction*. They wait for the voice of authoritative revelation, which can only come from him who is commissioned by God.

5-7 are clearly an expansion; and if Browne is right in seeing in **covenant of the people** an allusion to the primitive state of human society as portrayed in Gen 11 6, when mankind was 'one people,' then the thought is that Israel is to be the means by which the world enters into the covenant relation with Jehovah. Still, the idea is strangely expressed, though it can be maintained that parallelism supports this view, and it is historically true of Jewish proselytes and Christian converts.

6. Cf. 41 9, 13, which certainly refer to Israel. **will keep thee:** read *have kept thee*, etc. The analogy of 44 21 and 49 5 suggests that RVm **form** may be right. But the thought surely is **called, sustained, guarded,** and the climax **given** as the world's light: cf. the Benedictus.

8-9. Idols and the coming of Cyrus, two recurring themes.

10-12. Jehovah Praised by the Heathen.—The many affinities with certain Psalms will be apparent.

10*b* should probably be emended 'let the sea make a noise' as in Ps 96 11, 98 7.

11. sing: as in Job 38 7 *shout for joy*.

13-17. 'He depicts, in splendid anthropomorphic imagery, Jehovah's approaching manifestation for the deliverance of His people, and the discomfiture of those (primarily the Babylonians) who trust to graven images to save them' (Driver).

18-25. Israel's Actual State.—The contrast between the Servant of reality and the ideal Servant of 1-4 is painful. Here is no calm, unconquerable agent of God's salvation, but a miserable, despised race, deaf and blind to God's call, and suffering the punishment of its sins. 'There can be little doubt that in developing his idea of the Servant of the Lord, Deutero-Isaiah was greatly perplexed as to how imperfect Israel could be God's missionary to the Gentiles.' The great difficulty in reconciling these two conceptions must always afford some justification for those who cannot see in the Servant the historic or the ideal Israel. But the note of righteous indignation in the prophet's address in 18 seems to mark his resentment of the gulf between the Israel of God's calling and the Israel of reality.

19. he that is at peace with me. The second margin points to the only defensible rendering, *he that is repaid or requited*: cf. Jer 18 20, so Rashi. The hexaplaric text omits the line altogether, probably rightly.

21. It pleased the Lord: rather *Jehovah has willed . . . to magnify and glorify direction*. The tense is a perfect. God's purpose was being hindered by the people's insensibility and their resultant hopelessness. *Direction*, as in 3, is what Muhammed meant by *rushd*, right conduct in the things of this world.

24. Israel's miserable condition has been imposed by God. It is not an excuse for inertia and despair, but should rather compel Israel to lay the lesson to heart. **knew not:** *sc.* its real significance.

XLIII.-XLIV. The Coming Deliverance.—The prophecies become more definite. The conquest of Egypt, the fall of Babylon, and the appearance of Cyrus are all explicitly mentioned. Israel is to reflect on God's eternal purpose—the purpose for which He called the nation into being—and fulfil its high calling. The extraordinary change in the government of all the subject peoples of the world which Jehovah was about to make through His servant Cyrus would convince Israel that a glorious future awaited him.

XLIII. 1. But now marks the contrast with the preceding verse. **have redeemed;** a 'prophetic perfect'; the act being completed in the mind of God, is spoken of as already accomplished (Job 19 25 *v.n.*).

3. ransom (*kopher*) is the fine paid by an offender when his life is forfeit (Ex 21 30). **Egypt and Ethiopia** are to take Israel's place as Persia's vassals. The Servant's tender solicitude for the Gentiles is absent here. The prophet does not say that Cyrus will conquer Egypt; as a matter of fact Egypt fell to Cambyses his son.

5 f. The prophet, carried onward by his vision, sees the Jews of the Dispersion returning from the four winds of heaven: the whole world must then attend and witness that Israel is God's people, charged with His message.

9. Let all the nations be gathered together is probably right (Targum), but MT has 'have gathered.' As in 41 21 f.,

they must confess their impotence and Jehovah's omniscience.

12. **and there was no strange God among you**: better *I declared . . . when there was . . .* (cf. Dt 32 [16]). Some prefer the meaning, 'I and no god who is a stranger,' on the ground that past history is not referred to. The decision turns on whether the situation of [1-9] still holds in the prophet's mind.

13. Read as RVm.

14. **have sent** ([1] *v.n.*). **ships of their rejoicing.** The verse is corrupt, though the general sense is plain.

16. Remember the glorious Exodus from Egypt!

18. The second Exodus shall be like it. As then I made the sea dry land, so now I will make the dry land waters.

22-28. God's Forgiveness is not Dependent upon Ritual Sacrifice.—The point of this passage is elusive. Does it mean that Israel had sacrificed to other gods during the Exile, but God had forgiven them, or does it mean that God is indifferent to sacrifice? Probably both factors were present in the prophet's thought. Some had sacrificed to Babylonian idols; the majority had not sacrificed at all. And yet God in His mercy would overlook both classes if they would turn to Him.

22. **upon me.** **Me** is emphatic, and the implication is that Israel had called on another God.

24. **bought me,** because sweet cane came from India and Arabia (cf. Jer 6 [20]). It was not indigenous. **made me to serve**: the thought is bold even for an anthropomorphism. Just as the duty of sacrifice was admittedly heavy—it exacted the best of a man's beasts—upon the worshipper, so Israel's sins were heavy upon God: because while He allowed Israel to remain His people, He had perforce to tolerate that which He abhorred. This is incidentally one of many indications that the cultus was a burden upon all but the rich, and its elaborated requirements were impossible for the poor.

26. The language is forensic. God condescends to argument.

27. **Thy first father**: not Abraham, the friend of God, but the treacherous Jacob (cf. Hos 12 [3]). **interpreters,** i.e. those who were the spiritual leaders of the nation, from Jacob downwards. The term is general in order to include the many apostates, false prophets, and evil kings.

28. **I will profane** is obviously an impossible sense. A message of consolation and exhortation to a captive people will not contain a prophecy of their extermination (ban). The tense rests upon the vowel points which were added in post-Christian times, and the passage was intended by the punctuators to be a prophecy of the Roman arms (cf. 63 [3]). Read as RVm. **I will make Jacob a curse** should be *I gave Jacob to the ban* (*herem*).

XLIV. 1-5: **The Increase of the Community by (*a*) Propagation, (*b*) Proselytizing.**

1. 43 [1] *v.n.*

2. **Jeshurun**: Dt 32 [15] *v.n.*

4. **they shall spring up among the grass.** The sense is poor. Read with LXX *. . . like grass amid water.* Observe the improved parallelism.

5. **call himself by the name of Jacob.** To call 'with the name' (as the Hebrew text here) means to use the Name (Jehovah) as an invocation (cf. Gen 12 [8]), or to call a name (Is 40 [26]). Both senses are inept here. (Still there is a parallel in Ex 33 [19], where Jehovah says, 'I will proclaim the name of Jehovah.') It can hardly be right with RV to supply the crucial word 'himself' here and in [b]. Read with Sym. *shall be called by the name . . . shall be surnamed* (cf. Job 32 [21]). Among the Semites honorific titles are carefully graded. Muhammad's *kunya* (corresponding to the Hebrew *kinnah* here) was Abu Qasim, 'father of Qasim': in addition titles like 'Seal of the Prophets,' 'Best of Creation,' were bestowed upon him. For the heathen world the supreme honour was to be permitted to use the name of Israel. **subscribe with his hand** is *write on his hand,* i.e. brand or tattoo it (cf. Lev 19 [28]; Ezek 9 [4]; Gal 6 [17]; Rev 7 [3], etc.).

6-8. Cf. 41 [4, 21, 23].

7 is restored, on the basis of LXX, by most moderns with all reasonable certainty thus:

Then who is like me? Let him stand and proclaim;
Let him declare it, and set it in order for me!
Who hath announced from of old the things that are coming?
And that which shall come to pass let them declare!

The change is made by re-grouping the Hebrew consonants.

9-20. **The Folly of Idolatry.**—Some scholars regard this passage as an interpolation on the grounds of (*a*) its want of rhythm; (*b*) its love of detail; and (*c*) the supposed interruption of thought. As to (*a*) it is no more irregular than many passages ascribed to Deutero-Isaiah,

particularly 66 18-21. As to (*b*) we cannot be sure that Israel's temptation to idolatry, which was so insistent and so fatal to a realization of the prophet's vision of universal redemption, would not induce him to descend to any detail which would tend to discredit the insensate practice. Further, it is not clear that there is any other theme in this book which could lend itself to objective description, and thus provide a parallel to the present passage. (*c*) is not apparent.

No more thorough condemnation of the folly of idolatry has ever been written. The reader is asked to consider who it is that makes idols, then to consider all the hammerings, beatings, and solderings the image suffers; and lastly the fate of the substance of which it is composed, the cooking of the workman's dinner!

9. shall not profit: better *of no use.*

10. If read as RV means: Who can have been so senseless? But possibly we should render: *Whoever hath formed 'a god' hath molten an image to profit nothing thereby.* In Hebrew the result is often spoken of as though it were the design. He deliberately made a useless image!

11. his fellows. RVm gives the meaning of the root, and Hos 4 17 an example of its use. Here it is generally understood to be the idol's *koinônoi* as 1 Cor 10 20. In Rabbinic Hebrew the word meant (*inter alia*) the close associate or 'neighbour' of a pious Jew. The Jewish commentators understood 'his fellows' to be the friends of the idol-maker. This is not impossible. Duhm's ingenious manipulation of the vowels, whereby allusions to sorcery appear, is hardly convincing.

12. The text is doubtful. The LXX is little better. As a description of the manufacture of idols is wanted, perhaps we should read with Skinner: *The smith makes (it) in the coals.*

13. to dwell in the house: probably *a temple.*

16. part thereof: RVm gives the Hebrew. Read with LXX *upon its coals* (cf. 19), and transpose the verbs *roast* and *eat* to avoid the hysteron proteron.

18. he hath shut. There is no need to regard the verb as transitive. *Their eyes are smeared over.*

23. The prophet calls on the universe to rejoice in Jehovah's redemption of Israel.

24-XLV. 25. Israel's Restoration will be Wrought by Cyrus.—The importance assigned to Cyrus is remarkable. He, a Gentile, is accepted as Jehovah's shepherd. He has been strengthened and supported to the end that he may be Jehovah's instrument in restoring Israel to their land, and through Israel of bringing the knowledge of the Lord to the whole earth. Let none presume to criticize God's plans. Cyrus it is who is to build the holy city and let the people go.

The advent of the Aryans brought in an age of religious toleration such as the Near and Middle East had not known before. No longer were the gods of conquered nations insulted; Cyrus went out of his way to do them honour. He did not fulfil the prophet's hopes to the full, but he did 'let the people go.' For state reasons he seems to have laid aside (at any rate in his public life as the inscriptions witness) his countrymen's tendency to worship one supreme deity; possibly the Persian inclination towards monotheism encouraged the Deutero-Isaiah to hope that Cyrus would embrace Judaism. He seems to contemplate this in 45 3.

XLIV. **24-28. Jehovah's Majesty.**

25. The heathen soothsayers are destined to ridicule. **make mad** is too strong: *make a fool of* is what is meant.

26 f. The prophecy becomes more precise.

XLV. **1-8. Cyrus' Career is of Jehovah's Ordering.**

1. his anointed. The Hebrew *mashiaḥ* (Messiah) is of course the same word as that later rendered Christ. But in the Old Testament it is never used of the future Messianic King (unless Ps 2 2 is to be interpreted thus). It is here used of a Gentile, because he has been called to do the work of an ideal ruler, viz. to fill the earth with the knowledge of the Lord. The inscription of Cyrus contains phrases so closely resembling Deutero-Isaiah's that some scholars hold that this passage is due to the latter's familiarity with the court-style of Babylon. Thus Marduk appoints, holds the hand of, proclaims the title of, and beholds the deeds of, Cyrus whom he takes as his friend (cf. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the O.T.*). It is important to notice that the 'court-style' of Babylon, if it ever began, ceases at 4, where the monarch's career is said to have been furthered 'for Jacob's sake' (cf. 41 2-4).

2. doors of brass. According to Herodotus, i, 179 Babylon had a hundred such.

4. surnamed thee (44 5 *v.n.*) with the honourable titles of *Shepherd* and *Anointed.*

6. Through Cyrus the inhabited world is to recognize that Jehovah is the only God.

7. Kŏnig champions the older view

that here there is a polemic against the Zoroastrian god of light and goodness and the god of darkness and evil. Others have thought that the 'only dualism here referred to is the dualism latent in every polytheistic system, viz. the ascription of good and evil events to different classes of deities' (Skinner). The point is of very considerable importance, as it would determine whether the prophet thought that God accepted responsibility for *moral* evil. He would seem to declare this, if he meant that Jehovah combined the prerogatives of Ahuramazda and Ahriman. But there is no ground for asserting that the Old Testament teaches that God is the author of moral evil: here *ra'* is opposed to *shalom*, i.e. well-being in its widest sense. Hence it is *calamity* of which God is said to be the author: cf. Am 3 [6] 'Shall evil (i.e. calamity) befall a city, and the Lord hath not done it?'

8. It is a characteristic of Deutero-Isaiah to interject lyrical songs of praise into his verse (cf. 42 [10-13] and 44 [23]).

9-13. A rebuke to those who resented salvation at the hands of a Gentile. The exact situation is not clear, but it is evident that a certain section of the people disliked God's plan as it was outlined by the prophet. Accordingly he reiterates that Cyrus *will* build Jerusalem and liberate Israel.

9. **no hands**: i.e. no power.

11*b* should probably be emended to:

Of things that are to come will ye impudently
('al panai) question me,
And concerning the work of my hands will
ye lay commands upon me!

13. **I** is emphatic, as is he in [b]. There was to be no material inducement for Cyrus' acts.

14-17. **The Subjugation of the Heathen.**—It is hard to resist the conclusion that it is the personified Israel (or the Jerusalem of the preceding verse) that is addressed, though some prefer to follow Ibn Ezra in thinking that Cyrus is intended. Cf. 43 [3], where these countries become Israel's ransom.

14. **The labour** is that for which men labour, and so *earnings*. **make supplication.** This word is always used of *praying to God*, hence some read for **unto thee**, *unto thy God*. Still it is not impossible that the writer pictures the ignorant heathen giving almost divine honours to those with whom God's presence dwells (cf. Ac 14 [11]).

18-25. **Universal Salvation is God's Purpose.**

18. God's intention was that the earth should be peopled, not that it should be made a waste by the ruthless extermination of the nations.

19. **in vain** (*tohu*): the same word as in [18]. God did not set Israel to seek Him in an empty void where they could find nought, nor was His revelation kept secret. What is unsaid, but apparent nevertheless, is 'Seek and ye shall find.'

20. Cf. 41 [1-4, 21-29], 43 [9-13], 44 [7].

22. **Look**: lit. *Turn unto me and be ye saved.* Two imperatives often form a conditional sentence, i.e. *If ye turn to me ye will be saved.*

23*a*. The first margin is right.

24. A parenthesis in Hebrew is always suspect. Follow Skinner and LXX and read *swear,* [24] *saying, Only in Jehovah is righteousness and strength.*

XLVI.-XLVIII. **The Overthrow of Babylon and its Gods.**

XLVI. 1-4. Whereas the Babylonian gods must be carried about, the God of the Jews tenderly carries His people (cf. 40 [11]).

1. **Bel** was the city god of Nippur and **Nebo** of Borsippa near Babylon. They stood for Zeus and Hermes respectively. **their idols are upon the beasts.** The tenses are prophetic perfects. Schrader notes that Merodach Baladan despatched his idols by ship when Nebuchadrezzar advanced upon him.

5-7. Cf. 40 [18-20], 44 [9-20], the familiar theme of the futility of idols.

8-11. Cf. 41 [21-23], etc., the appeal to prediction.

12-13. A rebuke addressed to those who will not believe. To disbelieve is to be stubborn and rebellious.

12. For **stouthearted** the LXX has 'ye that have lost heart.' Some hesitate to accept this as the original reading, but it is a profound truth that the *oligopistoi* are 'far from righteousness.'

XLVII. **A Taunt Song against Babylon.**—There are few if any indications in the prose narratives of harshness on the part of the Babylonians during the Captivity; but the poetical passages in the Old Testament which refer to the Captivity speak in the bitterest and strongest terms of the Babylonian ferocity. In these a fierce hatred of the oppressor breaks out, and (as in Ps 137 [9]) we are shocked by the violence of the language and the implacable hatred it reveals. This seems the more to be deplored when the speaker evidently counts on God's support in the maledictions he hurls at his enemies. But we must remember first that the spiritual education of the Jews was still going on, and secondly that oppression, insult, and the blasphemy of one's God

are no light provocation to anyone, and very few religious people are capable of rising above the hatred such wrongs evoke. Thirdly, the highest possible attitude towards the Gentiles as a whole is shown in 53.

A good deal of this chapter is written in the Qinah measure (p. 514*b*). Its theme is a frank satisfaction in the humiliations which overtake Babylon; the city is personified as a voluptuous, tenderly nurtured lady who is forced to perform the duties of the meanest slave and to expose herself shamefully. The reason for all this is Jehovah's vengeance. Babylon has been merciless to His people. All her sorceries and black arts cannot avail to avert the coming doom. Babylon must perish.

3. will accept no man. König's *no man shall intervene* is an attractive alternative for the difficult Hebrew, though an exact parallel is wanting. Others connect with [4] and read *I will not let myself be entreated, saith our redeemer*, etc.

11. the dawning thereof. RVm is probably right. **put it away** (*kapper*): Lev 16[2] *v.n., to expiate.*

13. dividers of the heavens is literal, though RV=LXX gives the sense. The Babylonians used to divide the heavens into four sections in which the **stargazers** fixed lucky and unlucky days or **months.**

14. A momentary digression like 40[18-20] *v.n.* [c] Duhm and others would rob the poem of this grim jest.

15. trafficked with thee: lit. *thy merchants.* The mention of *merchants* is surprising and the reason is not apparent. The slight change suggested by Ewald producing *thy magicians* has much to commend it.

XLVIII. **Exhortation to Flee from Babylon.**—It is the eve of departure and the prophet endeavours to persuade the people that the approaching fall of Babylon is God's doing and no mere outcome of human lust for empire and dominion. The prophet's stern language is probably due as much to the reluctance of the great bulk of the exiles to become 'Zionists' as to their half-hearted idolatry. They called themselves 'men of the holy city' and worshipped Jehovah, but in their actions they denied His power and promise.

1. waters. It is better to assume that a letter has fallen out of the text and read *bowels.*

3. from of old: better *beforehand*, and so in [7, 8].

5. Mine idol. Hence it is clear that some of the Jews had practised idolatry in Babylonia while they kept up the worship of Jehovah. A somewhat similar state of affairs existed in Egypt at, or a little later than, this time, as the Elephantine papyri prove.

9. This verse is in marked contrast with the lofty destiny assigned to Israel elsewhere in this book, and is perhaps best explained by the prophet's righteous indignation at the prospect of his people's failure to co-operate with the divine will. Even so, God will 'curb' His anger.

10. chosen: rather *tried* as metal.

11. God's solicitude for Israel, and through Israel for the world, will not permit that His name be profaned among men, else would His gracious purpose be thwarted.

12. Simply *I am* as in 41[4].

14*b*. Hebrew is strange here, and on the basis of LXX we may read 'My friend shall work my will on Babylon and the seed of the Chaldeans.'

16. God is present in history. He is not a mysterious oracular deity who utters inscrutable sayings and leaves men to work out their meaning in perplexity and fear. **Jehovah is there. and now . . . and his spirit:** the Spirit is the second object, not a second subject—the thing sent, not the sender. In the Old Testament God's spirit never attains personality. But most commentators regard these words as misplaced. They have no apparent connexion with what precedes or what follows.

20-21. A joyous exhortation to the exiles to join in the second Exodus.

22. Cf. 57[21] where the verse is apposite.

(B) XLIX.-LV. are concerned chiefly with Israel's glorious future. Probably many of the foregoing predictions have been fulfilled, and the prophet now exhorts Israel to undertake the great task of evangelizing the world which God bids him press upon his nation. He presents the nation with two pictures: one of a righteous, suffering Servant; the other of a personified Zion decked in the raiment of a royal bride.

XLIX. **1-6. The Second Poem of the Servant of the Lord.**—In this poem the Servant addresses himself to the remote nations of the earth, and tells them of his prenatal consecration by Jehovah. He has been given a penetrating message to cut through pretence and opposition. He is a chosen Servant in whom God will glorify Himself. The Servant, who is expressly said to be Israel (but see below), affirms that his past labours have been fruitless,

and he has spent his strength for nought; nevertheless he is content to leave his recompense to God's justice. Jehovah answers that the task of bringing Israel back to Him is too light a thing for His chosen Servant, and therefore He will make him a light to the Gentiles that the whole world may come within the blessing of His salvation.

The interpretation of this poem depends first on whether the four 'Servant poems' can be separated from Deutero-Isaiah and ascribed to another author; and secondly, on whether the mention of Israel in [3] is original or a gloss. The view which I took in *Theology* (December [1925], 316) now seems to me less probable. The reasons for isolating the Servant poems are not irresistible; and if the poems *can* be explained by assuming that their hero is Israel, it is, on the whole, safer to interpret them thus. Such an interpretation does not rule out the possibility of their assuming a greater and unsuspected significance in the life of the suffering Messiah: but on the contrary it strengthens a view of God's providence which reveals itself in words and figures which are themselves capable of developing a new meaning with the gradual development of the divine purpose.

Assuming, then, that the author intended us to understand that Israel was the speaker, we must suppose that a confession of national failure was made, and that Israel now felt an imperative call to bring back all the tribes of the Diaspora to the worship of Jehovah; and that that was to be the beginning of a universal conversion.

Of course it must always be apparent that in this figure Israel is idealized. But it is not so much an ideal as opposed to a real and historic Israel that seems to be the subject of the prophet's thought. The real, historic Israel is called upon to act with an altruism almost ideal. In so far as we can regard Deutero-Isaiah as the mouthpiece of a section of Israelites who pondered over the past history of the nation in the light of the pre-exilic prophecies, it may be said that the righteous *kernel* of the nation is sometimes meant; but it is well to observe caution in attaching a precise objective significance to a prophetic ideal.

3. be glorified: better *show myself glorious*. Here Duhm would transpose [5b], but this is hardly necessary.

5. to bring Jacob again to him. Here there is an apparent contradiction. If the Servant is Israel, how can he restore Israel? Some favour the view that it is Jehovah who brings Jacob back to Himself. But (i) we can speak of England's duty to herself; and (ii) it is the Israel of Babylon which is to restore the Israel of the Diaspora. There is no philological necessity to interpret **to bring back** and **gather** as 'restore to Palestine'; probably, though not certainly, a spiritual restoration is meant. **be gathered:** reject RVm.

6. the preserved are those who escaped the sword of the Babylonians (cf. Ezek 6 [12]). **that my salvation may be:** as RVm.

7-13. Israel's Coming Exaltation.—The nation's present despicable plight is contrasted with its imminent glory which is the fulfilment of God's former promises.

7. redeemer: Hebrew *go'el*, a favourite word of the author's, 41 [14] *v.n.* **whom man despiseth . . . abhorreth:** perhaps to be rendered 'to him whom every creature (soul) despiseth, every nation abhorreth'; but the text is to be suspected.

8. covenant of the people: 42 [6] *v.n.* If the Servant is the subject, his mission is to repeople Palestine, and the prisoners will be the Jews hidden away in the various countries whither they have been scattered (cf. [12]). But some prefer to regard Jehovah as the subject.

12. these . . . these: better *some . . . some*. **Sinim:** as north and west have been mentioned, we must obviously look for Sinim in south or east. The Targum asserts that the south is meant, and we probably ought to read with an infinitesimal change Sevenim, i.e. Assouan, where a large colony of Jews was established.

14-L. 3. The Repeopling of Jerusalem; the Subjugation and Slaughter of Israel's Oppressors.—Though there is here the beautiful picture of Mother Zion welcoming her children, there is more than one hard saying in this prophecy. The bitter hatred the writer displays against the Gentiles is hard to reconcile with the context, and we may safely follow Duhm in ascribing it to the Trito-Isaiah: in fact, some passages are identical (cf. 49 [18] and 60 [4]; 49 [26], 60 [16], and 61 [10]; 49 [22] and 60 [4]; 49 [23], 60 [6], and 60 [14]).

[*Note.*—For convenience the passages ascribed to Trito-Isaiah are set out here, viz. 49 [14]-50 [3], 56 [1-8] (?), 56 [9]-63 [1-6].]

XLIX. **16, 17.** The mention of **walls** coupled with the haste of **builders** (RVm) and the exit of **destroyers**, suggests that this prophecy is to be dated some time before the incident mentioned in Neh 1 [3] *v.n.*

23. lick the dust of thy feet: contrast with 49 [6].

26. feed them . . . with their own flesh, i.e. cause them to slay one another. These ideas are foreign to the thought of the Deutero-Isaiah.

L. 1. There has been no formal dissolution of the agreement between Jehovah and Israel.

4-10. The Third Servant Poem.—The Servant relates his sufferings. He bore them voluntarily as the result of his obedience to the heavenly voice. Day by day he had been in communion with God, and thus was able to resist every temptation to shrink from scourging and insult. He endured in faith, believing that God would ultimately vindicate him.

Here the Servant is personified much more decidedly, and many scholars have felt that the experience of some 'actual prophet and martyr (such as Jeremiah) lies behind the representation, and has been transferred to the picture of the ideal Servant' (Skinner). Job (who is mentioned by Ezekiel) might also provide the prophet with material for his idealization. In fact we have reached a point where, though the identity of the Servant with Israel may still be asserted, it is hardly so clear. Thus G. A. Smith holds that the prophetic idea gradually contracts from the historical Israel to the spiritual kernel, and finally to an individual, the expected Messiah. This latter view can only be upheld if we can believe (1) that the prophet created an entirely new conception of the Messianic King, and (2) that he projected himself into a future where a prophet had suffered and his vindication was still to come. With the New Testament in our hands, such an explanation seems almost inevitably right; but if we put ourselves in the position of the Deutero-Isaiah's hearers, we are bound to feel that something more relevant to their lives and religion was needed, and that—whoever the Servant was and whatever his sufferings—God's message was (*a*) that suffering voluntarily borne for others must in the end evoke repentance and remorse in the hearts of the persecutors, and (*b*) that God Himself would vindicate His servants, if necessary, beyond the gates of death.

4. tongue of them that are taught: cf. 54 [13] 'All thy children shall be taught of the Lord.' **know how to sustain . . . weary:** the verb cannot mean **sustain,** and LXX omits **the weary.** RVm (transposing two Hebrew letters) is probably right. **he wakeneth,** etc.: the repetition here is suspicious and the text is corrupt.

5. I was not rebellious: cf. Jer 15 [15].

6. Cf. Ps 129 [8], where the nation is certainly the speaker.

8. justifieth me means *declares me to be right.* The term is forensic. **adversary:** at law.

9. The reference to the natural decay of the Servant's enemies is remarkable. It implicitly proclaims the Servant's belief that he will not likewise perish, and if the Servant is Israel, it is a remarkable statement of the conviction that Israel is indestructible. In 51 [6-8] the same metaphor is used of the transience of heaven and earth as compared with the eternal stability of God's righteousness.

10. It would seem that the writer speaks in his own person. Notice the obscure situation of the Servant.

11. Probably a later addition. **sorrow:** better 'place of torment.'

LI. 1-LII. **12. Encouragement Addressed to the Exiles and to Zion.**

LI. 1-8. As Abraham went forth from Mesopotamia to become the father of a nation, so will those who seek Jehovah go forth to found it anew. Like Abraham they will be a source of blessing to the nations of the earth in bringing true religion to them.

1. ye that follow after righteousness. The context suggests that only a few of the exiles are thinking of a return, and they are daunted by the thought of their small number.

3. hath comforted. The events are so certain that they are said to have taken place.

4. a law: the primary meaning of the word *torah* is direction; taken in conjunction with religion (**my judgement**) it means a new revelation of God's will, which no doubt would have to be expressed, or given effect to, in religious law. But that is not the meaning of the word here. The word *argi'a,* **make to rest,** is probably out of place in [4], and following a hint in the LXX we should transfer it to [5] and read:

4b. And my religion for a light of the peoples.

5a. I will quickly bring my righteousness near.

6. To Abraham the heavens with their countless stars were a sign of the great nation which was to owe its origin to him. To the exiles the heavens were to be but a sign of transitoriness and a contrast to the eternal salvation of God.

9-10. The exiles appeal to God in language reminiscent both of the Exodus and of the Creation myth (Job 3 [8], 9 [13], 26 [18] *v.n.*).

11. A repetition of 35 [10]. It has prob-

ably been transferred to this context because of the words **way for the redeemed** in [10].

13. when he maketh ready as an archer (Ps 7 [13], 11 [2], 21 [12]) **to destroy.**

14 is probably corrupt. The RV is a good attempt at an intelligible rendering.

15. Cf. Job 26 [12]; Jer 31 [35].

16. Repeated in 59 [21] and 49 [2]. The nation is addressed in the same terms as the Servant.

17-LII. 12. Zion's Restoration.

LI. 17-20. There are some striking parallels with Lamentations in [17-20].

19. how shall I: render *who shall comfort thee?*

LII. 1-2. Jerusalem will rise from its present degradation and clothe itself with the ordered beauty of godly citizens. There is probably an intentional contrast with the plight of the daughter of Babylon in 47 [1].

3-6. Jehovah is concerned for His own honour which is compromised by Israel's degradation.

5. Now therefore: better *But now.* **what do I here,** i.e. I have nothing to do with this place. **howl:** read *are profaned.* **blasphemed:** better *despised.*

7-12. Jehovah Returns to Zion.—The coming of the tidings that the exiles are returning to Zion is described by the prophet as though he saw from a hill the arrival of the triumphant exiles preceded by the priests bearing the holy vessels. God Himself had returned to Zion. It is significant that the existence of a community of Jehovah's worshippers in Palestine is excluded. Jehovah had gone into captivity with His people, and with His people He returned.

7. him that bringeth good tidings: in Hebrew one word *mebasser*, evangelist.

8. Thy god reigneth: or hath become king (cf. Ps 93 [1], 97 [1], etc.). **for eye to eye . . . Zion:** render *for eye to eye shall they look upon Jehovah's return to Zion.* In English the expression 'seeing eye to eye' has become proverbial for exact agreement and unanimity; but it has no such meaning in classical Hebrew.

10. made bare his holy arm, i.e. prepared for action—the deliverance of His exiled people.

11. be ye clean: rather *purify yourselves.* The parallels with the first Exodus are intentional, the language having been borrowed from Exodus.

12. the Lord will go before you: cf. Ex 13 [21] (J). **in haste:** Ex 12 [11] (P) and Dt 16 [3].

13-LIII. 12. The Suffering Servant.—In this, the last of the Servant poems, is the prophet's vision of God's plan for bringing the world to a knowledge of Himself. He sees a world startled and amazed at the spectacle of the sufferings of a despised and lowly individual. The world supposed that his grievous afflictions must necessarily come from God, until by reflecting on the Servant's blameless life and patient demeanour under suffering it became clear that he was bearing the punishment due to the sins of others. Those to whom this report had come confessed that he had suffered unjustly, and that they themselves ought to have suffered in his place. They recognized after his death that it had been God's will that he should endure these things. But God would not allow His Servant to perish; and after his death in some mysterious way God would reward him by giving him the spoils of a conqueror. Through him many would come to righteousness.

There are many exegetical difficulties in this poem; but on the whole the theory that the Servant is Israel seems the easiest. The Deutero-Isaiah began his teaching with the message that Israel had 'received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.' Here he puts himself in the place of the nations, and puts into their mouth the confession of guilt and repentance he fain would have them make. It is vain to enquire whether there was any *probability* that the Gentiles of the 6th century B.C. would so have expressed themselves. The picture is an ideal: its details are in part historical in so far as they refer to Israel's past history; in part they are prophetic. Christians are entitled to claim that the voluntary sufferings of Jesus, His apparently obscure origin in the 'dry ground' of Galilee, His silence before His persecutors, His quasi-judicial condemnation, His death with the wicked and His grave with the rich, His tender solicitude for His persecutors, and His vindication by resurrection are a fulfilment of a prophetic ideal more complete, both in spirit and in detail, than is to be found anywhere else.

The poem falls into three parts:

(*a*) Jehovah brings forward His Servant (52 [13-15]).

(*b*) Universal astonishment at his humiliation and his undeserved fate (53 [1-9]).

(*c*) The fulfilment of Jehovah's purpose and the Servant's coming exaltation.

LII. 13-15. These verses prepare the way for the announcement in 53 [12]. He who once startled all men by his miserable sufferings will again amaze them by his triumphal exaltation.

13. shall deal wisely. In Maccabæan times 'they that be wise' (Hebrew *maskilim*) are the leaders of the Jews who stood firm during the persecutions (cf. Dan 11 [33, 35]; 12 [3], which witness to the early interpretation of this passage). Parallelism requires us to adopt the RVm. **exalted and lifted up:** it is worthy of note that these words are used of Jehovah Himself in 57 [15], and cf. 6 [1].

14. astonied: lit. devastated, and so *appalled*. The **many** are apparently, as in [15], the nations. **his visage . . . men.** The Hebrew here is difficult, for strictly we should render *so* was his visage, etc., i.e. this clause is the apodosis to **Like as** at the beginning of the verse. We can either read *kī* (*because*) for *ken* (*so*), or transpose the parenthesis to the end of 53 [2] as Marti suggested.

15. sprinkle. It is unfortunate that this erroneous translation should have been given a place in the RV. The accusative of the verb is the liquid, not the thing *be*sprinkled (cf. Lev 4 [6], etc.). Render **startle** as RVm.

LIII. **1-9.** The identity of the speakers in this section is disputed. The most natural interpretation is that they are the nations and kings referred to in the previous verse. In that case we might supply the word 'saying' (cf. 56 [12], where the RV actually adds the words '*say they*'). What caused the nations' surprise was not the exaltation of the Servant (for that still lay in the future), but the explanation of his suffering which had been conveyed to them in such a way as to secure their assent to its truth.

On the other hand, if the expression **my people** in [8] is what the prophet wrote (and the LXX there differs considerably), the speakers must be Israelites, for we cannot suppose that the Gentiles as a whole could have thus spoken.

1. Who hath believed our report? The verb expresses incredulity, *Who could have believed* **that which we have heard?** as RVm. **to whom:** lit. *on whom*, i.e. the ground for astonishment is the character and position of the person on whom the hand of God has been working.

2. a root out of a dry ground. Probably no more is meant than that the Servant sprang from unpromising soil. His nation's past gave no hint of his spiritual greatness; indeed it discouraged any such anticipation. **he hath no form.** There is no verb in the Hebrew, and if one is inserted in English it must be in the past tense. But render *without form and without majesty*. It would be possible to translate 'without majesty that we should look at him, without comeliness that we should desire him.'

3. Almost all modern commentators regard the representation as of 'one stricken with loathsome and disfiguring disease, probably leprosy,' but it is doubtful if the language used need be so interpreted. **grief** (RVm **sickness**, Hebrew *ḥolī*) may mean illness resulting from disease or injury, as when Ahaziah fell down from his upper chamber and was *sick*. But both this word and **sorrows** (Hebrew *makhobhoth*) can be used of mental suffering, a sense which cannot be excluded, though it is hardly likely that only mental pain is meant. Similarly the word **stricken** in [4] seems to many to mean that the Servant was a leper, and the disease of Job is cited as a parallel. But (*a*) authorities differ as to the precise disease from which Job suffered, and even as to whether the symptoms can be found in any one disease; and (*b*) Job is nowhere said to have suffered from leprosy. In fact, Old Testament usage supports the assumption that God's stroke may take any form, and when leprosy is meant it is specified as in 2 K 15 [5]; Lev 13 [2], etc. And further the references to the injuries which were inflicted on the Servant by his persecutors (50 [6]) imply that his sickness was due to wounds rather than disease. One thing at least is certain, and that is that he cannot have been scourged while he was a leper. **rejected.** RVm is better (cf. Job 19 [14], 'My kinsfolk have *failed*'—the corresponding verb in Hebrew).

4. The speakers realize their mistake. The Servant was bearing their sins while they thought God was smiting him for his own wickedness. There is an emphasis on the contrasted words **our** and **he.**

4*b*. *While we thought him stricken*, etc.

5. Render *But he was pierced because of our transgressions, crushed because of our iniquities. Pierced* probably refers to the manner of his death at the hands of men (cf. [8]), just as the **stripes** refer to the weals made by the scourging in 50 [6]. Others see in these words allusions to the ravages of leprosy. **we are healed.** The speakers are themselves sufferers, but not of the same degree. Precisely *how* the Servant's suffering brought healing to others is not stated. Healing of soul and mind is in question, and this healing was mediated to others through one in whom the 'soul' of Jehovah delighted, one whose sacrifice of himself was voluntary and without reserve. The idea of (*a*) vicarious sacrifice and (*b*) remission of punishment for another's sake, though

worked out more fully and with greater power here than elsewhere in the Old Testament, is no new one. For (*a*) cf. Ex 32 [32]; for (*b*) Gen 18 [23], 19 [29]; 1 K 11 [13], etc.

6. have gone . . . have turned: render *had gone . . . had turned.* **hath laid on him**: rather *hath allowed to light* or *made to alight.* The causative form of the verb in Hebrew not unfrequently means to allow to happen, and this is probably the meaning here.

7. The description of the Servant's sufferings is continued. The emphasis on the violent and unjust treatment which was meted out to him is most marked. **oppressed** (*niggas*): as by a slave-driver (cf. Ex 3 [7]). **yet he humbled himself**: better *he allowing himself to be afflicted.* The repetition of the words **he opened not his mouth** may be an error. If so the verse should be divided differently, thus:

Like a lamb (lit. sheep) *that is led to the slaughter,*
And a sheep (lit. ewe) *that before her shearers is dumb.*

8. The interpretation of this verse is difficult. The RV offers two renderings of [8a], the LXX a third, and others could be added. **By oppression and judgement he was taken away.** This translation has the merit of giving a meaning to *'oṣer* **oppression**, which Ps 107 [39] supports, and implies that the Servant's death was a travesty of justice. **From oppression and from judgement** (RVm) implies that God (or, death) released him from his sufferings. Others, following Syriac, prefer 'He was taken away from prison,' etc., but 'prison' is a questionable rendering; others 'Without hindrance and without right,' etc., basing 'hindrance' on the sense of the cognate verb in 2 K 17 [4], while LXX has 'Through oppression his right was taken away.'

8*b*. **as for his generation.** The syntax here is difficult, for the RV implies a prosaic construction characteristic of later Hebrew, and the verb **consider** is not elsewhere construed with an accusative. However, if the text is sound it is difficult to improve on RV. **generation** (*dôr*) probably means his contemporaries, though the same word occurs in 38 [12] in the Aramaic sense of dwelling-place. If the verb can be regarded as transitive it is possible that *rîbho* (*his suit* or *case*) was the original reading, as *rîbh* is used frequently as a parallel to 'judgement.' **for the transgression of my people was he stricken**: lit. 'there was a stroke to him.' The difficulty of reconciling the expression **my people** with the circumstances of Gentile speakers is almost insuperable, and many scholars read either 'the peoples' (with the addition of a single letter), or 'for our transgressions' (with the deletion of one letter and the alteration of two others). Those who hold that Jews are speaking of a martyred Jew, or of the godly or ideal remnant, naturally uphold the integrity of the text. Almost all scholars accept the rendering *was he stricken to death,* which LXX seems to have read.

9. The Servant's grave was not with his fathers, but in some neglected spot where the lowest of the people were buried. Jer 26 [23], 2 K 23 [6] illustrate how deeply such a disgrace was felt. **and with the rich** can hardly be the original reading, and the addition of one letter gives *evil-doers.* **in his death**: the form in Hebrew is anomalous. Perhaps 'when he died' is intended (cf. LXX). The suggestion 'sepulchral mound,' though affording a parallel, is against usage. The *bāmāh* was a place of worship: the word could hardly be applied to a despised cemetery, unless, perhaps, it can be supported by Ezek 43 [7]. **although he had done no violence** (cf. Job 16 [17]). This summary of the Servant's career does not contain an explicit assertion of his sinlessness, but sinlessness is implicit in his voluntary resignation to God's call and his obedience unto death.

10-12. Unfortunately [10, 11] are obscure, and there are grave reasons for suspecting that the text is corrupt. The general sense, however, is clear. The Servant suffered because God willed that he should bring many to righteousness by his obedience. He will live to see a spiritual offspring and attain the position of a conqueror. Of necessity resurrection is implied. 'If the Servant be a personification of Israel, this is merely a figure for national resurrection from exile; but if he be an individual, then his resurrection must be accepted as a literal fact, just as his death must be literally understood' (Skinner).

10. bruise: rather *crush* as in [5]. **he hath put him to grief.** It is best to take these two verbs together, *to crush him grievously.* LXX, 'The Lord was pleased to cleanse him from disease'; but they gave an Aramaic sense to a verb which has already been used in [5] in its Hebrew sense. Peake's emendation 'was pleased to justify him' avoids the latter difficulty, but involves considerable textual alteration. The statement that the Servant's

sufferings were according to God's will prepares the way for God's vindication of His Servant. Vicarious suffering, which is repugnant to the modern mind, is an idea which could only arise among peoples whose sense of social and communal unity was highly developed. Even to-day the feeling that the clan or tribe is the unit rather than the individual lives on among Semitic peoples. Where the 'blood' was one, the life was one; all men at death returned to their 'fathers.' Consequently the whole body suffered with one member and *vice versa* in a very real sense. **when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin**: better *if his soul shall make a trespass offering*. Apparently the promise of spiritual descendants is conditional upon the Servant's life making a compensatory trespass offering (cf. Lev 5 [14]). The trespass offering (*āshām*) was made by those who desired to offer compensation for the infringement of the rights of, or obedience due to, God or man. Thus the Servant's life was regarded by the speakers as an offering to compensate for their own sins and spiritual blindness. The LXX here reads 'If ye will make,' etc. **he shall see** *a* **seed** (not 'his seed'). **pleasure**, i.e. will or purpose, **in his hand** means through him or by his means.

11. **He shall see of the travail of his soul.** The text can mean 'away from' or 'because of' or 'some of' the travail; therefore it is best to make a trifling change and read *He shall look upon the travail* (*ba'amal*) *of his soul, shall be satisfied by his knowledge* (or, *when he knoweth it*), dividing the words differently. The LXX here differs widely from MT. Most scholars agree that certain combinations of letters in the autograph have been duplicated, and the differences between LXX and MT can be resolved into a text somewhat as follows:

But it pleased Jehovah to justify him,
To deliver his soul from trouble (cf. Old Lat.),
To cause him to see light and be satisfied.

shall my righteous servant justify many: 'justify' in the sense of 'making righteous' as in Dan 12 [3] (see note on [12]). The Servant makes many righteous by instruction in the will of God and by example in constancy. The **many** are those of 52 [14]. Cf. Mk 10 [45]; Mt 20 [28], 26 [28].

12. The fruits of victory will be given to the Servant by Jehovah. **with the great should be** *among the many*. **yet he bare**: the true view of his death as opposed to the false judgement of men. **made intercession**: there is no trace in these poems of that resentment against the absorption of the individual in the corporate community for punishment and discipline which is a marked characteristic of the early exiles' outlook. On the contrary, the Servant accepts as from God the sufferings which were due to the sins of others. He acquiesced in the divine judgement. Through the innocent suffering for the guilty it was possible for punishment to take away sin, because a moral regeneration was wrought in all those who pondered thereon. And to the voluntary offering of one without blemish was joined an effective intercession for sinners.

[*Note.*—König's exegesis (1926) of this difficult passage deserves notice, as it departs in many particulars from the positions occupied by most biblical critics. Thus 53 [1] he regards as an exclamation of the prophet, and translates as does RV and St. Paul in Rom 10 [16]: the announcement of the era of salvation had not been believed, and the first acts of God in preparation for the freeing of God's Servant had been ignored. 53 [2-7] explain the ground of the Servant's lowliness which has been alluded to in 52 [14] (which König retains unaltered). The speakers in [2b] he identifies with all those—both Israelites and Gentiles—who had no faith in the divine calling of the Servant. [11a] he renders '*after* the travail of his soul shall he see how he will attain satisfaction.' Inasmuch as König interprets the Servant as Israel, the differences are only in detail; but his treatment is remarkable for its faithfulness to the existing Hebrew text.]

LIV. **Zion's Splendour and Magnificence.**

1-10. The prophet turns from the thought of the despised nation in exile to the contemplation of the glories of Zion when her sons shall have returned to her. Israel's maker is Jehovah, who like a husband takes back an erring wife. The marriage relation is indissoluble: never again will Israel be put outside His covenant.

2. The sudden influx of returning Jews calls for new buildings and enlarged sites. The new state promises to exceed the old in size and power.

4. **shame of thy youth** probably refers to the Egyptian captivity, though it may also have a wider significance (cf. Ezek 16 [4-8]).

5. **thy maker is thine husband.** The order of the words in Hebrew, which there is little reason to abandon, is *thy husband is thy maker*. **shall be called**: rather *is he called*.

9. as the waters of Noah. The text is to be preferred to RVm. The Exile has been to Jehovah as a second flood. As He sware after the flood that the deluge should not recur to man's destruction, so now He swears that His wrath will not destroy His people.

10. For the mountains shall depart: better *For the mountains may depart*, etc.

11-17. Jerusalem will be rebuilt a fair city where precious stones and gems reflect the beauty of righteousness exhibited by its citizens. Once more the city has been taken under God's protection.

11. fair colours: RVm **antimony.** Most commentaries suggest reading *nophek* (a precious stone which has not been identified, Ex 28 [18]) for *puk*; but this is unnecessary. Antimony is stibnite in a pulverized form; it was (and still is) used by women to blacken the eyelids. In its natural form it is found in crystals. Possibly these verses are meant to indicate a splendour which far exceeds that of Babylonian kings who boasted that they had adorned their buildings with precious stones. The new Jerusalem will be of gems laid, not like Babylonian buildings in asphalt but in stibnite.

12. The **pinnacles** (*shimshothaik*) glitter throughout the day in the rays of the sun (*shemesh*).

13. all thy children shall be taught of the Lord: like the Servant in 50 [4].

15. Render *Men may quarrel, but* (*it is*) *not of me. Whosoever quarrels with thee shall fall upon thee* (*sc. to his ruin*), i.e. offences must needs come, but woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh.

16. to destroy: or better *for destroying*. He that forged the weapon and he that wields it are alike God's creatures.

17. their righteousness. The blessing of *being in the right* when attacked by calumny or the sword is from Jehovah.

LV. **An Invitation to Join in the Coming Deliverance.**—The Return is at hand, and the prophet appeals to all those who are occupied in the business of this world to lay it aside and join those who are called to renew the everlasting covenant with Jehovah. Let them repent while Jehovah is still accessible. Let them abandon their wickedness and insincerity, and refrain from judging God by the standard of their human minds. God's purpose is immutable, and the glorious future which He has promised His people is at hand. This chapter contains the last words of the prophet which can confidently be regarded as uttered in Babylonia.

1. every one that thirsteth: cf. Jn 4 [10], etc. In the Old Testament salvation is seldom, if ever, without an earthly as well as a spiritual meaning; and though the Gospel message is adumbrated here, it cannot be denied that the blessings of earthly existence—water, wine, and milk—are intentionally present. The Deutero-Isaiah sought to wean away those who had settled down to the commerce of Babylonia by reminding them of Jehovah's promised salvation, which connoted spiritual and temporal spaciousness.

2. hearken diligently unto me and eat. Two imperatives in Hebrew frequently stand for a conditional sentence. So here *if ye hearken . . . ye shall eat*, etc.

3. your soul shall live. 'Man in his totality is a *nephesh* [soul]' (Pedersen, *Israel: its Life and Culture*, 104). 'This breath-soul is conceived as the animating principle of man's life, its essential constituent, though as much dependent on bodily organs for its activity as these are dependent on it for life itself' (Wheeler Robinson in *The People and the Book*, 357). These quotations from two recent essays on Hebrew psychology will serve as a warning against interpreting *soul* in the sense of Christian theology, and also explain why *eating* will delight the *soul*. **the sure mercies of David,** i.e. those promised to him in 2 S 7 [8-16].

4. I have given him: rather *I appointed him*, i.e. David. The nation is now to succeed to the privilege and responsibility of David. Some think that the Messianic King is meant; but against this view it may be urged that nowhere else in this prophecy is there a clear reference to the Messiah. **leader** (*nagid*): as in 2 S 7 [8] of David.

5. a nation, i.e. nations unspecified (Völkermassen).

10. but watereth: lit. 'except it hath watered,' and so *without having watered*, and similarly *but it shall accomplish* in [11].

12. Jehovah's word has gone forth to this effect. The returning exiles will find joy and peace amid fields where desert thorns once grew.

(C) LVI.-LXIV. **The So-called Trito-Isaiah.**—At this point a different outlook is apparent. The scene is no longer Babylonia, but Palestine. The ideal has given place to the real. The numerous references to sacrifices and to temple make it clear that the prophecies must have been written during the period which elapsed between the Return *c.* 538 and Nehemiah's visit to Jerusalem in 444. This epoch tested the Jewish Church to the uttermost. No real freedom of movement was allowed the people; they were

still under foreign domination. The unhappy management of the controversy with the Samaritans left them with implacable enemies at the very gates of Jerusalem. Times were hard (Hag 1 [6, 10]). Doubtless those who returned hoping to obtain their ancestral homes and estates found others in possession, and received anything but a welcome from those they not unnaturally desired to oust from their holdings. In any case the returning exiles must have created a serious economic problem which is reflected in 58. The stern realities of life damped the enthusiasm of these first Zionists; their own misfortunes and the prevalence of idolatry and superstition on every hand inevitably caused depression and discontent. The glorious future which the Deutero-Isaiah had promised them had not shown itself: instead of a population bursting forth as through the breached walls of a city too strait to contain it, Jerusalem was but sparsely peopled (Neh 7 [4]); poverty was general (Neh 5), and the feeling of the people is best shown by their half-contemptuous attitude towards temple and sacrifice against which Malachi protested.

These chapters are not so closely woven together as the preceding (40-55). They probably cover a long period, some possibly having been composed by the Deutero-Isaiah himself, while others must be very much later.

LVI. **1-8. Encouragement for Proselytes and Eunuchs.**—Already the proselytizing movement has borne fruit, and foreigners are numbered among the godly community. Apparently ([3]) objections to their presence have been raised, and the prophet in the name of Jehovah promises them an honoured place among God's people, provided that they keep His covenant and His sabbaths. The Temple now is to be 'a house of prayer for all peoples.' It is important to remember that the writer is dealing with concrete instances, and he clearly regards these Gentiles (even the sad victims of Oriental cruelty who were excluded from the congregation by Dt 23 [1], but see on [4]) as the beginning of an influx of Gentiles from all countries. The emphasis on the character of the Sabbath and the importance of its observance is something unknown in pre-exilic Judaism.

1. my salvation is near to come: 55 [1] *v.n.* Prosperity had not yet come, though God's *fairness* (**righteousness**) was the guarantee that it must.

4. eunuchs. There is no necessary contradiction of Dt 23 [1] if we accept W. R. Smith's suggestion that the prohibition there refers to 'the religious mutilation of the Galli.'

7. mine house . . . for all peoples. The last three words are emphatic (cf. Mt 21 [13]; Mk 11 [17]; Lk 19 [46]).

8. 'An interpretation . . . of what Deutero-Isaiah meant by saying that Israel the servant of Jehovah was to restore Israel: the Israel at present gathered was only part of the true Israel' (Browne).

9-LVII. 13. Denunciations of Wicked Rulers and a Heathen People.—Wild beasts are ironically invited to come and devour a land which lies unwatched and unguarded. Its watchmen spend their lives in drunken idleness. Through their carelessness the best of the community perish miserably. This last thought rouses the prophet's righteous indignation, and he breaks out into scathing rebuke: this idolatrous people is itself the issue of abandoned parents. The day of reckoning is coming.

9. Cf. 3 [17-21]; 33 [2-9].

10. they cannot bark: cf. Ezek 34 [2]. The shepherd's duty is to warn his charge. **dreaming:** better *babbling*.

11. dogs are greedy: prophets, priests, and judges were all insatiable in their demands. **and these are shepherds:** tr. 'and those are shepherds! (Why) they do not know how to observe!' **from every quarter:** RVm is to be preferred.

LVII. **1.** The saddest feature was the elimination of the godly—probably the generation of the Return.

1*b*-2. RV *may* be right, but a more natural rendering would be: 'And men of piety are swept away while none considereth. For because of the evil the righteous is swept away, he enters into peace. They rest upon their beds, they that walked uprightly.' The **beds** are coffins in which the righteous lie (Ezek 32 [25]).

3-13. Denunciation of Idolaters.—Most probably the persons addressed are Samaritans or the paganized population of Judæa. The features of the country with its deep gorges and terebinths ([5] and [6]) are Palestinian rather than Babylonian; in place of the detachment and contempt with which the Babylonian idolaters have been viewed, here we find expressions of hatred and hostility. The danger is too near and too pressing to permit of detachment.

3. But draw near: Hebrew 'But as for you, draw . . .' A new audience is addressed. **adulterer and whore:** the words could perhaps be applied to the Samari-

tans (cf. 2 K 17 [24]), but equally also to the Jews (cf. Ezek 16 [3, 45]).

4 f. These verses may well represent how deeply the Jews felt the taunts of the Samaritans (cf. Neh 4 [1-4]).

5. oaks . . . green tree. Trees are still worshipped in the country districts of Syria, where people are known to bring offerings and burn incense to an ancient oak. Doubtless the idolatry mentioned here was accompanied by the licentious rites of the cult of the Syrian goddess. **in the clefts of the rocks**: the significance of these words is unknown.

6*a*. The same may be said of the **smooth** *stones*. The word *may* mean 'false or deceitful gods.'

7. lofty mountain: perhaps Gerizim. **thou** throughout the following verses is a feminine personification of an adulterous community.

8 is obscure in its details.

9. and thou wentest to the king: these words may refer either (*a*) to pilgrimages to foreign shrines, or (*b*) to Molek, the god of Ammon, or (*c*) to political envoys. That it means 'the Great King' is improbable. Some scholars read (with Sym. and Vulgate) 'Thou anointedst thyself for Melek'; the parallelism is much improved thereby. **didst debase thyself even unto hell** is wrong. Render *Yea, didst send them* [the ambassadors] *deep down to Sheol*, i.e. to practise necromancy or the like (cf. [3]). But possibly the words are ironical: so far afield were the envoys despatched that they perished on the journey.

11. even of long time: read (with different vowels) *and hidden mine eyes*.

12. I will declare thy righteousness, i.e. expose the hollow claims (of the Samaritans?) **and as for thy works**: tr. *and thy works*.

13 should probably run:

And they shall not profit thee when thou criest,
Nor deliver thee in thine affliction (so LXX).

14-21. Solace for the Contrite.

14. Cast ye up. The application of the words of 40 [3] is different. There an actual **way** was meant; here the way is the path of the people's moral and spiritual advancement. A similar application of the same prophecy is made by John Baptist (Mk 1 [3]).

15. I dwell in the high and holy place: lit. 'on high and as a holy one.' Holiness primarily denotes separation, and separation is secured by the remote loftiness of God's heaven. 'It is the paradox of religion that Jehovah's holiness, which places Him at an infinite distance from human pride and greatness, brings Him near to the humble in spirit' (Skinner). The **contrite** are the crushed (cf. 53 [5, 10]) whose spirit has been chastened by affliction, deserved or underserved.

17. For the iniquity of his covetousness. The economic problems created by the returned exiles were the source of injustice, avarice, and sordid indifference to the claims of God and man.

19. God will relieve the suffering community of these burdens, creating cause for thankfulness and praise, and creating the peace, or the well-being, of the Jews of the Diaspora as of Jerusalem.

LVIII. **Fasting without Repentance and Reform is Hypocrisy.**—The people have complained that their fasts have produced no change in their material welfare. The prophet, in the name of God, replies that their fasting was a hollow pretence. Instead of giving their workmen a holiday (Lev 16 [29]) they worked them all the harder. They observed all the ritual of a fast, but the real self-denial of loving charity was unknown to them. If they would but feed the hungry and nurture the destitute God would lift them out of the miserable conditions in which they lived.

The reference to **the old waste places** in [12] suggests that the ruin made by the Babylonians has lasted much longer than the fifty years or so of the Exile.

3. pleasure, or *business*, i.e. they profit by employing their leisure in a rigorous supervision of their workmen, **exact**, etc.: RVm is probably right.

5. Render *Would such be the fast which I should choose—a day when a man afflicts himself?* The prophet denies any value to mere asceticism. Mortification of the flesh, when practised solely to that end, is useless.

6. The self-denial which is implicit in, and must inevitably follow, such acts of benevolence as the liberation of slaves, the remission of debts, the distribution of food and clothing, and the exercise of hospitality, is precious in God's sight, and will, if it become the practice of the whole community, usher in a period of happiness and prosperity when God's presence will be apparent.

10. draw out thy soul to the hungry. Follow some versions and render *bestow thy bread on the hungry*.

11. make strong thy bones. The verb, if correct, is an Aramaism, and many wish to read 'renew thy strength.' But bones are often spoken of as though they were the organic expression of a man's whole

being. They rejoice and sorrow, tremble and praise, rot and melt. **fail not**: lit. *deceive not* (cf. Jer 15 [18]), by leading travellers from the route to drink of their waters which have failed.

13. **sabbath**: cf. 56 [2]. **delight**: the Sabbath was meant to be a day of consecrated happiness, not of religious gloom. **Thine own words**: Hebrew merely has 'a word,' i.e. either matters of business, or (less likely) idle words.

LIX. **The people's sufferings are due to their sins, not to God's impotence. He will save a penitent people.** This chapter is a continuation of the preceding. The prophet reminds his audience that their troubles do not continue because God is indifferent or unable to help them. They must learn the lesson that sin erects a barrier between God and the community, and while crime is general salvation need not be looked for ([1-8]). Identifying himself with the people in their misfortunes the prophet describes their unhappy state and their longing for light. They confess their sins and that moral corruption has gone so deep that there is no visible means of improvement ([9-15a]). But in man's extremity God Himself, as a warrior, appears to work the people's salvation. He will reward His enemies according to their deserts and act as the vindicator of His servants. There is a certain vagueness here (as in most of the prophecies of human happiness in the Old Testament), but it is clear that the basis of man's felicity is conscious obedience to the word and will of God. In [21] the covenant is that there is to be an unbroken succession of generations faithful to the 'spirit' and 'word' of Jehovah. In the Book of Deuteronomy the prophetic ideal of a consecrated community had been put into language which every Jew could understand and translated into a rule of life which everyone could follow if he chose.

3, 4. The sins of the community are of the gravest character: murder, lying, perversion of justice in the courts, and deliberate and systematic efforts to attain their unrighteous ends.

5, 6. A figurative description of the deadly character of their conspiracies, which cost the lives of their accomplices and involved in destruction any who opposed them.

9. **Therefore**, not for the reason contradicted in [1]. No doubt the feelings of the more religious section of the community are expressed here; but they, too, admit that they must share the responsibility for the national degeneration.

10. **among them that are lusty.** The word translated 'lusty' occurs only here, and the LXX reads something quite different. A verb like 'we fall' is required.

13. **denying the Lord**, i.e. to act deceitfully towards Him. The meaning is that the people have pretended to acknowledge Him, but their evil lives are a repudiation of Jehovah; cf. **revolt** with Dt 19 [16] (the same word in Hebrew).

14. The national honour has fallen so low that there is no possibility of justice and righteousness, for truth, on which those virtues must always rest, cannot gain admittance to the law courts.

15. **judgement**: abstract justice is probably the meaning. The word 'judgement' (*mishpat*) has to do duty for a great many ideas, and in order that the reader of the RV may be able to judge for himself which *nuance* is the more suitable in this chapter, and indeed throughout the Old Testament, they are set out here:

(1) (*a*) Act of judging or deciding, e.g. Dt 1 [17].

(*b*) Place of judgement, e.g. 1 K 7 [7]; Is 53 [8] *v.n.*

(*c*) Litigation, e.g. Job 14 [3].

(*d*) A judicial case, a plea, e.g. Job 13 [18].

(*e*) A sentence, e.g. 1 K 20 [40].

(*f*) Execution of the judgement, i.e. the punishment or penalty, e.g. Job 36 [17], or the award, Ps 146 [7].

(2) Justice, e.g. Gen 18 [25] *v.n.*

(3) Ordinance, e.g. Ex 15 [25].

(4) A legal right, e.g. Dt 18 [3].

(5) Custom, e.g. 2 K 17 [33].

(6) Religion, e.g. 42 [3, 4]. The fundamental idea of *mishpat* is 'right': the right relation of man (or perhaps even of animals, Ex 21 [31]) to their environment, so that to disturb, or, as here, to remove or annihilate *mishpat*, was to commit a sin against the conception of life as an ordered whole.

15*b*. The situation can only be saved by the active intervention of God.

16. Cf. 63 [5]. **intercessor**: render *none to interpose* with RVm. External aid alone could restore the moral balance of human society.

17. Jehovah will destroy his enemies with the weapon of His own attribute of justice which they had discarded (cf. Eph 6 [14]; 1 Th 5 [8]).

18. Delete the word **accordingly**, which has been written twice by mistake. **to the islands he will repay recompense**: these words were not found in Origen's MSS. of the LXX (the oldest form of the Old Testament extant), and they are certainly a later addition to the text, made probably when the Jews suffered under

the oppressions of the Ptolemies and Seleucids. Here Jehovah's enemies are faithless and apostate Jews.

19. The effect of God's intervention is world-wide. **for he shall come as a rushing stream, which the breath of the Lord driveth:** except that RVm *pent in* should be read, this is the true meaning. The breath or wind is that which accompanies a theophany (1 K 19 [12]; Job 4 [16]). The first margin = AV may be safely discarded.

20. Render *And he shall come to Zion as a redeemer*, etc. **and unto them**, etc.: LXX (quoted in Rom 11 [26]) *and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob* involves a very slight change in the text, and may be the original meaning.

21. Jehovah's coming to Zion is to result in the renewal of the covenant which will endure throughout the generations.

LX.-LXII. **The Glory of the New Jerusalem.**—This chapter, with the two following, describes the waxing prosperity of Jerusalem. It has close affinities in style with earlier chapters, notably 49 [14] and 51 [17], but the resemblances are to be attributed to 'influence' rather than to common authorship. For Deutero-Isaiah contemplated the Gentiles coming to Jerusalem to enjoy her spiritual and temporal blessedness; his successor contemplated their exploitation. The first preached a message of service; the second appealed to covetousness and pride of race. The light which was to lighten the Gentiles has become (60 [3]) a brightness which attracts, if not to destruction, at least to spoliation ([12], but *v.n.*, [16]).

Despite this writer's insistence upon the political subjection of the Gentiles, the motive he assigns to the Gentiles is plainly religious. By their offerings of gold and incense, of cedar, of flocks and herds, they declare the praises of Jehovah. But not theirs to present before God the costly offerings which have been brought from afar; this is to be the privilege of the Jews (61 [6]). How great has been the fall from the lofty universalism of Deutero-Isaiah! The Gentiles must choose tribute or Jehovah's vengeance.

LX. 1. **Arise, shine.** The city is addressed. The light of the rising sun for which the people had vainly looked (59 [9]) is now shining upon them.

3. **nations shall come.** The nations come from outer darkness to the divine light which encircles Zion.

4. 49 [14] f. *v.n.*

5. **be lightened**, i.e. be radiant (with joy), **tremble** or throb with pleasure.

6. The commerce of the ancient world entered Palestine either from the Syrian ports or along the land routes from Arabia and Egypt; the latter seems to be ignored.

7. Render with RVm **I will beautify my beautiful house.** The natural inference is that the Temple has been rebuilt.

9. **Surely the isles shall wait for me.** The change of one letter (suggested by Duhm) would yield an attractive alternative to the text: *For to me shall the ships be gathered* (*siyyim* for *iyyim*). It is noteworthy that the dispersion of the Jews had already spread to the other side of the Mediterranean. **for the name**, etc. These words are apparently borrowed from 55 [5], and suggest that the later writer worked over and reinterpreted his predecessor's message. A comparison of the respective writers' ideas as to what **glorifies** (RVm *beautifies*) is instructive (cf. 44 [23], 49 [3], 60 [1, 9, 13, 21], 61 [3]).

10. **thy walls.** The question of the rebuilding of the walls was being discussed. The Temple is in existence, so that there is a fairly clear indication of the date of this prophecy. When Nehemiah came to Jerusalem in 444, it is implied that some recent restoration of the gates had been made abortive. They had been burned (cf. Neh 1 [3], 2 [13]). Ezr 4 [7-23] records a frustrated attempt of the Jews to restore the city, and dates the event in the reign of Artaxerxes, 465-425 (see p. 286*a*). Therefore if, as seems natural, our prophecy was written to stir up the Jews to repair the city, we can confidently assign it to some date near 450.

11. **their kings led with them.** If the text is right the kings must be led as captives, presumably of the armies of Israel. But there is nothing in the context and certainly nothing in the historical situation of the Jews at this epoch to warrant such an assumption, and therefore it is better to change the position of a vowel and read *their kings being the leaders*.

12. This verse is prosaic and stands outside the rhythmical order of the chapter and its strophes, and can safely be regarded as a gloss. Skinner suggests a parallel with the thought of Zech 14 [17, 18]. The bitter tone towards the Gentiles accords with the date of Zech 9-14.

13. The purpose of the cedars of Lebanon is to **beautify** an existing building, not to form the material for the construction of a new Temple.

15. **Whereas thou hast been:** better *Instead of thy being forsaken*. There had been nothing to attract wayfarers to the miserable ruins; but now Zion is to become 'the joy of the whole earth.'

16. Cf. 49 [23] and [26].

17. The answer to the despairing cry of 59. God will appoint **peace** to the government and **righteousness** to executive power. **exactors** is probably to be understood as a singular noun, though it stands in the so-called 'plural of majesty.' Literally the word means 'task-master,' and like *pekuddah* (**officers**) stands for coercive government. The new 'tyrant' is to be the righteousness and justice of God.

18. The result of the foregoing.

19. By the glory of Jehovah the city will be filled with such vivid light that sun and moon will shine unnoticed (cf. Rev 21 [23]). The conception of God as light, or dwelling in light, is all but universal. **glory**: tr. as RVm ([9] *v.n.*).

22. Render:

The least shall become a tribe,
And the smallest a strong nation.

LXI. 1-3 contain the utterance of one who is the herald of the new kingdom of righteousness. His mission is threefold: (1) to announce to the godly that their persecutions and sufferings have come to an end; (2) to proclaim the era of God's favour; and (3) His vengeance. Many have sought to identify the speaker with the 'Servant of the Lord.' There are points of resemblance in the gift of the Spirit (42 [1]), and of consolation (50 [4]) and of freedom (42 [7]); but the climax of the Servant's career was surely reached in 53. He was the mediator and triumphant agent of man's justification: this figure is but a herald. He suffered for his enemies: this prophet proclaims God's vengeance on them. It is significant that our Lord stopped at the words 'acceptable year of the Lord' when He applied this text to His own ministry (Lk 4 [18]). For the reasons given it is best to acquiesce in the interpretation of the Targum that the speaker is the prophet himself.

1. **meek**, i.e. the religious members of the community, those who suffered from the violence (60 [18]) which was the prevailing sin of the time, and commended their cause to God. **liberty**: the word (*dᵉrōr*) suggests the Jubilee year of Lev 25 [10].

2. **the acceptable year of the Lord**: better *The year of Jehovah's favour.*

3. **the spirit of heaviness**: better *a failing spirit* as in 42 [3].

4-9. A more material description of the new age, with the restoration of ruined cities, new centres of a prosperous population where the manual work is done by subject foreigners, is outlined here. Israel is to be a nation of priests susbisting on the wealth of the Gentiles to which their former sufferings entitle them.

6. **But ye.** The words are emphatic. 'The fundamental idea of priesthood in the Old Testament being the right of approach to God, this idea is conceived as realized in a system which may be likened to a series of concentric circles—priests, Levites, ordinary Israelites, Gentiles—each grade standing nearer to God than the next' (Skinner).

7. All that can be said of this verse is that the meaning must be that a double recompense for past miseries is to be the lot of Israel. The text of [7a] is seriously deranged, and the emendations which have been suggested are not of much value.

8. **with iniquity.** RVm follows the vowels of MT, which are certainly wrong. The iniquitous extortions of Israel's foreign oppressors are in question.

9. God's blessing marks out the nation from the peoples of the world.

10-11. The prophet in the name of the people rejoices in the new age when righteousness rises and grows amid the community as spontaneously as plants from the soil.

LXII. 1-9. The same prophet proclaims his determination to work for the realization of his vision of a great nation, ruled in righteousness and crowned with the visible favour of God. He sees the city's walls guarded by watchmen whose principal duty it is to 'remind' God of His promises to make Jerusalem the praise of the earth. The produce of the land, they are themselves reminded, shall be the property of those that grew it: it shall no longer be taken in tribute by foreigners. Doubtless these words would have a seditious ring in the ears of the Persian governor; they cannot be dissociated from the events referred to in 60 [10] *v.n.*

2. **a new name**: to correspond with the new character (cf. Rev 2 [17]).

3. **a crown of beauty in the hand of thy God.** The natural place for a crown is the head; but the prophet could not adopt the heathen figure of a god wearing a crown formed of his city's walls. The walls which surrounded the city of Zion, like those of Samaria (Is 28 [1]), may well have suggested the figure of a crown.

5. **so shall thy sons marry thee.** Fortunately the text does not require us to adopt such an unnatural meaning. The consonants should be vocalized so as to read *thy builder*, i.e. Jehovah as in Ps 147 [2]. With this alteration the parallelism is complete.

6. I have set watchmen. The speaker must be the prophet, for it can hardly be supposed that Jehovah should appoint those who are to remind him of His own promises. Those who hold that Jehovah is the speaker suppose the **watchmen** to be angels. But it is best to leave their identity in the vagueness of the prophetic conception and to regard as their function the stirring up of the priests. After **night** we must understand *saying*:

'They shall never hold their peace day nor night (saying)
Ye remembrancers of Jehovah, No rest to you!' etc.

The remembrancers (*mazkirim*) are probably those who offer the incense which calls to remembrance (the *azkarah*): 66 [3]; the rubrics of Pss 38 and 70; Lev 2 [2], etc.

8, 9. enemies . . . strangers. The reference to contemporary exactions, or taxes, is clear proof of post-exilic authorship. Whether the enemies were Persians, Samaritans, or Edomites, cannot be determined. Judæa was exposed to the ravages of all three.

10-12. The language of these verses is reminiscent of Deutero-Isaiah, but it is unnatural to suppose that Babylon's gates are meant, unless of course the prophet contemplates a further influx of exiles from that quarter. Such a transition from Jerusalem to Babylon would be most abrupt, and the language seems to imply the return of the Jews from the end of the earth.

10. Cf. 57 [14] and 49 [22].

LXIII. **1-6. Vengeance on Edom.**—Jehovah's vengeance on the heathen, which the prophet foretold in 59 [16-18], is described with singular vividness in a dialogue between the prophet and Jehovah, whom he sees coming from Edom stained with the blood of His enemies. In answer to his question he is told that the day of vengeance is the year of redemption. Jehovah has shattered the nations because there was no other to support His people in their distress.

There is no room for a Christian interpretation of this poem such as is suggested by its place in the Epistle for the Monday before Easter. The blood is not the Saviour's but that of His enemies. The Jews who interpreted the figure as the coming Messiah did so because they expected one who would 'restore the kingdom to Israel.' So little is known of the history of this period that it is impossible to connect the oracle with any event in which the Edomites are known to have been concerned. Some scholars, indeed, have ventured to eliminate all reference to Edom and Bozrah by two extremely ingenious manipulations of the punctuation (see below). But it is wiser to retain the text as it stands (cf. 34), especially as it is not asserted that the divine vengeance has been executed on Edom (though that is the natural inference), but merely that Jehovah *comes* from Edom. In early Israel Jehovah's seat was believed to be in Edom (cf. Jg 5 [4]), and this tradition was long-lived, for it is to be found in Hab 3 [3].

1. from Edom . . . from Bozrah. As [6] says that Jehovah's vengeance fell upon 'the peoples,' some commentators read *meoddam*, 'reddened,' for *me'edom*, 'from Edom,' and *mibbozer*, 'more than a vine-dresser,' for *mibbozrah*, 'from Bozrah.' But Is 34, which has affinities with these verses, also implies that universal judgement is to be executed within the boundaries of Edom.

2. Wherefore art thou red accords well with the emendation suggested above, but Cheyne remarks that the winepress appears on the coins of Bozra during the Roman occupation.

3. I trod them. Disregard RVm, which follows the punctuation of the later Jewish tradition which identified Edom with Rome.

4. Cf. 61 [2]. **The year of my redeemed,** or perhaps *my redemption*, the plural noun expressing the abstract idea.

5. Cf. 59 [16].

6. made them drunk: read as RVm. As the people's blood is represented as grape juice the reading of RV is obviously unsuitable here.

7-LXIV. **12. The Cry of the Rejected Samaritans.**—The starting-point for an enquiry into the date and circumstances of this passage must be 64 [11], which states that the Temple is still in ruins. Some date between 538 and 520 is therefore desiderated. But who can have given utterance to the complaint that **Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us** in 63 [16]? It has been customary to explain this as the cry of necromancers or ancestor worshippers; but apart from the fact that evidence for such practices is extremely meagre in any period of Israel's history, it is unthinkable at this late date and in this context. Moreover, such a theory involves the assumption that the speakers appealed to God because they had been unable to get an answer from Abraham and Jacob! Again, why in 64 [10] are holy cities referred to? In Deutero-Isaiah we read only of *the* holy city. The general teaching of

this book is that the people have suffered for their sins, but in 63 17 the prophet complains that God has made (or allowed) His people to err. Finally, what is the explanation of the tribes of thine inheritance in 63 17 ?

These questions have remained enigmas for many years, but an explanation of them has been given by L. E. Browne in his *Early Judaism*. His theory that this passage is 'the plaint of a Samaritan prophet' is singularly attractive and convincing, as it affords an answer to all the difficulties which have been mentioned above. The Samaritan prophet (7-10) reviews Israel's past history under Moses, and thankfully remembers God's guidance of His people. In spite of God's mercies the Israelites rebelled against Him (cf. Dt 32 15-25). (11-19) The prophet appeals to God to show Himself. The Samaritans, thrust out from fellowship with the Jews and denied the right of calling themselves children of Abraham and of Israel (cf. Jer 31 9), ask why God allows them to wander from the right way, and why must their hearts be thus hardened. The heathen have destroyed God's sanctuary, and they themselves are now called heathen. (64 1-7) Would that God would descend from heaven and manifest His glory among the Gentiles! The prophet then realizes the sinfulness of the community; he admits their uncleanness (perhaps in reply to the accusation made against them in Hag 2 14). God has hidden His face and delivered them into the power of their iniquities. (8-12) The holy cities, the pride of northern Israel—Bethel and Samaria—as well as Jerusalem are a desert. Will not God show compassion on His people? It is significant that this section looks to Jehovah Himself for deliverance, and not to any intermediary such as the Servant of Jehovah.

But, it may be asked, how did Samaritan literature find its way into the canonical scriptures of the Jews? The answer must be that the schism had not yet occurred. The bitterness which was aroused in the next two or three generations was only just beginning to be felt; and the readiness of the ordinary Jew to intermarry and mix with the Samaritans, a tendency against which Nehemiah laboured in vain, is a witness to the friendliness subsisting between these two parties in the early years of the Return. The fact that the Samaritans could accept the Pentateuch, which was not completed till after Ezra's day, points to a common religion and cultus. The letters of the Jewish community in Assuan to the sons of the Samaritan Governor Sanballat, which were written when they had failed to obtain an answer from the high priest Jehohanan, suggest that the Jews in Egypt, as late as the years 410-407 B.C., were ignorant of any deep cleavage between the two parties. Nor is 63 7-64 12 the only literature of the Samaritans which has found a place in the Jewish scriptures. Some of the 'Psalms of Asaph,' notably Ps 80 with its unmistakable emphasis on the northern tribes, have a Samaritan origin. Possibly, too, the fact that the Deutero-Isaiah himself replied to the plaint of the Samaritan prophet in 64-66 ensured this section its place in the Book of Isaiah.

LXIII. 7. **I will make mention of**, i.e. commemorate. **the praises**, i.e. the laudable acts (cf. 60 6).

8. Like his predecessor in northern Israel the prophet looks back on the nomadic days of Israel's youth as a time when Jehovah was the Father of the people in a peculiarly intimate relation which subsequent generations failed to attain to (cf. Hos 11 1 and Ps 44 17, 89 34).

8*b*-9 must be divided differently, and the reading of LXX adopted thus:

And he became to them a saviour in all their distress,
Not a messenger nor an angel—His Presence saved them.

RV **he was afflicted** can only be got by reading *lo*, 'to him,' for the consonantal text *lo'*, 'not,' which is correct. This verse affords an admirable example of the truth of the dictum that every reader of an ancient Hebrew document had to resort to conjecture. RVm and the rendering given above are both possible, though the former is unnatural, and RV implies an anthropomorphism which is almost unparalleled in the Old Testament. **his presence** (cf. Ex 33 14, 15) is literally *his face*. The expression denotes a manifestation which can be perceived, and has its analogies in the religion of Carthage, where the goddess Tanit is worshipped as 'the Face of Baal' (cf. Cooke, *N.S.I.*, 132). The conception of the face as personality must have been widely current in Semitic religions, for it was adopted to express the *person* of Christ in the Christological controversies of the Syriac-speaking churches. **bare them**: cf. Ex 19 4; Dt 32 11.

10. **grieved his holy spirit**: this is the nearest approach to a personification of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament. The rebellions in the wilderness (Dt 32 15-25) are referred to.

11. The italicized additions in RV in-

dicate the difficulty of this verse. Probably some words which recorded Israel's repentance when they remembered God's favour in the past are missing. Possibly (reading *'immo* for *'ammo*, his people) the original was *he* (i.e. Israel) *remembered the days of old when Moses was with him.*

11*b*. The speaker is the prophet, who prays for God's intervention (cf. [15]). It is best to follow many Hebrew MSS. and the versions and read: *Where is he that brought up from the sea the shepherd of his flock*, i.e. Moses? **In the midst of them** is in Hebrew '. . . of him,' and may mean Moses, though more probably the community is meant.

13. Cf. Ps 106 [9].

15. **thy compassions are restrained toward me.** All recent commentators emend the text; but it is probably right, and should be read as a circumstantial clause: *Where is thy zeal . . . seeing that thy compassions have restrained themselves towards me?*

16. **though Abraham knoweth us not and Israel doth not acknowledge us.** The idea that necromancy is implied must be abandoned (*v.s.*). **Abraham** was both the ancestor of all the Hebrews and the representative of the race, while **Israel** was the name the children of the northern kingdom had borne from the great schism down to the fall of Samaria. **acknowledge**: better *recognize*. Those who now claimed to be the children of Abraham and the real Israel denied to the Samaritans the use of the name they had always borne.

17. 'It is as if the Jews would throw the responsibility of their errors upon Jehovah; and this in spite of the encouraging invitations contained in this very book' (Cheyne). If we substitute 'Samaritans' for 'Jews,' this sentence admirably summarizes the situation. **the tribes** are of course the descendants of the 'Ten Tribes.'

18. **Thy holy people possessed** *it* **but a little while.** As RV indicates, the verb has no accusative, and nowhere else has the word translated **little while** such a meaning. An ingenious rearrangement of the letters yields:

Why do the wicked march through thy holy place,
Our adversaries trample thy sanctuary?

The wicked are the heathen and, probably, the Persian officials.

19. Render:

We have become 'Thou hast never ruled over them,
Thy name was not called over them,'

i.e. we have become heathen in the sight of the Jews.

LXIV. 1. **Oh that thou wouldest rend the heavens.** Eager desire for the visible manifestation of God's presence follows naturally the memory of man's injustice. **might flow down**: MT says *quake.*

2-4. Render:

As fire kindleth brushwood, fire causeth water to boil.
Oh that thou wouldest make thy name known to thine adversaries,
That the nations might tremble at thy presence!
While thou doest terrible things which we looked not for,
And which from of old men have not heard.
Ear hath not heard (1 Cor 2 [9]), *nor eye seen, a God beside thee,*
Who worketh for them that wait for him.

The prophet prays that the rending of the heavens may befall as naturally as fire kindles wood, and that the result of God's intervention may be that the heathen are brought to fear Him. (**thou camest down . . . presence** is an erroneous repetition of [10].) **terrible things**: like God's acts during the Exodus (cf. Dt 10 [21]). St. Paul's citation of [4] is almost certainly the original LXX text, and is a great improvement on the awkward Hebrew of MT. For **him that waiteth** the versions are probably right in reading *them* as above.

5. The text is corrupt (cf. LXX), and no satisfactory explanation of it has ever been given.

6. **we are all become as one that is unclean.** Probably in reference to Hag 2 [14], 'So is this people, and so is this nation before me, saith the Lord; and so is the work of their hands; and that which they offer there is unclean.'

7. A confession of sin on behalf of the Samaritan community wherein apostasy was rife. **consumed us**, etc.: read as RVm.

9. **neither remember iniquity for ever**: there was little to choose between the lot of the exiles and the lot of those left behind in Samaria. The reluctance of the Babylonian Jews to return to Palestine was no doubt due to their belief that they were better off where they were. **we are all thy people**: we as much as the newly returned Jews.

10. **Thy holy cities**: not only Jerusalem. **all our pleasant things**, or perhaps *our sacred* (lit. desirable) *places.*

LXV.-LXVI. **The Deutero-Isaiah's Last Words.**—These chapters are an answer to the foregoing. The writer, while

sharply reproving his hearers for heathen practices and abominations, yet holds out the hope of divine favour in 65 [1] and [8]. They had caused Jehovah chagrin by their disloyalty, and they had become renegade, but He would yet save the godly among them. The mention of **Sharon**, which lay well within the limits of the old kingdom of Israel, is significant. While the true Israel were to be spared, those who persisted in idolatry would be given to the sword.

It might be necessary ([15]) that the survivors should receive a new name. Denied the name of **Abraham** (*v.s.*): let them bless themselves in the **God of Truth**. A new state of things is at hand. Jerusalem will be a home of rejoicing in which old enmities will be entirely forgotten.

The Temple is about to be built (66 [1]), and the prophet utters a warning. He whose throne is the heavens cannot be housed in an earthly temple; and as for sacrifice it is as a heathen rite. Let not the faithful Samaritans ([5]) be discouraged, for those who expelled them will themselves be put to shame, and the imminent restoration to Zion of a contented populace will inaugurate an age of happiness and peace in which they will share. In [18-22] the prophet works out more plainly than elsewhere his missionary plan. All nations shall be gathered together (for judgement), and the survivors will go forth to the heathen world to proclaim Jehovah's glory. The Gentiles will bring back the scattered Jews as an offering to Jehovah, and they (the Gentiles) shall be chosen as priests and Levites. The last two verses ([23-24]), describing the weekly and monthly pilgrimages to Jerusalem and the fate of the wicked in unquenchable fire, are probably additions to the text which were made some centuries later.

LXV. 1-7. **Jehovah's anger against those who had rejected His appeal.**

1. Render:

I was ready to be enquired of by them that asked not,
I was ready to be found by them that sought me not.

was not called: read *did not call on my Name* (cf. RVm).

2. **rebellious.** Again (64 [4] *v.n.*) St. Paul's quotation from LXX in Rom 10 [21] is probably right. The rhythm requires another word (*umoreh*).

3 f. The degrading rites of these idolaters are but imperfectly understood. The practice of **sitting among the graves** still lives on in the Near East.

5. **for I am holier than thou** implies an all but impossible syntax. *else I sanctify thee* is, no doubt, the right meaning, and the reference is to contagious 'holiness' (see *R.S.*, 343, 357).

6. **it is written before me**, i.e. in the heavenly books (cf. Jer 17 [1]; Rev 20 [12]).

7. The personal application of the words is marked by the second person plural. **work**: rather *wages*.

8-10. **The Samaritans who were faithful to Jehovah** (cf. Ezr 4 [2]) **are addressed.** They will not be destroyed with their heathen kinsmen, but will inherit the land side by side with the Jews.

8. **Destroy it not**: these words, which serve as the heading or title of Pss 57-59 and 75, are generally understood to be the opening refrain of a vintage song (cf. 16 [10]; Jer 25 [30], etc.).

9. **I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob**, etc., plainly implies the incorporation of Judæan and Samaritan half-castes. (**Jacob**=Samaria in 9 [7]; Am 7 [2]; Mic 1 [5]; occasionally it stands for Judæa.)

10. **my people that have sought me**: in opposition to those in [1] who did not.

11-15*a*. **A threat of destruction against the idolaters. Their lot is contrasted with that of the faithful.**

11. **ye** (emphatic) **that forget my holy mountain**: the words must be interpreted in their context. They need not imply that the Temple services were in being, but that the idolatrous party, in contrast to those Samaritans who desired to participate in the building of the Temple, ignored contemptuously all that Zion had meant to the faithful Israelite. **prepare a table . . . Destiny**: the allusion is to the practice of spreading a table loaded with meat and drink for the gods (cf. Ep. Jer [27]; Bel [11]; Jer 7 [18], etc.). The presentation of the shewbread was a ceremony of the same nature. **Gad** and **Meni** (RVm) are perhaps rightly interpreted, though the latter may stand for *evil* destiny.

12. Here we should insert 66 [3-4].

15. **a curse**: rather *an imprecation*, which is possibly contained in the following words: 'And may the Lord God slay thee': *sc.* like So-and-so whom He destroyed.

15*b*-25. **The blessings of the righteous Samaritans in the New Age.**

but his servants (emphatic) **he shall call by another name**, in place of that they have been deprived of (*v.s.*). This need not mean that the name Israel was to disappear, but that a new name would be required to correspond to the new character of the citizens of the New Jerusalem.

16. **he who blesseth himself in the earth**, i.e. everyone. The words are a quotation,

with a significant alteration, from Gen 22 [18].

17. Isaiah had foretold a transformed nature in man and animals. The shaking and rending of the earth is a frequent expectation of the prophets; but this conception of an entirely new creation marks a definite stage in the development of the belief in the unseen world and its connexion with Earth. It was because the New Jerusalem from this time onward existed in the mind of God and had, as it were, an objective existence, that the writer of Rev 21 [2] was able to speak of it as 'coming down out of heaven.'

20. Longevity, not immortality, is the portion of God's people. **for the child**: rather *youth*. A centenarian would be but a youth. **and the sinner**, etc.: RV may be right, but many scholars prefer to omit one word (*ben*) and render: *And he that falls short of a hundred years shall be counted accursed* (cf. En 5 [9]).

23. The calamities and ills that flesh is heir to will not be known.

24. God's nearness is the cause and guarantee of man's felicity.

25. Cf. 11 [6-9].

LXVI. 1-4. **A Polemic against the Proposal to Rebuild the Temple, and against Semi-Heathen Sacrifices.**—These verses have given considerable difficulty to commentators, and no completely satisfactory explanation of them has been forthcoming. Browne (in our opinion rightly) holds them to be the work of Deutero-Isaiah. He thinks that they were directed against the Jewish project of rebuilding the Temple, and that 'the rites of lawful cultus are comparable with heathen rites.' He also thinks that Deutero-Isaiah was not altogether against the rebuilding, and that he probably did not intend to forbid the cultus. But if these verses are read consecutively, the words of [3], **their soul delighteth in their abominations**, make it all but impossible to believe that legitimate sacrifice is intended, for abominations (*shiqqusim*) is a technical term for the unclean idolatry of the heathen; and Jehovah says that just because they have delighted in such things He will take pleasure in their calamity.

As the verses stand they mean that the Temple is utterly inadequate to house the God of all creation, and that either (*a*) sacrifice of any kind is idolatry; or (*b*) that he who combines the heathen rites mentioned with the proper sacrificial worship of Jehovah will receive due punishment for his sin.

Again, is the temple the Jewish Temple, or is it a projected Samaritan temple at Gerizim? Against the latter possibility is the statement of Josephus that the Samaritans did not build a temple till *c.* 330, and the still greater objection that it is hardly conceivable that a Judæan prophet would use an argument which could so easily be turned against him as the unqualified deprecation of any earthly shrine which is contained in [1-3]. If the temple is the proposed restored Temple, can it be that prophets who wrote 44 [28], 56 [5, 7], 60 [7], and 66 [6] wrote so scathingly of Temple and cultus? On the whole, the most probable view is that Deutero-Isaiah was faced with an entirely new situation. The intention was to rebuild the Temple and to exclude the Samaritans—a death-blow to all his hopes of one great universal religion of righteousness and peace. Then better let the Temple remain in its ruins than alienate God by a repetition of the conditions of pre-exilic days!

As to the apparent condemnation of sacrifice it is clear from a comparison with 65 [11-12], where the rhythm is similar and the concluding refrain practically identical, that 66 [3, 4] have become misplaced. They really form part of the Deutero-Isaiah's condemnation of the Samaritan worship of Jehovah which was contaminated by the abominations of the heathen.

1. **footstool.** In Ps 99 [5], 132 [7]; 1 Ch 28 [2] the *temple* is Jehovah's footstool. **rest**: better *resting-place*.

2. **all these things**, i.e. all created things. **contrite**: lit. *smitten*. This passage is a remarkable anticipation of our Lord's saying in Jn 4 [24], with which cf. Ac 7 [48].

3. **he that burneth incense.** The reference is to the *azkarah* (Lev 2 [2], *v.n.*). **their soul delighteth in their abominations**: this and the following verse should be read after 65 [12]. Browne (and Wellhausen) interpret these verses of the lawful cultus, but we can hardly bracket the author with Isaiah (cf. 1 [14]) and then say, 'Probably neither prophet really intended to go so far as to forbid the cultus,' for the sacrifices are condemned because they are heathen.

4. **delusions.** 'The word . . . represents calamity under the figure of a petulant child' (Cheyne).

5-17. **Further comfort for the Samaritans. that cast you out**: a word which was used in late Hebrew for 'excommunicate.' **Let the Lord be glorified**: such a one 'thinketh that he doeth God a service.' **but they**: emphatic.

6. The mention of the Temple does

not prove that it was standing any more than the mention of the city, as Browne says.

7-9. A sudden influx of exiles is contemplated.

10. **all that mourned over her.** The Samaritans had religiously kept the fast which commemorated Judah's exile (cf. Zech 7 [3]).

12. Cf. 60 [4, 5], 61 [6].

15-17. Jehovah's vengeance on His enemies. These verses differ in style and thought from Deutero-Isaiah, and the connexion of [17] with the preceding is anything but clear.

17. **behind one in the midst:** better *after*, etc. It would seem that the leader advanced while his followers perhaps danced in a circle round him.

18-22. **The Conversion of the World.**—After punishment comes forgiveness. Jehovah's plan is to gather together all nations, and deal with them in such a way that the survivors become voluntary missionaries to their heathen brethren. Their contribution to the new Jerusalem will be the free transport of the Jews of the Diaspora. Of them (see on [21]) Jehovah will make priests and Levites, and the new age will last as long as the new universe which Jehovah intends to bring into being.

18*a*. As the italics in RV indicate, the Hebrew is untranslatable as it stands. Transpose **their works and their thoughts** to [17] as the subject of the verb **come to an end**, and continue [18] (as RVm) *I am about to come to gather*, etc. **my glory**: cf. Ezek 43 [1-4]. The presence of Jehovah will be visible in a way which is not defined. It is the **glory** of Jehovah—not Jehovah Himself—which will be **seen**; reverence for the transcendence of God demands reticence, and forbids any attempt to explain the nature of the Divine Presence or of its manifestation.

19. **I will set a sign among them** means I will work a miracle among them, not set a sign *on* them. (For the Hebrew cf. Ex 10 [2].) **such as escape:** these words certainly imply, though they need not necessarily require, a world-wide judgement. **Pul**, probably a mistake for *Put* (cf. Ezek 27 [10]), which, with **Lud**, was an African people. **For that draw the bow** most scholars read (cf. LXX) *to Meshek*, i.e. the Muski and (**Tubal**) *Tabal* of the Assyrian records, tribes which lay to the south of the Black Sea. **Javan:** properly the Ionians and, more generally, the Greeks. **isles:** better *coast lands* (cf. 40 [15]). If we are right in ascribing this passage to Deutero-Isaiah it must be observed that he corrects the teaching of Ezek 38 and 39, where it is said that after the restoration the distant nations of the earth will invade Palestine and be annihilated by Jehovah. Deutero-Isaiah says that the remote peoples will be evangelized. There is, too, a modification of his own earlier message. The missionaries to the coast lands are to be Gentiles, not Israel, the Servant of the Lord. The failure of his hopes and the rise of a narrow, self-centred attitude towards the Samaritans and the heathen world may well have constrained him to accommodate his missionary plans to the hard facts of the situation.

21. **of them also will I take.** It is impossible to say whether the additional priests and Levites are to be taken from the Gentiles or from the returned exiles. The Hebrew is as ambiguous as RV. On the whole the emphasis on **them**, and the fact that Jehovah **takes** them, favours the supposition that the Gentiles are meant. If there were Levites among the exiles, they would hardly need to be chosen by Jehovah.

22. **shall remain:** better *stand*. The participle expresses timeless duration.

23-24. The late passage Zech 14 [16] is closely parallel to [23], and [24], with its reference to Gehenna, the *Ge Hinnom*, implies a conception alien to this writer. The Jewish practice of reading [23] again after [24] *may* rest on a tradition that [24] was not the original ending of the book, though, it must be admitted, other books which ended on a depressing note were thus treated. It is not impossible that [23] has got into the text simply to provide a happy ending.

24. **their worm shall not die,** etc.: cf. Mk 9 [44]; Judith 16 [17]; Ecclus 7 [17]. Tradition records that the corpses of the unclean were cast into the Ge Hinnom to be burned or to decompose, and gradually this detested spectacle came to be employed as a figure for the punishment of the wicked after death. If the passage is a late insertion, as most scholars believe, the eschatological significance is implicit here. **abhorring:** tr. *aversion*. The word is elsewhere found only in Dan 12 [2]. Its meaning was forgotten by the Jews till comparative Semitic studies pointed to its significance.

JEREMIAH

By B. M. Pickering

With the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. the northern kingdom, Israel, had come to an end. Henceforth the southern kingdom, Judah, is the guardian of the religion of the Hebrew tribes as God's Chosen People. Judah alone was left to carry on the religious traditions and supply the means of spiritual development to which God had called His people out of Egypt. When the northern kingdom collapsed the king of Judah was Hezekiah, who preserved the independent existence of his kingdom and carried through comprehensive reforms in the national religion. Hezekiah was succeeded on the throne of Judah by Manasseh, during whose reign of fifty-five years heathen forms of worship and superstition were not only introduced but encouraged by the approval of the king and his advisers, and eagerly adopted by the people. Foreign deities were worshipped by the side of God, and the cult of the Canaanite Baalim flourished unchecked among those who sought to propitiate the givers of fertility. The king's religious policy was popular; any who opposed it did so at their peril; it was treason: the reward of faithfulness to God was martyrdom. Amon continued this policy. Though at the beginning of Josiah's reign religious conditions were unaltered, the teaching of the prophets was making headway, and preparing the people for a revival of true and pure religion with a change in religious policy. This change came in the Reformation of Josiah (621 B.C.), which was an attempt to purify religious worship and free it from degrading heathen rites and superstition. Whatever effect the reforms may have had in bringing the people to a truer conception of God the result was not permanent. Under Jehoiakim religious and social conditions were as bad as ever before: apostasy was as extensive and unchecked as in the dark days of Manasseh; corrupt religious belief and practice gave sanction to depravity and wickedness.

Josiah had been aided in carrying out reforms in Judah by freedom from the actual danger of war and a lull in the continual oppression by greater nations. But his early years of peace were disturbed by rumours of a new and terrible danger which threatened from the north—the Scythians. Judah was at peace, yet there was conflict in the world outside, and Judah was always involved in any change in the contest for supremacy among the nations. A period of turmoil came with the inroads of the Scythians over a large area of Western Asia; the effect of their migration was felt in the weakening of Assyrian power: Babylon had thrown off the Assyrian yoke. The Scythians advanced along the Syrian coast to the borders of Egypt; their hordes receded: Judah was unharmed. Nineveh fell in 612 B.C., and Assyria disappeared from the political horizon; but the contest for supremacy was not decided until the battle of Carchemish (605 B.C.), when the Babylonians were victorious over the Egyptians.

Such were the conditions of the time when Jeremiah was called to devote himself to God's service as a prophet: upheaval and changes among the nations outside the borders of Judah, within an apostate people with unrepentant hearts. Jeremiah was born about 650 B.C., towards the end of Manasseh's reign, when many had forsaken the true faith, and those who remained faithful to their God suffered persecution. The family in which Jeremiah was born probably traced its descent back to Eli, who had been custodian of the ark at Shiloh; in such a home he would be under godly influence and taught to cherish the family traditions of piety and loyalty. From his father, 'Hilkiah, of the priests that were in Anathoth,' he would learn of Israel's past in contrast to the irreligion of his day. As the influence of the home life left its mark upon Jeremiah, so also did the countryside around the village of Anathoth (now Anata). He knew about the nesting habits of the partridge (17 11); he had watched the migratory birds come and go (8 7); he had observed birds turn upon a bird of unfamiliar plumage (12 9); the almond tree awaking from its winter sleep (1 11); the wild asses panting in the drought (14 6); the straying ox killed by a lion (5 6); the farmers breaking up their fallow ground (4 3); the hot wind from the desert (4 11): all these and many other illustrations from agricultural and pastoral life are used by Jeremiah in his teaching.

The call to be a prophet came to Jeremiah in 626 B.C. It was not a task which he himself had sought, rather he shrank from it, for he was under no delusion as to the manner in which his message would be received. The account of the prophet's

call presents no awe-inspiring vision, as in the case of Isaiah (6 [1-9]) or Ezekiel (1 [1]-3 [3]). Jeremiah tells us of himself just alone with God. There is no question of choice for Jeremiah, he is a child of destiny; he has been born to do God's service; all along God had appointed him to be a prophet; his home, his upbringing, all the conditions of his early years had their place in fitting him for the prophet's work. But more than this, it is Jeremiah's own nature, his personal experience of God, which fit him for the prophetic ministry. Here it should be observed that Jeremiah realized, in the fullest degree, that a definite power outside himself was directing him—he is in touch with a living energy which worked in him and through him; this, as it were, clothed itself with Jeremiah. No one before Jeremiah had even felt, or been able to express, so intimate a personal relationship with God: it is this direct personal relationship of the individual with God which marks Jeremiah's supreme contribution to our knowledge of God; it may be traced over and over again in the record of his life and words. Jeremiah was a man of profound conviction; he had not been convinced by arguments, nor by sequence of events, nor by his own power of reasoning. Jeremiah was convinced by God: the power of his words lay in the fact that he allowed himself to be convinced by God. In the struggles of Jeremiah with himself to overcome human weakness there is revealed a sensitive, diffident nature; he feels the taunts of enemies, he would perchance soften the stern rebuke or tone down the unpalatable home-truth, but he must not hesitate for God has commanded and Jeremiah is assured of divine protection. Another side of the greatness of Jeremiah's character is shown by his understanding sympathy and interest in the ordinary, even small, affairs of life: an earthen jar, the potter's wheel, a caldron on the open hearth. He has sympathy with the wild animals; he knows well what occasions of domestic joy or sorrow mean in the home: all is an open book to Jeremiah's sympathetic insight. We feel he loves them all, even the weak king Zedekiah; not least does his love go out to the erring people whom he warns: perhaps that great love was the impetus which kept him to his task.

Very little is known of Jeremiah's personal history from his call, five years before Josiah's Reformation, until Josiah's death in 608 B.C. No doubt 1-6 belong to the period 626-620 and reflect the light in which Jeremiah viewed the condition of Judah. The nation is thoroughly corrupt, and the people have not even a desire for forgiveness. Then in 621 came Josiah's Reformation with which Jeremiah could not fail to be in general sympathy, though he would probably have wished for more drastic enforcement (see on 8 [8]). But little in the Book of Jeremiah belongs to the last twelve years of Josiah, to whose death Jeremiah pathetically refers in 22 [15, 16], where he laments the passing of his just and righteous rule: 'then it was well.' A contrast indeed with the selfish and unscrupulous ruler Jehoiakim, under whom Judah was not only politically, but morally and spiritually, corrupt. There was no social justice; the national wealth was squandered on luxury and ostentation; the poor and helpless suffered: all this because God was not in men's thoughts —Judah was unfaithful to the Lord. The reign of Jehoiakim was for Jeremiah a time of incessant conflict and trial: plots against his life, the stocks, narrow escapes from death, enforced hiding; but in spite of these Jeremiah's courageous faith remains unshaken. At times we seem to find a cry for revenge; but it is not personal revenge, and it is mingled with much tenderness. What Jeremiah thirsts for is that God should vindicate Himself and let men see His cause triumph.

Jeremiah is not merely a preacher of national conversion, his God-given insight takes him to the heart of the matter: the individual must know God, God's law must be written on the heart. Here, then, is the New Covenant (31 [31-34]) which Jeremiah's own consciousness of fellowship with God led him to see as the only true way to right conduct in practice and belief. That which Jeremiah himself through outward trial and inward struggle had proved true was possible for others. This also greatly influenced Jeremiah's teaching about sin; he broke away from the popular conception. The traditional belief in Israel was that the human unit in religion was the nation; God was concerned with His people as a nation, and cared for the individual, if at all, only through his membership of the group. The covenant at the Exodus had been made between the nation and God; the individual had no direct responsibility for his conduct to God; it was the concern of the nation as a whole to keep free from sin by observing the covenant. This idea of corporate personality in religion meant that if other individuals or the nation sinned, all, even the innocent, would be punished indiscriminately; and conversely that each Israelite had no individual moral responsi-

bility to God, with whom in fact there could be no personal relation (cf. 31 [29]). But Jeremiah from his own experience knew that the essence of religion was personal relationship between God and the individual. So in his teaching of moral responsibility he shifts the emphasis from the nation to the individual. The real source of sin is an evil heart (4 [4], 7 [9] f., 12 [2], 17 [9]); it is hardness of heart which prevents the individual having true knowledge of fellowship with God. God is the searcher of the heart (11 [20], 17 [10]), and because God calls men to personal consciousness of fellowship with Him (31 [33. 34]) there is individual responsibility for moral conduct (31 [30]). This doctrine is more fully developed by Ezekiel.

Jeremiah lifts religion, and conduct too, to the supernatural realm; spiritual life is largely fashioned by apprehension of supernatural truth. Just because Jeremiah was convinced that he was personally in touch with God he could denounce the religion of his day. Jeremiah was a man who faced facts; he pierced the veil which hid error under the mask of truth; his insight was not deceived by outward appearances, while he sternly rebuked that attitude of complacent optimism which lightly obscures the truth, God's truth, and deludes men into thinking all is well when it is not. What stirred Jeremiah's denunciation in the popular religion of his day may be summarized under four headings: (i) Degeneration from a true and pure origin; (ii) Sensuality: the moral restraint of true religion had been removed; (iii) Double-mindedness: an attempt to combine irreconcilable religious principles, Baal and the Lord; (iv) Unreality: religion is made a mockery, there is no sincerity (cf. Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion*, 64-73). Jeremiah's political outlook was influenced by religion; when he read the signs of the times he saw the hand of God. Judah had sinned; God would punish her by the Babylonian armies. As Jeremiah so often told Zedekiah, resistance is useless because God always punishes sin. So the policy of Jeremiah, a true patriot, was regarded as unpatriotic: but the man whose heart ached for Jerusalem's sufferings could also stand in solitary opposition to public opinion. There is a pathetic appeal in the loneliness of Jeremiah, yet there are indications that he had the support of friends among those families which in every age, however dark, have kept burning the flame of true religion. Among such was his companion, friend, and 'secretary,' Baruch.

How Jeremiah's prophetic utterances came first to be committed to writing by Baruch is narrated in 36. The roll contained Jeremiah's words, but when it was rewritten with additions it did not contain those after 604 B.C. Now in whatever it consisted, it was the earliest written collection of Jeremiah's prophecies; but there is much other matter in the Book of Jeremiah, and as this follows no chronological order it is impossible to discern the precise contents of the roll. In addition to the roll Baruch compiled a biography of Jeremiah; these memoirs, like the roll, have been rearranged by later hands. Thus the Book of Jeremiah presents us with (i) Jeremiah's words; (ii) Baruch's memoirs of Jeremiah; (iii) Jeremiah's words worked over by an editor; (iv) Baruch's memoirs worked over by an editor: (v) additions by supplementers. Though drawn upon previously in the book, a series of extracts from the biography begins in 26, and, with interruptions, continues down to 45, when Jeremiah is in Egypt, whither he and Baruch had been carried against their will. That is the last we hear of Jeremiah, who laboured through forty years —his disappointments overcome through courageous faith in God.

Bibliography

Commentaries: Binns (*West. Comm.*); Peake (*Cent. B.*); Streane (*C.B.*). **Translations:** Driver (trans. with notes); G. A. Smith (contains metrical trans. and exposition). **Other Literature:** Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion*; Articles in *H.D.B.* and *E. Bi.*; Robinson, *Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdoms* (*Clar. B., O.T.*, vol. 3).

I. 1-3. Introductory Title.—Dating the beginning of Jeremiah's prophetic ministry from Josiah's thirteenth year (626 B.C.), he is said to have continued his activity under Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, i.e. to 586, the year of the fall of Jerusalem (cf. 2 K 25 [8-12]). The book, however, contains prophecies uttered after this event (cf. 42-44), as well as biographical details.

4-12. Jeremiah's Call and Vision of Reassurance.—The Lord brings irresistibly before Jeremiah His purpose for him: there is no imagery but an overpowering conviction of predestination for his life's work as a prophet. Like the Servant of the Lord (Is 49 [1. 5]) and St. Paul (Gal 1 [15]), Jeremiah regards himself as set apart to his particular work

before his birth. The task awaited him; it required only the divine impulse to send him forth a prophet not only to his own people but to 'the nations' of the world. It has been suggested that the name Jeremiah means 'Jehovah hurls,' or 'Jehovah shoots forth.' In any case such derivation aptly describes the prophet and his mission: he is hurled like a projectile by a power which is not his own upon a hostile world. His sensitive nature shrinks from such a task.

5. sanctified. Originally the Hebrew word was not associated with a moral standard: it meant separated for a particular purpose. Jeremiah is set apart for God's service.

6. child. Confronted with his task, the sense of unpreparedness and insufficiency makes him feel a child; not in years, but in fitness he is too young.

9. He is to be the means by which God makes His will known: God equips those whom He chooses. **touched:** not to be taken literally; in expressing religious truth and experience Hebrew thought gained vividness and simplicity by applying to God terminology which was ordinarily used of men. The ritual laws make it clear that holiness was regarded as contagious; anything which came in contact with that which was holy became holy too: it could no longer be used for common purposes. The Lord touches Jeremiah's mouth, thereby appropriating it to His service; it will utter His words, not the prophet's own (cf. Dt 18 [18]).

10. set thee. Authority is given to act as overseer (cf. Gen 39 [4]; Jer 40 [5, 7]); he is the Lord's deputy to declare His purpose of destruction and restoration.

11, 12. Reflecting upon his call Jeremiah can see no sign in the world around him that God is going to act. Reassurance comes to him through his association of God with the ordinary course of nature; he learns the divine purpose by a parable of nature. In the Hebrew the word for 'almond tree' (*shākēd*) comes from the same root as 'I am wakeful' (*shōkēd*): in Palestine the almond tree is the harbinger of spring, awaking first from the winter sleep. Amid all the spiritual and moral deadness around God is awake; indications may seem scarce and the time long, yet God's word and judgement will certainly be fulfilled; the winter of moral desolation cannot last for ever; the Lord *is* wakeful. For a similar play upon words in Hebrew cf. Am 8 [2].

13-19. The Boiling Caldron of Judgement.—This is closely connected with the preceding vision, and indicates whence the Lord will bring the means of carrying out His judgement.

14. break forth. The LXX 'be blown upon' is accepted by many as more correct, and carries on the figure of the caldron.

15. kingdoms of the north. The north was connected with the thought of that which was mysterious and uncanny, as the quarter from which troubles usually arose. Not without cause was it regarded with fear; thence came the invading armies which carried away the ten northern tribes of Israel and the Judæan captives of Sennacherib. Jeremiah also saw on the political horizon danger to Judah from a northern foe. There is no definite mention of the name of the enemy in the text, but it is quite probable that the reference is to the Scythians, a wild and barbarous people coming from north of the Crimea, who, about 625, intending to invade Egypt, swept through Syria and advanced as far as Ashkelon (cf. Herodotus, i, 103-106).

16. my judgements. Foreign rulers, even in Jerusalem, will set their seats for the administration of justice; they will be the agents through whom the Lord condemns. Keenly aware of the moral shortcomings of Judah, Jeremiah traces the cause of the nation's social and ethical misconduct to its wrong relation to God: He has been forsaken in the interests of the heathen worship prevalent in the reign of Manasseh.

17-19. The message is to be delivered without fear. The prophet will provoke opposition on every side, but fearless confidence in the Lord will be his strength.

II.-VI. contain some of Jeremiah's earliest prophetical discourses; they appear to form one collection, and as a whole reproduce discourses delivered between 626 and *c.* 620. None of Jeremiah's prophecies was committed to writing until 604 (cf. 36), so that doubtless they contain later elements due to the influence of subsequent events and the revision which, according to 36 [32], took place in 603.

II. 1-III. 5. An Appeal to the Past History of the Nation.—The main theme is Israel's faithlessness and ingratitude. The name 'Israel' includes the northern kingdom Israel and the southern Judah, whilst sometimes it is used to contrast the northern kingdom with Judah.

II. 1-13 is a contrast between the happy devotion of Israel's early days and the folly of infidelity to the Lord. During the desert wanderings the people, described as a bride, had been faithful to the

covenant with their God; they were the firstfruits of the world, and as such set apart for His special possession; any interference from those outside the covenant brought punishment upon the offenders.

3. holiness: that which is set apart, consecrated, and so, like the firstfruits, belonged to God (Lev 23 [10-14]).

4-13. The prophet turns from the glories of the past and rebukes the crass ingratitude of the present generation who had forgotten the deliverance at the Exodus, the protection in the desert, and the settlement in the Promised Land. Blame cannot be laid upon the Lord as an excuse for following empty, unreal gods: He is entirely free from the charge of neglecting His part in the covenant relation, i.e. there is no unrighteousness on His side.

7. heritage: lit. means the land belonging to the freeholders of a village and apportioned among them; generally when the term is used in connexion with the Lord it denotes the people of Israel as being His special possession and under His care (cf. 1 S 10 [1]; 1 K 8 [53]), but here it means the land of Palestine which ought to be regarded as the Lord's land, and not the land of local Canaanite gods. **made an abomination:** desecrated with foul Canaanite ritual, even by priests and prophets of the Lord. No other nation had ever been so faithless as to forsake even their heathenish national gods though powerless to give help: yet Israel had forsaken the Lord and turned to the Baalim.

13. broken cisterns. A simile from life in Palestine; Israel has preferred stale rain water stored up in rock-hewn cisterns to the spring of pure running (lit. living) water; worse still, there is a crack in the cistern which allows the water to leak away. Israel has turned from her own God, and the faith she has substituted cannot supply her needs.

14-28. Israel's Infidelity and its Consequences.

14-17. A slave could not hope for deliverance, but Israel is a son; waywardness has brought disaster, it is not God's doing. These verses, though written by Jeremiah, have probably been placed here by a later hand; from [16] they appear to refer to events following the defeat and death of Josiah at Megiddo in 608 B.C.

16. broken: RVm 'fed on' is the actual sense of the Hebrew.

17. when he led thee by the way. Not in LXX, and should probably be omitted.

18 carries on the thought of [13]. Israel finding no water in 'cisterns' of her own making has turned to the Nile and Euphrates, and sought help from Egypt and Assyria, probably political help, which implied recognition of their gods' power to help.

19-28. Although God has done everything for the welfare of the nation, it has shown its rebellious spirit to be deeply rooted. This character is illustrated by a variety of figures taken from pastoral, agricultural, and home life.

20. I have broken: RVm is to be preferred.

23. Baalim: the local Canaanite gods. After the settlement in Canaan there was a tendency for many in Israel to adopt the religion practised by the Canaanites. The worship at the high places, though nominally offered to the Lord, was in reality an identification of the Lord with the Baalim, so that the religion of Israel assimilated licentious and degrading ritual together with idolatry; such apostasy is referred to as adultery, etc., a figurative description which the sensuous worship made literally accurate. **the valley** of the son of Hinnom: 7 [31] *v.n.*

25. there is no hope. So Jeremiah sums up the answer to his call to repent: 'No use! All is up!' It expresses utter helplessness: self-control and desire for amendment have gone.

26. As a thief when caught is ashamed because he has become a laughing-stock through a public miscarriage of his hope of gain, so Israel's devotion to idols of wood and stone (asherah and obelisk) will bring shame.

29-III. 5. The Punishment for Apostasy.—It is no use for Israel to plead a case against the Lord; He had admonished her through His prophets, but she had persistently refused to listen. Forsaking God implied disregard of moral standards required by Him, and inevitably brought social oppression and injustice. Israel's 'new love' will end in humiliation and disappointment; she is like a faithless wife for ever separated from her husband (cf. Dt 24 [1-4]); nothing has moved her to penitence for her shameless conduct; she has gone her own way; there is no return.

29. plead has the sense of contending in a court of law.

31. wilderness. Israel has not been left without guidance.

34. place of breaking in. The idea is that of digging through the mud wall of a house; it is justifiable to kill a criminal in such an act (cf. Ex 22 [2]), but the innocent poor have been murdered in Judah: the reference may be either to injustice,

or social oppression, or child-sacrifice, or possibly the martyrdoms in the time of Manasseh.

36. ashamed. The sense of the word is 'made a fool of through a public miscarriage of their hope.'

III. 1. Note RVm: some introductory formula, e.g. 'the word of the Lord came to me,' seems to have fallen out. **yet return:** RVm gives the correct sense, an indignant rebuke.

2. Arabian: like wandering predatory tribes of the desert a danger to all others.

5. hast spoken: RVm is better. **had thy way:** RVm 'been able' in sense of 'hast prevailed.' God cannot be deceived by mock penitence; Israel's sin has been whole-hearted.

6-18. Judah is Guilty of Greater Sin than Israel.—This passage, though in the main ascribed to Jeremiah, is considered by many to have been introduced from a different context. The kingdoms of Israel and Judah are contrasted. The northern kingdom Israel came to an end when Samaria fell in 722, a century earlier, but her sister Judah had taken no warning from her fate. Israel too had been faithless to the Lord; He had 'divorced' her. The consequence of this punishment was well known to Judah: refusing to learn from the experience of the past Judah's sin is more disgraceful. An offer of pardon and restoration is addressed to a righteous remnant of the northern kingdom. A later hand has added [17] and [18] as a Messianic promise that Judah, as well as Israel, will share in the future glory of Jerusalem.

8. bill of divorcement. The Lord had been longsuffering over the faithlessness of Israel; in vain had He looked for repentance and so He had cast her off (cf. Dt 24 [1, 3]). Judah cannot expect more lenient treatment.

13. strangers: the strange and (to Israel) foreign gods of Canaan.

16. ark of the covenant. After the erection of Solomon's Temple the history of the ark is obscure. Jeremiah proclaims that in days to come there will be no need for an external sign of the Lord's presence with His people.

19-IV. 4. God is Merciful: True Penitence Brings Hope for the Future.—[19] carries on the thought of [5]; the Lord had been willing to show His gracious purpose towards His people by giving them more than was theirs by right. Judah has frustrated His desire to show mercy: but the prophet pictures the return of penitent Judah confessing the folly of her faithlessness and seeking restoration. Jeremiah describes this in the form of a dialogue (3 [22]-4 [4]).

19. among the children: lit. 'set thee among sons.' According to Hebrew law daughters were usually unable to inherit. Judah, addressed as a daughter, could claim no right to receive divine mercy, yet figuratively she will be regarded as worthy of a son's portion. God is gracious: this is emphasized by the contrast of 'but I said' with 'thou' in [5].

22-25. Judah's response as Jeremiah desired to hear it.

24. shameful thing. In their desire to avoid using the name Baal, Old Testament writers often substituted the Hebrew word meaning 'shame.' In the orgies ('tumult') upon the hills in honour of Baal the people had devoured all their substance; even children had been required as sacrificial victims: the local sanctuaries had proved that morality can be divorced from religion.

IV. **2. bless:** cf. Gen 18 [18].

3. break up your fallow ground: possibly a well-known saying among the people meaning that fresh efforts must be made. Repentance is never easy; there must be inward cleansing and dedication as well as an outward sign.

5-31. A Description of the Approaching Judgement.—Judah's continuance in apostasy is bringing upon her the inevitable judgement of God, who uses human agents in carrying out His purpose. An enemy from the north is even now on his way; let Judah prepare to pay the penalty for her infidelity to the Lord. Jeremiah saw that his warnings had fallen upon ears made deaf by persistence in sin: he describes the dismay and helplessness which will follow the enemy's approach. The enemy from the north which Jeremiah probably had in mind when he first delivered this discourse was the Scythians (cf. on 1 [15]); but when the discourse was written down in 604 the intended reference was then to the approach of the Babylonian army.

5. trumpet: used to warn the inhabitants of a village of any danger.

6. standard. The fugitives are to follow the guide-mark ('standard') directing 'towards Zion,' a name of religious significance for Jerusalem.

9. Civil and religious leaders who have guided the people in their own way will be helpless and craven.

11. a hot wind. The enemy are described as the sirocco, a wind made unbearably hot by its passage over the hot desert. **fan:** the wind will be too strong to winnow: chaff and grain will be swept

away. Jeremiah implies that on the threshing-floor of divine judgement all will be guilty.

15. a voice: better *Hark! one declareth from Dan*, in the extreme north of Canaan: messengers hasten southwards in panic only to find that the enemy travels faster than the news.

19-22. A cry of agony from Jeremiah when he contemplates the destruction of his people; in sympathy he identifies himself with Judah: her sufferings are his. This is the first of several instances in which the book reveals the intense feelings of the prophet himself: his zeal was mellowed by sympathy.

19. my bowels: according to Hebrew thought the seat of deep emotion.

22. Persistence in sin had enhanced the people's aptness for evil and dulled moral perception.

23-26. Jeremiah's vision of the desolation about to overtake Judah described in most vivid terms. The earth becomes the formless mass it was before creation: there is no life, no light, the mountains totter, all is confusion and desolation.

27-31. The vision is explained; the doom of Judah is inevitable, no power can alter God's purpose. When helpless before the invader Judah is compared to a woman seeking in vain assistance from her 'lovers,' and is thus reminded that infidelity to the Lord has brought desolation and anguish.

V. 1-9. God would have Pardoned, but the People are Utterly Corrupt.—So great is the moral depravity of Jerusalem that it is impossible to find one sincerely righteous man, for whose sake the Lord may pardon (cf. Gen 18 $^{23-32}$); others benefit by the righteousness of one, just as the individual may suffer for the guilt of many.

2. As the Lord liveth. The usual formula of calling the Lord to witness a solemn oath is employed, and implies that they are loyal to Him; there is no sincerity in their religion.

4. judgement: better 'ordinance.' The meaning is the right way of worshipping God: the sense is practically 'religion' (Driver, 344, and Is 59 ^{15} *v.n.*). The poor and ignorant might be excused for their lack of knowledge about God's requirements; but when Jeremiah turns to the responsible leaders he finds the same ignorance, for like rebellious oxen (cf. 2 ^{20}) they have broken loose from the restraints which fidelity to God required; in renouncing His service they have forfeited His protection; they have strayed from the Lord only to find themselves at the mercy of the enemy figuratively described as beasts of prey.

7. assembled . . . troops: read with LXX 'made themselves at home'; the language in this and ^{8} is not figurative.

10-19. The Call to the Destroyers to Complete their Work.—The enemy is summoned to destroy: they are the Lord's agents for carrying out judgement. The faithless people have derided the word of those prophets who, like Jeremiah, foretold disaster. Jeremiah speaks from experience, and convinced of the truth of his message describes the prophetic word as fire among wood: scepticism will be consumed by truth. His words scoffed at as being 'wind' will be vindicated as 'fire,' for the Scythians (or, later, the Babylonians) will ravage the land.

10. walls: with Driver read 'vine-rows' (cf. 12 ^{10}; Is 5 $^{1-7}$).

18. Probably a later addition to qualify the severity of the destruction.

20-31. The Cause of the Coming Disaster is Moral Blindness.—Judah is rebuked for her folly in not regarding God when His controlling purpose is manifest in the universe. He who curbs the rebellious sea cannot be set at nought by a faithless people, who have lost His gifts of rain and harvest. Punishment is brought upon Judah, for evil-doers are destroying the souls of men and storing up wealth by the gains of deceit. Social righteousness has no place among them. The situation is rendered more appalling for the priests are guided by false prophets, and the people are content to have their conscience dulled by a false sense of security.

28. shine, i.e. with fat. 'The Hebrews regarded fatness as a mark of contented self-indulgence, and associated it with impiety' (Driver).

VI. 1-15. The Coming Ruin of Jerusalem is Caused by the Corruption of the People.—It is useless to turn to Jerusalem in the crisis; no spiritual help nor material security can be found there; the urgency of the danger is described by the personification of Disaster ('evil') looking down from the sinister north upon its prey. The invaders will ravage the luxurious city as flocks of sheep devour the grass; she is to be punished by the besiegers because she does not diminish her wickedness. Unless the people take warning and learn moral discipline the Lord will be alienated and desolation will follow. God's anger, shown in the completeness of the coming ruin, is justified by the unceasing wickedness of people deaf to moral warnings.

1. Tekoa: cf. Am 1 ^{1}.

4. prepare: lit. 'sanctify.' Warfare was regarded as undertaken in the name of a national god, whose favour was invoked at the opening of a campaign by sacrifice. In [4] and [5] the besiegers are discussing their plans; they are sure of success. If the opportunity of midday is missed the night will serve equally well.

7. casteth forth: RVm is better. The wickedness stored up in Jerusalem, like water in a rock-cistern, does not lose its vigour.

9. baskets: RVm is to be preferred. The ruin will be so complete that none will remain.

10. reproach. Jeremiah complains that the people's continued refusal to listen to his words has made them, at length, unable to understand: all they do is to deride; they have lost the power of spiritual perception.

11. pour: with LXX read *I will pour out.* Jeremiah cannot restrain his emotion: God's words well up within him.

13. covetousness: self-advantage at the expense of another's loss is the prevalent sin: prophet and priest alike use deceit.

14. lightly. The treatment of Judah's sin has been only superficial: with comfortable words of optimism the religious leaders have deluded the people.

16-21. The Penalty for Unheeded Warnings.—The people are urged to stand at the parting of the ways and to learn again the paths which of old led the nation to prosperity. The warnings of the prophets had been continuously proclaimed and disregarded; costly offering and sacrifice are not acceptable substitutes for obedience to the moral law of God.

16. rest for your souls. This is not to be taken in the spiritual sense of Mt 9 [29], though our Lord most probably had it in mind and gave it a fuller meaning. 'Good' here means 'which leads to prosperity,' 'rest' is the 'peace and security' which results from obedience to God's direction.

17. watchmen. Owing to their keener spiritual perception the prophets are described as 'watchmen,' who, seeing more than others, are ready to sound the alarm in warning.

18*b* in Hebrew gives no good sense.

19. law: not the 'written' Law, but 'teaching' or 'direction.'

21. stumblingblocks. In the divine judgement the enemy will be the means of causing the people to stumble to ruin.

22-26. Renewed Description of the Enemy.—The approach of the invaders towards Jerusalem is again described. The people are helpless with terror on every side: the prophet calls on them to prepare for disaster.

24. Uttered by the people in dismay.

25 and **26** continue the warning

27-30. Judah is Rejected.—The section which contains Jeremiah's earliest prophecies ends by comparing the prophet to a refiner of silver: he has failed in his efforts to purify the people; they are proved in the testing to be evil and, as such, rejected.

27. tower: RVm is evidently correct. **fortress** is probably a mistaken insertion.

29. '. . . so inextricably is the alloy mixed with the silver, that, though the bellows blow, and the lead is oxidized in the heat, no purification is effected: only impure silver remains' (Driver).

7-10, with the exception of 10 [1-16], form a record of discourses delivered by Jeremiah during the early years of Jehoiakim's reign (608-604).

VII. 1-15. Amendment of Life Required: Jeremiah's 'Temple Sermon.'—The sensation caused when he delivered this message is described in 26, together with the consequences to himself. Jeremiah stands at the Temple gate, where we are to picture him addressing the assembling worshippers: he warns them that the Temple and its ritual will not preserve them from disaster so long as their worship is made insincere by moral offences and social injustice. Let them consider the fate of the old sanctuary at Shiloh, which the Lord had destroyed rather than allow worship offered to Him to be associated with wickedness. Superstitious confidence cannot be substituted for sincere conduct.

4. lying words. It is useless to deceive themselves: their conduct has made the Temple and its buildings ('these') unfit for the presence of the Lord.

10. called by my name: RVm gives the correct sense. Calling a name upon any object implied ownership; as the Temple was 'set apart' to the Lord, so the worshippers must be 'holy' or 'set apart' for His service; formal association with the Temple, as belonging to the Lord, gave no security.

11. den of robbers. God will not allow evil-doers to conceal their real intentions under a misuse of His protection.

12. place: here, as in some other instances, the Hebrew word means 'sanctuary.' **Shiloh:** here had been the sanctuary containing the ark, which was regarded as the symbol of God's presence. The ark had not saved Shiloh from destruction, nor the northern kingdom ('Ephraim,' [15]) from overthrow and exile,

when Samaria fell in 722. Judah will share the same doom unless she amends her conduct.

16-20. Unavailing Prayer.—Faced with the prospect of national disaster Jeremiah's spiritual instincts and patriotism turn him to intercession on behalf of the people. God warns him that He will accept no such intercession. This appears to create difficulty about belief in prayer. But the meaning is clear: the people is wholly given to idolatry; in spite of repeated warnings God is deliberately disregarded, His worship perverted; those who persist in such conduct justly bring upon them the judgement of God. In the divine justice, defiance of God inevitably brings injury to those who rebel. Jeremiah's prayer is of no avail to stay the punishment; he prays and works for the removal of its cause. Cf. our Lord's teaching about blasphemy against the Spirit (Mt 12 [31], etc.).

18. queen of heaven, i.e. 'Ashtoreth' (Astarte), the mother-goddess of the fertility of nature, whose worship was widely diffused among the Semites. There is another reference to the cult in 44 [15-30].

21-28. Obedience is Better than Sacrifice.—Again the scene is at the Temple; the ritual system which the people had assembled to observe is worthless and debased by formalism. When He delivered them from danger in Egypt, at the Exodus, the Lord had demanded from His people obedience to His moral commands, not sacrifice; the covenant was based on moral conduct, not on a ritual system. The prophets had repeatedly given warnings that there is no substitute for loyalty and obedience to God; Israel had never responded to this demand.

21. sacrifices. The meaning is that by the ritual the people had their share of the 'sacrifices,' while the 'burnt offerings' were set apart entirely for God; the disobedient people can keep all.

22, 23 clearly indicate that the Priestly code was unknown to Jeremiah.

29-VIII. 3. Rejection of Judah and Mourning for the Dead.—The people are called to mourn because debased worship has caused the Lord to reject them; the name of the valley associated with their revolting sacrifices shall be changed to 'The Valley of Slaughter,' so terrible is the judgement; the graves of the dead will even be desecrated by the enemy: the living will prefer death to life.

29. cut off: a sign of mourning (cf. Job 1 [20]).

31. Topheth. The name is supposed to mean 'fireplace'; to avoid pronouncing the name associated with abominable rites, the word 'shame' was substituted. **valley of the son of Hinnom:** excavations in Palestine have revealed evidence of the practice of human sacrifice; the Israelites assimilated this rite together with other heathenish customs from their neighbours. Jeremiah protests against the sacrifice of children. The horror of the rite is increased owing to the people frequently identifying the Lord with Baal; thus in actual practice the God of Israel was regarded as the recipient of the offering (cf. Dt 18 [10]; 2 K 16 [3]; Jer 19 [5]; Mic 6 [7]). 'Gehenna' is derived from the name of this valley.

32. Slaughter. They themselves shall be slaughtered by the enemy in the place where they had performed their foul rites; the new name will give a true description.

VIII. **1.** The shades in Sheol were regarded as sensitive to pain or indignity inflicted on their bones. The dead will be punished for their share in the nation's sin.

4-17. Retribution will Follow Judah's Unnatural Conduct.—By persistent refusal to repent the people are acting contrary to the example they should take from Nature. Even migratory birds know the time of their return when the season comes: Judah has no inward impulse to return to the Lord. They delude themselves when they claim to know the law of the Lord, for they have received the instruction from unfaithful teachers; thus their wisdom is based on falsehood. So complete will be the coming destruction that they will be, like a tree without fruit, worthless: they will be powerless to avoid the assault of the invader.

4. 'If men fall, they rise again; if they go astray, they retrace their steps. But Judah obstinately keeps on the wrong path' (Peake).

5. deceit, i.e. either unfaithfulness to the Lord or false teaching.

8. The reference is to directions (about which there is no precise information) drawn up by the scribes who claimed for them divine authority; these Jeremiah denounces in the interests of true religion. By many good authorities this verse has been considered to refer to Deuteronomy, the publication of which in 621 resulted in the reforms of Josiah. Though in sympathy with the moral teaching and the attempt to check abuses in worship, Jeremiah is regarded as opposed to the prominence given to the Temple. But Jeremiah's teaching indicates an attitude which was not antagonistic to the main

purpose of Deuteronomy or the reforms of Josiah. When religion became utterly separated from the essential spiritual and moral elements, and all attempts at reform had failed, then Jeremiah announced that the Temple must go. That Jeremiah retained the loyalty of the family of Shaphan till the end of his life makes it improbable that he strenuously opposed the reformers or denounced them as deceivers.

10*b*-12. Omitted in LXX; repeated from 6 13-15.

14. **silent . . . silence:** RVm is to be preferred. 14 and 15 are the words of the people to one another. **gall:** figurative for bitterness.

18-IX. 1. **Jeremiah's Sorrow for Judah.**—Jeremiah was never wanting in sympathy for those he warned; he felt with them and for them. The blow has not yet fallen, but his sensitive nature feels the suffering of Judah as already present; in an agony of distress he bewails the piteous condition of the people. Jeremiah's weapon against discouragement was not the austerity of justice but sympathy.

19. **a land . . . far off:** lit. 'a land of wide expanse,' i.e. the whole land. All the people are asking why the Lord has given them up in this way. The Lord's answer is contained in 19*b*, idolatry.

20. Probably a proverbial expression to denote a hopeless situation: the harvest (April-June) and the later ingathering of summer fruit have passed, and there is nothing. **saved:** the reference is to material prosperity; better *delivered*. The people are driven to despair because the Lord has not delivered them.

21. **black:** better RVm *mourning*.

22. Is there no remedy? **health:** lit. the growth of new skin to cover a wound.

IX. 2-22. **Faithlessness Leads to Destruction.**—The corruption of society in Judah causes Jeremiah to long for escape to a quiet resting-place, such as refreshes the traveller in the desert; among the people of Judah all conduct is tainted with treachery and deceit. The Lord will punish and desolation follow; the wise man will understand the true reason of the desolation; Judah has forsaken her God; then let them prepare to lament over Judah; Death the Reaper has come. Social and moral ruin is the bitter consequence of neglect to observe the obligations demanded by fidelity to God: national well-being ultimately depends upon religion.

3. **bow.** Their tongue is like a bow, their arrows are falsehood; they intend to inflict hurt by their slander.

5. **taught:** they have perverted the natural use of the tongue.

6. **refuse to know me.** 'Those who love deceit and darkness by their very preference thrust the knowledge of God away from them' (Binns).

7. **melt,** i.e. smelt, for the purpose of purification, as in refining silver (cf. 6 27). **of the daughter:** with LXX read *because of the evil of the daughter . . .*

10. A vivid picture of the desolation of the countryside: the hill-country was used for pasture. **wilderness:** not the desert, but the place whither cattle were taken for pasture. **burned up:** probably read 'laid waste.'

11. Cities also will be devastated; jackals often haunt the ruins of deserted sites.

15. **feed . . . drink.** A figurative expression for extreme bitterness of suffering.

17. **mourning women.** In Syria women are still employed as professional mourners to chant dirges after a death: for this occasion no conventional nor extemporized dirge will be fitting, it is to be learnt from the Lord Himself. **cunning,** i.e. skilful.

22. **Speak . . . Lord:** omit with LXX.

23-26. **Knowledge of the Lord is Israel's Glory.**—These verses form two detached prophetic utterances, and have no connexion with the context. Only the acknowledgement that God is merciful, just, and righteous will profit a man (23, 24). These qualities God requires in men; without them religious privilege affords no security (25, 26). The value of the outward sign is dependent upon dedication of the heart as a token of sincerity.

X. 1-16. **The Gods of the Heathen are Powerless.**—This section (like 9 23-26) interrupts the connexion between 9 1-22 and 10 17-25; it belongs to a period later than that of Jeremiah, and is the work of a later prophet during the Babylonian captivity (about the time of Deutero-Isaiah), when the exiles required warning against standing in awe of the idols of the heathen. These are harmless unrealities, utterly powerless for good or for evil; it is folly to fear them or seek their aid. Who is comparable to the Lord, King of the nations, and wise above all? Israel's God is the Maker of heaven and earth; He alone is truly God.

2. **signs of heaven:** such as eclipses and comets: no doubt a reference to the astrology of Babylon; even in Christian countries celestial phenomena have been regarded with terror or superstition.

4. move: *totter* is better (cf. Is 40 [19, 20], 41 [7]).

5. palm tree: RVm is to be preferred, i.e. they are like a scarecrow. **borne:** the reference is to processions in honour of the idols.

8. instruction . . . stock. The core, or 'heart,' of an idol is wood: no moral instruction can emanate from such a source. Moral instruction requires spiritual force behind it.

11 is in Aramaic; it is a marginal note which has crept into the Hebrew; it was originally a reply used by Jews when invited to participate in idol-worship.

13. uttereth his voice: thunder was regarded as the voice of God.

14, 15. Before the manifestation of God's power, as in the storm, the idol and its maker are powerless.

17-25. The Exile is Near (the continuation of 9 [22]).—So certain is the coming doom that the people are already described as besieged in Jerusalem and warned to prepare for flight: the personified community bewails her desolation ([19, 20]); her troubles, says the prophet, are due to the leaders' ('shepherds') folly in neglecting God. Identifying himself with the suffering community Jeremiah prays that God will show mercy in judgement.

17. wares. The meaning of the Hebrew is doubtful: RVm is to be preferred; the sense is 'prepare for a journey.'

20. tent. The whole nation is pictured as an Arab tent, broken down, with none to repair the ruin.

23. God's purpose overrules all: 'Lord, I know! Not to man is his way, not man's to walk or settle his steps' (G. A. Smith).

25 cannot be regarded as Jeremiah's, for it is not in harmony with his teaching that the Lord used a nation, which did not 'know' Him, as His agent to punish Judah.

XI.-XII. 6. This section apparently has reference to the Reformation of Josiah in 621; it is usually taken to indicate Jeremiah's support of Deuteronomy; it is, however, open to question whether 'the book of the law' (2 K 22 [8]) is to be identified with the code of Deuteronomy. More probably this section represents Jeremiah's sympathetic attitude towards the purpose of the covenant renewed under Josiah, who aimed at purification of worship (8 [8] *v.n.*).

XI. 1-8. Exhortation to Keep the Covenant.—Jeremiah proclaims the obligations of the covenant, which dates from the time of the national deliverance from Egypt: the basis of the covenant on Israel's side is loyal obedience to God, the consequence of disobedience is forfeiture of blessing.

4. iron furnace: a furnace in which iron is smelted, a metaphor for acute suffering.

8. words: the penalties threatened for failure to obey the requirements of the covenant.

9-17. No Response from Judah.—Probably from the time of Jehoiakim, when it was evident that Josiah's reforms had failed, the effect of the renewal of the covenant had been only superficial; so stubborn are the people that there has been no response to Jeremiah's warning; he therefore reaffirms the sentence of judgement: in disaster their false gods will be powerless, and the Lord will not heed the cry for help.

9. conspiracy. The people are all leagued together in dishonouring the obligations of the covenant.

14. Cf. 7 [16].

15. The Hebrew is unintelligible (cf. RVm); a suggested restoration of the text is: 'What hath my beloved (to do) in mine house, (seeing) she bringeth evil devices to pass? Will vows and holy flesh remove thine evil from off thee? then mightest thou rejoice!' (Driver). Judah's ritual is futile because her intentions are evil; she has separated moral conduct from worship.

16. green olive tree. Judah is compared to a 'luxuriant' (green) olive tree, its beauty and usefulness destroyed by lightning: Judah has not produced the fruits of right conduct.

18-23. A Plot Against Jeremiah.—Jeremiah's support of the reforms of Josiah brought him into disfavour among his own townsmen: so great is his unpopularity that the men of Anathoth form a plot against his life. Though no reason is stated, it was probably because the Reformation was against the interests of the priests at Anathoth, whose opposition was embittered, when, as it were, one of themselves advocated the reforming policy. Jeremiah is content to leave the verdict on his conduct in the hands of God, who tests men by their feelings and intentions: the Righteous Judge will punish.

19. gentle lamb: like a 'tame' lamb which is trusting and unsuspicious of harm (cf. Is 53 [7]). **fruit:** it is better to adopt a slight emendation and read *sap*, the expression referring to the prophet's vigour.

20. reins, i.e. kidneys, which Hebrew thought regarded as the seat of the emotions or feeling, the heart being the centre

of the reasoning faculty. Jeremiah's singleness of purpose is known to God. **vengeance**: he does not desire personal vengeance, but a vindication of the cause he has taken up for God.

XII. 1-6. **Why do the Wicked Prosper?**—This passage is the earliest in the Old Testament which raises the problem of the prosperity of the wicked. Why does God allow evil men to prosper? Personal experience (cf. 11 18-23) forces Jeremiah to reflect upon the prosperity of the wicked men who oppose him in contrast to his own apparent failure. Though perplexed, Jeremiah is convinced of the truth of divine justice. The Lord is too righteous that he should dispute with Him, but he humbly offers arguments to support his plea for recognition of his own sincerity and purity of heart: punishment of his opponents would be a sign that God condemned their conduct. The prophet is rebuked for his impatience: his early trials are to prepare him for more severe tests.

2. **reins** (cf. on 11 20): inwardly they are insincere.

4. **He . . . latter end**, i.e. Jeremiah will not survive to see his predictions fulfilled: LXX reads 'God will not see our ways.'

5. **thou art secure**: by a change of one letter probably read 'thou fleest.' **pride**: the luxuriant growth of bushes on the banks of the Jordan, where the 'jungle' is the haunt of wild beasts.

7-17. **God's Grief for Judah's Desolation.**—This isolated discourse refers most probably to events following Jehoiakim's revolt from Nebuchadrezzar *c.* 589 (cf. 2 K 24 1-4), when Judah was ravaged by its neighbours. Jeremiah delivers the discourse in the first person as God's spokesman. Judah has challenged the Lord; with grief and reluctance He gives her up to the devastating attacks of her enemies; these evil-disposed neighbours will be sent into exile; there is hope of restoration for them if they learn to worship the Lord.

8. **uttered her voice**, i.e. openly declared that she is against the Lord.

9. **speckled bird.** As other birds attack a bird of unusual plumage, so is Judah attacked by neighbouring states.

10. **shepherds**: invaders who, like pastoral nomads, bring destruction on cultivated land: the Lord's care for Judah has been in vain.

13. **ashamed**, i.e. disappointed.

16. **As the Lord liveth.** To use the name of a national God in a solemn oath was a token of belief.

XIII. **The fall of pride.** Five separate warnings of uncertain date, except 18, 19.

1-11. **The Symbol of the Waist-Cloth.**—Jeremiah performs an acted parable to illustrate the consequences of the corrupt condition of the people. He bought a linen waist-cloth which he wore and then buried; subsequently he recovered it, only to find it rendered useless by damp. The explanation is: Israel has been brought near to God by the covenant, but her former purity in union with the Lord has been marred: thus she is unfit for His service.

1. **girdle**: a waist-cloth, not a girdle to keep the robes in place.

4. **Euphrates.** It is most improbable that Jeremiah made an actual journey to this river: some commentators suppose a reference to the Exile, but most likely (with the change of one vowel in Hebrew) Parah (Jos 18 23), not far from Anathoth, is meant.

12-14. **The Parable of the Wine-Jars.**—The people know the homely proverb 'Every wine-jar is filled with wine,' i.e. there is a purpose for all. The men of Judah cannot rely for the future on security in their destiny as God's chosen people: as the contents of wine-jars render men helpless, so will they be thrown into confusion in the coming disaster.

13. **drunkenness**: figuratively for paralysis and bewilderment which render men incapable of coping with calamity.

15-17. **Proud Self-will.**—Let Judah change her arrogant behaviour towards the Lord and listen to His warnings before it is too late.

16. **give glory**, i.e. honour God by obeying His words: pride impairs spiritual perception. **mountains of twilight**: RVm. The figure is that of travellers, disregarding the warning of twilight, overtaken by darkness upon the mountains.

18, 19. **Downfall of the Royal House.**—Jeremiah warns Jehoiachin (597) and the queen-mother of their approaching humiliation in captivity (cf. 2 K 24 8, 15).

19. **South**, i.e. the Negeb, a district in the south of Judah (cf. Jos 15 21-32).

20-27. **The Scourge of Sin.**—The approaching disaster through invasion by the Babylonians is due to the sins of Jerusalem.

20. **Lift up**: following LXX read *Lift up thine eyes, O Jerusalem.*

21. **when . . . against thee**: Hebrew is obscure; render *when he shall set over thee as head those whom thou hast thyself taught to be friends unto thee* (Driver); former allies (Babylonians) have become masters.

23. The habit of sin has become so deeply ingrained in the people's nature

that they are unable to expel it: they are so 'trained' to evil that it is second nature.

27. **how long**: a weary sigh, but a glimmer of hope.

XIV.-XV. 9. **The Drought and Jeremiah's Intercession.**—A severe drought is interpreted by Jeremiah as a sign of God's anger against Judah: in the name of the people he confesses the nation's sin, and prays that the Lord will still have mercy on His people. Then follows a dialogue in which the Lord replies that He will accept no intercession for the people. Jeremiah pleads that the prophets have misled them. The Lord will not accept this excuse. He will punish the false prophets and those who have allowed themselves to be deceived. Jeremiah renews his supplication in the people's name. Has the Lord utterly rejected them? There is no hope of succour apart from Him: all intercession for a stay of judgement is in vain; the consequence of sin must be borne. It is not the Lord who has cast off the people; *they* have rejected Him. Here is no cry of despair, but rather the horror which grips the soul of Jeremiah when he reflects upon the condition of those who have alienated themselves from God by sin, and thus wilfully separated themselves from the only source of hope and help (cf. on 7^{16-20}).

4. **chapt**: RVm 'dismayed'; LXX has 'the tillers of the ground are dismayed.'

8. **sojourner**: who, like a traveller, has no permanent interest in the people's joys and sorrows.

9. **called by thy name**: in token of ownership (cf. 7^{10}).

14. **prophesy lies.** It is only just to regard some false prophets as actuated by good motives, e.g. patriotism; but Jeremiah repeatedly emphasizes that the people's well-being depends upon the sincerity and honesty of spiritual guides.

22. **vanities**: unreal gods.

XV. 1. **Moses and Samuel**: two great intercessors in Israel's past history: even were they alive their prayers would be unavailing: 'The day of grace has gone, the day of doom is come' (Ball).

7. **fanned . . . fan**, i.e. winnowed them with a winnowing-fork. After threshing this implement was used to shake the straw, etc., to the wind, the grain falling on the threshing-floor (cf. Mt 3^{12}).

10-21. Jeremiah's outspoken denunciation of evil, and warning of its inevitable result, brought upon him unpopularity: he stood alone an object of ill-will to all. Though he longs to be free from his task the true knowledge of God's will urges him forward. In anguish of soul the lonely messenger of the Lord prays that he may have relief from the sufferings which he bears in God's service. Is his sorrow incurable, his confidence in God's support to be disappointed? Through the dark night of his soul there dawns afresh the assurance of God's supporting strength; but the prophet's doubt has been unworthy of his calling; he must put from him a doubting and complaining spirit, then he will know again the certainty that God is with him.

10. **usury.** His conduct has not been such as to arouse hostility.

11. The meaning is obscure. LXX differs from Hebrew; the sense appears to be that the Lord will strengthen Jeremiah and cause his enemies to seek his help.

12. Also obscure; RVm is better. Possibly the sense may be: Is Jeremiah's strength able to resist the power of his opponents?

13, 14. An insertion from $17^{3,4}$.

15. **longsuffering**, i.e. towards my opponents.

17. **indignation.** He saw moral corruption masked by the shallow joy of godless men.

18. **deceitful**: a dry stream unable to supply the needs of a thirsty traveller.

19. **vile.** Like a refiner he is to remove worthless dross from within himself.

XVI. 1-XVII. 18. **Judah's Ruin and Jeremiah's Comfort.**—So grave is the condition of the nation that Jeremiah is forbidden to marry, for every family will shortly be overtaken by the ruin which awaits Judah as the penalty for her sin. In universal disaster there will be no place either for mourning rites or domestic joy: the people will not be able to hide themselves away from the enemy nor conceal their guilt from the Lord. In the day of trouble Jeremiah is not alone, the Lord is his hope and strength: the time will come when even the heathen will acknowledge the true God. Judah's sin is deeply ingrained in her conduct and worship, both of which bear testimony to her guilt: the punishment is exile. Jeremiah's insight has revealed to him the real cause of Judah's troubles: the people rely upon themselves and human helpers; they have rejected the Lord who is the true source of strength; Jeremiah is convinced of this, and prays for deliverance from his mocking persecutors.

6. **cut themselves**: this mourning custom is forbidden in Lev 19^{28}; Dt 14^{1}; the latter also forbids baldness; it was a normal custom (cf. Am 8^{10}; Is 22^{12}, etc.),

7. It was customary for the friends of the mourner to induce him to take food (cf. 2 S 3 [35], 12 [17]).

13. **other gods**: a reference to the belief that it was necessary to worship the national gods of each land (cf. 1 S 26 [19]).

14, 15 interrupt the context; it is generally agreed that they have been inserted from 23 [7, 8]; [16] continues the thought of [9-13].

16. **fishers, hunters.** There will be no escape from the invaders.

18. **double** denotes the severity of the punishment (cf. Is 40 [2]).

XVII. 1. **pen of iron**: an iron stylus used to carve inscriptions on rock or hard material. Judah's heart is hard, and she cannot remove the marks of her guilt.

2. The text is difficult; Syriac omits 'whilst . . . Asherim.' **Asherim**: the Asherah was a sacred wooden post, probably representing a sacred tree, erected beside an altar.

3. **O my mountain in the field**, i.e. Jerusalem, though possibly Hebrew should be rendered 'the mountains in the field,' and attached to [2].

4. **discontinue.** The rendering of RV cannot be obtained from Hebrew; most probably 'and thou shalt let thy hand fall from thine heritage.'

6. **the heath**: the dwarf juniper tree, a starved and stunted desert shrub cropped by wild goats.

11. **fool**: not one inferior in intellect, but one lacking moral sense.

13. **earth.** The expression apparently means 'unenduring'; Hebrew is peculiar. **living**: fresh, never-failing (cf. 2 [13]).

17. **terror.** Jeremiah's contemporaries are a cause of dismay to him, but God knows that he speaks the truth.

19-27. **A Warning to Observe the Sabbath Day.**—It is considered by many that the attitude towards the Sabbath reflected in this passage denotes a later period (e.g. Neh 13 [15-22]) than that of Jeremiah. While there is much to support a later date, it is also probable that, besides its humanitarian purpose, Jeremiah did regard the Sabbath as an institution which bore witness to the nation's faith in God: neglect of the Sabbath was an act of social oppression as well as infidelity to the Lord.

21. **burden**: merchandise and produce from the country.

27. **fire**: figurative for destruction; the words are based on the refrain in Am 1 [3]-2 [5].

XVIII. **Clay in the Potter's Hand.**—Jeremiah is driven by a divine impulse to the house where he had often watched the potter at his wheel. As he reflects upon the skill and method of the potter a message from God flashes through the prophet's mind. The potter is free to mould clay according to his purpose; clay which does not yield to his design is not cast away, but fashioned again as the potter wishes. So does God deal with His people; for nations and individuals He has a purpose; He does not utterly cast away the intractable or rebellious; for such there is hope in repentance and response to the guiding hand of Providence. Judah prefers to go her own way and will not repent; Jeremiah reaffirms the warning of judgement, to which the people respond by plotting against his life. Jeremiah lays his cause before the Divine Judge, and prays that the truth of his message may be established.

3. **wheels**: lit. two stones: two horizontal stones attached to each other; the lower when turned by the feet caused the upper to rotate.

6. It may be observed that Jeremiah himself had not wished to be a prophet (cf. 1 [6, 7]), but God had directed the course of his life.

7-10. Repentance may save from disaster; disobedience may annul God's promises.

12. **no hope**: cf. 2 [25].

14. Obscure; apparently refers to unfailing snow and streams of Lebanon: contrasted with these Judah's conduct is unnatural.

18. **with the tongue**: 'evil-speaking, lying, and slandering' would be an easy means of misrepresenting Jeremiah's intentions, e.g. a charge of treason.

21-23. Jeremiah's tender compassion for his people would preclude these verses being ascribed to him unless they are regarded as expressing no desire for personal vengeance, but a passionate appeal that the righteousness of his cause on God's behalf may be vindicated by condign punishment on his slanderers.

XIX. 1-XX. 6. **The Parable of the Broken Jar.**—In the early days of Jehoiakim's reign, Jeremiah, accompanied by representatives of Judah, goes to the valley of Hinnom (7 [31] *v.n.*), and takes his stand by the gate near which broken earthenware, etc., were thrown. Here he proclaims the impending doom, and effectively emphasizes his warning by breaking the jar he has bought in the sight of his audience: so will God utterly destroy the people for their mockery of true religion. Jeremiah then goes to the Temple court, where he repeats what he had said at the 'Gate of Potsherds,' with

the result that he is thrown into the stocks by the superintendent of the Temple: here he is left to pass the night in physical discomfort and mental anguish. This attempt to break Jeremiah's spirit fails, and on his release he repeats the former warnings.

XIX. 4. **estranged**: by foreign modes of worship.

7. **make void.** There is a play upon the Hebrew word rendered 'bottle' (1).

10. The presence of 'elders' with Jeremiah on such an occasion indicates that he still retained considerable influence as a prophet despite his unheeded warnings; his life bore testimony to the truth of his words.

XX. 3. **Pashhur.** He is given a symbolic name (cf. RVm) to express the terror the Babylonians will bring upon him and his friends.

7-18. External Trial and Inward Conflict.—The incident just related wrung from Jeremiah a cry of agony; his life seemed to him to have been a failure; his teaching was received with apathy, ridicule, and unbelief. He had not desired to be a prophet, but his pleadings and scruples had been overcome by a will more powerful than his own. His overwhelming vexations and disappointments are the outcome of yielding himself to the Lord's service: yet he cannot withstand the power of the word which burns within him. (11-13) This mood of spiritual depression is relieved by faith and hope—the only remedy; the conviction that the Lord is with him encourages and supports Jeremiah; ultimately his cause will triumph. (14-18) The grip of despondency is never easily shaken off; the human element in the prophetic ministry leads Jeremiah to wish he had not been born. It might be preferred that such a note of despair had been wanting in the record of Jeremiah; but it is of inestimable value in that it fills us with wonder at the nobility of one who overcame such feelings and went forward to bear more bitter trials without complaint. Jeremiah is conscious of divine compulsion urging him to speak words which are not his own.

7. **deceived**: beguiled; he was persuaded against his will.

10. **denounce**: to the authorities. **enticed**: provoked to speak rashly.

16. **cities**, i.e. Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19 [25]; Is 13 [19]).

14-18. A similar passage is Job 3 [3-12], which is probably based on this; the language is conditioned by Oriental standards of taste and usage.

XXI. Jerusalem will be Captured.—Shortly after Nebuchadrezzar began the siege of Jerusalem in 588 Zedekiah sent a deputation to Jeremiah to enquire if the Lord would cause the Babylonians to withdraw: the prophet replied that the efforts of the defenders were useless for the Lord was against them. Jerusalem will fall and the survivors will be delivered into the hands of the enemy; the only hope of safety is for individuals to go over to the Babylonians. Two short warnings follow: justice alone can avert doom, wrong-doing will be punished.

1. **Pashhur**: not the same as in 20 [1].

2. **wondrous works.** In spite of Jeremiah's warnings about the necessity of right conduct Zedekiah apparently hoped for some words of comfort indicating divine intervention.

7. **with the edge of the sword**: Hebrew idiom for 'without quarter.'

9. **for a prey.** He will just escape with his life. A soldier expected to take spoil in battle; in this case all they can hope for is to preserve their lives (cf. 38 [2], 39 [18], 45 [5]).

11, 12 are unrelated to the context; probably a warning given by Jeremiah to the royal house at an earlier period.

13, 14. Another fragment apparently referring to Jerusalem, but as the description hardly suits Jerusalem, it may have been applied originally to some other city.

13. **inhabitant**: the community personified (cf. RVm). **habitations**: the word is used for 'lairs' where wild beasts are secure in the forest.

XXII. 1-XXIII. 8. Warnings to the Kings of Judah.—A collection of oracles on the kings of Judah delivered by Jeremiah and brought together by a compiler.

XXII. 1-9. Exhortation to do Justice.—The prophet's repeated warnings of ruin are conditioned by a firm belief that there is hope through amendment. It is this hope which leads him to exhort kings and their ministers to preserve the well-being of Judah on the basis of right moral conduct: neglect of the covenant and its moral obligations will lead to the downfall of the house of David. These introductory words of hope and warning are followed by their application to individual kings.

6. **Gilead, Lebanon.** The ruin of the royal house will be as though these richly wooded regions had been made a wilderness.

10-12. **Jehoahaz.** Here called Shallum, chosen by the people to succeed his father Josiah, who was killed at Megiddo. Jehoahaz had only reigned three months when he was deposed by Pharaoh Necho

and sent into exile (608): thus his lot was more pitiable than Josiah's (cf. 2 K 23 29-35).

10. the dead, i.e. Josiah, whose death was an irretrievable disaster in Hebrew history; for it was a set-back to the realization of the aims of the reformers, and the heathenish party could point to the calamity as a judgement upon his zeal in attacking cherished and popular beliefs.

13-19. Jehoiakim (608-597: 2 K 23 36-24 7), whose accession placed the reactionary heathenish party in control of the state. Jeremiah contrasts his selfish and unscrupulous conduct with the just rule of Josiah. The standard of conduct in social relations has become so corrupt that even the king uses forced labour and defrauds the artisans of their wages. The luxurious oppression and ostentation of Jehoiakim will end in ignominy; there will be no royal burial.

17. covetousness: RVm is to be preferred.

19. burial of an ass. There will be no marks of respect or lamentation: his body will be cast aside and left without burial, a fate regarded with utmost horror. In 2 K 24 6 his burial is not mentioned.

20-30. Jehoiachin.—Jeremiah calls upon Jerusalem to lament because neither her allies nor rulers have given her security. The Lord has rejected Jehoiachin who, with Nehushta, his mother, will go into exile; no son of his will be heir to the throne of Judah. Jehoiachin (also called Coniah or Jeconiah) reigned only three months, when he, with the flower of the nation, was taken into exile to Babylon by Nebuchadrezzar (597): the penalty of his father's folly fell upon him (2 K 24 8-16, 25 27-30).

20. Go up. The feminine pronouns indicate Jerusalem personified. lovers, i.e. allied nations.

22. shepherds, i.e. rulers.

23. thy nest: figurative of the security of a bird nesting among the cedars of Lebanon.

30. childless: not literally (cf. 1 Ch 3 17; Mt 1 12), but as regards the royal succession. David: the founder of the dynasty.

XXIII. 1-8. Denunciation of Unworthy Rulers: Promise of an Ideal King.—Judah's rulers have failed to watch over God's people, but *He* will restore the remnant of His people and set over them faithful rulers. Under a wise and righteous king Judah and Israel will be reunited and dwell in safety; in his day the standard of righteousness will be that of the Lord: the restoration will eclipse the memory of the deliverance from Egypt at the Exodus.

2. visited, i.e. attended to; RV retains the word-play in Hebrew.

5. Branch: RVm 'Shoot' is more accurate. Hebrew denotes that which sprouts from the roots: in Zech 3 8, 6 12 'the Shoot' is used as a Messianic title, which indicates that by that time this conception of Jeremiah had become a technical term for the Messiah. For Jeremiah 'the Shoot' is an ideal human ruler acting for the Lord.

6. The Lord is our righteousness. The name of the ideal king expresses what the character of the nation will be when he rules over them; the same name is given to the ideal Jerusalem of the future in 33 16. This title has an implied reference to Zedekiah, which means 'the Lord is righteousness,' and it is significant that Jeremiah did not denounce him. The important point is not what Jeremiah actually taught regarding the Messiah, but the fulness of meaning which sprang from his teaching and thus prepared the way for our Lord. In the hour of Judah's downfall, Jeremiah's ardent faith and hope saw that it was possible for God to raise from the ruin caused by sin a righteous community secure in the assurance of divine help.

9-40. The Prophets.—Jeremiah is dazed by the severe condemnation which he is driven to deliver upon the religious leaders. The moral corruption of the prophets is worse than that of those whose faulty guidance had brought punishment for false religion upon the northern kingdom; they will be punished. Jeremiah warns the people not to listen to delusive words which have been adapted by time-serving prophets to condone and not condemn; they falsely claim to speak in God's name: had they spoken under true divine inspiration they would have urged the people to turn from their evil conduct. God knows all: the source of the false prophets' message is known to Him; they say they have a message to communicate, but let a dream not be valued as a divinely given revelation; let him who declares God's word 'declare the whole counsel of God.' The true word of God is known by its effects. The prophetic utterance was called 'burden of the Lord'; the term has been misused, and is no more to be mentioned in Judah; the conventional utterance of the prophets is to be distinguished from the true word of the Lord.

11. profane: their conduct is unmarked by the influence of religion (cf. 6 13).

12. slippery places: they are like men who have missed their way and are forced to walk over slippery ground by night.

13, folly: lit. unsavouriness.

14. strengthen the hands: they not only sin themselves, but encourage others to sin as well.

16, 17. The utterances of the false prophets fill the people with vain hopes; they are spoken without divine guidance; the people are led astray by the smooth words of the prophets. **despise me:** RVm is better.

19, 20 have been introduced here from $30^{23, 24}$.

22. ran: they are eager to proclaim the message they have devised.

25. dreamed. Among ancient peoples dreams were frequently regarded as a means by which the deity communicated his will; the dreams of false prophets afforded scope for delusion, and are contrasted by Jeremiah with the word inspired by God.

28. straw, i.e. the words of false prophets, which must be distinguished from the word of God.

30. steal. Either they have no inward conviction, or pervert the message of the true prophets: they are 'spiritually bankrupt.'

31. He saith: the recognized formula for expressing the divine origin of prophetic utterances.

33. burden. In this and the following verses there is a play upon the Hebrew word which is used to denote both 'prophetic utterance' and 'burden.' Owing to Jeremiah's continual warning of disaster it appears that the people had mockingly attached the latter meaning to the word in his case; his message was burdensome to them.

XXIV. **Good Figs and Bad Figs.**—In 597 Jehoiachin and the flower of the nation were carried into exile by Nebuchadrezzar; those who remained in Palestine attributed their escape to their own merit. Jeremiah teaches them that this estimate of their superior virtue is untrue. In a vision the prophet sees two baskets: one containing good figs, the other bad; the good figs represent the exiles in Babylon on whom God looks with favour; the bad figs are those under Zedekiah in Palestine and those in Egypt; these will be destroyed. Jeremiah placed his hopes for the future on those in Babylon; in this he is supported by Ezekiel, and their judgement is confirmed by history.

1. shewed me: either in a vision, or the parable may have been suggested to Jeremiah by two actual baskets: it is difficult for those who have never had the abnormal psychical experience of visions to discuss their reality.

2. first ripe: valued for the excellence of their flavour.

7. 'Israel survives the Exile, no longer as a nation, but as a religious community, or Church' (Burney).

8. Egypt: the exiles taken thither with Jehoahaz ($2\,K\,23^{34}$), or fugitives who sought safety from the Babylonian army. The Elephantine papyri are evidence that there was a Jewish colony in Egypt long before 525. This chapter is a warning against a complacent attitude which finds it easy to see the hand of God in the misfortunes of others, but does not perceive that absence of misfortune is no certain sign of divine favour, nor cause for self-satisfaction.

XXV. **Babylonian Supremacy.**—The Babylonian victory over the Egyptians at Carchemish in 605 was, in political affairs, the turning-point of the age; the struggle for supremacy in Western Asia had ended in favour of the Babylonians, who were now without serious rivals. Jeremiah saw the necessity for Judah and the surrounding nations submitting to the authority of Nebuchadrezzar; he reminds the people that they have been deaf to his call to repentance for twenty-three years. Therefore the Lord will send the Babylonians from the north against Judah and the neighbouring countries: by the figure of the cup of the Lord's wrath Jeremiah describes Judah and other nations staggering to their doom in confusion before the Babylonian advance. This is followed by a figurative description of the Day of the Lord, when He will accomplish His judgement upon all the nations of the world. Let rulers and nobles bewail the coming doom.

3. thirteenth year, i.e. the year of Jeremiah's call, 626 (cf. 1^{2}). **rising early** expresses continual activity; the underlying meaning of the Hebrew word is to load the backs of beasts for the day's journey.

7. hurt. To go against the will of God is to court disaster.

9. my servant: not as a worshipper, but as God's instrument of judgement. **hissing:** an object of derisive hissing.

10. millstones. The sound of grinding the daily supply of corn will no longer be heard; this sign of the normal routine of domestic life will be wanting.

11. seventy: a round number; expresses two or three generations (cf. 27^{7}).

12-14 are a later addition; [13] indicates that the Book of Jeremiah had been com-

pleted: in LXX the prophecies on foreign nations (46-51) follow [13].

15. **cup.** The idea of the cup of suffering or bitter experience is frequent in the Old Testament (cf. also Mk 14 [36]).

18. **as it is this day:** added after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586; omitted in LXX.

20. **mingled people:** foreign traders, etc., settled in Egypt.

23. **polled.** It was the custom of certain Arab tribes to shave the hair off the brow as a religious rite.

30-38. It is improbable that the authorship of these verses can be correctly ascribed to Jeremiah.

30. **roar.** As a lion comes from his lair, so, with Jerusalem in ruin, will God go forth against all people. **tread the grapes:** the wine-press of the wrath of God; the wine is the blood of men.

31. **plead:** better *contend*.

38. **lion:** cf. [30]. The tenses of 'hath forsaken' and 'is become . . .' are prophetic perfects, which vividly describe future events as having already taken place.

XXVI.-XLV. contain, in the main, selected incidents from the life of Jeremiah, which were put into the form of a biography by Baruch.

XXVI. **Jeremiah's Life is Threatened for Predicting the Destruction of the Temple.**—This incident refers to the occasion when the Temple discourse in 7 was delivered (608). Jeremiah stands in the outer court of the Temple, and declares to those assembled for the festival that unless the people show repentance by amending their conduct the Temple will suffer the same fate as the sanctuary at Shiloh. This fearless warning is regarded as blasphemy: priests and prophets declare that Jeremiah must be put to death for claiming divine inspiration for his message. But the final decision does not lie with the religious authorities; members of the royal house and civil officials try the case. Jeremiah bases his defence on the fact that he has simply spoken words which were not his own but of divine origin: certain elders refer to the case of Micah, a century previously, whose warning had produced repentance and averted disaster. The 'judges' are convinced by the calm dignity of Jeremiah that he is sincere and his message true; thus he escapes with his life. To emphasize the danger Jeremiah ran reference is made by Baruch to the prophet Uriah whose message had led to his death.

2. **keep not back:** he is not to fear the risk of causing offence.

4. **law:** the instruction given by the prophets.

6. **Shiloh:** cf. 7 [12-14]. **curse:** an example of complete destruction; Abraham was proverbial for the blessing he received (cf. Gen 12 [3]).

8. **and all the people** should probably be omitted, as the people appear to have been friendly to Jeremiah in [11, 12, 16], yet a crowd is often fickle (cf. Ac 7 [54] ff.).

14. In the contest between right and wrong Jeremiah does not consider the consequences to himself; note his absolute conviction that he is speaking for God; thus he is without fear.

18. **mountain of the house,** i.e. the Temple.

19. **Thus . . . commit:** Hebrew 'But we are committing' evil against our lives if we murder Jeremiah.

20-23. Narrated to show the personal risk to which Jeremiah was subject.

24. **Ahikam:** the father of Gedaliah, who continued the family friendship towards Jeremiah (cf. 39 [14], 40 [5, 6]). This reference to Ahikam shows that Jeremiah was not without the support of influential friends.

XXVII.-XXIX. are a warning against false hopes of a speedy return from Babylon: it has been suggested that they were circulated among the exiles.

XXVII. **Warning Against Reckless Optimism.**—In 593 a conspiracy was formed among Judah's neighbouring states with the object of regaining freedom from Babylonian control: five kings sent representatives to invite Zedekiah to join the revolt. Jeremiah warns the ambassadors that opposition to Babylon is futile, and to enforce his warning he appears in a sensational manner, wearing a yoke upon his neck: let them tell their kings to submit to the rule of Nebuchadrezzar, and not be deceived by false predictions of freedom easily regained; Nebuchadrezzar is God's agent, and to oppose him is to rebel against God. This warning is repeated to Zedekiah: the priests and people are urged not to be deluded by false prophets who promise a speedy return of the Temple vessels; those still remaining in Jerusalem will be removed to Babylon and not restored until God's appointed time. Jeremiah's appeal was successful. Zedekiah did not join in the conspiracy; four or five years later he rebelled.

1. **Jehoiakim:** a scribe's error for Zedekiah (cf. RVm).

2. **bands and bars,** i.e. a yoke formed by wooden bars fastened with thongs.

3. **them:** omit with LXX of Lucian;

later Jeremiah was still wearing the yoke (cf. 28 10): only one yoke is mentioned in 2.

5. To the heathen kings the God of Israel is proclaimed as God of the whole earth; by His will Nebuchadrezzar has power over them: 'beasts of the field . . . serve him' denotes his absolute supremacy.

7. LXX omits: probably a later addition.

18. **make intercession.** If they were true prophets they would pray that further disaster might be averted: complacent optimism obscures the need for prayer. **Babylon:** whither the others had been carried off in 597.

XXVIII. **The Conflict of Truth.**—We are to picture Jeremiah still wearing the yoke, when Hananiah, one of the prophets who looked for a speedy end of the Babylonian supremacy, publicly replied to Jeremiah's symbol of the yoke; using the same figure he asserts that within two years the sacred vessels will be restored and the exiles return. Patriot that he is, Jeremiah solemnly declares his wish that this might be true, but he urges that true prophets in the past have condemned sin and not spoken smooth things; only the event can prove the truth of a promise of peace. Hananiah breaks Jeremiah's yoke, and briefly reaffirms his prophecy. 'And the prophet Jeremiah went his way.' It is useless to argue about the truth before a partisan audience. Jeremiah does that which only a man of deep conviction can do: he says what he knows to be true, then is silent. He does not believe Hananiah, nor is his own conviction shaken: he requires reflection in communion with God. Subsequently Jeremiah receives a divine message for Hananiah; the policy he advocates will only serve to make the Babylonian rule more burdensome; as a prophet he has the confidence of the people, but has deluded them into apostasy: for this he shall die. He died within three months. It should be noted that there is a marked restraint in the attitude of each prophet. Hananiah no doubt acted in good faith, and genuinely believed that what he said was true. There were also others among the 'false prophets' opposed to Jeremiah who were sincere in their 'false' convictions.

XXIX. **Jeremiah's Letter to the Exiles** (*c.* 595).—Among the exiles, as well as at Jerusalem, there were false prophets who promised that the Exile would soon end: in order to counteract their influence Jeremiah sends a letter in which he exhorts the exiles to settle down contentedly in Babylon. There is no hope of a speedy return to Palestine; they are not to be deceived by prophets who have no true message. It is the Lord's purpose for the restoration to take place after seventy years, when, through the discipline of the Exile, there will be a wholehearted return to true religion. [Here follows a digression on the fate of those who remain in Jerusalem.] Let the exiles be warned by the condemnation of two prophets among themselves, whom the Lord will punish by death for their immoral conduct and their false claim to speak in His name. Shemaiah, a false prophet in Babylon, wrote to the Temple overseer urging that Jeremiah should be arrested, and thus his activities prevented. No action is taken against Jeremiah, who replies to Shemaiah that God will punish him for his false teaching; his descendants shall not share in the restoration.

3. Evidently the royal messengers were well disposed towards Jeremiah. **Elasah:** brother of Ahikam (cf. 26 24) and of Gemariah (not his present companion) (cf. 36 10).

8. **cause to be dreamed:** RVm is to be preferred.

10. **seventy,** i.e. about two generations; the approximate date of the first return to Jerusalem is 536.

14. **And I will be found of you.** The remainder of the verse is wanting in LXX, and is a later addition.

16-20. Also omitted by LXX, and probably a later insertion into the original letter of Jeremiah. **the king,** i.e. Zedekiah.

21 in LXX continues 15 (in which verse 'for' should be rendered 'because'). **Nebuchadrezzar** would punish them for a political crime (e.g. sedition), but God delivered them into his hand for offences against Himself.

22. **The Lord . . . fire:** a formula of imprecation.

23. **folly:** 'senselessness'; 'denotes a state of mind, or an action, marked by utter disregard of moral or spiritual feeling' (Driver).

24-32. The sequence of thought is difficult to follow; LXX varies considerably. 25 begins a prophecy against Shemaiah, which is interrupted by a quotation (26-28) from his letter; 29 is narrative; 30-32 resumes the denunciation of Shemaiah.

25. **thine own name:** he had acted without genuine divine guidance. **Zephaniah** appears to have held a similar office to that of Pashhur (20 1 ff.), viz. keeping order in the Temple, which would include

the duty of restraining the enthusiastic eccentricities of ecstatic prophets.

26. mad. In some cases the prophetic utterance was accompanied by raving and frenzied gestures (cf. the modern dervish).

32. neither . . . good, i.e. his descendant who should represent him at the time of the restoration.

XXX.-XXXIII. The Book of Hope.—The main theme of these chapters is the promise of restoration. In the present form it is scarcely possible that their authorship is to be ascribed entirely to Jeremiah; they have been arranged by an editor so that the whole may form a unity; nevertheless a considerable amount is to be regarded as coming from Jeremiah.

XXX.-XXXI. The Future Glory of Israel and Judah.—In view of the coming return of Israel and Judah the promises of restoration are collected together. The Lord will make a decisive change in the fortune of Judah and Israel. A Great Day of Judgement is coming, in which Israel will be delivered from heathen rule, and in regained freedom will serve God under an ideal ruler; other nations will be destroyed, but Israel will be saved after bearing just punishment. Because 'the daughter of Zion' is in desperate need the Lord will heal the wound which has been caused by sin. The exiles will return, Jerusalem will be rebuilt, and under the care of God will enjoy prosperity (as in the days of David) with a ruler of their own race, who is in closest relations with God. The divine judgement will sift the righteous of the nation from the ungodly; the purpose of the divine anger will be understood in the latter days. (XXXI.) The northern Israelites will share in the joy of restoration, and the territory of Ephraim will again be under peaceful cultivation; with the old feud between Israel and Judah at an end, both will unite in worshipping their God. Let there be joy because the Lord has saved His people, who will return in penitence to have all their needs supplied by God. Let it be proclaimed among the nations that Israel sent into exile by the Lord is also restored and bountifully preserved by Him. Jeremiah describes himself as hearing Rachel, the mother of Joseph and Benjamin, bewailing from her grave the children she has lost in the exile of the northern tribes: let her refrain from grief, there *is* hope of restoration. This hope is based on Ephraim's repentance and the Lord's compassion. Let repentant Israel prepare for the return to Palestine and yield herself to the divine purpose; Judah also will share in the peace of the restoration. The Lord will be watchful over His people: in the happy future of the restored community children will no more suffer for their fathers' sins, but the individual will bear the consequences of his own sin. Jeremiah proclaims the *New Covenant* to replace the covenant made at the Exodus; he is convinced that no longer will the knowledge of God depend upon obligations imposed from without, but upon the individual's direct and personal experience of God. God's law will be written on men's hearts. Obedience to God will no longer spring from moral obligations, but from spiritual response to fellowship with God, who has made this possible through forgiveness of sins. The survival of Israel is as sure as God's control of the world of nature: Jerusalem will be rebuilt and be holy to the Lord.

XXX. 5. We . . . peace: a quotation of the people's words.

7. that day, i.e. the Day of the Lord, which in popular belief was the time when the Lord would intervene in human history and overthrow the foes of Israel (cf. Am 5^{18}). **Jacob** is a favourite name for Israel in Deutero-Isaiah, and in some of the later writings.

8. Cf. Is 10^{27}; LXX reads 'his' for 'thy,' before 'neck' and 'thongs,' which is probably a correction.

10, 11 are not in LXX: they recur in $46^{27.28}$ in Hebrew and LXX, and were probably inserted here by an editor.

10. afraid: cf. Is 17^{2}; the figure is that of sheep in undisturbed possession of their pasture.

13. RVm [1] is to be preferred.

14. lovers: heathen allies (cf. 4^{30}).

16. Therefore: the meaning is 'because thy need is so great.'

17. health: 8^{22} *v.m.*

18. heap: the city is to be rebuilt on the site of its ruins.

20. congregation: a term frequently found in the Priestly document of the Pentateuch; it denotes the people as a church rather than as a state; its use here suggests that the passage is later than Jeremiah.

21. hath had boldness: cf. RVm, which is nearer the Hebrew, 'who now has gone surety for his heart . . . ?' It is most emphatic, the point being that God Himself, who has taken the ruler into closest relations, is the guarantor of this ideal ruler's character and excellence, so that the implied answer is 'None other than God.'

XXXI. 2. wilderness: figurative of the land of exile; the tenses are 'prophetic perfects': '. . . will find . . . I will go that I may cause Israel to rest.'

3. **of old**: RVm is to be preferred, i.e. from Zion. **unto me**: read with LXX *unto him.*

4. **tabrets**, i.e. 'hand-drums' or 'tambourines,' used in dances, a sign of rejoicing.

5. **vineyards.** After planting some time elapses before the vine develops sufficiently to yield fruit; the planting of vineyards implies a state of peace and security.

6. **watchmen**: 'the keepers' of the vineyard who guard it from the depredations of thieves and animals. **Ephraim**: the ancient feud between Israel and Judah will have ceased; Jeremiah looks forward to both uniting in worship of the Lord at Jerusalem.

9-14. The thought and language of these verses are very similar to Deutero-Isaiah.

12. **goodness**: better *bounty.* **watered garden**: lit. 'saturated'; the meaning is that all their desire will be fulfilled; there will be outward prosperity and inward peace (cf. Is 58 [11]). This metaphor would be readily understood in a land where drought is common.

14. **satiate**: the same word as 'watered' in [12]. **soul**, as the seat of desire, here means 'the appetite': the claims of the priests will be richly satisfied.

15-22. A passage which displays the tenderness of Jeremiah's sympathetic nature as well as the hope inspired by the doctrine of repentance.

16. **work**: Rachel's toil and suffering have not been in vain.

18, 19. The word 'turn' is used in a double sense in these verses; the meaning is 'bring me back (as a penitent son) and I will turn (in penitence) . . . ([19]) after I turned from thee I repented.'

20. Though a 'prodigal' God loves him: God hates the sin, but loves the sinner. **bowels**: 4 [19] *v.n.*

22. **woman . . . man**: difficult and obscure. Driver suggests: '. . . the woman, instead of holding aloof and waiting to be sought by the man (typifying "the Lord"), will affectionately cling round her divine husband. . . .'

23. **habitation**: lit. 'homestead,' i.e. the land of Judah or Jerusalem, which will be greeted as the abode of righteousness. **mountain**: the Temple hill.

25. **satiated**: abundantly refreshed (cf. on [12]).

26. The author finds a sad contrast between actual conditions and the happy prospect of restoration.

28. Jeremiah recalls his commission and the lesson of the almond tree (1 [10-12]).

29. **The fathers . . . on edge**: a popular proverb. In ancient thought the idea of the corporate personality of the social unit meant that guilt of one member of the group was shared by the whole (cf. Jos 7 [24, 25]; 1 S 22 [16-19]; Ezek 18 [2]). Here the belief that God had no direct concern with the individual is opposed: the fact that God will restore the innocent descendants of the original exiles affirms the doctrine of individual responsibility for sin.

33. **the covenant.** The character of true religion under the relationship of the new covenant is marked by (i) the dependence upon divine origin; (ii) inwardness of moral conviction; (iii) personal consciousness of fellowship with God; (iv) forgiveness of sins. It should be noted that the terms of the new covenant are based upon Jeremiah's own personal experience and knowledge of God. The truth he teaches is enriched by a wealth of personal experience, which alone can make words ring with sincerity and conviction.

34. **forgive**: forgiveness of sins is the removal of that which hinders the knowledge of God.

40. **valley**: even the valley of Hinnom will be transformed (7 [31] *v.n.*).

XXXII. **The Redemption of Land at Anathoth.**—An incident during the siege of Jerusalem in 587. When Jeremiah was confined to the guard-court at the palace for his prediction of defeat, he exercised his right to purchase from his cousin some family property at Anathoth. He saw in the occasion an opportunity, which God had sent, to prove by deed that he was convinced of the truth of the words he had spoken. By the purchase of the land with precise legal formalities Jeremiah showed his confidence in Israel's ultimate restoration to the land now occupied by the enemy. To all intents and purposes the land seemed worthless as an investment, but in his own personal affairs Jeremiah was prepared to act upon the principles of the teaching he had given. Conditions were such that the assurance of restoration seemed based on false hopes, and subsequently Jeremiah has misgivings as to the issue; he lays his doubt before God in prayer and thus finds reassurance; nothing is too difficult for God; after punishment there will be restoration to Palestine and a return to closer union with God through true religion. The original account of this incident has received additions from an editor whose hand is discernible in [1-5, 17-23, 28-35], and [36-44]; the latter is 'substantially Jeremianic,' but has been rewritten (cf. Peake).

3-5. A parenthesis explaining why Jeremiah was imprisoned.

7. **Hanamel**: he was a refugee who had come to Jerusalem, and, owing to the financial difficulties in which he was thus placed, desired to sell his property. **right of redemption**: cf. Lev 25^{25}; Ru 4^{1-12}.

9. **seventeen shekels**: this weight of silver would be worth about £2 6s. 9d., but its purchasing power would be much greater.

11. **law and custom**: RVm is to be preferred. **sealed . . . open**: it was the custom to enclose the deed in an outer wrapper on which was inscribed a duplicate of the actual deed. Excavation has revealed that Babylonian and Assyrian deeds were frequently stored in jars of clay (cf. ^{14}).

13. **Baruch**: the faithful friend and 'secretary' of Jeremiah; it is to him we owe the greater part of the Book of Jeremiah.

16-25. The long introduction ($^{17-23}$) to the prayer in ^{24} and ^{25} is an expansion, resembling the style of Deuteronomy, with phrases used elsewhere by Jeremiah.

24. **mounts**: embankments made by the enemy along which they advanced to assault the city walls. **is given**: the city has not actually fallen, but is as good as taken; a perfect of certainty, so also in ^{36}.

29. Cf. 19^{13}.

34, 35. Practically identical with $7^{30, 31}$.

36. **ye say**: LXX has 'thou sayest' (cf. ^{24}).

40. Though not explicitly mentioned the reference is to the 'new covenant' of 31^{33}.

XXXIII. **Further Promises of Restoration.**—Though the signs of the times belied such hope, Jeremiah, while in the guard-court, a second time proclaims the promise of restoration. In spite of the present dire condition of Jerusalem during the siege the Lord will restore it to its former state and establish prosperity for His people, after they have been cleansed through punishment: instead of desolation there shall be joy, thanksgiving, and peace throughout the land. This is followed by renewal of the promise that, under an ideal ruler and the Levitical priesthood, both Israel and Judah will have security: the royal and priestly succession will be permanently established; the taunt of rejection will be disproved by the Lord's compassion.

2, 3. Probably a later insertion. **doeth it**: LXX is better, *who made the earth and formed it to establish it.*

3. **Call**: God's revelation is given to those who seek Him.

4. **mounts**: 32^{24} *v.n.*

5. **They . . . Chaldeans.** A slight correction of the Hebrew gives: 'The Chaldeans are coming to fight and to fill. . . .'

6. **health**: 8^{22} *v.n.*

8. Restoration is made possible through divine forgiveness, and (^{9}) the nations will be awed by this manifestation of the Lord's power and gracious purpose.

14-26 is wanting in LXX; thus there is good reason for regarding it as added at a time considerably later than Jeremiah: it contains many phrases repeated from other parts of the book.

14-16. Largely repeated from $23^{5, 6}$, where see notes.

16. **she shall be called.** It should be noticed that the title is here transferred to Jerusalem.

20. **my covenant**: God's promise is as certain as day and night.

24. **before them**: LXX (Luc.) reads 'before me.' Duhm by a slight emendation restores (after 'off') 'and despiseth his people, that it should . . . before him.'

XXXIV. resumes Baruch's biography of Jeremiah (26-45), which is interrupted by 30-33.

1-7. **A Message to Zedekiah.**—During the siege of Jerusalem (588-586) Jeremiah delivers a message from God to Zedekiah: Jerusalem will undoubtedly be taken by the Babylonian army and destroyed: resistance is useless. Zedekiah will be taken prisoner and obliged to answer for his rebellious opposition to Nebuchadrezzar, yet he himself will not suffer a violent death, and will receive the honours of royal burial. It is evident that this mitigation of what would be Zedekiah's normal fate is conditional upon his accepting Jeremiah's well-known policy of submission to the Babylonians. Zedekiah did not fulfil the condition, and his actual fate is narrated in 52^{11} (cf. Ezek 12^{13}): to reject God's guidance is to annul His promise.

2. **I will give**: better *I am giving*, emphatic and contrasted with 'thou' at the begining of ^{3}.

5. **burnings.** Sweet spices were burnt at the funeral of a king (cf. RVm): not a reference to cremation.

8-22. **A Broken Covenant.**—During the early days of the siege of Jerusalem Zedekiah had induced the people to release all Hebrew slaves, and a solemn covenant had been made to this effect; it therefore became a religious obligation. The purpose of the emancipation was an attempt to secure God's favourable support when the city was threatened by the

Babylonian army. But shortly afterwards, when the Babylonians withdrew to meet an attack from Egypt (cf. 37 [5]), the obligation to the slaves and to God was disregarded. The danger was removed: the masters reclaimed their slaves. Jeremiah condemns this breach of faith as a blasphemous insult to God. The old 'law of release' had been broken; so God will release them from His service and protection. The Babylonians will return and take the city.

11. turned: when the Babylonians temporarily retired (cf. 37 [5]).

14. A statement based on Dt 15 [12] ff. The ancient 'law of release' had been disregarded, probably for some time.

16. profaned. Though the agreement had been sworn in the Temple, it had been treated as of no consequence: God's Name was taken in vain.

18. when they cut the calf: an ancient rite which was transformed and blended with the religion of Israel. The passing of the contracting parties through the pieces of the victim was a mystic rite which signified that they were taken within the life of the sacred victim (cf. *R.S.*[3], 481). Another explanation is that the parties, passing through the divided victim, invoked a similar fate upon themselves if they failed in their obligations (cf. Gen 15 [17]).

XXXV. The Fidelity of the Rechabites.—The Rechabites, a branch of the Kenites, were a tent-dwelling tribe who continued the nomad life; they dwelt within the territory of Israel and worshipped the God of Israel. They were descendants of Jonadab, who had supported Jehu against Ahab in suppressing the worship of Baal of Tyre (2 K 10 [15-23]). Their fidelity to habits of nomad life was a protest against settled agricultural life in Canaan, which, in contrast with the wilderness days, had a degrading influence upon the pure worship of Jehovah, God of Israel. When, towards the end of Jehoiakim's reign, the country was overrun by marauding bands, the Rechabites had taken refuge in Jerusalem. Jeremiah, knowing their loyal adherence to ancestral habits, offered them wine, which they refused as conflicting with their rule of life: fidelity demanded that they should avoid any share in vine-culture, agriculture, or house-building. Force of circumstances had driven them to Jerusalem, but not to infidelity. Jeremiah points a lesson by contrasting the loyal obedience of the Rechabites with Judah's disobedience. The precepts of Jonadab are faithfully obeyed by the Rechabites: Judah has refused obedience to the commands of God, made known through a long line of prophets. Judah will be punished; the Rechabites are promised permanence as servants of the Lord.

1. days of Jehoiakim. This incident took place *c.* 598 (cf. [11] and 2 K 24 [2]) after the events recorded in 36.

6. ye shall drink no wine: as a protest against agricultural life which implied recognition of local gods of fertility; to avoid the use of houses was equally important.

11. See 2 K 24 [2].

14. I have spoken. The 'I' is emphatic, and contrasted with 'the words of Jonadab.'

XXXVI. Jeremiah's Roll and Jehoiakim's Anger.—This chapter from the hand of Baruch contains an account of how Jeremiah's prophetic utterances were first committed to writing in 604. In response to God's guidance Jeremiah is moved to record in writing all the words he had spoken as God's messenger since his call. It may be the people will hear and turn from their evil ways. Jeremiah, therefore, dictates his prophecies to Baruch, his friend and secretary; as he himself is prevented from entering the Temple, he directs Baruch to read the roll publicly when the people are assembled at the Temple on a fast-day, in the hope that they may heed the warning and repent. In the winter of the following year there is a fast, probably held in view of the danger of the political situation: so Baruch reads the roll in a room placed at his disposal by Gemariah, who is attending a council meeting at the palace; he is, however, informed by his son of the contents of the roll. When the princes, who are with Gemariah in the secretary's room at the palace, hear the report they send for Baruch; he is courteously received, and again reads the roll for their benefit. The princes are filled with alarm when they hear the contents, and decide that they must tell the king: with the fate of Uriah (26 [20-23]) in mind they advise Baruch that he and Jeremiah should seek safety by concealing themselves. The matter is reported to Jehoiakim, possibly in milder terms than Jeremiah's stern warning; but the king insists upon himself hearing read the actual words of the roll. He is enraged by its contents, and, cutting the roll whenever Jehudi has finished reading three or four columns, he throws each portion into the fire until the roll is completely burnt. Under the malignant influence of Jehoiakim none is perturbed, though some of those in

attendance had tried to stay the king's impious action. The king sends a prince of the royal blood to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch. But, adds Baruch, God watched over them, and their hiding-place was not discovered. The zeal of Jeremiah cannot be cowed into inaction, for him God is ever near to direct: the roll is rewritten by Baruch at Jeremiah's dictation and fresh matter is added, including the punishment which will come upon Jehoiakim.

5. **I am shut up**: RVm 'restrained' is to be preferred; apparently the authorities had forbidden Jeremiah to speak in the Temple (cf. 20 [1-3]). Baruch acts as his deputy: it is unlikely that the reference is to ceremonial uncleanness or imprisonment.

12. **princes**: the term is not confined to members of the royal house, but includes ministers of state, e.g. Elishama the scribe. **Elnathan**: cf. 26 [22, 23].

17, 18. The care taken to verify the words of the roll as actually coming from Jeremiah indicates that he is regarded with respect; but his outspoken words are inopportune from an official point of view. Contrast [16] with [24]: conscience is stifled through lack of moral courage.

23. **leaves**: RVm is to be preferred; the roll (or scroll) formed a long strip; as often as Jehudi had unrolled and read a portion the king slashed it off.

26. **the Lord hid them.** For the thought cf. Ps 118 [6], 124 [1].

XXXVII., XXXVIII. contain incidents relating to the personal history of Jeremiah during the siege of Jerusalem in 588-586.

XXXVII. 1-10. **Warning to Zedekiah.**—When the Babylonians raise the siege of Jerusalem in order to meet an attack threatened by the Egyptian expedition sent to the assistance of Jerusalem, Jeremiah, in reply to Zedekiah, declares that the relief is only temporary; he warns him against the delusion of believing that the Babylonians have abandoned the siege; they will return and certainly destroy the city.

3. A similar incident, narrated in 21, took place earlier in the siege. **Pray**: he sought direction; Zedekiah realized the situation was still critical.

11-21. **Jeremiah is Arrested and Consulted.**—During the withdrawal of the besiegers Jeremiah starts on a journey to Anathoth, but at the city gate he is arrested as a deserter to the Babylonians; his warnings as to the futility of resistance were well known and regarded as a friendly attitude towards the enemy; besides, the number of similar desertions was numerous, so that the action of the officer was reasonable. Jeremiah's denial of the charge is disregarded and he is thrown into prison by the 'princes,' who disliked him not only for his pro-Babylonian attitude, but especially for his interference in the matter of the slaves (34 [8-22]). Some time later, when the siege has been resumed, Zedekiah consults Jeremiah secretly; during the interview the prophet begs for less rigorous treatment. The king orders him to be kept in confinement in the guard-court; he knew Jeremiah was innocent, but had not the courage to set him free lest the 'princes' should resent his action. With this it is interesting to compare Herod's attitude to St. John Baptist (Mk 6 [17-26]).

12. Probably the journey was connected with the subsequent transaction recorded in 32 [6] ff.: it is not unlikely that a kinsman at Anathoth had died during the Babylonian advance, and thus changes in the ownership of family property needed adjustment.

16. **dungeon.** The horror of confinement in a subterranean prison of an Eastern city in time of siege can hardly be imagined, yet Jeremiah's faith in God is unshaken; the word of the Lord is still with Jeremiah ([17]). Men may forsake God: God does not forsake men.

XXXVIII. 1-13. **Jeremiah is Rescued from Death.**—In the greater liberty of the guard-court Jeremiah is able to speak to those who go to and fro; he advises them to desert to the Babylonians as the only hope of saving even bare life: he is accused before Zedekiah of treason; the king is weak and consents to his removal. The superstition of the 'princes,' or their lust of revenge, prevents their putting the prophet of God to death, so they cast him into a disused 'well,' where Jeremiah is left to die of starvation or suffocation in the mud. From this he is rescued through the kindness of Ebed-melech, an Ethiopian servant of the court, whose thoughtfulness prompts him to spare Jeremiah needless pain when weak through privation ([12]).

4. **weakeneth**, i.e. discourages (by predicting disaster).

5. Note that Zedekiah does not actually authorize Jeremiah's death: LXX reads 'for the king was not able to do anything against *them*.'

6. **dungeon**: an underground cistern for the storage of water.

9. **have done evil.** A word, even from a foreign servant, stirred the king's conscience: such is the power of a word spoken in season. **the famine**: better *of*

hunger; he would not receive the scanty rations (cf. 37 [12]). **for . . . city:** the meaning is perplexing; the sense of Hebrew may be 'unless, of course, there is no more bread in the city.'

10. thirty: probably read *three*.

14-28. Jeremiah's Final Appeal to Zedekiah.—Zedekiah once again consults Jeremiah secretly, and takes a solemn oath that whatever advice is given no harm shall befall the prophet. Thus reassured Jeremiah repeats the advice he had given previously: the only hope of safety is to surrender. But Zedekiah is morally weak; he fears the mockery and ill-treatment which might follow if he does as Jeremiah urges. Then Jeremiah beseeches the king to act upon the advice he has given; it is from the Lord, in whose name he speaks; even as he speaks, it seems, there flashed on the prophet a vision with which he closes his appeal. Zedekiah, haunted by fear, begs that the interview may be kept secret from the suspicious and intriguing 'princes.' Binns, following Buttenwieser, regards this passage as another account of the interview in 37 [17-21]; but its precise information points to its being original, not secondary.

14. hide: the king considers it possible that Jeremiah's recent physical suffering may have weakened his integrity (cf. Job 2 [7-10]).

22. set thee on, i.e. misled thee: the dirge, which the women will chant, recalls Jeremiah's recent experience in the 'well': Zedekiah will be left to his fate. **are sunk:** LXX reads 'they (i.e. thy friends) have made thy feet to sink . . .,' which is better.

26. to return . . . there: a very possible fate, the fear of which prompted the request of [15].

28*b*-XXXIX. 14. Jeremiah is Spared at the Fall of Jerusalem.—The continuity of the narrative in this section has been obscured by additions from 2 K 25 and Jer 52.

XXXIX. 1, 2 are inserted as an explanatory gloss in the middle of a sentence; see RVm.

4-13 are probably correctly omitted by LXX. Thus 38 [28*b*] connects with 39 [3], after which 39 [14] continues the narrative; when these verses are read consecutively the additions are apparent. When Jerusalem was captured the Babylonian officers met in council to decide matters relating to the city and its inhabitants: Jeremiah receives favourable treatment, and is entrusted to the care of Gedaliah, son of his friend Ahikam (cf. 26 [24]).

9. Nebuzaradan: according to 52 [13] he did not arrive in Jerusalem until a month after its capture.

11-13 are not in 2 K 25 or Jer 52; such instructions would be due to Jeremiah's advice to surrender.

14. Ahikam had befriended Jeremiah some twenty years earlier; it is noteworthy that Gedaliah continued the family tradition of friendship with Jeremiah.

15-18. A Promise to Ebed-Melech.—This is a supplement, added by Baruch, to the account of Ebed-Melech's deed in 38 [7-13]. The rescue of Jeremiah was not only an act of kindness; courage also was required to face the probable reprisals of the 'princes.' Ebed-Melech is rewarded by the promise of safety when Jerusalem is taken.

17. men . . . afraid, i.e. the 'princes,' whose enmity he had incurred by rescuing Jeremiah from the death they had planned. God watches over those who do His service.

XL.-XLIV. Events in Jeremiah's life after the fall of Jerusalem.

XL. 1-6. Jeremiah Remains in Palestine.—Jeremiah is among a band of captives from Jerusalem who are being deported to Babylon; he is released by the Babylonian commander of the guard and allowed complete liberty to choose where he will go: his choice is to remain in Palestine with the remnant of his countrymen who have not been removed to Babylon: he is given provisions for his journey and a gift in token of esteem. At Mizpah Jeremiah joins Gedaliah now made Governor of Judah by Nebuchadrezzar. In his choice Jeremiah was no doubt influenced by a sense of loyalty to Gedaliah, but it is probable that his chief reason for remaining in Palestine was that he felt called to direct and prepare the people for the future restoration of the nation to which he looked forward. He refused honourable treatment in Babylon ([4]) that he might do God's work.

1. in chains: in view of 39 [14] this is rather unexpected; possibly it took place in the confusion of marshalling the captives; the mistake was rectified at Ramah, five miles north of Jerusalem.

5. Now . . . back: omit with LXX; Hebrew is strange; probably a corrupt gloss.

6. Mizpah: four and a half miles north-west of Jerusalem.

7-XLI. 3. Gedaliah is Murdered by Ishmael.—The scattered fugitives, when they heard of Gedaliah's appointment as governor, came to him and began to settle down to agricultural life; the outlook was

brighter, and old hopes began to revive. Among those who came to Mizpah was Ishmael, who arrived with evil intentions against Gedaliah. Ishmael was of the royal house of David, and resented the governorship being in the hands of one not of royal descent; he had the support of Baalis, king of Ammon, who was also anti-Babylonian. Gedaliah is warned against Ishmael, but refuses to believe the charge of treachery, and subsequently extends hospitality to Ishmael, who uses the banquet as an opportunity to assassinate his host. His motive seems to have been jealousy, or possibly he regarded Gedaliah, now representing the Babylonians, as a traitor.

7. fields: i.e. the wild open country: it is not clear whether they were fugitives from the garrison of Jerusalem, or bands of armed men who had carried on guerilla warfare.

9. Gedaliah was loyal to the Babylonians.

10. stand before here means 'to intercede,' as in 15 [1].

14. Baalis: possibly his ambassador had been one of the five whose attempts to secure Zedekiah's support had failed (27 [3]) through the influence of Jeremiah and his supporters, among them Gedaliah. **believed them not**: the noble character of Gedaliah is shown by his refusal to believe an evil report, nor does he allow himself to be influenced by suspicion (cf. 41 [1]).

XLI. **3. even the men of war**: omit with LXX.

4-18. Ishmael's Atrocities and Flight.—Two days after the murder of Gedaliah, Ishmael waylaid and massacred a party of pilgrims who were carrying offerings to Jerusalem, where, it appears, some sort of worship was still carried on amid the ruins of the Temple. Ten of the eighty pilgrims are spared on account of their willingness to reveal hidden food supplies. Compelling the other refugees at Mizpah, among them Jeremiah and Baruch, to go with him, Ishmael starts for the land of Ammon, but Johanan with other leaders overtakes him and rescues the captives; Ishmael takes to flight. The murder of Gedaliah gave Johanan good cause to fear that the Babylonians would punish indiscriminately any they might find at Mizpah. He and his companions therefore decide to seek a new home in Egypt; taking with them the rescued refugees, they begin the journey southwards, and for a time remain in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem.

6. weeping: LXX has 'as they were going along and weeping,' but a man of Ishmael's treacherous character might well have feigned sympathy.

8. stores: in Palestine it is still a common practice to store grain, etc., in pits.

9. by the side of Gedaliah: read with LXX *was a great pit.*

14. cast about: an archaism meaning 'turned round.'

15. Ishmael: from what is narrated about him he seems to have been the fanatical leader of a roving band of desperados.

16. people whom . . . Mizpah: by a slight correction emend, 'people whom Ishmael . . . had carried away captive from Mizpah' (Hitzig); probably omit 'men of war.'

XLII. 1-XLIII. **7. The Migration to Egypt.**—The people have now but one hope left, Jeremiah. To him they turn in their perplexity; they ask that he will pray for them that through him God's will for them may be revealed; they promise solemnly that they will do whatever he may tell them. They wait ten days while Jeremiah reflects and prays. The answer is neither what they wish nor expect. Jeremiah in God's name urges them to remain in the land where they are; God will watch over them; there is no cause to dread the vengeance of the king of Babylon; if they persist in their desire to go to Egypt calamity will overtake them. But Johanan and the people are defiant; they have already made up their minds: they *will* go to Egypt. Because Jeremiah's advice is contrary to their own plans they refuse to believe that his message is of divine origin: they make the unworthy suggestion that Baruch has instigated the old prophet's reply so that it may conform to his own pro-Babylonian policy. In spite of their promise they proceed to Egypt, taking with them Jeremiah and Baruch, and cross the border near the frontier-fortress at Tahpanhes.

1. Jezaniah: read with LXX *Azariah* (cf. RVm).

2, 3. As the sequel shows (43 [4-7]) it was hardly a sincere petition for divine guidance in a crisis, but rather a request for direction in carrying out a pre-determined policy dictated by circumstance and not by God; from this Jeremiah could not dissuade them.

5. the Lord . . . witness. In spite of Jeremiah's hint that the answer may be contrary to expectation ([4]) they promise faithfully to obey; an obligation lightly disregarded when God's will crossed their own.

7. after ten days: Baruch recalls the

days of anxious waiting. Jeremiah's words are not his own; he can seek, but not command, divine inspiration; it is for him to lay the matter before God in prayer, the while sifting out his own thoughts and impulses; he will give voice to no prophetic utterance until he knows definitely that he speaks to reveal God's will. 'It was an element in his prophetic gift that he could clearly and sharply distinguish between objective and subjective, between the word of God and the thought of his own heart' (Peake). It was the sin of the 'false prophets' that they did not thus first scrutinize the quality of the prophetic impulse; they spoke too readily; they, and not God, controlled their utterances.

10. repent: not in the sense of 'regret'; but now the people have been punished God's attitude towards them has changed.

12. to return to: the Hebrew should be read *to dwell in*; so Syriac, Vulgate.

19. It should be noted that there is no mention of any spoken protest; it was clear to Jeremiah from their faces that they disapproved.

20. dealt deceitfully: with LXX read *ye have done evil against*.

XLIII. **2. saying**: the Hebrew is quite unusual; read 'and defiant' by a slight change, i.e. 'then spake . . . proud and defiant men.'

7. Tahpanhes, i.e. Daphnæ, a town in the eastern delta, modern Tell Defenneh.

8-13. The Conquest of Egypt Predicted.—At Tahpanhes Jeremiah performs a symbolic action: in the presence of the Jews he takes large stones which he buries in the pavement before the royal residence, and proclaims that Nebuchadrezzar will conquer Egypt and set his throne upon these stones; the land will become his, and the temples of the Egyptian gods will be destroyed. A fragmentary inscription of Nebuchadrezzar states that he invaded Egypt in 568 and defeated its king, Amasis. Josephus preserves a story that when Nebuchadrezzar conquered Egypt he 'took those Jews that were there captive and led them to Babylon; and such was the end of the nation of the Hebrews.'

9. in mortar in the brickwork: a difficult phrase; LXX translates 'in the forecourt'; other Greek versions and Vulgate have 'in secret': the latter would suggest that the action took place at night. **Pharaoh's house**: when Flinders Petrie excavated the fort at Daphnæ in 1886 he found a building in front of which was a large brick pavement; this may have been the scene of Jeremiah's symbolic action.

10. royal pavilion: the Hebrew word thus rendered is only found here; it may be connected with an Assyrian word 'to spread out,' and mean 'carpet' or 'canopy.'

12. array himself: denotes the ease with which he will subdue Egypt.

13. pillars of Beth-shemesh: to be identified, as RVm, with Heliopolis or On, six miles north-east of Cairo. 'Cleopatra's Needle,' now on the Thames Embankment, is one of these obelisks; only one remains in its original place.

XLIV. **Denunciation of the Worship of the Queen of Heaven.**—As the previous chapter indicates, Jeremiah, though he went to Egypt, did not, even in old age, diminish his warnings to conform to popular opinion: he was firmly convinced of the wilful folly of the people's migration because it was opposed to God's will. Even after receiving punishment from God, at the hands of the Babylonians, they are still rebellious; and now in Egypt Jeremiah has still to rebuke the people for turning from the Lord to heathen forms of worship. In Judah they have seen the result of their fathers' sin and their own sin; why, then, in Egypt do they persist in the same heathen forms of worship? Have they forgotten the repeated warnings? The punishment which has come once will again overtake them: of those who have sought refuge in Egypt at most a mere handful will ever return to Judah. (15) To this warning the assembled men and women reply that they will not abandon the worship of Ishtar, the Queen of Heaven, for, when in Judah, as long as they continued to worship her, their country had prospered. But when the reformation of Josiah had put an end to her worship a period of disaster had followed. From the death of Josiah to the murder of Gedaliah there had been a quick succession of calamities: these they attribute to the wrath of the neglected Queen of Heaven. The inference they draw from facts, as an excuse for sin, is absolutely wrong, replies Jeremiah: the disasters have come because they have incurred the Lord's anger for worshipping her at all. Let them fulfil their vows to the Queen of Heaven! The remnant in Egypt will be punished and share the same fate as their countrymen; the survivors, few in number, will know the truth of his words; even the king of Egypt, in whom they trust for protection, will be given into the hands of his enemies. Let this be a sign that the prophet has spoken in God's name.

1. Jews . . . in the land of Egypt. The

twenty-sixth dynasty had encouraged foreigners to settle in the Nile Valley as traders or mercenaries; possibly the strife between Assyrian and Egyptian parties in Jerusalem had caused some of the latter to flee to Egypt when their rivals were in the ascendancy. Nothing is known of these colonies until the 5th century B.C., in the Aramaic papyri.

4. Cf. on 25^{3}.

5. **to burn no incense**: as elsewhere 'burn incense' has meaning 'offer sacrifice.'

9. **their wives**: read with LXX *their princes*.

18. **left off**: it is noteworthy that in the decline of the Roman Empire the Christians were blamed for the misfortunes, as they had ceased to worship the old gods.

19. At the beginning of this verse some MSS. of LXX, with Syriac, insert: 'And all the women answered, and said.' **worship**: RVm is to be preferred; her image or symbol was impressed on the cakes. **without our husbands**: a woman's vow was not valid without her husband's consent (cf. Nu 30^{3-16}).

25. **Ye and your wives**: read with LXX *Ye women*.

30. **Hophra**: according to Herodotus (ii, 163 ff., 169) this ruler (Apries) was dethroned by Amasis (570), and later strangled by the people.

XLV. **Baruch.**—This chapter is a supplement to 36^{1-8}; its present position, at the end of the biography of Jeremiah, is due to Baruch's unwillingness to introduce a personal element into the narrative. Baruch, like Jeremiah, and indeed in company with many others who have striven to turn men to God, experienced times of depression and disappointment; he is overcome by such feelings after writing the roll in 604. He knows well the hardness of the people's heart and their persistent refusal to turn to God in response to Jeremiah's words; what useful purpose, then, can be served by the message he has written in the roll? The contents of the roll have filled him with sorrow for the doom which awaits the unrepentant people. His mental agony is increased, he is distressed in spirit, and can find no relief from sorrow. To Baruch in such a mood Jeremiah might have appealed from the example of his own life, but he can point him to a source of greater reassurance. When the Lord is compelled with reluctance to destroy His own work, how can Baruch expect success, or the satisfaction of his own ambitions? The Lord's pain is greater than Baruch's sorrow. Far from pining for success, let him be content that his own life is preserved in the disaster which will overtake the guilty people.

XLVI.-LI. **The Prophecies on Foreign Nations.**—In the LXX these prophecies are placed immediately after the vision of the cup of the Lord's fury, and follow 25^{13}. Though Jeremiah's mission is more directly concerned with his own people, the foreign nations are not excluded from his prophetical outlook. The prophecies on the nations have been worked over by later writers, and non-Jeremianic matter has been added; but there is a nucleus of genuine utterances from Jeremiah which has been expanded. For a detailed study the larger commentaries should be consulted.

XLVI. **Egypt.**

2-12 refer to the defeat of Pharaoh Necho at Carchemish by Nebuchadrezzar in 605.

4. **get up**: better *mount the chargers*.

13-26. The reference is to the invasion of Egypt, as the result of the Babylonian victory at Carchemish, either immediately after the event, or later as predicted in 43^{8-13}.

15. Read with LXX *Why is Apis fled? Thy strong one stood not, because the Lord did thrust him down.* Apis is the sacred bull of Egypt.

17. **noise**: a symbolic name is given: 'Call ye the name of Pharaoh a Crash.'

20. **destruction**: RVm 'gadfly' is much to be preferred; the Babylonians have stung 'the graceful heifer.'

22. RVm is to be preferred. Egypt withdraws like a serpent disturbed by woodmen in the forest; there is also a reference to the sacred serpents of Egypt.

XLVII. **The Philistines.**

4. **Caphtor**, i.e. Crete, the original home of the Philistines (cf. Am 9^{7}).

5. **Baldness**: a sign of mourning. **valley**: with LXX read *O remnant of the Anakim*, a prehistoric race of giants.

XLVIII. **Moab.**

7. **Chemosh**: the national god of Moab is powerless before the Lord.

13. **Bethel**: the sanctuary where the Lord was represented by the symbol of a golden bull; Israel's trust in it had been disappointed.

26. **drunken**, i.e. bewildered by terror (cf. 25^{15}).

40. **eagle**: frequently used to describe a conqueror.

XLIX. 1-6. **Ammon.**

1. **Malcam**: read *Milcom* (with LXX, Syriac, Vulgate), the national god of Ammon; so in ^{3} (cf. $1\,K\,11^{5,33}$).

2. daughters: figurative for surrounding towns.

7-22. Edom: there is much in common with Obadiah [1-6], which see.

8. dwell deep, i.e. in inaccessible retreats.

9. The foe spares nothing.

18. pride, i.e. 'jungle.'

23-27. Damascus.

23. melted: are powerless through fear.

28-33. Arab tribes.

28. Kedar: an Ishmaelite tribe (Gen 25 [13]).

29. curtains, i.e. tent-hangings.

32. polled: see on 25 [23].

34-39. Elam.

38. throne: the Lord's throne is set for judgement.

L. 1.-LI. 58. Babylon: largely composed of repetitions from the Book of Jeremiah and other prophetic writings, e.g. Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.

L. 2. Bel, Merodach: gods of Babylon.

8. he-goats: as he-goats are the first of the flock, so let the Jews be the first to leave the doomed city.

16. All agriculture will be at an end; foreigners settled in Babylon will disperse.

23. hammer: figurative of Babylon as destroyer.

27. bullocks: figurative for young warriors.

36. boasters: lying prophets and diviners.

38. mad: with versions render *they boast themselves of idols.*

LI. 2. fan: RVm is better, i.e. winnowers.

11. kings: LXX has 'king,' referring to Cyrus.

14. cankerworm, i.e. locusts.

34. The speaker is Israel.

59-64. The Mission of Seraiah.—When Baruch's brother accompanied Zedekiah to Babylon in 593, Jeremiah entrusted to him a scroll and bade him, on arrival, read the prophecy concerning Babylon written thereon; the message is to be enforced by a symbolic action.

59. Zedekiah. Nothing is known of this visit; it might have been connected with the attempts at revolt (27).

60. even . . . Babylon: a late addition identifying the scroll with 50-51 [58].

LII. The Capture of Jerusalem.—This chapter is taken almost verbatim from 2 K 24 [18]-25 [21, 27-30], except for [28-30], which is from an independent source; the commentary on 2 Kings should be consulted.

THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH

By R. K. Roper

Introduction.—The book commonly known as the 'Lamentations of Jeremiah' and placed after the writings of that prophet has neither that name nor that position in the Hebrew Scriptures. The English versions follow the order and title known to Western Christianity through St. Jerome's version, but which originated in the LXX. In Hebrew Bibles it is found in the third collection of books called 'the Writings' and not among 'the Prophets.' The title, as in some of the books of the Pentateuch is the first word of the text, *Ēkhāh* (Ah how!). But by later usage, in the Talmud it came to be known as *Qīnōth* (elegies or dirges), which justifies part of the modern title.

Contents and Structure.—The book consists of five poems, corresponding to the present division into chapters, each one complete in itself, rounded off and independent, but with a common theme. The poems describe the miseries in which Judah found itself involved in consequence of the fall of Jerusalem in 586.

The first four poems are in the form of an acrostic, the verses being arranged alphabetically. There is scarcely any feeling of artificiality; the poet has merely set an extra limitation upon his work. In the first and second poems each verse begins with a subsequent letter, and each verse is made up of three lines; the same arrangement prevails in the fourth poem, but each verse is only of two lines. The acrostic restriction of the third poem is far more severe; not only does each verse begin with a subsequent letter, but each of the three lines of the verse has to conform in this respect, the same letter successively beginning three lines. Such acrostic poems, fragmentary or entire, are found elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures.

These poems are of particular interest in connexion with Hebrew poetry. The rhythm used has been variously described as 'elegiac' or the 'limping metre': it is now generally termed the Qīnāh measure. In this form of poetry the rhythm rests on a division of the line into two unequal parts of which the longer precedes; the normal number of terms is five divided

by a cæsurá into three followed by two. The second half of the verse is usually in apposition to the first; any conjunction is studiously avoided.

The fifth is different in structure. It is not alphabetical, but nevertheless consists of twenty-two verses. The rhythm is not the Qīnāh: the normal number of terms is six, equally divided in two parts. The difference is probably due to the fact that it is throughout a prayer, not the conventional expression of grief which seems to have demanded the use of the Qīnāh.

Quite clearly the poems are not the spontaneous outpouring of sorrow, but compositions wrought together with conscious art, in which detail by detail the scene is depicted and viewed from different angles. There is none of that wild, almost vulgar distress displayed by Hecuba in the tragedy of Euripides, but rather the restrained and measured grief of Moschus in his lament for Bion.

Authorship and Date.—Jewish and early Christian tradition agree in ascribing the authorship to Jeremiah. The Targum introduces the book with the words: 'Jeremiah the prophet and chief priest said,' and the Talmud makes similar allusions. The LXX, in an introductory verse almost exactly translated in the Vulgate, gives its author as Jeremiah, and the occasion of its composition as the fall of Jerusalem, and the Fathers follow the same tradition. The only dissentient voice is from the MT, and this is negative rather than positive evidence, for it places the book away from Jeremiah's prophecy and makes no allusion in title or preface to the authorship. An important verse is noticed by both Josephus and St. Jerome (2 Ch 35 [25]): 'And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah, and all the singing men and singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations unto this day; . . . and, behold, they are written in the lamentations.' These writers interpret this as an allusion to the canonical Lamentations. The question arises, Is this verse a link in the tradition of Jeremian authorship, or is it its actual origin? If it is part of a genuine tide of tradition, even if Josiah's death is not the occasion (as most scholars are agreed it is not), it makes it very probable that Jeremiah wrote part of the book. The view has been held that the prophet was the author of the greater part of the poems—the second and fourth poems *c.* 581 prior to the third deportation after the murder of Gedaliah—while the rest, perhaps excluding the third poem, were composed during the sojourn in Egypt *c.* 550. But, if the view is held that the tradition is based on a misunderstanding of the Chronicler, the internal evidence is of such a nature as to make Jeremiah's authorship improbable. The linguistic similarities of this book with the prophecy may very reasonably be due to the admitted influence the prophet's work had on subsequent literature. The general tone of the book is not what would be expected from a man of his temperament, even allowing for a great versatility of character. The announcement that Jehovah no longer reveals Himself in the prophets (2 [9]) would come strangely from his mouth. The patriotism displayed is hardly consistent with what is known of the historical Jeremiah.

The freshness of the picture in the second and fourth poems is a strong argument in favour of an early date, and it seems likely that they were written by an eye-witness shortly after the capture of Jerusalem, 586. The other poems may have been written by an exile in Babylon during the earlier part of the Captivity. The third poem may be placed as late even as the return under Zerubbabel; the formation of the five into one book was for liturgical use in the new Temple.

The Maccabæan date advocated by some writers is fraught with historical difficulties; it is almost impossible to reconcile the political position of Lamentations with that which prevailed in Judah in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. And, whereas the Psalms which are of Maccabæan date constantly protest that Judah is suffering in spite of its innocence, the poet in Lamentations admits its guilt and confesses its sin.

Religious Value.—The attention this book has received in the past may to some extent have been due to the traditional authorship, for it has been treated as an appendix to Jeremiah's prophecy. The question of authorship, however, does not materially affect its value as a very fine example of elegy, indicative of religious thought immediately after the fall of Jerusalem.

Together with Canticles, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, and Esther this book goes to form the five *Megillōth*, or 'Rolls,' of which it is the third. This was a liturgical collection of books read publicly in the synagogues at special seasons. The Book of Lamentations was recited on the 9th of Ab, the day on which Jerusalem was destroyed, and is therefore in the Jewish mind inseparably connected with the greatest national catastrophe that ever befell their race.

Christians have always regarded it in the light of our Lord's Passion. Here too its influence has been largely liturgical, for the Church has read it from ancient times at Mattins during the last days of Holy Week.

Modern scholarship has rather tended to centre its attention in the metrical problem it presents than in the historical or religious significance of the book; and some writers seem insensible to the intrinsic beauty of these poems. The second and fourth in particular are magnificent examples of the exquisite pathos and cadence of which the Hebrew language and mind are capable.

Bibliography

Löhr, *Die Klagelieder Jeremias*, 1891; Adeney in *Exp. B.*; Peake in *Cent. B.*; Streane in *C.B.*; G. B. Gray, *Forms of Hebrew Poetry*, 1915.

I. The first poem deals with the desolation and misery of Jerusalem. In the first half the poet bewails the solitude and degradation of the city. The idea of the Captivity with all it involves is the main theme, the cessation of divine worship in the appointed feasts, the ravages of the enemy, and the entire departure of all Zion's majesty and glory. In the second half the speaker is no longer the poet but the city itself, trying to find a likeness with which to compare its sufferings. There is a brief interlude by the poet, and the elegy ends with an acknowledgement of Jehovah's justice and a dignified appeal for retribution on the enemies of Jerusalem.

1. provinces. So Vulgate and LXX. The word appears in 1 K 20 [14-19] with the same meaning, apparently a subdivision of the kingdom. In later literature its occurrence is usually with reference to Persian satrapies. In the Targum and Syriac this word is regularly used to mean 'city.' Parallelism, however, would rather seem to support the RV.

2. All her friends. It is not easy to find an historical situation for this treacherous behaviour of Judah's allies, unless this is a reference to Egypt, the reed which pierced her hand when she leant upon it for support. The idea is parallelled, however, in Ps 41 [9].

3. because of affliction. The LXX seems to regard the Exile as an amelioration from oppression which Judah was suffering in her own land, rendering 'away from affliction did Judah remove her dwelling . . . they took her from the midst of her oppressors.' A modification gives the better sense: Judah was taken from one affliction to another; already in straits and difficulties at home, the ruin was made complete by foreign attack.

7. The MT is irregular in having four lines. (The RV divides [1] and [2] wrongly into four instead of three.) The second line here is probably a gloss which may have belonged to 'majesty' of [6]. The present position, if it could be metrically justified, gives an excellent sense. The contrasted thoughts of the present misery of Jerusalem with its past happiness is natural enough, just as in Ex 16 [3] the children of Israel remembered the fleshpots of Egypt.

10. pleasant things. No doubt reference here is made to the Temple and palace treasures. Is 39 [4] ff. had prophesied that the treasures shown by Hezekiah to Merodach Baladan would prove to be the undoing of Jerusalem because of a rapacious enemy. Nebuchadrezzar carried away the vessels of the Lord. Antiochus Epiphanes robbed the restored Temple, even Pompey was attracted by the great wealth of the Temple. The idea of defilement of the Temple by the presence of Gentiles can scarcely be pre-exilic. Dt 23 [3] merely excludes the Ammonites and Moabites. The Exile and the subsequent political subjection to foreign heathen powers stimulated the growth of a fanatical hatred of the presence of Gentiles within the sacred precincts. The language about the Temple in these verses is a strong argument in favour of a late date.

11. Like an artist the poet has been drawing and colouring a portrait of Zion in her misery, adding detail to detail until the scene depicted is so real that it appears to come to life; and now the lament is no longer that of the poet, but comes from the mouth of the city itself.

12. Is it nothing. The Hebrew is 'Not to you, all ye passers of the way'; LXX and Vulgate: 'O all of you that pass by.'* The choice of words is limited, as the acrostic demands that the verse should begin with Lamedh. Kittel emends: 'To you (*sc.* I speak) that pass by.' Or more simply by the word usually rendered 'Go to now.' The ruins make their mute appeal to the traveller in the same way that the fallen figure of Ozymandias in the Egyptian desert draws the attention of the traveller in Shelley's sonnet.

* This great text in the AV and RV rests, it is true, on no philological foundation; but it marks the translators' deep religious insight and sound literary judgement. Till a satisfactory emendation of the Hebrew is forthcoming, the Church rendering may well be retained.—A. G.

14. The difficulty of this verse is caused by the Hebrew word 'is bound,' which is found nowhere else. LXX and Vulgate render a root differing only in a diacritical point 'watch.' Perhaps emend: 'Watch is kept over my transgressions, by his hand are they twisted together. They have come upon my neck as a yoke, they have made my strength to fail.'

18*a* is the high-water line of the whole poem. Zion has seen her plight, and having realized that it is the work of Jehovah is led to confess her guilt.

20. This is the Hebrew method of expressing depth of feeling: the bowels represent the centre of emotion; the idea is better expressed in English by 'heart.' In the following line the Hebrew idiom uses heart as the centre of intellectual activity, the will and reasoning powers.

21. **Thou wilt bring the day.** If this refers to the day of Jehovah's wrath on Judah foretold by the prophets, the text as arranged by Löhr, based on the Targum paraphrase, gives a better sense: 'Hear how I sigh, there is none to comfort me. All mine enemies have heard of my trouble, thou hast brought the day thou didst proclaim. They are glad that thou hast done it, let them be like unto me.' This emendation also has the merit of helping a metrical difficulty.

II. The dominant idea throughout the second poem is that of Jehovah's anger with His people. The cause of the country's sufferings is found in the fact that Jehovah has become its enemy. The description of the agony of the inhabitants, the famine, the contempt of the onlookers and the rejoicing of the triumphant enemy is more vivid, and the woe less formal than in the first poem. The last two verses are a prayer made in response to the writer's exhortation to Zion to entreat Jehovah for the sake of her young children. This pathetic appeal is a summary of the whole chapter in which Zion lays bare its misery and destitution to Jehovah.

3. **all the horn**: neither this nor the RVm gives the true sense. As in Jer 48 [25] horn has the meaning of 'strength and adornment.' The Targum renders 'all the honour of Israel.' Jehovah has taken away the right hand of His assistance from Israel, His divine help as well as their 'horn' or natural strength.

4. The RV wrongly divides the third and fourth line; the colon should stand after 'Zion' as in the LXX, not after 'eye.' This leaves an imperfect third line of only half the usual length. This may be original; such half-lines appear in Vergil occasionally.

6 is difficult. RV makes two lines of the first Hebrew line. 'his place of assembly,' supported by Targum and Vulgate, certainly is parallel with Ps 74 [8], but the same word is used in the following line with its usual meaning 'solemn assembly.' The rendering apparently was suggested by parallelism with 'tabernacle,' but this word should itself probably be rendered 'hedge' (cf. AV and RVm). Pareau translates: 'He hath taken away with violence his hedge as if a garden hedge' (cf. Ps 80 [12]).

9. **where the law is not** (cf. Kipling's Recessional, 'Lesser breeds without the Law'). Whatever the exact shade of meaning 'torah' may have here, this shows a strong national feeling of superiority. 'Law,' as in Is 42 [21], can hardly have the highly specialized meaning that it later acquired. The reference is possibly to the Deuteronomic code, or to the direction given by the priests. **her prophets**: the old prophetic communities had been destroyed at the fall of Jerusalem. Still it is a little surprising that Ezekiel's prophecies should be ignored; but [14] suggests that the old false prophets are meant. This verse summarizes the first part of the poem; [2-5] has dealt with the political, and [6-7] the religious, aspect of Jerusalem's fall.

11. **My liver**: cf. 1 [20]. This is the only certain instance of this metaphorical use of 'liver.'

13. **testify unto thee**: a slight alteration supported by the Vulgate gives a better reading 'compare.' **breach**: the same word is rendered destruction in [11], 'thy destruction is as vast as the sea.' But the text is uncertain.

14. **bring again thy captivity**: the same phrase occurs in Ps 126 [1] and [4]. The Targum paraphrases 'to cause thee to turn in penitence,' while Rashi interprets it 'to correct thy turning away.' The general sense must be that of the AV 'to turn away thy captivity.' **causes of banishment**: the word is found only here; the root clearly means 'expulsion,' but by the confusion of cause and effect (e.g. the same word in Hebrew means both 'work' and 'wages') so common in Hebrew the RV is quite justified.

16, 17. Some have wanted to invert these verses, as the order of the Hebrew alphabet usually found is not followed here; but the same order also prevails in the two following and other acrostic poems, and the sense is more natural in their present arrangement.

18. The first line should end with the word 'Zion.' The present text gives an interjected remark by the writer which is rather difficult in construction. Some have tried to obviate this by personifying the wall of Zion and reading a plural: 'The walls of the daughter of Zion, their heart cried unto Jehovah'; others wish to emend 'Cry out with thy heart, O wall,' etc.

22. my terrors: for this meaning cf. Ps 31 [13]. The LXX renders 'dwellers about Zion,' in which case it might mean that invasion had driven the surrounding villagers into the city, as if at a festival time, for protection; this helps the sense of the rest of the verse, but RVm points to a conscious use of Jeremiah's language.

III. This poem, although usually considered later than the rest of the book, is of particular interest, as it raises exactly the same problem as the 'Servant Passages' in Deutero-Isaiah. Is the speaker an individual sufferer, or is it the community personified? Budde and Löhr take the former view; Driver, here inclining to the national interpretation, considers that the poet is speaking in the name of the people. It is not unlikely that the poem is composite: notice the change to the plural in [40-47]. After bewailing grievous calamities the poet turns to the contemplation of God's compassion and the justice of His providence; this thought leads to an exhortation to penitence. The theme then changes from the minor to the major, and ends with a confident appeal for vengeance. The affinities with Job and some of the Psalms are noteworthy.

5. gall and travail. This strange combination has suggested to some that the text is disordered. LXX and Targum render 'head' in place of 'gall,' the same Hebrew word, changing the text: 'he compassed my head with travail.' Perhaps the phrase should be understood as a hendiadys for bitter travail.

8. shutteth out my prayer: the Targum refers this to the cessation of the Temple worship.

9. hewn stone. It is of these that the Israelites were forbidden to make altars (Ex 20 [25]), and of these the wealthy inhabitants of Samaria had their houses built (Am 5 [11]). The word seems difficult in this context: two of the chief MSS. of the LXX leave it unexpressed. It must be understood to emphasize the thoroughness of the obstructions Jehovah is raising against His people.

13 and the following verses have affinities with Job 6 [4], 16 [12], 41 [19]. **shafts of his quiver:** cf. RVm. The idea of an arrow as the offspring of the quiver is not confined to Semitic thought: cf. Horace, *Od.*, i, 22, 3, where the quiver is said to be pregnant with arrows.

14. my people: *'ammim* ("peoples") for *'ammi* ("my people") must doubtless be read with the Peshitto and many Hebrew MSS. and modern authorities. Either a letter has fallen out, or a mark of abbreviation has been disregarded' (Driver) (cf. 2 S 22 [44], Is 53 [8], Ps 144 [2]). This is supported by the grammatical form of 'their songs' in Hebrew. RV favours the individual interpretation.

17. And thou hast removed. The sudden change of person, although it can be parallelled, seems strange, and is unsupported by the versions. Targum 'my soul is turned back from seeking peace.' LXX 'he has removed' should probably be accepted.

22, 23. The former appears metrically too long, and the latter too short. Kittel suggests: 'The Lord's mercies are not spent, for they fail not. New every morning are his compassions, great is thy faithfulness.'

26. More literally 'It is good to wait silently for the salvation of Jehovah.'

36. the Lord approveth not: doubtful. RVm 'seeth not' is more literal. Some suggest it should be a question. RVm implies a statement of Zion complaining that Jehovah takes no notice of her affliction. The latter, however, is more natural a sense; in her affliction Zion questions whether Jehovah really does see and yet permits the atrocities perpetrated by a barbarous enemy. The Targum supports the interrogative.

38. evil and good. Jehovah here is not represented as responsible for moral evil, but as the supreme disposer of the vicissitudes of man's fortune. As in Is 45 [7] the Hebrew word *ra'*, which here appears in the plural, should be translated 'calamity.'

42. The word usually rendered 'saying' must be understood to introduce this verse; its omission is common in poetry, as it represents little more than inverted commas. This confession is the outcome of the exhortation in the preceding verse.

51. Mine eye affecteth my soul. This phrase is obscure. The ambiguity of the Hebrew verb is well represented by 'affecteth,' here probably for evil. The LXX and Vulgate, following a less common meaning 'to glean or gather grapes,' renders 'Mine eye hath robbed my soul of its fruit.' But the idea is probably one of physical discomfort of the eye through

overmuch weeping. 'My eye has inflamed itself': this is the sense of the Targum. 'Soul' by a Hebrew idiom is used in a reflexive sense.

52-66. The metaphor here seems to be that of an innocent man fleeing from vengeance. He is captured and thrust into prison where he cries to Jehovah for help. The help given was his vindication when brought to judgement. A prayer for vengeance on the unjust accuser ends the poem. Early commentators cite this as Jeremiah's experience at the hands of his court enemies (Jer 38 6-13). This is, however, too late to be the work of the prophet, and that the writer had him in mind when composing this poem is mere conjecture.

58. **thou hast redeemed**: Job 19 25 *v.n.*

65. **hardness of heart**: read with RVm *a covering*. This may be akin to an Arabic idiom which has the sense 'to cause to faint.' Render perhaps 'Thou wilt make them faint, thy curse is upon them.'

IV. This poem stands in close relation to the second of this collection, and like it seems to be the work of an eye-witness. The writer compares Zion's former splendour with its present humiliation, and asserts that it is the guilt of the priests and prophets that has been the final cause of Jerusalem's downfall. The help from Egypt, for which it had hoped, has failed. Jehovah's anointed (Zedekiah) has been trapped as if he were a wild beast. In this moment of distress the writer remembers the exultation of Edom over Jerusalem's punishment, and prophesies that its iniquities will also be visited when Zion has expiated her guilt.

1. Reference is made here to the Temple gold and treasures. **stones of the sanctuary** follows the Vulgate, but LXX 'holy stones' is equally possible. Parallelism would demand the meaning 'precious stones' rather than the stones of the building. In 2 the gold is interpreted as the 'precious sons of Zion,' which St. Jerome neatly renders 'nobles,' i.e. the civil authorities. Explanation of the 'stones of the sanctuary' is deferred to 13, and even there not expressly stated.

3. The ostrich was proverbially cruel to its young (cf. Job 39 13-17). Mention is made of jackals in connexion with the ostrich in Is 43 20.

6. Owing to the Hebrew confusion of cause and effect (cf. 2 14 *supra*) it is not clear whether it is the sins or the punishments that are being compared (cf. RVm). The LXX favours the former.

7. **nobles**: more literally 'crowned ones' unless following the LXX the word is rendered 'Nazirites.' A very slight change suggested by Kittel gives the attractive reading 'youths.' Exact identification of precious stones in the Old Testament is often questionable; the versions vary considerably in their renderings.

10. **pitiful**. Even those that were pitiful by nature in their straits have been reduced to these barbarities.

12. The writer pictures the surrounding nations as sharing the Jewish belief that Jerusalem was inviolable. Contrast Jeremiah's fervent assertion that Jehovah would destroy it (27 17-19).

13 is in agreement with 2 14, with which Targum compares it. There had been the corruption of the princes, but when the priests and prophets no longer testified in the name of Jehovah, the city could not be spared.

14. **wander**. The word is elsewhere used of branches swaying to and fro in the wind (Is 7 2). The interpretation of this and the following verses is difficult, and there is probably corruption in the text. Some take this to mean that the priests have been ostracized by their fellow-citizens for their crimes.

15. The original Hebrew must have been obscure, for there is strong metrical evidence of inserted glosses putting speakers to the different phrases. The murderous priests and prophets of 13 are hounded from the city as lepers; being unwilling to recognize their crimes it is the people who cry 'unclean' as they drive them away, nor are they able to find rest in foreign lands. The Hebrew is distinctly reminiscent of the language in Gen 4 12, 14 referring to the outlawry of Cain.

17. The writer seems to identify himself with the party that had looked to Egypt for help. This verse forms a very strong argument against Jeremian authorship.

20. Most ancient commentators in the light of 2 Ch 35 25, 'And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah.' Thus the Targum expounds: 'King Josiah who was beloved by us as the breath of life which is in our nostrils, and was anointed with the oil of Jehovah's anointing.' Ibn Ezra, however, rightly saw that the verse referred to Zedekiah, 'who although he was not the best of princes as events later showed, at the outset had great hopes centred in his person, that after the sad fates of Jehoiakim and Jeconiah the state would be more peaceful, which in fact it would have been if only Zedekiah had kept faith with Nebuchadnezzar, from whom he received the kingdom.'

21. The cry for vengeance on Edom is found in other places in Hebrew poetry (Ps 137 7). Edom had refused to join in the Egyptian alliance with Judah, Tyre, and the Ammonites under the Pharaoh Apries. When Babylon devastated the country round Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar gave the rural districts over as a prey to the Philistines and Edomites who had remained true to the Babylonian suzerainty.

V. The heading of this chapter in the Vulgate is 'A Prayer of Jeremiah the Prophet.' The poet calls upon Jehovah to look upon Zion's affliction, which he describes at length to add more force to his prayer. The thought of God's eternity inspires fresh confidence, and the poet renews his pleading. The political situation has variously been pictured as the siege of Jerusalem itself or the period directly following.

4. Some refer this to the price of water during the siege, but Grotius is probably right in saying that a toll or rent was placed upon access to rivers and wells by the Babylonians during their occupation.

5. Reference here may be to the barbarous practice of riding across the bodies of a conquered foe (cf. Is 51 23), as depicted in some of the Assyrian inscriptions. Rashi refers it to the heavy yoke of servitude placed upon their necks.

7. The poet still seems to advocate the idea contained in the proverb: 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge,' condemned by Jeremiah (31 29) and Ezekiel (18 2) alike. In 16, however, he admits Judah's present guilt, and the punishment is to be regarded as the accumulation incurred by their fathers as well as themselves.

12. **hanged up by their hand.** This may mean that princes were suspended by their hands, a form of torture common in England in Elizabeth's reign. Pareau considers this interpretation has absolutely nothing to commend it. Almost certainly 'their' refers back to the subject of 11a, the invaders, and the allusion is to the well-known practice of impaling.

19. The idea that Jehovah was as much dependent on His people as they were upon Him has utterly been disproved. Jehovah has not ceased to exist because of the extinction of the ritual of His cultus. This gives fresh hope to the poet.

22 ends with a note of pessimism. RVm offers a possible modification: 'Unless thou hast . . . and art,' etc. The Jews evidently understood it as the RV does, for in the synagogues, labouring under the idea that it was an ill omen to finish a book with a sad or threatening sentence, they repeated the penultimate verse. This is also done in Isaiah, Malachi, and Ecclesiastes.

EZEKIEL

By W. Emery Barnes

(1) Structure and Contents of Ezekiel. The book falls into six sections:

(A) I.-III. **Ezekiel's Vision and Call to be a Prophet in Exile.**

(B) IV.-XXIV. **Sin and Judgement.**—These are tremendous chapters. The sins of Israel (Judah) are stated mercilessly in detail, a specially prominent place being given to faithlessness to Jehovah; so especially in 8 (idolatry in the Temple), 16 (the spiritual adulteries of Jerusalem), 23 (the wantonness of 'Oholah' and 'Oholibah,' Samaria and Jerusalem). The speedy coming of judgement is announced with unflinching directness. The land of Israel must pay the uttermost farthing: 'There shall none of my words be deferred any more, but the word which I shall speak shall be performed, saith the Lord Jehovah' (12 28). 'Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter: they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness.' Such announcements should have been easy to understand, but in case his words should fall on deaf ears, Ezekiel makes an appeal also to the eyes of his people. He scratches on a tile the picture of a besieged city (4); he digs through the wall of his own house in the dark to illustrate the terrors of flight from the agony of Jerusalem (12 1-14). Ezekiel being of priestly family had probably known of these profanations of the Temple described in 8, even if he had not actually witnessed them. His vision was of the nature of a dream in which past experiences are recalled and presented vividly again to the mind.

(C) XXV.-XXXII. **Against Neighbouring Foreign Nations.**—Ammon is denounced because, as Israel's neighbour on the east, she desired to profit by Israel's fall (cf. Jer 49 1). Similarly Tyre

on the west is threatened because she said: 'I shall be replenished, now that she [Jerusalem] is laid waste' (Ezek 26 [2]). That great mercantile people thought only of their own prospective gain, when Israel fell. The prophet was mistaken in his forecast of the immediate future, as he himself confesses in 29 [18]. Tyre continued to exist as a semi-independent state under its own king for some 250 years, i.e. until its capture by Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. Even then, though the population was sold into slavery, the city was colonized with fresh inhabitants. It decayed gradually through centuries to its present insignificance.

But Ezekiel's moral vision was not in fault. The prophet is impressed indeed with the vastness of the trade and of the resources of Tyre. But he knows that the ships and the riches and the defences of the city represent material power only, the power of the flesh, not of the spirit (cf. Is 31 [3]). And the flesh must fail. St. John's vision of the fall of imperial Rome (Rev 18 [4-20]) is based on Ezekiel.

Finally Egypt is to be punished ('it shall be the basest of the kingdoms'), because Egypt so often held out misleading hopes to Israel (29 [16]).

(D) XXXIII.-XXXVII. **'The city [Jerusalem] is smitten.' Ezekiel as a Prophet of Comfort.**—In these chapters are found predominantly words of hope: 'Why will ye die, O house of Israel?' (33 [11] = 18 [31]). Promises are given—

(*a*) Of the coming of a good shepherd of the house of David (34 [23], 37 [24]).

(*b*) Of fertility for the land (34 [26] f.).

(*c*) That waste places shall be inhabited again (36 [9] f.).

(*d*) Of a new heart, faithful to Jehovah and obedient (36 [26-27]).

(E) XXXVIII., XXXIX. **Irruption and Interruption from the North.**

(F) XL.-XLVIII. A continuation of (D). **Restoration of Jerusalem, Rebuilding of the Temple, Reorganization of the Theocratic State of Israel.**

(*a*) The courts of the Temple and the surrounding wall with its porches (40).

(*b*) The house divided into Temple (Hebrew *hêykal*) and Holy of Holies (41).

(*c*) The chambers for the priests (42).

(*d*) Narrative. The Glory of the God of Israel enters the house (43 [1] ff.).

(*e*) The dimensions of the altar (43 [13] ff).

(*f*) Legislation. No uncircumcised foreigner to be allowed to enter the Temple. Only the Levites, the sons of Zadok, to be allowed to exercise the office of a priest. Strict laws for preserving the purity of the priestly clan (44).

(*g*) Ordinances for sacrifice at feasts and at other times (45 [9]-46 [24]).

(*h*) The life-giving stream, which proceeds from the threshold of the house, fertilizes the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea, and even heals the salt water of the sea (47 [1-12]).

(*i*) Redistribution of the land of Canaan among the tribes. Special holy territory reserved for the sanctuary and the priests (45 [1-8], 47 [13]-48 [29]).

(*k*) The gates of the city named after the tribes; the city named after Jehovah (48 [30-35]).

(2) **Ezekiel: Priest, Prophet, and Pastor of Souls.**—If a man's greatness be measured by the courage and moral strength with which he overcomes difficulties and performs his life's work, then Ezekiel was great even among those very great men, the Hebrew prophets. It is true that the stage on which he played his part was small and obscure. While Jeremiah could say of the last days of Jerusalem, as Æneas said of Troy:

> 'The woes I saw with these sad eyne,
> The deeds whereof large part was mine.'

Ezekiel was banished to a distant foreign village to catch rumours of a national disaster which he could do nothing to avert. Yet the prophet was deeply concerned with the fate of Jerusalem. He was a priest, and, as 40-46 show, his interests were largely with the priesthood and the Temple. But from the Temple he was torn away in 597 B.C. If the regulations of the Priestly Code were in force in his day, he was not at the time an acting priest, for he did not reach the age of thirty until the fifth year of his captivity. Still, as the priesthood was hereditary, and Ezekiel was twenty-five or twenty-six when he was carried captive, he may have acted as assistant in the ministry of the Temple. But 'in the land of the Chaldeans' Ezekiel 'the priest,' as he calls himself, was given a lowly and difficult task of another kind. Jehovah summoned him to Tel-abib (a place otherwise unknown) somewhere in southern Babylonia to become a prophet to the Jewish exiles gathered there. But these had no desire for a prophet, unless he were willing to announce smooth tidings of the nearness of Return from Captivity. But Ezekiel's commission was to deliver a different message. He was to announce that the punishment of Jerusalem was to be completed. The Holy City and the Temple in which the Jews trusted were to be destroyed by fire (10 [2]). This further judgement must precede God's future mercy upon Jerusalem.

But the end was not immediately. A space of six years elapsed between the call of Ezekiel and the final catastrophe of Jerusalem. During this interval Ezekiel was to be a 'watchman' at Tel-abib. In fact the great prophet was given a small cure of souls in a distant land. His hearers were few and at the same time hostile. He was warned that he 'dwelt among scorpions' (2 ^{6}).

Such was Ezekiel's work for the first five years of his ministry. He was to be a prophet to a mere fragment of a nation, to a chance group of individuals. It was a novel task for a prophet. In the social and religious life of the older Israel the individual counted for very little. The unit was the family, not the man. But under Ezekiel's eyes the families were broken up by the devastations of war and by successive captivities, and it became inevitable that the individual should emerge from the mass and make himself felt. In Ezekiel's community at Tel-abib there must have been many persons who were cut off from their families and forced to stand alone.

(i) So the spiritual needs of Tel-abib were those of the individual, and they called forth a very notable announcement from the prophet, of a doctrine which is fundamental in all true religion, namely that every man is responsible for his own soul (18 $^{1-18}$). If he persists in wickedness, he dies; if he repents, he saves his soul alive. The sin of his ancestors will not ruin him, nor will the righteousness of his ancestors save him. It is not the family nor the clan that will be held responsible before God; the individual sinner must answer for himself, and make a personal repentance.

(ii) Further, Ezekiel teaches that God demands from man not mere abstention from vice, but a life of active and beneficent virtue. The prophet's sketch of the righteous man in 18 starts indeed from the second table of the Ten Commandments. But his sketch embraces more than these great (but negative) commands. The righteous man (according to his ideal) is also actively merciful; he 'gives his bread to the hungry, and covers the naked with a garment' (18 ^{7}).

(iii) But Ezekiel has teaching not only for the individual, but also for the Chosen People as such. When Jerusalem fell the second time to the Chaldeans and the punishment of Judah was completed, Ezekiel became a prophet of national Restoration. His message for the individual had been clearly delivered, and would stand for all time. So in 37 (a passage of comfort comparable with Is 40) he turns to the more usual task of a prophet and shows himself as the religious guide and instructor of the nation. Ezekiel's teaching on the nature and scope of the Restoration of Israel is both large and deep. In the first place, of course, there must be a gathering together again of the scattered members of the nation from their 'graves,' i.e. from those remote and forgotten places of exile in which they and their hopes seemed to be buried for ever. Ezekiel announces a resurrection of Israel under the figure of the literal resurrection of the bodies of an army that had been slain.

Again he teaches that Israel renewed must be Israel reunited. The old division between north and south, Ephraim and Judah, must be healed. 'They shall be no more two nations' (37 ^{22}), but one people, one king, and—one God.

Further, the Restoration is to rest on an internal spiritual change. The Reformation which Josiah had effected had not lasted because it was external in its methods and in its character. But the Restoration which Ezekiel envisages goes deeper. It is based on a promise which Jehovah has made: 'A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes' (36 $^{26, 27}$).

Yet the prophet does not attain to the spiritual insight of a prophet of the New Testament: in his vision of the restored Israel the Temple ('a sanctuary of this world,' Heb 9 ^{1}) plays a leading part. He teaches that the Temple must be rebuilt, the sacrificial system must be revived, with even a scrupulous regard for details. But to the seer of the Apocalypse it was given to see a new Jerusalem, and 'no temple therein, for the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof' (Rev 21 ^{22}).

Yet Ezekiel's doctrine of the new Jerusalem is not outworn. Rather it is one of the links which bind the New Covenant and the Old. Too much has been said by some scholars of the difference between the two Testaments. But it is time to insist on a most significant likeness between them. Both have a doctrine of the Last Things. Both convey the promise of a *New Jerusalem*, of a City of God to come, in which the evils of the old order shall be done away. The multitude of details with which Ezekiel clothes his

expectations testifies to the strength and simplicity of his faith. He is no half-believer: he sees with the spiritual eye the whole fashion of the spiritual city to come, whose name is 'Jehovah is there' (48 35).

Ezekiel, though he is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews, truly belongs to the roll of those who 'died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar' (Heb 11 13). 'He it was who reconciled the ancient antagonism of priest and prophet, and brought the *cultus* of the Temple into intimate alliance with the ethical principle of spiritual religion.'

(iv) Yet another fundamental doctrine common to Judaism and Christianity finds a specially powerful exposition in our prophet. Ezekiel proclaims with force unmatched the eternal truth of the 'goodness and severity of God' (Rom 11 22). He may have been tempted to speak smooth things concerning the wretched remnant of his people which lingered on in Jerusalem under the last king of Judah. But in any case he resisted the temptation. He looked in vain for signs of repentance in the city, and when he found none, but rather fresh sins, he announced unflinchingly the severity of God without any attempt to qualify the sternness of the words. 'The iniquity of the house of Israel and Judah is exceeding great, and the land is full of blood . . . And as for me also, mine eye shall not spare, . . . but I will bring their way upon their head' (9 9, 10). And this is not an isolated utterance: it is the burden of nearly half the book (4-24).

But when the full penalty has been inflicted, then God will show His goodness. The repentance of Israel will call forth all the loving-kindness of Jehovah. There are indeed no more tender passages in the Bible than those Divine messages which Ezekiel delivers: 'Why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord Jehovah: wherefore turn yourselves, and live' (18 31, 32): and again: 'I myself will feed my sheep . . . I will seek that which was lost, and will bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken' (34 15, 16). In the same measure in which Ezekiel shows himself to be a prophet of judgement does he show himself to be a prophet of the grace of God.

(v) Ezekiel's teaching concerning the grace of God develops into Messianic teaching, when (in 34 and 37 15 ff.) the prophet speaks of the Restoration of Israel. He announces the reunion of north and south, of Joseph and Judah, to form one kingdom again. He promises that the reunited people shall have Jehovah for their God, and that Jehovah shall dwell among them for ever, that Jehovah's sanctuary shall be in their midst for ever. But the promise becomes presently of a mystical character: 'My servant David shall be prince among them' (34 24); 'David my servant shall be their prince for ever' (37 25). The promise is repeated in different words. But 'David' had been long dead, and his tomb stood as witness of the fact to the people of Jerusalem (cf. Ac 2 29). Moreover, Ezekiel speaks of a 'David' who shall be prince 'for ever.' So the prophet leads us to look beyond his own age to a Messianic age to come.

(3) **Ezekiel in the Lectionary.**—Considerable use of this book is made in the Church of England Revised Lectionary. Twenty-three separate lections are provided from it. It is an impressive testimony to the permanent value of the book.

I.-III. **Ezekiel's 'Apologia pro Vita sua.'**—The earlier prophecies, including 1, fall between the years 597 and 586 B.C., and between two captures of Jerusalem by a foreign foe. In 597 B.C. the city, which in the days of Isaiah had thrice escaped the ravages of the Assyrians, fell into the hands of the Chaldeans of Nebuchadrezzar. These previous deliverances had encouraged the belief that Jerusalem was inviolable; very bitter therefore must have been the disappointment when the city was forced to surrender. The sacred vessels of the Temple were carried off, and the young king Jehoiachin (called also Jeconiah and Coniah) was led into captivity together with some ten thousand of the flower of the population (2 K 24 10-16).

The work of expatriation was carried out with ruthless efficiency. The leaders, the men of valour, and the craftsmen were 'scattered among the nations'; and return was made very difficult. Ezekiel's own companions in exile had been put down south of Babylon 'in the land of Chaldea.' The aim of the conqueror was that the kingdom of Judah 'might be base (margin *low*), that it might not lift itself up.' The nation was deprived of its trusted leaders. Weakness and depression were the result (1 1-3, 17 12-14). But neither the remnant in Judea nor the exiles in Babylon showed any repentance towards God, nor willingness to submit to Nebuchadrezzar. There was no disposition to accept the catastrophe

of Jerusalem as a Divine chastisement. False prophets arose among the exiles in Babylon speaking treason against Nebuchadrezzar and predicting the return of Jehoiachin and of the sacred vessels to the holy city. Bitter resentment was shown when the prophet Jeremiah wrote from Jerusalem an inspired letter to the captives assuring them that their captivity should be long ('seventy years'), and bidding them identify themselves with the fortunes of 'the city, whither I [Jehovah] have carried you captive' (Jer 29 5-7, 24-28).

It was into such an unfavourable atmosphere that Ezekiel entered as a truth-speaking prophet. Like Jeremiah he was reluctant to take up his office. Though he never said, like his great contemporary, 'I cannot speak, for I am a child,' yet it is clear from several passages in his book that he spoke only because Jehovah forbade him to keep silence. His language goes beyond that of any other prophet (except Jeremiah) in describing his sense of an overpowering force swaying him as it willed.

He tells that he was compelled to eat a roll inscribed with words of woe. 'The spirit lifted me up, and took me away: and I went in bitterness, . . . and the hand of Jehovah was strong upon me. So I came to them of the captivity at Tel-abib; . . . and I sat there astonied among them seven days.' Prophetic inspiration meant compulsion for Ezekiel. Message and the destination of the message were alike independent of his will. He did not choose Tell-abib as the scene of his ministry: he was carried thither.

No welcome was to be expected for one who came to the exiles as a prophet of woe; on the contrary it was certain that they would challenge his claim to be a prophet. They looked for a promise of Return to their own land; Ezekiel, on the other hand, announced further calamity for Judah.

The message of 8-11 which foreshadowed the destruction of the Temple must have touched his hearers to the quick. They would fain believe that such words could not possibly come from the God of Israel. They could say of Ezekiel as their successors said of St. Stephen, 'This man ceaseth not to speak words against this holy place' (Ac 6 13). They would be more likely to stone him as a blasphemer than to acknowledge him as a prophet.

But a second prejudice, a prejudice deeply ingrained in the Hebrew heart, remained to be overcome. Could a prophet of Jehovah arise in the land of a strange god? Even as late as the time of our Lord the leaders of the Jews were capable of denying that any prophet could come out of Galilee (Jn 7 52)—for was it not rightly called 'Galilee of the Gentiles'? So Ezekiel has to assert the reality of his call to be a prophet.

His Apologia consists of an unflinching statement of the facts of his spiritual experience: 'I saw visions of God'; 'the word of Jehovah came verily unto Ezekiel'; 'the hand of Jehovah came upon him there.' This statement he proceeds to authenticate by giving details of time and circumstance and place. Twice he gives the date: 'in (my) thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month'; and again: 'On the fifth of the month, the year being the fifth of king Jehoiachin's captivity.' The prophet remembers the very day. Moreover, he cites his witnesses, who can testify that after the vision he sat down 'in amazement' among them for seven days (3 15). As to the place a note of defiance may be heard in the Apologia. It was 'by the Mighty River'—'in the land of Chaldea by the Mighty River'—'the hand of Jehovah came upon him *there*.' Ezekiel as a spiritual man rejects the thought of any limitation of Jehovah's activity to the Holy Land, just as in a later passage (11 16) he asserts that Jehovah Himself has become a sanctuary for Israel even in the land of exile. In short, Ezekiel apologizes in these three verses for exercising the prophetic office in a heathen land, but he apologizes with the confidence of a man who is conscious of a spiritual experience which gives him an authority which nothing can disprove. We may compare the similar emphasis and redundancy with which St. Paul (who also had received his commission in a vision) claims the apostolate to the Gentiles in 1 Tim 2 7.

Ezekiel, moreover, makes the point that he was of full age, no child, when the call came to him. He had reached his thirtieth year, the age at which the sons of Kohath, the kindred of Aaron, were allowed to begin their service in the sanctuary 'about the most holy things' (Nu 4 3 f). In 3 Ezekiel emphasizes the point by describing himself as 'the priest.' He was already a sacred person and so qualified to receive communications from Jehovah. So our Lord Himself was about thirty years of age when He began His ministry.

Ezekiel having once asserted his age in

support of his claim to be a true prophet has no further need to use this method of dating. He adds the public date of his call—the fifth year of Jehoiachin's captivity—and uses public dates only throughout the rest of the book (8^1, 20^1, 24^1 *et al.*). The identity of the Mighty River is uncertain; it may be the Euphrates.

I. 4-28. In this narrative natural phenomena and spiritual perceptions are mixed so that they can hardly be separated. The vision was introduced by a hurricane, which Ezekiel experienced on the bank of the Mighty River. Such a storm, striking the Euphrates a little above the village of Ana, destroyed one of the vessels of the British Surveying Expedition of 1835. The description of this calamity given in General Chesney's *Narrative* (London, 1868, 252 ff.) supplies some illustrations of the language of this passage of Ezekiel. 'In the course of a few minutes dense masses of black clouds, streaked with orange, red, and yellow (*a great fire-bearing cloud* in the language of the prophet) appeared coming up from the W.S.W. and approaching us with fearful velocity.' . . . 'The squall was observed coming in our direction from the W.S.W. with great rapidity, and looking like a large cloud of black mud.' . . . 'The clouds by this time were quite terrific. Below the darkest of them there was a large collection of matter, of a dark crimson colour, which was rolling towards us at an awful rate.' . . . 'All became calm and clear as before, and barely twenty-five minutes had seen the beginning, progress, and termination of this fearful hurricane. This whirlwind of the desert had swept across the river only, extending but very little above and below the spot where the steamers were.' Such a storm in its suddenness, its sombre glory, and its sudden cessation might well suggest to the prophet the intervention of an outraged and angry Deity.

Ezekiel's storm was the herald announcing the manifestation of Jehovah which followed. He describes this theophany as an 'appearance of the likeness of the glory of Jehovah.' The vision was threefold: first an appearance of living creatures, then of wheels full of eyes, and lastly of a firmament supporting a throne of lapis-lazuli. The forms of the living creatures were doubtless suggested by the forms of the *colossi* which the Assyrians and Babylonians set up at the gates of their palaces to represent guardian spirits. Ezekiel evidently took them as symbols of strength.

The wheels symbolized swiftness, like that of the hurricane which was the background of Ezekiel's vision. And in the wheels were eyes, symbols to show that strength and swiftness were guided by knowledge. Their onrush could not fail or turn aside.

Above the living creatures was an expanse (rather than 'firmament') of dazzling white cloud, and above the expanse a throne of lapis-lazuli (rather than 'sapphire'), and on the throne the fiery form 'of a man,' and round the throne a rainbow tempering the glare of the fire. It was a vision of terror and of beauty.

St. John's vision of the throne of God in Rev 4, 5 includes four living creatures, 'full of eyes before and behind.' The forms of the creatures are (as in Ezekiel) those of a lion, an ox (or calf), a man, and an eagle. Their function is to present to God the Lord and afterwards to the Lamb the praises of all creation (Rev 5^{9-14}). Similarly from Ezekiel's living creatures goes up the cry, 'Blessed be the glory of Jehovah' (3^{12}).

II.-III. must be read continuously There is no break of sense. The points particularly to be noticed are the following:

First, who the recipients of Ezekiel's prophecy are. They are unsparingly described with emphasis on their wilful estrangement from God (3^{3-4}).

Next to be noticed is the stress laid on the necessity of Ezekiel's own obedience. No easy task is given him. He is to address to the rebels words of rebuke and threatening. They will answer with wrath and defiance. Still Ezekiel is to accept willingly the bitter message given him to deliver. He is to show his obedience in the midst of a disobedient people.

A third point to notice is the effect of the spirit of prophecy on the prophet. Ezekiel was uprooted from one settlement by the Mighty River and brought to Tel-abib. The scene of his ministry was assigned him by the constraint of the Spirit. Just so six centuries later 'the Spirit of Jesus' would not suffer St. Paul to enter Bithynia, but led him into Europe (Ac 16^{7-10}).

The story of 3^{15-27} may be pieced together thus. Ezekiel on his first arrival at Tel-abib sat down overwhelmed with his vision and his call. At the end of seven days the Word comes to him that he is to tell the sinner, *Thou shalt surely die*. Overpowered by the Spirit

he is driven into the wilderness to receive a further revelation (cf. Mk 1 [12]). When he returns to his house the exiles seize him as a madman and bind him. Jehovah answers them according to their folly. They have bound the prophet; the Word too shall be bound (be unuttered) until Jehovah gives the sign to speak.

III. 16-21 occur in a fuller form in 33 [7-13] (*q.v.*).

IV., V. **The Message and the Manner of its Delivery.**—The exiles felt that their fortunes were bound up with that of Jerusalem. Their one hope was that they and their king (Jehoiachin) would return with the temple vessels to the city within a short time ('two years,' Jer 28 [11]). Why should it not be so? The house of Jehovah, the king's house, and the great houses of Jerusalem were still standing; indeed, half a dozen years were to pass before they were destroyed (2 K 25 [9]).

But Ezekiel's message of 'lamentations and woe' announced the total ruin of Jerusalem: how was the prophet to break such an announcement to his optimistic community in Chaldea? By a picture, not by words; by the slow method of an acted scene. So Ezekiel was instructed to take a tile of clay such as the Babylonian scribes wrote their letters on, and to draw upon it the outline of a city. It could be but the *one* city, which was in the heart of the prophet and of his auditors alike—Jerusalem. Against the city Ezekiel is to place an iron cooking plate as a symbol that the city is to be straitly besieged by a foe of iron strength. Next the prophet is to lie down behind his plate for two periods, once on his left side for 390 days, and again on his right side for 40 days. These two periods together represent the length of the siege of Jerusalem. The siege began in the tenth month of the ninth year of Zedekiah, and ended in the fourth month of the eleventh year; roughly it lasted for a year and a half. But this period was divided into two by a temporary raising of the siege by an Egyptian army. How long this relief lasted is not known, but if we may assign 100 days to it, these with Ezekiel's 430 days will make up (roughly) the year and a half required (Jer 52 [4-6]; cf. 37 [5, 11]). The 390 days of [5] will then probably represent the first stage of the siege which ended with the intervention of Pharaoh, while the 40 days of [6] will represent the second and final stage. In these two stages, divided as they were by a period of relief, are two separate punishments. Why *two*? Because one is due to the sin of Israel, the other to that of Judah.

In [9-11, 16, 17] the prophet is instructed to represent to his audience the famine which Jerusalem will suffer in the coming siege. For 390 days there will not be wheat enough to make pure wheaten bread; flour of every kind will be mixed to eke out the scanty supply. Even bread thus made will have to be eaten by measure. From five to six ounces of food a day must suffice. So too water will be drunk very sparingly by careful measure.

In [12-15] a further hardship of the siege is mentioned: the Jews will have to bake their bread with unclean fuel for lack of clean. This gives the prophet occasion to say that the necessity of eating unclean food will continue when the siege is over, and the besieged are led into captivity 'among the nations.'

In 5 the message of woe culminates in the announcement that only a very small number of the besieged will survive the sword, fire, and pursuit. The reason for this severe judgement is then given. Israel has been no ordinary sinner: he has done *not* as the nations round about him, but worse. So signal shall his punishment be that his neighbours shall cite his case as a telling instance of sin and punishment.

VI. **Denunciation of the High Places and of the Idolatrous Worship carried on there.**—High places were level spaces on the tops of hills or on the sides of mountains; they were not temples, but open-air sanctuaries. A *bāmah* or high place had an altar and perhaps a second elevated altar (for incense) called *hammān*, 'sun pillar'; further there was a *massēbah* and an *ashērah*, the former a stone symbol of a god, the latter a wooden symbol of a goddess. When a prophet threatens the destruction of a *bāmah*, what is meant is the destruction of this furniture; the high place itself might be defiled, but could not be destroyed (2 K 23 [13]). The *bāmoth* were used in early times for the worship of Jehovah, e.g. by Samuel and Solomon (1 S 9 [12-14]; 1 K 3 [1-4]), but owing to their idolatrous associations they were condemned by the prophets and religious reformers. Many of them were ancient Canaanite sanctuaries, and the temptation, while using them, to propitiate some Canaanite Baal was irresistible to many who in other respects were worshippers of Jehovah. Such a practice is described by Ezekiel and other prophets as spiritual 'whoredom.' It did indeed imply an incomplete faith in Jehovah as Lord of All, and it was morally dangerous, as all polytheism is. If I have two gods, may not one of them allow me practices which the other

forbids? Again, may I not be offending one in the very act of propitiating the other? Clearness of religious or moral vision becomes impossible. But high-place worship had become triumphant in Ezekiel's day, and there was no cure for it but the sword.

VII. **The Hour of Extreme Punishment come at last.**—There are obscure phrases in this chapter, but the general sense is clear. The time is come for the final punishment of Jerusalem; the statement is emphatic; nine times in the first twelve verses occurs the phrase 'is come.' The ground for this emphasis is that the people comfort themselves with the thought that Ezekiel's denunciations will not come to pass in their day: 'he prophesieth of times that are far off' (12 [27]).

Though the language is emphatic, it is curiously indefinite. The city denounced in [13-15] is Jerusalem, but it is not named; and 'the king' of [27] is anonymous. The Chaldean enemy is referred to, but only under a title 'the Rod' ([10]). The Temple is mentioned, but in enigmatic terms, in [20-22].

VIII. **Ezekiel shown in Vision the Idolatries of Jerusalem.**—The hand of Jehovah 'fell upon the prophet,' i.e. the Spirit took possession of him suddenly, and he found himself wafted off to the Temple at Jerusalem. Here he was shown in the Spirit the different forms of false worship practised in the Temple. First, at the very entrance was the 'image which provoketh to jealousy'; the deity which it represented is left nameless; possibly the Queen of heaven is meant, to whom the women of Jerusalem, with the approval of their husbands, poured out drink offerings (Jer 44 [15-19]). The presence of the image was in flat contradiction of Ex 20 [3], 'Thou shalt have none other gods *before me*.' Next in a secret chamber, perhaps a cave, Ezekiel was shown pictures or reliefs of the idols of Israel, animal forms such perhaps as were worshipped in Egypt: cats, ichneumons, jackals. The next sight was that of women weeping for Tammuz the Semitic Adonis, the hunter beloved of Venus, who was slain by a boar. Licentious rites were associated with the lamentation for him. Finally, Ezekiel was shown sun-worshippers in the Temple area, whose backs were turned to the Temple, and their faces eastward toward the sun. In the first three cases the idolatrous worship might not be in intention a forsaking of Jehovah, but this last case involved a direct renunciation of the God of Israel. Literally and in truth the worshippers of the sun turned their backs on the Creator of heaven and earth.

IX. **The Punishment of the Idolatries of Jerusalem.**—Ezekiel hears the watch of the city summoned; they present themselves to the number of six accompanied by a Recorder. The Recorder is charged to pass through Jerusalem, and to mark with the letter *Tau* (a cross) the foreheads of the men who grieve for the sins committed in the city. The watch is to follow and slay all who do not bear the mark. The slaughter is to begin (and does begin) in the courts of the Temple. The Temple is defiled with dead bodies, and then the watch goes forth into the city and slays there. Ezekiel cries out in fear that he alone will be left alive. The number saved is evidently very small.

The event corresponding to the vision is described in 2 Ch 36 [17]: '[God] brought upon them the king of the Chaldeans, who slew their young men with the sword *in the house of their sanctuary*, and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man or ancient: he gave them all into his hand.'

Ezekiel's vision seems to be referred to in 1 P 4 [17. 18], where the Apostle speaks of the persecution from which the Christians were suffering as the first stage of God's general judgement of the world: 'The time is come for judgement to begin at the house of God: and if it begin first at us, what shall be the end of them that obey not the gospel of God?'

X. **The Second Stage of Judgement.**

With 10 should be read:

XI. **22-25. The End of the Vision.**—During the execution of the judgement described in 9 the prophet's eyes are fixed on the awful scene of slaughter, but when the Recorder announces the accomplishment of the work Ezekiel raises his eyes to the throne of lapis-lazuli. From the throne proceeds a voice with further directions. The Recorder is bidden to come and take coals of fire from the fiery chariot of the cherubim and to scatter them over the city ([2]). How vividly does the form of this command show that the approaching destruction of Jerusalem is by the will of God! Jerusalem is to be destroyed (like Sodom!) by heaven-sent fire. While the command is being given, the chariot of the cherubim stands still on the south side of the Temple ([3]). The cloud, however, which is the sign of the immediate presence of Jehovah, stands above the threshold of the Temple, and fills the temple-court with brightness. This cloud is described

in 1^{4}; it is associated with 'a fire infolding itself.' It may be compared with the 'pillar of cloud' described in Ex 13^{21}. Next the Recorder approaches the cherubim, receives from the hand of one of them a portion of fire, and goes forth to scatter the fire over the city ($^{6, 7}$).

The narrative of the vision is continued in ^{18}. The glory of the Lord represented by the cloud departs from the threshold and rests upon the cherubim. The chariot of the cherubim then rises, but halts by the eastern gate of the Temple as though unwilling to depart (^{19}). The chariot bearing the glory of the Lord does not leave the Temple till 11^{22} ff., after which the vision ends and the prophet is brought back to 'them of the captivity' in Chaldea, to whom he relates his awful vision ($^{22-25}$).

XI. 1-13. A Judgement on False Confidence.—The vision described here does not seem to be part of the great vision related in 8-10. It belongs nevertheless to the same crisis in the history of Jerusalem, and so is described at this point. Ezekiel was shown five-and-twenty men, including two of the 'princes' sitting in the gate of the Temple, and communicating false encouragement to the people. The prophet had predicted that Jerusalem would be taken after a siege; that two-thirds of the population would perish in the city; and that the remaining third would be scattered among the nations (5^{1-4}). But the princes of Judah refused to believe Ezekiel. By means of a homely proverb they revived the teaching of Isaiah that Jerusalem was inviolate and would protect her inhabitants. Jerusalem was as it were the caldron, and her people were the flesh, which would not be removed from the caldron until the proper time. But things had changed since the days of Isaiah. Jerusalem had not repented to any purpose, and the blow which even Isaiah had spoken of must in the end fall upon her people. The remnant of her population would fall into the hands of strangers and meet their judgement not in Jerusalem but at a distance on the border of the land. The most important persons, the king, his sons, and the nobles were in fact judged at Riblah in the land of Hamath by Nebuchadrezzar himself (Jer 39^{5-7}).

The statement 'When I prophesied . . . Pelatiah died' is to be understood as belonging to the narrative of the vision. Pelatiah (whose name signifies 'Jehovah is a deliverer') is typical in his death. In the approaching judgement Jehovah will not show Himself in His character as Deliverer.

14-21. Jehovah Himself a Sanctuary for the Exiles of Israel.—Foreign invasion sometimes unites a divided people, but the great calamity of 597 failed to draw the nation of Israel together. Indeed, it helped to bring about a schism. A considerable body of captives was carried off to live in exile in distant Babylonia. By this event the Jews who remained in Jerusalem were moved not to sympathy, but to self-righteousness. They supposed that they who were left to live beneath the shadow of the Temple of Jehovah were Jehovah's favoured ones. As for the exiles, they seemed to have forfeited their position and to be cast off by the God of Israel. 'Get you far off from Jehovah,' said their scornful compatriots; 'unto us (who still inhabit Jerusalem) is the land (Judæa) given for a possession.'

If to be far from the Temple were to be far from God, then the exiles in Babylonia were indeed far from Jehovah. But this was not at all the teaching of Ezekiel. Ezekiel was of priestly race, and his devotion to the Temple and its services may be read in 40^{1}-47^{12}, but he realized acutely that there was One greater than the Temple. The prophet taught that the exiles though deprived of the visible Temple and its services could enjoy something better, namely Jehovah Himself. 'Though I have removed them far among the nations I have become their sanctuary in the lands whither they have come,' so does Jehovah speak through Ezekiel. They are magnificent words of reassurance; they find an echo in the description of the New Jerusalem in Rev 21^{22}: 'I saw no temple therein, for the Lord God All-ruler is the sanctuary thereof, and the Lamb.' And so the exiles needed not the purifications which the Temple sacrifices offered. On the contrary, they being purified by Jehovah Himself would return one day and succeed in cleansing His Temple at Jerusalem. And this they would do, because Jehovah would give them a single heart and a new spirit of obedience.

Such were Ezekiel's words. The significance of them was enforced by the vision which followed. He saw the glory of Jehovah withdraw from the city and take its stand eastward on the Mount of Olives. The men of Jerusalem could no longer boast that they had a higher degree of the Divine favour than the exiles.

XII. 1-20. Renewed Announcement of the approaching Captivity of Jerusalem

and her King (Zedekiah).—This chapter should be compared with 4, 5. In both passages Ezekiel announces by dumb-show the coming tragedy of Jerusalem. In his first actions the prophet was to represent the doings of the ordinary citizens of Jerusalem, but he is now called on to portray in dumb-show the fate of the prince (Zedekiah). In the sequel Zedekiah endeavoured to escape from Jerusalem, but he was overtaken, brought before Nebuchadrezzar, and blinded. Ezekiel is to dig through the wall—the mud wall—of his house by night, and to carry forth his things (as it were secretly) through the hole thus made. So did Zedekiah flee through the wall of Jerusalem by night in an attempt to escape eastward (Jer 39 [4,5]). He was carried to Babylon in his blindness, and so did not see 'the land of the Chaldeans' ([13]).

In [17-19] the reference is to the famine from which the inhabitants of Jerusalem must suffer in the approaching siege by the Chaldeans. They will eat their bread with 'carefulness,' i.e. with anxiety lest the supply come speedily to an end, and they will drink their water with 'astonishment,' i.e. with dismay because of the small quantity which remains. Ezekiel announces these woes of Jerusalem to his fellow-exiles, because they (instead of mending their ways) were looking for an early return to Jerusalem. They were doomed to disappointment, for Jerusalem herself was destined after a brief interval to a fresh overthrow by the Chaldeans.

21-28. Though the Prophet's Vision seems to Tarry, it will in fact be speedily Realized.—Ezekiel began to announce judgement on Jerusalem in the fifth year of his captivity (1 [2]), and it was not till the twelfth year that tidings came that the blow had fallen (33 [21]). These seven years of waiting gave occasion to his hearers to assert that the prediction must relate to the distant future. They did not charge the prophet with falsehood, but they comforted themselves by postponing (in thought) the accomplishment of his word to a remote time. In this attitude they trusted the false prophets, who are denounced in [24]; 'There shall be no more any vain vision, nor flattering divination.' Such evasion would prove useless, for the word of Jehovah spoken by Ezekiel, awful and incredible as it seemed, would be performed without delay ([28]).

XIII. **1-16. The Prophets who (falsely) prophesy Peace.**—In opposition to Ezekiel's prophecy of God's approaching judgement on Jerusalem for its wickedness, these prophets prophesied peace for the city ([16]: contrast 9, 10). Thus they 'strengthened the hands of the wicked . . . by promising him life'; the wicked (feeling safe) would not amend his ways ([22]). Ezekiel is unsparing in his satire on these prophets: he compares them to foxes gambolling among ruins. In the dreadful day of Jehovah they would not be found standing in the breaches of the walls to save Jerusalem from the enemy. Their false visions could not help ([4,5]).

Again Ezekiel compares the prophets to those who build a party wall and daub it with plaster, and think that such a wall can stand against the storm of the anger of Jehovah ([10-15]).

17-23. Against Women who practise Witchcraft.—The general sense of this passage is clear, though the particular magical practices referred to are obscurely described. Ezekiel denounces a species of witchcraft through which men aimed at the life of their enemies. For a slight fee ('for handfuls of barley and for pieces of bread') they secured the help of a witch. But witchcraft is never moral. It helps not the side of right, but the side which can pay ([19]). Ezekiel speaks of witchcraft as actually dangerous to the life aimed at, and this view is accepted by modern observers of witchcraft in Western and in Central Africa. The African who believes himself to be 'bewitched' does as a matter of fact die—through fear, if not through the malevolent action of the 'witch-doctor.'

XIV. **1-11. The Appeal of the Elders to Ezekiel.**—Here is a beginning of an acknowledgement of Ezekiel's commission. It is true that only 'certain' of the Elders come to the prophet, but these 'sat in his presence,' waiting to hear through him a word from Jehovah. But Ezekiel could give them no reassuring answer, for they were not whole-hearted worshippers of the true God. They combined the worship of Jehovah with the worship of idols. This mixed worship emerges on several occasions in the history of Israel. It is forbidden in Ex 20 [3], but it appears in 1 K 18 [21]; 2 K 17 [33].

12-23. The Sin of Jerusalem is such that no Intercession can save her from the Fourfold Judgement which is at hand.—Ezekiel has again to assert that God's judgement upon Jerusalem is inevitable; he must add that no intercession can avail for her with God. Not even three of the greatest heroes of Hebrew story could prevail to avert her punishment—not Noah, though he was perfect in his generation (Gen 6 [9])—not Daniel, though

he was acquainted with the secrets of God—not Job, though he was perfect and upright, and an intercessor for his three friends (Job 1 [1], 42 [8]). The sin of Jerusalem was too great to be pardoned. Nay, the exiles in Babylon when they meet the fresh captives from Jerusalem and take note of their ways will recognize the fact that Jerusalem was not punished so grievously 'without a cause.' [22], which is rather obscure in EV, may be rendered: 'And behold, if there be left in her a remnant, even men and women who shall be led forth from her (as captives), behold, they shall come forth to you (in Babylon), and ye shall see (for yourselves) their (wicked) way and their doings, and ye shall be reassured as to the evil which I brought upon Jerusalem.'

XV. **Jerusalem the Unprofitable Vine to be burnt.**—Nations are compared in the Old Testament to trees (31 [14]): the Amorite to the cedar and to the terebinth (Am 2 [9]); Egypt to the cedar (Ezek 31 [4]); Israel is likened to the vine (Hos 10 [1]; Ps 80 [8]). This last comparison is double edged. On the one hand, the vine is the object of care and cultivation: it is nurtured according to the description given in Is 5 [1, 2]. Thus indeed did God care for Israel and for Jerusalem, the surviving representative of Israel in Ezekiel's day. But the vine is a fruit tree, and unless it produces good fruit it is useless. The cedar and the terebinth have uses, though they bear no fruit, but an unfruitful vine is fit for nothing but to be burned. Its wretched wood can be made into no implement, not even into a peg.

The prophet's question in [2] contains a contrast between the future of Jerusalem and the past: 'What shall become of the wood of the vine, . . . the plant which was once reckoned among the trees of the forest (i.e. among the nations of the earth)?' [4] gives the recent history of the city in a sentence: 'Behold, it was delivered to the fire for fuel; the fire devoured the ends thereof, and the midst of it was burned; shall it be profitable for any work?' Thus Ezekiel describes the effects of the first capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. He describes the same events yet more succinctly in [7]: 'They came forth from the fire (i.e. the city was not destroyed, though it was plundered), but the fire shall (yet) devour them (the inhabitants of Jerusalem).'

XVI. 1-34. **The Unfaithfulness of Jerusalem to Jehovah.**—The history of Jerusalem is a strange one: it is a very ancient city (Gen 14 [18]) mentioned in the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence, but at the Conquest it was only partly occupied by Israel, for the Jebusites continued to dwell in it by the side of the Benjamites (Jg 1 [21]). It might still be called a Jebusite and heathen city when David took the stronghold of Sion and made Jerusalem his capital (2 S 5 [6-8]).

It is this heathen character of the city which Ezekiel wishes to emphasize when he uses the names 'Canaan,' 'Amorite,' 'Hittite.' With this semi-heathen Jerusalem, the prophet says, Jehovah made a covenant, i.e. He allowed His Temple to be built there. It was an unpromising site for Jehovah's House, and Ezekiel likens the old heathen Jerusalem to an infant exposed at birth and weltering polluted in blood ([5, 6]). But under the kings the city rose to a great position in the eyes of the neighbouring peoples—thanks, says the prophet, to the majesty which Jehovah gave to it ([14]). With the foregoing passage should be compared Hos 2 [8, 9].

The Covenant Ezekiel represents as a Covenant of Marriage, and so he describes Jerusalem's worship of other gods as fornication. This is the main reason for the prophet's use of the term, though it should be added that most heathen rites, then as now, had an element of uncleanness in them. Ezekiel complains specially ([20, 21]) of the worship of Molech (1 K 11 [7]; 2 K 21 [6]), and of Jerusalem's 'fornication' with Egypt, Assyria, and Chaldea ([26-29]). The influence of Egypt on the worship of Israel is illustrated by the number of figurines of Isis which the spade of the excavator turns up in many sites in Palestine. (Isis was the mother-goddess of the Egyptians.) To the influence of Assyria or Chaldea or both is attributed the star-worship, the worship of the Host of Heaven, which was introduced apparently by Manasseh (2 K 21 [3]; Ac 7 [42]).

The religious influence of these peoples on Israel was preceded by political influence. Ahaz of Judah made a treaty with Assyria against Pekah of Israel (2 K 16 [5-9]); Hezekiah or his ministers negotiated with Egypt against Assyria (2 K 18 [21]; Is 30 [1-7]); Hezekiah also negotiated with the king of Babylon (2 K 20 [12-18]). In all these treaties the names of foreign deities were no doubt introduced to give sanction to the agreements; if the Judæan sware by Jehovah, the Egyptian would swear by Re (Ra) or Ammon, and so on. Jerusalem heard new names and her curiosity was aroused; enquiry after unknown rites led ultimately to participa-

tion in them (cf. Dt 12 [29-31]). One further point should be noted. Judah—Little Judah could not obtain a treaty of protection from a great power without paying for it: Ahaz, for instance, emptied his treasury to pay Tiglath-pileser (2 K 16 [7, 8]). Such a present or tribute is compared by Ezekiel to the hire given to a harlot—only he says the process is reversed; Judah the harlot actually pays for her own shame ([30-34]).

35-43. The Punishment of Jerusalem.—Once more without flinching Ezekiel pronounces Jehovah's second judgement on Jerusalem. It will, he says, be inflicted by her 'lovers'; their hands will carry out her doom. And her doom will be complete: *first*, spoliation of all that is still left ([39]); *next*, death for her inhabitants ([40]); *finally*, destruction for her houses ([41]). After this Jerusalem will cease from her 'abominations.'

44-58. Jerusalem compared to Samaria and Sodom.—Sodom is mentioned in this connexion partly because of the greatness of her sin, and partly because of the completeness of her punishment. Here her sins are described in greater detail than in Gen 13 [13], 18 [20]. Her faults were those of the rich: pride, fulness of bread and prosperous ease, coupled with neglect of the needs of the poor ([49]). The horrible sin noticed in Gen 19 [1-11] is probably alluded to in [50]. The punishment of Sodom is not described: it was sufficiently well known: 'I took them away even as thou hast seen' (so the correct text).

The case of Samaria is more fully given in 23, where Samaria and Jerusalem are again described as two dissolute women. In 23 [11], as in 16 [51], the guilt of Jerusalem is reckoned as greater than that of Samaria.

58-63. After Punishment—Forgiveness.—At the head of this paragraph stands an oracle of Jehovah as follows: 'Thou thyself, O Jerusalem, who didst reproach Sodom (and others) with their sins, hast now borne (the punishment of) thy lewdness and thy abominable acts' ([58] paraphrased). The words are in part anticipatory, for Jerusalem's punishment was not yet complete. But this long indictment closes with a promise. After Jerusalem has borne her punishment Jehovah will re-establish His covenant with her and make it permanent. And she will cease to boast of righteousness over other cities.

What lessons has this terrible chapter for the Church of to-day? Perhaps no passage combines more vividly the two doctrines of the searching judgement and the everlasting mercy of God. Perhaps no passage suggests more strongly the need of corporate self-examination (cf. Rev 3 [17]).

XVII. 1-10. The Doom of Zedekiah, King of Judah, shown in Parable.—The parable is of easy interpretation. The first great eagle is Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, who deposed Jehoiachin and made Zedekiah his uncle king in his stead (2 K 24 [15-17]). But Zedekiah broke his oath of fealty to Nebuchadrezzar, and intrigued with Egypt ([13-15]: cf. 2 Ch 36 [13]). The second great eagle ([7]) is the king of Egypt, probably Pharaoh Hophra, called 'Apries' by Herodotus (Jer 44 [30]).

The Vine is the Jewish State as restored under Zedekiah. It was 'planted by great water,' i.e. it was to be dependent on Babylon the city of great waters. It was to be 'as a willow tree' decumbent, i.e. it was not to aspire to political independence; but it was to be content to be 'weak' ([14] 'base'; or 'low,' RVm).

11-21. The Doom of Zedekiah openly stated.—Pharaoh is mentioned in [17] because when Ezekiel uttered this prophecy Zedekiah and his advisers still hoped that with the help of Egypt they might throw off the Chaldean yoke. There was a military revival of Egypt in Ezekiel's lifetime under Pharaoh-necoh, who put Josiah to death at Megiddo (2 K 23 [29]), and under Pharaoh Hophra. In the final agony of Jerusalem Hophra actually advanced and raised the siege of the city for a brief interval (Jer 37 [5-10]).

22-24. The Plant of Jehovah's Choice.—The removal of Zedekiah to Babylon ([20]) leaves a gap; how is it to be filled? Jehovah Himself will find his successor; cf. [3, 4] with [22, 23]. There is a Messianic sound in the prophecy. The successor will be 'a tender one,' a 'child' (?) as in Is 9 [6]. Under the plant of Jehovah's choice shall dwell 'every fowl of every wing' (rather 'every thing that chirps, every thing that flies'), just as in Jer 23 [5, 6] under the Righteous Branch 'Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely.' Finally, the promise that Jehovah will dry up 'the green tree' and make 'the dry tree' to flourish is parallel to the Psalmist's declaration: 'The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner' (Ps 118 [22, 23]).

XVIII. 1-4. A Proverb popular but untrue.—The proverb, 'Fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge,' is quoted and controverted in Jer 31 [29, 30]. It represented a widespread conviction cherished in Israel; it attached itself perhaps to Josiah's Reformation (2 K 23 [1-23]). On that occasion public confession was made of the

idolatry with which the past of Israel was stained, and a thorough cleansing of the land from idolatrous objects was made. The Jews might now feel that the sin was their fathers', and that the Reformation was the act of the sons. But calamity still beset the little kingdom of Judah. Reformation had not brought prosperity. So the Jews concluded that they were still being punished for their fathers' sins. Jeremiah answered with the announcement: 'Every one shall die for his own iniquity,' and Ezekiel in slightly different words: 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.'

The two prophets were asserting a principle perhaps of further reaching consequence than they knew. Hitherto the sense of direct personal responsibility to God had been less strong than the sense of collective responsibility as members of the chosen people. But collective responsibility expressed itself chiefly in public acts of worship: personal responsibility must express itself further in a moral life. The second table of the Ten Commandments and the like precepts must now take a more prominent place. So the rest of this chapter lays stress on particulars of moral duty which the individual must observe. Ezekiel has replaced the popular proverb by the stark announcement: *The soul that sinneth, it shall die.*

5-9. The Righteous Man 'who shall Live' characterized.—Negatively that man is 'righteous' who has not been guilty of idolatry, nor of adultery, nor of acts of ritual uncleanness, nor of oppression of the poor in its various forms. Positively he is righteous if he has given bread and clothing to the needy, if he has given just judgement, and if he has been faithful in his dealings with God and man.

Two phrases in the list need a word of explanation. First, 'To eat upon the mountains' when it stands by itself (as in [11]) sounds harmless, but its true significance appears in [6] and [15], where the full phrase is given: 'eaten upon the mountains, and lifted up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel.' The reference is to taking part in the sacrificial feasts which were celebrated on the high places. The high places were associated with the worship of false gods, and the prophets would not admit that sacrifices offered there were acceptable to Jehovah.

The other phrase, 'hath restored to the debtor his pledge,' refers to the law of Ex 22 [26. 27], which forbids a creditor who has taken a debtor's garment in pledge to retain it overnight. He must restore it at sundown that the poor man may have it to sleep in. (Easterns wear the same garment by day and by night.)

10-13. The Man who 'shall Die.'—(Cf. 33 [25. 26].) The father shall live, but his son shall die; so much for the truth of the popular proverb. But in what case shall he die? If his conduct is the opposite of that of his father, and if in addition he be found 'a robber, a shedder of blood.' (The man appointed to death must be more than the opposite of his father.) For the modern world there is at least one surprise in this list of sins. To take usury (interest) is reckoned as a sin of the same grade (apparently) as adultery. To understand the position we must remember that there was no such thing in Israel of old as a 'moderate rate of interest.' A good man lent money *gratis* like Antonio, a bad man lent money like Shylock on exorbitant interest in order to suck his client dry (Ps 15 [5]). What a creditor's oppression of his debtor might mean is told in Neh 5 [1-5].

14-18. The Robber's Son who 'shall Live.'—This list of possible offences differs from that given in [6-8] by the omission of the act of ritual uncleanness. Possibly the series of father, son, and grandson given here was suggested by the three kings of Judah: Hezekiah, Manasseh, Josiah. The portrait of the robber, the shedder of blood, may well stand for Manasseh, a name of abhorrence in Kings and in Jeremiah (2 K 21 [16], 24 [3. 4]; Jer 15 [4]). The expression 'spoiled *his brother* by violence' is still suitable if the reference be to the action of a king, for the Israelite king's subjects were still his 'brethren' (Dt 17 [15. 20]).

19-29. Jehovah's Expostulation.—The teaching of personal responsibility was not well received by Ezekiel's audience. They did not use the proverb 'Fathers eat sour grapes' as a complaint, but as an excuse. It expressed their conviction of their own irresponsibility. So they answered back with the question: '*Wherefore* doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father?' Behind it is the unasked question: 'Must we be sinners, because we suffer death or exile now?' Certainly in their own blood feuds the son was held responsible for his father's deed.

But Ezekiel by repetition insists that Jehovah has greater discernment in His judgements than man. His decree is simply: 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' But His justice is allied with mercy: 'If the wicked man turn from his wickedness, he shall live, he shall not die.' Christianity has made these two announcements the 'current coin' of religion, but Ezekiel's

contemporaries hesitated to accept them. They had still to be taught the value of a personal repentance, which expresses itself in amendment of life. So Ezekiel states his doctrine in [21] and repeats it in [27], and again in 33 [14-16], where he declares that repentance brings salvation. He who turns to do that which is 'lawful and right' shall live. Things 'lawful' are things which may be judged by the law-courts; things 'right' are acts of righteousness, deeds of religious courage and of mercy of which God alone is judge (Mt 6 [1]). In the phrase 'save his soul alive,' the word 'alive' is otiose: 'he shall make his soul live' is a rather better translation. A revival of life is meant.

30-32. A Call to Repentance.—This call, 'make you a new heart and a new spirit,' must be combined with the promise of 11 [19]: 'I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you.' The two utterances are complementary; both are necessary to express the whole truth. God promises, but man must spring to meet the promise, or (as St. Augustine writes): 'Give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt.' Note that Ezekiel repeats in [32] the assurance of [23] that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked.

XIX. 1-9. A Lamentation for the last two Kings of Judah.—This is an interesting passage for its form as well as for its contents. It is a 'Lamentation' composed in verse. It is written in short lines, each divided into halves, the first half being longer than the second. The first of the kings referred to ([3, 4]) is to be identified with Jehoahaz, who was deposed by Pharaoh-necoh and died in Egypt (2 K 23 [31-34]). The second ([5-9]) is Jehoiachin, the last king of whom it could be said that 'his mother' had made him 'a lion' (2 K 24 [8-15]). (Zedekiah was simply the nominee of Nebuchadrezzar.) The reign of Jehoahaz (and likewise of Jehoiachin) lasted for three months only, but they apparently had time to show that they shared the family vice. Jehoiakim, the brother of the first and father of the second, is denounced by Jeremiah for a career of oppression (Jer 22 [17]). In [4, 9] 'with chains' AV should be 'with hooks.' Assyrian kings are shown on their monuments holding important captives by a hook thrust through the lips.

10-14. A Lamentation over the People of Israel.—The people of Israel are here, as in Ps 80 [8-16], compared to a vine, which once flourished exceedingly. Once she (Israel) had strong kings and leaders, but now she has 'no strong rod to be a sceptre to rule.' She has been 'plucked up' like a useless vine. 'She is a Lamentation (a subject for a dirge): she has become a Lamentation' (so the last sentence should be translated).

XX. 1-4. The Visit of the Elders to enquire of Jehovah.—Cf. 14 [1-11]. The seventh year of Captivity was now in progress, the Temple was still standing, but the anxiety of the exiles was deepening over the ultimate fate of Jerusalem and their own chance of return. So a second deputation of elders came to Ezekiel. The prophet viewed his people as sheep 'scattered because there was no shepherd' (34 [5]; cf. Mt 9 [36]), and he thought wistfully of the 'judges' whom Jehovah had raised up of old to deliver them (Jg 2 [16]). Jehovah answers Ezekiel's thought: 'Wouldest thou be their judge (i.e. champion), son of man?' But the time for deliverance was not yet come: his duty rather was to be a 'reprover' (3 [26]); he was to show his people the sins of their fathers, of which they were themselves also guilty ([4]).

5-26. The History of Israel's Idolatry.—From the very first when Jehovah sware ('lifted up his hand') in the land of Egypt to give Canaan to Israel, He summoned the people to give up Egyptian idolatry. They refused, and Jehovah thought of destroying them while still in Egypt, but for His Name's sake He forbore, and led them out of Egypt ([5-9]). In the wilderness He gave them 'statutes and judgements,' that by keeping them they might 'live' (i.e prosper; Lev 18 [5], 26 [3-13]). He also gave them the Sabbath to be a sign between Him and them (Ex 31 [13]). But Israel despised the judgements and polluted the Sabbath, and so Jehovah thought of destroying them in the wilderness, but again for His Name's sake He refrained. One self-inflicted punishment, however, He allowed to fall upon them. Their idolatry led them to the worship of Molech and they offered their firstborn by fire. We should say that they themselves made their homes desolate, but Ezekiel from the standpoint that what God allows, He does, writes: 'that I (Jehovah) might make them desolate' ([10-26]).

27-44. Israel's Worship of Molech: Jehovah's final Reckoning with Israel.—The worship of Molech roused the indignation of the prophets not only by reason of its unnatural cruelty, but also because the worshippers identified Molech (or Melech, 'the king') with Jehovah and asserted that the God of Israel commanded such sacrifices—a thing 'which

I commanded not, neither came it into my mind' (Jer 7 [31]). So Ezekiel writes in [27]: 'Your fathers have blasphemed me.' But the active motive to Molech worship was the practice of the surrounding nations ([32]), the Phœnicians, Ammon and Moab. The sacrifice of children was in general a secret rite (Is 57 [5]); the question in [29], 'What is the high place whereunto ye go,' implies that Jehovah has detected the sacrificers. He will punish them: 'As I live . . . with fury poured out I will be your *king*' ('Melech' =Molech). After punishment, however, will come a happy restoration of Israel to the Land of Promise, and Jehovah will accept the offerings of His people when they cease to worship other gods.

45-XXI. 7. The Judgement on Jerusalem in Parable and in Plain Speech.—The last five verses of 20 belong by subject to 21. The prophets speak sometimes of a people under the figure of a forest: Is 9 [18,19] (Israel), 10 [17-19] (Assyria). Here the forest is Judah, for the fire begins in the south, and burns northwards ([47]). Since the people complain of 'parables,' Jehovah repeats his announcement in plain language. Judgement in full measure will certainly come upon Jerusalem and the land of Israel. The prophet is to enforce his message by signs: he is to groan as though his body would break: pictures were to teach, if words failed (cf. 4 [1-5] [5], 12 [3-7]).

The announcement that both the 'righteous' and the 'wicked' will be cut off is in agreement with the picture of the catastrophe of Jerusalem in 9 [8-10]. The words are not to be read literally; for Jeremiah and Baruch escaped.

8-17. The Sword of Jehovah is prepared: it will do its Work completely on Jerusalem.—The sword is sharpened: it is made bright (furbished); the flash of it adds to its terrors; it 'compasseth them about' ([14], RVm); its point is against every gate (of escape); it is pointed for slaughter ([15]). Jehovah Himself gives it its commission: 'Gather thee together, go to the right (southward) . . . go to the left (northward).' The 'sword' is collective—the sword of the Chaldeans.

18-24. Nebuchadrezzar casts Lots: the Lot is cast against Jerusalem.—One brief hope remained to the guilty in Jerusalem. The king of Babylon in his march southward might turn aside to punish Ammon—a reprieve for the city. But no! Nebuchadrezzar makes careful divination; he looks on the liver of the victim which has just been sacrificed, and by certain marks on it decides that the gods direct him against Jerusalem. So Jerusalem is to suffer the horrors of a siege, and though the guilty cherish hope for the moment, they will ultimately meet their punishment.

25-27. Zedekiah the 'Prince' must give place to him whose right it is.

'And thou art pierced through, O wicked one,
Prince of Israel,
Whose day is come
With final punishment' ([25]).

'Until he come whose right it is.' The words have a Messianic sound: cf. Gen 49 [10], where for 'Until Shiloh come' read 'Till he come whose right it is.'

28-32. Ammon, buoyed up with False Hopes by Diviners, is doomed to Destruction (cf. 25 [1-7]).—This section is inserted here because of the mention of Ammon in [20]. Chronologically it belongs to the period after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., for Ezekiel speaks of the 'reproach' of the Ammonites (against Jerusalem). This reproach took the form of rejoicing over the profanation of the Temple, the desolation of Judæa, and the captivity of the Jews (25 [3]). [29] should read: 'Whiles they (the seers) see false visions (of hope) for thee.'

XXII. 1-16. The Sins of Jerusalem; the Retribution.—Ezekiel gives to Jerusalem two titles of bitter but deserved reproach: in [2], 'bloody city'; in [5], 'full of tumult.' The latter term should be rendered 'princess of confusion.' The essential idea of a city is 'order, *cosmos*,' so no worse reproach could be brought against 'the city of the Lord' than that of 'confusion.' But the sins of Jerusalem justified the reproach: judicial murder, bribery, and false witness ([6, 9, 12]); dishonour done to parents ([7]); sacrifice to false gods ([9]); gross sins of the flesh ([10, 11]); oppression and extortion ([7, 12]). For all these sins Jehovah will 'deal with' the city.

The mention of the 'stranger' should be noticed. Even when the state of Judah was falling, the religion of Jehovah had power to attract foreigners (cf. 47 [22, 23]).

17-22. Jerusalem to become a Furnace in which the House of Israel will be melted by Fire.—'Fire' represents the extreme of punishment, and since Israel is full of dross, he is to pass through fire.

23-31. Every Class in the Land of Judah is corrupt: no Restorer to be found.—[25] should be read: 'Whose princes (i.e. kings: cf. 19 [1, 6, 7]) in the midst of her are like a roaring lion.' The order of

classes is (1) the king; (2) the priests; (3) the princes (i.e. nobles); (4) the prophets; (5) the commons of the realm. All have sinned grievously. In particular the priests have been profane, and the prophets have predicted peace for the oppressors. No man has stood in the gap (as Josiah had done once: 2 K 22, 23) to bring about a real reformation. (Jeremiah was not strong enough for this.)

XXIII. 1-4. **The Unfaithfulness of Samaria (Aholah) and of Jerusalem (Aholibah) to Jehovah.**—The same subject is treated in the same manner in 16, where, however, Samaria is introduced as a subordinate subject.

5-10. **Samaria's Dealings with Assyria.**—Samaria's 'doting' on the Assyrians began with Menahem, who usurped the throne of Israel and paid the king of Assyria 1,000 talents of silver to be confirmed in his kingdom (2 K 15 [13-20]). Menahem's example was followed by Hoshea (2 K 15 [30]), as we learn from Assyrian records. Thus it was really Menahem and Hoshea who 'doted' on Assyria, but they must each have had a party behind him. But Hoshea brought about the catastrophe described in [9, 10] by revolting from Assyria to Egypt. This political entanglement with Assyria led to the introduction of foreign cults into Israel: see 16 [1-34] with the comment.

11-21. **Jerusalem follows the Example of Samaria.**—Ezekiel maintains here, as in 16 [51], that the sin of Jerusalem was greater than that of Samaria. This was because Jerusalem possessed the Temple of Jehovah, and had provoked the God of Israel to His face by introducing different kinds of idolatry into His Temple (8 [1-18]; cf. 2 K 21 [4, 5, 7]). Jerusalem 'doted' on Assyria under Ahaz (2 K 16 [5-9]), and on Chaldea (Babylon) under Hezekiah (2 K 20 [12-18]). Later she was 'alienated from them' ([17]), and they came against her as her destroyers.

22-35. **Judgement on Jerusalem will be delivered to the Chaldeans to Execute. Jerusalem must Drink the 'Cup' of Samaria and Empty it.**

36-49. **Summing up the Guilt of Samaria and Jerusalem: the Penalty.**—The phrase 'with their idols they have committed adultery' should be noted. Not literal 'fornication' or 'adultery' is meant usually in 16, 23, but unfaithfulness to Jehovah by worship of other gods. Once more the forefront of Israel's offence is stated to be idolatry and particularly the cruel rites of Molech.

XXIV. 1-14. **The Beginning of the End for Jerusalem. The Parable of the Caldron.**—In 11 [3] certain of the princes had used the metaphor of the caldron to express their confidence in the safety of those who had taken refuge in Jerusalem. The fortress was as a caldron: the fire might blaze fiercely without, but it could not reach the pieces of flesh within. The time had now come to test this confidence: it was year 9, month 10, day 10, and on this very day the Chaldeans began their second attack on Jerusalem (2 K 25 [1]). The 'caldron' would boil well. In [5] read 'and also pile the *wood* under it.'

But, Jehovah announces, the fire will burn until the caldron is empty; then the caldron itself will be consumed.

15-27. **Ezekiel's Wife dies: no Mourning to be made.**—Once more Ezekiel is called upon to give a sign to assure men of the certainty of the doom of Jerusalem (cf. 4 [1] ff., 5 [1] ff., 12 [3] ff.). His beloved wife died suddenly, but he was to make none of the usual mourning for the dead. Public noisy lamentations are the custom of the East (Ecclus 38 [16, 17]; Mt 9 [23]), but Ezekiel is to show no sign of grief; he may 'sigh, but not aloud' ([17]). The interpretation of his action is that in the overwhelming catastrophe when they of Jerusalem lose the Temple together with their sons and daughters, they will have no heart for formal lamentation: they will grieve in silence after the manner of Ezekiel.

At this point Ezekiel's prophesying to his own people halts during the long siege of Jerusalem. It starts again after year 12, month 10, day 5, when the prophet received the decisive news, 'The city is smitten' (33 [21]).

XXV.–XXXII. **Prophecies against Foreign Nations.**—**Ammon**, for exalting over the fall of Judah, shall be destroyed from being a nation. **Moab**, for her satisfaction at the fall of Judah, shall suffer 'judgements.' **Edom**, for taking vengeance on Judah, shall suffer Divine vengeance at the hands of Israel. The **Philistines** for taking vengeance 'with despite' shall suffer 'great vengeance' from Jehovah (25). **Tyre**, because she flattered herself that Jerusalem's fall should be Tyre's gain, should be reduced to a bare sea-rock. The city which traded with the whole world should become desolate to the dismay of all seafaring nations (26, 27). It will be seen from the contents of these prophecies against the five peoples that they belong to the time when the Temple was lying in ruins and Jerusalem lay waste after its second capture by the Chaldeans in 586 B.C. 'The gates of Hades' (Mt 16 [18]) seemed

to have prevailed against the Jewish Church, but in fact the five peoples perished, while Israel survived for centuries to receive the Gospel.

Tyre is of special interest because the king of Tyre was priest of Melkart (the Tyrian Baal), and the Temple of Melkart had world-wide fame. Its site was marked for those far out at sea by two tall columns of 'sapphire' (i.e. lapis-lazuli). The wealth of the world in precious stones was lavished on it.

XXVI., XXVII. describe the fall of Tyre as a political power, and the destruction of its material wealth. But 28 strikes the distinctivly religious note. With the Hebrew eye for the concrete Ezekiel singles out the king of Tyre as representative of his people and reveals his sin. The Tyrian is a man who thinks that he has tasted of the tree of knowledge and so is wise as God. In his sea stronghold he feels himself beyond the vicissitudes of time. He believes himself to be one of the *holy* who would never feel the profane touch of a conqueror, but 'Thou shalt die the death of the uncircumcised' (the unclean): 1-10. In 11-19 the prophet repeats his prediction in a parable. In Babylon there was a tradition of the daystar which fell from heaven. The Tyrian was as this daystar in the garden of God. The garden had a wall of precious stones, the stars; within that wall the Tyrian walked in safety under the protection of the anointed cherub 'that covereth,' i.e. that guardeth. The Tyrian sinned, so Jehovah rejected him, and the guardian cherub destroyed him.

Correct RV and read: *every precious stone was thy wall* (13); *in the day that thou wast created the anointed cherub that guardeth was prepared* (13-14); *and the guardian cherub destroyed thee from the midst* (16).

Compare in Rev 18 the description of 'Babylon' the trading city, proud and luxurious, which dealt in the souls of men and slew the prophets and the saints.

The rest of 28 contains a prophecy against Zidon, which is described as a 'pricking brier' to Israel (24; cf. Nu 33 55). After the removal of this 'brier,' Israel is to dwell 'securely' (26), undisturbed by an enemy neighbour.

XXIX.-XXXII. contain a group of prophecies against Egypt. If it be asked why Ezekiel denounces one particular nation so sternly, the answer is to be found in the history of its relations with Israel, and particularly in the latest phase. The prophet complains of his people's 'fornication' with Egypt (16 26, 23 3), meaning that Israel participated in Egyptian idolatry. It was indeed hardly avoidable. Egypt was Israel's great neighbour, an ancient kingdom, with a great prestige. She was defensively strong, seeing that her eastern frontier consisted of a desert and a tangle of pestilential swamps. The Nile was a God to the Egyptians, and at least a great wonder to their neighbours. Trade by sea with the cities of Phœnicia scattered the objects of Egyptian religion all over Palestine, for Egypt was nothing if not 'religious.' Israel saw, wondered, and worshipped—amiss.

The dates of the several prophecies are significant. In year 10, month 10, and year 11, month 3 (29 1, 31 1) the last siege of Jerusalem was still in progress; in year 12, month 10, Ezekiel heard that the city had fallen (32 1, 33 21). But Egypt was acting all the time the part of the untrustworthy friend. Owing to her encouragement Zedekiah broke with Babylon and brought the Chaldean armies upon Jerusalem. An Egyptian army gave momentary relief, and then left the city to her fate. Egypt taught Israel to practise idolatry and to break faith.

In the boast, 'My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself' (3), Pharaoh speaks in the character of 'the great dragon,' the mysterious being who represents primeval godship (i.e. Chaos). With 6. 7 cf. Is 36 6. Egypt is to be punished for forty years like Judah (4 6); and after its punishment to be only a 'base' or 'low' kingdom as Judah was in the reign of Zedekiah (17 14) subject to a foreign suzerain. With this prophecy cf. Jer 43 8-13.

How far the expectations of the two prophets were fulfilled is not at present known: the cuneiform records of the campaigns of Nebuchadrezzar are scanty. He made, however, an expedition against Egypt *c.* 568, i.e. some eighteen years later than the date of this prophecy, but about the date given in 17. Egypt became a base kingdom under the Persian kings, Cambyses (529) and his successors.

XXX. describes with fuller geographical detail than 29 the judgement which Nebuchadrezzar will execute upon Egypt. In 5 Ethiopia ('Cush' in Hebrew) is the land south of Egypt, and Libya (Hebrew 'Put') is the land to the west. Or Put may be Egyptian 'Punt,' a land reached by a voyage down the Red Sea, possibly Somaliland. In 6 (RVm) 'from Migdol to Syene (Assuan)' means 'from north to south.' In 13. 16 'Noph' ('Moph'; Hos 9 6) is Memphis south of Old Cairo, once the capital of Lower Egypt. In 14. 15. 16

'No' ('No-amon' in Nah 3 [8]) is Thebes, once the capital of Upper Egypt.

XXXI. is a parable which is based on Gen 2 [8-14]. God has a well-watered garden in which He plants the nations, described as trees. In the most favourable spot of all Egypt was planted; it surpassed all other trees in its growth. Then came pride and removal from this favoured place: 'I have driven him out for his wickedness' (cf. Gen 3 [24]). Pharaoh is brought down to Sheol and lies among the uncircumcised. This is the final touch in his punishment, for circumcision was practised in Egypt, and the priests at least were circumcised. Yet Egypt (ritually clean in his own estimation) must lie down among the 'unclean' [3] should run: 'Behold, a true cedar, as one in Lebanon with fair branches . . . .' This cedar is Pharaoh, *not* 'the Assyrian.' 'The Assyrian' is a mistranslation here.

XXXII. 1-16 (of later date than 29 [1-16] and 31) repeats the threats made in the two earlier passages. The sum of all is: 'The sword of the king of Babylon shall come upon thee' (cf. 30 [10, 11, 25]).

17-32, a passage dated in the twelfth year, enlarges on the dishonoured graves of the multitude of Egypt's warriors who are brought down to Sheol to lie among the unclean ('uncircumcised') of the nations.

XXXIII. 1-20. **The Commission of Ezekiel.**—This passage repeats 3 [16-21] in a fuller form, and traverses some of the ground covered by 18. Ezekiel's office is that of a watchman in time of war. [3b] lit. runs: 'If the people of the land take *one man* of their number . . .' Ezekiel is as this *one man*; if he does not give warning no one else will. He is to warn his people against wickedness, and to say: 'O wicked man, thou shalt surely die.' But Jehovah has no pleasure in the death of the wicked; the man who turns from his wickedness shall surely live. On the other hand, the man who trusts in his past righteousness and commits iniquity shall die.

This passage differs from 18 in two respects. First, it does not state so fully what is meant by wickedness or by righteousness (cf. 18 [5-9] and [10-13]). Secondly, the proverb of the teeth set on edge is not given, and there is no reference to the results of heredity. In 33 Ezekiel teaches simply that the wicked man shall die, and the righteous man shall live. 'I will judge you,' says Jehovah, 'every one according to his ways.' [10] shows that the exiles had fallen into despair: how (whatever the prophet said) could they live (prosper) now? Probably the reference is to the destruction of the Temple of which they had at length heard.

21-29. **The news of the Fall of Jerusalem reaches the Prophet. His Mouth is opened again to speak to his own People.**—The late date of this passage is to be noted, 'year 12, month 10, day 5,' whereas Jerusalem fell 'year 11, month 4, day 9.' The date refers perhaps rather to the revival of hope described in [24] than to the Fall of Jerusalem. The news of the catastrophe must have reached the exiles sometime within year 11. The confidence of those left in Palestine was ill-judged. They were still entangled in idolatry: they ate with the blood and looked to idols. The reference is, of course, to sacrifice made to idols: in sacrifices to Jehovah no fat nor blood was to be eaten (Lev 3 [16], 7 [26], *et al.*). For Israel's idolatry and other sins the land would be made 'a desolation and an astonishment' ([28]).

30-33. **Ezekiel's Words only 'a very tuneful song' to his People.**—Those who denounce sins, whether satirists or preachers, always get a hearing, but the hearers seldom apply the words to themselves so as to repent (cf. 8 [1], 14 [1], 20 [1]).

XXXIV. 1-10. **The Arraignment of the 'Shepherds' of Israel.**—The reference is to the recent kings of Judah (cf. 19 [1-9]; Jer 22 [10]-23 [4]), where the character of these kings is sketched: they were oppressors and reprobate.

11-16. **Jehovah will be the Shepherd of His People.**—In [11, 12] translate: 'Behold I, even I, will care for my sheep, and will examine their (hurts), as a shepherd examineth his flock.'

17-24. **Jehovah will Judge between one Sheep and another.**—The flock suffered not only from the oppression and from the neglect of the shepherds (the kings), but also from the selfish greed of some of the sheep themselves. So Jehovah will destroy 'the fat and the strong,' i.e. the rich among the people, who deprived the poor of their share of 'the pastures.' To ensure the future prosperity of the flock Jehovah will raise up a single shepherd, David, over them. He shall be 'prince' (*Nasi* in Hebrew), not 'king,' under Jehovah their God. So in Jer 23 [5-8] 'the Lord will raise up to David a righteous Branch,' who shall execute judgement and justice in the land.

25-31. **God's Covenant of Peace.**—The language of this section is remarkable. Jehovah will make a Covenant of Peace with His people. Now covenants are

made only at great epochs of history, as e.g. after the Flood, when the world of Gen 6-8 was left a *tabula rasa* (Gen 9 [8-11]). So the offer through Ezekiel of a Covenant came at a marked epoch. The Temple was in ruins, and Palestine lay waste (33 [28]). But the Covenant offers new prosperity to the people. The offer is as ample as may be. The flock shall dwell safely in 'the wilderness,' i.e. in the open pasture lands free from fear of wild beasts. There shall be no flood, nor drought, but seasonable rains. The yoke of the oppressor shall be broken, and Israel shall be no longer the prey of the nations. From being desolate the land shall become a 'plantation' of God, like the garden of Eden (36 [35]; Gen 2 [8] ff.); it shall be a glory, and not a shame to its inhabitants.

The close of this prophecy is emphatic. Jehovah addresses His people directly and with comfort: 'Ye are my flock, nay, ye are more, ye are *Adam* (so the Hebrew), my special creation of old' (Gen 1 [26-28]).

XXXV. **Jehovah's Judgement on Mount Seir (Edom:** cf. 25 [12-14]).—The judgement briefly stated in 25 is now more fully described. The indictment of Edom has three counts: (1) Edom has had a 'perpetual enmity' against Israel; (2) when Jerusalem fell Edom helped in the massacre of the inhabitants; (3) Edom hopes to occupy the land of Israel, now that Israel has gone into captivity ([10]). To intensify Edom's fault is the fact of blood relationship: Esau (Edom) and Jacob (Israel) were brothers (Ob [10, 11]; Mal 1 [2, 3]). [6] should be rendered:

Surely I made thee of blood kinship (with Israel),
So thy kindred (blood) shall pursue thee;
Surely thou hast hated kinship (lit. "blood"),
So thy kindred shall pursue thee.'

The same threat is more plainly made in 25 [14]: 'I will lay my vengeance upon Edom by the hand of my people Israel.' In [8] the watercourses are the deep dry beds of mountain streams in which fugitives might hide for awhile. The end of [12] should run: 'She (i.e. Jerusalem) is desolate (without inhabitants); they (her mountains) are delivered to us to enjoy.'

XXXVI. 1-15. **The Consolation of the Mountains of Israel.**—The denunciation of Edom is naturally followed by the consolation of Israel; the desolate mountains of Israel will henceforth be tilled and sown by their rightful possessors. Once these mountains supplied a reproach, a common taunt, for Israel's malevolent neighbours to use ([3]), now they will yield fruitful harvests for the exiles, whose return is near ([8]). Yet more the promise is that man and beast shall 'multiply and be fruitful' (Gen 1 [22]) upon the mountains. Again from of old Canaan had the evil reputation of devouring its inhabitants (Nu 13 [32]), i.e. it was subject to devastating epidemics (1 S 5 [6], 6 [19]; 2 S 24 [15]; Am 4 [10]: cf. Ex 30 [12]). So Jehovah promises that these shall cease ([14]), and that the land shall give no 'cause of stumbling' whatever to the inhabitants from henceforth.

16-32. **Israel's Uncleanness: Israel to be Restored 'for mine holy name's sake.'**—Israel, Jehovah declares, was 'unclean' (i.e. idolatrous), in their own land, and still 'unclean' when they dwelt scattered among the nations. Therefore not for their own sakes, but for His Name's sake He will gather them together and restore them to their own land. But mere change of place brings no improvement, and therefore Jehovah will give Israel a new heart and a new spirit ([26]). A similar promise is made in 11 [19], where 'one heart' is offered to Israel, i.e. an undivided heart which will follow Jehovah only.

33-38. **The Restoration of Israel.**—The land, so the promise runs, will be again tilled; its ruined cities will be restored; and the population will swarm once more, like the flocks of sheep which were driven to Jerusalem to supply her feasts.

XXXVII. 1-14. **A Vision and a Parable for Israel's Comfort; the Restoration of the Nation.**—The preceding chapter closed with a promise that the land of Israel—desolate now—should again swarm with inhabitants. But Israel found the promise hard to believe. Before Jerusalem fell they had been full of vain confidence (cf. 4, 5; with comment; 11 [1-13], with comment), after the catastrophe they sank into the deepest depression ([11], 33 [10]). Their minds were dulled; the promise unassisted could not penetrate. Israel's despair was expressed in the current saying: 'Our bones are dried up: our hope is lost.' They would never be a nation again. But now a vision was given to Ezekiel which attached itself to the popular saying. Jehovah showed Israel to the prophet as a vast quantity of bones scattered over the valley. They were dry and disjointed as the bones of men who have been long dead. But twice at the Lord's command Ezekiel prophesied over

them, and the bones became first bodies, and then living men. The empty valley became filled with 'an exceeding great army.' Such an army Israel might still become. Jehovah Himself interprets the vision: He will bring scattered Israel out of their 'graves,' that is out of the dark places in which they are held captive, and will bring them home again.

15-28. The Restoration completed.—Something still remained to be done. The union of the tribes of Israel which had been broken owing to the fault of Rehoboam (1 K 12 [1-6]) must be restored: the kingdom must return to its former state as it was in the reign of David when all Israel had 'one shepherd.' Jehovah will place His 'sanctuary' for evermore among them, and be their God. See further Intro., 2 (v).

XXXVIII. 1-23. 'Gog' invades the Land of Israel and is overthrown there.

1-13. The Purpose of Gog.—The last chapter was full of reassurance for Israel, who were to be restored to their country and to enjoy the prosperity which they once enjoyed under David.

But in Israel's mind one terrible doubt lingered: What of the barbarians of the far north? For about a century before Ezekiel hunger and the pressure of other barbarous nations had been driving them southward. Before 700 B.C. the Cimmerians were south of the Caucasus; moving westward through Asia Minor they took Sardis in 652 B.C. (Herod., i, 15) but a little later they were driven out. Then the Scythians, a people possibly related to the Cimmerians, passed round the eastern end of the Caucasus, traversed Syria, and reached the frontier of Egypt. There they too were stayed by the fortifications and by the 'presents' of Psammetichus I *c.* 630-625. But these archer-horsemen left their mark* on Palestine in the name of *Scythopolis* (formerly Beth-Shean) in the Jordan valley.

Might they not come again, and spoil Ezekiel's glowing picture of the future of Israel? These barbarians seemed to represent the ancient power of Chaos and the Abyss, something indeed outside Jehovah's ordered realm.

But Ezekiel faced the whole matter without flinching. Jehovah is Lord of the whole earth; His arm can reach to bring back His exiled people from all remote lands; so He is Lord also of the distant north and of its savage inhabitants. If Meshech and Tubal come out of their place to descend upon Israel like a cloud, it is the Lord's doing, and the Lord who brought them into Palestine will utterly destroy them there.

Gog boasts (says the prophet) that he will come upon unwalled villages, upon a people who dwell trustingly without 'bars or gates.' The newly returned exiles of course had to think rather of cultivating neglected fields for their immediate needs than of rebuilding the walls of cities. The merchants from Sheba in the south and Tarshish in the west will be on the watch to profit, when Gog wishes to make merchandise of his spoil, and the 'young lions' who love to devour men (cf. 19 [3, 6]) will be at hand to buy Israelite slaves from the spoiler. But all these expectations are only an empty dream.

14-23. The Destruction of Gog.—Gog and his ways are all known from of old to Jehovah ([17]); he is in the Lord's hands. All natural powers will combine against him; earthquake and storm and pestilence will destroy him; and every man's sword will be turned against his fellow; as it was with the mingled hordes of Midian (Jg 7 [22]) so will it be with the mingled hordes of Gog. So by delivering Israel from the greatest of all dangers Jehovah will be magnified and His glory made known among many nations.

The key of this chapter is in [4], which conveys an idea unfamiliar to the modern mind. It is that Jehovah does all that is done, whether good or bad, profitable or injurious (cf. Am 3 [6]; Is 45 [7]). So even the invasion of Gog can only be an act of God. [4] (addressed to Gog) should therefore be rendered: 'I will restore thee and put hooks into thy jaws, and bring thee forth.'

The barbarians after their defeats will be allowed by Jehovah to recover and to pour forth their hordes once more against Israel.

XXXIX. 1-22. A Second Prophecy concerning Gog's Invasion and his Overthrow.—Repetition is a conspicuous feature of this book. Ezekiel as a preacher was obliged to repeat his discourses (with variations) in order to impress his messages upon his people. His book reflects the conditions of his preaching. The cherubim are described in 1 and again in 10. 2 [3-7] is repeated in 3 [4-11]. Ezekiel is to be a watchman in 3 [17-21], and again in 33 [1-9]. Jerusalem is described as an unfaithful wife both in 16 and in 23, and so on.

1, 2. Render: 'Behold, I look upon thee,

* As the name Beth-Shean has survived in a corrupt form to this day, it is perhaps more probable that the name Scythopolis was given to the town because some Scythian soldiers of Alexander, or Antigonus, or Seleucus were settled there.—A. G.

O Gog, . . . and I will restore thee (to thy former strength), and will stir thee up . . . and I will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel.' Though Gog imagines that he is acting for himself, in reality Jehovah is hauling him forth with a hook in his lip (like some prisoner to the Assyrians), that he may invade Israel (38 4). But he is being led forth thus not to victory, but to annihilating defeat: Gog and all his hordes shall fall on the mountains of Israel: it shall take seven months to bury them. As for their weapons abandoned on the mountains, they shall last Israel seven years for kindlings for fires. (Wood, it should be noted, entered largely into the manufacture of shields and bucklers as well as of bows and arrows. A wooden frame was the basis, over which a skin was stretched. The skin was oiled, so that the attacking weapon should glance off its surface: Is 21 5.) Before the buriers could finish their work the vultures and the jackals would take their fill. Such details as these were only too well known to Ezekiel and his audience. They were needed to bring his message home. So both the nations and Israel, the prophet says, will learn the Glory of Jehovah.

23-29. Jehovah justified in the eyes of the Heathen.—How were the heathen to believe in the supreme Godhead of Jehovah, as long as His Temple was in ruins and His people in captivity? The Gentile doubt is to be resolved by Israel's return, by Israel's prosperity, and by the Spirit of Jehovah resting on Israel. Israel's great calamity can now be explained by Israel's revolt against Jehovah.

XL.-XLVIII. The Vision of the New Jerusalem.—In these last nine chapters the prophet loses himself in the seer. He has a vision full of details as a master-painter's picture of a new age for Israel. Ezekiel has no hope for the present (33 31-33); his eye is fixed on the future. He is a dreamer, but a practical dreamer. He desires a new Israel, but he wishes to build it on the old foundations, that is on a Temple rebuilt, on a King who has become a constitutional ruler (a 'Prince'), on a priesthood reformed, on rules of purity revised and strengthened, on a sacrificial system carefully regulated, on a Holy Land redivided among the tribes on new principles. He might almost be writing chapters of Leviticus or Numbers.

Ezekiel was now fifty years of age, an old man as they count age in the East. He had spent five-and-twenty years in exile, and for fourteen years Jerusalem had lain prostrate with its ruined Temple. The natural man could have seen no warrant for hope in the circumstances of his time: we know indeed that the people 'despaired of the republic' (37 11). But the spirit of Jehovah was in Ezekiel: he was a prophet, a seer, who saw in vision things unseen as yet. In 'visions' of God he beheld the Temple of Jerusalem restored, and these visions so real to him that he proceeded to deliver fresh legislation from Jehovah for the better government of the Temple and of the people who were to rally round it. To Ezekiel the vision came (it is to be noted) with authority. He did not simply 'see' the things, he was shown them. A Heavenly Being, 'a man whose appearance was as of bronze'—a deep glowing metal—led the prophet from point to point, and measured all that he showed. What a sense of reality is given in that measuring! That which can be measured can be touched. It is a material temple of which Ezekiel speaks. It is true that the new Jerusalem which St. John saw in the Apocalypse was also subjected to measurement, but St. John adds touches to show that *his* Jerusalem is spiritual: it has no temple, for the Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple thereof: it has no light of sun and moon, for 'the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb' (Rev 21 22 f.).

Ezekiel's temple, however, is *material*; he is charged to tell his people all that he is shown. They, no doubt, when the signal is given, are to set to work to build all that the prophet has seen, and to submit themselves to keep the regulations for the future which he is delivering to them. The vision of Ezekiel imposes a new religious task upon his people (40 4, 43 10 ff.). He becomes a lawgiver, but he must not therefore be thought to have ceased to be a prophet.

XL. 5-XLII. 20. The Description of the Temple: its Measurements.—The new Temple is described here more fully than Solomon's Temple in 1 K 6. Perhaps the chief stress is laid on the measures to be taken to preserve its ceremonial purity. The first object which is shown to the prophet is a substantial wall (Hebrew *ḥomah*) about 7½ feet high ('six cubits') and 7½ feet broad, enclosing the Temple and its courts. The purpose of this wall is 'to make separation between that which was holy and that which was common.' It is to be noted that in 43 8 the complaint is made that only a party-wall (Hebrew *ḳîr*) separated Solomon's Temple from the palace of the kings. There were gates

in the walls on the east, north, and south (40 6, 20, 24) with 'lodges' or 'guard chambers' for the Temple guards. There was no gate on the west, because the Holy of Holies was there. Worshippers approached from the east and faced westward (cf. 8 16). The sanctity of the Temple was further protected by the provision of two courts, an outer as well as an inner. Seven steps led to the outer court, and eight to the inner.

Just at the entrance of the inner court was a place set out with eight tables in all, for the washing and killing of the sacrificial victims (38-41). Here too the victims were cut up in pieces for offering at the altar, so that one priest might offer the head, another the shoulder, and so on. Nine (eleven) priests were employed at the sacrifice of a ram, and twenty-four when a bullock was offered. The Mishnah gives particulars: *Tamid* 3 1, 4 *fin.*; *Yoma* 2 6, 7.

A further sign of care for preserving the purity of the new Temple appears in the fact that service at the altar itself is reserved for those priests who are described as 'sons of Zadok' (40 45, 46: cf. 43 19 ff., 44 10, 11 and 15, 16). The sons of Zadok (it seems) had been Jerusalemite priests, who had not shared in the irregular high-place worship which had prevailed in country districts outside the city. This worship, though offered to Jehovah, had certainly absorbed some heathen practices.

From 41 1-4 it appears that the old plan of Solomon's building is to be kept. The new Temple like the old is to consist of an outer hall (Hebrew *heykal*) 40 cubits in length, and an inner hall, 'the holy of holies' called the 'oracle' in 1 K 6 5, 20 cubits (about 25 feet) square. Like the old Temple again the new is to be enclosed by priests' chambers, so that the sanctuary itself is protected from any external touch. In these chambers (which touch the holy place) the holy things, those offerings and portions of the sacrifices which are assigned to the priests, are to be kept and eaten in due time. So too the holy garments of the priests are not to be taken into the outer court. Not less striking perhaps as a measure to preserve the sanctity of the Temple is the regulation laid down in 42 15-20. The area of the Temple is to be protected by a broad strip of neutral territory completely enclosing it.

XLIII. 1-4. The Return of the Glory of the God of Israel to the Temple.—In 11 23 Ezekiel had a vision of the withdrawal of the Glory from the city to the Mount of Olives. The Glory lingered as though reluctant to depart altogether. In 43 1 ff. the prophet witnesses the return of the Glory: the old Temple which had been so deeply defiled with idolatry was gone, and a new Temple as yet unpolluted stood in its place. Into this Jehovah could enter.

5-12. Jehovah offers a New Covenant.—The Lord's return is not unconditional. He will abide for ever in the new Temple, if . . . The Temple must be no longer defiled. The plan of the new Temple and the regulations concerning it are made known through Ezekiel to the people, 'that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and do them.' A revelation is made to them; conformity to its terms is required of them.

13-27. The New Altar, and the Atonement to be made for it.—The only atonement known before Christ's coming was by sacrifice, hence an altar has to be provided. But the altar itself, though new and unused, has to be cleansed and atoned for. After this atonement has been made for the altar, sacrifices of the ordinary kind may be offered upon it. The whole transaction shows how great is the weight of sin which rests upon Israel.

XLIV. 1-4. The Glory of Jehovah seen (once more) in the Temple.—Ezekiel is brought to the east gate which is now shut. No man shall again enter it, now that Jehovah has entered by it.

5-14. No Profane Person is any longer to enter the Temple.—In the days of the kingdom foreign persons were employed in the house of God. Such were the Gibeonites who were made 'hewers of wood and drawers of water . . . for the altar of Jehovah' (Jos 9 27), and again the Carites, foreign royal guards, who were brought into the Temple by Jehoiada the priest (2 K 11 4). Uncircumcised strangers and Levites who had officiated in heathen high places were admitted to the sanctuary.

15-31. The Priests, the Sons of Zadok.—Only the sons of Zadok, as laid down before, were to approach the altar, and these were to observe the rules of ritual purity. They were to be 'clean' in person, and they were not to treat the 'holy' garments as common; when clothed in them the priests were not to mingle with the people. Further, they were to be separate from the people in manner of life; they were to have no landed possessions; their marriages were under stricter regulations.

XLV. 1-8. **Canaan to be divided up afresh on the Return from Captivity.**—Israel had gone into captivity as a punishment for many sins, and not least perhaps for the sin of the great in dispossessing the poor and weak of their holdings of land. Canaan was Jehovah's land; He had given it to Israel in the days of Joshua by lot (Jos 18 [1-10]), now it was His once more to give and distribute as in the Mosaic era. No obstacle is contemplated to such a redistribution: Ezekiel regards the land as standing empty; indeed, in 33 [23-29] he describes 'the mountains of Israel' as desolate that none shall pass through.'

The prophet requires in the first place that Israel should set apart a 'holy' portion of the land for the site of the Temple, and for the residence of the holy persons, the Priests and the Levites. After these the Prince is assigned a portion bordering on the sacred land with a warning attached that he should be content with his portion. The arrangements for Priests and Levites are repeated in 48 [9-14], and the proviso is added that the Levites are not to alienate their lands, nor the fruits which come from them.

9-15. **Due Sacrifices to be offered.**—Cheating in sacrifices was a fault well known both among the Jews (Mal 1 [8]), and among other nations. Ezekiel, who is working for a new era, demands just weights and measures, in the first instance (no doubt) that the sacrifices may be honestly offered. The offerings of oil and of barley are to be made by just measure.

16, 17. **The mutual Duty of People and of Prince.**—The whole people shall contribute to the offering to be made; the Prince is to see that it is rightly offered to God. In this way the Prince carries on the tradition of Solomon (1 K 8 [63-65]).

18-25. **Three 'Feasts' to be observed with Sacrifices.**—The first day of the first month, New Year's Day, the Temple is to be 'cleansed' with sacrifice. On the fourteenth day the Passover is to be held, and particular sacrifices are prescribed to be offered daily for a week. On the fifteenth day of the seventh month the autumn harvest feast is to be held with the same sacrifices as for the Passover. Yet more detailed directions are given in the following chapter, a strange phenomenon in a prophetical writing (*v. infra*).

XLVI. 1-15. **Sacrifices on the Sabbath and on the New Moon. The Daily Offering.**—This passage might seem from its contents to have been taken from Leviticus or Numbers. Full detailed instructions for the offering of sacrifices are given. The whole passage reads strangely beside the many prophetic utterances depreciatory of sacrifice. Even Ezekiel's contemporary, Jeremiah the prophet-priest of Anathoth, joins the prophetic chorus: 'I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people' (Jer 7 [22] f.). With this may be compared Hos 6 [6]; Am 5 [21-24]; Mic 6 [6-8]; Is 1 [11-17]; cf. 1 S 15 [22]. We should, however, be wrong if we concluded that the great prophets condemned Sacrifice absolutely. Their view is most clearly given in Hos 6 [6]: 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.' In other words, Jehovah requires mercy towards men, and acknowledgement of God as primary duties, and sacrifice and burnt offerings as secondary. Ezekiel's own mind is perhaps most concisely described in the appendix ([18, 19]) to Ps 51: 'Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt thou delight in the sacrifices of righteousness. . . .' The prophet believes that in a restored Jerusalem and from a reformed people Jehovah will accept the sacrifices which He had refused at the hands of a corrupt and idolatrous nation.

16-18. **The Prince shall not Seize the Land of any of the Commonalty.**—The very next utterance of Ezekiel shows that though he is keen for the due performance of the cultus, he is equally stout on behalf of the rights of the poor. He resents the oppression practised by the later kings of Judah (19 [6-9]: cf. Jer 22 [13-19]). The story of Naboth's vineyard was repeated (with variations) in Judah, and Ezekiel was willing to play the part of Elijah.

19-24. **The Boiling Places for the Sacrifices.**—The passover lamb must be 'roasted with fire,' but the victims of other sacrifices were boiled to be eaten (Ex 29 [31] f.; 1 S 2 [13, 14]).

XLVII. 1-12. **The Life-giving Waters (River of Life).**—Canaan the Promised Land is sometimes described as 'a land flowing with milk and honey,' a land for shepherds, sometimes again as 'a land of wheat and barley and vines and fig trees and pomegranates,' a land for agriculturalists (Dt 8 [8]). But if these two descriptions cover between them two-thirds of the land, a third remains, namely the district east of Jerusalem which in-

cludes the Dead Sea. This is described by George Adam Smith (*Hist. Geography*, 262) as follows:

'From the hard limestone of the range [on which Jerusalem stands] . . . the land sinks swiftly and as it seems shuddering through softer formations, desert and chaotic, to a depth of which you cannot see the bottom . . . to the coasts of a bitter sea. Across this emptiness rise the hills of Moab, and it is their bare edge which forms the eastern horizon of Judæa. The depth, the haggard desert through which the land sinks into it, the singularity of that gulf and its prisoned sea conspire to produce on the inhabitants of Judæa a moral effect such as, I suppose, is created by no other frontier in the world.'

The district thus described forms no inconsiderable part of the Holy Land, and now that the time has come, as Ezekiel reckons it, for Jehovah to give back the lost land to His people, the time has also come for healing this barren plot. Jehovah, the prophet announces, will perfect His gift. A stream of water, growing in volume as it flows, shall proceed from the House and shall fertilize the land. Life shall flourish where death once prevailed: even the Dead Sea shall be turned by the stream into sweet waters. Fish shall abound in the once salt barren sea, and fruit trees shall flourish on the once barren shores. And yet (for the priest's eye takes details in) shall some salt still be found by the Dead Sea margin. It was needed for sacrifice [Lev 2^{13}] and also for health.

The stream which Ezekiel saw appears again in Rev 22^{1} as 'a river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb.' And 'a tree of life' also appears on either side of the river, 'bearing twelve manner of fruits, yielding its fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.'

13-XLVIII. **29. Distribution of the Land to be made, a Holy Portion ('Oblation') being reserved.**—This subject was introduced in 45^{1-8}: here it receives fuller treatment. In 47^{13-21} the boundaries of the land to be divided are given, but not quite clearly. Ezekiel 'the priest' is in touch with 'the real' (*his* real), when he prophesies of the Temple and the sacrifices. But in dealing with the geography of distant Canaan he lapses into an ideal treatment of his theme, and loses touch with the actual state of things in that country. He plans as though his native land lay empty. While his scheme for the restoration of the Temple and its services is practical, even if not immediately practicable, his scheme for the resettlement of the land is a far-off dream. The 'moral' of his dream is the old prophetic teaching against earth-hunger. Each tribe is to receive the same extent of territory as the rest ($48^{1-7. 23-27}$). (With this we may compare the vision of the Apocalypse in which *twelve thousand* out of every tribe of Israel were 'sealed' for the triumph of the Lamb: Rev 7^{4}.) There is to be no inequality between tribe and tribe, when the great Restoration takes place. The moral interest prevails with Ezekiel, as may be seen further from $47^{22, 23}$, where he lays down that the sojourner' is to receive a share of the land when it is distributed. His thought for the 'sojourner' is shown also in $22^{7, 29}$.

[*Note.*—'Stranger' is a faulty rendering in these passages. It should be reserved for the Hebrew *zār*, which often means a real foreigner, a man uncircumcised.]

For 48^{8-20} (the Holy Oblation) and $^{21, 22}$ (the Prince's portion), see on 45^{1-8}.

30-35. The City and its Gates.—Much has been said about the land, but the prophet's last words must be about the city which expresses in summary all that Ezekiel has to teach of the Future Age. The city measures 4,500 'measures' on each side: it lies 'foursquare' like the new Jerusalem of the Apocalypse (Rev 21^{16}). The regular outward form is a symbol of the inner perfection of the city.

A further symbol is given in the description of the gates of the city. There are twelve gates each of which bears the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel. They are a symbol of the restored unity of the people. The city belongs neither to Judah nor to Benjamin, but to all the tribes. Jerusalem is built 'as a city that is compact together: whither the tribes go up' (Ps $122^{3, 4}$).

The name of the city given in the last two (Hebrew) words of the book closes one important line of thought which marks this prophecy. Jehovah solemnly forsook His city and summoned the Chaldeans to destroy it (8-11). But He is to return to it with equal solemnity, and to dwell once more in His Temple (43^{1} ff.). So the city is to be called, by all who see it, Jehovah—*shāmmah*, 'Jehovah is there.'

DANIEL

By L. Elliott Binns

When the ordinary reader thinks of the Old Testament prophets, he thinks inevitably of the four great figures of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. At the back of his mind there is perhaps a recollection of having seen these four in a stained-glass window or in some great painting. Such a reader is startled to find that the Hebrew Old Testament knows nothing of *four* great prophets, and that it does not count the Book of Daniel as a prophetic writing at all.

Of the man Daniel we have no knowledge beyond the picture of him presented in the book. It is usually supposed that the author borrowed the name from Ezek 14^{14}, 28^{3}, where it is used of a figure, presumably of pre-exilic date (and therefore far earlier than the 'prophet'), remembered by the Jews in Babylon on account of his wisdom and uprightness.

The book is written partly in Hebrew (1^{1}-2^{4a}, 8-12) and partly in Aramaic (2^{4b}-7^{28}), and so far no convincing reason for the change has been offered. Some say it was originally all in Aramaic, but before it could be included in the Canon part of it had to be turned into Hebrew. Others suggest that the Aramaic parts were to be read by the common people, the Hebrew by the learned: but this theory breaks down when it is remembered that the change in 2^{4} comes in the middle of a single narrative. It would seem that all clue to the difference has been lost. The book divides naturally into two parts: (*a*) 1-6, which forms a series of narratives dealing with the adventures of Daniel and his companions; (*b*) 7-12, which consists of four visions in which the history of the known world is portrayed in symbolical form from the Exile in Babylon to the final triumph of the saints. Between these two parts of the book there is a real difference, not so much of outlook but of atmosphere, and in recent years the feeling has been growing amongst scholars that the earlier part may be based on older sources, possibly on an Aramaic apocalypse (this might explain in part the difference of language) which the writer incorporated into his own work. Daniel as a whole makes use of earlier material, traditions of an apocalyptical nature to which references can be found in older writers. It should be noted that the LXX version differs considerably from the Hebrew text, both in details as well as in the range of its contents, and large additions (*Susanna*, the *Song of the Three Children*, and the *Story of Bel and the Dragon*) have been made to it. The version of Theodotion is much nearer the original, and in quite early days came to be used by the Church in preference to LXX.

Although the book nowhere claims to have been written by Daniel, the older scholars almost without exception concluded that it was by him, and therefore a product of the age in which he was supposed to have lived, namely at the end of the Babylonian and the beginning of the Persian period. This view has been abandoned as untenable by practically all scholars of the present day, and even so conservative a critic as Sellin concludes that its date in the Maccabæan period 'is proved to demonstration' (*Introd. to Old Testament*, 232). The reasons for placing Daniel in the middle of the 2nd century B.C. are many, and, as they have independent force, quite convincing. In the first place the fact, already stated, that Daniel finds no place in the Prophetic Canon of the Jewish Scriptures is very striking: there may have been reasons other than a late date to account for this exclusion, but none have yet been discovered which bear examination. It is generally held that the Prophetic Canon was closed early in the 2nd century, at which time Daniel was presumably not written. In further support of this late date can be adduced the omission of any mention of the book in Jewish literature before the 2nd century. It appears in the *Sibylline Oracles* (after 160 B.C.) and in 1 Mac 2^{60} (after 135 B.C.), also in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*c.* 109-106 B.C.); but in the list of great men in Ecclus 44-49 in which the other prophets are mentioned there is complete silence as to Daniel. Josephus, indeed, states that when Alexander visited the Temple (*Ant.*, IX, viii, 5) he inspected the book. But as the whole account of the visit is probably an invention his testimony is not of much value.

A third argument for the late date comes from the language of the book. The appearance in it of Greek or Persian words which are supposed not to have been known until a much later time is a phenomenon to which (so it seems to me) too great importance has always been attached on the one side or the other;

our knowledge of the diffusion of words is so slight that we cannot dogmatize. But we cannot escape from the significance of the type of Aramaic which forms a great part of the book itself. Experts like S. A. Cook state that it is a later type of Aramaic than that of the Elephantine Papyri (*c.* 408), and in his *Textbook of North Semitic Inscriptions*, xix, G. A. Cooke quite definitely assigns it to the 2nd century. But the weightiest argument of all follows on an examination of the actual contents. Such an enquiry shows us that the writer had a very exact and detailed knowledge of events in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C., but was amazingly ignorant of the history of the 6th century in which he was supposed to have lived. The first part of this statement is obvious from a reading of 11, and is admitted by all; the second part needs detailed proof. The mistakes and inaccuracies are many, and only the more important can here be recorded. (*a*) He speaks of a capture of Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim (1 [2]), an event which is not referred to elsewhere, and which the Egyptian supremacy in Syria until the battle of Carchemish in the following year would have made exceedingly unlikely; that he calls Nebuchadrezzar king is only a slight error; (*b*) the description of Belshazzar as the successor of Nebuchadrezzar and as his son (5 [1], 7 [1], 8 [1]) is much more serious, as he was never king of Babylon, and his father was Nabonidus; (*c*) the figure of Darius the Mede, son of Ahasuerus, who received the kingdom on the death of Belshazzar (5 [31], 9 [1]), has no existence in real history, in which there is indeed no place for him, as Cyrus was the immediate successor of Nabonidus. It is difficult to account for the writer's invention of these monarchs, but Professor Bevan seems to have put forward the most likely explanation. He thinks that the prophecies of Is 13 [17], Jer 51 [11, 28] to the effect that the Medes would conquer Babylon led to his making the city surrender to a Mede; as he knew no Median names he gave Persian names to Darius and his father.

The real date of the book is the age of the Maccabæan revolt, as can be seen by studying it with care. In 11 the review of the whole of history leads up to the appearance of the 'contemptible person' of [21], who is of course Antiochus Epiphanes, the 'little horn' of 8 [9], and the 'king of fierce countenance' of 8 [23]. The record of Antiochus is traced with minute fidelity up to his return from Egypt, and then it lapses into vagueness and inaccuracy (see on 11 [42] ff.). That a prophet could, in the age of Cyrus, have foretold events which were to happen nearly four hundred years later few would be prepared to deny; but such a prophet would stand alone in the Old Testament. The prophets of Jehovah were His spokesmen to the age in which they lived, and if their ministry required them to refer to the future they did so in general terms only. The whole teaching of the book, with its insistence upon unflinching faith in the power of Jehovah and on the reward of those who are faithful to Him, was well calculated to inspire the Jews in their desperate struggle against Antiochus. The exact date of the book is probably about 165 B.C., since the writer did not know the circumstances of Antiochus's death in 164 B.C., but was apparently present at the dedication of the Temple in 165 (8 [14]).

The following chronological table will enable the reader to trace the various events referred to in the several visions of the book.

B.C.

605. Nebuchadrezzar defeats the Egyptians at Carchemish.
586. Fall of Jerusalem and beginning of the Exile.
561. Death of Nebuchadrezzar.
555-538. Nabonidus, last king of Babylon.
538-529. Cyrus.
529-522. Cambyses.
521-486. Darius I (Hystaspis).
486-465. Xerxes (Ahasuerus in Old Testament).
465-425. Artaxerxes I (Longimanus).
331. Alexander the Great in Palestine.
323. Death of Alexander and partition of his dominions.
301. Egypt (Ptolemy) secures Palestine.
202. Antiochus the Great conquers Palestine.
171. Antiochus Epiphanes plunders the Temple.
169. A heathen altar set up in the Temple.
167. The Maccabæan revolt.
165. The recovery of the Temple.

Kings of Egypt

Ptolemy I (Soter), 322-285.
Ptolemy II (Philadelphus), 285-247.
Ptolemy III (Euergetes), 247-222.
Ptolemy IV (Philopator), 222-205.
Ptolemy V (Epiphanes), 205-182.
Ptolemy VI (Philometor), 182-164 [jointly with Ptolemy VII (Euergetes II), 170-164].

Kings of Syria

Seleucus I, 312-280.
Antiochus I (Soter), 279-261.
Antiochus II (Theos), 261-246.
Seleucus II (Callinicus), 246-226.
Seleucus III (Ceraunos), 226-223.
Antiochus III (the Great), 223-187.
Seleucus IV (Philopator), 186-176.
Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), 175-164.

Bibliography

Driver (*C.B.*); Charles (*Cent.B.*); Bevan, Marti, Meinhold; Haller, *Das Judenthum*, 271 ff.; and on the conservative side Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*; Wright, *Daniel and his Critics*; Wilson, *Did Daniel Write Daniel?* Montgomery, *I.C.C.* (after this article was written).

[The writers of the Old Testament have a matchless power as tellers of stories. And these stories of Daniel and the three children—stories of obedient self-restraint rewarded (1), and the courage of martyrs vindicated (3 and 6), and insolent power abased (4 and 5) have riveted themselves in the memories of men and especially of the young. And now we are told that though they may have some tradition behind them, yet they cannot be taken for history. And the reasons for this conclusion are decisive. We must accept it. And it is no doubt a shock. But when in loyalty to the truth we have made our effort and accepted the inevitable, we begin to recover ourselves. Two thoughts present themselves: (1) The cause of the great principle that God is on the side of all martyrs or confessors for His name's sake and that 'he putteth down the mighty from their seats' has not really suffered. The same legitimate criticism which forbids us to accept these stories in Daniel as history proper vindicates the New Testament histories of our Lord's Passion and Resurrection, and the history of the Apostles and the histories of the prophets in the Old Testament—Hosea and Amos and the rest—as true in fact. We can build therefore as before on facts of history. (2) But also we recall the fact that among many peoples moral courage—to stand faithful to God against desperate odds—has been nourished largely on stories that are dramas or romances and not histories, on the courage of Antigone and the faithfulness of Cordelia and the perseverance of Christian (in the *Pilgrim's Progress*) and the heroic devotion of Jeanie Deans. Why is it that all that is best in men and women has been so fortified by 'fiction'? Only because these stories were recognized as true to experience, as embodying in one ideal figure a multitude of such experiences. We notice that when a romance tells us of miraculous powers it does not excite us to imitation. The Arabian Nights amuse us, but we do not really attempt to summon spirits to work miracles for us. Among the stories in Daniel those representing powers of divination have not been the favourites. They represented nothing in common experience. But the stories of religious faithfulness rewarded do summarize a whole mass of experiences which centre in the 'faithful witness' of Jesus Christ. So we can love these stories still, and teach them to our children as ever memorable symbols of an unceasing experience of mankind (Heb 11 [32] ff.) that in the long run, in spite of all the seeming weakness of the cause of God and of righteousness, yet, at the last resort, 'great is truth and prevails.'—ED.]

I. Daniel at the Babylonian Court.—Nebuchadrezzar chose out from the Jewish captives of royal birth certain youths for training as future members of his court, and made provision for their maintenance. Among them was Daniel, who determined not to eat the meat from the king because it was in the eyes of a Jew 'unclean.' He accordingly persuaded the steward to allow him and his companions to adopt a vegetarian diet upon which they throve exceedingly. Daniel and his three friends made extraordinary progress during their time of training, especially in magic arts, so much so that the king found them more useful to him than all the magicians in his kingdom.

This story serves to introduce Daniel and his three companions; it also sets forth a splendid example of one who would not break the Law in any respect. In the time of Antiochus Epiphanes attempts were made to persuade or compel the Jews to eat 'unclean' foods; by the pious such an act was held to be as culpable as the worshipping of idols (1 Mac 1 [62] f.).

1. the third year, etc. Nebuchadrezzar did not become king of Babylon until the *fourth* year of Jehoiakim (Jer 25 [1]); he was, however, in Palestine about this time, and *may* have besieged Jerusalem, but no record of such a siege exists, and Jeremiah knows nothing of it, since he places Nebuchadrezzar's victory at Carchemish—which was before his entry into Palestine—in the *fourth* year of Jehoiakim (Jer 46 [2]).

Nebuchadnezzar: the correct spelling is Nebuchadrezzar.

2. land of Shinar = Babylon. So also Gen 10 [10], 11 [2], 14 [1, 9]; Jos 7 [21]; Is 11 [11]; Zech 5 [11]. The name may be a corruption of Sumer, i.e. South Babylonia.

his god: Marduk or Merodach.

3. even of the seed royal: AV renders 'and of,' etc., implying that Babylonian youths were also set apart; this latter rendering is supported by [6] which requires non-Jews amongst them. Xenophon tells us that 'all the boys of the foremost Persians' were educated at the king's court (*Anab.*, I, ix, 3; *Cyr.*, VIII, i, 6).

4. Chaldeans: the name of a people living in South-East Babylonia. After the fall of the Babylonian Empire it came to have the meaning which it has here of 'magicians.' The language is that of their sacred books.

7. The new names were probably given in order to substitute the names of Babylonian deities for Jewish, though Bel in *Belteshazzar* is hardly the god of that name (Jer 50 [2]), since it was originally *Balāṭsu-usur* (=protect thou his life). Ach in *Shadrach* and *Meshach* is perhaps Aku, a moon-god. *Abed-nego* should be *Abed-Nebo* = the servant of Nebo. It is possible that there is an implied condemnation here of later Jews who took Greek names, e.g. Jason for Joshua.

8. defile himself: the word here used is late and poetic. The command to avoid 'unclean' food was taken very seriously by the Jews, and food was always a problem in foreign surroundings. Josephus tells us of certain Jews in Rome who lived on figs and nuts in order to avoid offence (*Vita Jos.*, 3).

11. steward: the word appears here only.

12. pulse: a general term for vegetable food in Hebrew.

19. stood they, etc. The appointment of Jews to fill posts of responsibility finds a parallel in Neh 1 [11b].

20. magicians and enchanters. The art of magic had many divisions, but the author of Daniel, although he uses no less than six distinct terms to describe those who practised it (see Driver, *C.B.*, 15), does not attempt to discriminate between them. To a pious Jew all such practices were a sin against God and unworthy of curious study.

21. first year, etc.: that is 538 B.C. In 10 [1] he is still alive in 536 B.C., which means that he spent some seventy years at the Babylonian court.

II. Nebuchadrezzar's Dream and its Interpretation.—This story and that of Joseph and Pharaoh in Gen 41 have many things in common, and it seems likely, especially when it is remembered that the actual wording is sometimes the same, that there has been borrowing. If, however, there are resemblances between the two narratives, the atmosphere and the teaching based on the narratives is very dissimilar, for in Daniel we have a strong and highly developed apocalyptic element which is much less marked in the earlier story.

1-12. The Troublesome Dream.—Nebuchadrezzar being much troubled over a dream which he could not recollect summoned his magicians before him, and commanded them to bring it back to his memory and to interpret it. In spite of the promise of lavish rewards they were unable to do so. They demanded, not unnaturally, that the dream should first be told them, then would they supply the interpretation. An angry dispute ended in the order for the magicians to be put to death. Haller quotes in this connexion a very apt Arabian proverb: 'He who cannot tell the dream cannot interpret it.'

1. the second year. If Daniel's period of training had taken three full years (1 [5, 18]), it can hardly be reconciled with his being made a ruler before that time as is inferred by [48].

4. in the Syrian language. Since we begin here a long Aramaic passage (to 7 [28]), it is possible that this statement was originally a marginal gloss (cf. Ezr 4 [7]).

5. dunghill: cf. the similar threat in Ezr 6 [11]. The power of a despot was unlimited.

6. great honour: cf. the similar promise to Balaam (Nu 22 [17]).

9. one law, i.e. one possible punishment.

13-23. Daniel Discovers the Dream and its Interpretation.—The decree condemning the wise men to death applied to Daniel and his companions. Daniel thereupon asked for time to be given him, and in response to his prayers and those of his companions he received a vision. Daniel bursts out into a short psalm of praise in which he dwells upon God as the source of all power and all wisdom.

14. Arioch: also in Gen 14 [1]. It probably represents the Babylonian Eri-Aku = servant of Aku (1 [7] *v.n.*).

captain, etc.: the same title as in Gen 37 [36], 39 [1], etc. = 'captain of the butchers.'

16. Evidently misplaced (cf. [25]).

18. the God of heaven: a title common in Ezra-Nehemiah.

20. Blessed be the name, etc.: cf. Ps 113 [2], 115 [18]. The Name = the revealed Nature of God, that whereby He is known.

21. times . . . seasons: cf. Ac 1 [7].

23. God of my fathers: cf. Dt 26 [7] 'God of *our* fathers'; Daniel is more individualistic.

24-35. Daniel Declares the Forgotten Dream.—Daniel, at his own request, appears before the king. After making it clear that his power of discovering the secret was given by the God who was wiser than all magicians, he describes to Nebuchadrezzar the mysterious dream which had been sent to him to tell him of things that were about to come to pass. The king saw in his dream a gigantic image in human form. Its head was of gold; the upper part of the trunk of silver, and the lower part of bronze; it had legs of iron ending in feet which were partly iron and partly clay. This image, of a bright and terrible aspect, was destroyed by a stone 'cut out without hands' which struck its feet and caused the collapse of its whole body. The image was smashed to atoms and blown away like chaff, but the stone 'became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth.'

25. in haste: cf. Gen 41 [14].

found a man: Daniel was evidently unknown to the king (cf. [16]).

27. For the powerlessness of the magicians cf. Is 47 [12] ff.

29. thy thoughts: these were perhaps waking thoughts which suggested the subject of the dream.

31. a great image: cf. 3 [1]. The peoples of the ancient East were fond of constructing such images: e.g. the Colossus of Rhodes (cf. Herod., i, 183).

32. brass was hardly known in the ancient world; render *bronze* or *copper*.

36-49. The Meaning of the Dream.—Daniel's interpretation of the dream begins with a fulsome eulogy of Nebuchadrezzar whom he likens to the golden head of the image. Two kingdoms are to follow the Babylonian (for which Nebuchadrezzar stands), and they are to be inferior to it. A fourth kingdom shall then arise, strong and ruthless as iron, but its two feet and their toes are made of iron mixed with clay, a source of grave weakness. In the days of this last kingdom God, by supernatural means, will raise up a fifth kingdom which will destroy all other powers and reign eternally.

The meaning of the various kingdoms is fairly obvious: the second or silver kingdom is that of the Medes, which Daniel distinguishes from that of the Persians under Cyrus, the latter being the bronze kingdom. To it succeeded the all-conquering Macedonian kingdom of Alexander the Great. The succession of these kingdoms covers several centuries. Babylon may be said to have risen to supreme power in 605 B.C., to be conquered by Cyrus in 538 B.C., whilst the Persian kingdom collapsed before Alexander the Great in 331 B.C. Alexander's kingdom, the Greek or Macedonian, continued in two branches (the two feet of the image), the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. The writer looks forward to the rise of a future kingdom which, in Messianic power, is to destroy the others. The above interpretation of the four empires, which goes back to Jewish tradition, is that held by most modern scholars. Another line of interpretation, much favoured by the Fathers of the Church as also by later Jewish writers, makes the Medo-Persian Empire one (this is certainly an improvement),* and makes the fourth empire to be that of the Romans.

37. king of kings: this title was first used by the Persian monarchs (see *Camb. Anct. Hist.*, iv, 185).

the God of heaven: Daniel emphasizes the divine origin of the Babylonian rule.

38. gold: various ancient authors have described a succession of ages which took their names from different metals (e.g. Hesiod in *Works and Days*).

39. The division of the Median from the Persian kingdom, though scarcely justified by history, is in keeping with the ideas of the author of Daniel (cf. 6 [29]).

inferior: Hesiod also makes the second age silver and much inferior.

40. the fourth kingdom is described in much fuller detail, since it had greater significance for the writer and his readers.

41. divided: the two branches, Syrian and Egyptian, into which Alexander's empire eventually developed.

46. The heathen king falls at the feet of the pious Jew, and honours Jehovah in the person of His spokesman. Bevan points out the parallel in the story in Josephus (*Ant.*, XI, viii, 5) in which Alexander prostrates himself before the High Priest.

48. Cf. the similar treatment of Joseph (Gen 41 [40] f.).

III. The Faith of the Three Children.—Nebuchadrezzar set up an image of gold in the plain of Dura and ordered his subjects to worship it. The three friends whom Daniel had had promoted (2 [49]) refused to obey from loyalty to Jehovah (Daniel himself does not come into the story at all), and the king ordered them to be cast into a 'burning fiery furnace,' a fate similar to that which had overtaken two false prophets, the contemporaries of Jeremiah (Jer 29 [22]). The three young men accept their fate with calmness and

* But see Introduction to 7.—A. G.

resolution, and the event justified their trust in the God of Israel. The fire harmed them not, and even their garments remained unsinged; and to encourage them in their trial a divine being joined himself to them. Thus the promise of Is 43 [2] was found to be true, and the persecuted Jews of the Maccabæan age were encouraged to stand firm against their oppressors.

1. image of gold: probably the statue had a wooden core (cf. Is 40 [19]). Antiochus Epiphanes erected a colossal image at Daphne which may have suggested this story.

threescore cubits: a cubit was about 1½ feet, the height of the image was therefore 90 feet.

the plain of Dura: this plain is unknown. *Dûru* as a place-name is common in the inscriptions. There is a stream some six miles from Babylon of this name, and near it are a number of remains, one of which might possibly have been the base of the image.

2 f. This list of officials is interesting and important philologically (see Bevan for detailed discussion).

5. This list of musical instruments has been the cause of much discussion; four out of the six bear names similar to Greek instruments, but our knowledge of their history is insufficient to date them.

sackbut: this is a misnomer, since the original was almost certainly a string, and not a wind, instrument.

dulcimer: perhaps a form of *bagpipe* (margin).

8. The Chaldeans (1 [4] *v.n.*) evidently had a grudge against the Jews, or regarded themselves as guardians of religious opinion.

18. But if not. 'In this clause . . . we hear the true heroic note. Scarcely in early literature is this note elsewhere so surely struck. . . . Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego neither despair nor protest. They put the case hypothetically, but their determination is absolute' (Abrahams, *Judaism*, 22: cf. Est 4 [16]; Job 13 [15]).

21. hosen . . . tunics . . . mantles: the exact meaning of these words is doubtful; clothes of some kind are meant.

23. After this verse LXX has the 'Song of the Three Children,' the 'Benedicite' of the Prayer Book.

25. a son of the gods: AV 'the Son of God' is misleading; any supernatural being such as an angel, is meant.*

27. changed, i.e. in colour (cf. 5 [9]).

IV. The Punishment of Pride.—Nebuchadrezzar is troubled by a further dream. He sees a magnificent tree growing up to heaven and giving protection and sustenance to all. Suddenly an angel descends from heaven and commands it to be cut down leaving only a stump; by a swift transition the tree is revealed as a human being, for its heart is to be changed from that of a man to a beast's. This dream is told to the magicians, but they cannot interpret it. Daniel, after some natural hesitation, courageously makes known the meaning of the vision. The tree is the king himself, and for his pride he will be afflicted with madness, and, imagining himself to be a beast, with the beasts he will have his portion. This forecast came true, and for seven years the great king ate grass like the oxen.

This story professes to be narrated by the king himself—except [29-33], where the author uses the third person—and even to be sent forth to all peoples (LXX, however, omits [1-3]). That it has any basis in the history of Nebuchadrezzar is not in the least probable; certainly his vacating his throne for seven years without any record of it having survived is practically impossible. It has been ingeniously suggested that the story arose from the tradition preserved in Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.*, ix, 41, that Nebuchadrezzar called down a curse upon Cyrus, who was revealed to him as the overthrower of his kingdom, wishing that he might be driven out amongst the beasts.

The object of the story is to show that God is able to abase the lofty, and that even the overweening pride of Antiochus Epiphanes, a pride which gained him the nickname Epimanes (mad), could be brought low.

6 f. We are not told why Daniel was not consulted at first. The failure of the other magicians makes his success more striking.

8. the name of my god: the writer imagines that Belteshazzar (1 [7] *v.n.*) is derived from Bel.

10. a tree: cf. Ezek 31 [3-14], where Assyria is likened to a cedar of Lebanon.

13. a watcher: a title common in Enoch and in the Syriac Fathers.

a holy one: cf. Zech 14 [5]; Ps 89 [7]; Job 15 [15].

16. seven times = seven years (cf. 7 [25]).

22. it is thou, O king: cf. 2 S 12 [7].

27. The doctrine here put forth that sin may be atoned for by good works is frequent in the apocryphal books (see Ecclus 3 [3, 14, 30]; Ps. Sol. 3 [9]).

* Montgomery (153 and 215), renders 'a divinity (lit. a son of Deity)' on the ground that the plural of majesty was used in Babylonian and Aramaic. Jerome protested against the indentification of this figure with Christ.—A. G.

30. I have built: Nebuchadrezzar was famous for the buildings which he erected.

33. The form of madness, lycanthropy, by which men imagine themselves to be beasts was known in early ages.

34. unto heaven: cf. Euripides, *Bacchæ*, 1265 ff., where Agaue on looking up to heaven finds her delirium passing away.

37. The moral is driven home.

V. **Belshazzar's Feast.**—Belshazzar, king of Babylon, made a great feast for his nobles, and during its course sent for the vessels from the Temple at Jerusalem which had been captured by Nebuchadnezzar his father. Suddenly a man's hand appears writing a message in unknown characters upon the wall. The magicians once again prove unable to meet the situation, and at the suggestion of the queen Daniel, now an aged man, is brought in. The message when interpreted tells the king of the speedy end of his own life and kingdom. This prophecy is fulfilled within a few hours: the king is slain and his throne seized by Darius 'the Mede.'

The lesson intended to be conveyed by this story is similar to that given in the previous one: a heathen king exalting himself and then meeting sudden punishment. So Antiochus Epiphanes might for the moment be highly exalted, but his end was destruction.

Various statements in this chapter cannot be reconciled with the historical facts as recorded in other authorities. No Belshazzar was king of Babylon so far as is known. Nabonidus (Nabuna'id), the last king, had a son of this name, but the evidence at present available is against his ever having reigned: Cyrus knew of no king but Nabonidus. Belshazzar is claimed as the 'son' of Nebuchadrezzar. This again is historically incorrect, for Nabonidus, the actual father of Belshazzar, was a native Babylonian, whilst Nebuchadrezzar was a Chaldean. Further, Darius the Mede is an entirely unknown person, and history allows no place for him. Cyrus was the immediate successor of Nabonidus, and no other supreme ruler is known.

1. a great feast: an unusual event, since as Bevan points out, 'in the ancient East kings usually feasted in an apartment by themselves or with a few persons only.' There was a tradition that Babylon fell during a great feast (Herod., i, 188; Xenophon, *Cyr.*, VII, v, 19), but probably the reference should be to the later capture by Darius Hystaspis.

2. vessels: from 2 K 25[15] ('in gold . . . in silver') it might be imagined that the vessels had been cut up or melted down; but cf. Ezr 1[7].

3. wives and concubines: at the Persian court women were not usually present (Est 1[9] ff.).

5. the part of the hand: better *the palm* of the hand, which was evidently above the king.

7. For the promised reward cf. Gen 41[42].

third ruler: this term in the original is obscure. Bevan suggests 'shall rule every third day.'

8. Cf. 2[10] ff., 4[7].

10. the queen: perhaps the queen-mother, an important office: see my note on Jer 13[18] (*West. Comm.*).

20-22. A précis of 4.

25 ff. The two records of the writing vary. In [25] *Mene* appears twice, and *Upharsin* instead of *Peres*. The last may be explained as the substitution of the singular for the plural together with the omission of the connecting particle U = *and*. The interpretation is also difficult, since a number of noun forms are given the force of verbs. It seems probable that the words are all of them weights, and the meaning a mina, a mina, a shekel, and half-minas. The interpretation in the text consists of a series of plays upon words.

30. was slain: Babylon submitted without resistance to the Persians, but no doubt isolated acts of violence took place (see *Camb. Anct. Hist.*, iv, 12).

31. Darius the Mede: an unknown figure, possibly by confusion with Gobryas or Ugbaru, the general of Cyrus who occupied the city and slew the king's son.

VI. **Daniel in the Den of Lions.**—Darius reorganized the kingdom and made Daniel one of its three presidents. The other princes conspire against Daniel, and by a trick have him thrown into a den of lions. From the rage of the lions he is protected by his God, and the king punishes his enemies by exposing them and their families to the fate which they had intended for Daniel. The account concludes with a decree of Darius exalting the God of Daniel. The story is intended to encourage the Jews to remain true to their God in spite of the threats of Antiochus.

1. Darius. The actual organization of the Persian Empire was carried through by Darius Hystaspis (522-485 B.C.), one of the greatest men of the ancient world.

satraps: Herodotus says there were only twenty (iii, 89). For a description of the satraps and the organization of the empire see *Camb. Anct. Hist.*, iv, 184 ff.

8. Medes and Persians: the order is

wrong; it should be Persians and Medes as in Est 1 [19].

10. toward Jerusalem: cf. Ps 5 [7].

three times a day: cf. Ps 55 [17].

18. instruments of music: the meaning of the original is not certain; the rendering here follows the Rabbinic commentators.

22. his angel: God here works through an agent.

24. those men: presumably all the rulers and officials of the empire!

25. Cf. the decrees of Nebuchadrezzar in 3 [29], 4 [1] ff.

28. the reign of Darius. The writer evidently thought of Darius as an independent king, reigning before Cyrus, and presumably for some length of time.

VII. **The Four Beasts.**—Daniel in a vision saw four beasts rise from the sea: the first, a lion with eagle's wings; the second, a bear; the third, a leopard with four wings and four heads; the fourth, an unknown beast of terrible aspect having ten horns. As Daniel gazed at the horns he saw another smaller horn rise among them and uproot three of the original ten. After that a great assize was held, and one like an old man passed judgement upon the beasts. The fourth beast was slain and his body burnt; the lives of the other three were spared, but their powers taken from them. Another figure like a man then comes into the vision, and to him was given an enduring dominion. At Daniel's request an attendant spirit explains the vision. The four beasts are four earthly monarchs or monarchies; they are to be dispossessed by the saints of the Most High. Daniel asks for further details concerning the fourth beast and his horns, especially about the little horn which was now warring successfully against the saints. He is told that the beast represents a world-wide empire from which the kings are to arise; a further king shall arise and destroy three of them. This king shall persecute the saints, but in the end destruction shall overtake him and the saints shall enjoy everlasting power.

Much ingenuity has been employed, and still is being employed, in finding a suitable interpretation for this vision. An explanation sufficiently satisfactory lies in the circumstances of the writer's own day, and therefore to go beyond it seems unnecessary. The four empires are those of 2, viz. the Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Macedonian. The ten horns are ten kings who grew out of the Macedonian Empire and are probably (1) Alexander the Great; (2) Seleucus I; (3) Antiochus I; (4) Antiochus II; (5) Seleucus II; (6) Seleucus III; (7) Antiochus III; (8) Seleucus IV; (9) Heliodorus; (10) Demetrius. The little horn is of course Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) who dispossessed the last three. For variations in the list see Bevan, 115 f. The human figure (one like a son of man) is not an individual, but, as the explanation clearly shows, the representative of the saints of the Most High, and parallel to the four beasts representing the heathen powers. In later times the title 'Son of man' was used no longer of Israel but of a personal being. We first find it so used in En 46 [2] ff. This 'Son of man' or 'Elect One' is there represented as a pre-existent being (48 [3] ff.), and is called 'the anointed one' (52 [4]), that is he is a substitute for the human-born son of David. He is to judge kings and rulers (62 [9] ff.), and to destroy sinners (69 [26] ff.). He is also in one place called 'the light of the Gentiles' (48 [4]) like Isaiah's 'Servant of Jehovah.' Thus some features of the New Testament conception of the 'Son of man' are foreshadowed in Enoch, which cannot be read back into Daniel.

1. Belshazzar: see introduction to 5.

Daniel had a dream. In 2 the dream comes to Nebuchadrezzar, and Daniel interprets.

2. the great sea: usually of the Mediterranean, here more probably the primeval ocean (Gen 1 [7]) or perhaps the nations of the earth (cf. Is 17 [12]).

4. lion . . . eagle. In 2 [32] the head of the image is of gold, the most precious metal; here the noblest of the animal creation represent the Babylonian Empire.

were plucked, etc.: a reference to the 'humanizing' of the empire. There seems to be an allusion to 4 [16, 34].

5. another beast: the Median Empire which the writer inserts between the Babylonian and the Persian.

raised up, etc., as if to strike.

three ribs: perhaps three conquered countries.

6. a leopard: the Persian Empire.

four wings: either because of its extent, reaching to the four quarters of the globe, or because of the swiftness of its approach (cf. Is 41 [3]).

four heads: the four Persian kings known to the writer: Cyrus, Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes.

7. a fourth beast. The unfavourable estimate of the Macedonian Empire held by the writer was due in part to its being the parent of Antiochus, but the harsh cruelty of Alexander in Syria had no doubt become a tradition.

9 ff. For the idea of a great assize of nations cf. Jl 3 [1] f.

9. **ancient of days** means simply an old man (cf. Gen 24 [1]).

white . . . wool: cf. Rev 1 [14].

wheels: so in Ezek 1 [15] ff.

10. **fiery stream.** The Persians believed that the power of evil was to be destroyed by a stream of molten metal.

12. **the rest of the beasts.** The nations were to survive after their power had been lost.

13. **a son of man.** The rendering of AV 'the Son of man' is inaccurate and misleading.

16. For this use of an interpreter cf. Zech 1 [9].

21. **made war**: the attack of Antiochus Epiphanes upon the Jews and their religion.

25. **the times and the law**: Antiochus attempted to abolish the set feasts.

a time, etc.: a time is held to mean a year. Here we probably get a reference to the three and a half years ($1+2+\frac{1}{2}$) of the persecution (168-165 B.C.).

VIII. **The Ram and the He-goat.**—A further vision comes to Daniel in which he sees a ram with two horns of unequal length. So strong and fierce was the ram that no beast could withstand him, until a he-goat with a horn like a unicorn suddenly attacked him and overcame him. After a time the single horn is broken and four others take its place, out of one of which a small horn arises, and growing in power advances south and east. The Temple of God is desecrated and the offerings abolished for 2,300 days. Daniel then hears a voice commanding Gabriel to explain the vision. Gabriel comes to Daniel, much to his terror, and tells him in plain language that the ram with two horns is the joint empire of the Medes and Persians, that the he-goat is the king of Greece, Alexander of Macedon being the first horn. The four horns are four kingdoms, and from one of them a king 'of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences' will come forth. For a time his power will prevail, but in the end he will be overcome.

1. **the third year**: Belshazzar is represented as reigning for some time.

2. **Shushan**: Susa the capital of the province of Susiana and one of the favourite residences of the Persian kings (cf. Neh 1 [1]; Est 1 [2, 5]).

Elam: a district north of the Persian Gulf. Strictly speaking Susa lay outside its boundaries (Ezr 4 [9]).

Ulai: according to some ancient writers Susa was situated on the Eulæus, which is probably the modern Kārūn.

3. **two horns**: one for the Medes; the other, later in time but greater in power, for the Persians.

4. The Persians also pushed eastwards, but their conquests in that direction did not affect the Jews.

5. **touched not the ground**: the Macedonians moved so rapidly that they seemed to fly.

notable horn: Alexander according to [21].

8. **four notable horns**: the four kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was divided: (*a*) Egypt; (*b*) Syria and Babylon; (*c*) Asia Minor; (*d*) Greece and Macedonia.

9. **a little horn**: Antiochus Epiphanes as in 7 [24] ff.

the glorious land: Palestine.

10. **the host of heaven**: symbolizing the Jews and their religion.

11. **the prince**: Jehovah of Hosts.

12. The text is here corrupt. Measures of some kind were taken in order to suppress the daily sacrifice; the clue to their exact nature has been lost.

14. **two thousand and three hundred**: this means 1,150 days, which was considerably more than the three and a half years of 7 [25], 9 [27] and the 1,290 days of 12 [11] f. The actual time during which the daily sacrifice was suppressed was three years and ten days (the 15th of Chisleu, 168 B.C., to the 25th of the same month in 165).

17. **the end.** Every period of crisis seems to those who live in it to be the consummation of the ages.

25. **broken without hand**: that is supernaturally (cf. 2 [34]).

26. **shut thou up the vision**: keep it secret for the time to come (cf. Is 8 [16] f.).

IX. **Daniel's Prayer and its Answer.**—In the first year of Darius the Mede Daniel from a study of the Scriptures concludes that the seventy years of the desolations of Jerusalem foretold by Jeremiah should now be ended. In his perplexity over the non-fulfilment of the prophecy he turns to Jehovah in prayer and confession. His prayer is heard and Gabriel comes, by divine command, to reveal to him the real meaning of the prophecy. The seventy years is not to be taken literally; it is actually meant to represent seventy weeks of years (i.e. 490 years) divided up into three unequal periods. The first period lasts seven weeks, and runs from the prophecy of restoration to the coming of the anointed prince; the second period of sixty-two weeks is that during which the restoration is duly carried out: it ends with the cutting-off of the anointed one

and the coming of a time of desolation; the last period covers seven weeks, during half of which the sacrificial system will be suppressed.

This passage has inspired a large number of writers to put forward an almost equally numerous series of interpretations. No single view has met with sufficient support to enable it to claim the title traditional; St. Jerome tells us that even in his day no interpretation met with general approval, and amongst the Rabbis there was equal uncertainty. In order to approach the subject of the meaning of Gabriel's explanation three statements can be made: (*a*) The explanation was given to relieve Daniel's mind over the apparent non-fulfilment of prophecies of Jeremiah; (*b*) the explanation was concerned, not with unknown ages of the future or world-history, but with the actual times of the writer and with the Temple and holy city: (*c*) the threefold division of the period must not be ignored. Each of these three principles rules out any application of the prophecy to our blessed Lord, and the many and various attempts of Christian fathers to force the details so as to fit into their schemes are merely examples of perverted ingenuity.

The 490 years then begins from the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. If exact chronology is insisted upon it ended in 96 B.C. (But exact chronology was the last thing which we can expect from a writer like Daniel, whose ideas of history are extremely inaccurate. Even an historian like Josephus puts the reign of Cyrus nearly fifty years too soon, and Demetrius, as Bevan points out, made the fall of Samaria happen in 795 instead of 722 B.C. Exact chronology is a modern requisite, and the Jews never even had any system of annual reckoning of their own. The seventy years of Jeremiah were supposed by the Chronicler to have ended with Cyrus in 538, though it must be confessed that Zech 1 [12], ignoring any supposed return at that date, still regards Jerusalem as lying desolate for seventy years in 520 B.C.) Most modern scholars regard the end of the period as being the death of Antiochus in 164 B.C., which leaves sixty-eight years unaccounted for.

The first period of seven weeks, which ended with the coming of an anointed one, represents the years of the Exile up to the restoration of the priesthood in the person of Jeshua the High Priest (this is better than to take Cyrus as the anointed one). At the end of sixty-two weeks 'the anointed one' is cut off. The anointed one is again the priesthood, now represented by Onias III, whom Antiochus deposed. He was murdered in 171. The time during which the priesthood flourished was, however, in fact considerably less than the 434 years which Dan 9 demands. The final period of seven years is divided up into two equal portions: the half of it during which the sacrifices are made to cease must be the three and a half years of Antiochus's tyranny already referred to in 7 [25]; the second half of the week, 'even unto the consummation,' is left undescribed. The details of the interpretation defy accurate explanation, and no system really meets all the facts: this is due in part no doubt to our ignorance, but still more to the very vague chronology which marked the original writer.*

1. Darius: see on 5.

Ahasuerus: this name is probably borrowed from the Persian king of that name in order to give a father to the imaginary Darius.

Jeremiah: the references are Jer 25 [11] f., 29 [10].

4-19. Charles regards Daniel's prayer as an interpolation. It consists largely of borrowed phrases (cf. especially Neh 1 [5] ff., 9 [6] ff.), and its point of view is that of one living in Palestine ([7] and [16]).

11. the law of Moses: this is referred to only in Mal 4 [4] amongst the prophetic books, though Moses himself is mentioned in Is 63 [11] f.; Jer 15 [1]; Mic 6 [4].

21. to fly: the original is corrupt and probably contains no reference to flying. The idea that angels possess wings is a late one, which seems to have passed into the Church from the winged figures of the pagan world. But the seraphs of Is 6 and the cherubs of Ezek 1 have wings. So also the living creatures of Rev 4, and there is one reference in Rev 14 [6] to a 'flying' angel.

24. the most holy: this may refer to the Temple or altar; it is never used of a person (Bevan).

25. the anointed one: this may be Cyrus (Is 45 [1]) or, as Bevan thinks, Jeshua the son of Jozadak (Ezr 3 [2]). The identification of 'the anointed one' with the High Priest is certainly easier in view of the next verse.

26. shall be cut off: the High Priest Onias III was deposed by Antiochus in 175 B.C.

27. a covenant: perhaps a reference to agreements with apostate Jews.

* For an illuminating discussion of the chronology and the interpretations proffered from the earliest times to the present day see *I.C.C.*, 390. Professor Montgomery's book was published after this commentary was written.—A. G.

X.-XII. **The Final Vision.**—These three chapters form the most detailed of all the visions in Daniel. In the prologue (10 [1]-11 [1]) Daniel describes the visit of a heavenly messenger sent in answer to his prayers. The guardian angel of the Persian Empire had tried to bar his way, but Michael himself had intervened on his behalf. Then there follows the vision itself (11 [2]-12 [4]), which consists of a detailed survey of history from the supposed date of the vision in the third year of Cyrus down to the Maccabæan age in which actually the writer was living. The vision, and the book, concludes with a short interpretation (12 [5-13]).

The vision seems to belong to the period shortly before the death of Antiochus. The reasons for this date are (*a*) the inaccuracy of the final statements concerning his career: e.g. his supposed conquest of Egypt (11 [40] ff.) and his death in Palestine (11 [45]), and (*b*) the absence of any reference to the beginning of Jewish victories under Judas Maccabæus.

X. **1. the third year of Cyrus:** 535 B.C., since Jewish writers always date the beginning of the reign of Cyrus from his capture of Babylon. Daniel must now have been very aged, which may account for his remaining in Babylon instead of returning to Jerusalem.

4. Hiddekel is the Tigris (Gen 2 [14]), which is not usually called *the great river* this designation being reserved for the Euphrates (Gen 15 [18]).

5. For the description cf. Ezek 9 [2] and Rev 1 [13].

Uphaz is perhaps Ophir: see my note on Jer 10 [9] (*West. Comm.*).

6. beryl: better perhaps a *topaz* (Ezek 1 [16]).

7. the men saw not: cf. Ac 9 [7].

13. the prince, etc.: the guardian angel of the Persian people. In later times churches (Rev 2 [1], etc.) and even individuals (Mt 18 [10]) had guardian angels.

Michael was the guardian angel of Israel (12 [1]).

20. of Greece: the Persian Empire was succeeded by the Macedonian.

XI. **1. the first year of Darius.** This statement seems meaningless, and the text is obscure. Robertson Smith thought it was a heading which had gone astray. LXX reads 'Cyrus.'

2. the fourth. The writer may have depended for his history upon the Old Testament, in which only four kings of Persia, i.e. Cyrus, Darius, Xerxes (Ahasuerus), and Artaxerxes are mentioned. Actually Cambyses came between Cyrus and Darius. The description certainly fits Xerxes, whom the author may have put after Artaxerxes.

3. a mighty king: Alexander the Great, who rose to power some 150 years after Xerxes.

4. shall be broken: see on 8 [8].

5. the south: Ptolemy I of Egypt.

one of his princes: Seleucus I of Syria, who had served under Ptolemy.

shall be strong above him: the house of Seleucus gradually drove back the Ptolemies.

6. Ptolemy II (285-247) gave his daughter Berenice to Antiochus II, who divorced Laodice in order to marry her. But on the death of Ptolemy II Laodice recovered her position, and Berenice was put aside. Laodice, however, poisoned her husband and had Berenice put to death near Antioch.

7 f. Berenice's brother, Ptolemy III, overran Syria in revenge; he captured Seleucia and returned with much spoil.

9. Seleucus II unsuccessfully invaded Egypt in 240 B.C.

10. The sons of Seleucus II were Seleucus III and Antiochus III, surnamed the Great. It was really the latter only who attacked Egypt.

12. shall not prevail: Ptolemy IV defeated Antiochus at Raphia and forced him to retreat, but failed to take advantage of his victory.

13. Antiochus again attacked Egypt when Ptolemy V, a child, had succeeded his father.

14. many: internal revolts in Egypt and the help of Philip of Macedon.

children of the violent: perhaps Jews who helped Antiochus (cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, III, iii, 3 f.).

15. well fenced city: Sidon, in which the remnant of the Egyptian army took refuge after their defeat at Mount Panium.

16. the glorious land: 8 [9] *v.n.*

17. and upright ones with him: read *but he shall make an agreement with him.* The Romans protected Ptolemy and forced Antiochus to treat with him.

the daughter of women: Cleopatra, the daughter of Antiochus, who married Ptolemy.

18. Antiochus made an expedition into Asia Minor only to be defeated by the Roman general (**prince**), Lucius Cornelius Scipio, near Magnesia in 190 B.C.

19. fall: Antiochus attempted to plunder the temple of Bel at Elymais, and was in consequence killed by the people.

20. Seleucus IV reigned for twelve years (187-175 B.C.), and was then murdered by Heliodorus, possibly with the knowledge of Antiochus Epiphanes.

21. a contemptible person: Antiochus Epiphanes was a younger son and not the natural successor.

22. prince of the covenant: Onias III (9 [26] *v.n.*).

24. the fattest places: the meaning is unknown; possibly the text is corrupt.

25. Antiochus defeated Ptolemy VI at Pelusium in 170 B.C.

26. they that eat: Ptolemy was under the influence of certain courtiers who were disloyal to him.

27. After the defeat of Ptolemy VI he came under the 'protection' of Antiochus. Meanwhile his younger brother Physcon had been declared king at Alexandria.

28. the holy covenant: the Jewish religion and people. During the Egyptian campaign there had been serious disorders in Jerusalem, which Antiochus punished with a heavy hand.

29. not . . . as . . . the former: Antiochus's expedition in 168 was disastrous, as he was ordered out of Egypt by the Roman general, Caius Popilius Lænas.

30. ships of Kittim: cf. Nu 24 [24]. Here the reference is not to Kittim in Cyprus but to the Roman expedition. For the extended reference of Kittim cf. 1 Mac 1 [1], 8 [5]; Josephus, *Ant.*, I, vi, 1.

31. Jerusalem was plundered by the Syrians after their failure in Egypt, and a determined effort made to stamp out the Jewish religion.

profane the sanctuary: the Temple was rededicated to the Olympian Zeus, if 2 Mac 6 [2] is trustworthy.

the abomination: cf. Mt 24 [15]; Mk 13 [14]. The reference is to the heathen altar set up by Antiochus in the Temple (1 Mac 1 [54]).

32. do wickedly: many Jews apostatized.

shall be strong: cf. 1 Mac 1 [62].

36. above every god: his later coins describe him as 'God made manifest.'

37. gods of his fathers: Antiochus adopted Greek divinities.

the desire of women: probably the Babylonian god Tammuz (Adonis), who had been worshipped by Syrian women from very early times (cf. Ezek 8 [14]).

38. the god of fortresses: probably Jupiter Capitolinus, to whom Antiochus began to build a temple at Antioch (Livy, xli, 20).

40. Hitherto the vision has agreed with the history; from this point it no longer does so. The obvious inference is that the writer is now dealing with the future and not the past. The successful campaign here foretold never took place.

41. Edom, and Moab, and . . . Ammon: Moab had long ago disappeared. Edom and Ammon were still peoples (1 Mac 4 [61], 5 [3] ff.).

43. the treasures: at the end of his reign Antiochus 'was reduced to great financial distress,' and would have been only too glad to seize such treasures.

45. the glorious holy mountain: this must be Zion, for no Hebrew would allow the term to be used of a foreign sanctuary.

his end: the context suggests that Antiochus would speedily end his life, and that in Palestine. In reality he lived on for four more years and died at Tabæ in Persia.

XII. **1. at that time:** on the overthrow of Antiochus.

the book: cf. Ex 32 [32]; Ps 69 [28]; Rev 3 [5].

2. This is the first passage in which the doctrine of a resurrection of both good and evil is put forth. In earlier passages the only notion of a resurrection was in connexion with the revival of the nation (Hos 6 [2]; Ezek 37 [12] f.); later the idea was extended to include individual Israelites (Is 26 [19]). Here a further extension has taken place, though not all are to rise, and possibly none but Israelites.

4. seal the book: cf. 8 [26].

5. other two: doubtless angels.

to the man: the angel of 10 [5] f.

7. sware: the necessity for having two witnesses to an oath probably explains the presence of the two additional angels.

a time, etc.: see 7 [25].

9. A final explanation is refused.

10. Cf. 11 [35].

11. Cf. 11 [31]. The number of days is roughly that in three and a half years. In 8 [14] the number is only 1,150.

12. After the restoration of pure worship a further period of forty-five days is to elapse. No clue exists to the reason for this.

HOSEA

By L. Elliott Binns

The Book of Hosea is one of the most intimate of all the Old Testament documents. Its intimacy arises from the character of the prophet himself, a man of a deeply loving heart, a man who longed for the sympathy and understanding of his fellows. Furthermore he was one who felt, in a way which his predecessor Amos for example had not felt, the sins and shortcomings of his people. To these two factors predominantly the depth and intensity of the book are due.

The book itself comes very largely from Hosea, not perhaps directly, that is by his own composition, but by being based on oracles which he uttered. It also owes not a little to those, most likely his disciples, who heard him speak and knew the manner of his life. The text has not been well preserved, as can be recognized by the frequent need for emendation, and it seems probable that not a few interpolations, and even whole passages, from a later time have found their way into the original composition. As examples of interpolation may be cited 1^{7}, 8^{14}, 11^{12} (the references to Judah; the majority of these suspected cases of interpolation seem to have come from editors of Judæan sympathies). Longer passages are 10^{11} f., and possibly the whole of 14, though this is by no means certain (see notes below). The arrangement of the oracles, and indeed of the matter as a whole, is a little difficult to follow; no doubt short sayings have been grouped together in ignorance of their original context.

The book falls naturally into two main divisions: 1-3, which deal with the prophet's unhappy married life and the lesson he learnt from it; 4-14, which deal with more general themes. Such is the division which is accepted by most scholars. T. H. Robinson, however, has suggested that the dividing line should come before 3, so that each of the divisions will then begin with an account of the prophet's marriage (see *Prophecy and Prophets*, 75).

The style of the oracular portions of the book is highly poetic. The passionate nature of the prophet found expression in words which must have burnt themselves deep into the hearts of his hearers, whilst his intense subjectivity gave a force of lyric beauty to his utterances. Tenderness, and almost waywardness, mark them, as well as the use of a strong imagination (this can be seen in the wide and varied use of metaphors), and the whole is transfused by the prophet's vivid and unique personality. Hosea, then, was a poet of lyrical power: but in addition he had the eye of the writer of epic for the significant events of history. 'So numerous are his references,' says G. A. Smith, 'that from them alone we could almost rebuild the early history.'

Concerning Hosea the man we have some small fund of information, all of it derived from the book. He was the son of Beeri and a native of the northern kingdom it would seem (7^{5}, $10^{3f.}$). His activity as a prophet began in the reign of Jeroboam II, probably about 750 B.C., and continued for some years after that monarch's death in 743 B.C. Since Hosea apparently knows nothing of the alliance between Syria and Israel against Ahaz in 735 (in spite of Sellin's commendation I cannot accept Alt's theory that 5^{8}-6^{3} refers to it), or of the fall of Samaria in 722, we may conclude then that by 735 he had ceased to prophesy; or, if not, any subsequent oracles have been lost. According to the heading of the canonical book his prophetic career extended into the reign of Hezekiah. As this heading is almost certainly a later addition of a Judæan editor little value need be attached to it. Of Hosea's life we have some few details in 1 and 3. If the record of 1 and 2 is taken literally, we must believe that he married Gomer, a woman notorious for her immoral life (she was possibly a sacred prostitute) in the hope of reforming her. The experiment, however, proved unsuccessful: in spite of the care and affection of her husband Gomer fell back into her former habits. As I have explained below (1^{2-9}), I think it possible, even probable, that Hosea read his early experience in the light of what happened afterwards, and that we are not compelled to believe that at the time of the marriage Gomer was already a harlot. From his experience of the ingratitude and proneness to sin of his loved but erring wife Hosea learned something of the patience and long-suffering of Jehovah.

The times in which Hosea lived were 'out of joint.' Assyria, after a long period of quiet, was once more pushing into the west. During the last years of

Jeroboam the effect of this was not felt, but on his death a succession of petty kings quickly followed one another on the swaying throne of Samaria. The threat of Assyria seemed to make men desperate, and at one moment agreement and tribute were used to keep them off, at another plotting with Egypt. Such a policy was to Hosea a denial of the power of Israel's God (8 9 ff., 5 13 f.), and he came to regard the whole institution of the monarchy as little short of an act of apostasy (8 4). Internally also the country was in a desperate state: the old sanctions seemed no longer to have any force, law and order were fast disappearing in chaos and anarchy. Hosea says much less than Amos about social evils, not because he cared less, or because these evils had grown less in the lapse of a generation, but rather because the whole situation had become so much worse (4 1-4). Both politically and morally the nation was hurrying into disaster, and the religious leaders were apparently heading the procession (4 6 ff., 6 9, 12 11).

The message of Hosea for the time of desperate deeds and despairing counsels in which he found himself was based, as the message of every true servant of God must be based, upon the conception of God's character which had been revealed to him. To Amos Jehovah was primarily the God of Justice, to the more gentle Hosea he was the God of Love. His love had been shown from the very earliest days of Israel as a nation, when He had taught them to walk (11 1 ff.), when He had brought them into His own land (9 3), a land which they were defiling (9 15). Hosea's outlook was thus definitely historical: God was no mere abstraction, but One who worked in history and whose activities were revealed in the life of mankind, and especially in that of Israel. His relation to Israel was no mere voluntary alliance, but a union which could not be broken without the most utter disloyalty. As Buttenwieser says: 'For Hosea the relation between God and Israel is in the nature of an indissoluble ethical union, based not on any mere legal contract, which becomes invalid as soon as one party violates the covenant, but based, like the marriage bond, as he conceived it, on love and moral obligation' (*The Prophets of Israel*, 241). Hence, though Israel may be punished by Jehovah, His punishments are not intended to destroy the nation but to purify it. Their doom is certain because Jehovah cannot spare them; their offences have been too manifest; but beyond their doom lies a great hope, the hope of restoration when they shall have learnt the lesson which He is teaching them. This doctrine of the restoration of Israel after the discipline of suffering is manifest in the parable of Hosea and his wife, and, as Sellin points out, 'runs like a red thread through the whole book.' Hence passages of hope like the closing chapter are not to be rejected for this reason alone.

Hosea thus managed to combine a doctrine of God as love with a high ethical standard because his loving God would punish sin. Sin to him was not merely a breach of the law, but an offence against love. Israel had been unfaithful; she had seen in the Baalim her benefactors and gone after them, as the unfaithful wife went after her lovers. Her very worship of Jehovah, mixed up as it doubtless was with Canaanite customs, was a half-heathen system (4 10 f.), and the sacrifices were themselves of no consequence to Him (8 11 f.). In following after the cultus, the calf and the idols, the true knowledge of God had been passed by. Jehovah could not allow Himself to be found by them (5 6).

Bibliography

Cheyne (*Camb. Bib.*); Harper (*I.C.C.*); G. A. Smith (*Expos. Bib.*); Nowack, Marti, Duhm, Sellin, Van Hoonacker. [I cannot help thinking that we have still much to learn from Dr. Pusey's *Minor Prophets*. Granted that his critical positions cannot be maintained, his spiritual insight and his linguistic insight remain. Thus in his Introduction to Hosea his account of the moral conditions presupposed in the book, of the love of Hosea for his wife, and of Hosea's style are memorable passages which ought not to be allowed to pass out of memory.—C. G.]

I.-III. In these chapters we have an account of the prophet's unhappy married life and the lesson to be learned from it. As the text stands at present there seems to be a duplication of the narrative, for 1 1-9 and 3 can hardly refer to two separate but similar experiences. It should be noted that 1 1-9 is written in the third person, whilst 3 is in the first. In 2 2-23 the unfaithfulness of the prophet's wife is shown to be on a small scale a picture of Israel's unfaithfulness to Jehovah. See further p. 424*a*.

I. 1. **Superscription.**—As in the case of the Psalms the titles of the Prophetic Books are editorial and not infrequently

late. In this instance the introduction of a series of kings of Judah suggests a post-exilic date; moreover, the reigns of Uzziah-Hezekiah covered the period from 789 to 692 B.C., whilst Jeroboam's reign lasted from 782 to 743 B.C. only.

2-9. Hosea's Unhappy Marriage.—The story of Hosea and Gomer, forming as it does a parable of Jehovah and Israel, has been taken by scholars in a variety of ways. Some regard it as purely imaginary; some regard Gomer's fall from the ways of virtue as subsequent to her marriage; some again, giving force to 'wife of whoredom' (2), think that she was a harlot when Hosea was commanded to marry her. The first of these lines of interpretation has been given up by most recent scholars; the other two find, each of them, learned advocates. To the present writer the second seems the true explanation; he feels that Hosea, like many of the other prophets, read back later events into the past. This interpretation fits the facts of the parable, for Israel was faithful in her early days (2^{14} f., 11^{1}: cf. Jer 2^{2}).

2. The beginning of the verse is abrupt, and probably it originally formed part of the superscription which may have read: 'In the days of Jeroboam . . . the Lord spake,' etc

3. Gomer the daughter of Diblaim. The mention of the name makes it practically certain that the prophet's story was no allegory.

4. the blood of Jezreel. Hosea takes a very different view of the massacre of Ahab's sons from that of the writer of 2 K 10^{30}. It is important to notice that then, as in all ages, religious opinion was divided over the righteousness of specific events.

5. the valley of Jezreel: the place of the massacre and also the scene of many of Israel's battles.

6. Lo-ruhamah means 'unpitied.'

7 is to be rejected as the insertion of a later writer with Judæan sympathies.

9. Lo-ammi means 'not my people.'

10-II. 1. A Promise of Restoration.—This promise reads like an insertion and must come from a later time: it is a deliberate and apparently an unconditional reversion of the threats of the previous section.

The people are to increase and to be named 'sons of the living God.' Both Judah and Israel (note the order) are to assemble together under a single elected ruler, and to go forth to a great triumph at Jezreel. The passage suggests the post-exilic period (cf. Jer 3^{18}; Ezek 37^{21} ff.).

10. the living God: possibly the first recorded use of the term.

11. Judah . . . Israel: the division of the kingdom will be healed.

one head: probably of David's line (cf. Ezek 37^{24}).

from the land: the best sense is from the land of exile (cf. Ezr 2^{1}, 7^{6}; Neh 12^{1}).

Jezreel means 'God scatters,' but here with the sense of scattering 'seed,' i.e. 'sowing.'

II. 2-13. The Unfaithfulness of Israel and its Sequel.—Israel has been like an unfaithful wife to Jehovah, and her children (i.e. the men of Israel) are not His children. She has considered all the gifts which He has lavished upon her to be due to the bounty of her lovers, the Baalim. In order that she may learn the real source of her prosperity, the gifts are to be withdrawn and her whole life made sorrowful. By means of this severe discipline Israel will recognize the true state of affairs and return to her husband.

This and the passage following are best taken together: they presuppose 3 as well as 1^{2-9}.

2. Plead with your mother. The people individually are besought to plead with the nation. Plead is of course used with the legal sense and almost means 'strive.'

3. strip her: a punishment for adultery (Ezek 16^{39}).

5. my lovers, etc.: the local Baalim from whom the Israelites, following the beliefs of Canaan, thought the products of the soil had come.

8. silver and gold: these hardly came from the country's natural resources direct, since there were no mines in Palestine.

10. her lovers: the existence of the Baalim is taken for granted.

11 should probably follow ^{12}.

12. vines . . . fig trees: types of prosperity (1 K 4^{25}; Jl 1^{7}, 2^{22}; Zech 3^{10}).

14-23. Israel's Restoration.—Israel will be drawn out into the wilderness once more, and there as in the days of the Exodus she will respond to the love of Jehovah. The very names of the Baalim will be forgotten. A time of universal peace, in which the brute creation will be included, will then commence. The union of Jehovah and Israel will also mean a time of abundant prosperity, and the various ill-omened appellations which had been used of Israel will be reversed.

14. wilderness here probably means exile.

15. valley of Achor: cf. Jos 7^{26}. In that passage *trouble* was Israel's lot; in

the second entry (from Exile), it will be the beginning of new hope.

16. Ishi means *my husband*, which is also the meaning of *Baali*. The latter was to be abolished because of its connexion with the Baalim. Jehovah was once called Baal (2 S 2 [8] *v.n.*).

22. Jezreel: 1 [11] *v.n.*

23. have mercy . . . my people: reversals of 1 [6] and 1 [9].

III. **The Secluded Harlot.**—This section is closely connected with what has gone before, and may indeed be a parallel account of the prophet's experience. In form the section is probably a poem of three strophes with [5] as a later addition.

Hosea is commanded to love a woman who is an adulteress (cf., however, 1 [2-9] and p. 424*a*, *b*) whom he buys like a slave. Having redeemed her from a life of sin, the prophet places her in seclusion for 'many days.' So God will deal with Israel: His love is constant, in spite of the nation's 'adultery' in going after other gods. He will redeem her and then by a period of 'seclusion' seek to purify her.

1. a woman. The point of the story is lost unless this be Gomer. [On the position of this chapter see p. 424*a*.—Ed.]

cakes of raisins: such cakes were used in various festivals (cf. Is 16 [7] and Jer 7 [18] with my note in *West. Comm.*).

2. bought her. Gomer had evidently become the slave-concubine of her lover probably after Hosea's repudiation of her.

3. so will I also, etc. Gomer is not to play the harlot, nor to marry, and, final climax, her own husband will have no intercourse with her.

4. Israel is to undergo a similar discipline. Probably the Exile is here foretold.

pillar: evidently a valued adjunct of worship according to the prophet. The later law regarded them as dangerous (Dt 12 [3], 16 [22], etc.): Gen 28 [18] *v.n.*

ephod or teraphim: Jg 8 [27] *v.n.* and p. 210*b*.

IV.-XIV. This second part of the book consists of a number of oracles delivered by Hosea on different occasions. They appear to be arranged, in part at any rate, according to subject-matter rather than by chronological sequence. In 4-8 the sin of the nation is condemned, and in 9-11 [11] its consequent punishment is declared. In 11 [12]-13 the contents are not so clearly to be distinguished. The book ends on a note of hope (14).

IV. **The Corruption of an Ungodly Nation.**—The Lord has a dispute with His people, for they have forgotten justice and pity and the knowledge of God. Because of this the whole nation is corrupt, and even those whose office it was to be guides to higher things are themselves the leaders in wickedness. God cannot overlook such a rejection of Himself, but will in His turn reject the guilty nation. In [12-14] the idolatry and immorality which have led the people astray are described.

1. controversy: cf. Mic 6 [2]; Jer 2 [9].

2. swearing and breaking faith: the two are to be taken together, i.e. *perjury*.

killing, etc.: notice the order; the sixth, eighth, and seventh commandments.

blood toucheth blood: one murder leads to another.

3. Both men and animals are afflicted with famine and drought.

4. people . . . priest: this clause should be rendered *the people are like their priests*, or possibly *my controversy is with thee, O priest*.

5. the prophet. The corruption of the prophets was no uncommon thing (cf. 1 K 22 [6] f.; Jer 5 [31], etc.).

thy mother: perhaps the nation, or less probably the prophetic order.

7. I will change. Read with Syriac and Targum *they changed*.

8. sin. The priests encouraged the people in wrong ideas of Jehovah in order to preserve their own gainful offices (cf. 8 [11]; Am 4 [4]). To render *sin* as *sin offering* is hardly permissible as the parallel is *iniquity*.

9. like people, like priest: cf. Machiavelli's statement: 'We Italians are more irreligious and corrupt than others . . . because the Church and her representatives set us the worst example.'

12. stock . . . staff: some form of tree oracle is referred to such as survived long in Israel (cf. Gen 12 [6] [*Moreh* = augur]; Jg 9 [37] [*Meonenim* = soothsayers]; and perhaps 2 S 5 [24]).

13 f. whoredom . . . adultery: evidently religious prostitution.

15-19. The text of these verses is corrupt.

15. Judah. The warning to Judah reads like an insertion.

Gilgal: one of the great sanctuaries of the northern kingdom, and infamous for its religious practices (9 [14]; Am 4 [4], 5 [5]).

Beth-aven, i.e. House of Delusion, a satirical name for Beth-el (cf. Am 4 [4], 5 [5]).

17. Israel is so bent on idols that it is to be left to its fate.

19. Cf. Is 57 [13]. The reference here is perhaps to the Exile.

V. **1-7. Priests, People, and Court are Condemned.**—Israel has been snared and entrapped by her leaders, both priests and rulers, who have been unfaithful to their God. But God is not deceived, and

when they turn to Him He will not accept their offerings.

1. **Hear . . . hearken . . . give ear:** growing definiteness.

the judgement, i.e. *condemnation* as in Jer 1 [16], 4 [12], etc., not the office of a judge.

Mizpah: in Gilead (Jg 10 [17], 11 [11]).

Tabor: in the north. St. Jerome says that birds were still snared there in his day.

2. **And . . . slaughter:** read *and the pit of Shittim have they made deep.* Shittim was the place where the Israelites were enticed into false worship by seductive means (Nu 25 [1] ff.).

5. **pride,** etc.: cf. 7 [10].

6. **not find him:** God's patience comes at last to an end.

7. **strange children:** probably a reference to the growing generation which was copying the sins of its parents.

new moon = the coming month.

8-15. **The Rottenness of Ephraim.**—This passage reads like a collection of detached oracles whose connexion is found in their dealing with the same subject—the corruption and consequent punishment of Israel. Marti changes Judah to Israel in each case, and so avoids awkwardnesses which may, however, be original.

8. **behind thee, O Benjamin.** The meaning is uncertain: perhaps we should read with margin 'After thee,' etc., and regard the expression as the tribal war-cry (cf. Jg 5 [14]).

10. **landmark:** cf. Dt 19 [14]. Not perhaps here a reference to the particular offence, but 'a proverbial phrase for the lowest wickedness' (Harper). Land-grabbing was, however, common in Judah (Is 5 [8]; Mic 2 [2]).

11. **the command:** this can hardly be right. Read with margin *vanity*, i.e. idols.

12. **moth . . . rottenness:** internal corruption working in silence and unnoticed.

13. **king Jareb.** G. A. Smith renders 'Pick-quarrel,' a nickname for some king of Assyria.

15 gives more hope than [6] above.

VI. 1-3. **Israel's Repentance.**—Israel recognizes that her punishment is from the Lord, and determines to return to Him for healing. In but a short time He will give new life to the nation. His ways are sure and His refreshing powers abundantly effective. Some critics regard this passage as late, but nothing in the style or contents prevents its being attributed to Hosea. It is generally regarded as being a fitful turning to God on the part of a superficial people blind to the seriousness of their offences and ignorant of the nature of the God whom they had provoked. Welch has the ingenious suggestion that the passage came from a Temple-psalm, and that Hosea uses it as a text for the condemnation which follows.

1. **return:** after having found recourse to Assyria a failure.

2. **two days . . . third day:** a short interval. The Fathers naturally saw in it a foretelling of our Lord's Resurrection and ours in Him (see Pusey *ad loc.*).

3. **his going forth,** etc. Some render 'when we seek him, then shall we find him.'

4-VII. 2. **The Hopeless State of Ephraim.**—God is moved to despair over the fickleness of both Ephraim and Judah; their penitence is but 'skin-deep' and their 'charity' soon fails. Hence it is that they have suffered. God desires upright conduct and not sacrifices. Everywhere is crime and deceit, violence and immorality. God's efforts to heal His people only serve to reveal further the desperateness of their state.

VI. 4. **Judah.** Marti here reads 'Israel.'

goodness: better *charity* in the Christian sense.

5. **the prophets.** There is a negative and destructive side to their work (cf. Jer 1 [10], 5 [14]; 1 K 19 [17], etc.).

6. **mercy . . . sacrifice;** cf. Is 1 [11] ff.; Mic 6 [6] ff.; and Jer 7 [22] f. (with my note in *West. Comm.*).

7. **like Adam:** perhaps 'like men' (Harper), or possibly a place-name 'in Adam' (Jos 3 [16]) or 'in Admah' (11 [8]).

8. **Gilead** is perhaps referred to in Jg 10 [17].

Shechem is the well-known sanctuary.

11. **Also . . . thee:** perhaps a later addition by a Judæan prophet.

VII. 3-16. **Wickedness and its Consequences.**—This passage is difficult to understand in its details; the text is corrupt, and various fragments seem to have been combined together. The main contents are, however, clear, and we see once again a people full of wickedness and immorality going on to destruction with the active help of its natural leaders and guides. The foolish policy of seeking salvation by means of foreign aid instead of domestic amendment had drawn the strength out of the nation; ruin and destruction awaited it and the scorn of its Egyptian allies.

3. A slight emendation gives the better reading: *They anoint kings in their wickedness, and princes in their faithlessness.* Kings succeed one another by acts of violence and treachery (cf. 8 [4]).

7. devour their judges: the last kings of Israel had short and tragic reigns.

8. mixeth himself: perhaps a reference to the incoming of foreign customs.

cake not turned: Ephraim with his mixed religion is like a 'half-baked scone' (G. A. Smith).

11. Egypt . . . Assyria. There is no need to search out specific events, the whole national policy is condemned.

VIII. **Usurping Kings and Futile Idols.**—War is coming, swift and inevitable, because the nation trusts in godless kings and man-made idols. The people are already, by anticipation, dispersed among the nations, a fitting end to the policy of seeking foreign aid. The multiplying of altars and the offering up of sacrifices avails nothing with the God whom the nation has in fact repudiated.

1. the trumpet: amidst the confusion one clear note breaks forth—'the trumpet summoning to war' (G. A. S.).

an eagle: generally held to be Assyria on account of its swiftness (Is 5 [26]).

4. knew: the word has the deeper sense of *acknowledged* as in Ps 51 [3].

5. The first condemnation of the northern bulls (cf. 1 K 12 [28] ff.), a condemnation which may include all idol-worship.

6. the workman: cf. Is 44 [11] ff., etc.

9. wild ass: cf. Jer 2 [24], which may have been suggested by this figure.

10. they shall . . . princes. Following LXX some scholars emend so as to read 'They shall cease for a while from anointing kings and princes.'

11. Omit 'to sin' in the first half.

altars . . . sin: 'The more altars, the greater and deeper is Israel's guilt' (Harper).

12-14 are very obscure and the text uncertain.

14. fire . . . devour: cf. Am 1 [4], etc.

IX. **1-9. The Horrors of Exile.**—This passage suggests a violent contrast: on the one hand the wild, unrestrained rejoicings of those who take part in agricultural feasts, on the other the depression and sadness of exiles eating their necessary bread in an unclean land. Their anguish is increased by the knowledge that their own fields and vineyards, once the scene of their merriment, are now given up to thorns and thistles. God's patience will at last come to an end and the cup of the iniquities of Israel overflow. If the prophet and seer are mad they have become so because of the sin of their people. But punishment is about to overtake the ungodly.

1. hire. Israel regarded the fruits of the earth as given to her by the Baalim in return for her worship (cf. 2 [14]).

2. feed: by a slight emendation *know* should be read.

her: read 'them.'

3. Egypt . . . Assyria. The destination of the exiles is vague; the fact of exile, however, is certain.

unclean food: sacrifices could not be offered in a 'strange' land; the food therefore was unblessed.

4. mourners: not probably because of sorrow (though cf. Jer 16 [7]), but of uncleanness (Nu 19 [14]).

6. from destruction. Wellhausen suggests by a slight change 'to Assyria.'

Memphis: on the Nile, south of where Cairo now is. It had vast cemeteries.

7. the prophet is a fool: perhaps a gibe by the people.

8. It is difficult to get any meaning from the text.

9. Gibeah: perhaps taken from 10 [9] where it fits in better.

he will . . . sins: so 8 [13].

10-17. The Unfulfilled Promise of Ephraim.—At the beginning of the nation's life God's favour was upon them, but soon they gave themselves up to impure worship. Henceforth none shall be born to Ephraim, or if they are born it will be but for the sword. Because of their doings at Gilgal the Lord will drive them from His land. Ephraim is doomed to barrenness. The nation, since it is deaf to God's voice, will become wanderers among the Gentiles.

10. grapes, etc. An unexpected find.

firstripe: such figs were a delicacy (Mic 7 [1]; Jer 24 [2-5]).

Baal-peor: see Nu 25.

shameful thing (*Bōsheth*): a substitute for Baal (2 [16] *v.n.*).

13. like . . . place. Render, omitting two words and following LXX, *for a prey are their sons marked out.*

14. This interjection is a demand for stern dealing with Ephraim; it can hardly be an appeal to God to prevent the birth of those born only for slaughter.

15. Gilgal: 4 [15] *v.n.*

16. Wellhausen would place between [11] and [12].

no fruit: Ephraim = 'fruitful.' For the reversal of the meaning of a name cf. 2 [23].

X. **1-9. The Snare of Prosperity.**—With growing prosperity has gone an increased attention to the cult of the Baalim, but God will destroy the multiplied altars. The kings will be impotent, and the bull of Bethel will go into captivity. The king is slain in Samaria, and

on the site of her ruined altars thorns and thistles will come up.

1. vine: the symbol of a vine or vineyard was often used for Israel.

2. divided: that is between Baal and Jehovah.

3. no king: this may refer, as some think, to the Exile when actually no king was reigning, or it may be used in despair over the feeble power of one of the last Israelite monarchs.

4. They speak . . . covenants. Render *speak words*, etc., perhaps an answer to the question in [3].

covenants is used, not of religious, but of political, agreements.

5. Beth-aven, i.e. Bethel: 4 [15] *v.n.*

rejoiced: read by a slight emendation *shall writhe.*

6. shall be carried. It was no uncommon thing for the gods of a defeated nation to be carried away.

Jareb: 5 [13] *v.n.*

7. foam: better with margin 'chip.'

8. they shall say . . . us: cf. Lk 23 [30]; Rev 6 [16].

9-15. The Harvest of Sin.—Israel has sinned from the days of Gibeah onward. Jehovah is about to collect the nations against them. Ephraim is a heifer desiring only the light and pleasant task of treading out the corn, but she must learn to draw, and plough, and harrow. Hitherto Israel has sowed wickedness and lies (but there is still time to break up the fallow ground and to sow a better seed). The crop of the evil sowing is, however, about to be reaped—spoiling and tumult and destruction.

9. the days of Gibeah: this can hardly be a reference to Jg 19. Wellhausen thinks it means the beginnings of the monarchy (cf. 13 [11] f.), because Saul came from Gibeah.

10. two transgressions: perhaps the bulls of Bethel and Dan (Marti).

11. heifer: in 4 [16] Israel is a stubborn heifer.

Judah is out of place, and *Israel* should be substituted.

12 stands alone in the present context in promising time for repentance.

fallow ground: cf. Jer 4 [3] where it is perhaps a quotation.

13. way: read *chariots* with LXX.

14. Shalman . . . Beth-arbel: incident unknown: Shalman is probably Shalmaneser IV.

15. at daybreak: a slight change gives the reading 'like the dawn,' i.e. 'suddenly.'

XI. 1-11. God's Love for Israel.—God's choice of Israel was a romance to which Hosea seems ever to be looking back (2 [14] f.), no doubt with the thought in his mind of his own broken hopes. Israel was a child when God chose him, and like a father he trained him with affectionate care. But all was in vain; Israel turned from Him. The result must be exile and slaughter since the people are given up to idols. Once again, however, as their doom draws near, the prophet in God's name declares His yearning love. How can He give up Ephraim? Surely they will respond to His tender call. The exiles will come back from Egypt and from Assyria.

1. my son. For the idea that Israel was called out of Egypt as God's son cf. Ex 4 [22]. The text, however, is difficult, and Harper renders simply 'him.' In Mt 2 [15] the phrase is applied to our Lord.

2. As . . . from them. Render *The more I called them, the more they went from me* (cf. LXX).

3. to go. T. H. Robinson says: 'There are few more beautiful or appealing pictures in literature than that of the father teaching his child to walk.'

4. drew them . . . love: this phrase is a beautiful forecast of the revelation of One who would constrain in love.

jaws is rather awkward in connexion with 'yoke.'

5. Egypt . . . Assyria: cf. 9 [3] for the double place of Exile. The 'not' should be omitted as out of place: a slight emendation makes this possible.

8. Admah . . . Zeboim: cities of the plain destroyed with Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 14 [2, 8]; Dt 29 [23]). Amos and Isaiah make use of the latter pair in their warnings (Am 4 [11]; Is 1 [7] ff., 13 [19]).

9. I will not, etc. This should probably be taken as a question: 'Shall I not,' etc.

God, and not man: God cannot be moved from His just purpose, the vindication of His holiness.

10 f. look forward to a time when the people already in exile are assured of return.

11-XII. 14 (Heb 12 [1-15]). **The Consistent Falsity of Ephraim.**—This section, whilst its general teaching is clear, seems to contain later additions which present real difficulties: such are the references to Judah (note the contrast 11 [13] and 12 [2]), and the citation of episodes from the history of Jacob in [36-5] and [12] f. which interrupt the argument. These latter may of course be original, since the mind of an Oriental is less logical in its working than that of a Western scholar.

Jehovah cannot get away from the deceit of Israel [though Judah is far

different]. Israel is not only a deceiver, but one who relies upon things that deceive, such as agreements with Assyria and the promises of Egypt. Jehovah will punish [both Judah and] Israel. Jacob was from the beginning a supplanter [though later he had power with God whom he found at Bethel, a God who is still to be approached]. He is a trader who delights in his ill-gotten gains. Jehovah will again make him a nomad instead of a trader. The disaster which is coming has long been foretold. The shrines of Gilead and Gilgal will be overthrown. [Jacob once fled to Syria and then found a wife; and by a prophet he was led out of Egypt.] Upon Ephraim will the Lord execute judgement.

XI. **12. but Judah**, etc. In view of 12 [2] this must be either a gloss by a pious Judæan or should be read as a condemnation. This can be done by rendering the rare Hebrew word for 'rule' as 'be wayward' (as in the cognate Arabic),* and taking 'Holy One' (plural in Hebrew) in the sense which it sometimes bears, 'sacred prostitutes' (*qĕdēshim*).

XII. **1. oil . . . Egypt**: a bribe to gain support.

2. Judah should possibly be read as 'Israel' (cf. 4 [15], etc.).

3-6. This whole passage has a certain unity, but it hardly suits the context. It teaches that God may still be approached as of old. Welch has made the ingenious suggestion that it was part of a hymn sung at Bethel and quoted by Hosea.

3. References to Gen 25 [24] ff., 32 [24] ff.

4. Beth-el: Gen 35 [9] ff.

7. trafficker: lit. *Canaan*. Canaanite had become equivalent for 'merchant.' It is here a term of reproach, 'bagman.'

8. Cf. the Laodiceans (Rev 3 [17]).

9. Cf. 13 [4].

11. Gilead (6 [8]) . . . **Gilgal** (9 [15]) are famous sanctuaries. The text is here corrupt, and should perhaps be rendered 'In Gilead they have done iniquity; in Gilgal offered sacrifice to demons.'

12. Gen 29 [1-30].

13. a prophet: Moses (Dt 34 [10] f.).

XIII. (Heb 13 [1]-14 [1]). **The Coming Destruction.**—The greatness of Israel has been wasted upon idols. The last remnants of national power are about to disappear. The ingratitude of Israel is all the more remarkable since it was God who had led them up from Egypt and cared for them through the wilderness wanderings. God is about to turn against them like a wild animal and destroy them. Israel alone is responsible for his ruin, and his rulers cannot save him. The sin of Ephraim is stored up and he will not escape the coming judgement. Will God even now rescue him? He cannot, since Samaria is persistently untrue and rebellious. The horrors of the coming invasion will blight the land as an east wind blights an orchard.

1. When . . . trembling. This rendering of an obscure phrase, though it is not entirely satisfactory, is the best that is available. For the mark of respect to a speaker cf. Job 29 [8] ff.

exalted himself: better *was prince*.

2. understanding: better, following the versions, *pattern*.

kiss the calves: cf. 1 K 19 [18]; Job 31 [27].

3. cloud . . . dew: cf. 6 [4].

chaff: a common figure (Is 17 [13], 41 [15] f., etc.) and an obvious one, since all had seen the chaff blown away from the threshing-floor.

4. Egypt. It is important to notice the many early references to the sojourn in Egypt (cf. 2 [15], 9 [3]; Am 2 [10], 3 [1], 9 [7]; Mic 6 [4]; Is 10 [26], etc.).

5. know. Read by a slight emendation *shepherd* (LXX).

8. a bear, etc.: cf. 2 S 17 [8]; Lam 3 [10].

11. The frequent and tragic successions upon the throne of the northern kingdom were to a pragmatic people a sign of the divine disapproval.

12. in store. Either Ephraim treasures his sin, or perhaps better the sin is kept in store in order to be produced as evidence against him.

14. I will ransom. A promise is here out of place; render as an indignant question.

O death . . . O grave, etc.: quoted in 1 Cor 15 [55]; there in triumph over death, here more probably as an appeal to produce its tortures.

15. an east wind: that is the invading Assyrians (cf. Is 21 [1]).

16. children . . . women: cf. 10 [14]; 2 K 15 [16]; Am 1 [13].

XIV. **A Promise of Forgiveness.**—Many scholars consider that this epilogue is the product of a time later than that of Hosea. The suggestion of Buttenwieser, however, that it is addressed 'to a future Israel, the Israel that will have survived the downfall,' meets most of the arguments against its genuineness. In style and language it seems (with the exception of the last verse) to come from the prophet himself.

Israel is entreated to learn from its bitter fate the folly of separation from

* Or, better, 'be restless.' The LXX read these words quite differently.—A. G.

God, and is urged to return. There follows a promise from Israel of trust in Jehovah, and in reply an assurance of the divine forgiveness and of the divine willingness to restore the nation. In a number of beautiful illustrations, taken from the world of nature, Ephraim is promised his old 'fruitfulness.' He in his turn will recognize the true source of his prosperity in Jehovah, and will forsake his idols. A final addition urges the study of the teaching of the prophecy.

1. **hast fallen**: the ruin of Israel is presupposed.

2. **words**: not the old 'lip-worship,' but genuine penitence.

3. **horses**: Israel will no longer trust in the cavalry of Egypt (cf. 1^{7}; Is 30^{16}, 31^{1}).

5. **the dew**: a figure which would never lose its force in a hot country. Contrast the use in 6^{4}, 13^{3}.

as the lily: cf. Ecclus 39^{14}.

6. **olive tree**: used of Israel in Jer 11^{16}, and by St. Paul in Rom 11^{17} ff.

his smell: cf. Cant 4^{11}.

7. **They . . . return.** Render *Again will they dwell under his shadow.*

8. The speaker is not quite certain; probably it is Jehovah Himself.

9. For recommendations similar to this we must look to the Wisdom literature (cf. especially Pr 11^{5}, 15^{19}, and Ecclus 39^{24}).

JOEL

By S. L. Brown

Apart from his name ('Jehovah is God') and that of his father, we know nothing of Joel except what we can gather from his book. From his frequent references to Zion, Jerusalem, and Judah, and from his familiarity with the Temple and its ministers, we may infer with confidence that his home was in Judah. Some would go further and assert that he was a priest in Jerusalem. The superscription gives no information as to the period during which he lived, but, in the opinion of almost all modern scholars, the general background is sufficiently clear. The Northern Kingdom is never mentioned. Judah is a self-contained community, so compact that every man, woman, and child can attend an assembly at the Temple. There is no mention of a king: the rulers are elders and priests, and it is the priests who are prominent. The Temple with its daily services is central both in the life of the community and in the mind of the prophet. All this points to a post-exilic date, as do the reference to the Exile as a painful memory of the past (3^{2}), the twenty quotations from twelve earlier books of the Old Testament (see Reference Bibles), the mention of the Greeks as slave-traders (3^{6}), the prophet's attitude to the nations, and the development of Ezekiel's apocalyptic and eschatology. It is generally felt that the book should be assigned to the first half of the 4th century B.C., after the reforms of Nehemiah and Ezra. For the arguments in favour of an earlier date, the reader is referred to the article 'Joel' in *H.D.B.*

The immediate occasion of the prophecy was a plague of locusts which threatened to destroy all vegetation and render impossible the maintenance of the daily sacrifice. Joel's description of the locust army is true to fact: it agrees in detail with the testimony of travellers, ancient and modern, and rarely, if at all, does he indulge in hyperbole in this connexion. He sees in this calamity an indication that the Day of Jehovah is at hand, and that is the theme which dominates the book. It will be a day of judgement for the nations, of salvation for Israel.

Joel's attitude towards the nations compares unfavourably with that of Jonah and of some of the earlier prophets: there is nothing but destruction in store for the enemies of Jehovah; but this is probably due to the limitations of apocalyptic. We are indebted to him for immortal language about the outpouring of the Spirit, even though we may not be able to go so far as to say that he is the prophet of Pentecost, and for the sacramental view which he takes of the rain and the harvest. It has been said of him that 'we should call him to-day a churchman' (*I.C.C.*). If by a churchman is meant one who believes in united prayer and fasting, in public worship and the value of ceremonial as an aid to devotion, Joel was assuredly one, and, like all good churchmen, he laid stress on repentance, which must be from the heart: all men need it, and all are summoned to confess their sins, priests and people alike.

It is assumed here that the book is a unity, but it is only fair to say that

many modern critics would deprive Joel of all references to the Day of Jehovah, and assign them to an interpolator who was interested in apocalyptic; and that the reference to Phœnicia and Philistia (3 4-8) has been connected with the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus, some fifty years later. Thus all that Bewer (*I.C.C.*) would leave of the original Joel is 1 1-14. 16-20, 2 1α, 3-5, 7-9, 12-26α, 28-31α, 3 2α, 9-14α. His arguments are interesting, as also is his rearrangement of the original 'Joel,' but he seems to introduce a needless complication into a book which is perfectly intelligible when read as a whole, obscure though some of its allusions may be.

Bibliography

Driver (*C.B.*); Bewer (*I.C.C.*); G. A. Smith (*Exp. B.*).

I. 2-II. 17. A Plague of Locusts Announces the Approach of the Day of Jehovah: a Call to Repentance.

I. 2-4. The Unprecedented Character of the Plague.—Not even the oldest men can remember having seen, or having heard their fathers speak of, such a plague. The people are, therefore, exhorted to hand the story down in all its details to their children and their children's children, that it may never be forgotten.

4. Translate: *That which the shearer has left, the swarmer has eaten; and that which the swarmer has left, the lapper has eaten; and that which the lapper has left, the finisher has eaten.* Hebrew is rich in synonyms for locust. Here four are mentioned, the names suggesting various aspects of the locusts' destructive power and the completeness with which they did their work. What escaped the ravages of one swarm was devoured by the next, till all the herbage of the land was destroyed.

5-12. Effect of the Plague on Various Classes.—The extent of the devastation is graphically illustrated by a description of the distress which it brings (*a*) to the wine-bibbers, who can no longer drink their 'sweet wine' (5-7); (*b*) to the priests, who can no longer offer the daily sacrifices (8-10); and (*c*) to the husbandmen and vineyard-keepers, whose harvests have been destroyed (11-12).

5-7. The drunkards are aroused from the sleep of intoxication to bewail the ruin of the vintage. The locust is described as an invading nation, strong and without number (cf. 2 4 ff.; Jer 46 23; Pr 30 25 ff.). Its weapons are powerful teeth with a saw-like edge, comparable for destructiveness with those of a lion (cf. Rev 9 8). Speaking in the name of his people, Joel says: 'He has made my vines a waste and my fig-trees splinters: he has stripped them bare and cast away (the shreds), and (because the bark has gone) their branches shew white.'

8-10. The land is told to mourn like a virgin, bereft of her betrothed. For it is indeed bereaved, communication with Jehovah having been cut off through the cessation of the daily sacrifice. As there is no corn, new wine or fresh oil, the materials for the daily meal-offering and libation (Ex 29 38-42; Lev 2; Nu 28 3-8) are not available. So the priests mourn, and with them (by a beautiful personification; cf. Am 1 2; Ps 65 13) the land itself and its fruits. 'Blasted is the field, in mourning the ground; blasted is the corn, abashed the new wine, the fresh oil pines away.'

11-12. Husbandmen and vineyard-keepers are bidden to 'be abashed' and to 'wail,' i.e. to show outward signs of their grief over the loss of their harvests. For dried up (of the vine) and withered (with reference to joy) substitute in translation *abashed*, G. A. Smith's happy rendering of the oft-recurring word *hōbhīshā*. 'Joy is abashed (and gone away) from the sons of men.'

13-20. A Call to Repentance.—Joel summons the priests to do penance themselves, and to proclaim a day of national fasting and humiliation; for he sees in this visitation a sign of the approaching day of Jehovah, which will come 'as a devastation from the Devastating One.' The passage concludes with a further description of the country's dreadful plight: a drought has followed the locusts, so there is no food (not 'meat' as RV) to be offered in the Temple, garners and barns have gone out of use and are dilapidated, the cattle and sheep are perishing with hunger, the wild beasts from thirst.

14. If old men is not a gloss here, render 'O Elders'; the word 'and' is not in the Hebrew.

15. There is assonance between destruction (*shōdh*) and the Almighty (*Shaddai*).

17. The words rendered the seeds shrivel under their clods (RVm) yield no satisfactory sense. It is best to take them (with Bewer) as a corrupt variant of the next clause.

18. LXX (omitting one letter) reads: 'What can we put in them?' instead of the Hebrew, 'How the beasts groan!' and connects with the previous verse.

19. The prophet appeals to Jehovah on behalf of man and beast. There is no need to change 'I' to 'they.' The word translated 'wilderness' is not a barren desert, but uncultivated land, a prairie or steppe, to which sheep and cattle are driven for pasture. fire and flame refer to the conflagrations which result from drought (Am 7^4).

20. Translate: *The beasts of the field look up longingly unto thee.*

II. 1-11. The Day of Jehovah is at Hand.—The alarm-horn is to be sounded from the Temple hill to warn the people of the approaching Day. An enormous army of locusts, such as has never been seen, has already settled on the mountains. The destructive march has begun. Wherever it goes, it leaves the country as bare as if it had been swept by fire. The locusts are like horses, both in appearance and in the speed of their advance. The noise they make as they march is likened to that of chariots; and the noise they make when they feed, to the crackling of a prairie-fire. Their advance is well-ordered and irresistible, and they take possession of cities and houses ($^{1-9}$). Joel writes as a poet who sees in the locusts signs of the Day of Jehovah, and up to this point his descriptions are true to the facts. Their blackness as they appear in clouds, darkening the whole sky (Ex 10^{1-20}); their brightness as of the dawn when the rays of the sun catch their wings; the comparison between their depredations and the destruction wrought by a fire; their likeness to horses (Rev 9^7); the remarkable noises which they make when flying and feeding (Rev 9^9); the steadiness and regularity with which they advance, and the practical impossibility of stopping them—travellers testify to the accuracy of Joel's description. Not until $^{10-11}$ does he introduce apocalyptic elements: earthquakes, eclipses, and thunderstorms. For these cf. 2^{31}; Am 8^9; Is $13^{10, 13}$; Ezek 32^7 f.

2. as the dawn, etc., should be read with what follows, not with the preceding words.

3. Render *and nothing escapes them.*

4. Not horsemen but *war-horses.*

6. The text is doubtful. Translate: *Before them the peoples are in anguish: all faces gather redness.* The reference may be to the glow of excitement aroused by the approach of the locusts. Some would read 'hearts' instead of peoples.

7. A vivid description of the march of a locust-army. They move in straight lines, not crossing each other's tracks. Read in last clause (changing one letter): *they entangle not their paths* (cf. Pr 30^{27}).

11. For camp render *host.*

12-17. Repentance may Avert the Judgement.—Even at this late hour calamity may be averted, if the people turn to Jehovah with the entire force of their moral purpose. Joel bids them not only show the outward signs of repentance, but also the inward disposition; for Jehovah's character is such (Ex 34^6; Jon 4^2) that He may even now change His purpose (Jon 3^9), turn back from the path of judgement, and, as He turns, leave a blessing behind in the shape of a harvest which will restore meal-offerings and libations to the sanctuary. So the horn is sounded once more, not now as a warning of the judgement, but as a summons to a religious gathering. Everyone must come to the Temple. No one is so old or so young as to be exempt; even the newly married (Dt 24^5) must leave their nuptial tent. The priests, as representing the people, are to appeal to Jehovah for mercy, lest Israel should become a byword among the nations.

17. The priests were to weep between the porch (at the east end of the Temple) and the altar of burnt offering, with their faces to the sanctuary. Compare the position of the Litany-desk at the entrance to the chancel in an English church. Translate: *that the nations should make proverbs of them.* RVm suits the context better than RV. Bewer suggests—and it is an attractive suggestion—that the imperatives in $^{15-17}$ should be read as perfects. This would not involve any change in the consonants. It would have the effect of turning a reiterated appeal to hold a solemn service of penitence into a record of the holding of that service. We have in any case to assume that the people obeyed the prophet's exhortation before the prophecy which begins at ^{18}. It would make the transition less abrupt if the new paragraph could begin at ^{15}, and as narrative ('they blew,' etc. . . . 'the priests were weeping and said,' etc.), not exhortation.

18 to end. Jehovah's Answer to His People's Prayer.

18. The call to repentance was obeyed, and Jehovah heard the prayers of His people. A series of promises follows in answer to the nation's cry ($^{19-32}$).

19-20. Removal of the Plague.—Jehovah's people will no longer be deprived by the locusts of the fruits of the earth, nor will the heathen have occasion to reproach them; for the locusts will be

driven into the desert south of Judah, and then into the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. 'A wind rising first in the north-west, and afterwards gradually veering round to north east, would produce approximately the effects indicated' (Driver). It seems clear from the context that 'the northerner' refers to the army of locusts. They usually enter the country from the south or south-east, but there is no reason why this swarm should not have been blown from the north or north-east. It may be, however, that Joel was writing under the influence of passages like Jer 1 [14]; Ezek 38 [6, 15], 39 [2], in which Israel's foe comes from the north. Omit **and his stink shall come up** as a gloss explaining the rare word 'foulness' (RV: 'ill savour'). Render *that his foulness may come up.* The reference is to the putrefying carcases on the sea-shore. **he hath done great things**, usually applied to God (as in [21]), is here applied poetically to the locusts as His instruments. Perhaps it should be omitted as an accidental repetition from [21].

21-27. Renewed Fertility and Prosperity.—In jubilant strain Joel bids the ground, the beasts of the field, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem rejoice over the restoration of fertility ([21-23]); the renewal of prosperity will bring with it a renewal of the sense of Jehovah's presence in the midst of His people ([24-27]). Note the contrast with 1.

21. hath done is probably a 'prophetic past' describing what Jehovah is going to do. So also the verbs in [22-23].

22. wilderness = steppe, as in 1 [19].

23. in just measure = either 'in normal quantities' or 'according to righteousness,' i.e. as Jehovah's righteousness will determine. The second **former rain** is redundant; omit. **the rain** = the winter rain. **in the first month** is clearly wrong; either translate 'first of all' (in contrast to 'afterwards' in 2 [28]), or read with LXX and Syriac, 'as aforetime.' This verse supports the suggestion that the plague was accompanied by a drought. Some would follow LXX in reading 'food' instead of the first 'former rain,' and translate 'food as (a token of) your justification'; but the context supports the Hebrew.

25. years suggests that the plague extended over more than one year; or the reference may be to its effects. For the names of the locusts, see 1 [4]. Render *abashed* for **ashamed** in [26-27]. 'Rain and harvest are not merely physical benefits, but religious sacraments: signs that God has returned to His people' (G. A. Smith). If we remember this, we shall understand the connexion between this paragraph and the next.

28-29. Spiritual Gifts.—When the hearts of His people have been prepared by the restoration of material prosperity, Jehovah promises to add spiritual blessings. He will pour out His Spirit upon all flesh, without distinction of age, sex, or social standing. It is best (with Driver) to understand prophecy as insight into Divine truth, and dream and vision as two special modes of consciousness in which such truth presents itself. **all flesh** refers as a rule either to all living things or to all mankind, but here (notwithstanding *Cent. B.*) it must be limited to Israel alone, since the other nations are to be destroyed. It would seem also that St. Peter used the passage in this sense on the Day of Pentecost (Ac 2 [17]): for surprise is expressed when later the Spirit is poured out upon Gentiles (Ac 10 [45]). This exclusion of the nations is in painful contrast with the universalism of Jonah or of Is 2 [2-4], 19 [18-25], 42 [6]; Zech 14; Mal 1 [11], but it is possible that without this narrowness Israel might not have survived to influence posterity. If Joel's vision had not been limited by the thought of the coming convulsion, he might have seen that 'a nation of prophets is meant for the world' (G. A. Smith).

30-32. The Day of Jehovah.—After the outpouring of the Spirit, apocalyptic portents of the approaching judgement will appear: on earth, blood and fire and columns of smoke—the ravages of war; in heaven, eclipses and blood-red moons—which always inspired fear in ancient times. (As wars are not suggested by the context, Driver interprets **blood and fire** as abnormal atmospherical phenomena, and **pillars of smoke** as columns of sand and dust raised by local whirlwinds.) But terrible though the Day of Jehovah will be, those who are His true worshippers ('whosoever invokes Jehovah's name') will be secure. The words of [30] have 'a universal ring' (Bewer) and lend themselves to quotation in a wider sense (Rom 10 [13]), but here they refer only to loyal Jews of Judah and the Dispersion. Translate: *and among the fugitives those whom Jehovah calls.*

The next chapter explains how the faithful will be delivered, viz. by Jehovah's judgement on the heathen.

III. 1-3. Gathering of the Nations for Judgement.—When Jehovah 'restores the fortunes' of Judah and Jerusalem, He will assemble all the nations in the Vale of Jehoshaphat (='Jah judges'), and there

'contend in judgement' (play on words) with them, because they have dispersed His people amongst the heathen, and sold them into slavery, dividing His land (among new occupants).

2. The Vale of Jehoshaphat, called in [14] 'the Vale of Decision,' if an actual and not an ideal spot is referred to, must have been near Jerusalem. Christian, Moslem, and Jewish tradition identifies it with the valley of the Kidron, where it is the ambition of pious Jews and Moslems to be buried in order that they may be ready for the Day of Judgement.

3. Captives were so numerous that they were sold, as we should say, 'for a mere song.'

4-8. Phœnicia and Philistia.—The Phœnicians and Philistines are specially mentioned for judgement; for they have both enriched their palaces (not 'temples') with silver, gold, and valuables from plunder taken from Judah, and sold the children of Judah as captives to the Greeks. The punishment will fit the crime; they have sold the children of Judah to a nation in the far north-west; Jehovah will sell their children to a nation in the far south-east, i.e. to the men of Sheba, a rich commercial community in South-West Arabia (Jer 6 [20]).

4. A rhetorical question, meaning, 'Were you trying to repay some deed of mine, or were you intending to make an unprovoked attack on me?' RVm is preferable.

9-14. Jehovah's Challenge to Battle.—The nations are summoned by Jehovah's heralds to prepare themselves for war, and to march into the vale where the battle will be fought. Arriving there, they will meet their doom: they will be cut down like ripe corn, crushed like grapes in the wine-press.

10. A reversal of Is 2 [4] (=Mic 4 [3]). Render *lances* instead of spears. 'Let the weakling say, I am a mighty man,' i.e. a warrior.

11. thither cause, etc. If this is original, and not a gloss, it is a prayer to Jehovah that He will send His heavenly warriors down to meet the heathen armies. LXX suggests the emendation, 'let the coward become a hero.' In that case 'thither' goes with 'gather yourselves together.'

12. Another play on the name Jehoshaphat. In [2] Jehovah 'contends in judgement' (*nishpat*): here He 'judges' (*shāphat*).

14. The repetition suggests in the original Hebrew both numbers and noise.

15-21. Jehovah's Day will Bring Security for Judah, and Supernatural Fertility for the Land.—Darkness descends on the scene of battle, and in a mighty storm Jehovah comes in judgement. No details are given, but we are to understand that the nations are destroyed. We are told, however, that Israel is safe, and that never again will Jerusalem be defiled with the presence of strangers. The book concludes with a promise of rich fruitfulness in the ideal future which the Day inaugurates. Mountains and hills will be covered with vineyards and pastures, and the 'channels' of Judah will never again become dry. Egypt, Israel's oppressor, and Edom, bitterest of her foes, will become barren wastes, but Judah will remain inhabited (lit. 'sit') for ever, and Jehovah will be dwelling in Zion.

18. If the valley of Shittim (or Wady of the Acacias) is an actual place, it may perhaps refer to the lower valley of the Kidron. In any case, the point of the reference is that acacias grow in dry soil, and that henceforth this dry and unfruitful valley will be watered by a perennial stream issuing from the Temple (Ezek 47 [1-12]; Zech 14 [8]).

21. RVm is preferable. By making Egypt and Edom a desolation, Jehovah will declare to the world that His murdered people had suffered innocently. LXX suggests the reading, 'I will avenge their blood, (which) I have not (yet) avenged.' It is possible that both [19b] and [21a] are glosses. If [21a] is eliminated, render the last clause: 'and Jehovah (shall be) dwelling in Zion'; if it is retained, render: 'as surely as Jehovah (is) dwelling in Zion.'

AMOS

By E. C. Ratcliff

Introduction

The Prophet.—In point of time, though not of position in the Canon, Amos is the first of the great Hebrew prophets. His book, likewise, is one of first importance in the Old Testament, for without it we should know but little of the religious, social, and economic conditions of Israel in the 8th century. According to the superscription, which is an addition by a later editor, he delivered his message 'in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam, son of Jehoash king of Israel.' This would give us about 760–750 B.C. as the probable period of his ministry. The historical background of the prophecies is in agreement with this date, and if we are right in seeing in 8^{9} an allusion to the solar eclipse of June 763, we have here a further confirmation of our *terminus a quo*.

Of Amos himself we know only what the book has to tell us. He was of the people, a shepherd by occupation, who also tended fig-mulberries. The superscription states that he came from Tekoa. There is no good reason for doubting that this was the modern Teku'a, situated ten miles south of Jerusalem. It stands on the edge of the desert of Judah, but though somewhat isolated from the rest of the country, it nevertheless had contact with the world through the caravan routes which ran close by it.

The news of the nations, probable visits to Israel, and meditation upon the religious traditions and faith of his people, together with the communion with God that the quiet of his work assisted, were Amos's preparation for his call. That call, he maintained, proceeded directly from God. In 7^{14} he indignantly repudiates the suggestion of Amaziah that he was a professional prophet trained in one of the prophetic guilds.

Of the manner of the call we have no explicit information; $7^{1, 4, 7, 15}$, $8^{1, 2}$, 9^{1}, etc. may imply a psychic disturbance, accompanied by the hearing of a voice, and the seeing of visions, as in the case of Isaiah and Jeremiah. At all events the call carried with it its own credentials, and the prophet never wavered as to its divine character. Amos, therefore, may fairly be said to open a new chapter in the history of Hebrew prophecy; but while he is to be dissociated from the professional prophets of his time, he may not be regarded as entirely a new departure, for he stands in the succession of such earlier heralds of divine warning as Ahijah of Shiloh, Elijah, Elisha, and Michaiah the son of Imlah.

The Historical Setting.—That Amos should have been called to prophesy, not in Judah his own country, but in Israel, may at first be surprising. It should be remembered, however, that before the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. the northern kingdom, as its retention of the name Israel suggests, was the senior of the two Hebrew states, and Bethel, Gilgal, and Samaria, rather than Jerusalem, were the foci of religious and national interest. This fact is obscured by the historical books which were edited in a later age when Judah alone remained and when Jerusalem was the sole sanctuary. The exposed position of Israel, also, compelled it to take its part in the world politics of its time. For about a century before the time of Amos Israel had been at the mercy of Syria. Under Jehu it had lost to Hazael all its territory east of Jordan. Benhadad III, Hazael's successor, reduced Jehoahaz, Jehu's successor, to the status of a feudatory chief. Under Jehoash Israel partly recovered, and won back certain of the captured districts, as the attention of Syria was occupied by the advance of the Assyrians. Jeroboam II maintained the success of Jehoash. He not only completed the reconquest of the lost territory, but managed also to extend the limits of his kingdom, so that by the time of Amos Israel extended from 'the entering in of Hamath' to 'the brook of the Arabah,' one of the streams flowing into the Dead Sea. A lull in Assyrian activity seemed to be the removal of the only menace which Israel had to fear. It now attained a greater prosperity than it had yet known, and with the continuance of peace its prosperity rapidly became luxury. Luxury is invariably the parent of licence. This proved to be the case in Israel. Though there was no slackening of religious observance, the connexion between religion and morality was forgotten. The moral law was set at nought. Injustice, oppression, dishonesty, and sexual vice flourished. The religion of Jehovah, its ideas, its ideals, and its worship were debased by the association with it, and the introduction into it, of

Canaanite deities, beliefs, practices, and rites.

The prosperity of the people was itself proof to them that they enjoyed the divine favour, and that the religion which they practised was approved. But the national morale was corrupted, and Israel could not hope to stand when Assyria reorganized itself for conquest in Palestine. It was the tragedy of Israel that the supreme moment of success was the prelude of its doom.

The Message.—It was to give warning of this doom, and if possible to avert it by arousing the people to a sense of their responsibilities and high calling, that Amos came from Judah. Bred in the simplicity of largely desert surroundings, he was doubtless by nature suspicious of all but the most rudimentary civilization. In his own semi-nomadic group, righteous dealing between man and man was the main essential to the maintenance of the cohesion of the group; and righteous dealing, therefore, apart from ritual-worship, was regarded as pleasing to the group's god whose will it was believed to be. For his Golden Age, also, Amos looked back to a past in which social life and religion were ordered on a simpler plan, and in which, at the same time, God and His Israel were in close accord. Luxury, unrighteousness, and a merely ritual religion, then, can only call forth the displeasure of God. They both reveal a misunderstanding of the divine nature and also a failure to fulfil the nation's part in the Covenant-relationship. Destruction is inevitable for the state in which they are found. The message bears about itself all the marks of the prophet's ancestry and manner of living and thought, but it proclaims eternal truth which at this juncture of human history could not have been grasped by any other kind of mind, or in any different environment.

Characteristic Ideas.—Though Amos's message is rather social than religious and theological, yet it is grounded upon certain religious ideas which the prophet's experience has transmuted into conviction, and which form an unsystematized theological background for his thinking. These may be taken as three:

(1) *His Idea of God.*—The Israelites believed in the Canaanite deities as actually existent, and as powerful within certain spheres. Amos knows, but does not share, this belief. He nowhere definitely declares himself a monotheist, but it is clear from all that he writes that only one God is a reality to him. This God is Lord alike of nature and of nations. His power is revealed in the course of human history, especially in the history of the Hebrew people. Their deliverance from Egypt, their wanderings in the desert, their settlement in Canaan, were ordained by Him, and the future both of themselves and of other peoples lies at His direction. Jehovah, the one God of the world, then, is a Personal Being. Amos does not hesitate to speak of Him in anthropomorphic terms. Jehovah can be angry; out of pity He can relent and alter His purpose. But He is never capricious. His nature and His purpose are abidingly righteous, and His righteousness must ultimately involve the destruction of all nations that fall short of it.

(2) *The Covenant Relationship.*—Amos's conviction as to the righteousness of God colours his view of the relationship between Jehovah and Israel. It was the Hebrew belief that Jehovah was in a special sense the God of the Hebrew people, as Chemosh was the god of the Moabites, or Melkart of the Tyrians. The relationship between god and people was regarded as inevitable and indissoluble; provided that the people maintained regular sacrificial worship, the god was bound to afford them his protection in war and his blessing in peace. It is here that Amos's belief is strikingly different from that popularly held. For him, Israel's relation with Jehovah is grounded in and conditioned by the righteousness of the divine nature. The relationship arose out of Jehovah's free choice of Israel from among all nations to be His people; it is preserved by the maintenance, not of ritual, but of righteousness in national life. Israel's unrighteousness constitutes a violation of the relation with Jehovah. Because of it Israel forfeits all claim to divine approval and protection.

(3) *The Day of Jehovah.*—This bold reinterpretation of one popular belief led Amos to interpret afresh yet another, and to do this likewise in the light of Jehovah's righteousness. The Hebrews looked forward to a 'day of Jehovah,' in which their God would defeat and judge His and their enemies, would vindicate Himself over all other gods, and would make Himself Lord of the world. For the Hebrews it would be the day of their own triumph, the beginning of a Golden Age. But Israel is to be judged equally with the nations, and righteousness is the test for all. The Day of Jehovah, so far from being an occasion of glory, will be the day of

Hebrew humiliation. Jehovah's vindication of Himself will be supremely manifested in His overthrow of the chosen people.

The Book.—That in the main the book is authentic cannot seriously be disputed. It is therefore of more than ordinary interest as being the earliest prophetic writing which has survived to us. It is generally agreed by scholars, however, that certain passages are of later date, e.g. 1 [1, 2, 9-10, 11-12], 2 [4-5], 3 [1, 7, 13], 4 [13], 5 [8-9], 6 [2, 9-10], 9 [5-6, 8b, 9b, 11-15].* It is probable also that the text has been re-arranged. The re-arrangement may have been the work of the post-exilic editor responsible for the added passages. Several attempts at reconstruction of the original form have been made, notably by Duhm, Riessler, and Harper; but none of these is conclusive. As it now stands, the book falls into three main divisions: (1) 1-2, an introduction; (2) 3-6, three sermons elaborating the indictment formulated in the introduction; and (3) a series of visions driving home the lesson of the preceding sermons.

The unity of the plan in each of the divisions is marked, and the technique is perfect. St. Jerome's description of Amos as 'imperitus sermone' has no justification.

Bibliography

Driver (*C.B.*), Harper (*I.C.C.*), Edghill (*W.C.*), van Hoonacker, Riessler; Article in *H.D.B.*

I. Superscription and Text.—The editor prefixes to the book an historical memorandum, together with a text summing up Amos's message. The latter is reminiscent of Jl 3 [16]. There can be no doubt that it belongs to Joel, and that it has been borrowed and adapted by the editor of Amos. The significance of the verse is perhaps to be found in its references to Zion and Carmel, from which the Jewish reader was intended to gather that Jehovah had passed sentence against Israel by the word of a prophet of Judah.

1. herdmen: Hebrew *nōḳēdim*, i.e. keepers of the *naḳad* breed of sheep valued for its fine wool. Mesha, King of Moab, was an owner of *naḳad* sheep (2 K 3 [4]). **the earthquake** (cf. Zech 14 [5]). The date is unknown.

I.-II. Sins and Judgement of the Surrounding States.—Amos's message is addressed to Israel. He is therefore confident of an attentive hearing if he exposes the sinfulness of Israel's enemies. His condemnations will meet with ready assent, and the righteousness of Jehovah's judgement will pass unquestioned. This section would seem to be a literary unity, but the genuineness of the oracles against Tyre, Edom, and Judah is questionable.

3-5. Damascus.—Damascus is the Syrian or Aramean state, having the city of that name as its capital, and founded by Rezon in the days of Solomon (1 K 11 [23, 24]). Its hostility towards Israel dated from its foundation. For a brief period Benhadad I was in alliance with Israel against Judah, but Asa of Judah won him over by bribes to an alliance against Israel. Benhadad II continued the policy of aggression, and Hazael and Benhadad III reduced Israel almost to slavery. Though Jeroboam II had effectively freed his people from the yoke of Damascus, the memory of Syrian atrocities was still fresh and kept alive Israel's hatred of its neighbour. It is to one of these, 'threshing Gilead with threshing instruments of iron,' that Amos refers. No record of the occasion of it has been preserved, but it was probably Hazael's conquest of Gilead, mentioned in 2 K 10 [32, 33]. In requital of this sin Jehovah will send fire, a war of devastation, upon the kingdom of Damascus. The dynasty established by the usurper Hazael will be exterminated. The fortresses built by his son Benhadad III will be destroyed. Damascus city will be deprived of its bar, its defences. The valley of Aven, probably the Cœle-Syrian plain, will be depopulated. Beth-eden, perhaps the Bit-adini of the Assyrian inscriptions, is to receive like treatment. Neither of these districts belonged to Damascus: they represent the limits of the Aramean territory and indicate the extent of the Syrian debâcle. The climax is to be captivity, the deportation of the Syrian population to Kir. According to 2 K 16 [9], the Syrians were deported to Kir by Tiglath-Pileser IV, after the fall of Damascus in 732. Am 9 [7] states that it was the original home of the Syrians. So far Kir has remained unidentified.

4. palaces: better *citadels* or *fortresses*.

5. valley of Aven: LXX 'plain of On.' On, called by the Greeks Heliopolis, was the centre of Egyptian sun-worship. Baalbek, the centre of Syrian sun-worship, was also known as Heliopolis, and perhaps as the Syrian On. In Ezek 30 [17] the name On, used of the Egyptian city, is vocalized as Aven.

6-8. The Philistines.—The Philistines were another of the ancient enemies of Israel. Since the days of David they had

* But see p. 422*b*.—A. G.

ceased to be a military menace. They were, however, a trading power, and we are perhaps to interpret the carrying away 'captive of the whole people to deliver them up to Edom' as a slave-raid made with the intent to sell the captives to Edom. Only four of the five Philistine cities are enumerated here. The reason for the omission of Gath is not plain. It has been suggested that Gath was annexed or destroyed by Uzziah of Judah, and that therefore Amos could not reckon it with the other cities. Marti decides against the authenticity of the whole passage, holding that it was written after the destruction of Gath by Sargon in 711. The vagueness of the specific charge as compared with its definiteness in the indubitably genuine oracles against Damascus, Ammon, and Moab is noteworthy.

9-10. Tyre.—Many scholars following Wellhausen regard the oracle against Tyre as post-exilic. We may note again the indefiniteness of the charge. Tyre is to be taken as representing the whole Phœnician territory. It is accused of the same crime as Gaza, with the additional accusation that it violated the **brotherly covenant.** This may be an allusion either to the agreement made between Solomon and Hiram (1 K 5 ^{12}), or to the breach of a treaty with some other Phœnician city. Wellhausen suggested that the captives delivered over to Edom were themselves Phœnician. This would explain 'they remembered not the brotherly covenant.' The oracle against Moab shows that it is not necessary to interpret the specific crime as committed against Israel. Any offence against the common Semitic conscience is held to merit Jehovah's judgement.

9. to Edom: some commentators read *Aram*, on the ground of Aram's proximity to Tyre; and see an allusion to an incident in Hazael's invasion (2 K 10 ^{32}).

11-12. Edom.—The Edomites inhabited the territory that lay between Mount Seir and the Dead Sea. Since the 10th century they had been subject to Israel. It was not until the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar that the Edomites ranged themselves against the Hebrews. From then onwards the hostility between the two peoples was unbroken. It is impossible to find any historical incident before the Exile which would fit the allusion in 11. The passage is most probably an interpolation of the post-exilic editor who read into the past the situation of his own day. We may note the absence of any mention of Petra or Sela, the principal city of the Edomites in Amos's day, and the indefiniteness here also of the charge laid against them.

Bozrah: probably the modern el-Busaireh, twenty miles south-east of the Dead Sea.

13-15. Ammon.—The enmity between the Ammonites and the Israelites was of long standing. That they were connected in race may be inferred from the story of their origin told in Gen 19 ^{38}. The Ammonites had occupied territory east of Jordan before the Israelite invasion, but had been driven back by the Amorites. The Hebrews succeeded to this territory, and it was to recover it that the Ammonites made war on the Hebrews of Gilead (Jg 11). David subdued them, and they remained subject to the northern kingdom after the disruption. Israel's weakness, however, was Ammon's opportunity. In the Assyrian invasion of 734 the Ammonites supported the Assyrians, and later regained some part of their former territory. It is probable that they had also joined Hazael in the capture of Gilead, and that the ripping-up of pregnant women with which they are charged in ^{13} was an episode in the campaign. This form of atrocity was no novelty in Semitic warfare: it is referred to in 2 K 8 ^{12}, 15 ^{16}; Hos 13 ^{16}. Amos prophesies a severe punishment. Rabbah, the capital, will be overthrown. The Ammonite leaders will be deported, and the defeat will be completed by the deportation into captivity of Milcom, the national god.

15. their king: read *Milcom* or *Malcam* (cf. 1 K 11 ^{33}; Jer 49 ^{3}).

II. 1-3. Moab.—The oracle against Moab is the last to be proclaimed by Amos before he denounces Israel. The Moabites were related both with the Israelites and the Ammonites, and spoke a Semitic dialect closely akin to Hebrew. Until the reign of Ahab they seem to have been subject to Israel. Mesha, their king, led a successful revolt against Ahab or his son Jehoram, an account of which Mesha gives in his inscription known as the Moabite Stone. Apparently the Moabites did not again lose their independence. The charge alleged against them in this oracle is of doubtful interpretation owing to the uncertain meaning of the words 'to lime.' The reference is to some act of desecration of the dead, but no incident of this kind is on record. The punishment of Moab, no less than of Damascus and Ammon, is to be defeat and destruction.

2. Kerioth is mentioned on the Moabite Stone as a centre of the cult of the national god Chemosh.

4-5. Judah.—The majority of scholars regard this passage as an interpolation. It lacks the specific charges of the genuine oracles, and its style is Deuteronomic in character. In favour of the passage Driver says: 'Phrases approximating to those used in it must have been current' in pre-Deuteronomic times. But, though there are parallels in earlier writings, its language has the ring of post-exilic convention.

4. lies: perhaps excuses for error, but more probably false gods.

6-16. Sins and Judgement of Israel.—We now come to the dramatic dénouement of the prophet's discourse. Israel is guilty of sins no less heinous than those of its enemies. It therefore merits judgement equally with them. The principle of punishment, the justice of which it would affirm in their case, will be applied to its own.

6-12. The Indictment.—Amos now changes his form. In his oracles against Israel's enemies, he had specified but one act of wrong-doing. The force of his denunciation of Israel, however, is cumulative; he cites not one but a series of sins. The crimes of Damascus, Ammon, and Moab could, moreover, plead the provocation of war. Israel's sins, on the other hand, are the deliberate offences of peace. These offences are all of the nature of social injustice. The innocent are declared guilty for a bribe. The poor are sold into slavery, if they are in debt even for such a trifle as a pair of sandals, and generally are ground down with oppression. The humble also are robbed of their rights. With callousness goes lust, taking to itself the sanction of religion. Fathers and sons offer an affront to Jehovah by resorting to a *kĕdēshāh*, one of the consecrated prostitutes connected with the cult of the Canaanite deities. Not even then can they refrain from oppression, for they lie upon garments taken in pledge, which according to the Law (see Ex 22 [26-27]) should be restored to the owner before nightfall. They complete the tale of their iniquities by giving sacrificial feasts in the temples, at which they drink wine purchased with unjust fines.

Israel's wickedness is the more abominable in that it is committed in disregard of Jehovah's favour. To Jehovah Israel owes the country which it inhabits, for it was He who exterminated the well-established Amorites, the previous inhabitants. It was He also who had brought Israel in safety from Egypt through the desert to Palestine, and had chosen Israelites for His special service as Nazirites and prophets. Israel, in short, owes its very existence to Jehovah; but in return for His favour, it only debauches His Nazirites and forbids His prophets to speak.

7. that pant . . . poor: the text is probably incorrect. For the present *shō'ăphim* St. Jerome read *shâphim*, which gives the meaning, *who crush the heads of the poor on the dust of the earth.*

the same maid: Hebrew 'a girl.' For the *kĕdēshōth* see Hos 4 [14]; Dt 23 [18] *v.m.* (cf. 1 K 14 [24]; 2 K 23 [7]).

11. Nazirites: see p. 209*b* and Nu 6 [2-21].

12. saith the Lord: lit. Jehovah's oracle. The word is connected with an Arabic verb meaning 'to whisper.' In Hebrew it denotes the divine message 'whispered' by God to the prophets.

13-16. The Judgement.—The change of form is sustained. The judgement against Israel is not particularized, as were the judgements of the earlier oracles. The prophet describes instead the effect upon Israel of Jehovah's chastisement. Israel is to be crushed by Him, as though by a waggon stacked high with sheaves. The disaster will be overwhelming. The fleetest cannot escape it. The strongest will not stand against it. Weapons will avail nothing. Calamity is inevitable for all.

13. I will press . . . as a cart presseth: the text is obscure. Many commentators accept the RV translation, but the verb is Aramaic and occurs only here in the Old Testament. A slight emendation of the text gives us the rendering, 'I will make it (the ground) totter under you as a waggon totters that is full of sheaves.' It has also been suggested that we should translate: 'I will make you groan in your places, as the threshing waggon makes (the floor) filled with sheaves to groan.'

III.-VI. Expansion of Israel's Indictment and Sentence.—Each of the three sermons of this section begins with the formula: 'Hear ye this word.'

III. The First Sermon.

III. 1-8. The Cost of Irresponsibility.—Israel has forgotten that its privileged position as Jehovah's chosen people involves responsibility. Its privileges, so far from extenuating its faults, will bring upon them a heavier punishment. Jehovah and Israel can no longer walk together, because they are not of one mind. The following verses ([4-8]) are usually taken as illustrations of the law of cause and effect. The lion roars from his den because he has captured his prey. The bird has fallen because the snare has

caught it. The tocsin is sounded in the city because there is reason for alarm. So likewise disaster falls upon a people because Jehovah has sent it. And in the same way the prophet speaks because Jehovah has declared His secret to him. This view, however, is not accepted by all. Van Hoonacker pertinently points out that if Amos had wished merely to teach that every effect had a cause proportionate to itself, he would have asked not 'Does the lion roar when he has no prey?' but 'Does not the lion roar when he has his prey?' The purpose of Amos's questions, continues van Hoonacker, is to emphasize the calamity which he is prophesying and of which he is himself the first sound. The meaning will then be: 'Just as, when the lion roars, we know that he is seizing his prey, so, when Jehovah shows Himself angry, we know that disaster is upon us.'

3. Shall two . . . agreed: the interpretation adopted above seems the most reasonable. But some scholars connect this verse with those that follow and interpret it as an illustration of cause and effect.

7. the Lord God will do nothing: translate *doeth nothing.* Some critics think that this verse has been misplaced, and should follow [8]. Others hold it to be an interpolation.

9-15. The Sins of Samaria.—Amos proceeds to develop his theme. The great powers of the ancient world, Assyria (see note on [9]) and Egypt, are summoned to consider the condition of Israel's capital city. It will astonish even them. Samaria presents a sight of disorder and oppression. The cause is the moral perversion of the people. They are incapable of right action. Samaria is a storehouse of tyranny and violence. Such a city cannot endure. A foreign enemy will invest and sack it; and its overthrow will be absolute. If there be any survivors they will be as negligible as the pieces of an animal rescued by the shepherd from the lion that mangled it. Such is the judgement on luxuriousness. The false worship of Bethel will not avert it. Bethel itself will be razed to the ground together with all the palaces of the plutocrats.

This passage more than expresses indignation at unrighteousness; it reflects the semi-desert dweller's innate fear and distrust of civilization.

9. Ashdod: LXX reads *Assyria*, which is probably correct. Ashdod is hardly comparable with Egypt.

12. silken cushions: Hebrew *Dammeśeḳ*, which would seem to be an error for *Dammeśeḳ*, i.e. Damascus. This does not make sense in the context. The name has suggested the material 'damask': hence the RV. But the connexion of 'damask' with Damascus is questionable. No satisfactory treatment of the text has been proposed.

13. An interpolation concerning Judah.

14. Bethel: cf. Hos 10 [15] and 1 K 12 [32], 13 [4]; Jer 48 [13].

15. great houses: *great* or *many* (RVm) is a weak parallel with 'ivory.' A slight emendation gives us *ebony*.

IV. **The Second Sermon.**

1-3. The Wickedness of the Women.—History shows that when a state is corrupted by luxury, the evil can usually be traced to its women. Israel was no exception to this rule. Amos describes its women as 'Bashan kine.' Bashan was noted for some of the best pasturage in Palestine, and his words may be interpreted to mean *prize cows*. Food, drink, and pleasure were their sole interest. Their extravagant demand upon their husbands for more and yet more of these things was the root of oppression. They therefore are singled out for a particular judgement. Their punishment is to come in the horrors of the siege which Jehovah will bring upon Samaria. They will be dragged through the breaches of the city wall to be cast out to the dung-heap.

2. your residue, i.e. the last of you. **ye shall cast yourselves into Harmon:** the text is corrupt. We ought probably to read *ye shall be cast.* Harmon has been variously interpreted. Hitzig suggests that we should emend 'to Hadad-Rimmon,' i.e. to become *ḳĕḏēshōth* in the service of the god. Targum and Peshitto read 'Armenia.' The word may be the corruption of a form meaning 'to the dung-hill.'

4-13. The Uselessness of Ritual.—Amos has now to consider another cause of Israel's present state. It is religious failure. Israel has confused the worship of Jehovah with the ritual of the sanctuaries. It has assumed that daily sacrifices, more frequent tithes, visits to the shrines, will please Jehovah. In actual fact, such rites please only those who perform them. The sanctuaries are not places of worship; they are places of sin. Ritual observances are transgressions against Jehovah, and outrages upon His character. He had attempted to teach Israel this in the many calamities which He had already sent upon them. There had been famine. There had been a failure of the February rains, so that May brought forth a bad harvest and the springs dried up. The failure had not

been universal. Some few towns had had rain. But this indeed only aggravated the situation: for those who were suffering from the drought came to these towns in the hope of finding water, and there was not enough for all. The drought had been succeeded by blight and mildew upon the vines and fig and olive trees. Then followed an epidemic. Finally there had been a natural disaster comparable to that of Sodom and Gomorrah. Had not Israel been crass, it would have seen that these disasters were marks of Jehovah's displeasure, and would have returned to Him. But it persisted on its course despite Jehovah's warnings. Therefore He must resort to extreme measures. Israel is warned that it soon must meet its God. The prophet calls upon it to prepare for this, lest it should lose its last chance of amendment. The passage closes with a verse setting forth the power and majesty of Jehovah.

4. Gilgal (see also 5 [5]). According to Jos 4 [19, 20] it was the first camping-ground of the Israelites on their invasion of Palestine, and it seems to have been a religious centre from then onwards (1 S 7 [16], 11 [14, 15]; 2 K 2 [1], 4 [38]). Hosea associates it with the impure worship of Jehovah (4 [15], 9 [15], 12 [11]). It has been identified with the modern Jiljûl, four and a half miles west of Jordan. **every morning . . . every three days:** the earlier custom had been to offer sacrifice once a year (1 S 1 [3, 7, 21]) and to pay tithe once every three years (see Dt 14 [28], 26 [12]). Amos may be making an ironical reference to it. On the other hand, the words may be translated *in the morning—on the third day*. The reference might then be to the practice of the pilgrims to the shrine.

5. that which is leavened. Leaven, which may be taken also to include grape-honey, was originally forbidden in the worship of Jehovah (Ex 34 [25] and 23 [18]). In the present context, the leaven is probably grape-honey, the use of which the Israelites may have borrowed from the Canaanites in order to make the sacrificial cake more savoury for the deity.

9. multitude. Wellhausen emends: 'I have laid waste your gardens and your vineyards: and your fig trees and your olive trees hath the locust devoured.'

10. after the manner of Egypt: Hebrew 'by the way of Egypt.' This may mean that the epidemic came to Israel from Egypt; or that it was on the same scale as Egyptian plagues, which appear to have been noted for their severity.

11. I have overthrown you: perhaps a reference to the earthquake of 1 [1].

13. Other passages end abruptly on a note of warning. This verse has no essential connexion with what precedes it. As it stands, it blunts the sharpness of the prophet's concluding monitory command in [12]. The style of [13] is suggestive of later writing, and some scholars have therefore taken it to be an unauthentic addition.

V.-VI. The Third Sermon.

V. 1-17. The Imminence of Doom.—The solemnity of the third sermon is heightened by the use of the *ḳînāh* metre for its opening verse ([2]). This metre was regularly used for the dirges of the dead, and Amos's picture of Israel as already overthrown is made more vivid by his use of it. Israel, past all recovery, has fallen to the earth. Amos uses the perfect tense, for he sees the disaster as actually having happened. The dirge is possibly continued in [3], and announces the reduction of Israel's fighting force to a tenth of its present strength. With a rather abrupt transition, Amos then calls upon the people once again to turn to Jehovah. If they seek Him, they will escape death. Let them therefore put an end to the idolatrous worship of the sanctuaries. Gilgal and Bethel can bring them only to exile or annihilation. The possibility of repentance is not past, but if the opportunity be rejected, Jehovah will kindle a fire that the worship of Bethel will never make Him quench. Israel's perversion of justice will then meet with its due reward. Punishment will be exacted of those who silenced just complaint and criticism, who demanded 'presents,' and extorted bribes, from the poor, in return for what ought to have been protection and justice. These will never live in their fine houses. Ruin will overtake them before they can enjoy their vineyards and their wines. But it is not yet too late. A return to justice and good will effect a reversal of Jehovah's sentence. The prophet concludes by describing the effect upon Israel of the execution of that sentence.

3. to the house of Israel: an accidental repetition from [4].

5. pass not to Beersheba. These words mar the symmetry of the verse, and appear to be an insertion. **Bethel . . . nought:** Harper suggests that the sentence originally ran: 'Bethel shall become Beth-aven.' 'Aven' means both 'idolatry' and 'worthlessness.'

6. A textual emendation gives the better sense, *lest he set on fire*, etc.

7 should immediately precede [10].

8, 9 break the sequence of [7] and [10],

and are undoubtedly misplaced. Their style also is different from that which is certainly Amos's. These considerations have led certain scholars to regard them as the interpolation of a later, perhaps post-exilic, editor (cf. 4 [13]).

8. **Pleiades**: Hebrew *Kīmāh*, from a root connected with an Arabic verb 'to heap up': hence 'a heap of stars.' This is usually interpreted to denote the Pleiades, but several scholars think that it denotes Sirius.

9. **so that . . . fortress**: read *he bringeth ruin upon the fortress.*

18-27. The Day of the Lord.—The warning of Jehovah's approaching visitation leads Amos, as by a natural sequence, to expose the erroneousness of the popular expectation of it. This is the earliest mention of the Day of Jehovah in the Old Testament. The belief that Israel would share in the glories of the day was deep-rooted and widespread. But it was based upon ignorance of His true nature. Amos proclaims that for Israel the day will be no red-letter day, but one of catastrophe; it will be darkness, not light. The reason for this is to be found in Israel's utter disregard of the ethical in life and religion. Worship itself is ultimately ethical. To treat it as a matter of ritual observance and sacrifices is to mistake not only the nature of worship, but also the nature of the God to whom it is offered. Jehovah requires not music and incense and animal-offerings, but the true worship of moral living. To emphasize his point, Amos reminds Israel that in the desert, when Jehovah and Israel walked together, sacrifice was not offered (see note).

The lack of righteousness in Israel, despite its ritual, will call down Jehovah's doom upon it; it will go into captivity beyond Damascus.

21. **feasts**, i.e. the Passover and Feast of Booths. The word is derived from a root meaning 'to make a pilgrimage' (cf. Arabic 'hajja,' 'to make the pilgrimage to Mecca'), and should be translated *pilgrim-feasts.*

take no delight in: lit. *will not smell* (cf. Gen 8 [21]; Nu 16 [45-47]). The conception of God is still anthropomorphic.

21-23 throw interesting light on the manner of worship at this period.

25. The form of the question requires a negative answer. It is difficult to interpret this verse except as a condemnation of the cultus on the ground that it was not of the original deposit of Jehovah's religion. If the text be genuine, Amos would seem not to have known or not to have accepted, and to have expected his hearers not to have known or not to have accepted, any tradition of divine institution of sacrifice at Sinai. The difficulties about this are obvious, unless we suppose that the legislation and narratives of J and E were not generally held to be Mosaic in Amos's time, or were not generally accepted. Professor R. H. Kennett maintains that sacrifice was not a necessary element in the primitive religion of Jehovah, and sees in this verse (as also in Hos 6 [6]; Mic 6 [6-8]; Jer 7 [22]) a prophetic witness to a non-sacrificial tradition (for this view see *Enc. Rel. Eth.*, article 'Israel').* The genuineness of the verse has, however, been called in question, owing to the suspicious character of its rhythm. It may therefore be a gloss. On the other hand, it is difficult to see why a scribe should have written it, unless he believed it either to express the view of Amos himself, or, at least, to be consonant with a well-known tradition in Israelitish religion. It must be confessed that the verse presents an insoluble problem. One point is clear. Neither Amos nor Israel could see in sacrifice as they knew it the expression and symbol of the ethical and spiritual.

26. The difficulties are insoluble. Translate *ye shall take up.* For **Sikkuth your king** LXX reads 'the tabernacle of Moloch.' Sikkuth may perhaps be *Sakkuth*, a name for the Babylonian deity Ninib. This, however, is difficult, as **Chiun** is probably a wrong vocalization of *Kewan*, another name for the same deity. Wellhausen regarded the verse as the gloss of a later reader who thought the passage incomplete without a reference to the idolatry of his own time.

VI. 1-7. The Worthlessness of the Nobles.—The nobles of Israel are proud of their position and achievement, and fancy themselves secure. Their supposed security makes them the more unprepared for the doom to come, and so hastens its approach. The nobles will be the first to suffer. But they have deserved their fate, for they have not responded to the obligation of their position as leaders of the people. Selfish and effete, they recline on costly couches and live on the best that the land produces. They waste their time in musical diversions, flattering themselves that they are like David. They drink wine to excess, not out of cups as the custom is, but out of bowls; and they pamper their bodies with the choicest ointments and oils. Their selfishness has made them insensible to the disaster threatening Israel. But their

* But see p. 423*a*.—A. G.

recompense is at hand. The day will soon come when Israel's nobles will head the procession of captives marching into exile.

1. that . . . in Zion. An insertion.

2. The intention of this verse is to cite examples of states apparently secure that were nevertheless overthrown, and to warn Israel that it may suffer a similar fate. But the verse cannot be accepted as genuine, since Calneh did not fall until 738, Hamath until 720, and Gath until 711. Calneh is probably the Calno of Is 10 [9]. Hamath was on the Orontes, 150 miles north of Dan.

Read *are ye better . . .?* and *is your border greater than their border?*

8-14. Fragments.—This section is fragmentary. [9, 10] are an excerpt from a description of a scene during an attack of plague. Whole families die. When the relatives come to bury the dead, the survivors dare not use Jehovah's name in the customary greetings, for fear He shall thereby be aroused to further fury. These verses have no connexion with the rest of the section, and can hardly be ascribed to Amos. [11, 12] foretell an earthquake or landslide. Houses, both great and small, will fall into ruins. The horseman will not be able to ride, or the farmer to plough where once it was possible. The reason of the catastrophe is Jehovah's displeasure at Israel's perversion of justice: **ye have turned judgement into gall.** The remaining verses are an iteration of disaster. Jehovah loathes Israel, and will give it over to devastation. Some critics read **the thing of nought** and **horns** of [13] as the names of towns, *Lo-debar* (cf. 2 S 9 [4, 5], 17 [27]) and *Karnaim* (cf. the Ashteroth Karnaim of Gen 14 [5]), and regard them as references to victories of Jeroboam II. Even though this emendation be rejected, the sense of the passage is clear. Israel's boasting cannot last. Jehovah is raising up against it an invader who will afflict the country from north to south.

VII.-IX. 8. The Visions of Amos.—The last division of the book comprises five visions together with two passages probably misplaced (7 [10-17] and 8 [4-14]). The visions are pictures of the fate of Israel.

VII. 1-3. A Vision of Locusts.—Amos sees a swarm of locusts coming down at the bidding of Jehovah to devour the grass which had grown with the March rains. When the locusts have almost finished their work of devastation, Amos intercedes for Israel. How can it survive the starvation which must follow? Jehovah relents, and stays the calamity.

1. and lo . . . latter growth. LXX suggests the reading 'full-grown locusts'; **he formed** or *was forming* **locusts** would be a reference to the larva stage.

4-6. A Vision of Fire.—Jehovah summons a supernatural fire. Amos sees it consume the great deep (see Gen 1 [7]; Ex 20 [4]) on which the earth rests, and which is the source of its springs and fountains. When it is about to consume the dry land, Amos again intercedes. If Jehovah will not desist, how can Israel exist? Jehovah again relents.

7-9. A Vision of a Plumbline.—Amos sees Jehovah standing by a wall. The text terms it a 'wall of a plummet.' A plummet is in Jehovah's hand. He explains to Amos that He is going to set a plumbline in the midst of Israel, for He is wearied of relenting. The interpretation of the vision is difficult. Kent has suggested that, in the phrase 'wall of a plummet,' the latter word has intruded itself by dittography from the next clause and should be omitted. In this case, the wall would represent Israel. Jehovah, plummet in hand, is about to put Israel to the test. As a wall which is out of the straight is condemned by the builder, so Israel, if it cannot stand His test, will be condemned by Jehovah. If the text be correct, the wall is a perfect wall, and symbolizes Jehovah's work and character. Any wall not like this must be pulled down. Jehovah will not again pass bad work. The vision closes with a picture of Israel's downfall. The local sanctuaries are deserted; the great shrines are in ruins; and the climax is reached in the overthrow of Jeroboam and the royal family.

10-17. Amos and Amaziah.—The historical incident next related interrupts the series of visions; but it was probably introduced here on account of the prophecy against the king in [9]. Amos is accused of conspiracy to Jeroboam by Amaziah the priest of Bethel. Amaziah also warns Amos to go to Judah, where he may be able to practise the prophetic profession with more acceptance than in Israel. Bethel is no place for such persons as he, since it is the royal sanctuary and the principal shrine of the kingdom. Amos answers that he is no professional prophet. He was a shepherd and a tender of figmulberries until Jehovah Himself called him to prophesy to Israel. Amos takes the opportunity of personally denouncing Amaziah. The priest's wife will become a harlot, his family will be butchered, and he himself will go into exile with Israel. It was official hostility such as this that made it necessary for Amos's prophecies to be written down.

VIII. 1-3. **A Vision of a Basket of Summer Fruit.**—The visions are resumed. Jehovah shows Amos a basket of summer fruit. Its significance lies in a play on words. The summer fruit (*ḳayiṣ*) represents the end (*ḳēṣ*) of Israel. The palace will be filled with wailing, and the dead shall be thrown out of the houses with neither ceremony nor burial.

3. For **songs** (*shīrōth*) Wellhausen read *shărōth* (singing women). **temple** should be translated *palace*. **shall be howlings**: lit. 'shall wail.'

4-14. **Another Fragment.**—This section is again an interruption. It is an expansion of the prediction of [3], but it is reminiscent of the oracle against Israel in 2 [6-8]. Some commentators have denied the genuineness of the passage. The theme, however, is that of Amos. It is possible that we have here part of an authentic discourse of Amos, edited by a later hand, and removed from its context. The passage is addressed to the wealthy who, in their eagerness to oppress the poor, resent the observance of Sabbaths and holy days, because on these days business is prohibited. Their business instincts have killed their sense of justice. Neither their weights, nor their measures, nor their money can be trusted; and they are merciless to the poor who cannot pay their debts. They even charge prices for bran. Because of such wickedness Jehovah will convulse the land. The sun will be darkened, as on a day of eclipse. Rejoicing will give place to the bitterest mourning, and the end will be misery and despair. For a worse evil is to befall Israel than it has yet suffered. It will go hungry, not for food, but for hearing the word of Jehovah. The young men and women will long for it. Yet their hunger and thirst will go unsatisfied, and they will faint and die. Those also who swore by pagan gods will fall, never to rise.

7. **excellency of Jacob**: lit. pride.

12. **sin of Samaria**: the sin (*ashmath*) is clearly an idol, perhaps the Ashērāh of 2 K 13 [6], or the calf of Bethel (cf. Hos 8 [5], 10 [5, 8]). It is more likely, however, that for *ashmath* we should read *Ashîmath*. *Ashîma* was a god worshipped at Hamath (2 K 17 [30]), and the Aramaic papyri discovered at Elephantine show that the Jewish colony established there worshipped, besides Jehovah, a god of the same name, Ashem-Bethel.

14. **As the way of Beersheba liveth**: perhaps emend: *By the life of thy patron* [i.e. god], *O Beersheba*.

IX. 1-10. **A Vision of the Wrath of Jehovah.**—This is the last of the visions of Amos. It is a grand picture of Jehovah the Righteous, vindicating His righteousness against all nations and punishing His Chosen People for their offence against His character. Amos sees Him in a temple, doubtless the temple of Bethel. He is standing upon the altar; around Him are His ministrants, and before Him the worshippers gathered to offer sacrifice. But there is one sacrifice alone that can please Jehovah, and this the worshippers cannot present. Without it they must win, not His favour, but His wrath. He bids His ministrants smite the Temple that it may crush all that are assembled within it. None can escape. Wherever they hide—in the heights of heaven or in the depths of earth—Jehovah will drag them forth to suffer His vengeance. Though they be taken into captivity, they will not escape, for Jehovah's sword shall slay them even there. Will Israel lay claim to gentler treatment? Israel is of no greater consequence to Jehovah than the Ethiopians. The deliverance from Egypt was indeed His work. But it was He also that brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir. Jehovah's sentence is utter and relentless. Israel has sinned —Israel must die.

5, 6. Apparently another misplaced paragraph, having no necessary connexion with [4] and [7]. This paragraph bears a marked resemblance to 8 [8], 4 [13], and 5 [8-9], and if we are to regard these latter passages as interpolated by a later editor, we may reasonably so regard these verses.

8-10. The earlier part of this section prepares us for a conclusion upon a note of unrelieved doom. This we have in [10]. [8b] and [9b] are, however, contradictory of it. It has therefore been suggested that [8b] and [9b] are attempts on the part of the post-exilic editor to soften down Amos's original ending in order to make the transition from the prophecy to the appendix less abrupt and inconsequent. Many commentators treat [9] and [10] as part of the appendix. There is a difficulty about this. With the exception of [9b] both verses have the genuine ring of Amos's authorship; and they are connected in subject rather with the main body of the concluding prophecy than with the appendix.

11-15. **An Appendix.**—This passage is the work of one who had seen the Exile come to an end. Amos's prophecy was incomplete. History had shown that Jehovah did not utterly destroy His people. He had brought them up anew

into their land, there to re-establish them for ever. Life therefore holds no further fears or uncertainties. The golden future promises the restoration of David's dynasty. Edom, the old enemy, is beaten. Fruitfulness in crops and vines and gardens is assured. The Messianic age has all but dawned.

The author of the appendix lacks the fire and life of Amos; and his materialism is bathos after the prophet's grand revelation of the Supernatural.

OBADIAH

By A. Guillaume

The familiar words of Ps 137[7], 'Remember, O Lord, the children of Edom in the day of Jerusalem: how they said, Down with it, down with it, even to the ground,' are the burden of this short prophecy. Its close affinities with Jer 49[7-22] have been referred to on p. 428*a*; and the conclusion there reached is that the resemblances are best explained by the supposition that an older prophecy is the source of both documents. This may well be so; but it is not a necessary assumption. In Jeremiah the prophecy is anonymous (unless the general ascription at the head of 46 is accepted as authoritative), and there, on the whole, it is obviously an inferior version of the poem in Obadiah.

The critical problems arising out of this little book are out of all proportion to its size and importance (see further *Encycl. Bib.*, 3455). Since the destruction of Jerusalem is plainly referred to in [11], some of the book, if not all, must be exilic or later. The description of a past calamity has been turned into a prediction.

The prophet hears a report of divine origin that a messenger has gone forth to stir up the nations to destroy the Edomites, who deemed their mountain stronghold impregnable. Jehovah declares that however lofty their stronghold He will bring them down to the ground. Invaders will search every corner of their land and drive them from their own borders. Edom, whose reputation for wisdom and shrewdness was proverbial, will perish through trusting untrustworthy allies—a fitting punishment of those who violently despoiled their brother Jacob. In the day of Jerusalem's calamity Edom had joined in the sack of the city; they had lain in wait for the fugitives and cruelly slain them.

But now the Day of the Lord is at hand, and all nations will be treated according to their deserts; 'they shall be as though they had not been.' Those of Israel who escape will dwell in holiness on Mount Zion, and the house of Jacob will come into their own again. They will devour the Edomites, so that none remain. The southern Jews will occupy Edom; the western Jews Philistia; while others will take over the lands of Ephraim, Samaria, and Gilead. Two companies of deported Israelites (those 'of the children of Israel' and those 'of Jerusalem') will occupy the land from Zarephath in the north (between Tyre and Sidon) to the cities of the Negeb in the extreme south. And thus, judgement executed on Esau, the kingdom will be the Lord's.

Probably [15-21] are a later addition to the prophecy.

7. the men that were at peace with thee: these were the Nabatæan Arabs (cf. Mal 1 [2-5]). Allusions to a northern movement of Arabs is to be found in Ezek 25 [4]. Petra was occupied by the Nabatæans in 312 B.C.

15. The day of the Lord: this expression stands for widely different hopes in different epochs. To the Israel of Amos's day it meant Jehovah's triumphant vindication of His people against their enemies. Amos, on the contrary, asserted that it would be a time when Jehovah would vindicate His righteousness as against Israel, and it would involve their destruction. Modifications of these two radically opposite conceptions can be traced through subsequent writers. Nahum and Habakkuk claimed a *relative* righteousness for their people as against the Gentiles, while Zephaniah, Joel, Obadiah, Zechariah (12, etc.), looked for an overwhelming judgement on the nations. This conception, which paved the way for later apocalyptic teaching, arose comparatively late.

20. this host: a poor sense. Probably read *of Ḥalaḥ* (cf. 2 K 17 [6]); so Wheeler Robinson. **which are** *among* **the Canaanites** is an impossible rendering of a corrupt text. Read *shall possess the Canaanite* as in the following clause.

21. saviours: presumably the returning exiles who reinforce their brethren.

JONAH

By G. A. Cooke

Introduction and Notes

Unlike the other prophetic books, Jonah delivers its prophecy in the form of a story. Of course the story is not to be taken as literal history; yet it is historical in the sense in which the parable of the Good Samaritan, its New Testament counterpart, may be called historical. The author chooses for his hero Jonah ben Amittai, a name which would be familiar to his readers as borne by a prophet in olden days (2 K 14 [25]); and like a skilful story-teller, he has marvels to relate, and captures attention by the use of folklore (1 [4, 7, 15], 3 [5], 4 [6-8]; 1 [17], 2 [10]). His aim is to enlarge the current conception of God, and to revive in Israel a sense of responsibility towards the world outside. Jehovah is universal Lord; no nation, however heathen or remote, lies beyond His care; He is ready to welcome their repentance; and upon Israel He bestows, not His exclusive favour, but the task of furthering His purpose for all mankind. Even a prophet has to be corrected in order that Jehovah's will may be carried out; cf. the similar cases in Nu 20 [10-13], 22; 1 K 13, 19 [4] ff.; Jer 14 [10] ff., 15 [10-21], 20 [14-18].

Most likely the book was written in the period which began with the reforms of Nehemiah (*temp.* Artaxerxes I, 464-424 B.C.), and included the work of Ezra (*temp.* Artaxerxes II, 404-358 B.C.), and witnessed the establishment of Judaism on the basis of the Law. It was indeed necessary to safeguard the distinctive character of Israel's religion; but there was a danger lest devotion to the Law should overlook the ideals of the Prophets. In a day of lesser men and narrower views at least one prophetic voice was raised on behalf of the large theology which Israel's creed implied. No wonder that our Lord found the book congenial to His teaching. The 'sign of Jonah' (Lk 11 [29, 30]) was the appearance of a Hebrew prophet in a stronghold of heathenism.

Language and style, unclassical words, Aramaisms (1 [4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 17], 3 [7], 4 [1, 8, 10]), point to the end of the 5th, or to the 4th century B.C., as the date of the book. Ecclus 49 [10] proves that it was counted among 'the twelve prophets' before 200 B.C.; it is referred to in Tob 14 [4, 8] (? 2nd century B.C.).

The episode of the 'great fish' is derived from popular mythology; parallels exist in Egyptian, Indian, and late Greek legends, but they throw no light upon the real significance of Jonah. The 'great fish' may well be a variety of the Babylonian sea-monster, called in the Old Testament by such names as Rahab (Is 51 [9]; Job 9 [13]; Ps 89 [10]), the dragon (Is 27 [1]; Jer 51 [34]; Ps 74 [13]), the serpent (Am 9 [3]).

Among the inspired utterances of Israel's religion, the book takes rank with Is 53, Jer 31 [31-34], Ps 73, and comes as near to Christianity as anything in the Old Testament. By the Jews it is read as the prophetic lesson in the afternoon service on the Day of Atonement.

I.-II. Jonah takes ship in order to escape from his mission; but a storm comes on; he is thrown overboard, and miraculously brought back to land.

I. 1. **the word of Jehovah** comes to Jonah because he is a prophet.

2. **Nineveh**, on the east bank of the Tigris, *c.* 650 miles from Palestine, was the capital of Assyria, the centre of a heathen empire dreaded for its savage conquests. The city fell in 612 B.C., long before the author's day (3 [3] *n.*).

3. By flying to **Tarshish** in south-east Spain, the furthest port in the world, Jonah imagined that he would be beyond Jehovah's reach; he had not outgrown the old idea that Jehovah's influence was confined to the land of Israel (Gen 4 [14]; 1 S 26 [19]; 2 K 5 [17]). He started from Japhô, *Japu* in the T.A. letters (15th century B.C.), now Jaffa, still a much-frequented place of embarkation. The ship was no doubt a Phœnician vessel, owned at Tarshish, and manned by sailors of various nations ([5]). Jonah chartered it for the voyage; no other passengers are mentioned.

4. Jehovah **hurled a wind**: the first marvel. The ship **was like to be** wrecked, lit. 'was minded to be.'

5. The Jews were never a seafaring people; they borrowed the word for **mariners** (Ezek 27 [9, 27, 29]) from Babylonian. The cargo is **hurled** into the sea (cf. Ac 27 [18] f.). Meanwhile Jonah lay in the hold of the **vessel** (Aramaic) fast asleep (cf. Gen 2 [21], 15 [12]; Jg 4 [21]), thinking that Jehovah could not reach him; ctr. Mk 4 [35-41]: Jesus lay asleep through the storm, knowing that He was in the Father's hand.

6. call upon thy God, as the gods of the seamen had given no help; **if so be that God will think upon us** (Aramaic: cf. Dan 6 [3]); the captain, being a foreigner, uses the name *Elohim*.

7. The cause of a misfortune could be discovered by casting lots; so the heathen believed, and the Hebrews too (e.g. Jos 7 [13] ff., 1 S 10 [20-23]).

8. for whose cause this evil is come upon us: a gloss (LXX omits), turning into Hebrew the Aramaic idiom used in [7].

9. Jonah tells them that he is a Hebrew (*'ibhrî*), the name which Israelites used in speaking to foreigners (Gen 40 [15]; Ex 2 [7], 3 [18]). LXX 'I am a servant of the Lord,' confusing *r* with *d*, and taking the final *î* as an abbreviation for *Yahweh* (cf. LXX, Jg 19 [18]; Jer 6 [11]). Jonah uses the divine title adopted by the later Jews, **Jehovah the God of heaven** (Neh 1 [4, 5]; Ezr 1 [2], 5 [11, 12], etc.; Dan 2 [18, 37, 44]). Jehovah's rule is limited to Palestine, thought Jonah; but the author, who knew better, puts into his lips the name of the one God of the universe.

10. The confession of his religion was as good as a confession of his guilt. **because he had told them** looks like a gloss **on the men knew**: it spoils the point; they did not need to be told.

11. Jonah bids the sailors throw him overboard. The safety of the crew can only be won by the sacrifice of himself: his self-devotion is in line with all heroic acts for the good of others. The author hints at a profound law of human life.

13. One last effort to avoid sending Jonah to his death; **rowed hard,** lit. dug (into the water), the word in Ezek 8 [8], 12 [5].

14. Heathen though they are, the men pray to Jehovah in their extremity. They do not want to perish, nor do they want to take a man's life: Jehovah must solve the dilemma. The last line may be rendered *thou doest as it pleaseth thee*, as in Ps 115 [3], 135 [6].

16. The sailors are converted by the wonder, like the disciples in the Gospels (Mk 4 [41]; Mt 14 [32] f.). They offer sacrifices on board the ship, and vow offerings when they reach land. For the vow cf. Gen 28 [20]; Jg 11 [30]; 1 S 1 [11].

17. **prepared,** better *ordained*; each supernatural feature of the story is directly brought about by God (4 [6-8]). The writer borrows the **great fish** from popular mythology; what kind of fish it was he leaves to the imagination; Jonah must be saved and started again on his mission. **The three days and three nights** is a conventional expression for a short time; in some Egyptian and Phœnician myths it is connected with the death and revival of a divine deliverer; in Hos 6 [2] it has quite another sense. No one source can be assigned to the phrase, and different ideas were associated with it in different myths. The reference in Mt 12 [40] is generally held to be an addition to the original saying of Jesus, Lk 11 [30].

II. 1-9. A psalm of thanksgiving for deliverance, inserted with its title into the narrative at some later date (cf. 1 S 2 [1-10]). It was composed out of material gathered from the Psalms, some of them late ones, perhaps as a liturgical hymn ([4, 7]). It makes no allusion to Jonah's extraordinary situation, and does not agree with the author's idea of his character; it interrupts the connexion between 1 [17] and 2 [10].

2. Cf. Ps 18 [5], 86 [7], 120 [1]. **Sheol** was pictured as a greedy monster (Is 5 [14]).

3. The language may imply a literal shipwreck, or refer figuratively to some dire peril, as Ps 18 [4], 69 [1] f.; Lam 3 [54]. **into the depth** stands outside grammar and metre, and is a gloss on **in the heart of the seas. For the flood,** lit. river, cf. Ps 24 [2], and for the last line Ps 42 [7].

4. An echo of Ps 31 [22].

5. Partly from Ps 18 [4] f., 69 [1]. The text is corrupt at the end of this verse and the beginning of [6]. Read perhaps:

> *The weeds were wrapped about my head*
> *At the 'ends' of the mountains;*
> *I went down to the 'bars of the earth,'*
> *'To the foundations' of old-time.*

See Job 38 [17]; Gen 49 [26]; Dt 32 [22]; Mic 6 [2]; Hab 3 [6].

6. For **the pit** cf. Ps 16 [10], 103 [4].

7. See [3] and Ps 107 [5], 142 [3], 18 [6], 28 [2].

8. The singer turns aside to denounce idolaters, as in Ps 16 [4], 31 [6], who forsake **their own mercy,** i.e. their merciful God (Ps 144 [2]).

9. The sacrifice of thanksgiving and the payment of the vow, as in Ps 50 [14, 23] 42 [4]; the last line from Ps 3 [8].

10. Originally followed 1 [17]. The author of Jonah was not the first to make use of the myth: Jer 51 [34, 44] refers to it, but with a different application; Israel is the victim, Babylon the dragon; yet Israel will survive the exile and be restored. The **dry land** on which Jonah found himself was Palestine, as 3 [1] implies: he is brought back to where he was before.

III.-IV. Once again Jonah is sent to Nineveh; this time he goes. The Ninevites repent, and God spares them, to the deep vexation of the prophet. He is taught a lesson.

III. 1. The forces of nature and the

rebellious will of man have been overruled; neither can defeat the divine purpose.

3. So Jonah arose, and went: cf. Mt 21 [28-31]. The journey would take between four and five months: Ezr 7 [9] (Babylon-Jerusalem). When the author wrote, Nineveh's splendour had long been a thing of the past, and tradition exaggerated it. **The city was great unto God,** i.e. as God Himself would consider it: cf. Ac 7 [20]; 2 Cor 10 [4] (Greek), and Gen 10 [9] 'before Jehovah.' Such was the size of the city that to go from end to end of it was a three days' walk. Excavations show that ancient Nineveh extended for about two and a half miles on the left bank of the Tigris, opposite Mosul, in a long, narrow strip; it covered *c.* 1,800 acres, and would contain a population of *c.* 175,000.

4. The meaning seems to be that Jonah began to proclaim his message as soon as he entered Nineveh, and went preaching through the streets, a day's distance at a time, until he had traversed the whole. His message was a warning of **overthrow,** the word used of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19 [29]; Am 4 [11], etc.; Tob 14 [4, 8]). The punishment of the heathen had always been the burden of prophecy, e.g. Am 1 [3]-2 [3]; Is 10 [12-19], 30 [31-33] (Assyria); Nah 2 [8] ff., 3 [1] ff. (Nineveh); the preaching, therefore, was in accordance with Jonah's inherited ideas, and he could heartily deliver it. As the prophets sometimes did, he gave a time-limit (cf. Is 16 [14], 21 [16], 23 [15-17]; Ezek 29 [13]; Hag 2 [6]): in **forty days** (LXX 'three days,' perhaps interpreting 1 [17] symbolically, or recollecting Gen 40 [13, 19]; 2 S 24 [13]) Nineveh was to fall. However merciful, Jehovah could not ignore the idolatry, immorality, cruelties of the heathen. The writer maintains the divine authority of Jonah's message: but there was another aspect of God's relation to the heathen; would the prophet see it? Probably 4 [5] should follow here.

5. How the Assyrians could understand the language of a Hebrew prophet, speaking in the name of a God whom they did not know, is a difficulty which does not trouble the story-teller. They **believed (trusted in) God** (cf. Gen 15 [6]; Ex 14 [31]; Nu 14 [11]) and resorted to penitential rites (Jl 1 [13] f.; Jer 4 [8], 6 [26]; Lam 2 [10]: see Mt 12 [41] and Lk 11 [32]).

6. For the king of Nineveh a contemporary would have used a different title (2 K 18 [19, 28]). Cf. Job 2 [8] **ashes.**

7. Tr. *In Nineveh, by decree of the king and his nobles: Let neither,* etc. For the formula cf. Ezr 6 [3], 7 [21]; Dan 3 [10, 29]. Both man and beast are to keep the fast, the beasts being regarded as part of the human community (Jer 21 [6]; Ps 36 [6]). In Persia horses and beasts of burden shared in a general mourning (Herod. ix, 24).

8. Here **both man and beast** seems to be a gloss from [7]. All alike are to **cry mightily unto God:** for the animals cf. Jl 1 [20]; Ps 104 [27], 148 [10]. The edict required not only outward signs of penitence, but a moral reform: here writes the disciple of the pre-exilic prophets.

9. Perhaps a quotation from a penitential liturgy (Jl 2 [14]: cf. Tob 13 [6]).

10. and God repented. Human feelings are often attributed to God in the Old Testament. He does not really change His purpose, though He seems to do so; a change of attitude on man's part is met by a corresponding change in God's attitude (Ex 32 [14]; Jer 26 [3, 13, 19]); but when there is no prospect of a change on the human side, God 'is not a man, that he should repent' (1 S 15 [29]). The later prophets taught, and the author of Jonah believed, that even the heathen would be spared if they repented (Jer 18 [7-10]; Is 19 [22]; Zeph 3 [8, 9]).

IV. **1.** The punishment of the heathen Jonah could understand and announce with conviction; but that his prophecy should not be fulfilled, and Nineveh not be overthrown, **displeased him exceedingly** (Neh 2 [10]).

2. It was precisely this that he had dreaded from the first. He was well aware of Jehovah's essential mercy (Ex 34 [6]; Jl 2 [13]; Ps 86 [5]), but he had no desire that it should be extended to the heathen. Such was the mind of prophecy at the time! This is the most pointed piece of satire in the book.

3. Elijah prayed for death because his efforts seemed to be defeated (1 K 19 [4]); Jonah makes the same petition because his prophecy was not fulfilled. Both needed to learn a lesson, Jonah the more searching one.

4. The question receives no answer. Originally, no doubt, Jonah replied as in [9]; but the words dropped out when [5] was inserted by mistake.

5. The verse ought to follow 3 [4]; it takes us back to the forty days, whereas 3 [10] shows that they are over, and tells what became of the city. Jonah made a booth and **sat under it,** again reminding us of 1 K 19 [4]; **in the shadow** is an intrusion from [6], for the grateful shade was provided by God, not by Jonah.

6. *And Jehovah Elohim ordained*: cf. [7, 8], 1 [17]. The combination of Names is associated with the creation narrative,

Gen 2 [4]-3 [21] (only nine times outside of it): here was an act of creation! The Hebrew *kikāyon* may be rendered gourd, LXX 'colocynth,' if this is understood to be the bottle-gourd, cucurbita lagenaria, a quickly growing vine; otherwise, the cognate forms of the word in Assyrian, Egyptian, and the Talmud suggest palm-crist (AVm, RVm), the ricinus or castor-oil plant. Jerome *in loc.* favours the latter, and says he translated *hedera* (Vulgate) out of respect for Symmachus and others.

7. Another act of Providence: the worm that killed the gourd.

8. And yet a third: a heat-wave that prostrated Jonah. LXX 'a burning wind of heat' (cf. Jas 1 [11]); sultry is guessed from the context. The east wind is both scorching and violent (Hos 13 [15]; Ezek 17 [10]; Ps 48 [7]). Jonah prays again for death (cf. [3]), this time on account of his physical misery.

9. Self-pity blinds him to spiritual truth, and his language borders on irreverence.

10. Now comes the moral: 'You feel grief about losing the gourd, a trifle like that! Is it not right that I should feel grief at the destruction of a great city?'

11. Perhaps the author counted a round number, 40,000, for the extent of each day's journey (3 [3]); children of tender years are meant. It is remarkable that cattle should be included (cf. Ps 36 [6], and see on 3 [7]). So Jehovah, the God of heaven, does not confine His interests to Palestine or to the Jewish race. He cares for all His creatures, even for the heathen, the ancient oppressors of His people. He is not only the righteous and holy One who punishes sin; His mercy travels as far as His universal rule.

MICAH

By L. Elliott Binns

The Book of Micah contains some of the greatest passages in the Old Testament. Whether these were from the prophet whose name the book bears, or whether they are the work of nameless servants of God, is of little consequence, for inspiration is not limited to known channels, and the passages carry in themselves the marks of genuine oracles of God. In the case of many prophetic utterances a knowledge of the circumstances and of the life of their writers, even if it is not an essential condition, is a great aid to their understanding. The prophecies of Micah proclaim great principles which are independent of time and circumstance alike.

It is usual to divide the book into three sections: (*a*) 1-3, (*b*) 4-5, (*c*) 6-7. The first of these is assigned to Micah himself, the other two are held to be collections of anonymous passages coming from a later date. Certain scholars, including G. A. Smith and even Duhm, find fragments of Micah in the later sections, but the majority of modern critics limit his authentic utterances to 1-3. In contents there is some similarity between sections (*a*) and (*b*), for both alike consist of short impressive oracles, and both alike are interested in Judah and David. Section (*c*), however, contains a number of longer controversial passages in which several speakers are represented as taking part, and seems to have arisen in quite a different environment. Burkitt (*J.B.L.*, 1926, 159 ff.) has made the ingenious suggestion that the whole section is the work of a North Israelite prophet, and that the walls which are to be rebuilt (7 [11]) are not those of Jerusalem but of Samaria. The interest of the writer seems entirely to be in the north (e.g. the geographical allusions are all northern), and the captivity to which he refers is in Assyria and not in Babylon (7 [7-20]).

To his contemporaries, as to a later generation (see Jer 26 [18]), the prophet was known as Micaiah the Morashtite, a name derived from Moresheth-Gath, his native village, and probably intended to distinguish him from his earlier namesake Micaiah the son of Imlah. By a contraction, very common in Hebrew nomenclature, he was also called Micah, the name by which his book is known to later ages. He was the contemporary of Isaiah—by whose teaching he was probably influenced (so W. R. Smith)—though his call came later. The editorial superscription to the book tells us that he began to prophesy in the reign of Jotham (739-735), and continued to exercise his ministry into that of Hezekiah (720-692). G. A. Smith would ignore this superscription and postpone his first utterance to 720. Driver, who accepts the genuineness of 6 [1-8], thinks that he survived into the reign of Manasseh.

Moresheth-Gath is situated on the Philistine border of Judah in a fertile and

cultivated country. Micah had thus every opportunity of knowing, from his own observation, the sufferings and wrongs of the country people. A passionate sympathy for them breathes through his utterances, and, as G. A. Smith has well put it, 'pinched peasant faces peer between all his words.' Micah's style, in consequence, is vivid and energetic, full of rapid transitions, yet at the same time possessing a dignified simplicity; he is fond of plays upon words, using them with tragic emphasis.

The situation was well fitted to cultivate the fiery indignation of God's prophet, and with burning zeal Micah poured forth his bitter denunciations. In general it was very like that in Israel, as seen through the eyes of Hosea and Amos. Oppression was rife, and the rich landowners, supported, as in the days of Piers Plowman in England, by unjust judges, were able to see that the poor had no redress. The priests also were on the side of the wealthy, and false prophets were found willing to flatter those in power and to countenance or at least to overlook their doings. Micah is so full of the wrongs of his own order that he hardly sees beyond them. It is true that he denounces Zion, but it is because Zion is the seat of the oppressors and of those who support them. At the same time he has the natural pride of a Jew in the greatness of the national sanctuary, and a love for 'the gate of my people.' With foreign nations he has no concern except indirectly, and indeed there is not so much as a mention of Assyria by name in his genuine prophecies.

His message was stern and pointed: Jehovah will come quickly—but come in judgement. To a people who had seen the speedy fulfilment of the prophecies of Amos and Hosea against Samaria, such a condemnation might have been supposed to have come with compelling force; but so blind were the men of Judah to the signs of the times that it had but little effect. Those who suffered injustice doubtless supported their spokesman, but in the country public opinion had little strength and all the power was in the hands of the oppressors.

In other parts of the book there are striking passages, three of which may be picked out for special notice. In 4^{1-7} there is a wonderful collection of oracles. In them we see 'how the divine spiral ascends. We have, first, Religion, the centre and origin of all, compelling the attention of men by its historical evidence of justice and righteousness. We have the world's willingness to learn of it. We have the results in the widening brotherhood of nations, in universal Peace, in Labour freed from War, and with none of her resources absorbed by the conscriptions and armaments which in our times are deemed necessary for enforcing peace. We have the universal diffusion and security of Property, the prosperity and safety of the humblest home. And, finally, we have this free strength and wealth, inspired by the example of God Himself, to nourish the broken and to gather in the forwandered' (G. A. Smith). In 6^{1-8}, one of the greatest passages in all religious literature, we have a vindication of true religion as against soulless formalism—its shadow and curse. Finally, in 5^{2-4} there is the promise of a deliverer who is to arise from Bethlehem, the home of 'the darling of Israel's songs,' a prophecy which the New Testament writers saw fulfilled in the birth of David's greater son, the Redeemer, not of Israel alone, but of all mankind.

Bibliography

Cheyne (*C.B.*); Wade (*West. C.*); J. W. P. Smith (*I.C.C.*); G. A. Smith (*Ex. B.*); Nowack, Marti, Duhm, Sellin, van Hoonacker.

A. I.-III. **Prophecies against Samaria and Jerusalem.**

I. 1. **The Superscription.**—Micah as a mere countryman of no family is known from his native place, and his father's name is not even mentioned. The reigns of the kings mentioned here cover the period 739 to 692 (see above).

2-9. **Judgement to be Executed upon Israel.**—This prophecy belongs to a time when Samaria was still standing, probably to the time immediately before the disaster of 721; though some scholars, because of the threat to Jerusalem (9), place it as late as 701.

The earth, and all who dwell upon it, are warned that Jehovah is about to execute judgement upon Israel. He will come down upon the heights, and earthquake and eruption will mark His presence. All this will take place because of the sin of Samaria and of Jerusalem. Samaria will cease to be a city and become a ruin, and all its idols will be burnt; the destruction will even extend as far as Jerusalem. As a sign of mourning the lamenting prophet goes about stripped and cloakless.

2. **holy temple.** So in Ps 11 ^{4}; Hab 2^{20}.

4. **shall be molten.** A sign of volcanic

activity. So far as we know the people would not be familiar with such spectacles.

a steep place. The sudden awful descent of a waterfall.

5. Samaria . . . Jerusalem. The sin of each nation finds its centre in its capital (cf. [1]).

6. pour down. Samaria was built on a hill-side; the stones of the ruined houses would be rolled down, leaving only the foundations visible.

7. the hire of an harlot. Israel regarded her prosperity as due to her lovers (Hos 2 [12]); it will now be taken from her and given to another.

8. The prophet's action anticipates the evils coming upon his country.

9. incurable. 'The day of grace passes away at last, when man has so steeled himself against grace as to be morally dead, having deadened himself to all capacity of repentance' (Pusey).

the gate of my people. Micah evidently had some affection for Jerusalem.

10-16. A Lament over Israel.—This passage loses much of its force in a translation, since the effect depends largely upon word-plays and assonances, each town or village suggesting to the prophet some message of gloom or terror. Even in the original there are many obscurities, some of which are due to the corrupt state of the text, some to the loss of any clue to the prophet's reference (e.g. in [13]).

After warning the people against proclaiming their sorrows amongst the Philistines, and perhaps amongst the Phœnicians ([10] *v.n.*), the prophet goes on to enumerate various places in the Shephelah, and from their names to draw lessons as to their fate and conduct when the invaders come upon them. To us most of the names are unknown, and the sites occasion for guesswork; to Micah they were doubtless dear and familiar, and it must have been with a pang of sorrow that he set them down.

10. in Gath (cf. 2 S 1 [20]). An archaic reference due to David's lament; the town itself had lost all importance. **Gath** is probably not Tell es-Safi, but 'Arak el-menshiya, 'where the absence and wane of the Persian and Greek ages agrees with the disappearance of Gath from history after the 8th century B.C.' (S. A. Cook in *Expos. Times* [1926], 488).

at all. LXX perhaps read *in Accho*.

in Beth-le-Aphrah. Perhaps near Jerusalem. The word means *House of Dust*, and Pusey suggests as a parallel, 'In Ashe I roll myself in ashes.'

11. Saphir, i.e. *beautiful*. Possibly Suâfir, four miles south-east of Ashdod.

12. Maroth, i.e. *bitterness*. The site is unknown.

13. Lachish was originally an Amorite city. It is usually identified with Tell el-Hesy, sixteen miles east of Gaza.

beginning of sin. There is no record to explain this statement. G. A. Smith suggests that it was at Lachish that the Egyptian subsidies of horses and chariots were received.

of Israel (cf. 6 [16]). Hosea (4 [15]) likewise warned Judah against the corrupting example of Israel.

14. give a parting gift. The original represents the dowry with which the bride was sent away from her father's house.

Moresheth-gath. Micah's birthplace (see above), and, if St. Jerome is to be trusted, the place also of his burial. The site has at last been discovered in Tell Sandahannah (=Sancta Anna, a crusader's church), near Beit Jibrin, the ancient Eleuthropolis. The Tell is the site of the Greek city of Marissa. Particulars of this interesting identification are given in R. A. S. Macalister's *A Century of Excavation in Palestine*, 60 ff.

Achzib means a stream which dries up (Jer 15 [18]).

15. Mareshah is mentioned in Jos 15 [44] and 2 Ch 11 [8].

the glory of Israel. Perhaps the great men who will be driven, as was David, to taking refuge in caves.

Adullam, famous for its caves (1 S 22 [1]).

16. eagle. Better *griffon-vulture*.

II. The Injustice of Israel will be Punished, but Restoration is to Follow.—A condemnation of those who pass the night in devising plans for oppression of their neighbours. God will devise plans against them. The fate which will come upon Israel will provoke a lament, her lands shall go to others. Meanwhile an attempt is made to shut the mouths of the prophets. A further description is given of the injustices performed against the helpless and unwary. The land is so polluted that the people are bidden to leave it. As for the prophets, only those who declare smooth things can hope to receive attention ([1-11]).

The above passage is difficult, partly because it is fragmentary, and partly because the actual text needs considerable emendation before anything can be made of it. As a whole it is the genuine work of Micah. The two closing verses ([12] f.), perhaps, were from the post-exilic period, and promise that the flock shall be led

back to its fold. God will break down all barriers and lead them in like a victorious king.

1 f. The picture of oppression and injustice is very like that described in Isaiah (e.g. 5 [8]). The seizure of Naboth's vineyard is an instance of such oppression (1 K 21).

3. **this family.** Cf. Am 3 [1]; Jer 8 [3].

6. **Prophesy ye not.** Cf. Is 30 [10]; Am 7 [16].

8. **robe . . . garment.** That is the loose outer cloak and the inner robe as well (cf. Mt 5 [40]).

10. **Arise . . . rest.** Often used as a warning to the pilgrim. Notice that the original command is addressed to the spoilers—not to the godly.

uncleanness. Cf. Lev 18 [25, 28]; Jer 3 [2].

12 f. (cf. 4 [6] f.). The figure of the shepherd was very popular during the time of the Exile.

12. **of Bozrah,** better *into a fold.*

great noise. Cf. Ezek 36 [37].

13. **The breaker.** Either Jehovah Himself or His agent Cyrus.

III. 1-7. **A Condemnation of the Princes and the Prophets.**—Micah addresses the rulers of Israel as those who should be the guardians of justice. Because of their cruelty and oppression God will be deaf to their cries in the coming time of evil. In like manner the prophets prophesy falsely, and to serve their own ends. A day of darkness is coming in which they will long for divine guidance, and no answer will be given them.

'Preachers who care more for what goes into their mouths than for what comes out are an abomination unto the Lord at all times' (Batten, *The Hebrew Prophet,* 286).

3. The images suggest evil shepherds (Ezek 34 [2] ff.) in contrast with the Good Shepherd of 2 [12].

4. **will not answer.** So Is 1 [15]; Ezek 8 [18], etc.

5. The prophets suited to Judah have already been suggested (2 [11]); Micah now declares that they actually exist.

Peace. Cf. Jer 6 [13] f.; Ezek 13 [10].

6. The prophets are to be involved in the evils of the times which they failed to foresee.

the sun shall go down. Cf. Am 8 [9].

7. **cover their lips.** A sign of mourning (Ezek 24 [17, 22]) and of leprosy (Lev 13 [45]).

8-12. **A Denunciation of the False Confidence of the Rulers.**—Micah, in full consciousness that the Spirit of the Lord was inspiring him (cf. [7]), goes on further to denounce the rulers for the foolish confidence which is bringing disaster upon Jerusalem. In spite of the fact that all alike are using their various offices, administrative or ecclesiastical, for personal profit, they imagine that the presence of Jehovah's Temple on Mount Zion will protect them from all evil. Micah assures them that Jerusalem will be destroyed and Zion itself turned into a ploughed field. Part of this prophecy is quoted in Jer 26 [17] ff., and is of unique interest, since no parallel to such a quotation of one prophet in another exists in the Old Testament.

8. This utterance recalls Micah's earlier namesake Micaiah, the son of Imlah (1 K 22). It is interesting to notice the 'symptoms' of inspiration: moral courage and insight with burning zeal against wrong.

power . . . judgement . . . might. Notice these gifts of the Spirit and cf. Is 11 [2] ff.

10. **build up.** Cf. Jer 22 [13]. The middle years of the 8th century were a time of great building activity (Hos 8 [14]; Is 9 [10], and frequently in Amos).

11. The spirit of self-seeking appeared in every class, a sure and certain prelude, then as now, to material and spiritual destruction. Isaiah denounced the same crime (1 [23]).

the Lord among us. The mere presence of the Temple was regarded as a charm against disaster (Jer 7 [4]; Is 1 [10] ff.).

12. The tragedy of this denunciation lies in the fact that those condemned meant to build up Zion ([10]), instead of which they were destroying it.

B. IV.-V. **The Restoration of Israel.**—These chapters as they stand come from an age later by far than that of Micah. The people have already been scattered and punished, they are now to be comforted and restored.

IV. 1-7. **The Glory and Peace of Jerusalem.**—In the last days Jerusalem shall be made so lofty that it will be visible to all peoples and become the religious centre of the earth. Recognizing in Jehovah the true God, the nations will flock to the place from whence His teaching is to issue forth. The result will be universal quiet and peace. Those who had been driven out and punished will once more be restored to their former strength, and God will reign over them for ever.

The prophet reminds us that peace has its responsibilities no less than war, and 'without the redemptive forces at work which Christ brought to earth, peace is no peace; and the cruelties of war, that slay and mutilate so many, are as nothing to the cruelties of a peace which leaves us

insensible to the outcasts and the perishing, of whom there are so many even in our civilization' (G. A. Smith).

This passage seems to be made up of fragments, since [1-3] appear in Is 2 [2-4], [5] seems to be a gloss, and [6] f. hardly belong to their context.

1. **But**, better *And*.

the latter days, lit. *the end of the days*. Cf. Hos 3 [5]; Jer 23 [20], 30 [24], etc.

top of the mountains. Cf. Zech 14 [10].

2. A glorious picture of the future destiny of Jerusalem. The fulfilment of it began with the advent of our Blessed Lord.

4. **vine . . . fig tree.** A picture of rural prosperity. Both these trees were common in Palestine, as can be inferred from their frequent appearance in parables.

5. **in the name of his god.** This seems to follow awkwardly on a promise that all nations will follow Jehovah. Perhaps it contains directions for the period of waiting.

6. **her that halteth** (cf. Zeph 3 [19]). The image of the shepherd is here used, as so frequently in messages of consolation and restoration.

8-V. 1. Zion's Sufferings and Ultimate Victory.—This passage apparently consists of fragments, for [8, 9] f. and [11] ff. can hardly belong to the same context. We have, first, the figure of Jerusalem as the watch-tower of the shepherd being restored to its sovereignty. A sudden transition pictures her as a woman in travail, with the threat of exile in Babylon followed by redemption and restoration. The closing verses of the chapter seem late, and have an eschatological atmosphere about them. The nations gather themselves against Zion in order to seize upon her; by divine overruling their gathering together is for their own destruction. Zion shall thresh them like sheaves.

9. **no king** (cf. Jer 8 [19]). Probably the reference here is to an actual ruler.

10. **dwell in the field.** A picture of the fate of homeless captives.

Babylon. In Micah's own day Assyria was the world-power and Babylon a mere dependent.

13. **devote** (cf. Is 18 [7], 23 [18]). The devoting of part of the spoil to Jehovah is found elsewhere (Nu 31 [28]); here the whole is to be given.

V. 1. This is an obscure verse, and it is connected with what goes before by the mention of the siege.

2-9. Prophecies concerning the Messiah.—Several different prophecies go to form this section. In [2-4] occurs the well-known passage foretelling the coming of the ruler out of Beth-lehem. A further prophecy describes, in mysterious terms, the expulsion of the Assyrians from Israel and the spoiling of Assyria itself ([5] f.). Finally, we have a forecast, under various images, of the future glories of the remnant of Jacob. They are to be as the dew and the rain, or as a lion amongst the lesser beasts destroying and ravaging them.

2. This prophecy is of importance from its use in Mt 2 [6].

Beth-lehem Ephrathah. The home of David (1 S 20 [6]) and therefore a fitting place, in spite of its insignificance, for the Messiah's origin.

3. This verse seems to be an insertion, perhaps suggested by Is 7 [14]. It seems also to have connexions with 4 [7, 10].

5. **this man.** *Man* is inserted without any authority and merely to link up [4] and [5]. The reference of **this** is to **peace.**

Assyrian may mark the passage as early: but in view of its use for later oppressors (cf. Lam 5 [6]; Ezr 6 [22]; Zech 10 [11]) no argument can be based upon it.

seven . . . eight. The figures are not meant to be taken literally: a number sufficient for the task is all that is implied.

6. **land of Nimrod** (cf. Gen 10 [8] ff.). This included both Babylon and Assyria.

8. The sudden change of figure for the remnant is startling. 'What more unlike than the sweetness of the dew and the fierceness of the lion?' Sweetness and severity are both marks of God's people.

10-15. The Purifying of Israel.—In the coming day the Lord will destroy the things upon which Israel had placed its trust: horsemen and chariots, fortresses and strongholds, magic and divination, idols and images of every kind (cf. the denunciation of these things in Is 2 [6-8, 15]). But if Israel is thus to be relentlessly purged, the heathen are to be punished with unheard-of severity.

Some scholars regard this passage as being a genuine utterance of Micah. It is, however, full of ideas—e.g. the absence of warfare, the end of idols, the purified community—which are usually associated with the exilic or post-exilic age. Nevertheless such ideas may have flourished at an earlier date.

10. **horses . . . chariots** (cf. Zech 9 [10]). God wishes the nation to depend on Him alone. So too the Church. 'The more it is reft of human aid, the more it hangs upon God' (Pusey).

11. Cf. Zech 2 [4] f.

12. For the condemnation of magical practices see Dt 18 [9] ff.

C. VI.-VII. **Concluding Prophecies.**—The prophecies in this portion of the book are, with the exception of 7 7-20, akin in subject-matter and treatment to the genuine work of Micah. Most critics, however, regard them, chiefly on the grounds of difference of style and lateness of position in the book, as the work of an anonymous prophet. The section 7 7-20 is undoubtedly late and belongs to the post-exilic age.

VI. 1-8. **The Religion of the People and the Religion of the Prophets.**—This section culminates in one of the grandest utterances in the Old Testament, and one of the clearest statements of God's demands upon His children. The passage begins with a call to Israel to enter into a legal controversy with Jehovah in the presence of the mountains. The prophet, speaking in the name of God, demands from Israel evidence that Jehovah had been wearisome to them. He reminds them of the deliverance from Egypt and of the futility of Balak's plotting against them. The people respond by demanding what Jehovah really requires in the way of offerings and sacrifices: will He be pleased by the multiplication of beasts? does He even go so far as to require the sacrifice of the firstborn? In noble speech the prophet replies: man knows God's demands upon him, and the right way has been revealed, even the love of justice and mercy, and the humble walk with God.

2. the Lord's controversy. Jehovah's pleading with His people is often represented under legal forms (cf. Hos 4 1, 12 2; Is 3 13, 43 26; Jer 25 31). Here, as G. A. Smith says, 'God unfolds no mysteries, and pleads no power, but the debate proceeds upon the facts and evidences of life.'

3. O my people. 'This one tender word, twice repeated, contains in one a whole volume of reproof' (Pusey).

4. Miriam. The mention of Miriam is striking, as she is not in the surviving traditions of the Pentateuch a person of great prominence: cf., however, Nu 12 2 f. with my note in *West. Comm.*

5. Balak . . . Balaam. See Nu 22 5, etc.

Shittim was the last encampment east of Jordan, Gilgal the first on the west (Jos 3 1, 4 19, 5 9).

7. my firstborn. On the sacrifice of the firstborn see p. 209*a*. There is possibly a reference to Manasseh (2 K 21 6), from whose days the passage may well come.

8. These various virtues are enumerated in Am 5 24; Hos 6 6; Is 1 17, etc. Pusey quotes St. Augustine on the passage: 'Thou askest, what thou shouldest offer for thee? Offer thyself. For what else doth the Lord seek of thee, but thee? Because, of all earthly creatures, He hath made nothing better than thee, He seeketh thyself from thyself, because thou hadst lost thyself.'

9-16. **A Denunciation of Commercial Deceit.**—In 2 1 ff. Micah denounced the greed and injustice of the landowner; in the present passage, which may quite possibly have come from him, the wealthy tradespeople are exposed and condemned. Their chief crime, in the prophet's eyes, was the giving of short weight and the use of violence. The punishment which will come upon them is described in a variety of ways, all of which suggest the putting forth of effort and the failure to derive benefit. This fate is to come upon the nation because it goes in the way of Ahab, and observes the customs of Omri. In the end Jerusalem will be a desolation and a subject for reproach.

9. hear ye the rod, etc. The rod may be supposed to speak as the sword of the Lord was, by inference, capable of utterance (Jer 47 6). Wellhausen and others, however, render *hear, O tribe, and the assembly of the city* (cf. LXX).

10. ephah. This held about a bushel.

11. Cf. Hos 12 7.

14. Cf. Hos 4 10; Lev 26 26.

16. the statutes of Omri. Some special evil way is suggested, but there is no clue to it.

the house of Ahab. The murder of Naboth was no doubt prominently in the prophet's mind.

my people. Read with LXX *the peoples.*

VII. **1-6. The Utter Corruption of Society.**—Zion mourns because she is become like a garden or vineyard after ingathering; none that are good are left to her, all that are within the city plot against one another's lives. All men are moved by self-interest, and the best are like thorns instead of fruit. No longer is it safe to trust a friend, or even a near relative, for all are corrupt and disloyal. In face of this decay the prophet is driven back upon his God.

1. Isaiah compared Jerusalem to a vineyard which brought forth wild grapes (Is 5), 'Micah' to one which had been stripped of its fruit.

2. For the absence of good men cf. Jer 5 1 ff.

they hunt. Cf. Ps 35 7, 57 6.

3 is so obscure that much of the original cannot be translated.

6. Cf. Mt 10 35 f. (=Lk 12 51 ff.).

7-20. A Confession of Trust in Jehovah.—This passage falls naturally into three sections: (*a*) the patient waiting for God's intervention (7-10); (*b*) the restoration of Jerusalem (11-13); (*c*) Israel restored to Jehovah's favour (14-20). Originally these sections seem to have been distinct, but similarity of subject has been the cause of their being grouped together.

(*a*) The nation rejoices in the quickening power of Jehovah which enables it to survive all disaster, and even to recognize in such disaster the consequences of sin. The final justification of Israel will be the spectacle of her enemy put to confusion.

(*b*) A day is coming when the fallen walls of Jerusalem will be rebuilt, and the exiles will flock back from all quarters. But the earth in its wideness will be desolate because of the sins of its inhabitants.

(*c*) Israel calls upon Jehovah to restore His flock, now wandering on the hills, to its ancient pastures. Jehovah promises to do such marvels that the Exodus will be recalled and the nations dumbfounded and reduced to submissive awe. Israel bursts forth into a grateful eulogy of Jehovah as the God who pardons iniquity; in Him is the nation's confidence, and upon His mercy and truth they rely.

7. The first person may refer to the prophet; it seems best, however, to take it of the nation personified.

8. **darkness . . . light.** Cf. Ps 27 1; Is 9 2.

9. **I have sinned.** Not necessarily consciously (Ps 51 4 ff.); the sin is inferred from the disasters which have befallen the nation.

11. **thy walls.** This seems to belong to the time between 586 and 444 B.C.: cf also the reference in Ps 51 18 f.

12. **from Assyria.** Perhaps a reference to north Israelites (cf. Jer 3 12, 31 1 ff.).

13. **the land** is better rendered *earth*.

14. **Bashan and Gilead.** G. A. Smith takes this limited restoration as a reference to those deported by Tiglath-Pileser III in 734 (2 K 15 29), and from it argues for an early date for the whole passage.

16. **their hand,** etc. Cf. Job 21 5 and 29 9.

18. Cf. Ex 15 11.

NAHUM

By G. W. Wade

Author.—Nothing is known about Nahum '[(Jehovah) is full of comfort' (cf. *Nehemiah*)] beyond his connexion with Elkosh, an unknown locality conjecturally identified with (*a*) Alkush, 25 miles north of the site of Nineveh—a view implying that some of his ancestors had been deported with the Ten Tribes in 722; (*b*) El-kauze, in Galilee; (*c*) Capernaum, 'village of Nahum' (Tell Hûm or Khân Minyeh), also in Galilee; (*d*) a site near Beit Jebrîn, twenty miles south-west of Jerusalem. The last identification is to be preferred, since the prophet's interest is centred in Judah (1 15), of which he was presumably a native.

Contents.—The book falls into two parts, though the division between them is not quite certain. (1) The first (1 1-10 ?) is a psalm, having for its subject Jehovah's disposition and power to punish His enemies, and to succour such as take Him for their protector. (2) The second (1 11-3 19) is a prediction of the imminent doom of Nineveh and its reigning dynasty. The distinction between the two parts is accentuated by the abrupt introduction of the second person in 1 11, where the city is apostrophized.

Date and Occasion.—The original part of the book is the prophecy concerning the Assyrian capital, to which the opening poem has been prefixed; and its date, about which nothing is said in the heading (contrast Hosea, Amos, Micah, etc.), must fall between the destruction of the Egyptian city No-Amon by Asshur-banipal in 663 (3 8) and the overthrow of Nineveh (after a three years' siege) by the Medes under Cyaxares (aided by the Babylonians) in 612. The conclusion that the oracle was composed shortly before the last-mentioned year and not on some earlier occasion within the interval named is favoured by the prophet's convinced belief that the city's destruction is certain and speedy. If this is correct, it should follow and not precede Zephaniah.

Integrity.—The opening psalm is not in itself an inappropriate introduction to the rest of the book; but it contains no reference to Nineveh, and the circumstance that it is an imperfect acrostic, traceable as far as 10, points to its being part of an

independent poem, from which an editor of the prophecy borrowed as much as he deemed suitable. Its acrostical structure finds a parallel in certain psalms (9-10, 25, 34, 37, 111-112, 119, 145), and in Lam 1-4; and it is perhaps post-exilic in origin. In the body of the subsequent oracle there are a few passages (1 [13, 15], 2 [2]) which are addressed to, or have in view, *Judah*, and appear to be interpolations: a rearrangement of these and a few others can be seen in Moffatt (*The Old Testament—a New Translation*).

Style.—The introductory poem, descriptive of Jehovah's wrath, as manifested in storm and tempest, is dignified in manner, though the thoughts are for the most part abstract, and the diction does not call for special notice. But the succeeding prophecy is remarkable for its concentrated force; the emotion animating it is tense and passionate; and the language is singularly vigorous and dramatic, abounding in concrete and vivid imagery, and containing scarcely a superfluous word.

Teaching.—In the heart of the book the prophet, representing, as he does, the fall of the Assyrian capital as caused by Jehovah, and enlarging upon the crimes that rendered its fate well merited (2 [11-13], 3 [1, 4]) displays his faith in a Divine controller of human fortunes, and exhibits his convictions that the principles directing Jehovah's acts are ethical principles. Nevertheless he is exceptional among the prophetic writers, inasmuch as he never alludes to the sins of his own countrymen, which his predecessors considered to have been punished by God through the agency of Assyria (Is 10 [5] f.; cf. Mic 1 [5-9]), and so to have exemplified no less surely the moral character of His government of the world. Possibly the religious reformation of Josiah (*c.* 620), if this had preceded the composition of the book, had banished from his mind the memories of his nation's earlier impiety: this, at any rate, would account for the contrast between him and Zephaniah, who likewise predicts Nineveh's overthrow (2 [13]).

Original Form of the Prefatory Psalm.—The following is a reconstruction (with a literal translation) of the acrostic as far as 10, beyond which it cannot be attempted without violent alterations of the text. The poem is written in couplets, some of which are defective. Necessary supplements are placed in pointed brackets, but certain emendations are unmarked, and a few omissions and transpositions have been adopted.

Aleph. 2*a*. (*A*) *God jealous and avenging is Jehovah: Jehovah is avenging and full of wrath* [for 2*b*, 3*a* see below].

Beth. 3*b*. *In whirlwind and storm is his way; and clouds are the dust of his feet.*

Gimel. 4*a*. *Rebuketh he the sea and drieth it; and all the rivers he parcheth.*

Daleth. 4*b*. *Fade do Bashan and Carmel; and the sprout of Lebanon languisheth.*

He. 5*a*. [*The*] *mountains quake because of him; and* [*all*] *the hills do melt.*

Vau. 5*b*. *And wasted is the earth before him; even the world and all that dwell therein.*

Zain. 6*a*. (*The*) *indignation of him—who can stand before it? and who can abide in the fierceness of his anger?*

Kheth. 6*b*. (*The*) *fury of him is poured out like fire; and the rocks are broken because of him.*

Teth. 7*b*. *Good is Jehovah <to them that wait for him>; a stronghold in the day of trouble.*

Yodh. 7*b*. *Knoweth he them that put their trust in him; 8a. and in an overrunning flood <he delivereth them>.*

Caph. 8*b*. (*A*) *full end he maketh of them that rise against him; and he pursueth his enemies into darkness.*

Lamedh. 9*b*. *Not a second time shall trouble rise up: . . .*

Mem. 9*a*. *What do ye imagine against Jehovah? a full end doth he make.*

Nun. 2*b*. *Avenging is Jehovah to his adversaries; and reserving anger against his enemies.*

Samech. 10. *Thorns tangled and drenched (though they be), they are devoured as dry stubble.*

Bibliography

(*a*) Davidson-Lanchester (*C.B.*); Driver (*Cent. B.*); (*b*) G. A. Smith (*Ex. B.*); J. M. P. Smith (*I.C.C.*); Nowack (*H.K.*); Marti (*K.H.C.*); van Hoonacker; Duhm; Sellin. See also Farrar, *Minor Prophets*; Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*; Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh*; *C.A.H.*, iii, and articles in *H.D.B.* and *E. Bi.*

I. 1. Of the two titles the first probably belongs to the original prophecy (1 [11] f.), whilst the second was added when the psalm was prefixed. **burden of:** i.e. utterance (with uplifted voice) concerning. The oracles to which this term was applied were generally boding in tone (2 K 9 [25-26]; 2 Ch 24 [27]; Is 13 [1], though see Zech 12 [1]). The site of Nineveh is covered by the mounds of Kou-yunjik and Nebi-junus, opposite Mosul. The city was strongly defended by ramparts, by the Tigris, and by a system of canals. **vision:**

here used of an oracle communicated through mental intuition, without visual impressions (Is 1[1], Ob 1[1]; ctr. Is 6[1]; 1 K 22[17]).

2-10. Jehovah's character and the effects produced by His wrath upon physical nature.

2*b* is probably misplaced (see on [9]).

3*a*, which interrupts the alphabetic arrangement, seems to be an adaptation of Ex 34[6, 7], inserted to qualify [2a].

3*b*. **For the Lord,** which belongs to the preceding clause, substitute *He*. God's movements are associated with elemental commotions in Ps 18[9] f.; Is 29[6]; Mic 1[3, 4]; Jg 5[4, 5]; Hab 3[3-6]; ctr. 1 K 19[11, 12].

4. What is here described is the effect of a violent and hot wind upon water (Ps 18[15]) and vegetation. For **Bashan, Carmel,** and **Lebanon** see the article on *Geography*, p. 638*b*. The first was famous for its oaks (Is 2[13]; Zech 11[2]), and the last was clothed with forests (Jg 9[15]; Is 2[13], 40[16]). For the first **languisheth,** which disturbs the acrostic, LXX and Vulgate have a different verb, perhaps implying *fadeth* (Ps 88[9]) or *faileth* (Is 38[14]).

5. Earthquakes and torrential rains are elsewhere represented as accompanying the Lord's approach (Ex 19[18]; Is 64[1]; Hab 3[9, 10]). For **is upheaved** perhaps read *is wasted* (with OL), or *is bowed down* (cf. Hab 3[6]).

6. If the mightiest objects in nature cannot withstand the Divine anger, no human power can resist it.

7. The Lord is good. This, constituting the first line of the couplet, is defective; supply (with LXX) **to those who wait for him** (Lam 3[25]): for the second line cf. Ps 37[39]. **knoweth:** regards with kindness (Ps 1[6]; 144[3]; 1 Cor 8[3]; Gal 4[9]): omit **and.**

8. The opening words belong to the couplet in [7b], which, supplemented, should be, **and in an overrunning flood** (i.e. when foes, like a flood, overrun the land) **he** *delivereth* [or perhaps *hideth*] **them.** The rest is corrupt: read (with LXX) **He maketh a full end of** *them that rise against him* (Dt 33[11]), **and pursueth his enemies into darkness.**

9. The alphabetic arrangement requires [9b] to precede [9a]: for the former, instead of the present text, perhaps read, *upon his adversaries he taketh not vengeance a* **second time,** i.e. there is no need of a second blow. The parallel line, necessary to complete the couplet, is lacking. **what do ye imagine,** etc. The implication is that no hostile plans can succeed against the Lord. After [9a] (as rearranged), which begins with *m*, there should follow the second half of [2], which begins with *n*.

10. This, as it stands, is almost untranslatable; but if the opening and other words in the Hebrew be omitted, then the meaning seems to be that, though the Lord's enemies, like thorn-bushes soaked in rain, are dangerous to handle (2 S 23[6]) and difficult to burn, yet by Him they can be destroyed as easily as dry stubble.

11, 12, 14. With these verses, which should be taken together, begins the original prophecy of Nahum, who addresses Nineveh, announcing its impending destruction.

11. Read, *Did not one go forth out of thee, imagining evil against the Lord, counselling wickedness?* The reference is probably to Sennacherib, the invader of Judah in Hezekiah's reign (2 K 18, 19).

12. Though they be, etc. This is probably corrupt: perhaps read, **Though** *he* (the Assyrian king of [11]) *was ruler over many waters* (a figure for the vast Assyrian armies: Is 8[7, 8]), **even so they** *were cut off and passed away.* **though I have . . . no more.** If this is continuous with the preceding, the pronoun (fem.) refers to Nineveh, and the margin is better than the text: the impending punishment will be so complete that it will not need to be repeated.

14. The pronoun **thee** here is masc., and refers to the Assyrian king (Sin-sharishkun). **no more . . . sown:** the dynasty will cease to be perpetuated (cf. Is 14[20], of Babylon). **cut off,** the idols will be either destroyed or carried away by a conqueror (Is 46[1, 2]). **I will make . . . vile.** There is perhaps some duplication and other errors: read **I will make thy grave** *a place of ignominy*. Interlaced between the concluding verses of this chapter are two ([13] and [15]) which seem to be addressed not to Nineveh but to Judah, and to be of exilic date. In [13] Judah is compared to a beast of burden (Jer 30[8]), **the yoke** that it bears being the rule of Babylon (since in Nahum's time Assyria's control over Judah must have been much relaxed). As the reference in the pronoun **his** is obscure, perhaps for **his yoke from off thee** read *the bars of thy yoke* (Lev 26[13]). These, on either side of the neck, were kept in place by the **bonds** (cords fastened beneath the throat). It is possible that [12b] should be united with [13], and, like the latter, be taken to refer to Judah: if so, it must be rendered as in RV. In [15] attention is called to the arrival, on the Judæan hills, of a messenger, announcing the fall of the enslaving power (Is 40[9], 52[7]), and the restoration to its captives of freedom to renew their religious feasts.

II. 1-10. A graphic picture of an enemy's successful assault upon, and sack of, Nineveh.

1. **He that dasheth in pieces.** The Hebrew really means 'the scatterer': read either *the shatterer* or the *battle-mace* (Jer 51 [20]; cf. the names *Maccabæus* and *Martel*). The people that really destroyed the Assyrian capital were the Medes. **keep the munition**: an ironical command to guard the ramparts. **loins**: the seat of strength (1 K 12 [10]; Job 40 [16]).

2 separates awkwardly [1] and [3], and looks like an exilic interpolation (cf. 1 [13, 15]). Perhaps read: **for the Lord bringeth again the excellency of Jacob** (i.e. Judah), *and the vine of Israel* (the northern kingdom). **The vine branches** in [2b] are the populations of the two states, which have been carried off by foreign conquerors.

3. **is made red**: shields were perhaps constructed of wicker-work, and protected by leather, coloured red. **scarlet**: a favourite military colour in most ages. The Medes had a garment called *sārāges*, which was purple, striped with white. **steel**: presumably the metal sheathing of the wood-work. **spears**: strictly the spear-shafts (see margin): similarly in Greek and Latin authors, spears are sometimes termed 'firs,' and 'ash trees.' But the LXX suggests the correction *horses*, which quiver with excitement.

4*a*. Render: *the chariots are like mad things in the fields, they run to and fro in the broad spaces* (without the walls).

5. **remembereth his worthies**, reviews in his mind his principal officers, to select the best for special duties. **stumble**: in their eagerness to rush to the assault (omit **thereof**). **Mantlet**: a framework of wood, covered with skins or leather, to screen from missiles a party of soldiers using a battering-ram.

6. **the gates of the rivers** are possibly the sluices of the moats protecting the palace: when these are opened and the water runs off, the residents collapse (Jos 2 [9]; Jer 49 [23]) through fear.

7. **Huzzab**: if this is a noun, it is probably an Assyrian title for the principal deity, or for the queen, of Nineveh. **uncovered**: exposed to shame (Is 47 [3]). **she is carried away**: if **Huzzab** is a verb (margin it is decreed), the word here translated may be an Assyrian term (*etellitu*) meaning **the queen**, and forming the subject of **is uncovered**. **doves**: the note of these birds is plaintive (Is 38 [14], 59 [11]; Ezek 7 [16]). **tabering**: beating as on a tabor or drum.

8*a*. Read: **Nineveh** *is like a* **pool of waters, and they flowing** (i.e. ebbing) **away**. The allusion is perhaps to the flight of Nineveh's mercenaries (cf. Jer 46 [21] of Egypt), who are likened to a reservoir, of which the dam has been breached. **stand**: the shout of those who try to rally the fugitives.

9. **Take ye**: an exhortation to the victorious troops. A Babylonian tablet recently found records: 'The spoil of the city, a quantity beyond counting they plundered, and turned the city into a mound and a ruin.' **the glory**, etc.: better *a wealth* (or *an abundance*) of all precious wares (cf. Gen 31 [1]; Ps 49 [16]).

10 begins with a striking alliteration; *There is void and vacancy and vacuity*. The concluding words recur in Jl 2 [6].

11-13. The prophet, projecting himself into the future, muses on the disappearance of Nineveh.

11. Nineveh is likened to a den, whither lions were wont to drag their prey. **feeding-place**: as the Hebrew commonly means 'pasture ground' (Ezek 34 [18]; Job 39 [8]), read (by transposing two letters) *cave* (cf. [12]). **and the lioness walked**: there is no conjunction in the Hebrew, and the LXX implies the reading (*where the lion*) *walked to enter therein*.

13. **her chariots.** Some, to improve the parallelism, would read *thy thicket* (i.e. thy lair). **the young lions**: a figure for the Assyrian warriors. **thy messengers**, i.e. envoys carrying demands or orders to enemies or subject states (Is 37 [9]). The metaphors in [11-13a] are here dropped.

III. 1-7. A renewed description of Nineveh's crimes and her approaching fate.

1. **Woe to**, better, *Ha!* (Is 1 [4]). **bloody**: the Assyrians' own inscriptions witness to their horrible cruelty. **lies**: the insincere diplomacy, by which weaker nations were deluded and defrauded. **the prey departeth not**: the policy of plunder is never interrupted.

2. Read: *Hark! the whip, and the rumbling of wheels; galloping horses, and jolting chariots.*

3. **mounting**: better as in margin (lit. 'making his steed go up').

4. Nineveh, through the glamour of her power and the speciousness of her statecraft, seduced to their ruin the peoples that entered into relations with her. **By families** are meant nationalities (Gen 12 [3]; Am 3 [2]).

5. She will undergo degradation parallel to that inflicted on an unchaste woman (Is 47 [3]; Jer 13 [26]; Ezek 16 [37]): for **discover** substitute *remove*.

8-19. A city's greatness affords no

security (as past history can prove) that its overthrow is not close at hand.

8. **No-amon**, i.e. 'the city of (the god) Amon' (in Jer 46[25]; Ezek 30[14] simply No), called by the Greeks *Thebes*. It was situated in Upper Egypt, 440 miles south of Cairo, and is mentioned in Homer, *Iliad*, ix, 381-4. **rivers**: the Nile, and the canals supplied from it. **the sea**: a designation of the Nile (as in Is 18[2], 19[5]). **was of the sea**: read (LXX and Vulgate) **was** *waters*.

9. **Ethiopia**: when the city fell, an Ethiopian dynasty was ruling there. **Put**: a people mentioned in Ezek 30[5], and probably dwelling along the African shore of the Gulf of Aden (Somaliland). **Lubim**: the Libyans, west of Egypt.

10. No-amon, notwithstanding her strong defences, was captured in 663 B.C. For the barbarities here described cf. 2 K 8[12], 15[16]; Is 13[16]; Hos 13[16], etc.

11. **drunken**, i.e. staggering under a crushing calamity (Ob [16]; Jer 25[15]; Ps 60[3]). **be hid**: perhaps equivalent to swoon.

12. **fortresses**: situated in outlying parts of the territory. **firstripe figs**: these, found on the trees in early June, were a great delicacy (Is 28[3]).

13. The prophet, in imagination, is present when Nineveh is assailed and sees her citizens lose their manhood in the face of danger (cf. Jer 50[37]). **the gates of thy land**. Since Nineveh has not yet fallen (14), these must mean the approaches to the capital: similarly certain mountain passes in Asia Minor were called 'the Cilician gates' and 'the Syrian gates.' **bars**: probably forts commanding the approaches.

14 consists of ironical directions to Nineveh to replenish her supplies and to repair her walls in view of the coming siege. **the fortresses** are the forts on the walls. In the last clause the margin is preferable (cf. 2 S 12[31] margin).

15. **it shall devour thee like the canker-worm**: as the same comparison is used quite differently in the next sentence, the two words constituting this clause are probably accidental duplicates of neighbouring words, and should be omitted. **make thyself many**, etc.: Nineveh is ironically bidden to increase her numbers till they rival those of a locust swarm. The **canker-worm** is either a variety of locust, or one of the stages in the insect's development.

16. **thy merchants**: these had contributed to Nineveh's wealth, but in the presence of danger they disappear as young locusts do, after emerging from the chrysalis. For **spoileth** substitute *stripeth itself* (of its wing-cases), preparatory to flight.

17. **thy crowned . . . thy marshals**: probably Assyrian loan-words, denoting certain classes of officials: the first is thought to mean inspectors of some kind, and the second, military secretaries, who had charge of the muster-rolls (cf. Jer 51[27]). **swarms of**: omit. **grasshoppers**: inaccurately used for some kind of locust. **hedges**, better *fences* (of stone, Nu 22[24. 25]): on these they remain as long as they are torpid through cold. In [18] and [19] the overthrow of Nineveh is assumed to have occurred.

18. **shepherds . . . worthies**: leaders and other principal officers. The prophet mentally beholds these slumbering in death (for **are at rest** substitute *sleep* [Jer 51[39]], omitting one letter), and the rank and file dispersed (cf. 1 K 22[17]).

19. **assuaging**: read *healing*. **the bruit of thee**, i.e. the report of thy downfall, which will elicit universal demonstrations of joy. Though Nineveh was burnt and its king Sin-shar-ishkun probably perished in the flames, a remnant of the Assyrian nation established itself for a few years in Harran.

HABAKKUK

By G. W. Wade

Author.—Nothing is known for certain about the ancestry, abode, or precise date of Habakkuk (whose name perhaps means '[God] embraces'). A curious legend in which he figures is preserved in *Bel* (33 f.), a work which a Greek MS. affirms to be taken from a prophecy by him.

Contents.—The book may be conveniently divided into six sections: (*a*) 1[2-4], a complaint from the prophet that God is indifferent to the ill-treatment of the righteous by the wicked; (*b*) 1[5-11], an oracle announcing that God is about to raise up as an instrument of chastisement the rapacious Chaldeans; (*c*) 1[12-17], a remonstrance from the prophet against the permission accorded to the wicked to destroy a people better than themselves; (*d*) 2[1-5], a response from God that not the

presumptuous but the righteous shall survive; (*e*) 2 [6-20], a taunt-song from the victims of the oppressor, anticipating requital for him; (*f*) 3, a psalm describing a vision of God advancing both to overthrow and to save.

Date and Occasion.—The determination of these depends upon the conclusions reached in the next section.

Integrity and Arrangement.—Doubts about the proper order, or the genuineness, of some parts have been raised through (1) the uncertainty respecting the people who are the subject of the complaint in section (*a*), with consequent difficulties felt in connexion with the true sequence of (*a*), (*b*), (*c*); (2) some lack of harmony between (*f*) and the rest.

(1) The 'wicked' whom the prophet has in view in (*a*) are unnamed; and different opinions about their identity have been entertained. (i) The *prima facie* impression is that they are the *Judæans*, the remonstrance in (*a*) about their conduct (cf. Jer 12 [1]) being answered by the oracle in (*b*), predicting an imminent chastisement for them through the agency of the Chaldeans, experience of whose wickedness in turn evokes the expostulation in (*c*), which is met by the assurance in (*d*). This view assumes that the prophet questions the Divine justice on *two* occasions, receiving successive answers (1 [5-11], 2 [2-5]), and that a considerable interval separates (*a*) and (*b*) together (which must be prior to the first invasion of Judah by the Chaldeans in the reign of Jehoiakim, 607-597) from (*c*) and (*d*) (which must be subsequent to this invasion, if not to the fall of Jerusalem in 587). There is, however, in the text no indication of such an interval; and the similarity of the complaints of *violence* and *perverseness* in 1 [2, 3], and in 1 [9, 13], 2 [8, 17] favours the inference that the *same* people are meant throughout 1 and 2. Accordingly it has been held that the *wicked* in (*a*) are the same as those in (*c*); and in consequence (*b*) has been either omitted as an interpolation, or prefixed to (*a*), the *wicked* being, of course, the Chaldeans; or else (*b*) has been placed after (*c*) and (*d*), the *wicked* being then taken to be the Assyrians or the Egyptians, upon whom vengeance is to be inflicted through the Chaldeans. But neither omission nor transposition is required if it be assumed that (*b*) is cited by Habakkuk himself (prophesying after 597 or even some years after 587) from an earlier oracle (probably his own; note the similarity of the phrases *not theirs, not his* in 1 [6], 2 [7]), and has been placed where it occurs in order merely to depict the *character* of the nation allowed by God to oppress His own people. That the passage is a quotation is suggested by the absence of any introductory phrase like 'Thus saith the Lord.'

(2) The theophany described in 3 (which has a separate heading) is taken by some to be the 'vision' which accompanied the audible communication received by Habakkuk (2 [2-5]); but there are features unfavourable to the supposition that the chapter was originally composed as a sequel to 1 and 2. Thus (*a*) the speaker is the nation, and not the prophet ([14]); (*b*) the Divine wrath is directed against 'peoples' in the plural ([12]); (*c*) the calamity from which God is about to rescue His people appears to be an invasion impending or in progress ([16]), not a protracted reign of violence (1 [2]); (*d*) the concluding verses ([17-19]) imply that the calamity experienced is *scarcity* (but these are probably a later supplement). Whether the poem is pre-exilic or post-exilic is difficult to decide. If the main part of the book has been rightly dated, the three prophecies—Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk—should be arranged in this order.

Style.—The first two chapters are marked by vigour and animation; the argument with the Almighty is impressive; and the metaphors are appropriate and graphic. In 3 the course of the thunderstorm, thought of as concealing the Deity in His march, is depicted with vivid strokes, and the poem throbs with intense religious feeling.*

Teaching.—A conspicuous trait in Habakkuk is the breadth of his sympathy with humanity at large: his emotions are stirred by the sufferings not only of his own countrymen, but of the other victims of Chaldean rapacity. But he also claims attention through the fact that, in his distress at the prevalence of moral disorder in the world, he does not shrink from asking God for an explanation of the problem thereby presented. That he emerges from his perplexity with his trust in God and in the final vindication of righteousness unimpaired does not mean that the mental struggle has left him just as he was before, since the faith that was his originally through the accident of birth he has won for himself afresh through spiritual effort.

* The late Dr. Driver's estimate of the 'Prayer of Habakkuk' deserves mention: '. . . a lyric ode, which, for sublimity of poetic conception and splendour of diction, ranks with the finest which Hebrew poetry has produced' (*L.O.T.*, 9th ed., 339).—A. G.

Bibliography

(*a*) Davidson-Lanchester (*C.B.*); Driver (*Cent. B.*). (*b*) G. A. Smith (*Ex. B.*); Stonehouse; Nowack (*H.K.*); Marti (*K.H.C.*); van Hoonacker; Duhm; Sellin. See also Thackeray, *Schweich Lectures*, 1920; Farrar, *Minor Prophets*; Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*; and articles in *H.D.B.* and *E.Bi.*

I. 1-4. The prophet's complaint that wickedness has the upper hand.

2. I cry . . . of violence: better *I cry . . . Violence* (Jer 20 [8]). **perverseness:** better *mischief* (and so in [13]). **strife . . . riseth up:** aggressiveness is not suppressed as it should be.

4. the law is slacked: better *instruction is paralyzed.* The Hebrew priests and prophets are intimidated, or else their decisions are unenforceable in consequence of hostile oppression. **go forth:** become operative. **compass about:** envelop, suppressing all independence.

5-11. The oracle herein comprised forms part of the prophet's remonstrance, being seemingly quoted by him in illustration of the characteristics of the outrageous Chaldeans. It must originally have been delivered when the wickedness of *Judah* called for chastisement, which the Chaldeans, by God's decree, were to inflict. By the time the rest of 1, 2 was written, the offences of Judah had been dwarfed by those of the nation that punished them (cf. Is 40 [2], 47 [6]).

5. I work, i.e. I am about to work.

6. the Chaldeans. Their native home lay along the east coast of the Persian Gulf, but they became united with the Babylonians about 625. **bitter and hasty,** i.e. truculent and impetuous.

7. proceed from themselves: to no superior power do they acknowledge responsibility or gratitude.

8. Their horses, etc.: for the comparisons see Jer 4 [13], 48 [40], 49 [22]; Zeph 3 [3]. **and their horsemen,** etc. The end of this verse and the beginning of the next should probably be punctuated thus: **and their horsemen, their horsemen, gallop; they come from afar, they fly: as an eagle** (or **a vulture**) **hasteth to devour; they come all of them for violence.**

9. their faces . . . wind: perhaps better *the strain of their faces is ever forward,* i.e. they never swerve from their goal; but the text is probably corrupt. Since the word rendered *forward* usually means *towards the east,* whereas the Chaldeans invaded Palestine *from* the east, some have identified the people here described with the *Greeks* under Alexander (4th century B.C.), introducing that name, or an equivalent, in 1 [6], 2 [5]; but the Jews did not sustain from the Greeks the violence of which Habakkuk complains. **he:** the leader of the invaders. **heapeth up dust:** piles against a beleaguered wall a bank of earth with a sloping surface, enabling troops to reach the summit (cf. 2 S 20 [15]; Ezek 26 [8]).

11. Render: *then he sweepeth by* (in his career of conquest) *like a wind and passeth on; but guilty is he whose own might is his god* (cf. [7]). In the last clause the change of a letter yields: *and he maketh this, his might, to be his God.*

12-17. A renewal of the complaint (interrupted by the fragmentary oracle in [5-11]) that the ruthless conquerors are worse than their victims.

12*a*. The note of interrogation should be placed at **Lord.** Instead of **we shall not die** (an expression of hope that the nation will not finally perish), the original text, according to Jewish tradition, was *thou diest not* (altered through motives of reverence).

12*b* should be rendered as a question, *hast thou,* etc.: Habakkuk asks whether the Chaldean has been sent to execute judgement on Israel: if so, it is unintelligible how so holy a God can use as His instrument so brutal a power. **Rock:** the term is here a title for God as being His people's firm support (Dt 32 [4. 15]; 2 S 23 [3]; Is 17 [10]).

14. makest men, i.e. allowest men to be treated. **that have no ruler,** i.e. none to organize them for self-defence (Pr 6 [7], 30 [27]).

15. angle: an archaism for *hook.* **drag:** a net fitted to be drawn along the bottom of a river.

16. sacrificeth to. The Scythians are represented by Herodotus (iv, 62) as sacrificing to their scimitars (emblems of the god of war); but here the language is probably figurative, implying that the Chaldeans worship their own prowess. Their own inscriptions make it clear that they were, in reality, devout adorers of the gods Marduk, Nebo, and others.

17. If the text is sound, the sense must be, Shall he empty his net for the reception of further catches? This agrees very well with [16]; but since the parallel clause has **slay,** and the verb rendered **empty** can also mean *draw,* whilst the Hebrew for **net** and **sword** differ only by a single letter, perhaps read, *Shall he draw his sword continually, to slay the nations unsparingly?*

II. 1-5 contain the Lord's answer,

implying an assurance that Nemesis will overtake the insolent foe, but not immediately. Since the prediction is not to be verified at once, it must be put on record.

1. The language is probably figurative, and expresses the alertness with which the prophet looks out for the Lord's answer (cf. Is 21 [6, 8]); but it is possible that it implies an actual retirement to some elevated and isolated spot for communion with God (cf. Nu 23 [3]; 1 K 19 [8]). what I shall answer, better *what* (reply) *I shall bring back*, though the Syriac has 'what he will answer.'

2. tables, better *tablets* (of clay or wood), which would preserve the oracle against the time when its truth would appear ([3]); cf. Is 8 [1, 2], 30 [8]; Dan 12 [4]. The LXX has the singular. may run, i.e. run on in his reading of it, without having to pause to decipher the characters.

3. lie: disappoint.

4 and 5 probably comprise the oracle that is to be written down. In the first half of [4], as rendered in the RV, there is no antecedent to which the pronoun him can refer; and the text is probably corrupt. One suggested emendation (following in part the LXX) is, *Behold him that is puffed up, my soul hath no pleasure in him*; a second, which is perhaps better, is, *Behold, he fainteth* (i.e. collapses, Is 51 [20]) *whose soul is not upright in him.* the just, better *the righteous* (as in 1 [4]). his faith, better *his steadfastness* to God's laws (cf. Pr 28 [20]). This clause is quoted by St. Paul (Rom 1 [17]; Gal 3 [11]), who, however, enlarges its meaning (cf. also Heb 10 [38]).

5. Here the general principle, affirmed in [4], that the presumptuous will not experience God's favour, but will collapse, is declared to apply *a fortiori* to the tyrant Chaldean. The reference to wine must be due to some corruption, for the context has in view the inordinate greed for conquests, not the debauchery, of the Chaldeans; perhaps read: *How much more* (1 S 23 [3]; Job 4 [18-19]) *the oppressor, a treacherous dealer, a haughty man, shall not abide* (i.e. shall fail to continue in prosperity), *who enlargeth*, etc. as hell . . . as death: cf. Is 5 [14]; Pr 27 [20], 30 [15-16] (margin).

6-17. A series of four woes pronounced on the Chaldeans for their boundless rapacity, and put into the mouth of their victims.

6. a parable, etc. Better *a taunt-song* (Is 14 [4]) . . . *a satire, even dark sayings.* woe to him, etc.: better *Ha! he* (and so throughout). The Chaldean is here likened to a usurer who lends on extortionate terms, and owes reparation to those whom he has victimized (the subject nations).

7. bite. The Hebrew has a secondary meaning, 'to pay interest,' and there is a play on the double sense. The debtors of the usurer will force him to disgorge his gains.

9. The Chaldean king amasses power at the expense of his neighbours in order to render his capital and himself inaccessible to attack (cf. Nu 24 [21]; Ob [4]).

10. consulted: better *devised* (not in intention but as a consequence). and hast . . . soul: better *and that, forfeiting thy life.*

11. His very building materials will protest against the injustice by which they have been procured (Job 31 [38]).

12. Cf. Mic 3 [20]: the allusion here must be to forced exactions from subject states.

13. The strongholds built by tyrant peoples like the Chaldeans are destined to have no permanence (cf. Jer 51 [58]).

14. The Lord's aim is very different from that of the world's oppressors. The passage is slightly varied from Is 11 [9]. If the latter is exilic, the citation from it here must be an insertion, unless both writers have quoted an earlier source.

15 figuratively describes the prostrate and exposed condition to which the Chaldeans reduced nations weaker than themselves. For that addest thy venom read (assuming accidental duplication of a letter) *from the bowl of his fury.*

16. The Chaldeans will suffer the same doom as that which they have brought on others. Instead of be as one uncircumcised, render *shew thyself uncircumcised*, by self-exposure through drunkenness (cf. [15]). But the LXX implies the reading *stagger*. The cup: the same figure is used in Ps 75 [8]; Jer 25 [15] f.; Rev 14 [10], etc.

17. In felling timber and in hunting game on Lebanon the Chaldeans had predecessors in the Assyrians (Is 14 [8], 37 [24]). For which . . . afraid substitute margin (with the LXX).

18-20. It is not the inhuman self-aggrandizement of the Chaldeans which is here denounced, but the folly of idol-worship (as in Is 41 [6-7], 46 [1, 2]; Jer 10 [1-9]; Ps 115 [4-8], etc.); and the change of subject-matter suggests that the section is an addition: if it were original, [19], beginning with Woe (*Ha!*), would naturally stand at the head of it (cf. [6, 9, 12, 15]).

18. the teacher of lies: the oracles uttered by the heathen priests and prophets were attributed to the idol as their source. Omit of his work (as a duplicate).

19. **Awake**, i.e. to listen to the prayers of its worshippers (cf. Ps 44 [23]).

20. Contrasted with the lifeless idols is the living God, Jehovah, in His heavenly temple (Mic 1 [2]; Ps 11 [4]); for the exhortation to silence cf. Zeph 1 [7]; Zech 2 [13].

III. 1. The heading suggests that the composition which follows was once included in a collection of songs for the Second Temple. The description **A prayer** (see [2]) is applied to many of the Psalms (17, 86, 90, 102, 142). In the LXX Pss 146, 147, 148 are similarly assigned to prophets. The term **Shigionoth** probably denotes melodies of an irregular character (from a root meaning 'to wander'), perhaps expressive of ecstasy, or reflecting sudden changes of emotion (cf. Ps 7);* but the LXX here has *upon stringed instruments* (as in [19]). The poem falls into three divisions: (*a*) [2], (*b*) [3-16], (*c*) [17-19], and is composed in couplets.

2. A petition from the collective people for the Lord's intervention in the present, as in bygone years (cf. Ps 44 [1, 2]). The verse, which ought to consist of two couplets, has a superfluous line, and should probably be reduced to, **O Lord, I have heard the report of thee; *I have seen*** (so LXX), **O Lord, *thy work;* In the midst of the years** (i.e. without any long postponement) ***revive it;* In the midst of the years make it known.** The last clause, which spoils the parallelism, is most likely a later addition.

3-16 describe a Theophany: God (in response to the prayer) comes from the desert (south of Judah) to interpose on His people's behalf. The imagery is derived from the movement and bursting of a storm (cf. Dt 33 [2]; Jg 5 [4]; Ps 68 [7, 8]). Most of the past tenses should be replaced by presents.

3. **Teman**, in the north of Edom (Ezek 25 [13]; Ob [9]). **Paran**, west of Edom, along the Ælanitic Gulf (Akaba). **Selah**, a musical direction of uncertain significance, but probably a command either to strike up louder music (by way of interlude), or to lift up the voice in benediction. **glory . . . praise**: the grandeur manifest in the thunderstorm, evoking wonder and praise from all who witness it.

4. A line is missing before the last; possibly the original tenor of the verse was, *There is brightness* (produced by the lightning) *like the daylight; He hath rays* (flashes) coming forth *from his side* (i.e. from the edges of the thundercloud); *He maketh darkness his covering* (cf. Ps 18 [11]); *And the hiding-place of his power is there.*

5. Pestilence and fever (this is the virtual significance of the word rendered **fiery bolts**), thought of as occasioned by, or accompanying, violent storms, and attributed to burning missiles hurled by God (cf. Dt 32 [23, 24]; Ps 91 [5, 6]), are here represented as God's vanguard and rearguard on His march (**at his feet** means *behind him*).*

6 and 7 depict the effects produced on the earth and its denizens by God's approach. The last line, describing the mountain-ridges along which God moves in the storm, is a superfluous addition to the second couplet.

7. **Cushan**: some nomadic Arabian tribe (cf. Nu 12 [1], Cushite). **curtains**: tent-hangings. Here should probably follow [15]; the suggested transposition renders intelligible the question in [8].

8. There are here five lines instead of four or six, and the first two are tautological; either read as a single line, **Is thine anger hot against the floods?** (for the translation of the last word see Ps 24 [2]; Jon 2 [3]), or in the first line change **against the rivers** to *against the mountains*, and insert a parallel line, such as *Has God indignation against the hills?* **the sea**: the Gulf of Akaba. **thine horses . . . thy chariots**: the storm-clouds and the hurricane (Ps 18 [10], 104 [3]).

9. **Thy bow . . . bare**, i.e. is stripped of its case and made ready for use. **The oaths**, etc.: this line is almost untranslatable, and quite alien to the context. It has been most plausibly suggested that the three words composing the line (which is extraneous to the couplet) are merely catchwords, giving a clue to certain sections of the Law used in the Synagogue as First Lessons, corresponding to this prophetic section, constituting the Second Lesson at Pentecost. If so, one of the catchwords has been wrongly vocalized; when the error is corrected the translation should be **weeks, rods, word** (referring respectively to Dt 16 [9]; Nu 17 [1-9]; Gen 12 [1-8]). **cleave**, etc., i.e. scoop channels, like river-beds, with torrents of rain.

10. **were afraid**, better *writhe*, a figure for earth-tremors. **the deep**, etc.: the sea's roar and uplifted waves are likened to the cries and gestures of a terror-stricken man (Ps 77 [16]).

11. The first couplet is defective: its original form was, perhaps, *The sun forgetteth its rising, The moon standeth still in its habitation* (the words supplied resemble two others in the context), and the meaning is that the two luminaries are

* According to Professor Langdon it means a 'liturgical penitential psalm.'—A. G.

* The best-attested meaning is 'wherever he goeth.'—A. G.

obscured by storm-clouds. The second couplet should be rendered : *For light do thy arrows go, For brightness the glitter* (literally lightning) *of thy spear*, i.e. flashes illumine the darkness.

12 explains the motive of Jehovah's advance: He comes to chastise the nations and to save His own people.

13. **thine anointed.** If the psalm, or this part of it, is pre-exilic, the reference may be to the contemporary Hebrew king; if post-exilic, to the collective nation (Ps 28 [8] [margin], 89 [38. 51]). In the second couplet the figures of speech are confused: read *Thou smitest the house of the wicked, Thou layest bare the foundations even unto the rock.*

14 seems to be wrongly divided and metrically defective, whilst **as, in was as to devour,** is unnatural, since the metaphor is common (Pr 30 [14]; Ps 27 [2]). A conjectural restoration (partly after Marti) which may be suggested is *Thou dost pierce with thy staves* (i.e. shafts) *his* (the wicked man's) *head ; His hordes* (margin) *sweep as a whirlwind to scatter me : Their host hath come up like waters* (cf. Is 8 [7], 17 [12]), **To devour the poor** (i.e. the Jewish people) **secretly.** RV, **warriors,** is taken from the Vulgate, but the Hebrew seems to mean 'dwellers in villages.'

15 separates awkwardly [14] and [16], and would be more in place between [7] and [8]. For the second line perhaps read, *Foam do the mighty waters* (Ps 77 [17]).

16*a* describes the psalmist's emotions occasioned by the Theophany: the equivalent of the Hebrew idioms is that at the sound of the thunder (for this sense of **voice** cf. 1 S 7 [10] margin) **his bosom** throbs, **his teeth** chatter, and he nearly collapses (cf. Ps 32 [3]). After **my bones** read *And my steps tremble under me.* The second half expresses his resolution, consequent upon what he has witnessed; render: *I will wait* (patiently) *for the day of trouble, When it cometh up against a people that troopeth upon me.*

17-19. Here the calamity from which relief is hoped for is not hostile domination, but dearth occasioned by drought; and this difference suggests for these verses a later origin. In [17] the futures should be replaced by presents.

17. **labour :** better *produce* (Ex 23 [16]). **meat :** archaic for *food* (cereals being meant here). **cut off,** through lack of pasturage and water.

19. Speed and agility, like those of a hind, were valuable qualities in a warrior (Ps 18 [33]). **walk,** i.e. traverse in security. The poet speaks for his collective countrymen. **For the chief musician :** better *Belonging to the Director* (of the Temple music). **on my stringed instruments :** probably there should be no possessive pronoun (cf. the titles of Pss 4, 6, 44, etc.). The position of this note, at the end, and not, as usual, at the beginning of the poem, suggests that it really forms the *heading* of the psalm which, in the Director's collection, followed next. (See further on this psalm Dr. Thackeray's brilliant study mentioned above.)

ZEPHANIAH

By G. W. Wade

Author.—About Zephaniah ('Jehovah hath treasured') nothing is known for certain beyond what can be gathered from his book. His pedigree, carried back to the fourth generation (cf. Jer 36 [14], but ctr. Is 1 [1]; Jer 1 [1]; Hos 1 [1], etc.) and stopping with the name Hezekiah, suggests that he was a descendant of the king thus called (though the name occurs in other connexions, Ezek 2 [16]), and so was of royal blood and personally acquainted with court circles (1 [8]). That he was familiar with Jerusalem is indicated by his mention of localities there (1 [10, 11]) and by the expression 'This place' (1 [4]) in reference to it.

Contents.—The book is best divided into five parts: (*a*) 1 [2-13], announcing judgement impending over all the earth, but especially over Judah, whose sins are described; (*b*) 1 [14]-2 [15], reiterating the same announcement, with a specific denunciation of certain foreign nations; (*c*) 3 [1-8], renewing the arraignment of the Jewish people (more particularly of the leading classes among them) for their offences; (*d*) 3 [9-13 (15)], predicting the eventual spread of a knowledge of Jehovah among the surviving heathen, and of fidelity to Him among the remnant of the Jews; (*e*) 3 [14 (16)-20], exhorting Zion to rejoice, and assuring her of Jehovah's love and protective care.

Date.—The prophecy was delivered in the reign of Josiah (*c.* 637-607), and probably before the religious reformation in the king's eighteenth year (2 K 23 [1-24]), since wickedness appears still prevalent

(1 4, 5, 8, 9, 12), a natural consequence of the long reign of the unprincipled Manasseh; and there is no reference to the contemporary sovereign (explicable by the king's minority). The book, though in the Canon placed after both Nahum and Habakkuk, is chronologically prior to them.

Occasion.—In general the Hebrew prophets discerned the coming Nemesis for national sins in the menacing aspect of formidable powers looming on the political horizon; and when Zephaniah prophesied, there were movements on the part of various distant peoples, portending calamity for some or all of the nations on the Tigris and the Nile, and for the countries between. The Scythians from South Russia were invading Western Asia (*c.* 630-625); the Babylonians were revolting from Assyria (*c.* 625); and the Medes, from the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea, were also restless. It was presumably in these disturbed conditions that Zephaniah saw the premonitory symptoms of the catastrophe which he declared to be awaiting all who disregarded the principles of morality and true religion; and he was probably in the main influenced by reports concerning the Scythians, though the destined agent of Jehovah's judgement is left unnamed.

Integrity.—Various portions of the book have been pronounced unauthentic by different critics; those which may with most reason be considered later interpolations are 2 8-10 and 3 14 (16)-20, together with one or two smaller passages.

Style.—Zephaniah's language is impressive and forcible, though not marked by many distinctive features. Like some other prophets, and particularly the apocalyptists, he draws the outlines of the coming judgement on a large scale, embracing all nature (1 2, 3), though he really expects it to be executed upon special offenders through human agency; and he heightens the horror of the scene by representing it as accompanied by terrifying gloom (1 14, 15). A dramatic instinct leads him to the use of imperatives (1 2, 2 1); and he occasionally resorts with effect to assonance (2 4, Hebrew).

Teaching.—The message conveyed by the book is twofold, threatening and consolatory. All in Judah who are religious compromisers or open apostates, all who are guilty of violence and deceit, all who deny God's moral government of the world, and who, if civil officials or religious instructors, abuse their functions, will incur the Divine vengeance equally with Philistines, Ethiopians (Egyptians), and Assyrians. But the judgement will not be annihilating but purifying: those who practise righteousness may hope to survive; the heathen will be led to abandon their idols for the true God; whilst the remnant of the Jews, after the eradication of the arrogant and impious, will become humble, trustful, and sincere. Into the conception of God's character both justice and mercy enter; but the severe, rather than the tender, side of the Divine nature is most accentuated.

Bibliography

(*a*) Davidson-Lanchester (*C.B.*); Driver (*Cent.B.*). (*b*) G. A. Smith (*Ex.B.*); J. M. P. Smith (*I.C.C.*); Nowack (*H.K.*); Marti (*K.H.C.*); van Hoonacker; Duhm; Sellin. See also Farrar, *Minor Prophets*; Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*; and articles in *H.D.B.* and *E. Bi.*

I. 1. That Zephaniah appears as the fourth generation after **Hezekiah**, whereas Josiah, with whom he was contemporary, was only the third, is easily explicable if it is assumed that **Amariah** was born to Hezekiah many years before Manasseh (who was only twelve when he came to the throne), and married and died early.

2-6. The approaching judgement, at the outset depicted as universal (cf. Hos 4 3; Ezek 38 19, 20), becomes concentrated, first on Judah and its capital, and then on certain classes in it.

2. For **consume** read *remove*.

3. The stumblingblocks with the wicked, i.e. the idols together with those whose apostasy they have occasioned. But the first word elsewhere means 'ruins' (Is 3 6), and the LXX here represents it by a verb: hence read, *I will cause the wicked to stumble.*

4. the remnant of Baal, i.e. Baal to the last remnant (cf. Is 14 22). LXX has 'the name of Baal' (Hos 2 17). **the Chemarim,** pagan priests (2 K 23 5), perhaps introduced from abroad to impart to the native priests the proper ritual for the worship of alien deities (cf. the converse in 2 K 17 27, 28).

5*a*. the host of heaven. The heavenly bodies, believed to be the abodes of superhuman powers (Jg 5 20; Is 24 21), were extensively worshipped in Judah, first through Assyrian, and later through Babylonian, influence (2 K 17 16, 21 3; Jer 8 2, 44 17; Ezek 8 16). The place-names *Beth-shemesh* (the house of the sun) and *Timnath-heres* (the portion of the sun) also attest the ancient prevalence of sun-worship in Palestine, for which the flat

tops of the houses (cf. 1 S 9 [25]) were convenient sites (2 K 23 [12]; Jer 19 [13]).

5*b*. There is some accidental repetition and other errors: omitting **that worship**, read **and them which swear** fealty to the **Lord** (Is 45 [23]) **but swear** (in legal or business relations: cf. Am 8 [14]) **by Milcom** (an Ammonite deity: 1 K 11 [5]; 2 K 23 [13]). What is denounced here is religious syncretism.

6 has in view thoroughgoing apostasy.

7-13. A description of the overwhelming disaster about to befall the sinful.

7. **Hold thy peace.** The Lord's approach must be awaited with reverential awe (Hab 2 [20]; Zech 2 [13]). **a sacrifice**: the destruction of offenders is compared (as in Ezek 39 [17]; Is 34 [6]; Jer 46 [10]) to the slaughter of animals at sacrificial feasts (1 S 16 [2-5]). The hostile forces, the agents of the Lord's vengeance, are likened to the guests on such occasions, who were sanctified (rendered fit for receiving holy food) by ablutions and certain restrictions (1 S 21 [4]).

8. **the king's sons**: collateral branches of the royal family (the LXX has *the king's house*; cf. Hos 5 [1]), exercising, during Josiah's minority, much power for ill. The adoption of foreign modes of dress (consequent upon alliances and intercourse with alien peoples) would be accompanied by the imitation of foreign rites of worship (Is 2 [6]).

9. Those who are here designated are perhaps the grandees mentioned in [8], who filled the royal palace with ill-gotten gain (cf. Am 3 [10]). Such, on entering the building, were wont **to leap over the threshold**, probably because sanctity attached to it in consequence of sacrifices offered there to the tutelary deities of the house. It is possible, however, that the sanctity of the spot was due to foundation sacrifices of which it had been the scene: on the site of more than one Palestinian town infants' bones have been found under house-walls, children having been buried there when the houses were built.

10. The **cry** and the **howling** are the sounds of terror, and the **crashing** implies the fall of edifices, accompanying a hostile assault. The **fish-gate** (Neh 3 [3], 12 [39]; 2 Ch 33 [14]) and **the second quarter** (2 K 22 [14]; 2 Ch 34 [22]) were probably in the north part of Jerusalem, the side on which it was most open to attack.

11. **Maktesh.** This (literally 'the Mortar') must designate a hollow, such as the upper end of the Tyropœon valley. Here lived the Jewish merchants (margin), who, having adopted the business habits of the Canaanites, had come to be called by their name (Ps 31 [24]; Ezek 16 [29], margin). **silver**: bullion carried for trading purposes.

12, 13. The Lord's search for offenders (by means of foreign invaders) will be so thorough (for **candles** read, with LXX, *a lamp*: cf. Lk 15 [8]) that none may hope to escape (Am 9 [3]). Those who, lacking all belief in God's activity in His world (Is 5 [19]; Ps 10 [4]), have become dull to moral considerations (literally 'thickened,' like undecanted wine) will suddenly discover their mistake and find themselves despoiled of the wealth which they have amassed by violence. The last half of the verse is a stereotyped phrase (perhaps added from Am 5 [11] or Dt 28 [39, 40]).

14-18 seem introductory to 2, a second announcement of the universal judgement leading up to a detailed enumeration of various peoples upon whom the Divine vengeance will specially fall (2 [4] f.).

14. **the voice of**: better *hark!* i.e. to the crack of doom, which draws cries of terror from the stoutest.

15. **That day . . . wrath.** The Vulgate's rendering (*Dies iræ, dies illa*) forms the opening of the hymn composed by Thomas of Celano (*c.* 1250). **wasteness and desolation**: resulting from a devastating storm.

17. **walk like blind men**, i.e. be helpless and incapable of escape. **because**, etc.: the sins of the heathen, no less than of the Jews, are offences against the Lord, whose laws are written on every human heart (Rom 1 [18-23]).

18. **Neither their silver**, etc. (cf. Is 13 [17]; Ezek 7 [19]). The Scythians, however, when, after traversing Palestine, they invaded Egypt, are said to have been bought off by its king (Hdt., i, 105). The Nemesis for Judah's sins really came, not from the Scythians, but from the Babylonians, some forty years after this. For **land** perhaps substitute *earth* (cf. 3 [8]). The Lord's **jealousy** is His resentment, occasioned by the disregard of His moral and religious requirements (cf. Dt 4 [24]).

II. 1-3. A warning to the people of Judah to amend their ways before it is too late.

1. **gather . . . together.** So the O.L., but the verb naturally signifies *gather for yourselves stubble, yea, gather stubble* (cf. Ex 5 [7]), and is perhaps an ironical exhortation to pursue a policy which must in the end prove futile. But some would substitute *Be abashed before one another, be abashed*; and such an exhortation to repentance (for which the next verse implies that there is yet time) suits the context best. **hath no shame**: the margin

has **hath no longing** (i.e. 'to return to God'), but some render *is not longed for*, i.e. is hated or hateful. The LXX has 'unchastened.'

2. There is some duplication here, and it is the approach, not the passing, of the judgement that occupies the writer's thoughts: render, *before ye become* (so LXX) *as the chaff that passeth away* (Is 29 [5]; Ps 1 [4]), *before there come upon you the day of the Lord's fierce anger.*

3. The pious and humble minority (Ps 76 [9]) are encouraged to maintain such conduct as may make possible their survival in the cataclysm (cf. Is 26 [20]).

4-15. Prophecies of destruction for Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Ethiopia (Egypt), and Assyria (cf. Am 1 [6-8, 13-15], 2 [1-3]). If the passage relating to the Moabites and Ammonites is an interpolation ([8-10], see below), Zephaniah thinks of the Scythians as advancing through Philistia towards Egypt (Hdt., i, 105) and returning thence towards Assyria, with which they were on good terms.

4. Of the Philistine Pentapolis (1 S 6 [4]), Gath by this time had come to an end as an independent city-state. **at the noonday:** the assailants will be strong enough to dispense with the cover of night to screen their attack.

5. the Cherethites, i.e. the Philistines, so called as being immigrants into Palestine from Crete (cf. 2 S 15 [18]; Ezek 25 [16]), the **Caphtor** of Am 9 [7] and Jer 47 [4], though the countries of their remoter origin were probably Caria and Lycia. They had been the enemies of the Hebrews from the time of the Judges onwards (Jg 13). **Canaan:** the name is here limited to the southern part of the coastal plain, as in Jos 13 [3].

6, 7. Read (with LXX), *And Chĕrēth,* (see [5]) *shall become pastures of shepherds and folds for flocks; they shall feed by the sea; in the (ruined) houses of Ashkelon shall they lie down in the evening.*

7 appears to have been expanded at the beginning and end by an exilic writer who thought that the exiled Jews would return to their own soil and overflow into Philistia (cf. Ob [19]).

8-10. When Zephaniah wrote, the Jews were at peace with the Ammonites and influenced by their religion (1 [5]), and both Moab and Ammon lay off the main road traversed by the Scythians when advancing from the north towards Egypt; so these verses must be a later insertion, originating after the peoples mentioned had taken part with the Chaldeans against Judah in the reigns of Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin (2 K 24 [2]; Jer 48 [26]). The absence of any reference to Edom suggests, however, that the insertion dates from before the fall of Jerusalem in 586 (ctr. Ob [8-14]; Ps 137 [7]). **Sodom** and **Gomorrah** are cited in Is 13 [19]; Jer 49 [18]; 2 P 2 [6] as signal examples of God's vengeance on sinners. For the **pride** of Moab cf. Is 16 [6].

11, 12 should probably exchange places, for the words **ye Ethiopians also** ought to follow a threat against some other people, presumably the Philistines ([4-7a]). The calamities which Jehovah is about to bring upon Ethiopia (which here probably represents Egypt, where an Ethiopian dynasty ruled) will reveal the impotence of idol-gods, and cause men to turn to Him (cf. 3 [9]). Egypt, though actually invaded, was not overthrown by the Scythians. It is not improbable that [11b], like 3 [9], is an insertion of later date.

13. the north. Assyria, extending some 150 by 250 miles along the Middle Tigris, really lay north-east from Palestine.

14. of the nations. Though locusts are styled a nation in Jl 1 [6], and ants a people in Pr 30 [25], yet perhaps read (with a very slight change) **of the valley. pelican . . . porcupine** probably mean *jackdaw . . . night-owl* (more suitable denizens of ruined buildings). **chapiters:** archaic for capitals. **their voice:** read *the owl.* **desolation . . . in:** read (with LXX and OL) *the raven . . . on.* **hath laid bare,** etc.: the cedar panelling is stripped from the walls.

15. For this derisive dirge over the anticipated fall of Nineveh cf. Is 23 [7] (Tyre); for the vaunting egotism attributed to the proud city cf. Is 47 [8] (Babylon); and for the concluding taunt cf. Jer 50 [23], 19 [8]. **To wag the hand** (like shaking the fist) was a gesture of hatred.

III. 1-13. A return is here made from the heathen nations to Judah, for the city whose offences, impending chastisement, and eventual reformation are emphasized is not Nineveh but Jerusalem.

1. Woe to her, etc.; better *Ho! she that is defiant* (towards the Lord) *and polluted* (with blood; Ezek 24 [9]).

2. the voice, i.e. of Jehovah, speaking through His prophets (Jer 7 [23, 28], 26 [12, 13]).

3. For the comparisons cf. Ezek 22 [25, 27]. **they leave not,** etc.: better *they have broken no bones* (Nu 24 [8]) *in the morning,* and so are famished by the evening.

4. light and treacherous: guilty of underrating the seriousness of the situation and of misrepresenting the Divine revelations (Jer 14 [13], 23 [25] f.). **the sanctuary:** better (with LXX and OL) *that which is holy:* to distinguish this from

what was common was the priests' duty (Lev 10[10]; Ezek 22[26]). **the law**: better *instruction*, which they should have imparted faithfully (Dt 17[8-11]).

5. The Lord (whose seat is Zion: Mic 4[7]) does not fail to **give his judgement for light**, but those to whom His admonitions are communicated unblushingly disregard them.

6, 7. God thought that warnings from past history would have been laid to heart. There is some error in [7b]: read (with LXX): *and there will not be cut off from her eyes* (i.e. will not be overlooked) *all that I have enjoined upon her.*

8. As they have failed to profit by such warnings, and plunged eagerly into corruption, they must await apprehensively the merited chastisement. **For to the prey** the LXX and OL have *for witness* against the evil-doers (Jer 29[23]; Mic 1[2]).

9 and **10**, which interrupt the connexion between [8] and [11], have been suspected of being an interpolation inserted by one who shared the outlook of Deutero-Isaiah; if so, 2[11b] may come from the same hand. 'To turn here means 'to give in exchange' (1 S 10[9]); and **a pure language** (margin **lip**) is one unpolluted by the names of false gods and the vile utterances that are associated with idolatry. The phrase **with one consent** is a metaphor (see margin) from a team of oxen. In [10] the margin is preferable: the converted heathen will restore the Jews scattered among them to their native land as a token of homage to Jehovah (cf. Is 60[9], 66[20]). Since **daughter of**, when used to denote a people, is generally followed by a local name ([14]; Ps 45[12], 137[8]), it has been proposed to replace **my dispersed** (Hebrew *pūtsai*) by *Put* (Nah 3[9]); but a sufficient parallel is perhaps afforded by *daughter of my people* (Jer 8[11]).

11. ashamed: better, *be brought to shame*. The Jews, when once the presumptuous among them have been removed from the Lord's land, will no longer deserve or incur humiliation.

12. trust in the name, etc., i.e. repose exclusive confidence in the Divine character as made known by experience and revelation.

13. for they shall feed, etc. The sincerity of their reformation will be evident from the security ensured to them: for the final phrase cf. Mic 4[4].

14-20. This section as a whole has been thought to imply the conditions of the Exile ([19]), and to have been appended by one who sought, like Deutero-Isaiah, to foster in his fellow-captives faith in an approaching deliverance. But perhaps the supplement begins with [16]: there is nothing inconsistent with Zephaniah's authorship in [14, 15].

14. Israel. A synonym for Judah ([13]; Mic 2[12], 3[9]).

15. thy judgements: the punishments inflicted upon thee. But probably read (to improve the parallelism) *thy adversaries*. **the king**, i.e. Jehovah (Mic 2[13]; Is 41[21]). **fear**: the margin **see** means experience (Jer 5[12]; Ps 90[15]).

16. O Zion. The balance of the clauses in this verse is improved by the inclusion of this word in the first. **be slack**, i.e. through despair (Jer 6[24]).

17. will rest in his love. The Divine joy will sometimes be too great for utterance (see margin). But LXX has *he will in his love renew thee.*

18. If the text is sound, the first clause refers to the Jews in Exile who grieve for their enforced separation from the religious gatherings of Zion (cf. Ps 42[4]). But LXX attaches the opening words to [17], (**with singing**) *as in the days of a solemn assembly* (cf. Lam 2[7]). If this be adopted, continue (with a slight correction), *I will gather those that were of thee; because they bore on account of thee reproach.*

19. her that halteth: a figure for a sufferer under foreign oppression (Mic 4[7]). **a praise**, etc.: the reversal of the calamity of the Exile will cause the Jews to be regarded as the favoured people of a mighty God (Is 61[7-9]; Jer 33[9]).

20 is a duplication of part of the preceding. **before your eyes**: the promised deliverance will not be deferred until a later generation.

HAGGAI

By John C. H. How

Introduction and Notes

(1) **The Book and its Author.**—Of the prophet Haggai nothing further is known. His name would seem to be connected with the Hebrew word Hag = Pilgrimage-Feast (cf. Haggiah = Feast of Yah, 1 Ch 6[15]). Some have supposed that 1[13] (*Haggai Jehovah's Mal'akh*) intends to identify him with Malakhi = my Mal'akh,

(my messenger). But there is little to commend this identification.

The book as we have it is probably due to the work of some editor who preserved and collected the genuine utterances of the prophet, arranged them in chronological order, dated them, and set them in a brief outline of narrative (1 [1, 3, 12, 13, 14, 15], 2 [1, 10, 14, 20]).

There is no reason for doubting the authenticity of any of the utterances, nor for suspecting the accuracy of the chronology.

(2) **The Prophecies and their Historical Setting.**—All the utterances were given during the space of four months, in the year 520 B.C. Adopting modern symbols the date of the first is 1/6/520, and of the last 24/9/520. Sixty-six years had passed since the fall of Jerusalem and the second deportation of its inhabitants to Babylon (586), when the Temple was demolished and burnt. The Temple still lay in ruins, though the people of Judah and Jerusalem had managed to rebuild their own houses.

In 521 Darius the Great ascended the throne of Persia, at a time when the Persian Empire was staggering under the strain of insurrection and revolt in several regions. Judæa was then a province of the empire, and it must have felt the reverberation of the clash of arms in other parts, and have seen something of the great armies and powerful officials of the new Emperor, now engaged in the work of crushing revolts and beginning a masterful organization of his empire. Jerusalem felt smaller and more crushed than ever, and the hope of a return of independence seemed utterly remote. The distress created by the political situation was aggravated by a period of agricultural depression, due to a prolonged drought. It was the work of Haggai to stir up the people with a message of hope, and to arouse them to a realization of their duty to Jehovah, to call them to the work of restoring the Temple, and to awaken in them the spirit of expectation of help and blessing from God. An event took place in 520 that heralded a new era. There arrived in Jerusalem from Babylon a new governor, Zerubbabel, a Jew, and actually a member of the Royal House of David, holding the commission of the Persian Emperor to exercise full authority in the province (see 1 Esd 4 [13, 42, 47 ff.]). He was accompanied by a large retinue including Joshua, son of Josedek, a direct descendant of the line of High Priests, and he comes with the express purpose of restoring the ruined Temple and its worship. But Haggai has to meet Zerubbabel and Joshua with the depressing news that they will find no response from the people to any project for rebuilding the Temple (1 [2]); and in his first recorded utterance addressed to the people themselves (1 [3-11]) he has to rebuke the people for their sluggish disregard for the things of Jehovah. He interprets the recent famine as a judgement on their neglect of the Temple. The prophet's words had their effect both in encouraging Zerubbabel and Joshua (who had themselves received a set-back on closer acquaintance with the spiritual apathy of the people) and in arousing the people to be up and doing; and the work begins some three weeks later (24/6/520) (1 [14, 15]). But it appears that the enthusiasm is only temporary, for within a month (21/7/520) (2 [1]) Haggai had to renew his appeal, and to counteract the depressing effect of scoffers who had known the old Temple in its glory and heaped contempt on the project of rebuilding (2 [1-9]).

At this stage Haggai's words were reinforced by the sermons of Zechariah (see Zech 1 [1-6]), who opened his prophetic ministry with an appeal for repentance. The work had probably never proceeded further than the mere preliminary clearing away of debris, and now it had stopped altogether.

But the united efforts of Haggai and Zechariah proved effectual, and the next recorded sermon of Haggai is that which he preached on the day when the foundation stone of the new Temple was laid (24/9/520), two months after his last appeal, and a month after Zechariah's opening cry (Zech 1 [1]; see Hag 2 [18]).

The purpose of this sermon of Haggai's is to assure the people that they may now expect good harvests in the coming year. They were unclean before, and consequently all their labours were fruitless. But now, with their return to the work, their hopes may rise. They could not expect *immediate* results, as it was winter time, but there was seed awaiting the sowing, and the coming spring would confirm the prophet's message (2 [10-19]). On the same date (24/9/520) Haggai uttered his last message (2 [20-23]). This time it was a personal message to Zerubbabel. His vocation in the purpose of God was to be Jehovah's representative as ruler of the people. He was to receive the divine authority which his grandfather Jehoiachin had forfeited; and the way would be prepared for this restoration of the Theocratic state in Judah by a great world-commotion in which the heathen powers would fall in fight one against another.

See further for the history of the period, pp. 184, 285, and 428.

The Value of Haggai's Prophecy.—Haggai has suffered rather badly at the hands of some commentators. One writes of his book: 'There is no longer a really spiritual message . . . the prophet seems to have included stones and timber amongst the essentials of his spiritual and religious ideal' (Robinson, *Prophecy and the Prophets*). But the prophet's contribution to the religious development of the Jews cannot be thus contemptuously brushed aside. Unless it is maintained that 'Judaism' (the post-exilic form of the religion of Jehovah, with its notes of national exclusiveness, devotion to the written Law, and concentration on the ceremonial worship of the Temple) was an entirely false development of Old Testament religion and not the inevitable outcome of the nation's beliefs and history, it must be recognized that the work of Haggai was of paramount importance. The Temple worship was the centre of the religion of Judaism. No Temple—no Judaism. And almost it might be said, 'No Haggai—no Temple.' It is true that the prophet lacks the fire and poetic imagination of the great prophets of earlier days. He does not add anything new or rich to the people's conception of God. He was, apparently, mistaken in his hopes about Zerubbabel and the immediate break-up of the heathen world powers and the glorifying of the Temple by gifts of the nation's treasures. But he certainly succeeded in making men and women respond to the message he gave. And it was the message for the moment. If it took the form of interest in stones and timber, it was because a Temple lying in ruins was indicative of spiritual apathy and a worldly self-regard that set personal comfort before divine worship. It must never be forgotten that the 'uncleanness' he proclaims is *not* a mere ceremonial uncleanness, but the moral and spiritual uncleanness of apathetic disregard for the glory of God and His worship. The people needed to be aroused out of the depression of faithless despondency into which they had sunk in their condition of subjection to a foreign power. They needed to be 'taken out of themselves' in some great and splendid cause. And the building of the Temple was such a cause. It was a sacramental act demanding faith and deepening faith. The Temple once built was to become the rallying centre of the Jews and the standing challenge to objective worship. Haggai's work prepared the way for Nehemiah and Ezra, as they in turn prepared the way for the heroes of the Maccabæan age. Some may dub the Maccabæans and their forerunners, Nehemiah and Ezra, narrow-minded fanatics; but they kept the Jewish religion from becoming identified with the religions of the surrounding nations, with many of whom the Jews had so much in common, but from all of whom they were so essentially different. But, as was indicated above, the degree to which our appreciation of Haggai's work rises depends on our estimate of the value of the developments in Judaism which the rebuilding of the Temple rendered possible.

With regard to Haggai's 'Messianic' hopes, it should be noted that he is not alone in expecting *immediately* what was only to find fulfilment in the course of centuries. He does not actually foretell the coming of a personal 'Messiah,' though he expects that Zerubbabel will be the divinely authorized ruler in the new age, when the thrones of kingdoms are overthrown and the power of the nations is scattered (2 $^{20-33}$). But it was not so to be. The powers were indeed to be scattered—but not in the days of Zerubbabel. Nevertheless he was right in so reading the purpose of God that he saw that the power of nations, however great, is temporal and must pass; and mutual jealousies and hostilities spell in the end destruction (2 ^{22}). It is a lasting truth, though the prophet was wrong in expecting an immediate illustration of it in the history of his own days.

Again, his prophecy of the glory of the Temple (2 $^{6-9}$) was not to find literal or immediate fulfilment. And yet the prophecy has been abundantly fulfilled in the reverence and devotion which the whole Catholic Church in East and West shows towards the Holy City and the Mother-Church of Christendom, though the Temple building has since passed, and a Moslem mosque dominates its site. The earthly Jerusalem and its Temple of stones and timber still live in the heart and song of the Christian Church as the symbol of the Heavenly Jerusalem and the Temple not made with hands; and it was Haggai's work to effect the building of the symbol that has meant so much not only to the Jew but to the Christian.

Bibliography

Barnes (*C.B.*); Driver (*Cent. B.*); Mitchell (*I.C.C.*); Kennett in *Peake*; for historical background see under Ezra-Nehemiah.

I. 1-11. Haggai's report to Zerubbabel and Joshua (1. 2), and his appeal to the people to set to work and build up the ruined Temple at Jerusalem (3-11).

1. The date, the year 520 B.C. The 6th month = Elul (Neh 6 15) = our Aug.-Sept. May be represented thus: 1/6/520. **Zerubbabel**, direct descendant of the Royal House of David, grandson of Jeconiah = Jehoiachin (2 K 24 6, 15; 1 Ch 3 17). **governor**—a foreign title (cf. Mal 1 8), a subordinate official in the Persian Empire. **Joshua**, grandson of Seraiah the High Priest when Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar 586 B.C. (1 Ch 6 15; 2 K 25 18 ff.).

2-5. The people's reluctance to build the Temple, though they were well-housed themselves. **cieled** = *panelled*.

6-11. The prophet interprets the drought and consequent scarcity of food as a divine judgement on the people for their selfish neglect of the ruined Temple.

8. **the mountain** = *the hill country*, where ample timber could be found.

9. **blow upon it**—either = *blow it away*, or *breathe on it and bewitch it*.

12-15. The result of the prophet's preaching. The people, led by Zerubbabel and Joshua, begin the work of restoration within a month (24/6/520) (15)—but it is only a beginning.

12. **the remnant.** Does it signify the remnant returned from the Exile, or the remnant left behind in Judæa at the Exile? (see p. 285*a*).

13. **in the Lord's message**—better 'by virtue of his office as Jehovah's messenger.'

14. **did work**—*work* is a substantive, the object of *did*. The work done was probably merely of a preparatory nature.

II. 1-9. 21/7/520. The prophet encourages the people who were inclined to despair of ever making a Temple worthy of comparison with the old Temple burnt by the Babylonians in 586. The older men who knew the earlier Temple were inclined to be contemptuous about the attempt at a new building, and perhaps tried to discourage the younger by their scorn. But a glorious future is prophesied for the later Temple. The encouragement here offered perhaps indicates that the work had been given up very soon after the start.

4. **be strong. Take courage. people of the land**—(see note on p. 285*a*).

5. **according to . . . Egypt.** Omit with LXX. The words came in from some marginal note probably. As they stand in the Hebrew text they have no syntactical relation with what precedes or follows. The English versions attempt to make sense of the words by inserting *according to* or *Remember* (RVm); but it is best to omit them altogether. **abode**—more correctly, *is abiding*. The reference is to the *present* help of Jehovah, not to the past.

6-9. The new Temple will be beautified by the rich offerings of the nations, who will bring their treasures of silver and gold to the House of Jehovah.

6. **it is a little while.** The prophets generally tended to 'foreshorten the perspective.' Haggai expects an almost immediate glorifying of the new Temple by the Gentile offerings. **shake the heavens . . . shake all nations.** A world-commotion, physical and political. Political disturbances were already taking place in the Persian Empire, and more were to follow. The prophet interprets them as signs of the approaching completion of Jehovah's purpose of establishing the Messianic Kingdom with Jerusalem as its centre; and he expects, as did so many of his fellow-prophets, that commotions in the physical world would accompany the political and social upheaval.

7. **the desirable things, or as** RVm, **the things desired.** The AV (based on Vulgate, *et veniet desideratus cunctis gentibus*) interpreting the Hebrew word in a personal sense in the singular number is indefensible. The Hebrew verb (*shall come*) is in the plural, and the subject, although in the singular, is a collective = the *things* desirable or desired. The reference is to the riches and possessions of the nations which shall come to adorn the Temple (cf. Is 60 5, 9, 11).

9. The world-commotion is to issue in peace—at least in the Holy City.

[*Note.*—Although the reference to the coming of a personal Messiah (implied in the AV and Vulgate rendering of 7) is not to be found in this passage (6-9), the prophecy is definitely Messianic; and, like all Messianic prophecy, it finds a fulfilment transcending, if rather different in detail from, the conception expressed by the prophet. In the purpose of God the religion of the Jews, centring in the Temple, *had* a glorious future. In its midst was to arise the Son of God, the true Christ; and, if the earthly Jerusalem with its material Temple was never in actual fact to be the treasure-house of the world's earthly riches, yet the nations of the world were to bring their contributions, both of spiritual and material wealth, into the common treasury of the Church of Christ. Cf. the echo of the prophet's conception, interpreted spiritu-

ally, in Rev 21 [24, 26]. Cf. also the interpretation of [6] in Heb 12 [26, 27], where the writer applies the prophecy of the 'shaking' even to the old Temple worship of the Jews. He includes the Temple and its worship amongst the things that must be 'removed' by the shaking, but the unshakable things (of Christ in His Church) will remain.]

10-19. Date, 24/9/520. The 9th month, Kislev = Nov.-Dec.

The winter months had come, and still the actual building operations had not begun. But now, on this 24th day of Kislev, at last the clearing work is sufficiently advanced to permit of laying the foundations (see [18]). At this stage the people receive further assurance from the prophet that their work will draw down the divine blessing.

(*a*) **10-14.** The prophet begins by insisting that the people could not expect the blessing of Jehovah so long as they were unclean. Their past reluctance to set to work and build was the outcome of a selfish disregard for the things of Jehovah. They had shrunk from work on the Temple and excused themselves from it, though they had not hesitated to make their own houses comfortable (1 [2-4]). A ruined Temple and a roofless makeshift altar were indications of an unholy mind. The unholiness of the people rendered all their work in field and farm unholy too. Even the sacrifices they offered *'there'* (and the prophet points contemptuously at the temporary altar) were unclean. Let them consult the priests about the official teaching with regard to the comparative effect of holy and unholy objects. The priests' reply indicates that unholiness has a more far-reaching effect than holiness. A holy thing only makes holy that which it directly touches. No *person* or *thing* can be sanctified by indirect relation with a holy object. But a person, unclean by contact with an unclean object, can render unclean everything he touches. The people were unclean through their contact with the ruined Temple, and so all their work and worship was defiled too.

11. More exactly, *Ask now of the priests direction.* The word translated **the law** is Torah, and has no definite article—*a* Torah, not *the* Torah. Torah signifies, strictly speaking, *oral* teaching or direction. In course of time the *oral* teaching of the priests down the ages was codified and embodied in the Pentateuch, which in later days became known as 'The Torah,' 'The Law.' We cannot with any certainty decide how much of the *written* Torah existed in Haggai's day; but it is important to notice that his words here neither presuppose nor preclude the existence of a written code of Laws. Cf. Zech 7 [2, 3] for an example of 'asking for Torah' from the priests. There is no exact parallel in the written Torah to the oral Torah given in [12], the nearest approach being in Lev 6 [27, 28]. In Nu 19 [11, 12, 22] there are close parallels to the Torah in [13].

12. holy. The word has not necessarily nor primarily any *moral* signification. Its meaning is closely analogous to that of Taboo. Things might be 'holy' or acquire 'holiness,' and as such they might not be put to secular use, at least not without certain ceremonial treatment (cf. Lev 6 [27, 29]). Similarly **unclean** ([13]) has not primarily reference to moral qualities. It signifies in the first instance ceremonial uncleanness, even a quasi-physical uncleanness that might be contracted through the touch of an unclean object. But it would seem that the prophet in this passage is concerned with no *mere* 'ceremonial' uncleanness amongst the people, but with a moral and spiritual uncleanness evidenced by their unwillingness to rise to the duty of restoring the Temple. Yet at the same time there is present the idea that the ruined Temple is in a manner unclean and infects the people. Possibly there is something in the nature of an *a fortiori* argument implied. A person unclean by contact with a dead body conveyed uncleanness to all he touched. So—much more so—the people spiritually and morally unclean conveyed uncleanness to all their labours, and even counteracted the 'holiness' of their sacrifices and made *them* unclean.*

(*b*) **15-19.** The prophet bids them look forward to a bright future. True it was that, prior to the commencement of the actual building work, there had been a time of want and scanty produce. The past was dark behind them. But they must look forward. 'Now,' he says, 'look forward from this day when the foundation of the Temple has been laid. Seed still lies in the barn awaiting the time for sowing. Fruit trees have not yet brought forth—it is not the season yet. But you may now look forward to the blessing of Jehovah in a fruitful season in the coming year. The building of the Temple will usher in a new and prosperous era.'

15. this day and upward, i.e. this day

* Browne (*Early Judaism*, 56), following Rothstein, points to 2 [4, 5] as irreconcilable with 2 [14] if they refer to the same people, and interprets the latter of the Samaritans. There is much to be said for that view.—A. G.

forward (cf. 1 S 16[13]). A full-stop should be placed after 'upward' (=forward), and 'from' should be omitted. A fresh sentence then begins at 'Before.' [18] reiterates the first clause of [15], after the intervening words.

16. through all that time—read, with slight change in Hebrew supported by LXX, *What were ye?* i.e. 'How did ye find yourselves?' 'What was your condition?' **18. upward**—see on [15].

19. Is the seed yet. Read, '*Lo! the seed is yet in the barn.*' It was winter time and immediate changes could not yet be expected; but the blessing would follow in the spring in answer to the people's awakened religious devotion manifested by their work on the Temple building.

20-23. Date, 24/9/520, as before ([10. 18]). The prophet foretells the break-up of the great powers that now dominated the world. The tremendous force of the Persian Empire might seem to be unconquerable and permanent. But Judah would see its downfall. Zerubbabel is to receive Jehovah's authority as His vicegerent. **21.** Cf. [6].

23. signet. Bearing the stamp of Jehovah's authority. Zerubbabel is to receive the authority which Jehoiachin his grandfather had forfeited (Jer 22[24]).

ZECHARIAH

By John C. H. How

ZECHARIAH (I.-VIII.)

Introduction and Notes

It is almost universally agreed that the first eight chapters of Zechariah are not by the same author as 9-14.

1-8 are a unity, and are the utterances of a prophet living in the reign of Darius the Great (Hystaspes) (521-486 B.C.), and exercising his ministry in Jerusalem under the same circumstances as Haggai (*q.v.*).

9-14 are by some unknown prophet living at a later age and dealing with a quite different situation.

(1) I.-VIII. Of the prophet Zechariah we know nothing more than what is told us in this book, though mention is made of him in Ezr 5[1], 6[14].

The historical setting of the book is, for the most part, the same as that of Haggai's, but incidents and allusions in Zechariah's work help us to fill in the background with a few additional details; though the bulk of his prophecies were uttered after Haggai was silent (Zech 1[7]; date: 24/11/520), and he carries us on a couple of years after the last utterance of Haggai (Hag 2[10-23]; date: 24/9/520; Zech 7-8; date: 4/9/518).

Zechariah's first utterance is dated the 8th month of 520, and so falls between Hag 2[1-9] and [10-23]. There is no just cause for doubting the authenticity of Zech 1[1-6], as some do, on the ground that Zechariah's appeal for repentance is out of place if Haggai's preaching had been effective (Hag 1[12-15]).

In actual fact it was only effective up to a point, and the activity it aroused was only temporary, and Zechariah's preaching of repentance was needed to supplement Haggai's renewal of encouragement (see p. 603*b*).

Zech 8[10] confirms the picture Haggai gives us of the famine conditions before the building of the Temple, and also reminds us of the 'adversary' from the neighbouring region of Samaria who was attempting to stop the building work (Ezr 5[1] ff.). Further, he alludes to civil strife in Jerusalem, on which Haggai is silent, though perhaps underlying Hag 2[3] we may detect the presence of quarrelling parties, one for building and another contemptuous of the whole project.

Zechariah is one with Haggai in his confidence that Zerubbabel is really to be King over Jehovah's people, and he does not hesitate to identify him with the promised 'shoot' of the stock of David (see on 3[8] and 6[12]); but we may be right in seeing in 2[1-5] the prophet's discouragement of an attempt by Zerubbabel to build the walls of Jerusalem as a step towards making a fight for political independence. The prophet is not attempting to kindle a political revolution with Zerubbabel as its leader.

Zech 3[1-9], if it does not give us any very definite information about Joshua the High Priest, at least leads us to make possible conjectures as to his history.

He appears to have suffered some disgrace. Some suggest that he was not a recent arrival from Babylon at all, but was of the number left behind in Palestine after the Captivity, and one of a line of priests who had officiated at the roofless altar in Jerusalem during the Captivity period. On the arrival of Zerubbabel,

with priests of the old Zadokite line, from Babylon, Joshua had been deposed and disgraced; and in consequence a personal quarrel had sprung up between him and Zerubbabel, who now came claiming the chief position of authority himself and superseding the previous authority of Joshua, whilst his priests from Babylon claimed to have the true succession.

Zechariah champions Joshua's cause (3^{1-9}) and also works for a reconci iation between Joshua and Zerubbabel, giving them both authority in the community, the one as priest in Temple affairs and the other as civil ruler (6^{9-13}). It is an attractive theory, but it involves rejecting as unhistorical often-repeated statements in the later writings of the Old Testament that Joshua came from Babylon; and it is perhaps safer to conjecture that Joshua, the priest from Babylon, had suffered at the hands of the people and the priests who had *not* been in exile. His claim to authority had been disputed, and perhaps he had suffered injury as well as insult. Zechariah first champions him, and assures him and the people that Jehovah's choice falls on him and his fellows (3^{1-9}); and then, at some later date, he meets the question which was bound to be raised as to the relative authority of the priest and the governor (6^{9-13}). Quite possibly there had been friction between the two—in fact, the last words of ^{13} seem to imply it clearly—and Zechariah has to act as peacemaker and show them the possibility of exercising a joint authority.

(2) The dominant note of Zechariah's prophecies is that of hope and joyful expectation. He had certainly to open with an appeal to repentance (1^{1-6}), but, as the visible expression of the awakening of the people's religion, the Temple was daily rising before his eyes, and he anticipates an almost immediate future of ideal happiness.

The quiet that settled down on the Persian Empire under the strong hand of Darius was only the lull before a storm ($1^{13-15, 20, 21}$. 2^{9}). The iniquity of Judah was pardoned, and evil was to be removed right away out of her midst (5^{8}). The armies of Jehovah were preparing to strike (6^{8}). The scattered exiles were to return (7^{7}), and Jerusalem would be the scene of a happy and contented life (8^{3-5}); and even the great world powers would come to seek life with God in fellowship with the Jew (8^{20-23}). But at the same time the prophet re-echoes the stern demands of the earlier prophets for a religion that shows itself in justice and social morality ($7^{9, 10}$, $8^{16, 17}$), and he proclaims the curse of Jehovah on thieves and perjurers (5^{4}); and though he does not forbid or denounce fasting, he exposes the shallowness of the customary fast that was not really Godward in spiritual devotion. In his ideal future state all fasts will have given way to festivals ($7^{5, 6}$, 8^{19}).

(3) The Visions and other prophetic utterances seem to have been collected and arranged and probably dated by some editor (as with Haggai), and in some parts the work was not very skilfully done see on $1^{7, 8}$). The text in several places seems to be in serious disorder, and in at least one place a fragment of the original MS. seems to have been torn off and lost, leaving an unfinished sentence (6^{15b}). As so much of the book is cast in the form of visions there is bound to be a considerable variety in interpretation, as the imagery is unfamiliar to the modern mind, though doubtless it was readily understood by the prophet's contemporaries.

It is not possible in a short space to discuss or even to present to the reader all the suggestions that scholars have made for emending the text or interpreting the allusions. It has often been possible only to select and follow one of many alternatives.

Bibliography

Barnes (*C.B.*); Mitchell (*I.C.C.*); Driver (*Cent. B.*).

I. **1-6.** The prophet calls for repentance, and points to the warning given by the past experience of the nation. Their fathers had disregarded the prophets' teaching, and disaster had befallen them.

1. *Date.*—Zech 1^{1-6} falls between Hag 2^{9} and ^{10}. The month (8th) is Bul ($1\ K\ 6^{38}$) = Oct.-Nov.; the year 520 B.C.

son of Berechiah: perhaps omit, as due to a confusion between this Zechariah and that of Is 8^{2}. **son of Iddo,** and so perhaps of a priestly family (Neh $12^{4, 16}$).

5. Men come and go—even prophets pass—but Jehovah's words find fulfilment.

6. they turned, i.e. the fathers, in view of their experiences. But it was too late. However, they acknowledged the justice of their punishment.

[*Note.*—The fact that Zechariah has to appeal for repentance in Oct., 520, is further evidence that the work on the Temple which had begun in answer to Haggai's appeal (p. 603*b*) had been broken off again, or at least had proceeded no further than making a preliminary clearing.]

7-17. The Vision of the Four Horsemen.—The agents of Jehovah's vengeance on

the heathen. Date, 24/11/520. Shebat = Jan.-Feb. Three months after Zechariah's first prophecy and two months after Haggai's last.

7, 8. came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah . . . saying, I saw. [7] must be an editorial introduction to the series of visions that follow. A formula 'The word of the Lord came saying' has been loosely and rather clumsily prefixed to a passage in which the prophet tells his vision in *oratio recta*. It is clearly the prophet who says 'I saw in the night,' etc.

8. bottom, read as RVm, **shady place** (cf. LXX). **behind him . . . horses**—and clearly riders thereon, since 'they' speak in [11]. There is no clue to the symbolism of the horses' colours.

9. the angel that talked with me. The Interpreting Angel, who is here abruptly introduced, and who reappears constantly in the coming visions.

10. The horsemen are Jehovah's mounted watchmen, patrolling the earth (cf. Job 1 [7]). The imagery may well have been supplied to the prophet's mind by the familiar sight of the Persian mounted patrols moving about the country. If Persia is patrolling Palestine Jehovah has a wider patrol.

11. The answer of the horsemen perhaps echoes the disappointment of the people of Judah at the seeming delay in the shaking of the heaven and earth which Haggai had led them to expect (see Hag 2 [6]). The Persian Power seemed to be settling down as a permanency, and showed no signs of a break-up.

11, 12. the angel of the Lord. Is this yet another figure in the scene, or is he to be identified with the first horseman who appeared or with the Interpreting Angel? Probably he is distinct from both. He reappears in 3 [1, 3, 5, 6], and is probably to be regarded as at one and the same time the representative of Jehovah (whom the prophet never sees or hears immediately) *and* the representative of Judah. He is a mediating angel—Judah's 'patron' angel with Jehovah's authority. Thus in 3 [1-6] he can speak as Jehovah's representative towards the people, and here in [12] he can plead for Jerusalem and Judah as the representative of the people towards Jehovah.

13. Jehovah's answer is conveyed to the prophet through the Interpreting Angel; but the prophet does not hear Jehovah's message, but only the angel's communication of the message ([14]).

14, 15. The ease and quiet of the nations **has no true basis.** They had exceeded their legitimate rights in oppressing Judah, and Jehovah would now avenge Himself on them.

16. I am returned. Ezekiel had seen the 'glory of the Lord' depart from the Temple (Ezek 10 [18], 11 [23]), but also had seen its future return to abide for ever, on conditions (Ezek 43 [4, 5, 9]). **my house shall be built** (cf. Haggai *passim*). **line,** i.e. measuring line for the builders.

17. my cities, etc. RVm is correct.

18-21. The four horns and the four smiths.

19. Israel and Jerusalem—perhaps an explanatory gloss (see [21]—Judah only).

21. The horns are clearly iron horns, symbolical of the iron powers of oppression. The smiths will **fray** (terrify) them, i.e. the powers they symbolize, and fell them.

II. 1-5. The surveyor.

1. measuring line (cf. 1 [16]).

2. With a view to the rebuilding of the city walls.

3. went forth—read *stood still* as LXX. **went out**—better *came forth* from the unseen.

4. and said—*and he said*, i.e. the Interpreting Angel.

4, 5. as villages without walls. It is of no avail to think of building walls. The city will be too populous to permit of confinement within walls. Jehovah will be her protection.

[*Note.*—The prophecy may relate to a proposed rebuilding of the walls of the city by Zerubbabel, perhaps as a step towards claiming independence. The prophet deprecates such a revolutionary scheme.]

6-15. The sequence of the visions is broken by a lyrical passage. A call is sent out to the people of Judah in Babylon. Let them return to their own city. And let Zion rejoice, for Jehovah's purpose is to return to Jerusalem to dwell there.

6. the north. Often used in Old Testament for the hostile quarter from whence the invader comes (Is 14 [31]; Zeph 2 [13]; Jer 1 [14, 15], etc.). Used even for Babylon, as a hostile region, though Babylon actually lay east of Palestine (Jer 6 [1, 22], 15 [12], etc.). **spread you abroad as the four winds.** The sense of the Hebrew is that of *scattering* abroad. Captives and refugees from Judah were in Egypt and other lands besides Babylon. '*As* the four winds' occurs nowhere else. The LXX renders *I will gather you from* the four winds—and is perhaps to be preferred.

7. Ho Zion, escape. Read as LXX, *To Zion escape, O thou that dwellest*, etc.

The prophet's words indicate that there are still a number of Hebrews in Babylon.

8. thus saith, etc. Either treat **after glory hath he sent me** as parenthetic, or omit the words altogether. In either case **saith the Lord of hosts** connects with **unto the nations which,** etc. **Unto**—better *with regard to*. **After glory,** etc. Very difficult to explain, if retained—but equally difficult to explain its insertion if omitted. If retained the meaning may be 'To win glory (for Jehovah or for Judah) hath he (Jehovah) sent me (the prophet).' The prophet's mission is to forward the purpose of Jehovah of glorifying His people; winning from them their fuller recognition of His glory (ye shall know that the Lord hath sent me, [9, 11]). There is no ground for supposing that the angel of the visions is speaking.

10-13. The glorious future. Jehovah dwelling in the people's midst, in the restored Temple. The expansion of Jehovah's kingdom by the incorporation of Gentile nations. But Judah and Jerusalem are to be the peculiar domain of Jehovah and the seat of His power.

13. Be silent. An exclamation, *Silence! Hush!* (cf. Zeph 1 [7]; Hab 2 [20]). **holy habitation** must here be *the Heavens*: cf. Dt 26 [15]; also Is 63 [15] (a different expression but the same idea).

III. **1-10.** The vindication of Joshua the High Priest, and the promise of the future Messiah.

1-7. Joshua the High Priest (see Hag 1 [1]) stands at Heaven's tribunal accused by Satan the Public Prosecutor of the spirit-world. It is not clear what the accusation is (see below). But he is acquitted of the charge and reinstated in his office and given full authority over the Temple.

1. the angel of the Lord. The Representative of Jehovah, here as Judge. **Satan.** Lit. *the Adversary* as RVm. Here a title rather than a proper name, as always in Old Testament, except 1 Ch 21 [1]. Note that the Satan here appears not as the Tempter, but as the Accuser, the Prosecutor (cf. Job 1 [9, 10, 11], 2 [3-5]). But in Old Testament he also appears as attempting to contaminate men (cf. 1 Ch 21 [1]), and as allowed by Jehovah to *test* by misfortunes those who have a reputation for integrity, though his powers have certain limits set to them (Job 1 [12], 2 [6, 7]).

2. the Lord. Read *the angel of the Lord*, as the speech that follows seems to require. **a brand plucked,** etc. Cf. Am 4 [11], rescued from being burnt up.

4. And he, i.e. the angel. **those that stood before him** = attendant angels (cf. 1 K 10 [8]).

5. I said. Note RVm. LXX implies that the angel still speaks, and other versions (Syr. and Vulg.) read *he said*.

7. keep my charge, i.e. be faithful in the office with which you are charged by me (cf. Ezek 48 [11]; and also 44 [16]). **judge my house**—i.e. govern the affairs of the Temple. **a place of access.** RVm more correct. **among those that stand by,** i.e. the attendant angels. Joshua's position as the accredited High Priest of Jehovah gives him the entrée into the circle of Jehovah's immediate attendants. His earthly ministry ranks with the ministry of angels in the Heavenly Courts.

[*Note.*—The nature of the accusation brought against Joshua is not clear. In all probability it is not against Joshua as an individual, but as Joshua as a representative of the people who had experienced the Exile and especially of the priesthood that had been taken to Babylon. The Exile was an indication of Jehovah's wrath, and the priesthood had shared it, and had been deprived of all opportunity of exercising their priestly functions. The filthy garments ([3]) symbolize the past sin of the nation and the consequent condemnation of Jehovah. But now Jehovah's absolution is given to the nation as represented by Joshua the High Priest; and Joshua is reinstated into the sacred office with the promise that his ministry will be accepted by Jehovah. It may be that the claims of Joshua to the position of High Priest were challenged by a rival priestly ministry that had been exercising the priestly functions on Judæan soil amongst the remnant left behind at the Exile. Joshua may have even suffered insult and persecution at the hands of the rival priesthood. But he now receives from the prophet the assurance that his ministry has the authority of Jehovah, and the shame and indignity he has suffered is removed by the honour Jehovah confers on him.]

8-10. The establishment of the true priesthood once again in Jerusalem is an earnest of the advent of the true King, and the arrival of the ideal age of bliss.

8. Omit **for they,** and thus read: *Thou and thy fellows that sit before thee* (i.e. his subordinates in the priestly ministry) *are men of omen that behold I am bringing forth my servant the Branch.* **the Branch**—better *Shoot*, a title or proper name with no definite article (cf. 6 [12]). It is an echo of Jer 23 [5], 33 [15]. See further on 6 [12].

9. the stone. Perhaps some curiously shaped stone awaiting its incorporation into the Temple building, perhaps in a place of honour as a coping- or key-stone,

or at the top of a pillar. It had seven facets (seven eyes), on each of which some symbol or name might be carved, or some message of favour from Jehovah. There may have been some dispute about its inclusion in the building. Some wanted to reject it. To the prophet it seemed to be a parable of Joshua's own experience. Could it have been the same stone as that mentioned in Ps 118 [22], which our Lord used as a parable of Himself? (Mt 21 [42], etc.). Zech 4 [7] probably has reference to the same stone, now to be placed in its position of honour.

10. The picture of friendly intercourse in the ideal days of peace that are to come (cf. 8 [12]).

[*Note.*—Perhaps 4 [6b], 'This is the word of the Lord,' to [10a], 'hand of Zerubbabel,' should come in here (see under 4 [6] below). Zerubbabel, like Joshua, had been meeting with opposition, and his task of effecting the building of the Temple was impeded by obstacles that seemed insuperable. Not the least was the contemptuous and disheartening scorn which was heaped upon his efforts ([10]). The prophet encourages him with the assurance of success through the Divine Power ([6b]). The obstacles would disappear ([7]), and Zerubbabel would himself bring forth the stone that crowned the completion of the work ([7]). He would really complete the work he had begun ([9]). If people now scoffed they would soon rejoice when they saw the plumb-line in the hand of Zerubbabel as he set the last stone true to the perpendicular.]

IV. **1-13. The seven-branched lampstand and the two olive trees.**

2. candlestick—bowl—seven lamps, etc. A seven-branched standard lamp with one central oil bowl feeding the seven lamps by separate pipes. **seven pipes to each.** Read as LXX and Vulgate, *seven pipes to the lamps*, i.e. one to each. **upon the top thereof**—probably repeated from [2] in error. Read *upon it.*

6-10. The section **This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel,** etc., down to **in the hand of Zerubbabel** ([10]) should probably be omitted as out of place here. It should perhaps follow 3 [10]. The first part of [6] (to **saying**) should be followed immediately by the second part of [10], in which the angel explains the significance of the seven lamps.

7. Grace, grace, unto it. Either *May the divine favour rest upon it* or *How splendid! How splendid!*

10. even these seven which are. Render *these seven are the eyes of the Lord.* The seven lamps symbolize the watchfulness of Jehovah, who scans the whole world with His gaze.

11, 13. Omit [12]. The answer to the question in [11] is given in [13]. **The two sons of oil,** not as 'anointed ones' (the word for oil denotes the fresh olive juice rather than oil prepared for burning or for anointing), but as *rich in supply of fresh oil.* A similar idiom occurs in Is 5 [1], rendered 'a very fruitful' (hill) (see RVm). The two olive trees are probably to be understood as symbolizing Joshua and Zerubbabel. Jehovah indeed surveys the whole world, and is cognizant of the disturbing events that are troubling the Holy People in Jerusalem. But waiting on His command are the two representatives of His authority in Jerusalem, Joshua and Zerubbabel; and they are richly endowed with that which the people may turn to use for the lighting and cheering of their lives.

12. May be a fragment of another vision that included a similar though not precisely the same imagery (olive *branches* or olive *clusters*, rather than olive *trees*). If we keep it in its context we must suppose that the prophet in his second question lets us see elements in the vision he has not described in detail. The two olive trees each have an olive cluster on a branch that conveys oil through a golden spout into the oil-reservoir or bowl of the standard lamp. The trees with their constant supply of oil to the lamp would then symbolize not Joshua and Zerubbabel, but the unfailing supply of spiritual illumination to the seven eyes of Jehovah.

14. stand by, i.e. as attending and serving and waiting on his command.

V. **1-4. The Flying Scroll.**

A scroll of great size (30 × 15 feet) is seen flying in the sky. It is explained as the expression of Jehovah's curse on thieves and perjurers.

3. for every one . . . purged out . . . according to it. The Hebrew is very difficult. As the text stands it might be rendered: 'Every thief shall be made desolate (or be emptied out, cf. Is 3 [26], RV, and RVm) according to its wording on one of its sides; and every (false) swearer shall be made desolate according to its wording on the other side.' But the word rendered 'purged out' usually means 'held guiltless.' Some would emend the Hebrew slightly to give the meaning 'How long hath every thief been held guiltless! How long hath every false swearer been held guiltless!' It is the cry for justice arising from earth.

4. The answer comes. The scroll is

Jehovah's curse, and it will invade and consume the house of each offender.

[*Note.*—In [3] we must supply 'falsely' after 'sweareth' (cf. [4]).]

5-11. The woman deported in a tub.

5, 6. The verses are in some disorder, and some of the words are out of place. They may be rearranged thus: *Lift up now thine eyes and see. What is this ephah that goeth forth? And I said, What is it? And he said, This is their iniquity in all the land.* **their resemblance.** The Hebrew = lit. 'their eye' (*'eynam*); LXX reads 'their iniquity' (= Hebrew, *'awonam*), which gives a better sense.

7. Read *And behold, there was lifted up a disk of lead: and behold, a woman sitting in the midst of the ephah.* **ephah**—a vessel capable of holding well over a bushel of corn. The woman was shut down into the measure by a circular lid of lead.

8-11. The wickedness of the land and the people is deported by two stork-winged women to be dumped in Shinar (= Babylonia), where it would find itself more at home.

VI. The Four Chariots.

The vision in 1 [8] ff. should be compared. The horsemen there are scouts; here perhaps they are attacking forces, as the chariots imply. The chief objective is the hostile north (2 [6] *v.n.*). The fighting in that region satisfies Jehovah's fury.

1. the two as RVm. It is idle to attempt to identify them. But, being of brass, they seem to symbolize the impregnable strongholds of Jehovah.

3. bay. Hebrew = strong. Perhaps omit with Syriac (cf. RVm).

5. Perhaps *'el* = *unto* has dropped out after *'elleh* = *these.* Render thus: *These unto the four winds of heaven are going forth from* (*after*) *standing*, etc.

6. the black as the darkest and most terrifying go north (see 2 [6]). **after them.** A corruption of *to the after-region*, i.e. the west. The east was regarded as the front, the south the right hand, the north the left, and the west behind (cf. Dt 11 [24]: the hinder sea = the Western Sea, the Mediterranean). The white horses perhaps indicate that that region was to enjoy comparative peace.

7. the bay. Heb., *the strong*, as in [3]. Syr. reads *the Red.* Perhaps insert 'eastwards,' and read: *And the red went forth eastwards. And they* (i.e. all of them) *sought to go.* They were impatient to be off. **and he said**, i.e. the angel, but as Jehovah's representative he can use the very words of Jehovah himself ([8], *my* spirit).

8. quieted—by satisfying my fury (cf. Ezek 16 [42]).

9-15. An episode in which the prophet is to perform a symbolic act. A party of men had arrived in Jerusalem from Babylon. The prophet is bidden visit them and take of them precious metal for making crowns. He is then to set the crowns on the head of Joshua and Zerubbabel, and to proclaim Zerubbabel as the promised King, and Joshua as his fellow in authority as High Priest. The crowns are to be preserved in the Temple as memorials of the donors. This would seem to be the most probable reconstruction of the course of events, which has become obscured in the Hebrew text. The following points should be noted:

11. crowns. The word is a *plural*, and attempts to explain it as a singular are forced.

12. the Branch (*shoot*) is clearly not Joshua but Zerubbabel, who is to build the Temple (see on 3 [8] and 4 [9])

13. he shall be a priest must refer to Joshua. There is no word for 'he' in the Hebrew text. **between them both.** Clearly *two* people have been mentioned. Probably in the original draft of the written prophecy a blank was left in [11] after 'upon the head of,' into which it was intended to insert the names of *both* Joshua and Zerubbabel. Possibly the political situation necessitated the suppression of the names in the script as a precaution against providing what might be regarded by the Persian authorities as documentary evidence of treasonable sedition. In [12, 13a] we have the prophet's message to Zerubbabel as he crowns him *King.* In [13b] another blank was left for the name of Joshua, who was to receive a royal power too, but as a priest. [13c] proclaims that this joint authority in Church and State will be of the most amicable nature. The symbolic act may have been the outcome of a rift between two parties in Jerusalem; one claimed Joshua as the real leader of the nation, and another Zerubbabel. The prophet shows that *both* have a part to play in the new government, and both have the authority of Jehovah. A possible alternative theory is that in [11] the blank was left for the name of Zerubbabel, who is clearly addressed in [12]; and the word for crowns is to be read as a singular by a slight change in the Hebrew. Then in [13] the name Joshua should be inserted before **shall be a priest**, etc., instead of **he.** On this theory there is one crown, namely for Zerubbabel the

King; but Joshua is promised the place of honour by his side as co-ruler with him as High Priest. The blank in [11] was wrongly filled at a later date with the name of the priest instead of Zerubbabel.

14. **Helem.** Read with Syriac Heldai as [10]. **to Hen.** We should expect *Josiah* as in [10]. Either we must so read (though it is difficult to explain how such a corruption could arise), or, more probably, take *hen* as the noun = favour or kindness (see RVm). It is the same word as that rendered 'grace' in 4 [7].

15. **they that are far off,** i.e. Jews scattered in various lands, and especially those still in Babylon. The prophet expects a return in large numbers. Probably the small party of three ([10]) whom he had visited on their arrival had brought news of a plan for an early return in large numbers. **And this shall come to pass.** Read *and it shall come to pass, if,* etc. The scroll must have been torn here and the subsequent promise has been lost.

VII., VIII. **Two years later,** 518 B.C.

The prophet's answer to a deputation which arrived in Jerusalem to enquire about the necessity for continuing the days of mourning and fasting in commemoration of the burning of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. The full answer is delayed until 8 [19], as the prophet is carried away on a long digression of warning and promise. The date is 4/9/518, when the Temple building has progressed considerably.

VII. 1. **Chisley** = Nov.-Dec.

2. The Hebrew is difficult, and perhaps corrupt. A probable emendation gives the following sense: 'And El-Sharezer and Regem-Melech sent men to the House of the Lord to intreat,' etc. The envoys were sent from Babylon. Sharezer is an Assyrian name acquired in Babylon, but it needs the name of a god to complete it. The ending of Beth-el supplies such a name and should be attached to Sharezer, which follows it in the Hebrew. Beth = House, and was probably followed by a shortened form of the name Jehovah, but this had been smudged out in the MS.

3. **speak unto the priests.** Hag 2 [11] *v.n.* **fifth month** (cf. [5]), **seventh month.** Two months of gloomy memory for the Jews. The former being the month in which Jerusalem was finally destroyed by the Chaldeans in 586; the latter that in which Gedaliah was murdered (see Jer 52 [12, 13], 41 [1, 2]). See also on 8 [19], where the answer is given to the question.

4-14. Before giving a definite answer to the question, the prophet first exposes the traditional fasts as devoid of spiritual worth, because not Godward. Then he delivers an utterance on the kind of religion Jehovah had taught by the earlier prophets, a religion that expressed itself in brotherly love and social justice ([9, 10]); but their teaching had been ignored, and disaster had followed in consequence ([11] ff.).

7. Either as in EV supply *Should ye* but *hear,* or read with LXX, *Are not these the words,* etc. The prophet claims to be merely reiterating what his predecessors had taught (cf. Is 58 [3-10]).

8. Perhaps omit, as [9] and [10] follow [7] as a summary of the teaching of the former prophets and do not seem to be a new prophecy. For [9, 10] cf. 8 [16, 17].

11 ff. Zechariah's comment. **pulled away:** RVm better.

12. **the law:** Hag 2 [11] *v.n.*

VIII. Ten short promises of future bliss for Zion, each beginning with the same introductory formula: 'Thus saith the Lord,' divided into two uneven sections (seven and three) at [18], by the delayed answer to the question of 7 [3].

2. **Thus saith:** so [3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 14, 19, 20, 23].

3. **returned** (1 [16] *v.n.*). **city of truth**—rather *of fidelity.*

9, 10. Cf. Hag 1 [9], 2 [5-19].

10. **every one against his neighbour.** Haggai does not mention the element of civil strife, but it may be implied in some of his utterances, e.g. 2 [3] *v.n.* and 6 [9-15] *v.n.*

12. **For there shall be the seed.** Read *I will sow peace.*

16, 17. Cf. 7 [9, 10]. Zechariah reiterates the appeal of the earlier prophets for a religion of social righteousness.

19. The answer to the question is 7 [3] (*q.v.*). In the 4th month (586 B.C.) the Chaldeans entered Jerusalem (Jer 52 [6-8]). In the 10th month (588 B.C.) the Chaldeans began the siege of Jerusalem.

20-23. The attractive power of the true religion of Jehovah in the future. The wider vision of Jehovah's purpose, that Jerusalem should be the centre of a great and living religion embracing not only Jews but Gentiles (cf. Hag 2 [6-9]).

20. **many cities**—better *great* or *populous.*

21. **speedily** does not represent the Hebrew idiom here used. The sense is rather *we must most certainly go.* **I will go also**—not strong enough. *For my part, I am determined to go.*

23. Through fellowship with the Jew to fellowship with God. The Jew the missionary in God's purpose.

ZECHARIAH (IX.-XIV.)

(1) **Introduction.**—It is almost universally agreed by modern commentators that the second part of the book 'Zechariah' is not by the same author as the first. We pass into a totally different atmosphere at 9, leaving behind the historical setting of the section 1-8 with its definite dates (1 [1, 7], 6 [7], etc.), its allusions to the Captivity as a recent event (6 [9]), its particular mention of individuals figuring in current history (3 [1, 8], 4 [6, 10], etc.), its reference to the building of the Temple (4 [9], 6 [15]). With absolute certainty we could place the first eight chapters in a definite period of history (520 B.C. and the few following years), and, for the most part, give some satisfactory explanation of the allusions, even in the more obscure visions. But all this now changes, and there are few more difficult problems in Old Testament criticism than the placing of 9-14.

The title (9 [1]) shows that a new prophecy is beginning, and the repetition of the same (unusual) title in 12 [1] seems to indicate that here yet another prophecy begins. It is interesting to note that the same title appears also at the beginning of Malachi (1 [1]), and in these three places only in the Old Testament. This suggests that we have here at the end of the Hebrew prophetical writings three separate collections arranged in their present order after Zech 1-8 by the same editor who prefixed to each the same title. They were all anonymous (see Mal 1 [1] note), and probably the actual authorship of the prophecies was unknown to the editor. He placed them at the end of the last of the identified writings, and in course of time the first two became attached to the authentic writings of Zechariah, whilst the third retained a separate position.

(2) **Analysis of the Two Sections.**—(*a*) 9 [1-11 17] and (*b*) 12 [1-14 21].

(*a*) 9 [1-11 17].

9 [1-8]. The collapse of certain great heathen cities bordering on the Holy Land, and their *submission to Jehovah* as their conqueror. The security and freedom of Jerusalem.

9 [9, 10]. The approach of the lowly King, inaugurating an age of peace.

9 [11-17]. The gathering of *the dispersed* of Israel and Judah for war against the Greeks. A bloody war will issue in conquest for Jehovah's people, and material prosperity follows. The figure of the *flock* appears in 9 [16].

10 [1, 2]. Against popular superstitions. The people go astray like *sheep*, because they have no *shepherd*.

10 [3-12]. The *restoration* of Ephraim and Judah from *dispersal* from Egypt and Assyria, and their rescue from oppression by *shepherds* ([3]).

11 [1-3]. The fall of the *oppressors* as the felling of forest trees. Incidental mention of the wailing of *shepherds*.

11 [4-17]. Two allegories depicting (*a*) [4-14], a *Good Shepherd* who was rejected; (*b*) [15-17], a *shepherd* careless and selfish, who brings disaster. *Traffickers* in sheep appear in [5, 7, 11].

(*b*) 12 [1-14 21]. Mainly apocalyptic visions of the future, but including one *Shepherd* passage (13 [7-9]).

12 [1-13 6]. A combined attack of *all nations* on Jerusalem repelled by Jehovah ([1-4]). Allusion is made to *antagonism between Jerusalem* and the ruling class and *the country districts of Judah* ([5, 6, 7]). Some representative of Jehovah had been foully murdered; but, chastened and penitent for the crime, Jerusalem and her ruling families will mourn bitterly for the outrage ([10-14]). And thus sin-stricken but penitent they will be washed in the *cleansing fountain* now to be opened in Jerusalem (13 [1]). Their penitence will take practical form in the *abolition of superstition and lying prophecy* (13 [2-6]).

13 [7-9]. The assassination of a *shepherd* leads to the scattering of the *flock*—one-third of which will alone survive, after a fiery trial and purgation.

14 [1-21]. *All nations* in battle against Jerusalem opposed by Jehovah ([1-3]); the prelude to *the universal sovereignty of Jehovah* ([9]). Jerusalem sends forth *living waters* over the land ([8]), whose flow is directed on the east by a newly formed valley cut out of the Mount of Olives ([4]), and on the west by the blocking up of valleys which might otherwise deflect their course or collect them to stagnate ([5]). Jerusalem towers above the surrounding country now depressed to the level of the Arabah ([10, 11]). The opposing nations are wasted with plague ([12-15]), and any which survive *join in the worship of Jehovah*—or suffer the consequences of refusal ([16-19]). Every commonplace thing in Jerusalem is now holy to Jehovah ([20]), and traffickers cease from the Temple ([21]).

(3) **A Constructive Summary.**—Before attempting to discuss the date of the prophecy, it will be well to present a constructive summary of the two sections, in which attention will be drawn to features which appear in each, and which may assist in determining the date.

(*a*) The first part opens with the note

of hope. Heathen strongholds are falling and are to be embraced in the Kingdom of Jehovah; whilst Jerusalem is to remain immune and be free from the oppression of tyrants (9 1-8).

But this is a vision of the future. Meanwhile the conditions of Jehovah's people are far from happy. Many are in captivity, dispersed in foreign lands (9 11-12, 10 10); whilst in Jerusalem and Judah the people are suffering at the hand of overlords who have bought them (11 5 note) from their native rulers ('shepherds' as they are called), who are quite unprincipled and exploit the poor folk (11 5). The guilt of the rulers in this matter is shared by the stronger and more prosperous of the people (the 'he-goats' of 10 3). Under this suffering the people are depressed and have lost faith in Jehovah, and at a time of drought and consequent scarcity are prepared to seek the help and advice of sorcerers rather than of Jehovah (10 1, 2). This restless wandering from the truth is due to the fact that they have no real shepherd to guide and care for them (10 2b). Their own shepherds had incurred the fury of Jehovah (10 3); but there is one after Jehovah's heart who hears His call to shepherd the flock (11 4). The prophet impersonates him and describes his experience as he attempts the difficult task of leading the people into happiness and unity—two ideals symbolized by the two staves of the shepherd (11 7). He found the people sullen and obdurate, and his patience was tried beyond endurance. The 'flock' refused his guidance, and now they must be left to their fate (11 8, 9). But in rejecting the shepherd they had rejected the word of the Lord—and the sheep traffickers knew it (11 11 *v.n.*). In consequence they will receive the government they deserve —that of a senseless, worthless shepherd whose own interest is his only concern, and who exploits the people to his own advantage (11 15, 16). The prophet teaches this by again impersonating a shepherd—this time an evil one.

Thus the first section ends with the picture of the disastrous consequences, both to the sheep and the shepherd himself, of refusing the approach of Jehovah in the person of the good shepherd. It is a refusal in face of repeated messages of hope and assurances of Jehovah's pity for His people, and His promise of protection and deliverance and restoration (9 11-17, 10 5-12). So depressed are the people under the strong hand of the foreign domination that the promise of their ultimate deliverance and the downfall of the heathen powers (11 1-3) falls on deaf ears. It seems clear that there is no king on the throne—the 'shepherds' being probably priests, now the chief officials of the state. There may well have been a craving in the hearts of the people for the restoration of the old kingdom, with a king after their own heart who would lead valiant armies to battle against the foreign tyrants. But this was not the way of Jehovah then, and the prophet presents to the people's mind a different ideal of the king. He is not the conquering warrior, but the man of peace who has himself endured and been rescued from affliction. He comes not seeking vengeance, but crying peace to the nations and establishing a kingdom of peace (9 9, 10).

(*b*) 12 1-14 21. The second part again opens with the note of hope and the message of an approaching defeat of a terrifying coalition of all the nations of the earth against Jerusalem (12 1-6). It also ends on the same note with the vision of Jehovah supreme over all nations (14 9), and Jerusalem rising aloft above all the surrounding country (14 10, 11), all holy (14 20, 21), and sending out streams of life to the land about her (14 8).

But before this political and spiritual supremacy can be attained there is need for penitence, cleansing, and practical and vigorous reform (12 10-13 6).

The people once deserved Jehovah's pity in their oppression—part (*a*)—now they need His cleansing. Not only is there jealous rivalry between the capital and the country districts, but some horrible crime has been committed through the instrumentality or with the connivance of the leading families in Jerusalem. Someone has been foully murdered (13 10). It may be that we have the key to the event in 13 7. A true shepherd of Jehovah (whether he of 11 4-15 or not we do not know) has been smitten, with disastrous consequences—the scattering of the flock. The event is so graphically described by the prophet that it appears as if Jehovah Himself were commanding not only the consequences but the murder. This may well be a misunderstanding of the sense. Quite possibly the verse might be regarded as a very vivid and graphic equivalent of 'The sword awakes against my shepherd! The shepherd is smitten! So the sheep are scattered—and (in judgement) I turn my hand against the little ones' (13 7 *v.n.*). Further, heathen superstitions have been in common vogue (13 2), and the profession of the prophet has become so completely identified with false

religion that it is inconceivable that anyone claiming to be a 'prophet' could be a true servant of Jehovah (13 2-6 and p. 430*a*).

But repentance and cleansing are to come (12 10), and then the great and glorious triumph of Jerusalem (14 3 ff.); but only a small fraction of the people will enjoy this restoration, and then only through a purging affliction (13 8, 9, 14 2), so completely has the nation forsaken Jehovah.

(4) **The Two Sections Compared.**—It will be seen that there are certain striking differences between the two sections (*a*) and (*b*) of the prophecy; though, at the same time, there is one dominant idea common to both. We may deal with this common element first.

In both sections appears the thought of an approaching crisis in history, in which the heathen nations who oppose or have opposed the people of Jehovah will meet their fate in defeat under the hand of Jehovah; many will submit to His Kingdom and accept the religion of the Jews, and Jerusalem will be seen exalted in victory and dwelling safely under the protection of Jehovah (see [*a*] 9 1-8, 13-17, 10 3-12; [*b*] 12 2-8, 14 1-3, 9-19).

But even in this matter there is *a difference* between the two sections. In (*a*) definite nations or heathen powers are mentioned by name (see 9 1-7, 13, 10 10, 11); but in (*b*) there is no such definite mention of particular heathen powers, but only of 'the nations' or 'all the nations,' except in 14 18, where Egypt is expressly mentioned, but for a special reason (see note *ad loc.*). We are led to the impression that (*a*) is dealing with a definite historical situation, but (*b*) is more vaguely apocalyptic, dealing with an ideal future of indefinite date. Notice the constant repetition of the phrase 'in that day'—the certain but undated judgement day of Jehovah (12 3, 4, 6, 8, 9–13 1, 2, etc.).

Further differences appear as we examine the two sections more closely.

(i) In (*a*) the northern kingdom of the ten tribes of Israel (or Ephraim or Joseph) appears on the purview, though the tribes are scattered in various parts—as also are many of the Judahites—and they are to be gathered again and restored by the act of Jehovah (see 9 10-13, 10 6-11, 11 14).

But in (*b*) only Judah and Jerusalem appear, and further, in antagonism with one another, 12 5-8 (see note). And there are indications that in the final restoration only a small fraction of the people will share (13 8, 9, 14 2).

(ii) In (*a*) the people of Jehovah appear as suffering under the hands of tyrannical oppressors, who appear to dominate the life of the community—the 'trafficking shepherds' of 11 5, 7, 11. It is clear that the people are regarded as crushed, and defenceless as sheep—a favourite figure in (*a*) for the people.

In (*b*) these tyrants do not appear. But in place of a people suffering at the hands of tyrants we find what appears to be mutual jealousy and civil war between two sections of the people, Jerusalem and Judah, and certain prominent families in Jerusalem involved in guilt for a dastardly crime that needs repentance and cleansing (12 5–13 1).

It may be that the prominent families mentioned are the tyrants and oppressors of (*a*)—the ruling classes of Jerusalem who were crushing the simpler peasantry of Judah. But it is by no means clear.

(iii) In (*a*) there is promise of a human king (9 9), but in (*b*) there is no suggestion of this—Jehovah only is King. It is striking that the coming king in (*a*) is one who clearly emerges from persecution, one who has been rescued from some crushing suffering—vindicated now and saved, but still poor, and riding on an ass as a man of peace, not a triumphant war-lord (9 9). He stands out in marked contrast to the proud and high-handed oppressors. He emerges from the *suffering* people.

(iv) In (*b*) there is a striking feature which is absent in (*a*)—namely, the stream of living water flowing from Jerusalem for the cleansing first of the great houses of Jerusalem (13 1), and then for the refreshing of the neighbouring peoples (14 8).

It would perhaps be true to sum up by saying that in (*a*) the message is one of pity to an oppressed nation; whereas in (*b*) it is one of future cleansing to a sinful people (cf. 12 10, 11, 13 1, 2, 9).

(5) **A Collection or a Unity?**—There is enough similarity between the two sections to suggest that they are not wholly independent; but the differences both between the two main sections and between certain elements in the first section have led many to the conclusion that we have in these six chapters rather a collection of oracles by unknown writers than the utterances of a single prophet. It is certainly difficult to understand how the same writer could present such contrasted ideals as that of the lowly and peaceable king (9 9), and that of the bloodthirsty conquerors in Zion's war of vengeance on Greece (9 13-15). Such contrasts might well appear in a collection of oracles all relating to one period of Jewish history (though a long period),

but by various prophets, delivered at different times, interpreting the various experiences of the Jews and confirming or challenging their ideals and hopes, in their varying phases of fortune.

(6) **The Period of the Prophecies.**—But to the question 'To what period are we to assign them?' many different answers have been given. To some earlier commentators the mention of Assyria and Egypt and the references to Ephraim as well as Judah seemed to point to a pre-exilic date for at least part of the work, though some were prepared to maintain that pre-exilic elements had been incorporated into a post-exilic book.

Few moderns would be prepared to defend either of these positions, and we need spend no time on discussing them further.

Almost all recent writers declare the chapters to be undoubtedly post-exilic. But as to what period of the post-exilic era they belong opinions differ; and various dates, from the early years of the return from Babylon to the Maccabæan age, have been suggested. The general trend of modern criticism is, however, quite definitely to prefer some date in the Greek age rather than the Persian, i.e. after rather than before 333 B.C., when Alexander the Great became Master of the Eastern World by his defeat of Darius at the battle of Issus.

(7) For the history of Palestine during the Greek age see p. 186*a*, and especially Apoc., p. 1.

Our knowledge of the actual history of the Jews during the period from Alexander to the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes is slender in the extreme, and we have not sufficient data to justify our assigning Zech 9-14 (or its various sections) to this or that particular phase of the whole period. Attempts have been made to do so, but they cannot be said to be very convincing. It must suffice to say that a probable background to the oracles is supplied by what we know of the history in general. The Jews were suffering from the domination of foreigners, and the spirit of complete antagonism to the 'nations' was growing in consequence. Many were carried off, or migrated, to settle in Egypt and other lands—and we know that the Greeks encouraged or enforced such settlements (cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, xii, 2, 1). The Jewish rulers were corrupt, and ready to buy their office from the Greek overlords with money exacted from their own people. Many of the Jews lost faith in the power of their God and fell away to heathen superstition and Greek customs; but a body of faithful ones stood firm in the traditions of their fathers, facing oppression and suffering (the Hasidim, or pious ones), though later they rose up into an armed offensive against the Greeks and the renegades of their own nation.

It will be seen how applicable are the oracles to such a situation, with their call to faith in the certainty of Jehovah's victory over the nations, their promise of a great return of the dispersed, their hints at quarrels between sections of the Jews, their denunciation of a corrupt ruling class, and their hope of a purified Jerusalem to be the source of spiritual life to the surrounding country.

It remains only to be said that the pagan kingdoms of the north (Seleucus in North Syria) and of the south (Ptolemy in Egypt) are alluded to by the old historic names of Assyria and Egypt; whilst (it may be) the dispersed of Judah, along with the scattered tribes of the old kingdom of Israel, are termed 'Ephraim,' 'Israel,' or the 'house of Joseph' (9^{1}, $10^{6\text{-}12}$).

(8) **Quotations and References in the New Testament.**—It is remarkable that from these few short oracles no less than four direct quotations appear in the Gospels. [N.B.—Discussion of the actual *form* of the quotations in the New Testament is out of place here. It is rather a matter for the student of the New Testament. It is sufficient for the present purpose that the words in 'Zechariah' are referred to in the New Testament, though their actual form may be different from that in MT.]

(i) 9^{9} (see Mt 21^{5} and Jn 12^{15}).

The passage was widely interpreted as 'Messianic' by Jewish writers. For abundant evidence of this see Dr. Pusey *ad loc.* The action of our Lord in riding into Jerusalem on an ass on Palm Sunday was a literal fulfilment of this prophecy. We may, indeed, reverently believe that He intended openly to proclaim His Messiahship by the act.

This is not to say that the prophet actually foresaw the event and deliberately foretold it. He may have had hopes of an early restoration of the monarchy which the people of his own time would see. But the king he depicted was not the king of common hope and expectation—no conquering and proud monarch trampling his enemies under foot, but one who had survived suffering and who came to bring peace. No figure in history that we know of did correspond to the prophecy until the true Messiah came. He literally fulfilled the ideal in the prophet's

mind, though probably in a way the prophet had not himself anticipated.

(ii) 11 [12, 13] (see Mt 26 [15], 27 [9, 10]).

It should be noted that the reference in Matthew presupposes the existing MT (*potter*), and not the Syriac reading (*treasury*). See on Zech 11 [13].

In St. Matthew's Gospel the passage (incidentally attributed to Jeremiah) is quoted as if it were a direct prophecy of the paying of the price to Judas, for the betrayal of our Lord, by the priests; and this method of interpretation is followed by earlier commentators on Zechariah.

This is not the place to discuss the method of Old Testament quotation in the 1st Gospel; but it must be said that in this case at least the evangelist seems to have been quoting from memory, or has freely edited the original to suit his use of it (cf. the passages). There is, in actual fact, very little correspondence between the events in Zechariah and those of Mt 26 [15] and 27 [3-10]. In Zechariah, according to the traditional interpretation of the passage (11 [4-14]), the *good shepherd* asks for his hire and is paid the price of an injured slave. Whereupon 'he casts it to the potter' (MT), in disgust—or, if the Syriac be followed, he casts it into the Temple *treasury* as money earned in the service of God. In Matthew it is the *traitor* who asks for hire for treacherous work and receives his thirty pieces. There were, it seems, two traditions as to the disposal of the money after the condemnation of our Lord to death. According to Ac 1 [18] Judas himself bought a field with it, and there met his death. But, according to Matthew, the priests purchased 'the potter's field' with the money which Judas had flung back into the Temple. It may be that the account in Matthew is coloured by the memory of the verse in Zechariah quoted (very roughly) apart from its context. It is difficult to believe that there is really any *direct* prophecy of the priest's transaction with Judas in Zech 11. The only real parallel is in the amount of the sum paid.

(iii) 12 [10] (see Jn 19 [37]).

The parallel would seem to be very close between the events alluded to in the two passages. In each case an assault had been made on a true representative of Jehovah (see note on Zechariah text *ad loc.*), ending in his death. In each case it is Jehovah Himself who suffers in the person of the one who is put to death. The words once applied by the prophet to some person unknown to us are most aptly applied to Him whom we believe to be the true Messiah, God Himself Incarnate, literally pierced on the Cross.

(iv) 13 [7] (see Mt 26 [31]).

It is not clear whether the shepherd in Zech 13 [7] is a good shepherd or a bad (see notes *ad loc.*). In the New Testament the words apply to the smiting of the *Good* Shepherd, and His desertion by His disciples. In Matthew probably the quotation is added by the evangelist, and is not part of the actual speech of our Lord. It is not recorded by the other evangelists. The writer of the Gospel is following his usual custom in citing Old Testament quotations that seemed to him apt. But as in the case of (ii) the context forbids us seeing in the Zechariah passage a direct prophecy of the event in the Gospels. In Zechariah the 'scattering' is the judicial act of Jehovah in judgement on the flock, not the desertion by followers.

It will be seen from the above notes that we must surrender much of the earlier custom of regarding Old Testament quotations as direct prophecies of events in the life of our Lord. The critical method of studying the Old Testament requires us first of all to try to find some meaning of the words of the prophet for the men of his own age. Their first reference is to current or immediately expected events. Certainly the experiences of godly men of old at the hands of those who rejected them anticipated in a remarkable way the experience of our Lord Jesus Christ—and He fulfilled them in a unique sense. The ideals and hopes of prophets in many an instance *only* found true realization in the Incarnate Son of God. In this sense their writings were prophetic of Christ, but not in the sense that they actually pre-visaged the life and death and character of Jesus. Quoted apart from their context words sometimes seem to be a remarkable prophecy of some happening in the life of Christ, but studied in relation to their original context, it is often found that the parallel they suggest cannot be closely pressed.

(1) IX.-XI.

IX. 1-8. The incorporation of neighbouring cities and states into the Kingdom of Jehovah, with Jerusalem as the inviolable capital.

1-4. Cities in the north of Israel.

1. **The burden** [or **oracle**] **of the word of the Lord:** the title, peculiar to this verse and 12 [1] and Mal 1 [1], indicating probably editorial connexion between the three sections of prophecy. **upon, etc.:** rather *in.* Probably the preposition is not to be taken with what

precedes, as if what follows were part of the title. Probably the divine name has fallen out after its use in the title, and we should render thus: *The burden of the word of the Lord. The Lord is in the land of Hadrach, and Damascus is his resting place.* These foreign districts (Hadrach, probably in the neighbourhood of Hamath and Riblah) in the north of Israel are to be under the sway of Jehovah. **for the eye of man** (*Adam*) . . . **is toward the Lord**: the only really possible translation of the existing text. RVm forced. But the sense given is not appropriate. Probably a place-name is to be found in the words 'eye of man.' The Hebrew for **eye** is *Ain*, and in Nu 34 [11] Ain is mentioned in connexion with Riblah. Possibly **man** (=Adam) is a corruption of Aram, with common confusion of *r* and *d* in Hebrew. Then render: *Ain of Aram is* (belongs) *to the Lord, and* (as also) *all the tribes of Israel.*

2. Tyre and Zidon, *though* (RVm) *they are* (as LXX) *very wise,* must fall to the power of Jehovah. Tyre was specially renowned for the skill of her craftsmen and her worldly wisdom and her commercial success (cf. 1 K 5; Ezek 27, 28).

4. her power: better *will smite her rampart into the sea.*

5-7. The south-west, Philistine country, is next mentioned. It is to be subjected and incorporated into Jehovah's Kingdom.

5, 6. Four of the five Philistine cities, Gath not being mentioned, perhaps because it had already been captured by Uzziah (2 Ch 26 [6]: cf. Am 1 [6] *v.n.*).

6. a bastard: as RVm =a mixed breed, a rabble population of half-castes instead of proud Philistines.

7. take away his blood, etc. The heathen Philistines had no scruple about eating with the blood forbidden by Hebrew law (Ezek 33 [25]). This and similar heathen **abominations** (pagan customs) will give way, for the Philistine is to form part of the **remnant** for Jehovah, i.e. he will be incorporated into the inner circle of true Jehovah worshippers. **a chieftain,** i.e. *a clan chief,* or perhaps, with slight change in Hebrew, 'a clan.' **as a Jebusite. Ekron** will be merged into Judah as the old inhabitants of Jebus (Jerusalem) had been (cf. 2 S 5 [6] ff.).

8. Jehovah will guard Jerusalem, the seat of His Temple. It will be immune from danger and free from oppression. **against the army**: probably better as RVm.

[*Note.*—In 9 [1-8] the writer seems to be visualizing a conquering army sweeping down from the extreme north, laying cities and territory low in its advance, and penetrating to the south-west, but leaving Jerusalem untouched. The prophet interprets this march of conquest as an act of Jehovah, and the prelude to the extension of His sway over the devastated cities and lands. Some have seen in the verses a reference to, and a sanguine interpretation of, Alexander's march through Palestine to Egypt, after the battle of Issus (333), beginning with his long but ultimately successful siege of Tyre (332).]

9, 10. The approach of the Messianic King is heralded.

He comes in peace ([9]) to establish an era of peace ([10a]), reigning over a world-wide kingdom ([10b]). The prophecy seems to have no connexion with [11-17] which speak of war and fury. It may be connected with [1-8] as depicting the next stage. After the devastating conquest of a world-warrior comes an age of peace, under a prince of peace. The verses seem to indicate that there was then no king in Jerusalem, but the hoped-for day was about to dawn when once again a king would reign, not as a proud man of war, but as a man of peace and patient endurance.

9. The character of the king. **just,** or *righteous*, i.e. either in administering justice (cf. Is 11 [3-5]; Jer 23 [5, 6]) or (better) as having been shown by Jehovah to be righteous, vindicated in the face of opposition, shown to be 'in the right.' Frequently so used in Is 40-55. This sense seems to agree wth the probable meaning of the next word. **having salvation**: Hebrew passive participle = 'saved,' 'rescued.' He has experienced some great salvation or rescue. He is one who has suffered, but has been delivered. **lowly**: perhaps better *afflicted,* of poor estate and such as the world would despise. Frequent in psalms of the pious in Israel ('poor') afflicted by the proud and ungodly (cf. Ps 10 [2, 9], 35 [10]). **an ass**: the beast of peace and not of war as the horse. Probably an echo of Gen 49 [11]. Quoted in Mt 21 [5]; Jn 12 [15]. The verse as a whole recalls the figure of the Suffering Righteous Servant of Jehovah (Is 50 [5-9], 53 [3-12]), who has passed through the crucible of suffering, but has been rescued and vindicated.

10. The kingdom of peace. **I will cut off**: LXX 'he will cut off.' **from sea to sea,** etc.: cf. Ps 72 [8]. The bounds indicated are not obvious: one sea might be the Mediterranean and the

other the Dead Sea. **the River** is the usual term for the Euphrates. **The ends of the earth** are the extreme limits of the known world. On this interpretation the kingdom is narrowly limited on east and west, definitely limited on the north, but of unlimited extension on the south. It seems better, however, to take the words as a more general hyperbolical expression of vast territory, 'from sea to sea' indicating all solid land from west to east; 'the River' the extreme limits of the north; and the 'ends of the earth' an entirely indefinite extension—virtually a boundless empire.

[*Note.*—It is futile to try to identify the king indicated with any known individual in history. The figure is doubtless an 'ideal' one, and it supplies one conception of the ideal Messianic King, closely allied to that of Is 11 [1-9], and strikingly similar to the afflicted 'Servant of the Lord' in Is 52 [13] ff. Some would maintain that the portrait is that of the ideal Messiah as the Hasidim conceived of Him (see p. 617*b*). The conception certainly finds remarkable fulfilment and realization in Jesus of Nazareth not merely in the manner of His entry into Jerusalem (Mt 21 [1-11]), but in the qualities of His character, and in His experience of 'affliction' and 'vindication.']

11-17. Another picture of the approaching ideal age. The dispersed Israelites will return ([12]). Judah and Israel will together oppose and rout the Greeks ([13-15]), and an age of prosperity will follow for the victorious people ([15-17]). The passage has little in common with the previous verses.

11. as for thee, i.e. Jerusalem. **because of the blood of thy covenant,** i.e. because of the fidelity of Jehovah to the blood-covenant made with Israel (Ex 24 [5-8]). **pit . . . no water,** i.e. 'the thirsty dungeon,' where captives were tortured with thirst—in Egypt perhaps? (see Josephus, *Ant.*, XII, ii, 1).

12. stronghold (only here) seems to mean Jerusalem. **double,** i.e. compensation (cf. Is 61 [7]).

13. bent, i.e. as a bow, figurative. **filled,** i.e. as with an arrow. **Greece:** Hebrew *Yavan* (cf. Ezek 27 [13], etc.). An indication of late date. The Greeks became a menace after the conquests of Alexander.

15. devour: LXX 'prevail.' **sling stones** makes no sense after **tread down.** A slight emendation in Hebrew gives *sons of* for **stones of** (*b'ne* for *ab'nê*). 'Slings' is possibly a corruption of the name for a place or race, but so far not identified. It is tempting to think that it might be a corruption or a disguised form of Alexander. **drink, and make a noise:** a probable emendation (with LXX support) gives *they shall drink their blood as wine.* **like bowls,** etc.: a revolting picture, to the modern mind, of men drinking and drenched with blood, like the bowls that were filled with blood at a sacrifice to be dashed over the sides of the altar.

16. as the flock, etc.: better '(even) *as a flock his people.*' Note how the metaphor of the flock appears here, to be used again later (see 10 [3], 11 [3] ff., etc.). **lifted on high:** perhaps better as RVm, but this involves a change in MT. The sudden change from the metaphor of a flock to that of a crown has led some to suspect corruption in the text, but emendations suggested are purely conjectural.

17. his: better *their*, referring to the people. **goodness: prosperity** as RVm.

X. **1, 2.** A fragment not connected with its context, except in the reference to sheep and shepherd ([2]), which probably explains its position here. Jehovah is the true Lord and controller of the forces of nature. The gods of popular superstition can give no sure guidance to the bewildered people. It is idle to speculate as to the occasion that evoked the short oracle.

1. the latter rain: better *spring rain*, in March and April.

2. Teraphim: 1 S 19 [13, 16]; Gen 31 [19]; Jg 17 [5], 18 [14]; Hos 3 [4]. **therefore:** superstitious practices so far from guiding had led to aimless wandering. The reference may be to the adoption of Greek paganism. **are afflicted:** better *wander about*, transposing two letters in Hebrew. **no shepherd:** cf. 1 K 22 [17]; Ezek 34 [5]; Mt 9 [36].

3-12. The rescue of Judah ([3-5]) and of Ephraim ([6-11]) from their oppressors, foreign rulers ('shepherds,' [3]), and fellow-countrymen ('he-goats,' [3]).

3. the shepherds: here probably of foreign rulers dominating the life of Judah and holding Ephraim in captivity. **punish . . . visited:** in Hebrew the same word 'visit' in each case, though with differing construction and differing nuance brought out by the English translation. **he-goats:** probably the wealthy and godless 'aristocracy' amongst the people of the Lord—sheep in the flock of Jehovah, but trampling on their weaker fellows (cf. Ezek 34 [17-19]). It may, however, denote foreign rulers. **goodly horse:** *majestic steed.* The weakling sheep are to be transformed into a superb charger on which Jehovah rides to battle.

4. **From him**, i.e. from Jehovah. **shall come forth**: better *go forth*. The verb should come at the end of the verse, applying only to 'every exactor.' Render thus: *From him* (i.e. Judah) (is) *the corner stone* (cf. Jg 20 [2]; 1 S 14 [38]; Is 19 [13]), *from him the stake* (Is 22 [23]), *from him the battle bow. From him shall go forth together every exactor* (oppressor) (Is 9 [4], 14 [2, 4]; Zech 9 [8]). **corner stone, nail** ('stake'), **battle bow**: metaphors for chief, leader, warrior. In Judah will arise a civil and military leader, and oppressors will vanish.

6*b*-12. The restoration of Ephraim, the house of Joseph, i.e. the ten northern tribes of Israel, carried into exile or scattered at the fall of Samaria before the Assyrians (2 K 17 [6] ff.). Perhaps a wider reference to *all* the dispersed—of Judah as well as Israel.

8. **hiss**: perhaps better *whistle* or *call in shrill notes* (cf. Is 5 [26], 7 [18]). **have increased**: *did increase*, in the past.

9. **And I will sow**: better perhaps as RVm. **live with**: emend with slight change to *preserve alive their children*.

10. **Egypt.** At the fall of Samaria many Israelites may have escaped to Egypt (cf. Hos 9 [3, 6], 11 [11]). But see also Intro., p. 617*a*. **and place shall not be found**, i.e. so numerous will they be.

11. **And he shall pass through**—Ephraim, though we should expect the plural. Some understand it of Jehovah. This is less likely, as Jehovah is the speaker. The idea seems to be that Israel will again cross the Dead Sea and the Nile in triumphant passage home.

12. **walk up and down**: with slight change in Hebrew *shall they boast themselves* or 'glory' (cf. Ps 105 [3]), as LXX.

XI. 1-3. The sequel to 10 [3-12]. Under the metaphor of great trees the oppressors are addressed. Their doom is sealed. They can only surrender to it (1, 2). The metaphor of the shepherd appears again (4). Their rich pastures are ravaged.

1. **Lebanon**: not literal, but as a figure for proud and domineering rulers, here probably foreign oppressors. **oaks of Bashan**: ditto (cf. Is 2 [12, 13]).

3. **shepherds**: cf. 10 [3]. For the thought cf. Jer 25 [36]. Render: *Hark! the howling of the shepherds, for their glory* (rich pastures or splendid flocks) *is laid waste.* **a voice of the roaring**, etc.: *Hark! the roaring of young lions.* **pride of Jordan**: the rich and thick foliage of the Jordan Valley, where the lions and their cubs found safe shelter, is pictured as wasted by the fire.

4-17. An allegorical passage (in two parts, [4-14. 15-17]), the meaning of which it is difficult at this distance to understand at all fully, as we have not sufficient knowledge of the events to which it alludes. Attempts have been made to find a period in history the events of which would explain the allusions, but the results cannot be accepted with any real confidence. It is not easy even to follow the actions described in the allegory, but the following is an attempt to trace and to interpret them.

4-14. The prophet receives the divine call to act the part of a shepherd (4). Throughout shepherd and flock are figures representing ruler and people. The flock have fallen on evil days, having been sold by their rightful but mercenary shepherds (rulers) to buyers (i.e. foreigners), who merely butcher them (5). The result of this was soon bound to be anarchy and civil war (6). The prophet becomes the shepherd, in place of the traffickers (7 *v.n.*), and enters into agreement with the foreigners who had bought the flock (10) (the representatives of the 'peoples'). The prophet's aim appeared to be to establish 'happiness' and 'unity,' symbolized by two staves (7 *v.n.*); and it would seem that he hoped to effect his aim by some form of compact between the foreigners and the people of Jehovah. He aimed at being a mediator between the two parties, trying to win the support of both. He made a covenant with the peoples (heathen) (10), and also fed the flock that had been marked out for slaughter (7). But the people's own rulers (shepherds) (8) opposed his policy, and he was obliged to remove three of them (8); and further, the people really gave him no response; in fact, his relations with them became strained and ultimately impossible (9), and he gave up his attempt (9), broke off relations with the heathen, and lost all hope of establishing happiness (10). The mercenary rulers knew in their hearts that his aim was the will of Jehovah (11), but they showed their contempt for his work by rewarding him with the price of a slave (12). His whole project having failed, he throws to the winds all hope of unity and breaks the staff that symbolized that ideal (14). It must be recognized that the prophet is not here depicting an actual attempt of his own to rule the people. He is impersonating in allegory either an actual individual who felt called to make the attempt he describes, or an ideal figure in his own mind.

15-17. The prophet impersonates another type of shepherd—a worthless one whose aim is purely self-interest. The refusal of

the good shepherd leads to disastrous consequences. The people receive the government they deserve.

4. The prophet receives the divine commission to play the rôle of shepherd. There is no need to suppose that the words are to be taken literally, in the sense that the speaker did actually himself undertake the government (7). It is all allegory, the meaning of which would be clear to those of his own day who read with an understanding mind. **the flock of slaughter**, i.e. doomed to slaughter by their present owners (5).

5. possessors: owning by purchase, as RVm indicates. The foreign overlords, who seemingly obtained the upper hand by the treachery of some of the Hebrews themselves (**they that sell them**). **their own shepherds**, i.e. the Hebrew rulers who should have guarded the interests of their people.

6. For I will, etc., gives the reason for the need of a new and good shepherd. The present régime is heading towards anarchy and civil war. Perhaps a reference to the mutual hostilities of the Greek nobles? (see 14 13). **land**: better *earth*, in wider sense. **the men**: better *mankind*.

7. So I fed: but probably only in the imagery of the allegory (see 4). **verily the poor**: a forced translation of the Hebrew, 'verily' being a mere guess at the meaning of a word that nowhere else has this force. LXX gives the clue to a simple and slight emendation, *for the traffickers of the flock*. The newly commissioned shepherd acts instead of, or as the representative of, the mercenary rulers of the flock. **two staves**, i.e. shepherds' staves. Another feature in the allegory. **Beauty . . . Bands.** He pictures the two staves as symbols of the two great ideals for which he would work. **Beauty** is a poor rendering. *Happiness* is perhaps as near as we can get. The word is of the same root as Naomi (Ruth 1 20). Joyous prosperity was to be one of his ideals. The other is *unity* or *fellowship* expressed by **Bands**, binding all together into one harmonious whole.

8. three shepherds, i.e. leaders of the people, whose policy and methods were out of harmony with his own. MT has *the* **three shepherds**: evidently the allusion would be quite plain to his readers, though it is quite obscure to us. **for my soul . . . them.** Hebrew *and* **my soul**, etc. The sentence does not give the reason for the removal of the shepherds, but what followed. **them** refers to the sheep. The shepherd forcibly removes the shepherds, and also conceives a growing antipathy towards the flock, which is reciprocated. He is confessing failure.

9. Then I said: '*So* I said.' He gives up in despair and leaves the flock to their fate.

10. All hope of achievement of his first ideal is gone, so he smashes the rod that symbolized it. **Beauty**: see 7. **all the peoples.** The happiness of the Hebrews could only be secured if the surrounding peoples were won over to goodwill towards them. The shepherd had entered into contract with the peoples, i.e. foreign overlords. But now he repudiates the contract, through lack of mutual sympathy between himself and the flock. He had failed.

11. and thus the poor, etc. Render *and the traffickers of the flock knew*, emending as in 7. The mercenary rulers (or perhaps some of them, 'they that gave heed') recognized in his action an expression of the mind of Jehovah.

12. unto them, i.e., surely, to the traffickers, whose representative he was (7), not to the people, as many interpret. The people were sheep and could not be expected to pay. The shepherd applies for his wages on surrendering his charge. But as he has 'given notice', they may not care to pay—**If ye think good . . . if not. thirty pieces of silver**, i.e. thirty shekels, the value of a slave (Ex 21 32).

13. unto the potter. Probably, with slight emendation supported by the Syriac version, as RVm, **into the treasury.** So also in the second half of the verse, where notice the location of the treasury **in the house of the Lord.** The money was paid into the Temple fund, as earned in the service of Jehovah. **I was prised at.** Is it Jehovah who is speaking or the shepherd? Probably the latter, **the goodly price**, etc., being a sarcastic exclamation of the prophet. Render thus: *And the Lord said unto me, Cast it into the treasury—the noble price that I was prised at of them!*

14. Bands: see 7. The second ideal is shattered. There is to be no harmonious unity. **Judah and Israel.** Many have suspected the mention of Israel here as an error or a later correction. Some LXX MSS. read *Jerusalem*, and some commentators would so read. It is supposed that friction had arisen between Jerusalem, the seat of government, and the other quarters of the province of Judah (cf. 12 5-7). The shepherd had attempted to heal the breach, but had failed. If 'Israel' be retained, we must either suppose that the prophecy alludes to the period when

Israel was still existing as a separate entity before the fall of Samaria in 722, or, as some, that Judah and Israel are used allegorically to represent rival factions in the Jewish state. But with no certain knowledge of the political background of the oracle, it is impossible to explain the allusions.

15-17. The foolish shepherd.

15. Take unto thee. The prophet again plays a 'rôle,' representing either some actual individual ruler or a type that is prevalent or expected. The prophet sees only disaster ahead for the flock at the hands of their (typical) rulers, whom they prefer to the good shepherd they have rejected. **instruments,** i.e. dress and gear, staff, wallet, etc.

16. We cannot identify the individual alluded to. **those that be scattered:** RVm represents the usual meaning of the word in Hebrew, but it is never used of cattle. It signifies a lad or youth. AV really involves an emendation in MT which LXX and Vulgate suggest.

Possibly 13 [7-9] (*v.n.*) should follow here.

(2) XII.-XIV. A second collection of prophecies, chiefly apocalyptic in character.

XII. 1-XIII. 6. The future triumph of Jerusalem and its purification after penitence.

XII. **1. The burden,** etc. The heading indicates a new section (see on 9 [1]). **concerning Israel:** but in the widest sense, as the subject is mainly Judah and Jerusalem. See below [(2)].

2-9. The triumphant deliverance of Jerusalem from a concerted attack of the nations.

2. cup of reeling: pouring out strong drink and confusing the nations. A figure for the infliction of a paralyzing disaster. **upon Judah shall it be,** etc. A most difficult sentence. Attempts to make sense are not satisfactory. The Targum omits 'upon' (Judah shall be in the siege against Jerusalem, i.e. either as taking part with the enemy or as sharing in the privations). Probably the text is corrupt. It is tempting to think that the words were originally a note in the margin relating to the title. 'Upon Israel' [(1a)] was seen to be misleading, as the prophecy is about Judah and Jerusalem. Some hand added a note: 'And also upon (concerning) Judah. It (the oracle) is dealing with the siege against Jerusalem.'

3. in that day: notice the constant repetition of the phrase (12 [4, 6, 8, 9, 11], 13 [1, 2, 4]). The 'day' is the day of Jehovah's decisive judgement of the nations and His vindication of Jerusalem. **burdensome stone:** another figure for cause of complete and crushing exhaustion.

4. every horse, etc., i.e. of the besieging army. **open mine eyes upon,** i.e. regard and watch with favour.

5. chieftains of Judah: better *clan-chiefs*. The verse seems to indicate a rupture between the capital and the provincial area of Judah, now to be healed (cf. 11 [14] note: cf. also [7]).

6. Judah's clan-chiefs join in the work of routing the opposing armies of the nations. **(even) in Jerusalem:** omit with some LXX MSS.

7 reflects some existing jealousy between the city and the country-folk (cf. [5]).

8. as David: the daring warrior. **the house of David shall be as God.** The royal house of David will figure as the representative of the divine leadership (cf. Ex 4 [16]) in the theocratic state. Possibly **as the angel of the Lord** was inserted to explain 'as God,' interpreting and qualifying the bold expression (cf. Ex 14 [19], 23 [20, 23]; Mal 3 [1] note).

10-14. The royal family and the capital will mourn in deep penitence for some outrageous crime they have committed. It would seem that a murder had been perpetrated that needed expiation. Of the historical allusion we know nothing, but the crime may have been an incident in the period of jealous rivalry between Jerusalem and the country dwellers in the province of Judah (see on [7]). The change in political status [(1-9)] is to be accompanied by a change of heart. Victory and freedom are to lead not to selfish boasting but to compunction.

10. the spirit of grace and of supplication. In Hebrew the two words are cognate in root. **grace** is perhaps too vague and general in sense; *generosity, kindness* is perhaps nearer—kindness shown (grace), and kindness sought for (supplication). Or to paraphrase: 'forgiveness offered and begged for.' **shall look unto me whom they have pierced:** better *they shall look upon me* (or *him* ?) *whom,* etc. RVm gives alternative reading in several MSS. It is impossible to decide which is original. The allusion also is uncertain. If **me** be retained, then the words may refer (*a*) to the prophet, or (*b*) to Jehovah, or (*c*) to one in whose mutilation Jehovah suffered as if it were inflicted on Him. The word rendered **pierced** seems usually to refer to 'mortal' wounding (cf. 13 [3]), so that it is unlikely that the prophet is referring either to himself (unless he foresaw his death) or to Jehovah. If the reference

is to some other, we have no key to his identification; but he may have been a Judahite patriot of the country districts criminally assassinated by the Jerusalem faction, to the grief and 'wounding' of Jehovah (whether 'me' or 'him' be the true reading). On the application of the words to our Lord in Jn 19[37] see Intro., p. 618*a*. **mourn**: better *wail* (in loud lamentation). **11. mourning**: *wailing*. **Hadadrimmon in the valley** (*plain*) **of Megiddo.** Of Hadadrimmon nothing is known. By some it is regarded as a place-name (Targum, Syriac, Jerome), and it is suggested that the reference is to the lamentations for the death of Josiah at Megiddo (2 K 23[29] ff.) that were continued as an established custom down to the days of the Chronicler (2 Ch 35[25]). Others think it is the name of a heathen god (cf. 2 K 5[18]), whose rites included 'ritual lamentations.' Cf. the weeping for Tammuz in Ezek 8[14].

XIII. 1-6. The purification of Jerusalem from idolatry (2) and from lying prophecy (3-6).

1. a fountain opened: better *there shall be a fountain* (that shall be) *open*—the Hebrew participle (open) probably denoting a continuing state. **house of David . . . Jerusalem.** It is the royal house and the people of the capital who need purification. See 12[10-14] for allusion to some great crime of which they were corporately guilty.

2. names of the idols, etc.: cf. Hos 2[17]. **the prophets**: evidently prophecy had become degraded. Probably a class of mercenary professional 'prophets' had arisen. The sacred profession had become a scandal (cf. Am 7[14]; Jer 23[9-32]; see also [5]). **the unclean spirit**: Hebrew 'the spirit of uncleanness,' i.e. the impulse that prompts men to uncleanness (cf. 'spirit' in 12[10]).

3. Even parents will not shrink from strong measures against a son who professes to be a prophet. For the death penalty for a false prophet see Dt 18[20]. **thrust him through**: the same word as 'pierce' of 12[10].

4. hairy mantle, i.e. a rough skin garment, the recognized garb of a prophet (cf. 2 K 1[8]; Mt 3[4]).

5. I am no prophet: cf. Am 7[14]. **been made a bondman**: a mere guess at an unintelligible phrase. Lit. in Hebrew: 'mankind has caused (one) to purchase me.' Probably with slight emendation translate *for the land hath been my possession*.

6. between thine arms: Hebrew *hands* as RVm. A curious expression apparently for the breast or the shoulders. The labourer working bare to the waist discloses tell-tale scars—either the result of an attack made on him as a false prophet (see [3]) or, as has been recently suggested, 'marks tattooed on his shoulders in token of his holy office' as the devotee of a false god (J. G. Frazer, *Adonis*, etc., quoted by Peake, *Comm. ad loc.*). **friends**: lit. *lovers*; either 'close relatives' (see [3]) or, as some, 'false gods' (see Hos 2[5, 7, 10], etc.), in whose temple (house) he had received his 'brands.'

7-9. Perhaps continuing 11[17]. A shepherd is to be smitten and the sheep scattered. Jehovah's anger is kindled against the flock. They will be smitten in judgement, and only a purified remnant will survive. If the passage continues 11[17], then the shepherd is the worthless one who has desecrated his sacred calling as Jehovah's 'fellow' (7), and Jehovah bids the sword smite. But it is possible that the reference is to the murder of some *good* representative of Jehovah (cf. 12[10]). In which case the imperatives 'Awake, O sword,' 'Smite the shepherd' are to be interpreted as graphic descriptions rather than actual commands. They might almost be rendered 'The sword awakes! The shepherd is smitten.' Thus, in consequence, Jehovah's anger is kindled against the flock.

7. my fellow. So lofty is the vocation of one called to rule Jehovah's people. **smite the shepherd**: not addressed to the 'sword' (fem.), as the imperative is masc. Some LXX MSS. read 'I will smite' (cf. Mt 26[31]). **upon**: better *against*, in judgement.

8. Only a remnant will escape and survive. A constant theme in Isaiah (cf. Is 10[21], etc.).

9. The purification of the remnant by trial (under the figure of smelting gold and silver: cf. Ps 66[10]) issues in the establishment of true relations between Jehovah and His people.

XIV. The glorious future that awaits Jerusalem after a great deliverance from heathen powers (1-3). She will stand aloft supreme, towering over the surrounding countries (4-10), witnessing the expiring agonies of the hostile nations (12-15) and the punishment of peoples who do not submit to the religion of Jehovah (16-19), whilst every common thing in Jerusalem will be holy as consecrated to Jehovah.

1-3. The great deliverance from a coalition of all nations (cf. Ezek 38, 39; Jl 3[2]). **thy spoil**: addressed to Jerusalem; the spoil taken of her by the enemy.

2. Seemingly complete disaster (3) is turned into victory, as Jehovah marches to battle.

4-11. Picturing a reconstruction of the physical formation of the country about Jerusalem, the prophet shows us Jerusalem towering aloft on the mountain on which the city stood, whilst the surrounding country is reduced to the level of the deep gorge of the Jordan (the Arabah). From Jerusalem there flow refreshing streams down the mountain-side and through a cleft made in the Mount of Olives, watering the country that lies around her at her feet. It is an extravagant picture to the modern mind, but we must not suppose for one minute that the prophet meant it to be taken literally. It is a poetic and figurative way of expressing the thought of the final spiritual supremacy of Jerusalem. She alone is raised aloft above all other land, but from her go forth streams of living water to the thirsty country about her. She is to be supreme, but the source of spiritual life. The sense of the passage is obscured by a slight corruption of the text in [5], where the English versions represent faithfully the MT, but the key to the probable emendation is provided by some of the versions, and is referred to in RVm. But see on [5].

4. **his feet shall stand . . . mount of Olives**: whence Ezekiel saw the glory of the Lord finally depart after the forsaking of Jerusalem (Ezek 11 [23]). **the mount of Olives shall cleave . . . east . . . west.** The prophet pictures the Mount of Olives being split across the middle into two sections, a northern and southern, so as to create a deep valley running east and west between the two sections, thus linking up the Jerusalem hill with the Dead Sea by a clear passage. The verse must be read in conjunction with [8], when the purpose of this change in the configuration of the country becomes apparent. It was to provide an uninterrupted channel for the living waters to flow from Jerusalem to the eastern (i.e. the Dead) sea. Without this splitting of the mountain their course would be impeded by the great mountain wall of Olivet.

5. **And ye shall flee**: so MT as pointed, but some Hebrew MSS., LXX, and Targum, with differing vowel points but the same consonants, give the sense *shall be stopped up* (see RVm). There is no thought of 'fleeing' in the passage, but of victory and security (see [11]). We should probably render *and the valley of my mountains shall be stopped up*, and understand the words as applying to the valley running round the *south* and *west* of the Jerusalem mountain (or rather mountains or heights). The point seems to be that the valley on the south and west is to be blocked up, so that the waters from the Holy City may be directed to flow westwards and not stagnate in the deep valley. In order to facilitate this westward flow, 'the valley of the mountains' will be altered in its course and run in a *westerly* direction, instead of a southerly, and it will 'reach unto Azel,' some town in the west unknown, but perhaps the same as Beth-Ezel in Mic 1 [11]. **yea, ye shall flee, as ye fled**: render *yea, it shall be stopped up, as it was stopped up.* **from before**: render *because of* or *through* **the earthquake.** A landslip had caused a block in the valley as the result of the earthquake mentioned by Am 1 [1]. Josephus refers to the occasion in *Ant.*, IX, x, 4. **the holy ones**, i.e. the angels who attend Jehovah's presence (cf. Dan 4 [13], 8 [13]). **with thee**: read with several MSS. and versions *with him.*

6. **the light shall not be**, etc. The Hebrew seems to be corrupt and yields no clear sense. Further, **there shall not be light** (RVm [a] and virtually AV) seems to be contradicted by [7]. Of many suggested emendations perhaps the simplest and most satisfactory is *there shall not again be cold and frost*, the latter part having the support of LXX, Syriac, Targum, and Vulgate (see RVm [b]). The day that is coming will be one that is free from climatic discomforts.

7. **one day**: render *It shall be one* (long) *day. It is known to Jehovah,* **not day, and not night** seems to mean 'without day and night,' i.e. without alternating light and darkness, but as the verse continues, unceasing light.

8. **living waters**, i.e. running water, but here a figure of spiritual power flowing from Jerusalem over the surrounding country, winter and summer, i.e. incessantly, in contrast to the natural streams of the country usually dry in summer (see under [5]).

9. The universal supremacy of Jehovah, the monotheism of the Jew being accepted by all lands. **the Lord . . . one**: cf. Dt 6 [4]. **his name one**, i.e. not identified with other gods, as had been the constant tendency, but universally recognized as Jehovah, the one true God.

10. Another transformation of the physical features of the land. The unique position of Jerusalem will be shown by her remaining lifted up on her high mountain while all the rest of the neighbouring country is depressed to the level of the Jordan Valley (**the Arabah**); the hills between **Geba** (six miles north of

Jerusalem) and **Rimmon** (mod. Umm er-rumâmîn? thirty-five miles south-west of Jerusalem) being levelled to a plain. **Benjamin's gate**: presumably at the north-east corner towards the territory of Benjamin. **first gate** or *former gate* (not identified): perhaps on the north-west roughly opposite the Benjamin gate. **corner gate**: at the north-west corner?—perhaps in apposition to 'the former gate,' on the 'site of' (**place of**) the former gate that had been demolished (see Jer 31[38]). **tower of Hananel**: at the north-east corner near the Benjamin gate? See Neh 3[1], 12[39]. **king's winepresses**: probably at south-east corner near the king's garden (Neh 3[15]). The boundaries mentioned probably cover the breadth (across the north wall) and the length (along the east wall) of the city.

11. curse: or as RVm **ban.** The technical word (of the root translated 'devote': cf. Jos 6[17], etc.) for utterly destroying unclean things or persons. In the new Jerusalem all will be clean (cf. [20] ff.).

12-15. The fate of the enemies of Jerusalem—a wasting plague will devour them ([12]), leading to utter confusion and civil war ([13]). But Jerusalem will receive their wealth as spoil ([14]). Ctr. [1].

13. Perhaps a reference to the constant wars between the Greek nobles after Alexander (cf. 11[6]).

14. Judah also shall fight against Jerusalem seems foreign to the picture here, though appropriate earlier in reference to the quarrels between the capital and the rest of the province (cf. 11[14], 12[5, 7, 10]). Some would transpose the words to an earlier and more appropriate place, e.g. after [1] or [2]. Others would render '*in* Jerusalem,' i.e. Judah will be on the side of Jerusalem and be found amongst the defenders of the city.

15. as this plague: referring to that mentioned in [12]. Animals will suffer as well as men. It may be that [15] originally followed [12]; [13] and [14] being out of place (see under [14]).

16-19. The fate of the remnant of the nations who are unwilling to submit to the religion of Jehovah.

16. Of the surviving nations most will submit to Jehovah as **King**, and join in His worship as the giver of life, **tabernacles** being the great harvest festival to Jehovah the Source of life.

17. Those who refuse will suffer, being punished by drought and bad crops.

18. Egypt will suffer equally with other nations, though she does not depend on rain for her crops, but on the flooding of the Nile. Omit **neither shall it be** (as LXX and Syriac), and remove the semicolon after **upon them** (see RVm).

20, 21. The final and complete holiness of Jerusalem. Nothing will be common or unclean in the fully consecrated city.

20. horses, instead of being cut off as symbols of war (as in 9[10]), will find their place in the new Jerusalem and be capable of consecration. **the bells** will bear the same words as the priest's mitre (Ex 28[36]). **pots** used for meaner purposes will be as holy as the **bowls** used for the blood of the sacrifices (cf. 9[15]).

21. every pot: even those in common use for mean purposes will be touched by the holiness of Jerusalem, and be as suitable for sacrificial purposes as those specially set apart hitherto for 'holy' use. The passage is a great and inspiring vision of the possibility of the sanctifying of the common place. **a Canaanite**: better as RVm **trafficker.** The money-making traffickers, who probably exploited the pilgrims to the Temple, will disappear (cf. the incident in Mt 21[12]; Jn 2[13-16]). There may, however, be an allusion to the mercenary priests as rulers of the people, called 'traffickers' in 11[7, 11] in the emended text (see note *ad loc.*).

MALACHI

By John C. H. How

(1) **The Title** (1[1]).—The book is really anonymous, as 'Malachi' is probably not a personal name but an echo of 3[1] 'my messenger,' which is what the word Malachi in Hebrew means. The LXX endorses this view in the title: *Oracle of the word of the Lord against Israel by the hand of his messenger.* It is idle to speculate as to the identity of the writer. Jewish tradition preserved in the Targum assigned the work to Ezra: '*By the hand of my messenger whose name is called Ezra the Scribe.*'

But there is no other ground for supposing that Ezra was the author, though it may well be that the writer was a con-

temporary of Ezra, and probably the herald of his reforms.

For the sake of convenience it is, however, admissible to use the name Malachi to designate the writer.

(2) **The Date.**—The prophecy clearly belongs to the Persian age when Judah was under a 'governor' (1 [8]: cf. Hag 1 [1]; Neh 5 [14]), and the references in the book all point to the period when the Exile was over and the Temple rebuilt, and the sacrificial worship in full vogue (cf. 1 [7-10], 3 [1, 10]). The absence of any allusion to a recent return from exile seems to indicate that the work is long after 520 B.C. The community had settled down to normal life in Judah, and the first flush and excitement of return was over.

Further, the abuses referred to by Malachi correspond very closely to those which Ezra and Nehemiah set themselves to remove.

The book has, then, to do with the later rather than the earlier stage of the period after the return.

The assigning of a more exact date depends on the view taken about the relative dates of Ezra and Nehemiah and the course of events in their days. The reader must here be referred to the Introduction to Ezra and Nehemiah (p. 285*a*).

Space does not permit of a discussion of all the suggested dates. It must suffice to say that the view taken by the present writer is that Malachi prepares the way for the coming of Ezra in 398 (p. 288*a*), and should be assigned roughly to 400 B.C. The ministry of Nehemiah was over, and it had been only temporarily successful. After his decease the people lapsed again into their former habits, and the priesthood became more and more corrupt. But reform must come, the prophet is convinced. And reforms *are* coming, for Ezra is at hand, and his work is to meet with success. Malachi heralds his approach. The prophecy found its first and immediate fulfilment in the arrival of Ezra and the effective reforms he accomplished.

(3) **The Circumstances** under which the prophecy was uttered may now be described more fully.

Nehemiah's reforms had failed, with perhaps the one exception of the observance of the Sabbath (Neh 13 [15-22]).

[*Note.*—Malachi does not refer to any breach of the Sabbath. It may be noted, however, that Ezra thought well to make special mention of the Sabbath in his covenant (Neh 10 [31]) to guard against a tendency that no doubt existed, though it had not reached the point of being an actual scandal.]

Mixed marriages between Jews and foreigners (2 [11]), infidelity to the marriage bond (2 [14, 15]), social injustice (2 [10], 3 [5]), refusal of ecclesiastical dues (3 [10]), were common amongst the laity, whilst the priesthood had sunk to a very low level and connived at the failings of the laity (1 [13, 14], 2 [8]). The priests were guilty of partiality and favour in their demands and their interpretation of the law (2 [9]), whilst their ministrations at the altar just bored them (1 [12, 13]).

It would seem that the country was suffering from the effects of drought or pestilence, or both (2 [2], 3 [10, 11]), which the prophet interpreted as a divine judgement on their conduct, not to be removed by mere ceremonial worship, however much wailing accompanied it (2 [2, 13]), but which the people regarded as evidence that there was really after all no profit in practising religious worship. Not only was the country suffering from agricultural depression, but the province was under the government of a Persian official. National pride was wounded, and hopes of real freedom and self-government seemed to be very faint. Such conditions tended to develop scepticism and complaints against the divine justice; and the voices of agitators and objectors were loud in protest, and the faith of simple folk was strained to the uttermost. It seemed that God did not after all love Jacob any more than Esau (1 [1]).

(4) **The Prophet's Message.**—Amidst the general scepticism and spiritual and moral laxity there was to be found a small body of people who, whilst no doubt perplexed, yet stood firm and trusted their God in faith (3 [16]). The writer of the prophecy was probably one of their number. The divine Spirit came upon him and moved him to write an answer to sceptics and a challenge to the prevailing godlessness, and to put forward a 'theodicy' to strengthen the strained faith of the few who still hoped and trusted. He adopted an original mode of presenting his message. He set it in the form of an imaginary dialogue between himself and the objectors he is proposing to answer. A sceptic questions some contentions of the prophet, and the prophet gives him his answer (see 1 [2-5], 1 [6, 7], 2 [13, 14], 2 [17]). Perhaps the written prophecy is, so to speak, a later summary report of open-air preaching by the prophet in the streets and market of Jerusalem, in which he has incorporated the objections thrown at him by 'hecklers' in the crowd. He is fearless and out-

spoken, and does not shrink from vigorous denunciation of the officials in the Church, for he held the highest views of the true ideal of priesthood, and he saw that if the community was to be reformed the priesthood must first be purged (1 [6-9], 2 [1-9], 3 [3, 4]).

To those who questioned the justice of God (2 [17], 3 [14, 15]) he gave the answer that the mind of God would certainly be manifested in a decisive act of judgement (3 [1-3]) when the *really* pious and faithful would be vindicated, and the proud and stubborn, along with offenders against the moral law, would be declared guilty and condemned to extinction (3 [5], 4 [1-3]: cf. also 1 [3-5]). Like many other Old Testament teachers he unhesitatingly asserted that the prevalent drought and pestilence and consequent scarcity and suffering, so far from being evidence of the futility of worshipping God, were expressions of the divine condemnation of worship that was sacrilegious and profane, in which the laity were dishonest and the priests bored (1 [10, 12-14], 3 [10-12]).

(5) **The Lasting Value of the Book.**—The prophet's words may well be studied and pondered for guidance and inspiration in these modern days. They are the utterances of a man on fire with spiritual zeal, and deal with questions that were not merely local and temporary in their importance, but which have to be faced repeatedly in successive ages. Innocent suffering and the seeming failure of reward to the righteous (3 [14]), with their accompaniment of doubt as to the moral governance of the universe, are problems that have exercised minds in all ages Malachi may not solve them, but his faith persists in maintaining that there will be an ultimate judgement when wrongs will be righted—and it is doubtful whether we can get much further than this even now; though, of course, the Christian faith introduces additional considerations.

His strictures on unspiritual worship apply to-day as much as then. To him ritual and ceremonial offered a great challenge to the right spirit in worship, and had their distinct spiritual value. He supplements the teaching of the earlier prophets in this matter. They had to condemn devotion to ceremonial religion divorced from moral effort (cf. Is 1 [11]; Am 5 [21-24]). Malachi has to denounce laxity in externals as indication of spiritual apathy. Worldly profit and self-interest led to niggardly giving both in the matter of animal sacrifice and the payment of clergy (1 [6, 14], 3 [8-10]). Men dared to offer to God what they would never have dared to offer to their civil authorities. Their unready spirit in worship is perhaps contrasted with the ardent worship of heathen, in much the same way as the devotion of Moslems might be with the nominal religion of many churchmen. As so often happens, neglect of duty in worship was coupled with a low tone of morals both in social and sexual matters (2 [10, 14-16], 3 [5]). In social matters the root of the evil was the desire for private gain then as now. In sexual matters the chief evil was infidelity to the marriage vow, accompanied, it seems, with disorder in families and the break-up of the right relations between parents and children (2 [14-16], 4 [6]). This latter evil the prophet seemed to feel to be especially displeasing to Jehovah, and likely to lead to a curse on the whole land if not remedied. In these days as in those, anything that tends to destroy the sanctity of married life and the family brings with it a train of evils. The prophet has here a message for these days. Again, it is not fanciful to see something of an analogy between the danger to religion of marriages outside the covenant in those days and 'mixed' marriages in these days (2 [11]). They so often result in a falling away from religion rather than the strengthening of religious practice in the family.

Finally, the prophet's indictment of an unworthy priesthood has its value to-day as then. It is a high ideal he sets forth for the priest (2 [4-7]), and the Christian priest can without much difficulty apply it to his own most sacred calling. The prophet saw that the first need was reform of the ministry. Low ideals in the priesthood are bound to have a detrimental effect on the religion of the laity (3 [3, 4]). Perfunctory performance of divine worship (1 [12, 13]), failure to study and teach Christian truth and morals (2 [7, 8]), class-favouritism and partiality (2 [9]), are sins as deadly now as then, both to the priest and to the worshipping community.

(6) **The Interpretation and Application of the Prophecy.**—As with all prophecy, so with Malachi, differing views about the mode and effect of inspiration will produce differing ideas about legitimate lines of interpretation. This is not the place to discuss the question fully, but it may be said that we must interpret our prophet's words as having primarily a message intelligible to his own generation; though, in so far as they proclaim some lasting principle of divine truth, they may have a much wider application and speak to subsequent ages. In foretelling the future (it must be frankly admitted) the prophet

was often mistaken with regard to the immediacy and the exact manner of the fulfilment of his words. Yet his utterances may remain true as the expression, in local and topical form, of a divine mode of action or a divine principle, and find fulfilment on a scale and in a manner beyond the prophet's expectation. Two passages in Malachi call for special note:

(*a*) 1 [11]. The AV rendering applies the prophecy to the future, and in doing so it is following an early Christian tradition. Dr. Pusey in his Commentary cites quotations from Christian writers from Justin to Augustine illustrating the early interpretation of these words as prophetic of pure Christian worship in the Eucharist. It must, however, be admitted that there is some doubt whether the Hebrew will bear a future sense. The words may describe what was the case in the days of the prophet and not what would be in some remote future. We must in any case beware of reading into the passage a direct prophecy of the institution and continued use of the Eucharist by Christians in all lands, even though the prophet may be speaking of the future (see further note on the text).

(*b*) 3 [1-4] with 4 [5]. The two passages may be taken together, though it cannot be certain that the 'Elijah' of 4 [5] is to be identified with the messenger of 3 [1].

It should be noted that, in the New Testament, 3 [1a] and 4 [5] are interpreted by our Lord Himself as prophetic of the coming of St. John the Baptist (Mt 11 [10], 17 [10-13]; Mk 1 [2], 9 [11-13]; Lk 1 [17], 7 [27]).

The similarities in character, manner of life and experience, between Elijah and John Baptist are marked. No doubt the prophecy led to the expectation of an actual return of Elijah from heaven, whither he had so mysteriously disappeared (2 K 2: cf. Justin, *Dialogue*, 49). But our Lord, by His application of the prophecy to John Baptist, shows us that the words of prophecy must not be taken too literally. One who, as John Baptist did, went before the Lord 'in the spirit and power of Elijah' (Lk 1 [17]), adequately fulfilled the prophecy of Malachi. If John Baptist filled the rôle of the forerunner of 3 [1a] and 4 [5], then our Lord must be identified with Him who comes (3 [1b-3]). The 'angel of the covenant' would seem to be an actual visible representation of Jehovah Himself (see note on text). We may be right in asserting that no prophet of the Old Testament actually expected the Incarnation as we Christians know it. But Malachi, with others, expected a visible and personal manifestation of Jehovah, visualized here under angelic form. The fulfilment far exceeded the prophecy.

What of the effects of His coming and the manner of His work? (2-4) The prophet no doubt expected a coming of Jehovah for terrible judgement (*he is like a refiner's fire*); and John Baptist echoed the same expectation, though he employed different imagery (cf. Mt 3 [7-12]).

Neither of them had proved the full depth of the longsuffering love of God. Purging was indeed to take place, and a sacrifice pleasing to the Lord (4) to be offered. But the fulfilment differed from and really transcended the expectation, in the incarnate life, work, and death of Jesus. Yet the final judgement remains still to come, and our Lord endorsed the prophet's expectation of that great event. Malachi's words retain a message for all time, and their complete fulfilment is yet to be in the second coming of Christ (cf. Justin, *Dialogue*, 49, and Pusey *ad loc.*). But to find fulfilment of Malachi's words in the events of the Gospels and the future coming of Christ for judgement is not to suggest that the prophet *consciously* anticipated events that were to occur 400 years after. His message was primarily for his own time, and probably within his own time they found some measure of fulfilment in the coming of Ezra and the purging and reformation he effected. The prophet was conscious first of the *need* of reform; secondly, of the imminence of some crisis that would issue in reform. His inspired insight into the mind and character of Jehovah led him to conviction that Jehovah must and would manifest Himself in such action as the circumstances demanded; and he gives forth an utterance that finds immediate fulfilment in the work of Ezra, but is not exhausted by it. His words lived on to find a further and richer fulfilment in the coming of John Baptist and the incarnate Lord; and their final fulfilment has yet to be.

(7) **Malachi and Deuteronomy.**—There are striking echoes of Deuteronomy in Malachi, both in phraseology and in spirit.

The opening verses ([1, 2]) at once suggest the theme constantly repeated in Deuteronomy—Jehovah's love for His people (Dt 4 [37], 7 [7, 8, 13], 10 [15], 23 [5]). Intermarriage with foreigners (2 [11]) is specifically forbidden only in Dt 7 [3] and in Ex 34 [16] (probably influenced by 'D). The use of the name 'Israel' for the people, though they were almost entirely Judahites, may be an echo of the use of Deuteronomy (cf. 1 [1, 5], 2 [11]). To Malachi there

is no distinction between priests and Levites, which is again a mark of Deuteronomy. His high estimate of the unique privilege and lofty vocation of Levi echoes the Levitical ideals of D (cf. 2^{4-7} with Dt 18^{1}, 21^{5}, 33^{8-11}). The humane spirit manifested in 3^{5b} (towards the hireling, the widow, the fatherless and the stranger) is a note of Deuteronomy (see Dt $10^{18, 19}$, 24^{19-21}). 4^{4} is thoroughly Deuteronomic in language and idea, and there can be little doubt that the law of Moses there mentioned is Deuteronomy itself. In fact, it is probable that Deuteronomy was the only codified form of law which the prophet knew. The fuller law (roughly as we know it in the Levitical books of the Pentateuch) was not yet published in Judæa. Ezra was to bring it with him from Babylon, and to promulgate it shortly after Malachi's date (see p. 289*a*). But Deuteronomy was thoroughly familiar to the prophet. He had studied it and imbibed its spirit, and was dominated by its influence. There is, however, one passage in which it has been thought the prophet shows acquaintance with the regulations of the priestly code (P), which Ezra brought from Babylon. In 3^{10} it has been maintained, he requires the laity to conform rather to the orders of P than of Deuteronomy in paying the *whole tithe* into the Temple. It is argued that Deuteronomy only allows the Levites a share in and not the whole of the tithes, except in the third year; and further it provides that the tithe should be eaten at a local sanctuary near the worshipper's home, as one element in sacrificial offering (see Dt 12^{17-19}, 14^{22-29}, 26^{12-15}). In Nu 18^{21-24} (P), on the other hand, it is provided that the Levite shall have the full tithe. But it must be remembered that in Malachi's day conditions were very different from those of the days when the Deuteronomic laws were first drawn up. Not only had the local sanctuaries gone, and only one, Jerusalem, remained, but the territory of the people was much reduced, and all were living within easy range of the city. Further, all Levites had probably now taken up their abode in the city (cf. Neh 13^{10-13}). The local Levite had gone. The altered conditions had led to a development of the law in practice, though there might not have been as yet any actual authoritative written law on the subject. Perhaps the negligent worshippers were taking advantage of the difficulty of fulfilling the written law, and were withholding part of the tithe in consequence. Malachi is simply calling on them to act up to Dt $12^{6, 11, 17}$ under the new conditions. They must pay their full dues, even though the letter of the law with its reference to local sanctuaries and neighbouring Levites was not practicable. In due course the revised practice received official sanction by being admitted to the statute-book (Nu 18^{21-24}).

[*Note.*—It is assumed in the above that Deuteronomy definitely incorporates ancient laws drawn up to regulate worship, etc., in the days before the abolition of the local sanctuaries and the limitation of sacrificial worship to Jerusalem (see A. C. Welsh, *The Code of Deuteronomy*).]

For the various laws on tithe see note on Neh 10^{37}.

Bibliography

Barnes (*C.B.*); Driver (*Cent.B.*); J.M.P. Smith (*I.C.C.*); Grieve in *Peake*.

I. 1. burden: RVm better. **Malachi,** as RVm (*v.s.*).

2-5. The first objection answered. Jehovah *does* love Jacob (=the people of Israel) in spite of appearances. Esau (=Edom) had recently suffered some disaster, and their hope of recovery was vain; but Israel had been re-established in Jerusalem after their exile, though they might be suffering now. Israel and Edom, though akin and traditionally the descendants of twin brothers (Gen 25^{21-23}), were time-long enemies. What disaster to Edom is here referred to is uncertain, but it may have been the invasion of their territory by the Nabatæans who settled in the conquered land. The date is uncertain. The Edomites secured a footing in South Judæa with Hebron as their capital, and during the Maccabæan wars harassed the Jews, but Judas Maccabæus and John Hyrcanus successfully invaded their country, and the latter compelled them to adopt Judaism. Later, however, an Idumæan (Edomite) became, through Roman influence, King of the Jews, in the person of the hated Herod the Great.

2b, 3a. Quoted by St. Paul (Rom 9^{13}).

6-8. The second objection (of the priests) answered. They plead 'Not guilty' to the charge of contempt of Jehovah's Name (7). They cannot see that there is any cause for the depression under which the land is suffering. The answer is that the priests have been offering blemished sacrifices, an indication of their contempt for the service of the sanctuary. Carelessness about the sanctuary and holy things is the outward expression of low spiritual tone.

7. bread, i.e. food, in reference to the sacrifices. **The table**, etc. Their conduct implied that they thought this, though they would not have used the exact words.

8. See Lev 22 [20, 22] (H). **governor**: see Hag 1 [1] and Neh 5 [14, 15].

9-11. The indictment of the priests.

9. And now, I pray you. Ironical. The priests may try the line of entreating God's favour, but it will be useless in their present attitude. They are to blame for the present alienation of Jehovah (read as RVm *from your hand*). **accept any of your persons**: better than RVm. Here, as in [8] and commonly, the words are literally *lift up* (your) *faces*. The thought is of the lifting up of a face of a prostrate suppliant as a sign of acceptance of the petition.

10. Far better to shut up the Temple altogether than profane it by such unworthy offerings.

11. A much disputed passage. It is not clear whether the prophet is referring to what is actually the case in his own day (RV) or whether he is depicting a future ideal as a vivid present (AV and RVm). Either interpretation of the Hebrew is defensible, and scholars are divided on the matter. If RV rendering is right, the reference must be either to Jewish worship in Gentile lands such as Egypt and Babylon, or to the sincere but ignorant worship offered by heathen in many parts, and more acceptable to Jehovah on account of its sincerity than the heartless and formal worship of the Jews in Jerusalem. But to the former reference it must be objected that, in at least the literal sense, incense (i.e. sacrificial worship) was not being offered to Jehovah by Jews amongst Gentiles, except possibly in the Jewish Temple at Elephantine in Egypt. Objection to the latter is found first in the fact that heathen sacrifice, however sincere, was not offered unto the Name of Jehovah, and secondly in the fact that it is highly dubitable whether a writer of the age of Malachi could possibly have adopted so liberal a view of heathen worship as to regard it as accepted by Jehovah as offered in His Name. Christian tradition has always adopted the interpretation which appears in AV and RVm, making the reference to a future age when Jehovah will be worshipped far and wide in Gentile lands. This interpretation cannot be ruled out as impossible, though it must be admitted that the construction in the Hebrew is not the usual 'prophetic perfect' commonly used by the prophets to depict a future event vividly as a present reality. It may, however, be a variation of the more usual construction, and we may be right in regarding the verse as a prevision of a future ideal. Justin, Tertullian, Irenæus, and many later writers saw in the words a direct prophecy of the Christian Eucharist. Though we cannot admit that the prophet actually foresaw the institution and the repeated offering of the Eucharist in the Christian Church (the pure offering), yet we may claim that in the spread of Christian worship from the rising to the setting of the sun in Gentile lands his words are finding a fulfilment beyond his highest expectation.

12. ye say, i.e. in effect, by your action, as in [7]. **the fruit thereof, even**: omit. The words (one word in Hebrew) are probably due to a corruption of the word for 'is contemptible,' which follows it in the text. Translate *and his meat is contemptible*.

13, 14. The priests (*a*) are bored and contemptuous, and (*b*) think anything will do for the Temple offering, whilst the laity ([14]) think likewise.

14. Translate *And hath in his flock a male, and voweth it, but sacrificeth unto the Lord a blemished one.* The layman promises his best by vow, but actually offers an inferior animal. For the law see Lev 22 [18-24] (H). **is terrible**, i.e. feared or reverenced ([11] *v.n.*).

II. 1-10. Jehovah's wrath must break over the priests, whose conduct is in such marked contrast to the ideal of the Levitical tribe entrusted with the sacred ministry (cf. Dt 33 [8-11]).

3. Behold, I will rebuke, etc. The text is corrupt. Read (as in 1 S 2 [31]) *I will cut off your arm*, i.e., render you useless for your profession. LXX and Vulgate both read 'arm' here for **seed**. The words are similar. 'Seed' is inappropriate in this context, as the Levite did not till the ground. If, however, the text is kept, the reference is either to the seed of the ground farmed by the laity, the tithes of which were given to the Levites, or to the farms unlawfully developed by the Levite in the days of Nehemiah (see Neh 13 [10]) when the laity were withholding their tithes.

4. might be, i.e. might stand or remain. The judgement of Jehovah is for a remedial purpose. The Levites had disregarded the covenant, but Jehovah cannot do so. The Levites forfeit their privileges by their disregard of their obligations; but Jehovah's purpose is to purify and renew (cf. 3 [3, 4]).

Levi = the tribe of Levi, the priestly tribe (see p. 630*a*). For the covenant cf. Dt 18 [1-8], 33 [8-11].

5. The terms of the covenant. The Hebrew is not very clear, and the English versions are not accurate. Better thus, omitting **that he might**, and altering the English punctuation: *My covenant was with him. Life and peace* (offered on my side)—*and I gave them him. Fear* (due on his side)—*and he feared me and stood in awe of my name.*

6. **The law of truth**: better *True Torah* (or *direction*). See under Hag 2 [11]. The reference is not to a written code of law, but to oral decisions given by the priests as occasion required (cf. Dt 17 [8-12]). 'The priesthood is conceived of as much more than a body of men set for the exact performance of the ritual. . . . It is rather an agency endowed with great possibilities as a positive force for instruction and reproof in righteousness' (*I.C.C. ad loc.*).

7. **knowledge**: not merely of correct ritual and the ceremonial law. It was possible for priests to know such things according to the traditional standards and yet not 'know the Lord' (cf. Jer 8 [7-9]). Nor merely intellectual knowledge, but such a knowledge of God as issued in moral conduct and spiritual desire (cf. Hos 4 [1, 6], 6 [6]). **the law**, i.e. oral teaching and counsel about the things of God (cf. [6]). The priest should be the spokesman of Jehovah's mind. **the messenger**: Hebrew *Mal'ach*, the word commonly translated 'angel' (cf. 3 [1]), hence Mal'achi = my messenger (see p. 626*a*); perhaps used of the priest in Ec 5 [6], but nowhere else. Compare the exhortation in the Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer.

8, 9. The Levites of the prophet's day contrasted with the true ideal just sketched.

8. **in the law**: better *by direction*. The counsel of the priests hindered rather than helped progress in true godliness.

9. The priesthood had lost its prestige amongst the laity through its corruption. The past tense (**have I**) may be the Hebrew 'prophetic perfect' to denote a certainty in the future = *will I*. **have had respect of persons**, i.e. shown partiality, fearing the wealthy and important but despising and oppressing the poor.

10 may either be connected with the preceding, having reference to the 'respect of persons' just denounced and now shown to be a denial of the essential unity of the people, or it may stand by itself as dealing with a wider social evil such as is revealed by Neh 5. It has nothing to do with what follows, though many commentators connect it with the following verses. **one father**: either Jacob the ancestor of the race, or God (cf. Dt 32 [18]; Is 63 [16]).

11-16. Two current social scandals: (*a*) intermarriage with foreigners [11, 12]; (*b*) divorce [13-16].

11, 12. Foreign marriages—the first scandal.

11. **in Israel.** Some would omit the reference to Israel as uncalled for at this period when the northern tribes were scattered far and wide. But it may be that Malachi uses 'Israel' as he uses 'Jacob' in 1 [2] as the designation of the chosen people descended from Jacob (Israel), of whom only a remnant (Judah) now remained. Compare the use of 'Israel' in the title 1 [1] and in 1 [5]. It is probably due to the influence of Deuteronomy on the mind of the prophet. **daughter of a strange god**, i.e. women of foreign (non-Israelite) race who worship their foreign gods. See Dt 7 [3]: cf. Ezr 9 [2]; Neh 13 [23] ff.

12. **The Lord will cut off**: better as an imprecation, *May the Lord cut off.* **him that waketh**, etc. An instance of the use of a combination of opposites to express totality; 'the caller and the called' together represent every individual. In the Hebrew the expression is alliterative and was perhaps proverbial. Compare a similar idiom in 1 K 14 [10], 21 [21], etc., and perhaps also in Zech 8 [10]. The prophet calls for the extermination of all posterity from the family of the offender.

13-16. Divorce—the second social scandal.

13. **again**, i.e. in the second place. **ye cover**: RV implies that the divorced women came weeping to the sanctuary, and the offerings are not accepted by Jehovah on account of the wrongs inflicted on the outraged wives. But it is better to translate 'ye cover,' etc., '*because* he regardeth not,' etc. Some disaster had happened betokening Jehovah's displeasure and His refusal to accept the offerings.

14. **Wherefore?** The people ask calmly what they have done to incur Jehovah's displeasure. **Because**: the prophet's answer. It is this practice of cruel divorce that has displeased Him. **wife of thy covenant**, i.e. wife by solemn and holy contract to which Jehovah was witness. It may, however, mean a wife from the covenant people—a fellow-Israelite put away in favour of a foreign woman.

15*a*. Very difficult and almost certainly corrupt. Various attempts have been made

to give sense, but none are satisfactory. RV seems to refer the words to the original creation of the one man Adam: '(Only) one was made at the beginning, though he (God) had enough spirit or life available to create more. And if it is asked why God limited his creation to one, the answer is that he could only trust one pair to produce godly offspring.' RVm interprets differently: 'No one who had even a remnant of the (divine) Spirit in him has (ever) done (such a thing) (as to divorce his true wife). Or what? (meaning?). Is there anyone now who seeks to produce godly seed (by a holy marriage within the covenant)?' The versions really give no help and make no sense. The Targum paraphrases, introducing a reference to Abraham as the 'one' chosen that he might rear a godly seed. Various emendations and further interpretations have been offered, but all are mere guesses, and it is unprofitable to spend time in studying them. It is best to admit that the passage is corrupt and the original sense lost. Most probably there was a reference to Gen 2 ^{24b}, before the text became confused.

16. **I hate,** etc. This involves an emendation in the text. The exact Hebrew is as RVm. Some suggest the rendering 'He who hates and puts away (his wife), saith the Lord,' etc., 'covers his clothing with violence.' The latter phrase is difficult and unique. **putting away,** i.e. divorce: cf. Dt 24 $^{1-4}$ (the Old Testament concession), and Mk 10 $^{3-9}$ (the New Testament teaching).

17. Another objection voiced. What evidence was there for the existence of a moral judge of the world? A persistent question in the minds of troubled Hebrews (cf. Pss 37 and 73 and the Book of Job). The verse really introduces the following passage 3 $^{1-6}$.

III. 1-6 (*7a*). The prophet foresees an inevitable demonstration of Jehovah's wrath on the Levites and on the immoral laity. He will show Himself to be Judge in spite of their scepticism.

1. **whom ye seek.** Perhaps ironical, as also *whom ye delight in.* They professed to seek a God of judgement and an authoritative representative of Jehovah who would manifest His justice. They would find what they asked for, but His manifestation would not be so gratifying to themselves as they had hoped (cf. Am 5 $^{18-20}$). First the messenger would come preparing a way (cf. Is 40 ^{3}), then the Lord Himself would come in an unexpected moment. **and the messenger:** better '*even* the messenger,' or perhaps *angel.* The word may mean either 'messenger' or 'angel.' Probably in this verse it means 'messenger' in the first part, where the reference is to an expected herald of the coming of the Lord, a human being, probably a prophet (cf. Is 40 ^{3})—perhaps the Elijah of 4 ^{5}. In the second part it probably = angel. Here the expression 'angel of the covenant' is in apposition to 'the Lord, whom ye seek,' and the reference is probably to the 'angel of the presence,' who is virtually a manifestation of Jehovah Himself (see note on Zech 1 $^{11, 12}$). There may be an echo of Ex 23 ^{23} here: cf. also Is 63 ^{9}. The opening words of the verse appear to be quoted (freely but not exactly) in Mt 11 ^{10}; Mk 1 ^{2}; Lk 1 ^{76}, 7 ^{27}, in reference to St. John Baptist, who heralded the coming of the Lord in His incarnate life, though He came then not for judgement, but for the salvation of the world (see Introduction, p. 629*a*).

2. **the day:** cf. Am 5 ^{18}; Zeph 1 ^{7}. The terror of the Lord's coming for purgation.

3. **the sons of Levi,** i.e. the priesthood. The first necessity is a purging of the corrupt representatives of the priesthood.

5. But the laity will be judged too—for superstitious practices, sexual immorality, perjury, social injustice, neglect of the fear of God.

6. Difficult as it stands. **therefore:** MT has simply *and.* Attempts are made to preserve the MT and make sense, e.g. 'Ye are not utterly consumed because my purpose for you stands. But ye must be thoroughly purged.' But the interpretations are rather forced. LXX and Syriac render (in effect) 'And you, sons of Jacob, have not desisted (?) from the wickedness of your fathers. Ye have turned aside,' etc., linking the verse on to the next one. This perhaps indicates the original sense of the Hebrew now corrupt.

7*a*. **From the days of:** see previous note and read *from the wickedness of your fathers. Ye have turned aside,* etc.

7*b*-12. The prophet appeals for repentance, but so self-satisfied are the people that they can see no need for it.

8. **Will a man.** The prophet's answer to the question, 'Wherein shall we return?' countered by another question, 'How have we robbed God?'. **In tithes,** etc.: Neh 10 ^{37b} *v.n.* **and offerings:** Hebrew *Terumah,* as in Dt 12 $^{6, 11, 17}$ *not* 'heave offering.'

10, 11. It would seem that there had been a famine and a plague of locusts. If the people will repent and do their duty the famine and plague will cease (cf.

Jl 1, 2 [12] ff.). **the whole tithe**: see Introduction, § 7. **the devourer**, i.e. locust (cf. Jl 1 [4]).

13-IV. 3. Another objection of the questioners met. The seeming injustice of God's ways led to doubts about the practical wisdom of trying to serve God. The prophet is convinced of an ultimate judgement and a final vindication of the righteous, in spite of the seeming injustice of the present.

13. stout, i.e. defiant.

14, 15. A recurring problem for thought in the Old Testament (see 2 [17]). It was expected that 'righteousness' would *pay* materially and financially, but the expectation was constantly disappointed. Experience showed that material prosperity often accompanied moral obliquity, and that the 'good' and 'innocent' often suffered terribly. Here the prophet meets the questioners with the assertion that there *will* be a final and manifest judgement; and he seems to expect it in the near future.

16. The inner circle of the faithful few take courage from mutual counsel, refusing to be moved from faith by the arguments of the sceptics. The prophet is convinced that their names are written in heaven (cf. Lk 10 [20]).

17. I do make: better *in the day when I act* (*take action*). **peculiar treasure**: cf. Ex 19 [5], etc. (of *all* Israel). Here only of the faithful kernel of the nation. Cf. 1 P 2 [9] —of the Church.

18-IV. 3. The judgement will be a manifest and final discrimination between the evil and the good.

IV. 2. the sun of righteousness . . . his wings. his = *its*, archaic, not personal. Hebrew *her*, of sun (fem.). **righteousness** = here, as often, *vindication of integrity*. The whole passage might be paraphrased thus: 'Your integrity will be clearly vindicated by Jehovah. It will shine out like the rising sun with healing rays over the darkness of your gloom and depression and disappointment.' **sun of righteousness** = (virtually) righteousness (vindication) as the sun. It must be observed that in the original application of the passage there is probably no allusion to a *person* under the figure of the sun, though Christian writers have naturally and aptly applied the figure to our Lord. The capital 'S' of the AV arises out of that application.

3. I do make = *act*: see 3 [17].

4-6. Conclusion.—Moses and Elijah—the Law and the Prophets—each have their part to play in preparing the people for the great day. Moses in the Law sets the moral and ethical standard; the prophet calls for its application to life (cf. the appearances at the transfiguration of our Lord, Mk 9 [4], etc.).

4. the law of Moses . . . Horeb . . . statutes and judgements. Probably the reference is primarily to Deuteronomy, as the phraseology suggests. Horeb is the name D uses for the sacred mountain, which P terms Sinai.

5. Elijah. His mysterious disappearance (2 K 2) led to the expectation of his reappearance. Our Lord found fulfilment of the prophecy in the coming of John the Baptist (Mt 11 [14]; Mk 9 [11]: cf. also Lk 1 [17]; see Introduction, § 6).

6. to: better than RVm 'with.' The verse indicates that dissensions had arisen between the older and younger generations, and had reached very serious proportions. Family life was in danger of disintegration —perhaps one of the inevitable accompaniments of laxity about the marriage bond (see 2 [11. 14. 16]: cf. Lk 1 [17]). **the earth** = *the land* (of Israel).

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND

By W. J. Phythian Adams

Introductory

Shut in between the Mediterranean on the one side and the deserts of Arabia on the other, the narrow isthmus of habitable land which links the valleys of Nile and Euphrates has formed from time immemorial a landbridge for the passage of caravans and the march of armies.

Syria, the northern section of this bridge, with her wide inland plains, enjoys the additional advantage of a well-harboured seaboard. Palestine, its southward continuation, is in both respects less fortunate. The eastern-setting currents along the African coast have banked her shores with sand almost as far north as Carmel, and given them that smooth inhospitable curve which has daunted every mariner except the indomitable Greek. She has therefore had no share in the seafaring adventures of Phœnicia; her history has been continental, and even thus her rôle has been usually a passive one. Her

physical resources are meagre. She is for the most part a mountainous country of grey limestone hills where few trees grow and springs are rare and precious. Her richest cornland lies in the Plains of Esdraelon and Philistia, but unfortunately these have profited her but little in the past, since it is they which formed the sole means of passage over the landbridge of the ancient empires. Thus Palestine was for centuries No Man's Land or Any Man's Land. The very regions which should have brought her wealth were forced to minister to the warring ambitions of her neighbours, and while Tyre became the pioneer of ocean highways, Palestine was herself a path trampled beneath the feet of conquerors.

Climate and Population

The poverty of her water supply has always been a serious factor in the history of the Holy Land. The winter rains are normally very heavy, and in addition to these there are lighter falls in autumn and early spring ('former' and 'latter' rains), but most of the water is instantly absorbed through the porous rock or carried off in cataracts down steep ravines (*wadis*), whose beds are dry through the greater part of the year. The Palestinian, exposed for long months to the scorching glare of the sun, is thus compelled to depend either upon the sparsely scattered springs, or upon his own wells and rock-hewn cisterns (Jer 2[13]). Usually, where both are available, these are to be found together, since in a bad year even the strongest springs are known to fail before the autumn, and few of them at best provide a copious supply. The chief result of this ever-present menace has been to restrict the number of habitable sites in Palestine, and to fix each in the neighbourhood of one of these ancient sources of supply. It is for this reason that so many of the towns have been built and rebuilt for centuries over the same spot, so that the history of a site can often be discovered from an expert examination of its debris. Many are now mere *tells* ('desolate heaps,' cf. Jer 49[2]), and it is these which are even now giving us back the buried secrets of the Holy Land.

General Divisions

Palestine is a country of marked physical divisions, some at least of which seem to have been also distinguished by the racial difference of their inhabitants. 'Amalek dwelleth in the *Negeb*, and the Hittite and Jebusite and Amorite dwell in the *mountains*, and the Canaanite dwelleth *by the sea*, and along *by the side of Jordan*' (Nu 13[29]). This report of the spies serves as an admirable introduction to the geography of the Holy Land, which may be roughly described as a central block of mountains surrounded on three sides by plains, and on the fourth by the deep rift of the Jordan valley. The isolation of these mountains, in which the religion of Israel was nurtured and preserved, is strikingly illustrated by the fact that the country derives its present, as it derived its ancient, name not from the hill country but from the inhabitants of the seacoast. It is only by Jews and Christians that it has been remembered as the 'Land of Israel.'

Its general divisions, which must include some not mentioned above, may be conveniently arranged and studied as follows:

I. The South Country (the Negeb).
II. The Maritime Plain (Philistia, including the Shephêlah, and Sharon).
III. The Plains of Esdraelon and Acre.
IV. The North Country (Galilee, including Gennesaret).
V. The Central Range (Samaria, Mount Ephraim, and Judæa).
VI. The Great Rift (the Jordan Valley and Dead Sea).
VII. Eastern Palestine.

I. The Negeb ('*the South*'—Gen 13[1], 24[62]; Jos 10[40], etc.). — The traveller moving northwards from El Kantara on the Suez Canal will find little to gladden the eyes till he has passed the Egyptian frontier at Rafa (Gk., Raphia). The oasis of palms at El Arish, whose wadi may be identified with the 'brook of Egypt' (Nu 34[5], etc.), is the sole break in the monotony of tufted sandy hillocks and low scrub which form the scenery of the southern wilderness. Even north of Rafa the country seems hardly more cheerful. The panorama from any high point near the track will only disclose wide undulating stretches of bare downs, crested at long intervals with sparse cactus enclosures and an occasional building. This poverty-stricken expanse, which extends from the Mediterranean to the south end of the Dead Sea, is the 'South Country' or Negeb of the Bible. Its sandy soil is capable only of the lightest cultivation, and its pasturage is equally poor, yet it contrives to maintain a semi-nomadic population of Bedouin (the Biblical Amalekites, Nu 13[29]), and thus provides a link between the pastoral and

agricultural types of society. To-day, as of old, its inhabitants scrape the soil with their oddly assorted teams of camel and donkey or quarrel fiercely round one of the precious wells with which the labour of their ancestors had furnished them (cf. Gen 26[17] f.). To-day, as of old, they come in crowds for their marketing to Gaza or Beersheba, but it is more rarely and in smaller numbers that they penetrate into the mountains of Judæa or find their way into the fertile maritime plain. In patriarchal times the Negeb seems to have been held by the more highly civilized power of the Canaanites (Nu 21[1], 33[40]), who are sometimes by an anachronism described as Philistines (Gen 21[32], etc.). Their fortresses were situated on the main caravan routes or commanded some pass into the hills, lateral communication being ensured by their proximity to one of the great *wadis* which run down in long curves from the mountains to the sea. It is thus that we account for the position of **Gerar** (Gen 10[19], 20[1], etc.), now Tell Jemmeh on the Wadi Ghuzzeh (Wadi of Gaza); of **Beersheba**, whose ancient site was at Tell es Seba on the same *wadi* facing directly up the main pass of Hebron; of **Sharuhen** (Jos 19[6]), now Tell esh Sheriah on the *wadi* of the same name. All vestige of building has long since disappeared from these rounded weather-worn mounds, but they still survive as monuments of the well-organized kingdom of **Arad** (the name lingers at Tell Arad, east of Beersheba), which repulsed the first northern movement of Israel (Nu 14[45], 21[1]). The Byzantine mosaic map of Medeba shows this region thickly dotted with settlements, some of which, like Elusa (Khalasa), might even be called cities; but the effort to reclaim the wilderness failed to survive the uprooting of Christianity by Islam, and the Negeb as we see it now is probably much as it was when Abraham first came to sojourn in Gerar (Gen 20[1]).

II. **The Maritime Plain**—(*a*) *The Plain of Philistia* (*including the Shephêlah*).—After crossing the Wadi Ghuzzeh less than two miles from the sea, the traveller finds himself in a small plain narrowing to a gap between the lofty sand-dunes of the coast and a barrier of rolling foothills. In this gap, commanding the great high-road between north and south, stands **Gaza**, surrounded by its palm trees, its watered fields, and its orchards of fig and olive. Beyond it is the beginning of the Philistine Plain. In Greek and Byzantine times the city boasted a port, but its importance as the southern door of Palestine and the market for all the caravans of the desert has ever lain on land and not at sea. Its vital strategic value and the great natural strength of its defences were amply proved in the late war, but they had already been recognized and tested for centuries. Every great conqueror who has passed this way has found himself forced to knock first at the gates of Gaza.

The plain to which it is the key takes its name from the Philistine invaders (Egyptian, *Purusatu*), who after their repulse from Egypt by Ramses III (*c.* 1190 B.C.) set up in it their small confederacy of five city-states, and for a time made themselves masters of the greater part of Palestine. It is to them that we owe the present name of the country. Though they belonged to the 'sea-peoples' of the far north-west, only one of their cities, **Ashkelon** (Ascalon) is actually on the coast, and even here the choice of site did not belong to the new-comers, for Ascalon was famous long before their arrival, and its situation is more probably due to its unusually good supply of well-water than to any maritime ambitions. Like all other cities on this coast it is devoid of even the semblance of a natural harbour. Some miles to the north-west of it **Ashdod** (Esdud: **Azotus**, Ac 8[40]) stands, like Gaza, athwart the main road, and beyond it is Jamnia (Yebnah), famous in later days for its Rabbinical school. On the shore there is no trace of an ancient site till we come to **Joppa** (Jaffa); and the two remaining cities of the Philistines, **Gath** and **Ekron**, though not yet satisfactorily identified, must certainly be sought inland. It is indeed along the eastern side of the plain that most of its ancient cities are to be found, though their old names are many of them still unknown. On this side the plain, which is for the most part a red, featureless expanse of gently undulating corn and pasture land, swells up into loftier contours and forms at the abrupt foot of the Judæan mountains a line of detached and hilly down-country which gained from the Hebrews the separate title of Shephêlah (RV 'lowland,' Jos 10[40], 11[16], etc.; 'Sephela,' 1 Mac 12[38]). It was on the prominent spurs and amongst the rich cornfields and olive groves of this region that the older inhabitants of the plain preferred to make their homes, and here as elsewhere their history can be learned from the *tells* under which their towns lie buried. As we study these a fresh point of interest emerges, and we realize that the Shephêlah

was valuable not merely for its fertility, but still more because it formed a convenient barrier against the inhabitants of the mountain range. A glance at the map will show that wherever there is a pass or outlet from the mountains (and these inevitably follow the course of the great valleys), there also at its mouth, stationed on some brow or eminence of the Shephêlah, is one of those ancient fortress-sites which the Bible ascribes to the domain of the Amorites (Jos 10 [5]). So it is that we find in the Wadi el Hesy what is probably the ruin of **Eglon** (Tell el Nejileh), while at its opening was the famous city of **Lachish** (Tell el Hesy). A little further north the vast mound of Arak el Menshiyeh (**Gath** [?]) hides an unknown fortress which commanded one of the ascents to Hebron. East of it, in the very heart of the Shephêlah, **Moresheth Gath**, or **Mareshah** (Tell Sandahannah, Jos 15 [44], etc.), controls the Valley of **Zephathah** (2 Ch 14 [10]) and the network of roads which meets at Beit Jibrin (Eleutheropolis).

This latter town, which became famous under the Romans, has well been called 'the true capital of the Shephêlah.' From it the old Roman roads lead away, by Lachish to Gaza, by the Wadi el Afranj ('Valley of the Franks' = Crusaders) to **Hebron**, northwards to the **Vale of Elah** and westwards into the Philistine Plain. In later years the Crusaders themselves called it Gibelin and made it their base against Ascalon. They have left behind them the ruins of their Gothic church.

The Vale of Elah (Wadi es Sunt, 1 S 17 [2]) is the next great valley to the north, and it in turn was commanded at its mouth by a mighty fortress, now called Tell es Safi (**Libnah** [?], Jos 10 [29]). We actually hear of one Philistine invasion along this pass (1 S 17 [1]), but the historic victory of David near Shocoh (Shuweikeh) doubtless marks only a single episode in years of desperate resistance. In the Wadi es Sur, not far south of the battlefield, **Adullam** (Aid-el-Ma) and **Keilah** (Kela) recall his later trials and triumphs (1 S 22 [1], 23 [5]).

Northward again lies the **Vale of Sorek** (Wadi es Surar, Jg 16 [4]), the route of the modern railway. Emerging from the mountains as a narrow and precipitous gorge it opens out suddenly into a broad and fertile valley. Its sentinel here was **Beth Shemesh** (Ain Shems, 1 S 6 [9]) with the Danite villages of **Zorah** (Surah) and **Eshtaol** (Eshua) on the slopes opposite it (Jg 13 [25], 18 [2]).

Parallel with the Vale of Sorek and only a few miles to the north is yet another pass, the Wadi 'Ali, with the same deep and narrow exit from the mountains, here called the Bab el Wad (Gate of the Wadi), and the same westward extension through the Shephêlah in the form of an open smiling valley. This is the route traversed by the main road from Jaffa to Jerusalem, which may be called the northern boundary of the Philistine Plain. At Latron a ruined castle still overlooks the junction of this road with that leading from Gaza to Aijalon and its vale, but the city which in old times dominated both valley and surrounding country was **Gezer** (now Tell Jezar), one of the strongest cities of the Canaanites (Jos 10 [33]; Jg 1 [29]).

Finally, at the northernmost point of the Shephêlah lies the celebrated Vale of **Aijalon** (Jos 10 [12]), named after the city which stands on its southern slopes (the present Yalo). It derives its importance from the no less famous pass of the **Beth-horons**, which has always been the easiest and most natural route from the seacoast to Jerusalem. The 'outgoings' of this vale lay actually in the hands of Gezer (2 S 5 [25], where 'Gibeon' should be read for 'Geba').

This brief survey will have been enough to show the vital importance of the Shephêlah, whether in relation to the mountains or to the plain. While the great cities of Gaza, Ascalon and Ashdod, situated *en échelon* along the high-road, guarded the southern gateway of Palestine, the plain itself was defended on its dangerous eastern boundary by such a series of fortresses as must have reduced the inhabitants of the mountains to a veritable state of blockade (cf. Jg 1 [34]).

How strong these 'frontier' cities once were may be gathered from the fact that even in the time of Solomon Gezer had not yet fallen into the hands of Israel, and that it required the strength of the Pharaoh himself to take possession of it as a gift for his royal son-in-law (1 K 9 [16]). How and to what extent they were wrested by the Philistines from the hands of their Amorite masters is a problem for the archæologist to solve, but it is quite certain that no Philistine invasion of the mountains, such as we read of in the Books of Samuel, could have taken place until the lines of communication with Philistia had first been secured by their capture or conciliation.

(*b*) *The Plain of Sharon.*—The Plain of Philistia ends, or rather merges into the Plain of Sharon (1 Ch 27 [29]), on a line which may be roughly drawn through

Lydda (Lydd), the traditional scene of St. George's martyrdom, to the precarious, but to Israel all-important, harbour of **Joppa** (2 Ch 2 [16]). Around this line the modern landscape is thickly studded with the tree clumps and orchards, the vineyards and orange-groves, of flourishing Jewish colonies. This is the old **Ge-Haharashim** ('Valley of the Smiths,' cf. 1 S 13 [19]), which once included with Lydda the Jewish villages of **Ono** and **Hadid** (Neh 11 [34, 35]). Behind the last named (the present Haditheh), a little village, Midieh, echoes the once-stirring name of **Modin** (1 Mac 2 [1]). Only Ramleh ('Sandy'), at one time the Arab capital of Palestine, breaks in here with discordant memories of later and alien conquerors.

There seems no obvious reason why the Philistines did not extend their territory permanently to embrace the wide reaches of the well-watered Plain of Sharon, particularly as at one time they made themselves masters of **Esdraelon** (1 S 29 [11]). Probably they found the way barred by swamps and jungles of thorn-thicket and oak forest. (Remnants of this forest still survive at the northern extremity of the plain). The Shephêlah, too, disappears, and the high-road, bending eastward to avoid the marshes which surround the main springs of the River Auja at Antipatris (Ras el Ain, Ac 23 [31]), is pressed up against the lower spurs of the mountains and exposes its flank to a series of open valleys, leading from the very heart of the hill country behind. It runs thus to Tulkeram, whence the present light railway ascends to Nablus and by **Dothan** to Jenin. This was in old times the high-road to Samaria and **Shechem**.

From this point the hills begin to curve westwards towards the sea, and the traveller who would gain the Plain of Esdraelon is brought up against a choice of rocky and by no means easy passes thereto. Somewhere near this forking of the roads (perhaps at El Jit or Baka) stood that **Aphek** (Jos 12 [18], 'Aphek in Sharon'), which the Philistines made their base for operations in **Esdraelon** (1 S 29 [1]). A much earlier conqueror, the great Pharaoh, Thothmes III (1479 B.C.), was also constrained to halt his army in this neighbourhood—the place is given as Yehem (perhaps the present Yemma)—and to decide which of three possible routes he should take to surprise the waiting Canaanites at **Megiddo**. Centuries afterwards the same problem presented itself to Napoleon, and in our own days it has been solved triumphantly by a British General. A more detailed discussion of these routes may be postponed to the following section: it is enough at this point to realize the immense strategic importance of these hills which, linking the great masses of **Carmel** and **Gilboa**, oppose a barrier of great natural strength across almost the whole breadth of Western Palestine.

Turning now to the north-westward the road skirts the foothills till it reaches their southernmost headland above Mamas (an old 'Maiumas' = 'watering-place' [?]). On the coast, some four miles to the south-west, lay the Herodian city and later Roman capital of **Cæsarea**. The bluff headland is joined here by the Crocodile River (Nahr ez Zerka), which from this point flows tortuously through swamps and sand-dunes to the sea. A gap of only a few dozen yards divides its stream from the precipitous cliffs above, and it is through this gap that the traveller must pass if he wishes to reach Haifa by the coast road. This easily defended gateway gives access to a long, narrow plain, which extends along the whole western flank of **Carmel** and closes to a second gap between the cape and the seashore. Little is known of its history, though its ruins include the ancient maritime city of Dora (Tanturah) and the Crusaders' harbour and fortress of Athlit (Castellum Peregrinorum). It is indeed a backwater of Palestine, rich in soil, but shut off on almost every side from the great centres of life and trade. Even to the Plain of Esdraelon, near as it is, there is no easy means of access, save where the hills fall away near the Jewish colony of Zimmarin (or Zichron Jacob) and a rough track winds over the stony downs to **Jokneam** of Carmel (Tell Keimun).

III. **The Plains of Esdraelon and Acre**—(*a*) *The Plain of Esdraelon.*—It is time now to examine the defences of the great central plain, of which the fortress of **Jokneam** (Jos 12 [22], 19 [11]) was but one, and that the least impressive. Nature has provided the northern section of Palestine with a southern frontier line of which the importance has not yet been fully recognized. This line is based at its western flank on the imposing mass of **Carmel** (Jebel Kurmul, rising to 1,810 feet), and at its eastern on the hardly less lofty **Mountain of Gilboa** (Jebel Fukua, rising to 1,648 feet). Between these eminences runs a continuous chain of hills, which fall seldom below 1,000 feet, and at one point (near Umm Fahm) rise well above 1,500. The western section

of these consists of the stony plateau of the Belad er Ruhah, the eastern of loftier and more rugged peaks, but at no point do they cease to present a formidable obstacle to the passage of an invading army. To cross them speedily and without risk of serious disorder it is necessary to make use of one of the four available passes. Of these the westernmost runs by Subbarin to Tell Keimun (Jokneam), where it joins the track from Zimmarin and the sea. This was the route taken by Napoleon in his advance on Acre. The next also crosses the Belad er Ruhah and descends into Esdraelon under the walls of an unknown fortress now called Tell Abu Shusheh. This was one of the two routes utilized by General Allenby. The third and most famous—followed in the end by Thothmes III, and in modern times by the main force of the British cavalry—is the Wadi Arah (Egyptian, *Aruna*), which divides the Belad er Ruhah from the loftier and partly volcanic hills of Sheikh Iskander. Entering the hills on the south through an open valley it narrows rapidly to a deep and rocky defile, and continues thus till it emerges into the open spaces around El Lejjun (the Roman camp of the *Legion*) to fall finally into the Plain of Esdraelon under the frowning height of **Megiddo** (Tell Mutasellim). Beneath the walls of this once famous stronghold fell Josiah fatally wounded (2 Ch 35 [22]); and conquerors of all ages have deluged its soil with blood: **Har-Magedon**—the hill of Megiddo—is indeed well suited to be the scene of the last great Battle of the World (Rev 16 [16]).

The fourth and easternmost pass from Sharon follows the general course of the Wadi Selhab into the **Plain of Dothan**, and thence branches northwards to the old city of **Taanach** (Tell Tannuk) and north-east to **En-Gannim** (Jenin), 'the Garden House' (2 K 9 [27]). We shall return to this Jenin road a little later.

Thus we find, as we found in the Philistine Plain, that the mouth of each pass was guarded in ancient times by a Canaanite fortress, and this fact gives us the clue to the purpose of that league of kings which, under Jabin of **Hazor**, sought to dispute the advance of Israel to the north (Jos 11 [1-3]). **Taanach, Megiddo, Kedesh** (Tell abu Kudeis, which lies between them) and **Jokneam** all appear in this confederacy (Jos 12 [18-24]). **Dor**, too (if this be the same as Dora-Tanturah), sent its contingent across the hills, and the king of the Goyim ('Nations') of **Gilgal** joined the rally. Some of these names meet us significantly again when Sisera, captain of the host of Hazor and ruler of **Harosheth** of the Goyim, led the 'kings of Canaan' to utter defeat 'in Taanach by the waters of Megiddo' (Jg 4 and 5 [19]), and fell himself by a woman's hand under 'the oaks in **Zaanannim** which is by **Kedesh**' (Jg 4 [11]).

The easternmost of the approaches to this side of Esdraelon, namely that which debouches on it through Jenin, has a peculiar interest for the Biblical student. Behind the palm trees and rich verdure of this beautiful little town, the road winds southwards up a narrow gorge, the Ascent of Gur, now Wadi Belameh, until after a mile it forks to left and right under the lofty *tell* which is the site of Ibleam (Bileam, 1 Ch 6 [70]: modern Belameh). This stronghold, on a site carefully chosen to protect the defenceless town of En Gannim, thus takes its place among, and completes the number of, the frontier sentinels, but its interest lies rather in its being the scene of the fatal wounding of King Ahaziah (2 K 9 [27]). Flying before Jehu from Jezreel, which lies across the plain to the north, the King of Judah turned his chariot-horses towards **En-Gannim** and had actually reached the winding 'Ascent' beyond it when he was overtaken by his enemies. Driven away from the left fork, which was then and remained until quite recent times the regular main road to Jerusalem, he took to horse under the walls of **Ibleam**, his chariot being useless off the highway, and after wandering among the trackless hills reached the shelter of Megiddo, where he died. No better instance could be given of the vivid brevity and pictorial accuracy of the Bible.

We have now surveyed the southern defences of Esdraelon. Its flanks were equally well protected. On the east the city of **Jezreel** (Zerin), between Gilboa and **Little Hermon** (Jebel Duhy, 1,690 feet), guarded the upper end of its Vale, and at the same time commanded the copious **Spring of Harod**, which lies beneath it (Jg 7 [1]). For the defence of the wide Valley of Jezreel (Nahr Jalud) itself a more forward station was provided. Eleven miles to the east, sited on a ridge from which the ground drops away rapidly to the Jordan, was the strong city of **Beth-Shan**, or **Beth-Shean** (the later 'Decapolis' city of Scythopolis, now Beisan). It had existed as a garrison-fortress from the days of the Egyptian Empire and was clearly designed to control the trade routes from Damascus and Gilead to the sea, and to keep in check the bands of marauding Bedouin who

even to this day harry the countryside around (cf. Jg 6 [33]). It is hardly a coincidence that the defeat and death of Saul should have taken place so near its walls (1 S 31 [10]). He fell probably in a gallant effort to turn the Esdraelon barrier from the east, and to repeat the glorious exploit of Deborah and Barak by uniting in one army the divided tribes of Israel.

The western flank of this barrier lies properly at the Cape of **Carmel**, where the old site of Sycamonium (Tell es Semakh) commands the passage, but what may be called an inner line of defence is also provided a few miles north of Jokneam. Here the **Kishon** (Nahr el Mukutta) takes its sluggish way between steep clayey banks into the Plain of Acre. It was probably at its single ford, in the narrow defile which lies below the traditional site of Elijah's sacrifice (El Mahrakah), that the chariots of Sisera met with their final overthrow (Jg 5 [21]).

Within this ring of defences the Plain itself stretches in a vast checker-board of many-coloured fields, hedgeless and heaving gently from end to end, peaceful, opulent and helpless. It is indeed a fit domain for the 'strong ass crouching down between the sheepfolds,' a goodly resting-place in a pleasant land (Gen 49 [14, 15]). A few villages skirt its northern edge, but there is scarcely one to be found at any distance from the hills. The ever-present scourge of malaria is no doubt partly responsible for this, but it is chiefly the absence of a good water-supply which has checked the spread of population into the plain.

(*b*) *The Plain of Acre* plays little part in Biblical history. Both its chief city, the port of Akka (OT **Acco**; Gk., Ptolemais: called by the Crusaders 'St. Jean d'Acre'), and its other ancient harbour **Achzib** (Gk., Ecdippa, mod. Ez Zib) were in the hands of the Phœnicians (='Canaanites,' Jg 1 [31]); and even its inland villages were readily sacrificed to the commercial policy of Solomon (1 K 9 [11-13]). A passing reference to the famous glass industry on the river Belus (Nahr Namein) may possibly be found in the Blessing of Moses (Dt 33 [19]), and a still more doubtful allusion to the 'seashore' (*ḥoph*) of Asher (Jg 5 [17]) may point to an ancient settlement on the site of the present port of Haifa: beyond these the Biblical narrative tells us little or nothing of the fortunes of Israel in these parts.

Yet the plain itself, or at least the northern part of it, is well wooded and fertile: it is protected from the north by the mountains of Upper Galilee and the rugged promontory of the Ladder of Tyre (Ras en Nakura): more important still, it is linked by a number of direct routes with the marts of Damascus and the great cornlands of Transjordania. The story of these roads belongs properly to the story of Galilee and may be told later; it is only their 'outgoings' which at present concern us. From these we can learn the explanation of Phœnicia's hold over the country, for all these routes converge upon Akka itself, and the plain is seen as little more than a bridge by which the merchandise of the East passed to the markets of the Mediterranean. Around its verge or flung out to control its high-roads were a number of Canaanite cities whose *tells*, often of imposing height, have still to be explored, but which even in decay attest the strength of Tyre. These were connected from north to south by a chariot track which ran through **Achsaph** (Kefr Yasif?) past Shefr Amr and the mouth of the Wadi Abellin to El Harbaj, which is probably the true site of Sisera's capital **Harosheth** of the Nations (Jg 4 [2, 16]). This once strongly walled city, now a miserable hamlet, stands in a narrow gap between the foothills of Galilee and the swamps of one of the chief tributaries of the **Kishon**, and thus effectually commands the southern approaches of the plain. Beyond it the road crosses the modern highway from Haifa to **Nazareth**, and after fording the main river follows its defile to **Jokneam** and the other fortresses of **Esdraelon**. The Plain of Acre was thus by nature cosmopolitan, a meeting-place for the 'Goyim' of the world, and this destiny is necessarily reflected in Galilee, through whose arteries it received the inexhaustible abundance of the East.

IV. **Galilee (including Gennesaret).**—*Galilee* is divided into two distinct portions, the Upper and the Lower. Of these the former needs only a brief description. It is a lofty plateau rising in places to nearly 4,000 feet, thinly populated and remote from the main stream of life. Its principal town Safed is a comparatively modern development, largely Jewish. Of its ancient sites **Kadesh Napthali** (Kades) can alone be identified with certainty, and the remainder are indeed little more than a list of names (2 K 15 [29]).

Lower Galilee is not merely at an advantage in contrast with this: it may well be called the chief glory of Palestine. Its oak-forests and magnificent olive groves give it a beauty and a luxuriance

which is not to be found in any other part of the country, and its larger towns, Seffurieh, Shefr 'Amr, Abellin and **Nazareth** reflect a happiness which is elsewhere often sadly to seek in the Holy Land. Much indeed of its natural attractiveness is due to its variety. It is composed not of a single high plateau or rolling plain, but of a series of transverse ridges alternating with wide enclosed valleys or picturesque wooded defiles. This is the true **Galilee of the nations**, Galilee by the **way of the sea** (Is 9 [1]), and it was between her protecting hills that the caravans of Asia passed, as they still pass, on the last stages of their journey to the Mediterranean. The ridges are three in number. The northernmost, on which stands Jotopata (Kefr Jefat—Josephus: *Wars*, iii, 7) with Khurbet Kana (Cana ?) below it, confronts the loftier mountains of Upper Galilee, where they end abruptly over the watershed of the Wadis Shaib and Tuffah. The almost continuous valley thus created provides a direct but difficult route from Gennesaret to the Plain of Acre. To the south of the Jotopata hills lies the broad vale or inland plain of Asochis (Sahel el Buttauf). At its eastern end this communicates through Hattin with **Tiberias**: at its western end it disappears into two defiles, the mouths of which are commanded by a large but unknown fortress now called Tell Bedaiwiyeh. The more northerly of these passes is the Wadi Abellin, which is the main route to the west and is still used by caravans from the Hauran. The other, the Wadi el Melek, leads directly to El Harbaj, which we have tentatively identified with **Harosheth**.

A second ridge of hills, Jebel Toran, divides the plain of Asochis from the Wadi Rummaneh, which runs into it at its south-west corner. Through this valley the great high-road from Gilead passed by way of Sepphoris (Seffurieh) into the Wadi Abellin. At its eastern extremity this road drops into the broad dale Sahel el Ahma, and descends along it till it reaches the Jordan near Semakh. Its course thereafter lies up the valley of the Yarmuk. This route is in all probability the **way of the sea** to which Isaiah alludes, but certainty is in the nature of things impossible, and it may well be that Galilee as a whole was regarded by the prophet as an international highway.

The last and southernmost Galilean ridge is that which embraces the rounded outcrop of **Tabor** (Jebel et Tor, 1,845 feet) and the lofty hills around **Nazareth**, and which drops thence by easy stages to the ridge of **Bethlehem of Zebulun** (Jos 19 [15]) and the spurs overlooking the **Kishon** defile. The peculiarly favoured position of **Nazareth**, sheltered in its green cup amongst the mountains, is too familiar to need further description here.

From the summits above it a magnificent panorama unfolds itself. **Carmel**, the whole wide sweep of **Esdraelon** with the hills of **Samaria** beyond it, **Little Hermon** with **Nain** (Nein), **Shunem** (Solam) and **Endor** (En Dor) at its feet, **Tabor**, the mountains of **Gilead** and the Jaulan, the heights of Upper Galilee seen across a perspective of intervening ridges, and even a suggestion of the mighty mass of Lebanon behind: all these display their varied beauties in turn, and when it is realized how many of the sites and scenes thus witnessed have played their part in sacred history, it will be recognized that few places in Palestine possess a stronger fascination for the traveller.

Such, then, are the chief features of Lower Galilee, and its history will be found to conform to them. It is a region crossed and recrossed by well-worn highways, fertile, easy of access, a prize for any man, a countryside different indeed from the remote and forbidding highlands of Judæa, and odious to the strict Jew for its compromising hospitality to the Gentile (Jn 1 [46]). There remains finally a district which, if not strictly to be classed as Galilee since it belongs properly to the Jordan valley, must naturally be included here, namely the western shores of the **Lake of Chinnereth** or **Gennesaret**. The Sea of Galilee lies more than 600 feet below the level of the Mediterranean, but its history is bound up with the heights that lie above it, and Nazareth necessarily leads us in thought to **Capernaum** (Lk 4 [31]).

The modern road from Nazareth crosses the watershed into the Jordan valley by the strange craggy outcrop of the Horns of Hattin, where the army of the Latin Kingdom was annihilated by Saladin in A.D. 1187. From this point it drops almost precipitously to the flourishing little town of **Tiberias** (Jn 6 [1]), more than 1,700 feet below. The wide panorama of the lake seen from this hill produces a deep impression of loneliness and silence. Of the once great cities which fringed its shores nothing is visible to the naked eye: indeed, the merciful earth has so well hidden their ruins that now men even question where they lay.

Two miles north of Tiberias the forlorn

mound of Kuneitriyeh may conceal the old name and site of **Chinnereth** (Dt 3 [17]); in the little sun-baked plain of Gennesaret which opens beyond it lie the Arab village and Jewish colony of Mejdel (**Magdala**); and the deserted *tell* at Et Tabgha hides yet another of these ancient towns. **Capernaum** is now only known by the remains of a synagogue at Tell Hum; **Chorazin** (Kerazeh ?) is an overgrown ruin; vanished, too, are the glories of **Bethsaida** (Julias, now Et Tell) at the upper end of the lake, on the eastern bank of Jordan (Lk 9 [10]). The lake itself is hardly ever spotted with a sail, and its eastern shores are barren and lifeless. No one who has stood by the Sea of Galilee can forget the incomparable beauty of the scene, yet 'Ichabod' is written clearly over the whole. The world, quickly forgetful, has passed it by and left it in peaceful seclusion, overlooked from afar by the snowy peak of **Hermon**, and treasuring in silence the memory of a sacred past.

V. **The Central Range.**—We have so far accepted the Central Range as a distinct and coherent unit, but with the disruption of the Kingdom after the death of Solomon we become aware of a marked division within it, and this agrees with the natural configuration of the country.

The line of demarcation may roughly be drawn through **Shiloh** westwards down the Wadi Deir Ballut to the maritime plain. South of this line the mountains form on all sides a formidable and almost precipitous mass, penetrable only by deep and sinuous defiles; north of it, while retaining their height or but little declining from it, the ridges draw further apart and admit of easy access to the interior through a number of wide and almost level valleys. These differences will be treated in detail below, but the broad statement is sufficient to explain the divergent destinies of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel, the poverty and aloofness of the one, the wealth and far-reaching ambitions of the other; the long fight of Jerusalem against idolatry and invasion, the rapid corruption and early doom of Samaria.

(*a*) *The Mountains of Samaria.*—The old road from Esdraelon to the south passed up the 'Ascent of Gur' to Ibleam. Thence it climbed the hills past **Bethulia** (Judith 5 [1], 7 [1], Methelieh ?), and descended upon **Shechem** by a mountainous track over the spurs of **Mount Ebal**. The modern road, bearing to the right from **Ibleam**, takes the easier gradient into the **Plain of Dothan**. This was, as we have seen, one of the main passes into **Sharon**, and seems to have been much used by caravans (Gen 37 [25]). Thence it swerves to the south passing close to the ancient site of **Dothan**, a high, isolated mound overlooked on three sides by the adjacent foothills (2 K 6 [15]). From this point it mounts and descends a succession of lofty spurs till it drops into the broad valley (Wadi esh Shair) which runs up from Tulkeram to Nablus. On a branch of this valley, just before the main tributary is reached, the road skirts a large and prominent hill, on which can still be seen the ruins of the once almost impregnable **Samaria** (Sebastieh). For the purposes of ancient warfare no better defensive position could have been chosen, the only danger to the garrison arising from a shortage of either water or food (2 K 6 [25]); but the very size of the site selected and its proximity to the maritime plain are eloquent proofs of a bolder ambition in Omri (1 K 16 [24]). Jeroboam I had been content to rebuild the old fortress of **Shechem** for his capital (1 K 12 [25]), while Baasha maintained his court at the unknown **Tirzah** (1 K 15 [33]). It remained for Omri to take a wider view of his kingdom's destiny and to bring Israel into open competition with the nations around her. The new capital of Samaria meant more than the mere transference of a court: it was a challenge to the outer world which that world was not slow to accept.

From its junction with the main valley the high-road runs between the mountain ranges of **Ebal** (Jebel Eslamiyeh, 3,077 feet) and **Gerizim** (Jebel et Tor, 2,849 feet) (Jos 8 [33]), till it reaches the modern town of Nablus (Neapolis) and, less than a mile beyond it, the ruins of the older **Shechem**. This valley with its countless water-wheels and little irrigated meadows is one of the happiest and most picturesque recesses in Palestine, and Nablus itself is a scene of almost tropical luxuriance. It is not surprising that Shechem should be counted as one of the most ancient seats of habitation in Palestine (Gen 33 [18]).

From Shechem the road enters a little inland plain (possibly the **Michmethath Asher** of Jos 17 [7]) and, leaving behind it the traditional Well of Jacob and the little village of **Sychar** (Jn 4 [5]), bends sharply and finally southward towards Jerusalem. Behind it also, at the northern end of the plain, is the opening of the Wadi Farah, along which passes an important route to the Jordan valley and **Beth-Shan**. It was this old Roman road that witnessed one of the most terrible scenes of the late war, when the

Turkish retreat was converted by British airmen into a panic-stricken rout.

(*b*) *Mount Ephraim and the Mountains of Judæa.*—Southwards from Mount **Gerizim** a succession of broad valleys penetrate from the west into the heart of the hill country, whose watershed is here confined to a narrow spine overlooking the steep descent to the Jordan, but when the small plain of **Lebonah** (Jg 21 [19]), Lubban, is reached the spine is already beginning to thicken towards the west and south, where it forms the famous **hill country of Ephraim** (Jos 17 [15], 19 [50]; Jg 3 [27], etc.). From **Lebonah** the road climbs an almost precipitous hillside, on the summit of which, but shut off by low hills, stand the desolate ruins of **Shiloh** (Seilun, Jos 18 [1], etc.). At Sinjil (the Crusaders' 'Saint Giles') the mountains close in from right and left, and the road follows the deep Wadi Jib to Jifna (**Ophni of Benjamin**, Jos 18 [24]), when it climbs once more to the top of the bleak plateau which surrounds **Jerusalem.** Here the olive groves and holm oaks, the terraced sides and trailing vines of the lower slopes seem to be left for ever behind: a grey moorland stretches away on either hand, sombre in the rain, intolerable in the glare of the sun or the parching heat of the Khamsîn wind from the south (Jer 4 [11]). It is a vision of 'bare heights,' which the mourning prophet had no need to exaggerate, and Benjamin, whose home it was, might well be described as 'a wolf that ravineth' (Gen 49 [27]).

Yet in spite of its poverty the Benjamite territory was of peculiar importance to Judah. In the days of the divided kingdom it acted as a kind of buffer or 'no man's land' between the two sections of the nation. Each strove for possession of the northern edge of the plateau which, as we have seen, formed a natural frontier for the kingdom of Judah. Thus Abijah, son of Rehoboam, is said to have taken the first step by capturing **Bethel** (Beitin) from Jeroboam (2 Ch 13 [19]), a move dictated not by the sanctity of its shrine, but by its strategic position at one of the highest points of the plateau. The tables were turned upon Judah by Baasha, who not only recaptured **Bethel**, but began building an advanced fortress at **Ramah** (Er Ram) only five miles north of Jerusalem (1 K 15 [17]). This move was foiled by Asa, who in his turn built frontier forts at **Mizpah** (Tell en Nasbeh ?) and **Geba** (Jeba, 1 K 15 [22]). The importance of both Ramah and Geba turned upon their relation to the pass of **Michmash** (Mukhmas), which meets us earlier in the days of the Philistine occupation (1 S 13 [5, 11, 16], etc.), and reappears with the prospect of an Assyrian invasion (Is 10 [28, 29]). It was one of the vital approaches to the **hill country of Judæa** (Lk 1 [65]), which lay within the territory of Benjamin. The other, on the opposite side of the plateau, was the famous pass of the **Beth-Horons** (Beit Ur el Foka and El Tahta), which witnessed the victory of Israel under Joshua (Jos 10 [10]), and at a later time the rout of the Syrian army by Judas Maccabæus (1 Mac 7 [39] f.). This route was guarded at its upper extremity by the strong Hivite city of **Gibeon** (El Jîb, Jos 9 [3], etc.). Between these two passes the main north road is commanded by the site of Tell en Nasbeh (**Mizpah** ? Jg 20 [1]; 1 S 7 [5]; 2 K 25 [23]; Jer 40 [6], etc.), where a strongly walled fortress has recently been discovered, and by the lofty watch-tower of **Gibeah of Saul** (Tell el Ful, 1 S 11 [4], etc.).

The ancient **Jebus** was built on the spur of **Ophel** at the south-east corner of the present city of Jerusalem. Like Gezer and Ibleam it derived its water from an adjacent spring to which access was gained by means of a rock-cut tunnel from the interior of the city. Defended on three sides by precipices, and on the fourth, where it joined the main hill, by a deep dry moat, the position might well be boasted impregnable (2 S 5 [6]), and it actually owed its capture to the discovery by David of the hidden entrance to its 'water-course' (2 S 5 [8]).

With **Gibeon** and **Hebron** it was a Canaanite outpost in the mountains, and maintained close touch with the Shephêlah (Jos 10 [1] f.). It was splendidly situated to command the summit of the plateau, for it is the natural focus of a large number of roads and tracks. Besides the main north road through Gibeah of Saul a second on the east of the watershed passes through **Anathoth** (Anata, Jer 1 [1]) to Mount Scopus; on the east the Jericho road crosses by Bethany (Jn 11 [18]) over the Mount of Olives; on the west the Jaffa highway comes up from Kuriyet el Enab (**Kirjath Jearim** ?, Jos 9 [17]; 1 S 7 [1]) and Kulonieh (**Emmaus** ?, Lk 24 [13]), while the **Vale of Sorek** opens out into the **Plain of Rephaim** almost under the city's walls (2 S 5 [18, 22], etc.); lastly, there is the main south route to **Bethlehem, Hebron** and **Beersheba.** It is not surprising that David found himself powerless till he had reduced so strong a fortress.

The Hebron road follows roughly the line of the watershed, throwing off a short branch after five miles to **Bethlehem,** and leaving to the east the wilderness of **Tekoa,**

the birthplace of Amos. It passes on its way the two great sources of the water-supply of the capital: El Burak, generally called 'Solomon's Pools,' which also supplied **Etam** (near Urtas, 2 Ch 11 [6]) and Herod's desert fortress (Herodium) at Jebel Fureidis (Frank Mountain); and the Wadi Arrub, whose strong springs still send their water by ancient winding aqueducts to the Temple Area. At **Beth Zur** (Beit Sur, 2 Ch 11 [6]; Josephus, *Ant.*, XII, ix, 4) it is joined by one of the old main routes from the Vale of Elah. **Hebron** (El Khalil) itself lies in a well-favoured valley at the head of the Wadi Afranj, through which it communicates with Beit Jibrin as in old days with **Mareshah.** Like Shechem its fruitfulness early attracted settlers (Gen 13 [18], Nu 13 [22], etc.). From this point the road pursues its normal course over high saddles into small secluded plains till it climbs at length to a wind-swept moorland plateau on the edge of which stands the village of Edh Dhaheriyeh. Beneath this it falls into the long winding Wadi el Khalil and sinks gradually to the Negeb, the distant folds of which can be seen stretching out innumerably to the horizon. Here, as elsewhere on these Judæan mountains, the traveller is impressed with a profound sense of aloofness from the bustle and fever of life. Even the air itself seems charged with a rarer strength and lifts the heart from the bleakness of crag and wilderness to a sense of awful communion with the sublime Creator of the universe. We realize vividly how well the prophetic spirit of Israel is typified by the herdman of Tekoa, as in the cold silences of dawn and eve he gazes from his lofty watch-tower over the hills of Moab and sweeps his eyes thence to the white sand-dunes of the distant coast. 'Seek him that maketh the Pleiades and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night; that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth; the Lord is his name' (Am 5 [8]).

VI. **The Great Rift.**—The interest of the Jordan valley is mainly geological. At some remote age a disturbance or shrinkage of the earth's crust created an enormous fissure, which stretches from between the Lebanons to the Dead Sea and continues thence along the hollow of the Arabah to the Gulf of Akaba, a distance of 350 miles. For 160 of these miles, that is from Lake Huleh to the south end of the Dead Sea, this rift, the *Ghor*, falls actually below sea-level, descending to a depth of more than 800 feet beneath it in the bed of the Sea of Galilee, and of no less than 2,600 feet at the bottom of the Dead Sea. The result of this extraordinary feature is to interpose between Palestine and the plateau of Transjordania a barrier not indeed impassable, but certainly of sufficient difficulty to act as a natural frontier. And this indeed was the rôle of the Jordan throughout Biblical history. The mountains of Moab are called *Abarim*, those of 'the other side,' and Jordan is generally mentioned as a mere line with a 'this side' and a 'that.' Certainly the river as such is neither useful nor attractive. It runs in a deep bed between muddy banks and through a tangled mass of jungle, coiling and twisting about in its rapid rush, to find a melancholy end in the salt waters of the Dead Sea. Thus, while it is too low and too swift for irrigation works, it lacks also the sparkle and thrill of a highland torrent, and might well excite contempt in those who knew the clearer waters of Damascus (2 K 5 [12]).

Twice in Biblical history its fords were held to prevent the escape of fugitives (Jg 7 [24], 12 [5]), but it has never proved a real obstacle to invaders, be they Israelites, Midianites (Jg 6 [3]) or Moabites (Jg 3 [13]), and there is no recorded instance of any protracted defence of its crossings (cf. David's retirement to **Mahanaim,** 2 S 17 [24]). To-day it is spanned by three main bridges—Jisr Benat Yakub, which carries the Damascus road between Lake Huleh and the Sea of Galilee; Jisr el Mujamia, which gives passage from Bethshean and Esdraelon to Semakh and the gorge of the Yarmuk; and 'Allenby' Bridge (Jisr el Ghoraniyeh) on the Jerusalem-Jericho-Amman high-road.

It is true that the Jordan itself has never proved an obstacle to determined invaders, yet it remains equally true that its valley has always acted as a barrier. We can see this in the fears of separation which the eastern tribes of Israel experienced (Jos 22 [24-25]; cf. Nu 32 [6]), and still more clearly in the way those fears were realized (Am 1 [13]). The explanation is to be sought in the abnormal depth of the Ghor. The Jordan valley is a place of exuberant and tropical fertility, and much of it in ancient times was noted for its corn, dates and flax. But the very conditions which have made for luxuriant growth have at the same time made human life in it impossible except to a scanty population of feeble and spiritless Bedouin. Its intolerable heat inevitably saps the vitality of its inhabitants and readily accounts for the abject surrender

to Israel of its only important town, **Jericho** (Tell Es Sultan: mod. Erika).

The **Dead Sea**—that strange salt inland lake nearly 50 miles long and a dozen broad—is perhaps best known for the extraordinary buoyancy of its waters: it is not so fully realized that, like the Sea of Galilee, it is subject to sudden and terrible storms. Fishing, of course, there is none, since no fish can live in it. Its shores are fringed with bleached and salt-encrusted driftwood, with briny swamps and deposits of reeking sulphur. Bituminous limestone is also not uncommon in the surrounding strata, and gained the sea in old days the name of Asphaltitis. The whole scene has been well described as 'a hell with the sun shining into it,' for the mountain walls which fence the sea on either side only intensify the ghastly desolation of the place. On the west they form the abrupt edge of the gaunt Wilderness of Jeshimon, where the oasis of **Engedi** (**Hazazon Tamar**, 2 Ch 20 [2]) alone produces a refreshing note of verdure. On the east they rise in limestone crags to the uplands of Moab, 2,500 feet above, a savage rampart broken only by the wild and beautiful gorge of Arnon. On this side, too, is the curious peninsula called El Lisan ('the tongue') rising some 60 feet and now extending almost to the further shore. The intervening gap, with the arm of the sea to the south of it, is reported to be gradually silting up, and it has been recently suggested that this process may account for the complete disappearance of the five doomed **cities of the Plain** (Gen 13 [12]), which seem to have been grouped round this south-east corner of the Sea.

VII. **Eastern Palestine** may conveniently be divided into three sections:

(*a*) From the foothills of Hermon to the River Yarmuk.

(*b*) From the Yarmuk to a line which may be drawn roughly east and west along the Wadi Hesban.

(*c*) From this line to the River Arnon.

Of these the first is thickly covered with volcanic deposits, the second is composed of a mountainous district similar to, but more thickly wooded than, the Central Range of the West, while the last is a treeless tableland, the *Mishôr* of Moab or **Medeba**. The three may now be described in greater detail.

(*a*) Immediately overlooking the Sea of Galilee is the rocky district of the Jaulan (Gk., Gaulanitis), the outlines of whose extinct craters can easily be discerned from the opposite shore. To the east of this is the great 'hollow' plain of Hauran (Gk., Auranitis), the southern end of which is now called En Nukra (Gk., Batanea?). Eastwards lies the broad stretch of black lava which the Greeks called Trachonitis and which is known to-day as El Leja. All the above regions were comprised in the tetrarchy of Philip (Lk 3 [1]; Josephus, *Ant.*, XVII, viii, 1, etc.). The remaining portion of it, **Ituræa**, seems to have lain further north on the eastern slopes of Anti-Lebanon. In earlier times the whole of this country was known by the single name of Bashan, though this title should properly be confined to the southern end of the Hauran round its chief cities of **Edrei** (Deraa), the capital of Og (Dt 3 [10]), **Ashtaroth** (Tell Ashtar, Dt 1 [4]; Jos 9 [10], etc.), and **Golan** (Dt 4 [43]; Jos 20 [8], etc.). The rich volcanic soil which has made the Hauran the granary of Syria and the bulls and kine of Bashan proverbial, gives to this northern section a value which is further enhanced by its geographical position. It is, in fact, the region through which all the most important high-roads from Damascus and the north-east must pass on their way to Palestine and Egypt. Hence the continual warfare between the kings of Israel and Syria centred on this favoured land and its approaches, and though its site is still unknown, we shall probably be right in placing among the latter the long-contested fortress of **Ramoth-Gilead** (1 K 22 [3]; 2 K 8 [28]).

(*b*) The **land of Gilead** (Nu 32 [1, 29]) or **Mount Gilead** (Gen 31 [21]) is divided into two parts (Jos 12 [5]) by the River **Jabbok** (Gen 32 [22]), which, rising west of Amman (**Rabbah of Ammon**, Dt 3 [11]; Gk., Philadelphia), flows at first towards the desert, but swings back from it northwards in a long curve to the Jordan. The northern section of this country, now Jebel Ajlun, was given to the half tribe of Manasseh, the southern, called to-day the Belka, to Reuben and Gad. Scattered throughout it in later days along the main roads of commerce, as far south as Philadelphia and as far east as Kanatha (Kanawat) and **Bozrah** (Bosra, Is 63 [1]) at the foot of the Druze Mountain (Jebel Hauran), were the majority of the Greek cities which composed the **Decapolis** (Mt 4 [25]; Mk 5 [20], 7 [31]). But Gilead with its breezy uplands, its forests (2 S 18 [8]), its rich moorland pasturage (Nu 32 [1]) and its famous balm (Jer 8 [22]) belongs inseparably to the history of Israel. It was here, though the site of **Mahanaim** is unknown, that the house of Saul found refuge in defeat (2 S 2 [8]), and David a brief home in exile

(2 S 17 [24]): it was hence that Jair and Jephthah came to judge and defend the nation (Jg 10 [3], 11 [1]), and that Elijah of Tishbeh descended on a sterner mission (1 K 17 [1]). In later days, when under Herod Antipas it formed the somewhat vague province of **Peræa**, it retained to the full its enthusiasm for the national cause (Josephus, *Ant.*, XX, i, 1).

(*c*) South of **Heshbon** (Hesban), the old capital of Sihon (Nu 21 [27]), begins the flat tableland (*Mishôr*) of **Medeba** (Jos 13 [9]) which stretches to the old southern boundary of Israel, the deep ravines of the Arnon (Nu 21 [14]). Between Hesban and Medeba the name of **Nebo** (Neba) still lingers on the heights from which Israel gained its first view of the promised land (Nu 33 [47]). To-day an empty and featureless expanse of rolling hills intersected by deep ravines, this great plateau bears upon its surface the signs of a more illustrious past. Its numerous megalithic monuments attest the presence of a considerable population even in prehistoric times, though of the 'Emim' (Dt 2 [10]) who raised them nothing is known. Its ample pasturage made it a desirable possession for the peoples who lived upon its borders, and will explain the energy with which its soil was contested in ancient times. Wrested by Sihon from the Moabites (Nu 21 [26]), it was in turn conquered by Moses and given, at their request, to the pastoral tribes of Gad and Reuben (Nu 32 [34] ff.; Jos 13 [15] ff.). It is significant that of the first towns to be built by the newcomers the names of **Dibon** (Dhiban) and **Aroer** (El Ar'air) head the record (Nu 32 [34]). Both of these stand as guards over the natural frontier of the **Arnon** valley, and both before the end of the 9th century B.C. passed once more into the hands of Moab. It was, indeed, at Dibon that King Mesha (2 K 3 [4]), who successfully revolted from Ahab, set up his stela of victory, the famous 'Moabite Stone.'

In the period of peace and prosperity which followed its reconquest by Moab, the Mishôr became a land of many cities (cf. Jer 48 [24]), and the Hasmoneans who won it back again for Israel in the 2nd century B.C. thought it to be a sufficiently important prize to be protected from the encroachments of the Nabatæans from beyond Arnon. The great fortress of **Machaerus** (Mukaur), which was built by Alexander Jannæus for this purpose, has its own tragic memory as the prison in which the Baptist was put to death.

With the vast and precipitous gorge of the **River Arnon** (Wadi Mojib) we have reached the historical confines of the Holy Land. Beyond lie the territories of Moab proper with its fortress-capital of **Kir** (Kerak) and the mountainous desolation of Edom. It remains, in conclusion, to consider the eastern boundary of this section of Palestine. At all points the hills of 'Transjordania' fade gradually away into the desert, along the edge of which runs the famous caravan and pilgrim route to Mecca and the south. Eastern Palestine has therefore always been exposed to the incursions of Bedouin, whether as invaders, as semi-nomadic settlers, or merely as the masters of innumerable flocks and herds of camels who seek its profusion of pasturage when their own has failed them. In early days these were well known to Israel as the Ammonites and the Midianites or Sons of Ishmael, but while the latter were still nomadic marauders who could be called in for assistance by the agricultural inhabitants of the land (cf. Balak's summons to the Midianites, Nu 22 [4, 7]), the Ammonites were already lightly settled in the neighbourhood of the city which still bears their name. Before the beginning of the present era, however, Moabites, Ammonites, and Midianites had all succumbed to a stronger power, that of the Nabatæan Arabs whose capital was at the ancient Edomite city of Petra, but who spread northwards till they covered the whole region of eastern Palestine. It is this exposure to the wild tribes of the desert which has prevented Transjordania from enjoying the prosperity to which her natural advantages richly entitle her. For centuries the Roman power strove by every means to set up a barrier against this persistent pest, but to-day the country is once more almost deserted, and the melancholy ruins of ancient grandeur are used as encampments by the enemies against whom no threats or promises, no forts or armies, can avail.

Literature

G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. Palestine Exploration Fund: *Survey of Western Palestine*; *Survey of Eastern Palestine*; *Quarterly Statements* (from 1869). *Bulletins of the British School of Archæology in Jerusalem*. *Journal of American School of Oriental Research* (Jerusalem). *Journal of Palestine Oriental Society* (Jerusalem). Special articles in *H.D.B.*, *H.S.D.B.*, *E.B.* G. A. Smith, *Atlas to the Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. Luke and Keith-Roach, *Handbook of Palestine*. Baedeker: *Palestine and Syria* (revised).

TEXT AND VERSIONS (OLD TESTAMENT)

By L. Elliott Binns

The Old Testament of our English Bible is translated from what is known as the Massoretic Text of the Hebrew. This text was the fruit of the long labours of the scribes and Massoretes (see below), and represents a single type of text which has successfully crushed all Hebrew rivals. As a result the textual criticism of the Old Testament is a much simpler matter than that of the New, for which many varieties of text and reading have come down to us. The traditional text of the Old Testament goes back, if we include the vowels and accents, to the 10th century, and if we take merely the consonants, almost to the 2nd century A.D., when the Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures was finally fixed. De Lagarde would trace all MSS. back to a single archetype which he attributed to Rabbi Aqiba, who died in A.D. 135. Whether this hypothesis is a true one or not will probably never be known; it certainly represents the fact that from about his day variations of the consonantal text ceased almost entirely. Before this date, however, unless the evidence of the versions is entirely at fault, there were in the text of the Hebrew Bible at least as many variations as in the Greek New Testament.

Thus, though it is remarkable how well the import of the inspired message of the writers has come down to us through the ages, we can in some passages have no certainty as to the text. The differences between the Hebrew text and that which is presupposed by the various versions are many and, in some cases, important. The text as we have it is in not a few places so corrupt that all clue to the original has been lost; we can only conjecture what was the writer's exact meaning. On the other hand, it seems fairly clear that the type of text which is preserved in the Hebrew is nearer to that of the original than that in any of the versions, not excluding the most important of them, the LXX. This judgement does not mean that in every case the reading of the Hebrew is the original; in very many instances a better reading is to be found in LXX or even in the other versions; but these instances, though many, are not sufficiently numerous when the vastness of the Old Testament is considered to invalidate it.

The Hebrew Bible as we now have it is printed in the 'square' type of consonant. This type is not the original Hebrew script. The original script is similar to that found in the Moabite Stone and in several smaller inscriptions (see Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, i ff.), and it was retained by the Samaritans for their version of the Pentateuch. When the change from the old characters to the 'square' or 'Aramæan' was made is not certainly known; according to Jewish tradition it was the work of Ezra, but Jewish tradition is no very reliable guide in such matters. At any rate by the time of our Lord it had fully taken place (perhaps hastened by the destruction of manuscripts in the Maccabæan persecutions), since His reference to *yodh* as a small letter (Mt 5 [18]) would have had no meaning in the older script in which *yodh* was of ordinary size. The 'square' type itself has divided into two not very different groups, the Ashkenazic or German and the Sephardic or Spanish; it is the former, more cursive, form of the script that is usually followed in our printed Bibles.

In recent years the suggestion has been made that originally the Old Testament was written in cuneiform, the script of the Babylonians, which was used almost entirely throughout Western Asia for official documents. The evidence for this theory is considerable, but not convincing, and though admitted by some scholars cannot yet be regarded as more than a plausible hypothesis.

A distinction was made above between the consonantal text and the vowels of the Hebrew Old Testament. This distinction is necessary, since for many centuries the vowel-points were never written or printed. Into the different systems of vocalization we cannot here enter; they can be studied in any large Grammar.

The text as it stands to-day is almost identical with that of the 2nd century A.D., and its preservation is due to the labours of a long line of scribes and scholars who made it their aim to see that no alterations were made. They were the disciples of Hillel, and their doctrine of an unchanging text was the inevitable consequence of his system of exposition. In order to carry out their object they composed and collected a large number of notes on the sacred text which in later times became the *Massorah*. The word *Massorah*, or *Masorah*, means literally 'that which has been handed

down,' that is tradition, and strictly speaking it would apply to any kind of tradition; but in practice it was limited to literary and textual matters, whilst the rest of the content of tradition was called the *Qabbalah*, that is 'that which has been received.' The *Massorah* therefore is, to adopt Geden's definition, 'the collection of notes and discussions, critical and explanatory, on the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, which the learning and diligent care of Jewish scholars accumulated during the centuries immediately before, and the early centuries after, the beginning of our era.' Jewish tradition claims that the system goes back to Moses whom it claims as the first Massorete. The Massoretes were exceedingly thorough in their methods; first of all they noted the exact number of consonants in each book and any peculiarity connected with them (some characters are written large and some inverted); then they treated the vowels and accents in the same way and added punctuation marks; the number of words was also noted, and the various readings which they considered to be worthy of preservation. On the subject of the various readings more must be said. In a number of passages the reader is instructed to ignore what is written in the text (the *Kethîbh*), and to follow the *Qerî* (correction). To help him in this the vowel-points of the *Qerî* were put under the *Kethîbh*, and thus a hybrid form was produced, as in the imaginary name of the deity, *Jehovah*, which is merely a compound of *JHVH* (probably Jahveh)* and the vowels of the Hebrew word for *Lord*. Thus, in reading, *Lord* was always uttered, and Jahveh silently ignored as being too sacred for the ear of man.

The aims and methods of the textual critic are the same in every branch, whether his subject be a classical author, the Greek New Testament, or the Hebrew Bible—to recover the text as nearly as possible in the form in which its author left it, and in addition to account as far as may be for the various alterations which have been made and to trace their history. It is seldom that this aim can be realized, and in the case of the Old Testament it certainly has not been done.

The material at the disposal of the critic, called the apparatus, naturally differs both in nature and extent. It is usual in the case of an ancient document of any widespread popularity to find three classes of material: (*a*) actual MSS.; (*b*) translations into other languages: these are known as versions; (*c*) quotations in other writers. In the case of the Hebrew Bible the last class is practically non-existent, since Hebrew was a dead language before our Lord's time, and quotations from the Old Testament were made in Greek or some other language: such quotations are therefore of value for the textual criticism of the *version* in which the quotation was made, but not directly for the Hebrew text itself. Something must now be said of the remaining classes of material.

(*a*) **Manuscripts.** — Unfortunately no early MSS. are in existence, as will be seen by the date of those given below. This is largely due to the Jewish habit of destroying a synagogue roll when once it was worn out and could no longer be used; to have allowed it to remain would have exposed it to possible profanation. Thus out of many thousands of existing MSS. none is older than the 10th century, and the oldest complete Old Testament dates from A.D. 1010. There is in addition the tiny Nash Papyrus, which contains only the Decalogue and part of the Shema; this goes back to the 2nd century and is probably part of a service-book. A celebrated codex of the Prophets, known as the Cairo Codex, is dated 827 years after the destruction of the Temple (A.D. 875), but there are reasons for supposing that it is but a later copy of an original of that date, the scribe having made an exact copy *including the date*. All these MSS. witness to one type of text, that which was guarded by the Massoretes.

(*b*) **Versions.**—Since all the MSS. thus go back to one original, they are, for purposes of textual criticism, valueless. We have therefore to look to the versions—having seen already that quotations are lacking—for practically the whole of our material. The versions are numerous and in some cases important.

(1) *Samaritan.*—We begin with this, which strictly speaking is not a version at all, but a Hebrew text written in the ancient character. It dates back as a tradition (the oldest MS., however, does not go back beyond the 12th century) to the schism between Jews and Samaritans which took place in 330 B.C., or according

* The name Jahveh has been excluded from this commentary *inter alia* on philological grounds. The earliest form of the name which has been found is YV (YW), discovered on ostraka at Samaria. As late as the 5th century B.C. the Jews at Elephantine wrote YHV (which was probably pronounced, like the early Samaritan form, YĀV or YĀW). Owing to the difficulty of pronouncing this form a final H was added in post-exilic times. See Cowley in *J.R.A.S.* [1920], 175 f.—A. G.

to some scholars in 433 B.C. It consists of the Law, that is the five books of Moses, only; presumably at that date no other books were considered to be canonical. In the Law it reveals no less than 6,000 variant readings from the MT. Some of these may be due to corruptions in the Samaritan, some to alterations; but in a number of passages the Samaritan is distinctly superior, and in Dt 27^4 the reading *Ebal* may point to a Jewish alteration having been made for dogmatic reasons.

(2) *Greek.*—This is generally known as the *Septuagint* (LXX) on account of the tradition that the translation of the Law was made by seventy (or seventy-two) separate writers in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.). The other books were translated at a later date, in some cases perhaps before they had actually been recognized as canonical. This version is exceedingly valuable, since its text is older by many centuries than that of the Massoretes, representing as it does the one current in Egypt in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. The LXX is itself, of course, the subject of textual criticism, and a number of MSS. and dependent versions are in existence upon which scholars have done much work.

In addition to the LXX three other Greek versions deserve mention. That of *Aquila* (*c.* 100 A.D.) was the work of a Jew, and follows the original with slavish literalness, even rendering the sign of the accusative—which in Hebrew is placed before certain nouns—by *sun* because the Hebrew for *with* was similar in spelling to this sign. His version must have been a strange phenomenon to any Greek reader unacquainted with his method, but for the textual critic its literalness makes it a very valuable witness: unfortunately fragments alone have survived. Another version was produced by *Theodotion* about the same time; this, like the contemporary attempt of *Symmachus*, was an endeavour to bring LXX into closer similarity with the Hebrew text now being fixed by the scribes. No doubt owing to such attempts the text of LXX had got into some confusion by the middle of the 2nd century A.D., and various efforts were made to correct it. The most famous was that of *Origen* in his *Hexapla*, which was so called because it consisted of six parallel columns in which were set out the original Hebrew and the various attempts to render it into Greek. Other similar attempts were made by *Lucian* of Antioch, the martyr (*d.* A.D. 311), and by *Hesychius*, who was also quite possibly martyred in the same persecution. The text of LXX had thus three different editions in circulation, and scribes not unnaturally in copying one introduced readings from the others, so that the task of recovering the original text has been made much harder.

(3) *The Targums.*—These were Aramaic translations, often so free as to be almost paraphrases, of the Old Testament. The decay of the knowledge of Hebrew among the common people made them necessary, but they were looked upon with disfavour by the earlier Rabbis. The most important Targum is that of *Onkelos* on the Law. From its use in the Babylonian synagogues it is sometimes known as the *Babylonian Targum*, though strangely enough the dialect in which it is written is Western Aramaic, a sign that it was composed in Palestine. The famous *Targum of Jonathan* on the Prophets is also of Palestinian origin, but of authority in Babylon only. The Targums current in Palestine were two in number and were renderings of the Law alone. One was sometimes called the *Targum of the Pseudo-Jonathan*, a late attribution to the author of the Babylonian Targum on the Prophets having earned it this title, but the more usual designation was the first *Jerusalem Targum*, and its fellow, a fragmentary and unimportant work, was called the second of that name. These two, in their present form, probably belong to somewhere about A.D. 700, the Babylonian Targum being considerably older. The Targums on the Writings are of little consequence. As a whole the Targums demonstrate that many varieties of reading were current even after the attempt to fix the text had been initiated.

(4) *Syriac.*—The older version, or *Peshitta* (=*simple*), was made in Christian times (probably in the 2nd century), and included the New Testament as well as the Old. The former is well done, but except the Law the latter is evidently the work of unskilful scribes (another exception is Job). The text is on the whole similar, though by no means identical, with that of the Massoretes; in the later books, however, a certain amount of dependence on LXX must be allowed for. The other Syriac version is known as the *Syro-Hexaplar*, and it can be dated exactly, since it was known to have been the work of Paul of Tella done in A.D. 616-617. It is based on the Greek of Origen's *Hexapla*, hence its name. No complete edition of this version is known, and its value comes from its being a witness to LXX rather than to the Hebrew text.

(5) *Latin.*—Two main types of version exist, as in the case of the Syriac. One, the *Old Latin* or *Itala*, is based on an early form of LXX; the other is the *Vulgate* of St. Jerome, a rendering made direct from the Hebrew in the years 392-405. This great work was done by one who had a competent knowledge of Hebrew, but much of its value for critics has been lost through the corruptions which have been allowed to affect the text. It supports the MT, as would naturally have been expected from its date.

(6) The remaining versions are hardly of sufficient importance to deserve anything more than a bare mention. The various types of *Coptic* come from the 3rd century or later, and are mere translations from the Greek, for the text of which they are valuable. The *Ethiopic*, which may be dated *c.* A.D. 500, is also based on LXX, though in some places it appears to agree with MT against it. The famous translation of Ulfilas into *Gothic* is of the 4th century, and is also derived from LXX; it exists in fragments only. The *Armenian* is a little later in date but of a like origin. The *Arabic* versions are later still, and the influence of the Greek, Syriac, and Coptic versions can be traced in them, as well as that of the original Hebrew and even of the Samaritan Pentateuch: a truly curious version, but late and of little value to the critic.

Thus the textual criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament is a task of much difficulty on account of the early suppression of variant readings which, as the versions show, were exceedingly numerous. The corrupt state of the text in many passages shows that the original has been lost, and in order to recover it the critic has to fall back, first on the help of the versions, and then on conjecture. That the conjectures of scholars are in many cases correct need hardly be doubted, but conjecture without the support of outside evidence is a dangerous procedure, and the subjective element can hardly fail to come in. Before treating his conjecture as in any way worthy of serious notice the critic must see not only that it makes good sense, but in addition that the present text could have arisen from it. The various critical editions of the Hebrew Bible, such as that edited by Kittel, contain many suggested emendations of the text; these emendations are mostly the result of comparing the different versions with the text and with each other: many of them, however, are the product of conjecture.

When printing was invented the Jews quickly took advantage of it in order to circulate their scriptures. The first volume to be issued was a copy of the Psalms accompanied by the commentary of the famous Rabbi David Kimchi. This was issued in 1477, and within five years it was followed by an edition of the Pentateuch also accompanied by a commentary, this time that of Rashi. The whole Bible first appeared in 1488, and was issued at Soncino, whence an edition of the Prophets had already come in 1485-1486. The first small edition was the famous Bomberg Bible printed at Venice in 1517; this was not a folio, but a quarto of 530 leaves, and to save space did not include any commentary.

We have seen that between the Samaritan edition of the Pentateuch and the MT no less than 6,000 differences of reading have been noted. Between MT and the various versions for the whole of the Old Testament the number would go into six figures; one need only glance at a critical edition of the Hebrew Bible to see that on every page there are dozens of variant readings. The question of the origin of all these differences naturally arises. They came from two classes of alteration: *involuntary* and *deliberate*. The *involuntary* mistakes were due to the fact that even with great care and conscientiousness those who copied MSS. did not always do so accurately, did not in fact always understand what they copied. The Hebrew Old Testament was especially liable to be mistakenly copied, since it contained no vowels, but consonants only, and moreover was full of abbreviations. The mistakes which scribes make in copying MSS. are so common and so similar that technical terms have been invented to facilitate reference to them. If, for example, the scribe copies a letter, a word, or even a group of words twice over, he has been guilty of *dittography*. If he has allowed his eye to stray from one similar group of letters or words to another, and so omitted a portion of the original, he has committed *homoioteleuton*. The copying of MSS. by hand is a task which is beset with many opportunities of error: the original may be obliterated and difficult to read; similar letters may be substituted for one another; the memory of a parallel passage may come into the mind and be inserted; familiar phrases may be completed (e.g. 'the Lord of Hosts' written where the original had only 'the Lord'); and, if the scribe is copying from dictation, mistakes as to sounds may easily occur. But a

second class of alteration has to be reckoned with, that which is made *deliberately*. Sometimes corrections were placed in the margin (often to be incorporated in the text by the next copyist); sometimes a supposed mistake would be actually corrected in the text. Sellin, a conservative critic, states that 'the MSS. themselves force us to the conclusion that the original text has in many cases been deliberately altered, partly from religious motives, partly from political and patriotic motives, and partly for æsthetic reasons' (*Introduction to O.T.*, 17). That the text which they preserved and guarded was an inaccurate one was admitted by the Massoretes, since they had a system of marginal corrections called the *Qerî* which has been described above. They have preserved in addition a list of passages which have been altered in order to avoid representations of Jehovah which seem to have been unworthy, e.g. in Gen 18 [22] the original text was supposed* to have said *Jehovah was yet standing before Abraham*; this was considered unworthy of the dignity of Jehovah, and so the two names were reversed. Sometimes the text has been altered in order to give a happy ending. The Jews were very superstitious about this, and so, for example, when the Book of Isaiah was read it was ordered that after 66 [24] the previous verse should always be read a second time. This probably accounts for the strange phenomenon that Ezr 1 [1-3a] = 2 Ch 36 [22]. Originally the two were parts of one work and ran straight on; then 1 and 2 Chronicles were cut off at 2 Ch 36 [21], probably because it was not thought that 1 and 2 Chronicles were worthy of a place in the Canon, as parallel narratives (which incidentally did not quite agree with them) were already included; finally, the books were placed in the Canon, but so late that they are actually the last books in the Hebrew Bible. Thus the Bible ended with the dreadful thought of Judah lying desolate; the scribes were equal to the occasion, and they placed the original sequel (Ezr 1 [1-3a]) after them, but without removing it from its proper position. In these various ways the original text was lost and can now never be recovered with absolute certainty; the labours of expert scholars may get us nearer to it in this passage or that which is now hopelessly corrupt, but even their knowledge and skill cannot restore the Hebrew text as a whole to its primitive purity.

* The supposition, for reasons which need not be given here, is highly improbable.—A. G.

In conclusion a little may be said of the history of the attempts which have been made in the field of textual criticism. In one sense the Massoretes and the scribes who went before them were the first critics, for not only did they try to prevent any further corruptions entering into the text, but they preserved records of various readings, and made marginal corrections of errors which they recognized in the text itself. In the earliest days two schools existed who made it their business to study the text: one in Babylon, a great centre of Jewish learning for many centuries, the other in Palestine with its headquarters at Tiberias. These two schools had different traditions as to the real text, and in the 10th century each produced a great master, and gave to the world an edition of the text as it was held by them. Ben Naphtali was the Babylonian representative, and Ben Asher the Palestinian. Their differences almost always concern minutiæ, and have little or no importance for exegesis. Unfortunately the actual codices which they produced have been lost, but lists of the differences of reading between them have been preserved. From them we recognize that the system of Ben Asher and the Western school has become predominant. The revival of Massoretic studies in more recent times was the result of the vast learning and energy of Johannes Buxtorf of Basle, who published a great Rabbinic Bible in 1618-1619. Of modern scholars the pioneer was Benjamin Kennicott (1718-1783), Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. He brought out an edition of the text in which 'an immense amount of material was accumulated; the lack of a sufficient number of really skilled collators, however, allowed the entrance of many errors. In the year after Kennicott's death the great Italian scholar, De Rossi, produced an immense work on the critical materials for reconstructing the text, but did not actually print a new text. His work on the whole was more thorough and comprehensive than the Oxford volumes.

Finally a word must be said of the great labours in our own day of C. D. Ginsburg, who has not only produced an edition of the *Massorah* but in addition a Hebrew text with critical apparatus based upon it.

Literature

Weir, *A Short History of the Hebrew Text of O.T.*; Geden, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*; Buhl, *Canon and Text of O.T.*; Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient*

Manuscripts; Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*[2]; Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*; *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. Kautzsch, revised by A. E. Cowley, 1910; Swete, *Introduction to O.T. in Greek* (2nd ed., by R. R. Ottley); articles in *Enc. Brit.*, *Enc. Bib.*, and *H.D.B.*

SACRIFICE AND PRIESTHOOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By F. S. Marsh

(A) SACRIFICE

(i) **The Meaning of the Term.**—Sacrifice means 'primarily the slaughter of an animal (often including the subsequent consumption of it by fire) as an offering to God or a deity. Hence, in a wider sense, the surrender to God or a deity, for the purpose of propitiation or homage, of some object of possession' (*Oxford Eng. Dict.*); and secondarily 'that which is offered in sacrifice, a victim immolated on the altar; anything offered to God . . . as an act of propitiation or homage' (*ibid.*).

(ii) **The *Provenance* of Hebrew Sacrifice.**—The origin of the practice of sacrifice is the subject of many and conflicting theories (see 'Sacrifice' in *H.D.B.*, *E.R.E.*), but that origin is, in any case, antecedent to the rise of the Hebrew nation, and need not be discussed here.

The earliest writers of the Old Testament simply accept sacrifice as a normal religious custom which needs no explanation. The only early allusions to its inception in Israel are made by Amos and Jeremiah, and they only say, or imply, that sacrifice was not practised by the Israelites before the conquest of Canaan (Am 5 [25]; Jer 7 [22]). Even the much later Priestly narrative of the Pentateuch, which suggests that sacrifice received divine sanction in the time of Moses and makes no mention of the use of sacrifice at any earlier time, never states explicitly that sacrifice began with Moses.

(iii) **Sacrifice as the Prophets found it.**—Our information concerning the sacrificial practices which the great prophets of the 8th century found in existence is derived from the following sources: The prophets' own words; the accounts of sacrifices contained in the older portions of the Books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and in the stories of the patriarchs as told in J and E; the laws concerning feasts and offerings preserved in J (Ex 34 [17-28]) and in the so-called Book of the Covenant (Ex 20 [18]–23 [19], E); and the implicit allusions to former customs which are made in the prohibitions of Deuteronomy.

In estimating the value of any inferences drawn from this information two things must be remembered: (*a*) Some of the narratives and laws just mentioned were put into their present form by writers who were already acquainted with the teaching of the great prophets, and their acceptance of, or opposition to, that teaching may occasionally have coloured what they say about sacrifice (cf. Gen 22 [1-14]; 1 S 15 [22]; R. H. Kennett, *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, 53 f.). (*b*) There is no reason to suppose that the writers of any of the earlier documents allude to every form of sacrifice which they knew. Some rites and ceremonies which are mentioned for the first time in the later law may well have been practised before the age of the prophets.

The sacrifices of which we read in the sources defined above will be more easily surveyed if we make successive classifications of the whole material according to different principles. Thus:

(1) Dividing according to the use which is made of the sacrificial gifts we have (*a*) *Those which are wholly devoted to God.* These would include all human sacrifices (cf. Jg 11 [31, 39]; Mic 6 [7]; Dt 18 [10]; 1 K 16 [34]; 2 K 16 [3]; Jer 7 [31]; Ezek 20 [25, 26]: cf. 2 K 3 [27]); the species of animal offering called *'Olah* (='what ascends' *sc.* in smoke or 'what is burned,' EV 'burnt offering'); offerings of firstlings, firstfruits, and tithes (cf. Ex 13 [11-13], 22 [29, 30], 23 [16]; Am 4 [4]). (*b*) *Those of which a portion is devoted to God and the rest eaten by the offerers.* Chief of these are the species of animal offering called *Zebah* (='what is slain,' EV 'sacrifice') and *Shelem* (='payment' or *eirenikon*, EV 'peace offering'), of which the blood and fat were surrendered to God and the flesh boiled and eaten by the worshippers (cf. Gen 31 [54]; Ex 18 [12]; 1 S 1 [4], 2 [12-17], 9 [12, 13]). The slaughter of animals merely for food was probably a rare occurrence amongst the early Israelites, but any animal so

slaughtered would come under this heading (1 S 14 32-36).

(2) Dividing according to the time at which the sacrifices are offered we have (*a*) *Those which are repeated at regular intervals.* These include the offerings made on the three yearly occasions when every male was required to 'see the face of Jehovah' (Ex 23 16, 17, 34 22, 23); the spring sacrifice called *Pesaḥ* (EV 'Passover') (Ex 12 21-24; cf. 2 K 23 22); the morning and evening offerings in the Temple at Jerusalem (2 K 16 15 f.; cf. 1 K 18 36); and the annual or periodical *zebaḥim* mentioned in 1 S 1 21, 2 19, 20 6. (*b*) *Those which are offered on special occasions.* Such occasions might be times of calamity (e.g. 2 S 24 13, 18; cf. 1 S 26 19), of peril (Jg 6 26; 1 S 13 8, 9; cf. Jg 11 30, 39; 2 K 3 27), of awe in the presence of the supernatural (Gen 28 18; Jg 6 19, 13 19 ff.; 1 S 6 14), of victory (1 S 11 15; cf. Jg 16 23); the departure on a journey (Gen 31 54), the visit of a 'holy' man (1 S 16 5), the making of a compact (Gen 15 8-18, 31 54; Ex 24 3-8), the accession of a king (1 K 1 19), the dedication of a sanctuary (1 K 8 63).

(3) Dividing according to the offerers of the sacrifices we have (*a*) *Those which are offered by, or for, the whole people* (e.g. Ex 5 1-3, 24 5; 1 S 7 5, 9; 2 S 6 1, 13, 17, 24 25). (*b*) *Those offered by a single family or clan* (e.g. Ex 12 21; 1 S 20 6). (*c*) *Those offered by individuals.*

(4) Dividing according to the nature of the thing offered we have (*a*) *Animal sacrifices*: oxen, cows, calves, sheep, lambs, goats, kids are all mentioned as victims; (*b*) *vegetable offerings.* These include the firstfruits of the harvest, the tithe, oil (e.g. Gen 28 18, 35 14; Mic 6 7; cf. Jg 9 9), wine (e.g. Hos 9 4; Gen 35 14; 2 K 16 15; cf. Jg 9 13), flax (Hos 2 5), and bread (1 S 21 4); (*c*) *human sacrifices* (see above).

The evidence now before us suggests that the early Israelites offered much the same kinds of sacrifice as other nations at the same level of culture. Apparently they offered them for much the same reasons. Certain things, e.g. the blood and the firstborn of animals and of men (and even, at some stages of belief, a bride's virginity: cf. Hos 4 13, 14), must be 'given to God' because they are in themselves too mysterious and dangerous to be put to common use (cf. Ex 13 13). Other things are given because God is gratified to receive them, or displeased and therefore dangerous if they are withheld (Ex 5 3). God enjoys sacrifice even in a material sense (Gen 8 21; Jg 9 13; 1 S 26 19; cf. Lev 21 6; Ezek 44 7; Ps 50 12, 13); sacrifice, or even the promise of a sacrifice (Jg 11 31), may move Him to benevolence (Gen 8 21), or turn away His wrath (1 S 26 19; 2 S 24; cf. 1 S 3 14). Sacrificial blood sprinkled on the doorposts and the lintel has power to drive away 'destroyers' from a dwelling (Ex 12 21, 23; cf. Driver, *Exodus*, App. 1); a (human) foundation sacrifice guards a newly built city from misfortune (1 K 16 34). Parallels to all these ideas and practices may be found in the cultus of other nations.

(iv) **The Prophets and Sacrifice.**—From the conception of God in which such practices originated Israel was delivered by her great prophets. To them at least there is no true parallel in the spiritual history of other nations.

The prophets of the 8th and 7th centuries B.C. pour scorn upon the conventional religion of their day, and declare that their contemporaries attribute to sacrifice an efficacy which it does not in fact possess. Let the sanctuaries continue to be thronged with worshippers, let burnt offerings, peace offerings, tithes and oblations be multiplied, if the people will have it so; but let them remember that Jehovah did not command these things, does not desire them, and will not accept them. His favour cannot be compelled by magic or bought with gifts, His eyes cannot be blinded by bribes, His wrath cannot be averted by piacular offerings. 'God desires not sacrifice but the knowledge of God—not sacrifice but justice and mercy which are the necessary outcome of the knowledge of God. . . . God's favour is found by man's becoming, like Himself, just and merciful . . . religion is to be found in Israel's returning God's knowledge and care for Israel by knowing and caring for God' (G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, 44; cf. Am 4 4 f., 5 21-25; Hos 6 6; Is 1 10-17; Mic 6 6-8; Jer 7 21 ff.; 1 S 15 22).

It is important to notice in all these passages that the thing which excites the prophets' scorn is the worshippers' false ideas about God, not the particular form of their worship. The prophets declare that some practices associated with sacrifice are abominable (cf. Hos 4 13, 14); they say that God has no need of sacrificial gifts and that material oblations have no power to influence Him; but they do not say that the practice of sacrifice is wrong in itself, and probably no prophet, except perhaps Jeremiah, really wanted it to be abolished. Sacrificial worship was the only kind of public worship known to the prophets: certainly it was the only kind of worship which the mass of the people

of their time could recognize as such. Unless, therefore, we can believe that the prophets seriously contemplated the possibility of a national religion without a cultus of any kind—and for this belief no sort of evidence can be found outside the Book of Jeremiah—we must suppose that they neither expected nor desired sacrifice to cease. 'Sacrifice may well have seemed to them the natural expression of homage and gratitude' (G. F. Moore, 'Sacrifice' in *E.B.*: cf. Gray, *op. cit.*, 43).

(v) **Deuteronomy.**—We need not be surprised, therefore, to find that in the Book of Deuteronomy, which was the direct outcome of the teaching of the great prophets, though some offerings formerly offered are now definitely forbidden (12 [31], 18 [10], 23 [18]), provision is made for the continuance of many of the old forms of sacrificial gift (Burnt Offerings, Peace Offerings, Vows, Tithes, Firstlings, Firstfruits, Passover: cf. 12 [6, 11, 13, 26] f., 14 [22] ff., 15 [19] ff., 16 [1-7, 16], 18 [1-4], 26 [1-14]). The only conspicuous departure from former custom is the limitation of sacrifice to one sanctuary alone (12), and the consequent relaxation of the law which required the blood of animals slain for food to be poured upon an altar (12 [15]). But the whole conception of the meaning and purpose of sacrifices which underlies the sacrificial laws of D represents, one may surmise, a considerable departure from former ways of thinking.

A sacrifice, as it is depicted in D, is the occasion of a joyful feast, when the worshipper 'rejoices before God' in grateful remembrance of God's past mercies, and thinks of the needs of his less fortunate brethren. It is no longer the offering itself, but the gratitude of which the offering is a token and the benevolence displayed in the entertainment of the destitute at the sacrificial meal which cause the blessing of God to rest upon the labours of His worshippers (12 [12, 14], 14 [26, 27, 29], 15 [20], 16 [2, 6, 11, 12, 14], 18 [2], 26 [1-15]). We may notice in passing that D contains the earliest definite regulation allotting to the priests for their own use a fixed portion of sacrificial victims (18 [2-4]: cf. 1 S 2 [13]).

(vi) **Ezekiel 40-48.**—The sacrifices contemplated in D are almost exclusively offerings made by private individuals; in Ezek 40-48, on the other hand, we find very few allusions to private offerings (? 44 [11], 46 [2]) and a considerable number of references to public sacrifices, provided by a tax in kind levied by the 'prince' (45 [13-17]). There are daily (46 [14]), weekly (46 [4]), monthly (46 [6]) sacrifices, and special sacrifices for great festivals (45 [21-25]) and particular occasions (45 [18-20]): the priests are maintained by those portions of the offerings which are not consumed upon the altar (44 [28-31]).

As the Book of Ezekiel now stands the directions concerning these sacrifices form part of a vision in which the dimensions of a new Temple and the constitution of a new Israel are revealed to the exiled prophet. How far the sacrifices described represent the ancient practice of the Temple at Jerusalem (cf. 2 K 16 [15]), or how far they are part of an entirely new scheme of worship devised by Ezekiel and his brother-priests in exile, our ignorance of the sacrificial practice of the first Temple makes it impossible to determine. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that the ritual laws in Ezek 40-48 represent an early experimental stage in the process of law-making and codification which finally produced the Priestly Law of the Pentateuch (cf. G. A. Cooke, *Z.A.W.* [1924], 111).

The sacrifices mentioned in these chapters are the *'Olah*, *Zebaḥ*, *Shelem* (see above), *Nesek* (EV drink offering); an offering of flour and oil for which the old generic term *Minḥa* (=gift) now becomes the technical name; and two sacrifices not mentioned in the earlier books (on 1 S 6 [3, 4]; 2 K 12 [16]; see below), the *Ḥaṭṭath* (EV sin offering) and the *Asham* (AV trespass offering, RV guilt offering), of which we shall say more presently. In these chapters also we meet the idea that sacrifice cleanses from defilement, and the statement that the purpose of sacrifice is 'to make atonement' (43 [20, 26], 45 [15, 20], etc.; see below).

(vii) **The Sacrificial System of the 'Priestly' Law.**—The so-called Priestly Law consists of the great majority of the various and precise commandments which, according to the Biblical story, were given by God to Moses at Mount Sinai and other places in Egypt and in the wilderness. A comparison of these commandments with similar commandments in the vision of Ezekiel points to the conclusion that the 'Mosaic' Law is, in fact, a later development and modification of the law of Ezekiel. It is now held by most authorities that the representation of Moses as the mouthpiece through which all religious law was given to Israel is simply a legal convention similar to that by which all the later developments of Moslem law are attributed to Muhammad; and that some of the incidents described in P are probably hypothetical legal cases thrown into the form of a story (e.g. Nu 9 [6-10], 15 [32-36]). What we really learn from P is not how

the Israelites worshipped at the tabernacle in the wilderness, but how the Jews were meant to worship in the second temple at Jerusalem from the latter half of the Persian period until the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70.

Repetitions and occasional discrepancies show that the Priestly Law as it now stands contains strata of different origin, but the laws of sacrifice are sufficiently uniform in outlook to be treated, for the present study, as a unity. These laws, which are found in Ex 12 [1-20, 43-51], 13 [1], 29-30, 35-40; Leviticus; and Nu 5-9, 15, 18, 19, 28, 29, contain full instructions concerning the matter, mode, time, place, of every kind of sacrifice, public or private.

Public sacrifices are to be offered on behalf of the whole community every morning and evening, every Sabbath and new moon, at the annual festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and New Year, on the Day of Atonement, at the consecration of High Priest or Sanctuary, and whenever occasion demands a sin offering from the whole congregation (Nu 15 [22] ff.; Lev 4 [13] ff.) or from the 'anointed priest' (Lev 4 [3]). Private sacrifices are to be offered by individuals at certain set times (e.g. Passover), and whenever any mishap or misdeed necessitates 'atonement'; and may be offered at any time as an expression of piety or gratitude or in fulfilment of a vow previously made. In P the species of sacrifice mentioned by Ezekiel (Burnt Offering, Meal Offering, Guilt Offering, Sin Offering, Peace Offering, Drink Offering) are described in much greater detail; the ancient gifts of firstlings, firstfruits, and tithes are placed under new regulations; and certain other sacrificial rites are mentioned for the first time. For the purpose of survey we may divide these various forms of offerings, according to the sacrificial material, into (1) Animal; (2) Vegetable, etc.

(1) *Animal.*—(*a*) The *Burnt Offering* (Ex 29 [15-18, 39-42]; Lev 1, 6 [8-13], 8 [18-21], 9 [12-14], 22 [18-20]; Nu 28 [3] ff.) is the most frequent sacrifice; it appears on every ordinary and most extraordinary occasions of public worship, and may also be offered by a private individual (Lev 1). The victim must be an unblemished male, and may be a bullock, sheep, goat, turtle-dove or young pigeon. The offerer of a private burnt offering brings the animal to the sanctuary, lays his hand upon its head, slays it on the north side of the altar, flays and cuts up the carcase; the priest receives the blood which he sprinkles about the altar, lays the pieces of the carcase upon the altar, and burns them in a wood fire. According to Lev 7 [8] the skin belongs to the priest. The effect of the burnt offering is said to be 'to make atonement' (Lev 1 [4], 16 [24]) and to serve as a 'soothing odour' to God (Lev 1 [9]: on this phrase see Gray, *op. cit.*, 76 ff.).

(*b*) The *Guilt Offering* (Lev 5 [14-19], 6 [1-7], 7 [1-7], 19 [21]; Nu 5 [5-8], 18 [9]) is first named by Ezekiel, but not specifically as a new institution. The word 'Asham' occurs in 1 S 6 [3], 2 K 12 [16]: in the first case with reference to the golden mice placed by the Philistines beside the restored ark, and in the second with reference to money payments. In P it means a sacrifice offered in the first place in expiation of the misappropriation of property and of the tribute due to God, and at a later time prescribed for other offences also (Lev 5 [1] ff., [17] ff., 19 [20] ff.). The regular victim is a ram; the blood-ritual is similar to that of the burnt offering; specified parts of the animal are burned upon the altar, and the flesh, which is most holy, is given to the priests to be eaten in a holy place. The effect of the guilt offering is said to be 'to make atonement' and to secure forgiveness (Lev 6 [7]).

The offering for the cleansed leper (Lev 14 [9] ff.) is called a 'guilt offering,' but the ritual is quite different from that of Lev 7 [1-7].

(*c*) The *Sin Offering* (Ex 29 [11-14]; Lev 4 [1-35], 5 [1-13], 6 [24-30], 8 [14], 10 [16-20]; Nu 15 [22-31], 18 [9]). The word *Ḥaṭṭath* occurs in 2 K 12 [16] apparently to denote presents or fines paid to the priests: as the name of an animal sacrifice it first appears in the directions for certain cleansings and dedications given in Ezek 40-48 (43 [19] ff., 45 [17-23]: cf. 40 [39], 42 [13]).

In P a sin offering is prescribed for persons (*a*) as part of the rite of consecration to a sacred office (Ex 29 [11-14]; Lev 9 [8-11, 15]); (*b*) after certain breaches of the law committed accidentally or through ignorance (e.g. Nu 15 [22] ff.), or after accidents, maladies, or natural processes, which lead to ceremonial impurity (e.g. Lev 12 [6], 15 [14] f., [29] f.); and for things (e.g. the altar) which need to be cleansed or consecrated (Ex 30 [10]; Lev 8 [15], 16 [16]). (The RV of Nu 19 [9] which suggests that the slaughter of the red cow described in the preceding verses is a sin offering is wrong: cf. Gray, *op. cit.*, 59 f.)

The victim in different cases may be a bullock, he-goat, she-goat, ewe-lamb, kid, turtle-dove or young pigeon, or even, when the offerer is very poor, fine flour (Lev 5 [11] f.). The offerer brings his victim to the sanctuary, lays his hands upon its head, and slays it on the north side of the

altar; the priest smears some of the blood on the horns of the altar and pours out the rest at its base; the same parts of the carcase as in the guilt offering are burned upon the altar; the skin, entrails, and in certain cases (Ex 29[14]; Lev 6[30], 9[11], 16[27]) all the flesh, are burned outside the camp; in the remaining cases the flesh, which is most holy, is given to the priest (Lev 5[13], 10[16] ff.; Nu 18[9]). The effect of a sin offering is said to be 'to make atonement' and secure forgiveness (Lev 4[26, 35], 5[10, 13]).

(*d*) The *Peace Offering* (Ex 29[31-34]; Lev 3[1-16], 7[11-21, 34], 8[22-32], 9[18-21], 10[14], 17[1-9], 22[21-33]) is much less prominent in P than in the earlier literature. The only public peace offerings are the 'installation' ram of Ex 29, and the two lambs offered at Pentecost (Lev 23[19]). Three varieties of private peace offering are now distinguished: 'thank offerings,' 'vows,' and 'freewill offerings' (Lev 7[12, 16]). The victim may be of the flock or of the herd, male or female, of any age, but, except for a 'freewill offering,' must be without blemish. The first part of the ritual is exactly like that of the burnt offering, except that the slaying need not be done on the north side of the altar; after dissecting the carcase the offerer brings to the altar the fat, the breast, and the right leg, and 'waves' the breast before God (Lev 7[30], 9[21]; Ex 29[26] f.); the priest then burns the fat upon the altar, takes the breast for the priests in general and the right leg for himself, and the worshippers eat the rest of the flesh in a sacred meal. The flesh of peace offerings is less sacred than that of guilt offerings or sin offerings, and the priests' portion need not be eaten in a 'holy place' nor by the priests themselves.

Nothing is said of the effect of peace offerings except that they provide 'the food of a fire offering, a soothing odour' for God (Lev 3[5, 16]).

(*e*) *Firstlings* of clean animals (Ex 13[1]; Lev 27[26]; Nu 18[15-18]), which, according to the earliest law, were sacrificed to God (Ex 22[30], 13[15]), and, according to Dt 15[19-23], were 'sanctified unto God' and eaten by the worshippers at the sanctuary, are treated otherwise in P. The blood is sprinkled, and the fat is burned, upon the altar, and the flesh is given to the priests (Nu 18[15-18]). The offering of the firstborn of men is commuted into a tax of five shekels (=12s.) paid to the priests (Nu 18[16]); and a sliding scale of similar payments is provided for the redemption of persons 'vowed to God' (Lev 27[1-8]).

(*f*) Pseudo-sacrificial practices like the burning of a red cow in order to make ritual use of its ashes (Nu 19), the killing of a pigeon over running water at the cleansing of a leper or a leprous house (Lev 14[5, 50] ff.), and the sending away of a goat for Azazel (AV 'scapegoat') on the Day of Atonement, need not be discussed at length here.

(2) *Vegetable, etc.*—(*a*) The *Minḥa* (AV 'meat offering,' RV 'meal offering': Ex 29[2, 23, 32]; Lev 2[1-16], 6[14-23], 7[9, 10], 8[2, 26, 31], 10[12]; Nu 15[1-9, 17-21], 18[9]) consists of fine flour and oil variously prepared (either as dough, or baked, or fried), always salted, sometimes sprinkled with frankincense, but never mixed with leaven or honey (Lev 2[11]). A meal offering is to accompany every burnt offering or peace offering (Nu 15[1-9]), but may also be offered separately (Lev 2; Nu 15[17-21]). The priests' own meal offerings are wholly burned upon the altar; of other meal offerings a handful, including the frankincense, if any, is burned upon the altar, and the rest goes to the priests. The handful burned upon the altar is called the '*Azkara* of the offering' (LXX 'its memorial' or 'reminder'). The word *Azkara* occurs only in P, and only with reference to vegetable offerings (cf. Lev 2[2, 9, 16], 5[12], 6[15], 24[7]; Nu 5[26]); its form is peculiar and its original significance not quite clear. It may mean 'that which calls (the whole offering) to mind,' i.e. a 'representative portion' burned upon the altar to indicate that in intention the whole offering is offered to God, though actually most of it is consumed by the priests.

(*b*) The *Shewbread* (Ex 25[30]; Lev 24[5-9]). The priest is to place on a table 'before the Lord' twelve cakes of fine flour arranged in two rows, and frankincense with each row to serve as *Azkara* to the bread. Each Sabbath the old cakes, now replaced by new ones, are given to the priests, and the frankincense is burned on the altar. The cakes are said to be part of a 'fire offering' (Lev 24[9]), and may therefore be reckoned as 'sacrifice.'

(*c*) Two interesting survivals of ancient agricultural practice are the offering of the *First Sheaf* of barley at Passover (Lev 23[9-14]; see Gray, *op. cit.*, 323-336), and of *Two Loaves* at Pentecost (Lev 23[15-21]).

(*d*) *Firstfruits* (Nu 15[17-21], 18[12] f.; Lev 2[14-16]) and *Tithes* (Lev 27[30-33]; Nu 18[21-24]) are still said to be 'given to God,' but in practice it is probable that all the tithes, and nearly all the firstfruits, were paid simply as taxes to the Levites and priests (see Gray, *op. cit.*, 22 ff.).

(*e*) *Wine Offerings* (Ex 29[40]; Lev 23[13];

Nu 15[1-16, 28]) accompany all public burnt offerings. The quantity offered varies according to the size of the burnt offerings; the manner of offering is not defined (cf. Nu 28[7]; Ecclus 50[15]).

(*f*) *Incense* (Ex 30[1-9, 34-38]; Lev 10[1-5], 16[12, 13]; Nu 16), made according to the recipe of Ex 30[34-38], is to be burned as a separate offering by the High Priest (i) in a censer when he enters the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16[12]); (ii) on the Altar of Incense each morning and evening (Ex 30[1-9]). The effect of the incense, in some stories at any rate, is to avert plague and supernatural danger (Lev 16[13]; Nu 16[40-46]; cf. Tob 6[7], 8[1-3]).

(*g*) *Salt* is required to be added to all sacrifices (Lev 2[13]; cf. Ezek 43[24]).

The most important of the sacrificial terms in Ezek 40-48 and in the Priestly Law is *Kapper* (EV 'to make atonement'), which is used in Ezekiel to describe the effect of all sacrifices (45[15, 20]), in P to describe the effect of certain sacrifices (see above), and of all sacrificial blood (Lev 17[11]). The primary meaning of the root is uncertain; 'to cover,' 'to brighten,' 'to remove,' 'to turn away,' 'to wash out with a liquid,' 'to make satisfaction by a payment, bribe, or gift' have all been suggested, and something is to be said for each of these suggestions. But the way in which the priestly writers use the word makes sufficiently clear the general sense they attached to it. We may observe: (*a*) The things which make it necessary 'to make atonement' are sin and defilement (Lev 4[26], 5[6, 10], 14[19], 16[16, 34], etc.); the words 'to unsin,' 'to cleanse,' 'to sanctify' are used as parallels to *Kapper* (Ezek 43[20, 26]); in Lev 16[30] the effect of this process is 'to cleanse from sin,' and in other passages its consequence is that the sinner is forgiven (Lev 4[26, 31, 35], 6[7]). (*b*) *Kapper* is followed occasionally by a direct accusative (but only of things, never of persons: Lev 16[20, 33]; Ezek 43[20, 26]), generally by a preposition meaning 'on behalf of' (a person or thing); once at least it is used absolutely (Lev 16[32]). (*c*) Not only animal sacrifices can 'make atonement,' but also vegetable offerings (Ezek 45[15-17]; Lev 5[13]), and things which are not sacrifices at all (Ex 30[15] f.; Nu 8[19], 25[13], 31[50], 35[33]). (*d*) In Lev 17[11] the means by which 'atonement' is made is said to be given by God to man.

A study of these facts suggests that *Kapper*, as used in the Priestly Law, is 'a stronger synonym of "to unsin" or "to cleanse" or "purify"' (Driver, *H.D.B.*, iv, 131). Its central idea is the removal from persons or things of that which makes them unfit to be members of God's people, or to be used in His sanctuary. No doubt the thought is not far distant that when their unfitness is removed, God's attitude towards them is changed; but the whole emphasis is on the change in the sinners' condition, not on the change in God's attitude. The priestly writers show few traces of the ideas which find expression in the story of the sons of Rizpah (2 S 21[3-14]). 'To make atonement' never means for them to placate an angry God by the offering of blood, or by the penal suffering of an innocent victim substituted for the actual sinner. Exactly how sacrifices can 'make atonement' or 'expiation' they do not say. Probably they had no definite theory. But in Lev 17[11] they affirm their belief that the God to whom the sinner is reconciled Himself bestows the means of reconciliation, and the law of the guilt offering (Lev 6[4] f.) shows clearly that, in their opinion, sacrifice could not 'expiate' a wrong done to a brother until that wrong was righted.

It should be noticed that, with the exception of the offences described in Lev 5[1], 6[1-3], 19[20], all the 'sins' for which 'atoning' sacrifices are provided in P are ceremonial defilements or sins committed inadvertently or in ignorance. For sins committed 'with a high hand' (i.e. deliberate sins) no sacrifice can 'make atonement'; the sinner must be cut off from his people (cf. Nu 9[13], 15[30]; Davidson, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 313 ff.).

(viii) **The final significance of Jewish Sacrifice.**—If we wish to learn the true nature of 'Deuteronomic' religion we must read not only the sacrificial laws of Deuteronomy, but also the prayer which a 'Deuteronomic' writer put into the mouth of Solomon (1 K 8[22] ff.); if we wish to learn the true nature of 'priestly' religion we must read not only the Book of Leviticus but also the first chapter of Genesis and the prayer put into the mouth of David by a devoted follower of the Priestly Law (1 Ch 29[10] ff.). It is incredible that men who held the lofty idea of God expressed in these passages believed that sacrifices, in themselves, had power to change His purpose, or that the offering of the appointed sacrifices was the whole of man's duty towards Him; and there is sufficient evidence to prove that those who lived under the 'Mosaic' Law did not in fact believe these things (cf. Pr 15[8], 21[3, 27]; Ps 26[6], 40[6] ff., 50[7] ff.; Ecclus 7[31] ff., 34[18-35]). If such men had been asked, 'Why then do you offer

sacrifices at all?' most of them would probably have answered, 'It is the law.' Some might have added, 'Because sacrifices are the divinely appointed means of expressing our gratitude and devotion to God at all times, our sense of sin and of our need for forgiveness when we have gone astray.' But most would have agreed that it is the obedience of the worshipper, his gratitude, his devotion, his penitence, not his material offering, which pleases God and obtains His blessing or His forgiveness. The primitive beliefs in which the sacrifices had their origin had all but passed away and been forgotten; and when, after the destruction of the Temple, the sacrifices themselves became impossible, all that was best in Judaism could, and did, survive.

(ix) **Sacrificial Metaphor in the New Testament.**—The earliest Christians were devout Jews, and it was not unnatural for them to use metaphors borrowed from the sacrificial terminology of the Old Testament with which from childhood they had been familiar. Thus, for example, St. Paul speaks of himself as 'poured out as a wine offering' upon the 'sacrifice' of his converts' faith (Phil 2 [17]); exhorts the Romans to present their bodies 'as a living sacrifice, holy, well-pleasing to God' (Rom 12 [1]); enjoins the Ephesians and Colossians to be, like the sacrificial victims, 'without blemish' (Eph 1 [4], 5 [27]; Col 1 [22]: cf. Phil 2 [15]; Jude [24]; Rev 14 [5]); speaks of the kindly gifts of the Philippians as 'a smell of sweet savour (the LXX rendering of "soothing odour," see above) well pleasing to God' (Phil 4 [18]: cf. 2 Cor 2 [15]; Heb 13 [16]; 1 P 2 [5]).

In the same way the New Testament writers sometimes use sacrificial metaphors with reference to Christ. Such metaphors are found in the Pauline Epistles, 1 Peter, Hebrews, 1 John, and the Revelation. Thus Christ is compared to the Paschal lamb (1 Cor 5 [7]; Eph 1 [7]; Rev 5 [6], 13 [8]), to a covenant sacrifice (Heb 9 [15], 10 [29], 13 [20]: cf. Mt 26 [28]; Mk 14 [24]); is called the 'atonement for our sins' (1 Jn 2 [2], 4 [10]: cf. Rom 3 [25]—the noun 'atonement' is formed from the verb by which the LXX renders *Kapper*, see above); by His blood, it is said, Christians are 'cleansed,' 'loosed from sin,' 'justified,' 'sanctified,' 'brought near,' 'made bold to enter the Holy Place' (Rom 5 [9]; Eph 2 [13]; Heb 9 [14], 13 [12]; 1 Jn 1 [7]; Rev 1 [5], 7 [14]).

The precise meaning which the New Testament writers attached to the metaphor of sacrifice as applied to the life and death of Jesus Christ cannot be discussed here. Nevertheless, it may be well to point out that the emphasis of the comparison is upon the effect produced, not upon the method by which the effect is produced. 'In Christ' the early Christians experienced a new sense of deliverance from sin and of nearness to God; they compared themselves to Israelites delivered from the destroyer by the blood of the Paschal lamb, or to men whose ceremonial defilement had been removed by the offering of a sin offering; they even compared the blood of Christ to the blood of the sacrificial victim. But there is nothing in the New Testament to justify any attempt to carry the comparison beyond this point. We cannot say more than that the sacrificial regulations of the Old Testament provided the writers of the New Testament with part of the vocabulary in which they described what Christ had achieved.

(B) PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICE

The history of the Jewish priesthood, the many problems connected with that history (e.g. why priests and Levites are identified in D, but distinguished in Ezekiel, P, and Chronicles; why legitimate priesthood is restricted in Ezekiel to the 'sons of Zadok,' in P and Chronicles to the 'sons of Aaron'), the functions of semi-priestly officials, and the non-sacrificial functions which the priests, strictly so called, at all times possessed, lie outside our immediate subject (see pp. 123*a*, 161*a*, and 541*a*). Concerning the sacrificial functions of the priests little remains to be added to what has been said already (A, vii).

Early narratives of the Old Testament tell of a time when, though priests existed, sacrifices could be offered without their aid (e.g. Ex 24 [5]; 1 S 14 [34-36]; 2 S 6 [17]; 1 K 8 [63], 18 [33]), and it has even been maintained that the earliest Israelite priests were not 'ministers of the altar' at all (*E.B.*, iii, 3,841; *E.R.E.*, x, 308). However that may be, there is no reason to doubt that, at least from the time when legitimate sacrifice was restricted to one sanctuary, the official priests played some part in the offering of every sacrifice which was actually brought to the altar (cf. Dt 18 [1-3], 33 [10]; 1 S 2 [28]; cf. Ezek 44 [15] f.).

The earliest allusions to the priest as sacrificing are quite general (Dt 33 [10]; 1 S 2 [28]). From Dt 33 [10] we learn only that the priests burned certain sacrifices or portions of sacrifices upon the altar; from Ezekiel only that the portions presented (at the altar) by the priests are the fat and the blood (44 [15]), and that every

priest, when called upon to minister, must first put on a linen dress, which is to be left behind in the inner court of the Temple when his ministry is ended (44 17-19). P, on the other hand, gives minute instructions as to how priest and High Priest shall prepare for ministration (Ex 30 17-21), what they shall wear (cf. for priest Ex 28 4. 40. 42; Lev 6 10, 8 13; for High Priest Ex 28, 29 4-6, 39 1-31; Lev 8 6-9, 16 4. 23. 32), and what they shall do at the altar. The priest's part in the offering and consumption of each of the various kinds of sacrifice prescribed in P has been indicated above. Here it may be added that, according to P, only the High Priest is competent to offer the sin offerings and the burnt offerings of the annual Day of Atonement (Lev 16) and any occasional sin offering made necessary by his own sin or the sin of the whole congregation (Lev 4 1-21), and that the ritual of the sin offerings of the Day of Atonement differs from the ritual of ordinary sin offerings in that the blood is sprinkled not only on the altar but upon and before the 'mercy-seat' in the Holy of Holies (Lev 16 14, 15).

According to P the special function of the priest in sacrifice is to perform, as the worshippers' representative, those parts of the ritual which require a more exact knowledge of procedure and a higher degree of ceremonial purity than a layman could be expected to possess (cf. Nu 3 10, 18 1, 7). The lay worshipper himself, however, performs all the acts which do not involve entrance into the sanctuary.

Authorities

H.D.B., articles 'Priests and Levites,' 'Propitiation,' 'Sacrifice'; *E.R.E.*, articles 'Expiation and Atonement,' (Hebrew), 'Sacrifice' (Semitic, Jewish); *Enc. Bib.*, articles 'Levite,' 'Priest,' 'Sacrifice'; G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*; W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*[3].

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND ARCHÆOLOGICAL RESEARCH

By E. O. James

Introduction

Of the literature that has survived from the ancient world, a considerable mass is to be found in the pages of the Old Testament. In a word, the Bible is not only the record of a gradual revelation of God to man, but also a mine of information and of invaluable material for the student of comparative religion, and especially of early Semitic manners, customs, and beliefs. While the Hebrews—unlike their neighbours the Moabites, Canaanites, Egyptians, Babylonians, Sumerians, Elamites and others—have left us practically no archæological remains of their culture, they have given us instead this amazing collection of devotional poetry, lofty folklore and mythology, oral tradition, sacred drama, the germ of philosophy in the form of theodicies and apocalypses, extending over a lengthy and most important period in human history, and representing the thought and knowledge of a great variety of writers. Whatever may be the point of view from which the information contained in this Sacred Book is regarded, no serious student would deny that it is of the utmost importance to know what the Israelites themselves believed as to the creation of the universe, the origin of their own race and of the adjoining nations, the history of their ancestors, and the customs, ritual and belief of themselves and their neighbours, to say nothing of the historical facts and theological doctrines revealed in these records.

But primarily the Bible is the message from God to a particular people, and the record of a divine revelation which has been a lamp unto the feet and a light unto the path of thousands for many generations. It is therefore all the more important that a distinction should be drawn in this inspired literature between what is primitive, incomplete, or temporary, and what is of lasting value for all time. If Israel has been the recipient of a unique revelation of divine truth, it is only by a comparative study that these higher developments of religious thought can be shown to have been the special possession of this nation. Moreover, the very character and claims of the Biblical narratives demand that they

shall be treated not only with the utmost reverence, but also as historical documents of the first importance, and consequently subjected to the most stringent enquiry in the light of all the available evidence.

To-day it is practically universally agreed by scholars of various shades of theological opinion that the books of the Old Testament are of a composite nature compiled at different periods from the 9th century B.C. onwards from sources of various ages, revised, enlarged, and woven together by later editors to produce consecutive narratives. It is generally admitted that the Priestly document dealing with the origin of the sacred institutions of Israel, and especially the priesthood, the worship and ritual observances and laws, was drawn up after the Babylonian Exile, probably later than the time of Ezekiel.

Turning now to the larger problem of the cultsand culture of the ancient Eastern world of which Israel formed but a small though by no means insignificant part, we are at once faced with a vast accumulation of material upon much of which at present there is by no means unanimity of interpretation. We shall be compelled to confine ourselves to the barest outline of important themes in the hope that the student will be led to investigate the subject more thoroughly for himself, for which purpose a bibliography of some of the standard works has been added.

(1) **The Place of the Hebrews among the Surrounding Nations.**—It is now generally agreed by scholars that the Israelites represent a composite people who established themselves in Palestine in comparatively recent times (i.e. probably about 1200 B.C.). While extreme caution is necessary in the reconstruction of the early history of Israel from its oral traditions, it cannot be denied that tribal history is very frequently passed on from one generation to another by means of ancestral legends and myths. The occurrence of names such as 'Abram,' 'Jacob' (Yakub-ilu, yakubum), 'Ja' (Ya or Yau, the shorter form of Jehovah), and 'Amraphel' (probably Hammurabi) in early Babylonian records, is suggestive of an historical background to the patriarchal narratives. To this can be added the description of the battle of the Plain (Gen 14^{1-10}), since it contains names that appear to refer to historical individuals, and is consistent with the political situation in the East at that time as now disclosed by the Babylonian monuments. It is highly improbable that a Jewish scribe in the period of the Exile could have invented these names or been aware of the historical facts which have only recently become known. The data suggest that he obtained his information from an ancient record, and this is supported by the chapter (Gen 14) having the appearance of an isolated narrative with a peculiar literary history. There is, in short, a strong case for the view that the Abram tradition represents an actual migration from Babylonia to Palestine at the end of the third millennium B.C. (probably about 2250), soon after the vast hordes of Semites had established themselves in the valley of the Euphrates after their long struggle with the original Sumerian settlers. It was in this first dynasty of Babylon, established by Hammurabi (=Amraphel ?) *c.* 2123-2081 B.C., that the names of Abram and Abraham occur in the Babylonian records together with the forms Ya, Yau in connexion with proper names derived originally, it is thought, from an Amorite deity Ya or Yau. Furthermore, the migration which was responsible for the Semitic predominance in Mesopotamia also gave to Palestine the first influx of Semites.

Passing to Egypt, the other great centre of civilization with which the Hebrews were in intimate contact in early times, the evidence is perhaps less convincing so far as the patriarchal traditions are concerned. Nevertheless, it is beyond dispute that the Semites penetrated into the valley of the Nile between the 7th and 12th dynasties (*c.* 2600-2212 B.C.). When they were finally expelled by Amenemhet I, possibly expeditions into southern Palestine were carried out by way of reprisal. At the end of the 12th dynasty, however, Egypt was again invaded by Asiatics, and although the details of the period are very obscure, it appears from the Egyptian historian Manetho that successive waves of Semitic tribes poured into the fertile valley, plundering and destroying, till ultimately they established themselves as a monarchy known as the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings (1800-1580 B.C.). It is apparently to these Semitic migrations that the various descents into Egypt recorded in Genesis refer, though at present it is impossible to arrive at anything like a satisfactory correlation of the Biblical and Egyptian chronology. Nevertheless, there are adequate grounds for believing that certain of the Israelite clans temporarily sojourned in the valley of the Nile, probably during the rule of their fellow-Semites, the Hyksos, and there came under the influence of Egyptian culture and of the inspiring personality of Moses. It

does not seem very likely, however, that all the tribes were ever in Egypt, and it may be that the activities of the Habiru mentioned in the Amarna letters, and usually interpreted as the Hebrews, reflect an Aramæan (Syrian) movement of which the conquest of Palestine under Joshua was part (see p. 177). The belief that their ancestors had been Aramæans and had once lived in north-east Syria is very strongly entrenched in Hebrew tradition (Gen 11 31, 32, 22 20 ff., 25 20, 28 5, 31 20, 24, 33 18; Dt 26 5; and although this may have been due partly to the fusion with Aramæan settlers in the 8th and 7th centuries B.C., it seems very probable that Israel had affinities with the Aramæan stock of the desert.

In view of these ethnological considerations, and of the geographical situation of Palestine lying between Mesopotamia and Egypt and the Mediterranean ports, the religion of the Hebrews inevitably was subject to numerous reactions in the long and varied course of its history. The Israelites belonged to the group of peoples known as Semites, a name referring originally to the supposed descendants of Shem (Gen 10), but now applied to the linguistically allied nations predominating Western Asia and Eastern Africa from the fourth millennium onwards, and comprising the Aramæans (Syrians) in the north, the Babylonians and the Assyrians in the east, the Arabs in the south, and the Phœnicians, Hebrews, Moabites, and surrounding tribes of kindred stock in the west. The Biblical narratives make the Amorites (Amurrû or 'Westlanders') the inhabitants of Canaan at the time of the conquest, and these again represent a Semitic race that poured out of Arabia and overran Syria, Palestine, and Babylonia during the third millennium B.C. Just as the so-called 'Canaanites' arose by the union of the Amorite invaders with the Neolithic (prehistoric) aboriginal inhabitants of Palestine, so the Israelite conquerors, with the exception perhaps of some families, such as the Rechabites, became merged with the conquered Canaanites, adopting the customs, and consequently to some extent the religion, of the mixed race. Thus the earlier sacred places continued to be used as shrines, and became associated especially with the traditions of the patriarchs.

(2) **The Religion of the Semites—***Animism.*—It is evident from the patriarchal traditions of Genesis, as well as from the records of the popular religion of Babylonia, Syria, and Palestine, that the belief in spiritual beings associated with certain natural objects figured prominently in Semitic cult, both before and after the conquest. The crises in the lives of the patriarchs are all connected with sacred stones, trees, wells, and springs, and although the narratives in their present form have been made to take on a monotheistic guise, the original beliefs connected with these sacred spots are still apparent. At every sanctuary one or more stones were set up and regarded as the abode of the Deity in a localized sense. Thus Jacob is said to have anointed with oil the stone on which he had laid his head when he dreamed his remarkable dream, vowing that upon his return he would make the monolith (or sacred pillar) a *beth-el*, the abode of the indwelling *El*, this being the name given to a supernatural being associated with a natural object (Gen 28 10-22). Moreover, the same verb (*mashaḥ*) is used of his ritual treatment of this stone (Gen 31 13) as is employed by the Arabs to denote the ritual stroking of a sacred pillar. The conclusion is therefore obvious, the anointing in the first instance was intended by Jacob as an act of homage to the indwelling deity. Similar pillars, designated in the Hebrew *Maṣṣebôth*, are mentioned as existing at Shechem, Mizpeh, Gibeon, and En-Rogel, and it is clear from the denunciations of the prophets that they survived in Israel until long after the prophetic movement. The Deutero-Isaiah at the close of the Exile, for instance, speaks of libations being offered to sacred stones by the idolatrous Israelites (Is 57 6), and the Deuteronomist prohibits absolutely the *maṣṣebôth* (Dt 12 3). Saul erected a stone at which animals might be killed, and on which blood might be sacrificially poured out: 'the same was the first altar that he built unto the Lord' (1 S 14 35).

It would seem from this last passage that the *maṣṣebah* had some vital connexion with the altar (*mizbēah*, from the root meaning 'to slaughter'). From very early times the blood has been associated with the life animating a living body, and as far back as the Aurignacian phase of the Old Stone Age human remains were frequently smeared with red ochre (a substance which was regarded as the equivalent of blood), apparently with a view to enduing the body with life. Later, in Egypt elaborate attempts were made to preserve the mortal remains and their likeness by embalmment and mummification, but the expense and technical difficulties involved in these processes led to the adoption of simpler alternative

methods for all but the most prominent members of the ruling class. Images of the dead were constructed as substitutes for the actual body, and 'animated' by special ceremonies which sometimes included the transference of parts of the physical body to them as well as the application of such life-giving substances as water and incense.

Breath-Soul and Blood.—Early man judged things as he saw them. Something of vital importance had left the body at death, he observed, and if life was to continue, this missing vitality must be restored. Since loss of blood produced loss of vitality resulting in faintness and death, the primitive mind naturally came to associate blood with the life of man and beast. Again, the first need of a living being is air to breathe, and breath is clearly a thing that is absent in a corpse. Consequently the breath-soul, or *nephesh* as the Hebrews called it, like the blood was conceived as the animating principle, the 'going out' of which constitutes death (cf. Gen 35 [18]; 2 S 1 [9]; 1 K 17 [21]; 2 K 4 [34]; Job 41 [19]; Cant 5 [6]). In Lev 17 [11] the *nephesh* of the flesh is said to reside in the blood, which is sacrificed upon the altar 'to make atonement for your *nephashoth* (souls); for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the *nephesh*.' This association of the blood and the breath in the conception of the soul doubtless explains the belief common among primitive people that the air passages lead to the heart as the centre of life. In the Old Testament the breath, blood, and heart are all used to indicate the 'soul,' an expression which covers potentially the whole conscious personality, though it may also be used in a more restricted sense in reference to the mental, intellectual, emotional, or sensational activities of consciousness (cf. Gen 18 [5]; Jg 18 [20]; 1 S 25 [37]; Hos 7 [11]; Is 29 [13]).

In view of these considerations it is possible to supply a reason for the pouring out of the blood of a slaughtered animal at a sacred stone or altar, which played a prominent part in the sacrificial system of Israel, and to find an interpretation of Jacob's ritual treatment of *massēbah* at Bethel. The belief that the life resided in the blood led to the use of this substance in the reanimation of the portrait statues of the dead, and when the soul came to be regarded more and more as a separate entity independent of the body and its surrogate, the statue seems to have become the abode or vehicle of a spirit, instead of that of a human being, a conclusion that is supported by the occurrence of human designs on sacred pillars which may reasonably be regarded as the survival of the original portrait of the deceased. Moreover, we know that objects associated with life and the dead were regarded by primitive man with religious awe. This apprehension of supernatural power producing the idea of non-moral holiness has been called by Dr. Otto the concept of the 'numinous,' in which he and others find 'the beginning of the notion, however vague, of a transcendent Something, a real operative entity of a numinous kind, which later, as the development proceeds, assumes concrete form as a 'numen loci,' a dæmon, an El, or the like.' It is this which lies behind the notion of sacredness, worship, theism, and animism, producing the attitude of mind which finds expression in the cry, 'How dreadful is this place!' Thus the concept of the awful passes into that of the 'numen,' a divine power associated with an object or place. 'This is none other than the house of Elohim.'

Man can never be content to regard the objective power behind Creation as merely impersonal, and therefore the category of the numinous has tended to become systematized and expressed in terms of concrete and intellectual concepts. Thus the Hebrews, when we encounter them in the Old Testament, like the rest of the Semites, had got beyond the notion of God merely as the 'mysterium tremendum,' the awe-inspiring impersonal power behind the inexplicable. To them He was *El*, having personality and a localized abode in stocks and stones, though, as we shall see later, this was not their only conception of the Deity. It is natural, however, that in those far-off days, when the processes of nature and the physical causes of life and death were so imperfectly understood, a habitation should have been assigned to supernatural beings similar to that formerly occupied by human souls. Furthermore, if portrait statues were smeared with life-giving substances, the ritual observances would naturally tend to be continued after the sacred stone had become a beth-el, especially as blood was frequently supposed to have a rejuvenating effect on the gods as well as on the souls of men.

Sacrifice.—The notion that the Deity is not of His own nature immortal and self-existing, but dependent like mortals on continual nourishment, was prominent in Semitic cult. This apparently was the motive behind the practice of human

sacrifice, a custom which was prevalent among the Canaanites and kindred tribes (Dt 12 31, 18 10; Lev 18 21; 2 K 3 27; 17 31), and made its way to some extent in Judah, especially under Ahaz and Manasseh, despite the strenuous opposition of legislators (Dt 12 31) and prophets (Mic 6 7; Jer 7 31). Human sacrifice, in fact, seems to have been more inveterate in Syria and Palestine than in Arabia, Babylonia, or Egypt; and the story of the offering of Isaac (Gen 22) and the practice of redeeming the firstborn (Ex 13 13, 15), suggest that the early Hebrews were acquainted with the rite. The Biblical narratives, however, indicate that the practice was exceptional among them, the animal offering having been substituted for the human victim.

The precise attitude of the pre-exilic prophets towards the institution of sacrifice is a matter of dispute among scholars. Amos and Jeremiah appear to deny the divine origin of the rite (Am 5 25 *v.n.*; Jer 7 22 f., and see p. 423*a*), and Hölscher goes so far as to assert that the former regarded the custom as contrary to the will of Jehovah with whom perfect relationship may be attained by the fulfilment of His ethical commands. But as J. M. P. Smith has pointed out, it is difficult to believe that a religion without sacrifice would be conceivable to the Hebrew mind (cf. Hos 3 4, 8 13). Moreover, the emphasis laid on the ethical demands of Jehovah does not necessarily involve the exclusion of sacrificial worship, as is seen by the place occupied by Pss 49, 50, 51 in the Temple ritual. It is undoubtedly true that Moses did not lay stress on ritual observance, but if he was in any sense virtually the founder of the Jehovah religion it would seem he must at least have tolerated the sacrificial system, and probably directed it towards the God of the Hebrews. It was the unity of the tribal blood, valued alike by God and man, that held Israel together, and sacrifice throughout the Old Testament is the recognized means by which the group and the individual are brought into touch with Jehovah. Thus as soon as the people established themselves in Palestine, they seem to have made the old sanctuaries into their sacred places, where Jehovah was to be met and presumably approached in the customary manner like the Baal (a supernatural 'occupier' of a shrine, and later a fertility-god), who formerly had there received sacrifices. For no one was to 'appear before Jehovah' empty. But, it may be objected, if Jehovah was worshipped like the Baalim, what was to prevent His becoming merely a 'numen' or Semitic deity?

This, in point of fact, was precisely the difficulty with which the upholders of the Jehovah religion had always to contend. Sacrifice may have had little or no place in the actual teaching of Moses, but for better or for worse, Jehovah in Palestine did become a God of shrines and altars, the successor of the Semitic *El* or Baal. Thus, besides the *maṣṣēbah*, the *ashērah* or sacred pole stood in many an Israelitish sanctuary as a symbol of the divine presence (Hos 3 4, 10 1), and sometimes carved in the resemblance of the human form and draped (2 K 23 7). In Arabia, among the Amorites, the *ashērah* apparently became a goddess (2 K 23 4; Jg 3 7; 1 K 18 19), and it has been conjectured that the cultus was connected with the worship of the fertility-goddess Astarte (i.e. the Old Testament Ashtoreth), which was introduced into Palestine probably by the first Semitic migration. In her temples she was symbolized by *maṣṣebôth* and *ashērîm*, and it was around these objects that orgiastic rites were performed in spring and autumn. It is therefore possible that the text in the Old Testament has been glossed, and that the goddess Ashera is the result of a confusion between Astarte and her symbol. It is clear from the stories of Saul, David, Michal, Jephthah's daughter, and the prophets on Mount Carmel, that despite Astarte worship being regarded as a foreign religion in Israel (1 K 11 5), and the strenuous opposition of priests and prophets in later times, the orgiastic element was by no means eliminated from Hebrew religion. Ritual dancing doubtless frequently had this significance in Israel as elsewhere among the Semites, and it would seem that, in the original tradition, Rachel's conception of Joseph was attributed to the eating of mandrakes (Gen 30 14-24), a renowned fertility charm, associated by the Greeks with Aphrodite, the Hellenic counterpart of Astarte.

Again, the *teraphim*, 'nourishers' or 'maintainers' or 'household gods,' which Rachel stole from her father (Gen 31 19, 30; cf. 35 2, 4), were in all probability amulets having a similar significance, resembling perhaps the small figures of Astarte which have been found in abundance in the Canaanite High Places, in tombs and private houses at Gezer, Taanach, and other Palestinian sites. These figurines, which have been recovered in considerable numbers from the prehistoric deposits in France, the Ægean, Malta, Egypt, Babylonia, and Western Asia generally,

are known to have been associated with the cult of the mother-goddess, and used as charms to secure the increase of man and beast. A pastoral people, as the patriarchs are represented to have been, would readily resort to 'household gods' of this nature, and if Rachel employed mandrakes as a fertility-charm, she would naturally desire to retain the amulets of her father's house in order that her household might be fruitful and multiply.

The *teraphim* mentioned elsewhere in the Old Testament, when the nomadic life of the desert had given place to that of the settled agricultural community, seem to have been of a different order, and are more easily correlated with ancestor-worship than with the mother-cult. The image, for instance, that Michal put into her husband's bed to deceive the emissaries of Saul (1 S 19[13, 16]) must have had the size and appearance of a man; while the 'gods' of Micah appear to have been the rulers of the family (Jg 17[4], 18[24]). Anthropomorphic figures as images of ancestors and dead heroes are of very common occurrence in many parts of the world, representing possibly a survival of the portrait statue as a surrogate of the deceased. Again, the *teraphim* are associated with the *ephod* (Hos 3[4]), an object used for obtaining oracles but originally in the nature of an image (Jg 8[26, 27]; 1 S 23[9-11]; 30[7, 8]), and quite distinct from the vestment called the 'linen ephod.' It is because of their connexion with divination, therefore, that they are condemned in the later texts side by side with necromancy and idolatry (1 S 15[23]; 2 K 23[24]). In view of the various purposes for which these objects were employed, it is probable that the word *teraphim* in the Old Testament has been used to include several different articles, such as female figurines, anthropomorphic images, and instruments for divination.

So long as the position of Jehovah as the God of Israel was not actually challenged, the cult of the local Baalim and household deities was allowed to continue. But when, as in the days of Ahab, the worship of the Tyrian fertility-god Baal was definitely set up as a rival allegiance, it involved intentional apostasy from the national God, and consequently had to be rigorously suppressed. But if, as seems probable, the Jehovah religion goes back in some form to patriarchal times (cf. p. 68*a*), it appears from its own traditions to have encouraged rather than otherwise the notion of the Deity as an *El* localized in certain places and objects. Thus Abraham is represented as making his way to the terebinth of Moreh (the oak or turpentine tree of the oracle) at Shechem to seek the guidance of the *El* (Gen 12[6] ff.), just as in later times David resorted to the oracle of the mulberry trees before he attacked the Philistines (2 S 5[24]). Deborah the prophetess likewise dwelt under the palm associated with the grave of Rebekah's nurse near Bethel (Jg 4[5], 6[11]), and thither the people went up for judgement, as the Roman envoys made their complaint to the Æquian commander under a large oak on Mount Algidas. The famous terebinth at Mamre, where Abraham is said to have built an altar, survived till the Christian era, when, according to Eusebius, it was destroyed by Constantine because of the heathen worship that took place at the spot.

In addition to sacred stones and trees, the ancient Semites had their sacred wells. Since man depends upon water for his very existence, and in arid districts like Western Asia, through its agency sees the desert made to blossom as the rose, it is not surprising that he should associate with it supernatural powers. Thus, for example, the Egyptians regarded wells, fountains, rivers, and lakes as sacred, possessing all the qualities of a supernatural being. The Nile was worshipped under the name *Hapi* or *Hyrp*, who, as the great revivifier, was identified with other gods such as Osiris, the god of the dead; Hathor, the mother goddess; and Nut, the female aspect of the cosmic waters. In Israel, as in Babylonia and Egypt, life was generated out of the cosmic waters, and the waters of the deep were part of the cosmogonic process. Although sacred wells and springs are less frequently mentioned in the Old Testament than sacred stones and trees, there are nevertheless traces of the sanctity with which 'living water' was once surrounded (Nu 21[17, 18], 5[11, 17]). From very ancient times such spots as En-mishpat, Beersheba, Dan, and En-rogel were regarded as the abode of an *El* who caused the fertilizing and healing waters to spring forth (Gen 14[7]; Am 8[14]; 1 K 1[9]). Since *En-mishpat* means the 'spring of judgement,' it would seem that this well was used for divination like the oracle terebinth. *Beer-la-hai-roi*, 'the well of the living one that seeth me' (Gen 16[7, 14], 24[62], 25[11]), near Kadesh, was a holy place as the abode of an *El*, and Beersheba received its name from the sanctuary of the 'seven wells,' whither pilgrimages were made even from the northern kingdom in the time of Amos (Am 5[5], 8[14]; cf.

Gen 21 [22] ff.), as late as the middle of the 8th century B.C. Here Abraham made a covenant with Abimelech to which the gift of seven ewe-lambs was the witness (Gen 21 [30]). At En-rogel, by 'the serpent stone,' Adonijah held a sacrificial feast (1 K 1 [9]), and at the sacred spring of Gihon his rival was crowned (1 K 1 [38, 45]).

Although nothing is actually said in the Old Testament* about the indwelling *El*, it is clear from Jewish folklore and the traditions of the Rabbis, that wells and springs were generally considered to be haunted by demons, or to be the habitation of a spirit. For this reason, until quite recently, the peasants in Palestine asked the permission of the spiritual 'owner' before drawing water, and water was never drunk from a vessel that had been uncovered during the night lest it should have been contaminated by demons. Hot springs were thought to have derived their heat from the fires of hell, and David is said to have reached the floods of the cosmic deep in digging the foundations of the Temple. They surged up and threatened to destroy the world, whereupon he receded, reciting the seventeen Songs of Degrees until, writing the Name of God on a stone, he closed with it the mouth of the abyss. There are also records of votive offerings being thrown into wells, and, in later times, worshippers bathed in sacred springs. As the Old Testament makes no mention of these ritual observances, it is impossible to say whether they were practised among the Hebrews, but the available evidence suggests the probability that such was the case. Moreover, we know that water, like blood and oil, was used as an oblation (1 S 7 [6]; 2 S 23 [16]), while from the Talmud we learn that it continued to constitute a feature in the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles, even after the commencement of the Christian era (cf. Jn 7 [37]). There can be little doubt but that similar ritual acts were in common use in Israel both before and after the conquest, following naturally as they do from the belief in water as a life-giving element and the abode of spiritual beings.

Holy Water.—The notion of water as a purifier and cleanser from all kinds of physical contamination (Lev 14 [5, 50], 15 [5, 18], 17 [15], 22 [6]) probably arose from this belief in its being charged with vitalizing energy which could be imparted to objects or beings. The primary conception of uncleanness (i.e. tabu) among primitive people is that of non-moral holiness regarded as a dangerous infection. The ceremonial washings that figure so prominently in Semitic ritual conveyed to the unclean a renewal of holy life, and therefore 'living water' was thought to be especially efficacious in the purification of the leprous (Lev 14 [5, 50]). Again, if a wife was suspected of infidelity she had to drink 'holy water' (Nu 5 [17])—an archaic expression occurring in the Old Testament only in this place—administered with an oath, as an ordeal, in the belief that if she were guilty she would contract dropsy. Behind all these rites there appears to be the one general conception of the potency of sacred water to purify, heal, and even to destroy by virtue of its inherent spiritual properties and powers.

Demonology.—Analogous to the belief in the local manifestation of supernatural beings in stones, trees, wells, and other natural objects, is the elaborate demonology of jinn, afrit, and ghul that prevailed in Arabia. These corporeal beings usually assumed the proportions of animals such as an ostrich or a snake, but they were capable of taking human form, of appearing and disappearing at will, and sending disease or madness. They were always objects of fear, and frequented deserted and unhealthy spots. The ghul was the most dangerous of all, and it was supposed to lie in wait at some place where men were destined to perish. In the Old Testament there is scarcely a trace of demonology* except in the post-exilic literature, though it is difficult to believe that it was unknown in Israel in earlier times. The fact that in the Hebrew Scriptures all spiritual beings are brought under the control of Jehovah and unified in Him (1 S 16 [14] ff.; 1 K 22 [19-23]; Am 3 [6]) has so frequently changed the original nature of the lesser spirits that their true character is not readily discerned. This probably accounts for the apparent absence of demons in the Old Testament records. Thus the seraphim or 'burning ones,' though represented by the pre-exilic Isaiah as the attendants of Jehovah (Is 6 [1-7]), on analysis can be shown to have been the dreaded flying serpent (seraph) (Nu 21 [6]; Dt 8 [15]; Is 14 [29], 30 [6]) of early Semitic belief, just as the 'satyrs' (Is 13 [21] f.), the 'golden calf' (Ex 32 [4] ff.; Lev 17 [7]; Dt

* This is not without significance. Two points ought to be emphasized. First, the gulf between the beliefs of Israel's religious leaders and those of the ordinary peasant is as old as history, and the Old Testament writers belonged to the former class; secondly, such traces of primitive Semitic heathenism as survive in the Old Testament are almost all purged of their original significance.—A. G.

* See the previous note.—A. G.

9 [21]), and the 'scapegoat' (*Azazel*, Lev 16 [8-10]) probably represent the hairy jinn in the form of a calf called *Seirim*, who haunted waste places and were worshipped among the Assyrians and Phœnicians. The other strange creatures mentioned in the desolation of Babylon (Is 13 [21, 22]) apparently refer to demons such as *Iyyim* ('wolves'), *Tannim* ('jackals'), *Siyyim* ('wild beasts'), and *Ochim* ('doleful creatures'). *Lilith*, the 'night monster,' mentioned in Is 34 [11-15] (cf. Ps 91 [5]), was a well-known Assyrian night demon that in later times among the Jews became a molester of children and men in the form of a beautiful woman.

Satan.—These passages suggest that in former times demonology prevailed among the Hebrews, as among other Semites prior to the suppression and transformation of the cult by the monotheists, and it was doubtless the memory of this belief in jinn and ghuls that in later times reacted in favour of the doctrine of 'the Adversary' (the Satan) as the arch-enemy of good. Upon further reflection on the character of Jehovah in the light of ethical monotheism, it became apparent that to make the Doer of Righteousness the Author of Evil was an anomaly. Yet plainly there is evil in the world; whence came it? There must be a supernatural adversary who as a roaring lion goes about seeking whom he may devour. The earlier Hebrew Satan, however, was not the rival or even the enemy of God, nor in any sense the equivalent of the devil in Christian theology, but one of the 'sons of God,' or spirits attached to the court of Jehovah, exercising his functions by divine permission (cf. Job 1 [6] ff., possibly a pre-exilic narrative). In Zech 3 he is the adversary *par excellence* who accuses men before God, and is rebuked by the 'angel of Jehovah.' Finally, in 1 Ch 21 [1], Satan becomes the tempter instead of the accuser, and therefore the originator of evil. But in the beginning he was simply one of the *elohim* or 'sons of God' (lit. 'the sons of the gods': Gen 6 [2-4]), with whom Jehovah discussed the case of Job in the presence of the heavenly courtiers (Job 1 [6]-2 [1]).

Angels.—The *elohim*, like the *cherubim* (Gen 3 [24]), were spiritual beings analogous to the inferior spirits recognized by the Semites as benevolent, and possibly in a later stage they were sometimes regarded as the servants of the gods. They were spirits capable of animating certain objects (*el*), and the use of the term for 'God' by the northern tribes of Israel (in E) instead of 'Jehovah,' as in the southern narratives (J), indicates that the Deity in Israel was regarded as the Lord of the *elohim*. But there is no radical difference of conception concerning the existence of angels between J and E, though references to them are of more frequent occurrence in the E narratives. Thus in Gen 22 [11] it was an angel that stayed the hand of Abraham, and Jacob saw the angels of God (*Elohim*) ascending and descending on the ladder (28 [12]), just as it was an angel of God that appeared to him in Aram (31 [11] ff.), though here it would seem that the angel was also identified with God Himself (31 [13]). This identity is also implied in the version of the Hagar story in this document (21 [8-11]), and the heavenly visitation to Jacob in the way at Mahanaim was apparently a manifestation of the Deity (32 [1] ff.). The angel of God who went before the camp of Israel in the wilderness was the equivalent of the pillar of cloud in the J document (Ex 14 [19] f.: cf. Nu 20 [16]; Ex 23 [20] ff.), and the man of God who appeared to Manoah's wife was singularly god-like in his behaviour (Jg 13). Similarly in the J narratives, the angel of Jehovah who found Hagar in the desert was regarded by her as Jehovah (Gen 16 [13]), and at the burning bush the identification is complete (Ex 3 [2] ff.). On the other hand, the angel of Jehovah who appeared to Balaam was essentially a messenger from God (Nu 22 [20-38]), and the angel who led the children of Israel through the wilderness (Ex 32 [34]), like the cherubim guarding the entrance to Eden (Gen 3 [24]), was not identified with Jehovah.

It would seem, then, in the Old Testament that the origin of the doctrine of angels must be sought in the *elohim*, the counterpart of the Semitic benevolent spirits. The extraordinary story of the *Nephilim* or 'giants' in Gen 6 [4] undoubtedly represents the incorporation of a piece of very ancient folklore into the later narratives, and it is very likely that the old myth contained a fuller account of the exploits of these heroes and demi-gods with which the references to the fall of the angels in later sources are connected. With the development of the worship of Jehovah as the one supreme God of the Hebrews, these 'sons of the gods' became His attendants and messengers with whom He took counsel (cf. 1 K 22 [19-22]; Job 1 [6], 2 [1], 38 [7] ff.; Ps 19 [1], 29 [1, 2], 89 [5-7]). But because He was not a remote All-Father disinterested in the affairs of men, He is constantly represented in the Old Testament (except in the P Document where angels do not

occur) as appearing in the world in various forms, with the result that the angel or messenger of Jehovah is often confused with a manifestation of the Deity Himself. Later, however, the angels became quite distinct and were assigned definite functions in the court of heaven, principally that of worship (Ps 103 [20, 21], 148 [2]), and as the messengers of God to man (Gen 19 [15]; 1 K 19 [5] ff.; Ps 34 [7], 91 [11, 12]).

The cherubim, on whom Jehovah was at one time thought to be enthroned (Is 6 [1-7]), were originally connected, perhaps, with the Hittite griffin, the servant of the Deity (Ex 25 [18, 22]; Ezek 1 [10]) and possibly a personification of the storm-clouds (Dt 33 [26]; Ps 18 [10], 104 [3]; Is 19 [1]; Hab 3 [8]). The seraphim, after their dissociation with the flying seraph, appear, in the only passage in which they are mentioned in the Old Testament (Is 6 [1, 7]), as the mighty attendants of God, praising Him and carrying out His commands with utter abasement. The transformation of the seraph-serpent into a beneficent worshipping being (Nu 21 [6]; 2 K 18 [4]) may have had some bearing on the transition of the seraphim from demons to angels. It is clear, however, that the memory of their original nature was never quite obliterated, since in the Book of Enoch they are conceived as still being in the form of serpents, and rulers of 'paradise and the serpents' (20 [7], 61 [10]). In the Maccabæan period, when the Book of Daniel was written, 'the great prince' *Michael* (who is like God ?) had been raised up to act as the patron saint and spirit guardian of Israel to save the people from extinction in the clash of great powers, Syria and Egypt, and the indeterminate barbarians termed Gog and his host (Dan 10 [13, 21], 12 [1]: cf. 8 [25]). Besides Michael, Gabriel (man or servant of God) is also mentioned, his function being that of imparting wisdom to Daniel. Both these beings are represented as subordinate agents and ministers of God, and from this conception of angelic attendants developed the doctrine of guardian angels such as Raphael (Tob 5 [4]), and the whole elaborate system of angelology which characterizes the apocryphal literature.

Totemism.—In addition to animistic notions, Semitic cult is sometimes alleged to have passed through a totemic stage. This view was strongly advocated by no less an authority than Robertson Smith, who explained the recurrence in Israel and the surrounding people of animal names, appearing as totem tribes in Arabia, as a survival from the time when a sacred alliance existed between an animal species and a human group. While the sporadic use of such names as Simeon for a hybrid of wolf and hyena; Leah for wild cow; Rachel for ewe; and the sons of Hamor for ass, is insufficient evidence upon which to base a theory of totemism in Israel, it supports the contention in so far as it affords a reasonable explanation of them. In the south of Palestine (chiefly in Judah) town names also frequently are connected with animals, and are immediately explained by the totem theory as derivative from clan names; but, again, in themselves these town names do not prove the former existence of a totemic organization. Similarly there are difficulties in interpreting the long list of unclean animals (Lev 11 [4] ff.; Dt 14 [3] ff.) in terms of totemism, since whole classes of animals exhibiting the same characteristics, such as four-footedness, chewing the cud, aquatic creatures without scales and fins, and four-legged winged animals, are pronounced unclean apparently on account of their anatomical features. On the other hand, the sanctity of both animal and human blood implies a certain kinship of 'life,' and it is the 'oneness' of the blood of the social group that holds the tribe together. In fact the tribal blood has a life of its own, and, as we have seen, a special efficacy with God. The distinction drawn between man and the animals in the Creation narratives is not primary, but stands in contrast to the ceremonial treatment of the blood of both, and to the close association of certain animals with certain gods in the earlier Babylonian legends. The animal cults in the Temple at Jerusalem (Ezek 8 [10]) were under the direction of the son of Shaphan (i.e. 'coney'), and other Temple officials had proper names such as 'mole' or 'weasel' (Huldah), and 'mouse' (Achbor son of Micaiah). All this is very strongly suggestive of Israel having passed through a totemic stage in some period of its history, revivals of which in a measure may have recurred in the troublous times of Josiah and Ezekiel.

Among primitive people the union of the clan with the totem assumes a mystic aspect and generates an intense feeling of kinship which often results in the notion that all the members of the community are descended from the supernatural ally or totem. The totem, however, is never regarded as the tribal god; totemism, in fact, being a social rather than a religious institution, is founded upon the idea of a community of nature between men and the rest of creation, and in particular those

species of animals and plants used for food, or in some way especially useful or ornamental. From it arose the subdivision of the tribe into its component parts—the clan, phratry, and matrimonial classes—each associated with a particular species tabu to the members of the group who are also charged with the duty of performing rites for its multiplication. The relationship between the totem and the totemite makes the members of the same totem-kin regard themselves as brethren. Therefore they act together on all occasions, and marriage within the food-group is strictly forbidden. As a result of these prohibitions a complicated system of marriage regulations known as exogamy (marrying outside the food-group) prevails in totemic society.

(3) **Social Organization.**—The solidarity of the social group and its God was the characteristic feature of Israel as a theocracy, although the conviction tended to weaken amid the social and political disintegration resulting from ideas of individualism. Nevertheless, the original notion survived more or less until Jewry ceased to be a state. Israel was Jehovah's spouse, and therefore the people stood in the same kind of relationship to Him as did Pharaoh to the sun-god Re. As Merenptah declared Egypt to be the only daughter of Re, whose son sits upon the throne, so Israel was the anointed of God; and the king, in the days of the monarchy, ruled by divine authority, though the people were in no need of an intermediary between themselves and God (Jg 8 [23]; 1 S 9 [16] ff., 12 [12]; Hos 13 [10]; Jer 1 [5]; Ps 28 [8]). This social and religious group-unity with its blood-kinship, blood-rites, and group-consciousness, would follow naturally in a community in which the totemic system had prevailed. It cannot, however, be affirmed that totemism existed in Israel in any period known to us, and if it was ever practised, it must have broken up before the time of David, as the clan names were then applied to individuals.

The notion of corporate personality, or mutual interdependence of each unit in the community upon the whole nation, so prominent in Hebrew social and religious organization, naturally leads to the treatment of the whole group as an individual (cf. Am 3 [2]). Thus when Achan broke the tabu set on the spoil of Jericho, not only he but his family was stoned and his possessions burned (Jos 7 [25]). The group suffered for the offence of any of its members (cf. Gen 20 [4]; Ex 34 [7]; 1 S 22 [16]; 2 S 21 [8]; Mic 3 [12]), and, according to later thought (1 Cor 15 [21] f.), even the original sin of the first parents was visited upon the whole human race (Gen 3 [15] ff.). To this conception of group-unity belongs the custom of the levirate marriage by which the widow of a childless man marries her brother-in-law to raise up seed to the deceased (Dt 25 [5] ff.). This sense of ancestral unity may be a dim reflection of ancestor worship in some remote period when the dead were worshipped as heroes (cf. Jer 31 [15]; Nu 20 [1]), as it is in connexion with this worship paid to ancestors and the dead that the family and the clan appear as associations for purposes of worship (1 S 20 [6]; Zech 12 [12-14]). But, however it arose, the unit is the family in Israel, as in Hammurabi's code in Babylonia the wife, the children, and slave are parts of one unit and share the responsibility. The city also has a unity of its own, and therefore the Deuteronomic law directs that the inhabitants of an idolatrous city shall be destroyed utterly with the edge of the sword (Dt 13 [15]).

Marriage.—In the tenth commandment the family is described as the social unit, and the wife is regarded as part of the wealth of her husband (Ex 20 [17]). To betroth a woman, and pay a *mohar* (purchase-money) for her, was the recognized method of acquiring possession of her. This commercial idea of marriage reacted in favour of the practice of polygamy, a custom that marred the beauty of social life among the Hebrews. Wives tended to increase in number in proportion to a man's wealth, and to these were added female slaves of the family as concubines (cf. Gen 16 [2], 30 [3, 9]; 1 K 11 [3]—but Cant 6 [8] is a more probable estimate). The poor, because of their poverty, must have been monogamous, and two wives doubtless sufficed in the middle classes (cf. 1 S 1 [1]). The woman being the man's property, he could divorce her at will (Dt 24 [1]), or send her back to her own kin, if he returned the dowry; but the bill of divorcement secured the divorced wife from further obligations to her husband. Among the Jewish papyri discovered at Elephantine in Egypt, however, a marriage contract was found in which the bride claimed and secured the right to divorce her husband, and while this may have been an advance on the normal custom, Hebrew legislation tended to curb the despotic authority exercised by the husband in Eastern lands. Thus the Deuteronomic law decreed that if a man falsely charged his wife with unchastity before marriage, or if he seduced her and had been compelled to marry her in consequence, he forfeited

his right to put her away (Dt 22 [13, 19, 28]). But it was only the woman who was stoned for adultery, or perhaps at one time burned (Gen 38 [24]). True, if she were married or betrothed, the man suffered the same penalty, but only because he had offended against the property of another.

The Position of Women in Israel.—Although a definite step was made towards the emancipation of women in Israel, the Old Testament legislation was clearly based on the patriarchal system. Descent was reckoned through the father, and potestal authority was exercised over the children, who were regarded as the property of the father and could be seized for debt (2 K 4 [1]), or, in the case of very young girls, sold into marriage but not into slavery (Ex 21 [7-11]). Nevertheless, there are traces of a former mother-right having prevailed among the Hebrews, as in other Semitic tribes, when descent followed the female line, as in the case of Isaac who obtained his inheritance from Rachel (Gen 31 [43]; cf. 30 [3] ff.). Jacob, taking up his abode in his wife's clan, and the daughters being regarded as Aramæans (Gen 31 [43]), has been quoted as an example of matriarchal marriage, but extreme caution should be exercised in putting such an interpretation on a narrative that very probably has an ethnological motive. Moreover, Jacob is represented as a fugitive from vengeance, who was not in a position to bring his wife into his own family. Again, it has been suggested that Gen 2 [24] implies that the husband is conceived as adopted into his wife's clan, but clearly we are dealing with prophetic influence here directed towards monogamy and the purification of Hebrew family life (cf. Hos 3). It is not improbable, however, that the position occupied by such 'mothers in Israel' as Leah, Rachel, Bilhah, Zilpah, Keturah, and Hagar, is a relic of mother-right, and Gen 43 [29], 44 [20]; Jg 9 [1] may be quoted as references to genealogy 'following the distaff.' The comparative freedom of women in Israel may be due in some measure to matriarchal conditions having predominated at one time, but whether or no long after the patriarchate was firmly established attempts were constantly made to elevate family life, and the spirit of romance was by no means dead.

While polygyny persisted, and the wife was placed in subjection to her husband, marriage was regarded as honourable, and a virtuous woman was deemed of more value than rubies (Pr 31 [10] ff.). Men and maidens met freely at wells in a simple pastoral society, and love-matches were contracted (Gen 29 [18, 20]). Even in the royal house unions were not always conventional (1 S 18 [20]). The mother was highly esteemed, especially if she had many sons to establish and carry on the house to succeeding generations (Ps 127 [3-5]; Gen 30 [23]; 1 S 1 [11]). Maidens were admired for their beauty, and chastity was honoured (Ps 45; Cant 1), while widows were regarded as a worthy object of benevolence (Dt 14 [29], 16 [11, 14], 26 [12] f.). The prophets emphasized monogamy as the ideal, the wife being the helpmeet for her husband and not merely his chattel (Gen 2 [18] ff.), and divorce a thing hateful to Jehovah (Mal 2 [14-16]). These ideals represent a decided advance on Semitic social organization, and undoubtedly prepared the way for the lofty conceptions and hallowed relations of Christian home-life as exemplified in the Holy Family at Nazareth, and subsequently made the 'type of that Divine Society towards which humanity with a Christ within it must move.'

Slavery.—Although slavery was taken for granted and recognized, it was regulated among the Hebrews with the object of ameliorating the conditions of the slave as much as possible. The circumcised slave was regarded as a member of the family, and could claim his freedom in the seventh year of his captivity if he wished (Ex 21 [2-7]). In the year of Jubile all slaves were set free together with their children unless the latter were born of a Gentile woman. In the Deuteronomic law this humane legislation rested on the consideration that the Hebrews themselves once were bondmen in the land of Egypt, and the Lord redeemed them (Dt 15 [15], 16 [12]). In the post-exilic code, the emancipation had gone so far that the Hebrew slave was regarded as a hired servant (Lev 25 [39] f.).

Humanitarianism.—The belief that the land belonged to God reacted on the social life of Israel inasmuch as it prompted such legislation as that concerning the Sabbatical year, according to which the land is to 'lie fallow' every seventh year that the poor may eat from it (Ex 23 [10-13]). The growing humanitarianism is also shown in the prohibition to extract usury from the necessitous (Ex 22 [25]), and social justice is maintained in the regulations defining the rights of property and the restoration of lost property to its owner (23 [4-5]). In the later codes these injunctions are more strictly applied (Dt 22 [1-3], 23 [19] ff., 24 [6, 10, 11, 14, 17], 14 [21];

Lev 19 [33] f., 24 [16, 22], 25), and every precaution taken to prevent unjust trading (Lev 25 [14]), avarice, and oppression. These legal enactments were emphasized and spiritualized by the social teaching of the prophets both before and after the Exile (Am 1 [6-8], 3 [2], 5 [11], 6 [4]; Hos 5 [10]; Mic 2 [2], 6 [11]; Is 3 [15]; Jer 34 [11]; Ezek 34; Mal 3 [11]; Jl 1 [5]), and it was this prophetic economic consciousness that played a great part in moulding the later conception of the Messianic Kingdom as a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness (Ezek 47 [1-12]; Is 65 [17]; Zech 4 [11-14], 6 [12-15]; Enoch 10 [17-19]; Apoc. Baruch 29 [5] ff., 73).

(4) **Jehovah the God of the Hebrews.**—Hitherto we have been concerned chiefly with the religious and social environment of Israel, and its reactions on this 'peculiar people,' without reference to the fundamental concept that distinguishes them from the rest of the ancient world. It is now agreed by scholars that there arose in Palestine from the 8th century B.C. onwards a unique development of the doctrine of a Supreme Deity who was the sole moral ruler of the universe as well as the God of the Hebrews. It was this belief that gave to Israel its sense of undivided allegiance to a Higher Power, and although it is not the only occurrence of the belief in an external Creator, beneficent and ethical, dwelling in the heavens, it undoubtedly represents the loftiest and purest expression of the doctrine of monotheism. In Egypt in the eighteenth dynasty (*c.* 1375 B.C.) Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton) made the son-god Aton the beneficent creator of all things, 'beside whom there is no other.' The triumph of solar monotheism, however, was short-lived, and after the death of Amenhotep the cult of Aton was swept away, not merely because polytheism had a greater hold on the popular mind and found favour with the priesthood, but also because it represented the elevation of a nature-god to the rank of an omnipotent and omnipresent universal Creator. In this syncretistic deity direct ethical characterization was wanting, and all the weaknesses of a nature-power remained. So the reform ended, as it began, in violence, though the human and beneficent aspects of Aton, in his care for all men, had taken hold upon the imagination of thinking people, and the same qualities subsequently were attributed to the old Egyptian sun-god Amon, whom Aton for a while had displaced. In the later hymns Amon is hailed as 'the lord of truth' (i.e. righteousness and judgement), 'sweetness,' 'great in love,' 'lord of the silent, who cometh at the cry of the poor.' Nevertheless, he had a nature origin, and as the growth of magic persisted, especially in connexion with the cult of the dead, his ethical attributes declined and were lost in the tangle of polytheistic cults.

Monotheistic Tendencies in Babylonia.—Similarly in Babylonia there are indications of a monotheistic tendency in the ascription to Marduk, the city god of Babylon, of the attributes of the other gods when he became head of the pantheon about 2000 B.C. Like Aton and Amon, Marduk was originally a personification of the sun with his cult localized at Babylon, over the destinies of which he presided. Consequently when his city became the capital, he attained pre-eminence and was recognized as the leader and director of the three great gods—Anu, Enlil, and Ea—who governed the universe and all the lesser deities and spirits, just as when Uru, in an earlier period, became supreme its moon-god Sin was regarded as the chief god of the land. His immediate predecessor was Nebo, who was worshipped over a wide area, from whom Marduk derived some of his powers, and the hymns and prayers originally addressed to local deities were also transferred to him as head of the pantheon. But although the monotheistic strain in these petitions is so marked that they might easily be mistaken for Jewish or Christian prayers, Marduk was never more than a 'great king above all gods,' one god among many—a belief that is generally called henotheism. The lesser deities still continued to receive worship in their sanctuaries and temples in different parts of the land, and in the New Year Festival, at the spring equinox, when a formal assembly of the gods was held in Babylon, all the chief deities were grouped round Marduk, paying homage to him as their lord, and collectively deciding the fates of individuals and the affairs of the State. No attempt, in fact, was made to establish Marduk as the only god in Babylonia, and the powerful personality of Ishtar, the mother-goddess, would alone have made monotheism impossible in the Euphrates Valley. But apart from the fact that the goddess-cult always has worked against monotheism, the people were unable to regard each and every Babylonian god as the highest deity, without conflicting with the claims of any other god. Neither the Sumerian Enlil, nor the Babylonian Marduk, not

even the Assyrian Asur, represents a deity as the Creator, the Lord of Nature as a whole, the Controller of the entire universe and of human history, having the destinies of all nations completely in His hands, bringing to pass His own predictions. Yet these are the qualities and powers attributed to Jehovah explicitly by the later Hebrew prophets, and implicitly by the earlier monotheists in Israel.

The Monotheism of the Deutero-Isaiah.—While gross polytheism predominated more and more in Babylonia as city conquered city, in Israel, on the other hand, notwithstanding the apparent anomaly of Sion lying still in ruins, and Judah remaining in captivity with Babylonia supreme, the unknown author of Is 40-55 (commonly called the Deutero-Isaiah) was challenging the heathen deities as mere idols to compete with Jehovah as omnipotent Lord of Creation and the Shepherd of His people (Is 44 [6], 45 [6-7]). Towards the close of the Exile and before the coming of Cyrus the Persian (*c.* 549 B.C.), material prosperity was at a low ebb, and the people may well have argued that the great and unique Jehovah, of whom the earlier prophets had spoken in the 8th century as the national God controlling for good the destinies of His chosen nation, had been overcome by the foreign gods. It was perhaps in reply to such questionings that the Deutero-Isaiah strove to convince the people that Jehovah was the only God, who 'hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out the heavens with a span' (Is 40 [12] ff.). This explicit monotheism was implicit in the teaching of the earlier prophets (Am 9 [7]; Is 5 [26], 6 [3]), but the great prophet of the captivity was the first to proclaim explicitly and controversially that Jehovah was the God of the whole earth, and that the so-called gods of other nations had no real existence (41 [24], 43 [12-13]). Having established Jehovah's absolute supremacy, he then concerned himself with His people. Israel is represented as the 'servant of Jehovah,' 'taken hold of from the ends of the earth, and called from the corners thereof' (41 [9], 48 [1-11]), to make known a revelation and a message to the world at large (42 [6], 44 [12]). But despite the victories of Cyrus, who the prophet maintained was the instrument of God to bring about the restoration of Israel (45), the 'servant' was blind and deaf to his vocation (48 [6] ff.). This led to the formulation of his doctrine of the *ideal servant* who would accomplish the mission entrusted to the nation through much suffering (53), a prophecy which, as we believe, found its ultimate fulfilment in the Incarnation and Passion of our Lord, though to the Deutero-Isaiah it referred primarily to Israel as a nation passing through the sufferings of the Exile—an Israel within Israel, having a mission first to the nation and then to the whole world. The prophet's hope, however, was never realized in post-exilic Israel because the people sought revenge on Babylonia (Ps 137) and the neighbouring nations (cf. Obadiah), and developed an exclusiveness and ritual holiness which militated against the notion of their world-wide mission (Ezek 18, 33; Ezr 9, 10; Neh 13 [23] ff.).*

Post-exilic Monotheism.—It was almost inevitable under the circumstances that the more practical policy of Ezekiel to establish the kingdom here and now in Palestine should prove more attractive to post-exilic Israel than the higher ideal of the Deutero-Isaiah, especially as his promises about the restoration had not been fulfilled exactly as had been expected. Moreover, the worship of Jehovah had been neglected, and therefore it became necessary to tighten the outward observances of Judaism. But the post-exilic reformers were not merely narrow legalists. Thus the prophet Malachi, for example, who was only slightly earlier than the reforms of Nehemiah (*c.* 444 B.C.), proclaimed that Jehovah's coming judgement would turn on moral issues, and confidently predicted the time when all mankind would worship Him (1 [11]). This is also the burden of the latter part of the Book of Isaiah (56-66, frequently called 'Trito-Isaiah'), which was compiled almost certainly in Palestine after the Exile, though the dating and authorship are still uncertain. Here Jerusalem is figured as the centre of the universe whither all nations and kings shall come (60: cf. 66 [1, 2]). Foreigners who keep the Sabbath are to be admitted to the Temple, which shall be called a house of prayer for all people (56 [1-8]). Ps 87 is an echo of the same conception, and the Book of Jonah shows that Jehovah's compassion is extended to the heathen city Nineveh, 'wherein are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand.' The Book of Ruth is generally thought to have been re-edited in post-exilic times, and if this was so, it may well represent a protest against a narrow attitude towards mixed marriages, since the Moabitess (like Rahab the Canaanite in

* But see p. 185*a*, *b*.—A. G.

Ps 87 [4]) is represented as a Mother in Israel. Moreover, even Malachi's denunciation of alien wives was prompted by a sense of injustice to the Jewish women who had been put away by their husbands in favour of 'strangers' (2 [14]) rather than from a desire to maintain the doctrine of ritual exclusiveness. In short, throughout the post-exilic literature there is a blend of the universal and the national claims of Israel, just as moral and ritual interests occur side by side. When the Temple was in process of rebuilding, Zechariah, the colleague of Haggai, prophesied concerning the ideal political and theological reconstruction of the world, looking forward to the time when many nations would be joined to Jehovah (Zech 2 [10-13] [AV], 8 [1-13], 14 [9]) without altering Israel's peculiar relation to Him as the 'Branch' (6 [9] ff.). Zephaniah, somewhat later (c. 500 B.C.), speaks of people from beyond the rivers of Ethiopia bringing their offerings to Jehovah and serving Him with one consent (3 [9, 10]), while the Psalms of the period also refer to Zion as a spiritual metropolis whither the nations of the earth resort (cf. 9 [9] ff., 48 [2], 87, 102 [21-22], and Is 25 [6, 8], which is thought to be a post-exilic addition to Isaiah proper).

From this evidence it is clear that the ethical monotheism of the Deutero-Isaiah, and his conception of the universal jurisdiction of Jehovah, persisted in Israel after the return from Babylonia, and the history of the subsequent centuries shows the growth of monotheism among the Jews, so that by the 2nd century B.C. the mono-Jehovist minority had succeeded in transforming the whole nation into the worshippers of the one Supreme God, Creator and Sovereign of the world. Moreover, the priestly school, despite its tendency to conservative legalism, played its part in the establishment of Hebrew monotheism by its insistence on the strict observance of outward ordinances. Thus, for example, the tabu of the Sabbath (Ex 35 [2]; Nu 15 [32-36]; Neh 13 [15-18]) was a special mark of loyalty to Jehovah and His commands (Ezek 20 [12]; Is 56 [2-6], 58 [13]) rather than a mere ritual regulation. It was also not without its social implications (Ex 34 [21]; Dt 5 [14]). The enforcement of tabus and a minute system of religious injunctions undoubtedly consolidated the work of the 8th-century prophets, and at length their message was accepted by the mass of the people who took as their watchword to 'wait on Jehovah, and keep his way' (Ps 37 [7, 34]).

Pre-prophetic Monotheism.—The 6th century B.C. represents the beginning of a new Israel, and it can hardly have been purely accidental that the culmination of the prophetic teaching was reached when important internal social and political changes were fast approaching, consequent upon the return from the Babylonian captivity, and the resettlement of the returned exiles. It was at this time that the Judæo-Edomite influence from Southern Palestine made itself felt strongly in the traditional literature then in process of formulation. Thus the Book of Chronicles, which is much later than the Book of Kings, gives a perspective of the history of David, and the worship and ritual of the Temple from the point of view of the tribe of Judah, and the names of several prominent Levites therein recorded are of semi-Edomite origin. Again, whereas in the northern narratives the general term Elohim, God, is used, in the southern cycle the proper name 'Jehovah' (printed in our version 'Lord' in small capitals) is preferred. The pronunciation 'Jehovah,' however, rests on a misconception, and the form 'Yahweh' or 'Jahweh,' being nearer the original,* is generally employed by scholars, but the more familiar form, having been used throughout this Commentary, is adopted here.

The provenance of the name of the national Israelite God, Jehovah, is as yet uncertain. Ex 3 [14] (E) represents it as revealed to Moses at Sinai (Horeb), whereas, according to J, the name was known to the patriarchs and antediluvians (Gen 4 [26]). The expression Ya or Yau appears to have occurred in the first Babylonian dynasty, in the days of Hammurabi, in connexion with an Amorite deity, and it is therefore not improbable that the patriarchs were familiar with the name, and they may have attached to it a special monotheistic significance. Unfortunately, however, we cannot be certain about the specialized Hebrew beliefs of this period, since the evidence depends entirely upon oral traditions collected and presumably re-edited by the later scribes. Nevertheless, there is some ground for the view that the patriarchs were worshippers of an ethical tribal god whatever may have been his name and precise nature.

Moses.—While in the present state of our knowledge the patriarchal period is still very obscure, few competent authori-

* Recent discoveries tend to show that the form Yahweh is late and secondary. See p. 648, footnote.—A. G.

ties would now deny that the foundations of the Jehovah religion probably were laid by Moses in the desert. The principal documents of the Hexateuch, and the occasional references in the prophetic literature, agree in making him the great legislator, prophet, teacher, and advocate of Israel, who established the worship of Jehovah as the God of the Hebrews, and with divine guidance and assistance led them through the wilderness. However much his exploits may have been embellished in later ages, the figure is too prominent in the national history to justify any attempt to dismiss the character as merely fictitious. We may regard Moses, then, as the first commanding figure in Israel as a nation, since, as Sir James Frazer says, 'there seems to be no sufficient reason to doubt that in these broad outlines the tradition concerning him is correct' (*Folklore in the Old Testament*, ii, 437). But if we accept this conclusion it is difficult to avoid the deduction that his religious position is incomprehensible unless it be granted that he appealed to the God of the patriarchs. He could hardly have made his way among the people if he had come in the name of an absolutely strange and unknown God. But he might reasonably hope for some success if he rested his position on a fresh revelation made to him by the God of Abraham (whatever His designation may have been), whom some at least still remembered and acknowledged.

Monolatry.—While Moses' conception of Jehovah undoubtedly differed from that of the Deutero-Isaiah and the later prophets, no sharp line of demarcation can be drawn between the religion of Amos and that of the founder of the national life, to whom the God of the Hebrews was one among many tribal-national deities who would not allow His chosen people to have unlawful dealings with His rivals. He was in short a 'jealous God' (Ex $20^{3.5}$) (whether or not these words were due to Moses, they give every appearance of expressing his belief). The first two of the Commandments (see p. 84*b*) can be interpreted as an assertion of monolatry—the worship of one particular God by one community—rather than of pure monotheism, and this, as we have seen, was the more general position of the 8th-century prophets. It is also a doctrine by no means unknown elsewhere. Thus in almost every primitive community we find the shadowy form of the ethical All-Father or Supreme God who dwells in the heavens and has never been a man. Sometimes, as among the aborigines of Australia, the deified culture hero (like the Egyptian Osiris) has become fused with the remote, ethical Creator, but in origin the two appear to be quite distinct. There is reason to think, as we have explained, that among the earliest religious concepts was the realization of a 'transcendent Something, a real operative entity of a numinous kind,' and this doubtless found expression in the remote beneficent, ethical Supreme Being as a psychological tendency rather than as a stage in an evolutionary system—the climax of religious experience. Thus, although primitive people have hardly any relations with the tribal All-Father in practice, yet they attach to him a value superior to that of all other supernatural beings, a value that amounts to the conception of the Divine in the highest sense in which they are capable of receiving it. That it is not the result of an intellectual process of reasoning is clear from the fact that when man in a primitive state of culture does reflect upon the universe and its relations to supernatural agencies he is invariably led to a polytheistic interpretation of Nature. Rather certain individuals seem to have become spontaneously aware of this conception of the Deity as a kind of natural revelation, the purposive functioning of an inherent type of thought and emotion called forth by numinous experience. Everywhere there are a few people to whom religion makes a ready appeal, but in the case of the majority it is only at certain times—at crises such as birth, marriage, death, harvest, during fasts and festivals, and at critical junctures in the national or family life—that the religious emotion is aroused to any appreciable extent. Since it is generally thought in primitive society that it is the lesser spirits, totems, and ancestors who are mainly concerned with human affairs, the High God tends to become remote unless He is brought into relation with a popular hero or spirit. Thus among the Shilluk of the White Nile the divine king Nyakang is the object of veneration, but behind him stands the shadowy figure of the All-Father, Juok, whose worship has been eclipsed by that of the deified ancestor. In the Central tribes of Australia, this process of degeneration has gone further, the high gods having become mere bogeys to frighten women and children.

There is no reason to suppose that the Semites differed from the rest of mankind

in their religious outlook. That they more than any other people had a racial tendency to monotheism, as Renan maintained, is clearly not the case, since there is no evidence to show that prior to the rise of Islam any Semitic people save Israel were monotheistic. The Babylonian attempts to exalt one god above the rest as head of the pantheon were but transitory, as we have shown, and never attained anything that can be called ethical monotheism in the primitive or Hebrew sense, though they reveal at least a tendency towards unification in a complex polytheistic system in the second millennium B.C. The Jehovah religion, however, rests on an entirely different basis from the various developments of animism and polytheism which characterize the other Semitic cults. The great and unique achievement of Israel in the history of religion seems to have been the ability of a few individuals with a special kind of religious temperament and intuition to develop the concept of a benevolent Creator in such a manner that the Supreme Deity was rescued from isolation and re-evaluated in terms of ethical monotheism. Undoubtedly the fundamental concept has existed implicitly among all the races of mankind, but only in Israel did it become the prevailing and exclusive official religion of the community. In ancient Greece, for example, a few passages occur in the Homeric literature in which *Theos* is used in the abstract as the equivalent of Zeus, thus showing that the notion was not unknown in the Hellenic world. But polytheism continued to be the popular religion because it solved the theological problems more easily than monotheism, just as in Egypt Aton and Amon, after a short reign, returned to their proper place in the pantheon, being at the best but nature-gods raised to the highest power. But not so with Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews.

The Hebrew Monotheists.—The remarkable triumph of monotheism in Israel presupposes, as it seems to us, a series of deeply religious men who by virtue of their own spiritual experiences were able not only to give utterance to monotheistic beliefs, but also to keep alive in a minority of the nation the Faith as they had received it, till at last virtually the whole community was transformed into a monotheistic people. They saw behind all the phenomena of Nature one creative and sustaining, omniscient, and omnipotent Will—that of Jehovah the righteous Ruler of the universe, the Doer of justice, whose law is holy and whose power is infinite. That such a Deity should intervene in the course of Nature from time to time was not extraordinary, since He sends the wind, the ice, and the snow, speaks in the thunder, appears in the form of fire in the midst of a burning bush, controls the earthquake, and smites His enemies (Ex 3 [2], 19 [16]; Lev 10 [2]; Nu 11 [13], 16 [35]; Dt 4 [12]; 1 S 26 [10, 19]; 1 K 18 [24, 38]; Job 37 [10] f.; Ps 10 [17], 18 [7], 147 [16-17]; Jer 1 [13]). Clearly they were just ordinary men distinguished only by their religious experiences and spiritual insight (Am 7 [14]). They made no claim to scholarship, as the ancient philosophers did, and, in fact, they were conscious of the contrast between their own feelings and ideas on the one hand, and of the purpose and mind of God who constrained them on the other (Am 7 [2] ff.; Is 6 [5] ff., 22 [4] ff.). They spoke that they did know and testified that they had seen and heard. In the case of the prophets of the 8th century and onwards, the message of each bears the stamp of originality, of opposition to contemporary thought, of a word of God forcing itself to find expression through the human instrument. As Dr. Gore has said, here we seem to have 'a downrush from the super-conscious,' rather than an 'uprush from the sub-conscious'; in other words, a definite revelation from God to man independent of human reflection and discovery.

But if this claim for the doctrine of the prophets from Amos onwards be admitted, is there any adequate reason to deny that the earlier Hebrew monotheists, such as Abraham, Moses, and Elijah, were also the recipients of an external self-revelation? True, the evidence for the pre-prophetic religion rests upon documents belonging to a period removed by some centuries from the events described, but, as every anthropologist admits, deeply ingrained traditions cannot be set aside lightly in reconstructing the customs and beliefs of any people. Moreover, it would be contrary to what is known from other sources if eminently religious leaders did not arise from time to time capable of transforming, if only temporarily, the prevailing system of nature-worship and polytheism into at least a monolatry, and thereby preparing the way for the lofty ideals of Amos, Hosea, and the Deutero-Isaiah. The prophets, so far from regarding themselves as the originators of a new religion, looked back to the fathers of Israel as their prototypes, representing them-

selves rather in the light of reformers, reclaiming the people to the heights from which they had fallen.

If, as we believe, the doctrine of a benevolent and ethical Creator is not the product of philosophical thinking, or of the triumph of abstract over concrete thought, but the expression of a special kind of religious experience and emotion called forth from without (recurring among both primitive and civilized people, though normally confined to certain individuals), the tradition concerning the revelation vouchsafed to Moses at Sinai may well represent an historical fact. All the circumstances are such as would suggest a numinous experience calculated to call forth spiritual insight and the highest religious concepts. Sinai, 'the Mount of God,' probably derived its name from Sin, the Babylonian moon-god, and therefore it was regarded as a holy or numinous place, and the alleged revelation is represented as having been given amid the awe-inspiring phenomena of thunder, lightning, and the storm-cloud. 'The Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly' (Ex 19 [16] ff.). An experience of this kind in an ancient sanctuary could hardly fail to make a deep impression on a religiously minded person like Moses, and we know that thunder is invariably associated with the All-Father belief among primitive people. A desert tribe would naturally interpret an event of this kind in terms of a Supreme Being, and that the phenomena made a lasting impression on the folk-memory of Israel is apparent from the numerous references in the Old Testament to Jehovah having connexions with fire, storm, and earthquake (Nu 11 [1-3]; Dt 4 [11] ff.; Ps 29; Is 30 [30]; Jer 10 [13]; Jl 2 [11], 3 [16]; Am 1 [2]).

If only certain tribes went down into Egypt, it is not improbable that they had forgotten the name of the God of their fathers in Palestine.* Moses, however, having married into the Kenites (Ex 2 [21]), may have become acquainted with Jehovah during his sojourn in Midian, though scholars are very much divided about the theory that Moses derived his religion in the first instance from Jethro (Ex 18 [5-12]). There is nothing in the Old Testament to suggest that the God of the oppressed clans was formerly also the God of the Kenites, but it is important to remember in this connexion that the tribe of Judah, like the Rechabites (another desert people), had affinities with North Arabian tribes (Kenites, etc.), and both were staunch Jehovah-worshippers and champions of the Mosaic religion (Nu 10 [29] ff.; Jg 1 [16], 4 [11]; 1 S 15 [6], 30 [39]; 2 K 10 [15] ff.; Jer 35 [6] ff.). It is possible, therefore, that Moses may have been acquainted with a primitive conception of monotheism, possibly connected with the name Yau and the Sinaitic sanctuary, before he gave to Jehovah an entirely new meaning and significance as a result of his numinous experiences. But, however he may have discovered the Divine Name, it was undoubtedly he, in our opinion, who first declared to the Hebrews the doctrine of God as a mighty deliverer, having a special covenant relation with His people, and ruling all their religious and social life.

According to Dr. Burney, the tribes who remained in Palestine uninterruptedly from the time of the original migration in the second millennium B.C. also worshipped Jehovah, but only as a Semitic agricultural deity, having never been under the influence of Moses. This view accords with the fact that the northern kingdom was more infected by polytheism than Judah, and it also gives a reason for the persecution of certain Jehovah-worshippers in the days of Ahab (1 K 18 [4], 19 [14]; 2 K 9 [7]), while the four hundred Jehovah prophets escaped attack (1 K 22 [6]). It seems that there were virtually two religions in Israel connected with the worship of Jehovah—the religion of the desert and the religion of the agricultural community. This no doubt accounts for the attitude of the Rechabites and Nazirites towards the agricultural Canaanite culture, fearing lest their lofty ethical ideals should be contaminated by association with the local cults. Both sections, however, recognized Jehovah as supreme in Israel; but while the Mosaic minority looked upon Him as dwelling not in houses made with hands, the majority regarded Him as enshrined at Shiloh or Bethel or Jerusalem, and therefore dependent on a place. It was this latter conception that readily became assimilated with the original Semitic cults that still survived in Palestine, and led to such conflicts as that which took place on Mount Carmel (1 K 18 [19] ff.).

Elijah and Carmel.—Jezebel, the wife of Ahab, being a daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre and priest of Astarte, caused her husband to erect a sanctuary for the worship of her god Melkart, the Tyrian Baal, in Samaria (1 K 16 [31] ff.), while her

* This hypothesis creates serious difficulties. —A. G.

daughter Athaliah instituted a similar temple in Jerusalem (2 K 11 [18] ff.). The destructive drought that visited the land at the time afforded an excellent opportunity for the adherents of the ethical (Mosaic) Jehovah religion to precipitate a crisis and exterminate the rival Baal cult. After his decisive victory, Elijah (Jehovah is God) retired to the cave at Horeb (Sinai, the original home of his religion) for a new revelation of Jehovah (1 K 19). Like his great predecessor (Ex 33 [18-23]), he determined to stand in the cleft of the rock as Jehovah passed before him, and there, in the very spot at which Moses had assembled the tribes to give them the Law, and amid the numinous phenomena of hurricane, earthquake, and fire, a new command was vouchsafed, having far-reaching effects on the subsequent history of Israel. This event reveals a remarkable continuity with the Sinai manifestation to Moses, but with this difference. While Jehovah is still represented as associated with the awe-inspiring forces of Nature, the hushed whisper of the human voice is made the medium for His self-disclosure. Apart from this, Elijah's conception of monotheism does not appear to have differed essentially from that of Moses. For both Jehovah is the God of the Hebrews, and Him alone must the people serve, though probably neither would have denied the existence of other gods among other nations. Thus when Ahab and Manasseh tried to set up the cults of foreign deities, the mono-Jehovists resisted to the utmost of their capacity because, according to their theology, Jehovah was a jealous God who would tolerate no rival or companion in Israel.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding the reforms of Elijah, and the subsequent efforts of such kings as Asa in Judah (1 K 15 [12-14]) and Jehu in the northern kingdom (2 K 10 [18] ff.), the cults of the Canaanite deities continued to flourish (2 K 12 [3]). Zion remained the earthly home of Jehovah, it is true, and in consequence desperate efforts were made to centralize worship at Jerusalem, but it was to the high places or local sanctuaries that the people persistently resorted, despite the destructive measures instituted by such reformers as Hezekiah (2 K 18 [4]) and Josiah (23). Even after the Exile, the cults of these ancient sanctuaries were still practised (Ezr 9), and in the days of Zephaniah 'the remnant of Baal' had not been cut off (Zeph 1 [4]). Moreover, in the 8th century, Assyrian influences were beginning to make their way in Israel, so that, in addition to the Canaanite vegetation religion, solar cults were introduced and incense burned to the Zodiac and all the host of heaven (2 K 21 [3] ff., 23 [5] ff., [11] ff.). It was against these 'abominations' that the pre-exilic prophets raised their cry, recalling the people to the Mosaic-Elijah recognition of Jehovah as the one and only national God, and adding sometimes the further consideration that He was the controller of the destinies of other nations as well. Thus, prior to the Deutero-Isaiah, the monotheists were feeling their way towards the exaltation of Jehovah as the God of all the earth (Am 9 [7]), whose sphere is universal, and who, if need be, would destroy His own vineyard (Is 5), and act as a stranger to His chosen people (Jer 14 [8] ff.), making even Nebuchadrezzar His servant to punish His wayward children (Jer 25 [9]). This shows a definite advance on the earlier monolatrous doctrine of Jehovah as the jealous national God guiding merely the destinies of a particular community.

While it has to be remembered that psychological concepts do not admit of division into an evolutionary sequence comparable to the geological record of the earth, certain ideas and experiences being as ultimate for man as a religious and social being, as specific physiological reactions are for him as a biological entity, it is possible, nevertheless, to postulate three stages in the development of Hebrew monotheism. The earliest is represented by the worship of Jehovah either solely or in association with other gods (i.e. Mosaic-Elijah monolatry). This apparently continued down to and even after the Exile, but during this period there appears to have been two distinct attitudes towards Jehovah, both parties, however, regarding Him as supreme in Israel. In the 8th century the Mosaic-Elijah faith triumphed, and gradually there arose a wider conception of the Deity as the controller of the destinies of all nations, though at this stage it did not necessarily entail the denial of the existence of other gods. Lastly, in the 6th century, with the Deutero-Isaiah, came the explicit formulation of monotheism proclaiming Jehovah as the one and only God.

The real miracle of Judaism, however, is not so much the development of the belief in a Supreme God, Creator, and Sovereign of the world, as in the maintenance of this ethical doctrine as the prevailing and official religion of the nation against the natural polytheistic

tendency of the majority of the people. Apart from the notion of a self-revelation, the only explanation of this unique phenomenon is that it was an accident of history. This latter argument is hardly calculated to carry much conviction in view of the fact that the Hebrews drew the whole of their material culture from the great empires that surrounded them—Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, the Hittites, and Crete—everything except their gods. True, as we have shown, the polytheistic majority frequently and persistently fell away from the worship of Jehovah, but even in the worst times of the northern kingdom, there was no actual apostasy, but only an attempt to establish the cults of foreign gods, mainly for political reasons, in addition to, but never exclusive of the worship of Jehovah. Moreover, the monotheistic minority always ultimately prevailed till at length, in the 2nd century B.C., virtually the entire nation acknowledged exclusively one ethical, universal Deity. Furthermore, in the official documents it is monotheism, implicit or explicit, that is always clearly and definitely maintained. This is well illustrated from the Biblical Creation stories.

(5) **Cosmogony**—*Gen* 1-2 [4] (*P. Cosmogony*).—Of the two distinct cosmogonies with which the Bible opens, the first—Gen 1-2 [4], a product of the post-exilic priestly school—is the more complete and systematized narrative. That this has been influenced by the corresponding Babylonian Creation legends will hardly be disputed in these days by any well-informed person, though the tendency of modern scholarship is to emphasize the divergences rather than the points of contact between the two versions. The Babylonian cosmogony is set forth in seven tablets, just as the Hebrew story distributes the work of Creation over seven days. So far as can be determined from the fragmentary tablets, the order of events is much the same in both. In the beginning a primeval ocean-flood, personified by a male and female being (Apsu and Tiamat), alone prevailed. From this arose the successive generations of the gods of the upper and under worlds, who quarrelled about the creation of light. A great conflict ensued between Marduk and Tiamat (the mother of all the gods)—according to another version it was Apsu—the account of which occupies three tablets. Finally Marduk succeeded in catching Tiamat in a net, drove an evil wind into her mouth, and cut her in two halves, one of which he stretched across the sky to prevent the waters which were in her veins from breaking forth again. The other half was confined under the earth and sea to feed the springs. So the waters that were above the firmament were divided from those that were below. The heavenly bodies had existed before the war with Tiamat, Marduk himself having been at one time a sun-god, and it was he who fixed the course of the planets, placing a door at either end of heaven through which the sun passed in and out. He also regulated the calendar, dividing the year into twelve months; the moon, and probably also the sun, as in Genesis, being 'for signs and for seasons, for days and years.' The fifth tablet is so fragmentary that its contents cannot be determined, but it is sometimes supposed to contain an account of the creation of animals and plants. We know from the bilingual story of Creation, published by Pinches in 1891, that Marduk was regarded as having made 'the beasts of the field, the living creatures of the desert, the Tigris and the Euphrates, the grass, the marsh-plant, the reed, the forest, the verdure of the plain, lands, marshes, thickets, and plantations.' It is not improbable that this information was recorded on the fifth tablet, as in the corresponding 'day' of the Hebrew story. This would accord with the fact that on the sixth tablet, which again is defective, the creation of man is described as the culmination of Creation. The gods were lonely despite the world having been made and inhabited. Therefore they brought mankind into being to build temples and altars and offer sacrifices and prayers to them. The gods approved of the creative functions of Marduk, and the seventh tablet consists of his glorious names representing his manifold powers, and the attributes of the other gods transferred to him.

The glory of Marduk is also extolled in the bilingual legend from Nippur in Akkad, the object of which seems to have been to set forth the cities and temples of Babylon, Nippur, Erech, and Eridu as divine foundations. It starts with the primeval ocean pervading everything as in the Seven Tablets, the dry land appearing through the gathering together of the waters into a channel. Eridu was formed first that 'the gods might sit in a pleasant place,' and there man first appeared, created by Marduk, though the goddess Aruru is introduced from an earlier version as sharing in the

act—'making the seed of mankind with him,' together with the flora and fauna of the world. Marduk, however, is represented as the creator of the gods.

That these myths were known to the writer of Gen 1-2 [4] and influenced his narrative will hardly be doubted, since both stories begin with a description of a primeval ocean out of which life was generated, and which was divided to form heaven and earth. Light was prior to the existence of luminaries, while the 'wind that moved on the face of the waters' in the Biblical version may be a dim reflection of Marduk using wind as his weapon against Tiamat. The order of events in both more or less coincides. But in their main points the two accounts are practically distinct. Thus not only has the Hebrew narrative been purged of the grosser polytheism which occupies so much of the Babylonian legends, but the fundamental conceptions of Creation and the nature and attributes of the Deity are utterly different. Throughout the priestly story maintains a thoroughly spiritual and sane cosmogony and ethical monotheism in place of the fantastic, puerile, and polytheistic fancies of its Babylonian counterpart. The Deity is set forth as the external transcendent Creator of all things visible and invisible, omniscient and omnipotent, in accordance with the theology of the post-exilic reformation. Even though the primeval waters are said to have brought forth living things, they are clearly His creation, and owed their creative functions to the 'Spirit of God' moving upon them. Dualism is avoided by the elimination of the quarrel about the creation of light, and nature-worship excluded by the origin and entire control of the natural world, its attributes and inhabitants being assigned to the one and only Creator. The waters above and below the firmament are in His hands; He made the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit, and gave them their powers of reproduction, just as the beasts of the field and the creatures in the air and sea increase and multiply in accordance with His ordinance, and without the aid or intervention of magical rites and fertility cults. Similarly, since God made the sun, moon, and stars, little room is left for the introduction of a polytheistic worship of the heavenly bodies, as in Babylonia, where the monolatrous movement failed because the people were unable to regard each and every god as the highest deity without conflicting with the claims of any other god. The Priestly writer assigned to one God all those attributes which hitherto had been distributed among many deities, and by placing the animal creation under the domination of man, he removed the temptation to worship the creature rather than the Creator. Again, if making man in the image of God fostered an anthropomorphic conception of the Deity, it was better so in those days than that He should be regarded as a nature-god, since the Semitic mind, unlike that of the Greek, was reluctant to picture to itself a human-shaped deity, whereas the vegetation cults proved extremely attractive.

Gen 2 [4]-3 (*J Cosmogony*).—In the earlier (pre-exilic) cosmogony of the J document (Gen 2 [4]-3), the creation of man, his nature and destiny, receive much fuller treatment than in the later Priestly narrative. The world is assumed as already existing, although at first it was barren and desolate because the Lord God (Jehovah Elohim) had not caused rain to fall upon it, and there were no men to till the ground. Then a mist ascended and watered the earth, and Jehovah Elohim made man out of the dust of the ground, breathing into his nostrils the breath of life. Next the Creator planted a garden eastward in Eden, irrigated by a river, and placed the man in this terrestrial paradise to till and guard it. Seeing it was not good for man to be alone, He determined to give him a companion, and to this end He created all the beasts of the field, and the birds of the air, and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them. But none of them proved to be a suitable mate for the man, so Jehovah Elohim caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and while he slept He removed one of his ribs, and clothing it with flesh made of it woman. On seeing this new creation, the man at once recognized her as his partner—'this is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh'—and he thereupon made her his wife. Now all would have been well for this happy pair, free from care and toil in the delightful garden, if the serpent, the arch-enemy of mankind, had not planned otherwise.

As a crowning act of mercy, the benevolent Creator seems to have intended to give Adam and Eve the gift of immortality, but left them free to accept or reject this great offer. Here, however, the narrative is somewhat confused. In its present form, the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil alone occupies the central position in the garden, but

the casual mention of the tree of life (3 [22, 24]) at the end of the story has led scholars to think that either originally there were two narratives, in one of which the tree of life figured alone, and in the other the tree of knowledge alone, the two having been skilfully blended into a single story; or, as Frazer suggests with less probability, that against the tree of life stood the tree of death, which has been changed in the Hebrew version into the tree of knowledge. On this latter view, the Deity is supposed to have commissioned the serpent to tell the human pair to eat of the tree of life but avoid the tree of death. The serpent, however, perverted the message, persuading the woman to eat of the latter, appropriating the life-giving fruit to himself. That the Hebrew writer was acquainted with a story in which man lost immortality accidentally or by a similar device is very probable, as in the Gilgamesh epic, one of the oldest Semitic legends, a serpent is represented as stealing from Gilgamesh a plant which 'would make an old man young again.' In another myth (to which Frazer makes no allusion) Adapa is said to have been offered the food and water of life by Anu, but refused it because Ea his creator, who had withheld the gift of immortality from him, warned him that he would be offered the food and water of death which he must refuse. So he missed the boon by obeying this injunction.

In the legend of Enki-du, as given in Tablet 1 of the Gilgamesh epic, man (Enki-du) was formed out of the clay by Aruru in the image of Anu, the head of the Babylonian pantheon, and remained with the beasts of the field, just as Adam reviewed and named the animals. Both Adam and Enki-du chose woman to be their life-companion to their undoing. In the Babylonian legend the man was enticed to Erech by his wife, Samhat, while in Genesis it was Eve who persuaded Adam to eat the forbidden fruit. In the Enki-du story, however, the serpent does not occur, though it is possible that there is a connexion between *Havva* (the Hebrew form of the name Eve) and an Aramaic word meaning 'serpent,' and that the serpent therefore is a later insertion in the story, the original form of which represented the woman as the tempter, as in the Enki-du legend. In any case, the J cosmogony appears to have been influenced by the Gilgamesh epic, though the Hebrew writer very likely was also acquainted with a myth in which the food of life was offered and rejected through the serpent perverting the message sent to man. The colouring, however, is Palestinian, fertility being represented as dependent upon rain, and not, as in Babylonia, on the overflowing of rivers.

The substratum of the story probably belongs to the ancient folklore of Palestine, and this has been overlaid by Babylonian elements, and the whole thoroughly Hebraized in the pre-exilic period to explain the origin of man and woman, the marital relationship, and the beginning of clothing in connexion with the sense of shame that accompanies adolescence, and possibly the antipathy to serpents, together with such problems as why children are brought forth in sorrow and travail, and man must eat his bread in the sweat of his brow; the subjection of woman to man and his relation to the animals. All these questions are answered in a fanciful and delightfully childish manner without any gross polytheistic fertility traits generally conspicuous in agricultural mythology. The view of God, in spite of crude anthropomorphisms, is that of the 8th-century prophets, Creation being the work of Jehovah Elohim only, who is holy, just, and transcendent, exercising His sovereign will over mankind, yet repenting of the evil wrought by wayward humanity.

The Fall.—Exactly how far the doctrine of the Fall and of Original Sin is implied in this cosmogony it is difficult to say. The belief in the goodness of the Creator necessarily carries with it the notion of a 'first sin,' since a benevolent God could not create man inherently evil. But while the initial act of disobedience recorded in Gen 3 brought down upon the offenders an exterior punishment, there is no suggestion that this included a bias towards evil in Adam's descendants. On the contrary, when the problem of sin was systematically investigated by the Jews after the Exile, human wickedness was explained in relation to the strange myth concerning the Nephilim in Gen 6 [4]. This is very apparent in the Book of Enoch and the apocalyptic literature generally, but although this view continued down to the Christian era as a popular belief, the official Rabbinical doctrine of evil, as at the present day, was based on Gen 8 [21] and 6 [5]. Moreover, even as a popular theory, the Nephilim were unsatisfactory because they failed to explain the continuance of sin after the Flood. Gradually, therefore, another interpretation of the Fall arose based on the assumption that the original state of

the first parents was one of unfallen righteousness, till their initial act of disobedience in the garden brought sin and death into the world as the enduring heritage of the human race. It was this theory which St. Paul used to explain the doctrine of Redemption (Rom 5^{12} ff.; 1 Cor $15^{21, 22}$). It deeply affected Christian theology, though it is to be noted that no such theory is ever alluded to by our Lord. Christ certainly did not represent human nature as utterly corrupt, but at the same time He taught that man had fallen very far short of the original purpose of his creation. This applies both to the individual and to the race as a whole. The seat of sin, however, is in the will and not in matter. Therefore redemption necessitated the restoration of the will to a right relationship with God. If in the subconscious there is stored up the memories of our primeval experiences, as some psychologists surmise, it is possible that we start life with perverted instincts, but in any case we are inheritors of a social tradition that has gone wrong. In this fallen condition man could never fulfil his true vocation, and Christ being the Image of God in human terms revealed what man essentially is and what he may become. He started as it were a 'new race,' a regenerated humanity, to enable man to realize the purpose of his creation. 'As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' Therefore, while there may be in Gen 3 (and in the Watcher-legend of Gen 6) remaining traces of the idea of God as grudging to man all such knowledge as would increase his power and independence—what has been called the '*Prometheus-motif*'—there is also a deeper meaning in the allegorical eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Man as a moral being became conscious of ethical distinction between right and wrong, and thus incurred moral responsibility. So our Lord represented our life here as a state of probation in which we may, if we will, move towards perfection as members of a redeemed race by accepting His offer of salvation. In short, Christ became 'what we are, that He might make us what He is.'

The Flood.—The Flood is represented as the sequel to the degeneration of the human race in both P and J. The P narrative gives a chronological list of ten patriarchs to connect the Deluge with the Creation (Gen 5), and then describes in detail the construction of the ark (6^{13-16}), the blessing of Noah 'the righteous' and his sons, and the opening of the subterranean fountains and the windows of heaven in the 600th year of Noah's life ($7^{6, 11}$). After the Deluge a new age commences in which the former restrictions on the shedding of blood are removed to a very considerable degree (9^{1-7}). The story closes with the covenant sign in the form of the rainbow as the perpetual memorial that the catastrophe shall never occur again (9^{8-17}).

Traditions of a deluge in which almost the whole of mankind perished are part of the folklore of primitive people in many parts of the world. So numerous, in fact, are the examples that they occupy nearly one-sixth (258 pages) of Sir James Frazer's work on *The Folklore of the Old Testament*. The origin of these legends has sometimes been attributed to local inundations resulting from seismic action, violent storms, and even the disappearance of the ice at the end of the Glacial period. Others have seen in them an attempted explanation of such phenomena as lake and islands, land and sea, while Professor Elliot Smith has recently connected the deluge myth with the slaying of mankind to rejuvenate the king in ancient Egypt, an event which, in his view, has become confused with an inundation of the Nile. In this way he makes the essential incident in the legend not the Flood but the destruction of mankind.

Whatever may have been the ultimate origin of the myth, it is clear that the Biblical narratives derive their inspiration from the Babylonian and Sumerian legends. The Chaldean account of the Deluge, discovered by Mr. George Smith in 1872 among the remains of the library of King Ashur-bani-pal at Nineveh (668-626 B.C.), makes the all-destroying flood the result of the anger of the gods at the sins of men. Ea, the lord of wisdom, revealed their purpose to Ut-napishtim, the Babylonian Noah, and bade him escape by building a great ship, 120 cubits high, and divided into six stories, each containing nine rooms. Into this vessel Ut-napishtim brought the 'seed of life of every sort,' together with all that he had of gold and silver. At the time appointed the storm burst, and for a whole day the tempest raged, the waters rising on the mountains. In heaven even the gods were afraid of the deluge, and climbed up into the heaven of Anu. Ishtar lamented the day when she commanded evil in the assembly of the gods for the destruction of her people. For six days and nights the deluge prevailed, and on the seventh day the

storm ceased, but only to reveal that all mankind was turned to clay, and the fields had become a swamp. After twelve 'double hours' (i.e. perhaps 'days') an island arose, and the ship held fast on Mount Nisir. Whereupon Ut-napishtim sent forth a dove, but there was no resting-place for her so she returned. The same happened when he released a swallow. Subsequently, however, a raven was despatched, and finding that the waters had abated, she did not return. The inhabitants of the ship thereupon disembarked, and Ut-napishtim offered a sacrifice on the mountain around which these gods gathered like flies when they smelt the sweet savour. Ishtar reproached Bel (Enlil) because, instead of destroying a single place, he had wrought this wholesale destruction of mankind. At first Enlil was wroth at the escape of Ut-napisthim, but later he was brought to a better frame of mind, and took his adversary by the hands and blessed him and his wife, making him like unto the gods.

This legend, of course, might be explained as a Babylonian version of the Hebrew story, since it was discovered in a library no older than the 7th century B.C., if it were not that more ancient Deluge myths have been found which are clearly the prototypes of both the Genesis and the later Babylonian legends. Thus a fragmentary Flood story occurs on a broken tablet at Abu-Habbah (the site of the ancient city of Sippar), assigned to about the year 1966 B.C., while at Nippur a Sumerian version was discovered in 1912 which can hardly have been written later than the end of the third millennium B.C. More recently (1919) another Flood-text has come to light on a tablet of the same series and of the same period. This Sumerian legend, being so very much older than either the Genesis or Babylonian myths, is obviously the source whence the later stories were derived, though, in the case of the Hebrew narrative, the original has undergone a thorough revision by later writers.

As in the Babylonian account, Enlil or Bel tried to destroy the human race by a deluge, but Enki (i.e. Ea) warned man (Zuidsuddu) of the impending danger. Zuidsuddu (i.e. Ut-napishtim = Noah) then built a ship, and for seven days and nights the rain-storm continued, till at the end of this time the sun-god came forth and the waters abated. A gap in the text follows, after which the man is represented as offering a sacrifice to the sun-god, and becoming immortal. The similarities between this Sumerian legend and the later Semitic story are so apparent that there can be no doubt about the former being the prototype, from whatever source the Sumerians in their turn may have derived it. After passing through several Babylonian versions, finally it became incorporated in the Gilgamesh epic, while the Genesis narrative represents a monotheistic and spiritualized edition of the Sumerian-Babylonian story. In both the divine powers determined to destroy all flesh by a flood, a man having been directed to save himself and his family by building a large vessel, the dimensions of which are similar. J compares with the Babylonian story in the special mention of the number seven, in the prominence given to the downpour of rain, the sending out of the birds at intervals, and the offering of the sacrifices to the deity after the waters had abated. P shows points of contact in regard to the size and description of the ark, and the grounding of it on Mount Ararat, the rainbow, and the covenant. Since the Sumerian-Babylonian texts are the earlier, the Hebrew account must have been derived from them, unless both were taken from a common source. The Biblical story is clearly Babylonian and not Palestinian in setting, but the differences between them in certain details may indicate that both traditions proceeded from a common original current among the ancestors of the two peoples in remote times. Jastrow thinks that the Hebrews introduced the legend into Palestine with their first migration in the third millennium B.C., a suggestion that certainly is more probable than that which would derive it from the native Canaanites after the conquest of the land, as the narratives show no traces of a Canaanite element.

The Tower of Babel.—It is not improbable that originally the Hebrews had a cycle of traditions in which the continuous progress of the human race was not interrupted by a deluge (Gen 4^{17-24}). This may explain some of the inconsistencies in the account of the building of the city and tower of Babel (11^{1-9}) with which the J cosmogony concludes, in relation to the foregoing story of the Flood. The reference to 'the whole earth speaking one language,' for instance, obviously implies the existence of considerably more than the 'eight souls' of Noah's family who survived the catastrophe. The Babel narrative is clearly quite independent of the Priestly tradition where diversity of speech is

attributed to the division of mankind into nations dwelling in a variety of widely separated countries (10 5, 20, 31), and not to a miraculous intervention of the Deity as in J.

The confusion of tongues and the dispersion of mankind have been regarded as a curse by many peoples, and although numerous myths occur in different parts of the world to explain the misfortune, no parallel to the Genesis legend has been found as yet in the Babylonian cosmogonies. The setting, however, appears to be Babylonian, though expert opinion is still divided concerning the site of the tower of Babel between the ruins of Birs-Nimrod at old Borsippa, to the south of Babylon; the ruins still called Babil, within the circuit of ancient Babylon itself; and the ruined temple-tower at Mugheir (probably Ur of the Chaldees). On the other hand, the tradition may not have originated in Babylonia at all, since Babylon is represented in an unfavourable light, though it apparently was regarded as the centre of civilization. But wherever and however the story arose, in its present form, while the naive anthropomorphisms of the J cosmogony are retained, the cruder polytheistic elements have been systematically eliminated. Jehovah is represented as coming down from heaven to see the city and tower, and He was jealous and afraid lest the people should invade His celestial abode. 'This is what they begin to do; and now nothing will be withholden from them, which they purpose to do.' To prevent this, He determined to 'go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech' —the plural of the verbs in 11 7, being perhaps a survival of the original polytheistic version of the narrative, retained as a 'plural of majesty.' Thus the work at the city and tower was made to cease, and the men were scattered abroad upon the face of the earth.

While the setting of the story is so essentially primitive in its outlook, in spirit it belongs fundamentally to the thought of the Hebrew monotheists, like the rest of the Biblical Creation narratives. The Deity is represented as the supreme controller of the actions and presumptions of men, bringing down the haughtiness of the proud that He alone may be exalted (Is 2 11-17). The Deutero-Isaiah seems to have been acquainted with the current cosmogonies, and, like the later Psalmists, he emphasized the spiritual and monotheistic interpretation of the popular stories by insisting on the absolute supremacy of Jehovah over creation (Is 55 6 ff.). It was the Priestly narrative (Gen 1-2 4) apparently that formed the basis of the later Jewish thought concerning Creation, the universe being represented as the expression of the power and wisdom of God, whose wonderful works are manifest in the midst of the earth (Ps 74 12-17, 89 7-14, 114; Pr 8 23-31). But along with this some of the older mythologies seem to have survived, and reminiscences of primordial struggles between the gods and the monsters of the deep, so prominent in Babylonian Creation legends, recur in a book as relatively late as that of Job (7 12, 9 13, 26 12 ff., 40, 41: cf. Ps 148 7; Is 30 7, 51 9; 2 Esd 6 49-52), where Jehovah does battle with mythical subterranean creatures as Rahab, Leviathan, Behemoth, the flying serpent, and the dragon. Such lapses were an almost inevitable consequence of the retention in Genesis of the Semitic cosmogony with its upper and lower firmament above and below the earth. If Jehovah dwelt in the upper chamber beyond the windows of heaven, through which the water above descended, there would be naturally a tendency in the popular mind to look upon the great watery abyss beneath as the abode of the monsters of contemporary folklore. But despite the constant recurrence of these less edifying allusions, the Hebrew cosmogonies illustrate in a very remarkable manner the triumph of ethical monotheism in Israel during the prophetic era, especially after the Exile.

No people so successfully reinterpreted and spiritualized their legendary history as did the Jews, making the ancient myths invaluable parables of moral and religious truth, setting forth the unchanging verities respecting the nature of God and man. To mistake the stories for scientific statements of fact is to do them an injustice almost as great as to deny them a place in inspired literature. Science rightly regards the material universe as operating automatically through natural law, but an automaton, however automatically it works, may still be the creation of Mind. Science as such does not deal with ultimate origins and values, and here the Priestly writer supplies an eternal truth about Creation outside the scope of scientific definition, when he postulates, 'in the beginning, God.' Again, amid all the naive anthropomorphisms of the earlier J story, there emerges the thought that man's disobedience to the higher light within him involves not only the death of the body, which is inevitable, but a death of the

soul, or, as we should say in theological language, a falling away from grace. Free-will is a fact of experience, and it implies responsibility and entails far-reaching consequences. It is therefore hardly surprising that these poetic and allegorical descriptions should have been made the vehicle for conveying to more enlightened generations revealed truths and divine instruction about matters above and beyond the realms of scientific observation.

(6) **Immortality**—*Egypt.*—The Hebrew attitude towards the doctrine of immortality demands some consideration, especially in view of its peculiarities. From the earliest times of which we have knowledge, i.e. from the middle of the Old Stone Age, the eternal question of questions has passed down from grave-side to grave-side: 'If a man die, shall he live again?' Although to the primitive mind death probably appeared as a sleep that knows no waking, it is evident from the ample provision made for his welfare in the hereafter, that death was not the ultimate end of human existence for cave man and his successors, whatever may be true of the Lower Palæolithic races. With the beginnings of civilization in the ancient East in the middle of the fourth millennium B.C., this cult of the dead received an enormous impetus, and in the Nile Valley it was the dynamic in the production of the culture that has made Egypt renowned throughout the ages. The care and extraordinary skill employed in the mummification of the bodies of the ruling classes after death, and the preservation of the likeness of the deceased—an art that reached perfection from the eighteenth to twenty-first dynasties (cf. the mummies of Yuaa, Tuaa, and of Seti I)—the magnificence and luxurious equipment of the royal tombs, and the complex and contradictory beliefs concerning the hereafter, show the Egyptian's passionate desire for immortality. His first concern, in fact, seems to have been to provide himself with an eternal habitation on the most magnificent scale possible, and to ensure that his corruptible body should put on incorruption. Thus he spared no trouble or expense in his attempt to conquer death by mechanical devices calculated to render the body imperishable, and convey him to the celestial realms of the sun-god Re, or to the kingdom of Osiris.

Babylonia.—In Babylonia the doctrine of immortality was also quite definitely maintained, but it never occupied the prominent place assigned to it by the Egyptians. No attempt at mummification appears to have been made either by the Sumerians or the Semites, and although inhumation in brick vaults containing funeral furniture was the common method of disposal, cremation was also sometimes adopted. The body seems to have had some connexion with the fate of the soul, as the greatest misfortune that could befall the deceased was to be unburied, but it never attained to the prominence assigned to it in Egypt. In the later myths the dead are represented as passing to a gloomy subterranean region (Arallu) without distinction of rank, where 'even light is as darkness.' But the fear of the return of the departed to their old haunts, and the provision made in the graves for their well-being, suggest that this was a later and specialized development of an earlier belief in the life of the dead in the tomb and in an underworld. But in the myth of the descent of Ishtar into the 'Land of No-return' (Hades) in search of Tammuz the sun-god, recorded on tablets belonging to the library of Ashur-bani-pal (*c.* 650 B.C.), the unfortunate inhabitants are definitely represented as clothed with wings like birds, but unable to escape from their underground prison, the seven gates of which are guarded and under the watchful eye of the goddess Ereshkigal, 'the ruler of the great place.' Their food is the clay, and the dust is their sustenance; 'light they see not, in darkness do they sit.' As she passed through the gates, Ishtar was deprived of her garments one by one, till, finally, she reached Hades naked, and was at once smitten with diseases in her eyes, sides, feet, heart, and head. Being a goddess, she was able to secure release through the intervention of Ea, but this apparently was not possible for ordinary mortals.

In the Gilgamesh epic there is an account of the journey of Gilgamesh, the legendary king and hero of Erech, to the island of the dead, Dilmun, in search of immortality. Like Ishtar, he was also allowed to return, but the expedition proved fruitless so far as the solution of the problem of immortality is concerned. Ut-napishtim whom he encountered was not in the sad plight of the inhabitants of the Land of No-return visited by Ishtar, for his 'appearance was not changed,' but when Gilgamesh was allowed to speak with Enki-du, his former companion who was then in the underworld, and asked him to relate 'the law of the land which he had seen,' the only reply he solicited was: 'I cannot tell thee, my friend, I cannot

tell thee. If I were to tell thee the law of the earth which I have experienced, you would sit down and weep the whole day.' This probably represents the last word of the Babylonian theologians about the doctrine of immortality, though even in these gloomy legends there are traces of a larger hope. This is more apparent in the annual Tammuz Festival, the underlying motive of which is that of resurrection and life. Again, in the practice of placing incense before statues of the departed at the sacred ceremony of breaking bread and pouring out water for the souls of the dead—a ceremony strangely suggestive of the Egyptian ritual of 'opening the mouth of the mummy'—there seems to be a survival of the notion of reanimation. In this connexion it is interesting that Herodotus alleges the Babylonians to have embalmed the dead in honey (i, 198), and although no embalmed bodies have been found, a cuneiform text mentions embalming with cedar oil. It would seem, then, that Egyptian influences were not entirely absent from the Babylonian conception of immortality. But, even so, the prevailing idea in later times undoubtedly was more akin to that of the author of Ecclesiastes: 'All go unto one place, all are of the dust, and all turn to dust' (3 [20]).

Sheol.—This uninspiring doctrine was apparently common to the Babylonians and the Hebrews about the time of the Exile. Thus the philosophy censured by the first Isaiah, 'let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die' (22 [13]), was apparently an echo of the words of Gilgamesh as he gave up the search for immortality, 'Thou, Gish, let thy body be filled, day and night, dance (?) and joy (?).' The gift of life and death belongs to the gods, and men cannot wrest it from them. All they can hope for is length of days, health and prosperity. This was clearly also the official view of the hereafter in Israel at the beginning of the prophetic period (8th century and later). The dead are represented in the writings of this period as lying huddled together in a subterranean region of darkness, covered with dust, conscious but inactive and silent (Gen 3 [19]; Job 10 [22]; Ps 22 [15], 30 [9], 31 [17], 49 [19], 115 [17], 143 [3]; Is 47 [5]). Even kings and rulers had their final habitation with the 'rephaim' or shades of the departed, and, putting off their former pomp and glory, became 'weak' as they (Job 3 [13-19], 14 [12-14]). 'The small and the great are there, and the servant is free from his master.' Nothing could be less inspiring, in fact, than the conception of immortality that persisted in Israel till long after the Exile. That it was largely influenced by Babylonia is obvious, Sheol being the Hebrew counterpart of the Land of No-return—a shadowy existence of inactivity, cut off from all the interests of terrestrial life, and in particular excluded from all relation with Jehovah. 'In death there is no remembrance of thee; in Sheol who shall give thee thanks?' (Ps 6 [5]; cf. Ps 88 [5, 10-12], 115 [17]; Is 38 [18, 19], 47 [5]). Unlike Osiris in Egypt, Jehovah was regarded essentially as the God of the living, and consequently He had no connexions with the land of the dead and its inhabitants. Therefore all trafficking with Sheol was forbidden by the monotheists on the ground that it involved unfaithfulness to Jehovah.

This modification of the Babylonian doctrine of immortality, however, was not the original belief of the Hebrews, and it never seems to have met with any very general acceptance in Israel. In early times Sheol was regarded as a rather nebulous nether-world whence the dead could return to the body, or hover around the grave. This doubtless explains the abundant archæological evidence of food offerings in the shaft tombs and rock-cut chambers belonging alike to the Israelite and pre-Israelite periods in Palestine (cf. Dt 26 [14]). Moreover, the mourning ceremonies such as the rending of the garments (Gen 37 [34]; 2 S 1 [11], 3 [31]), the laceration of the body and cutting off of the hair (Lev 19 [27, 28], 21 [1-5]; Is 15 [2]; Jer 16 [6], 41 [5], 47 [5]; Ezek 7 [18]; Am 8 [10]; Mic 1 [16]), the putting on of sackcloth (2 S 3 [31]; Is 22 [12]; Ezek 27 [31]), fasting (1 S 31 [13]; 2 S 1 [12]), lamentation and wailing (Gen 37 [34]; 2 S 3 [31] ff.; 1 K 13 [30]; Jer 22 [18]), testify to the existence of a developed cult of the dead in Israel comparable to that which prevails elsewhere among primitive people. If the departed were merely prisoners in Sheol, as the later writers suggest, food offerings at the grave and mourning ceremonies would be meaningless, and contrary to the motives underlying these customs among other peoples as they are known to anthropologists. Again, the care bestowed on the body in later times looks uncommonly like a survival of an earlier method of disposal in which embalmment was adopted (2 Ch 16 [14]; Mk 16 [1]; Mt 27 [59]; Lk 23 [55]; Jn 11 [44], 19 [39], 20 [6, 7]), especially as the Jews were particularly conservative where the cult of the dead was concerned. The mummification of Jacob and Joseph (Gen 50 [1-3, 26]) was, of course, due directly to Egyptian influence, but the respect

shown to the bones of the skeleton, which were sometimes regarded as the equivalent of the individual (Gen 2 21 f., 29 14; Job 4 14 ff., 20 11; Ps 35 10), points to some conception of the revivification of the physical body after death having obtained in Israel as among other people who adopt this custom. (Brinton in his *Myths of the New World* [New York, 1876], 257, for instance, describes the practice as it occurs in Central America.) Again, the Hebrews thought apparently that the preservation of the bones sufficed to preserve the whole body intact (Gen 50 25; Ex 13 19; Jos 24 32; 2 S 21 13; 1 K 13 31), and, conversely, to disturb them brought about the disquieting of the deceased (1 K 13 31; 2 K 23 16; Jer 8 1, 2; Am 2 1). Moreover, beside these ritual survivals, the story of the earthly paradise with its tree of life (Gen 3), and the mountain garden where the king of Tyre dwelt (Ezek 28 13 f., 31 8 ff.: cf. Is 14), contain unmistakable traces of a doctrine of immortality very different from that of Sheol, and comparable to the belief in an idealized earthly life similar to the Egyptian notion of the fields of Aalu, where the dead passed a luxurious hereafter under the happiest conditions.

Necromancy.—But side by side with these undefined beliefs, the practice of necromancy seems to have been common in Israel. Thus the witch of Endor called up the shade of Samuel at the command of Saul (1 S 28 7 ff.), and the fact that the king had previously 'put away out of the land all who had familiar spirits, and the wizards,' shows that this form of divination was established, or at any rate tolerated, among the Hebrews as among the rest of the Semites. From Is 8 19 it would appear that, despite Saul's attempted suppression, necromancy prevailed throughout the period of the monarchy (cf. Is 19 3, 29 4). It was probably largely because of its prevalence that the monotheists took such an uncompromising attitude towards any traffic with Sheol (Dt 18 10 f.; Lev 19 31, 20 6, 27), insisting that instead of resorting to those who have familiar spirits, the people should seek unto their God. But this was easier said than done. As long as it was believed to be possible to communicate with the dead concerning the future, the reformers were but a voice crying in the wilderness. The realization of this doubtless influenced them in their formulation of their doctrine of human survival in an inactive, silent, semi-conscious state as 'weak ones,' incapable of even praising Jehovah. True, they allowed certain expressions of the cult of the dead to continue, as for example in the case of those mourning ceremonies which did not necessarily imply more than a continuation of life beyond the grave, but they endeavoured to give them a Jehovistic interpretation, such as a rending of the heart as a sign of grief for the nation's infidelity (Jl 2 12, 13), to direct attention away from their original significance. But every practice which seemed to suggest the belief in any other god than Jehovah, or which could be construed to mean a cult of the dead, was suppressed (Lev 21 1-5, 19 27, 28).

Immortality in Post-exilic Israel.—Nevertheless, if the Jehovah religion was to fulfil its purposes, it could not end in the *cul-de-sac* of Sheol. The relationship between the faithful and their God, as represented by the monotheists, was far too intimate and enduring to be terminated by death. Gradually, therefore, a new conception of immortality found expression in the post-exilic period deriving its inspiration from the lofty universalism of the Deutero-Isaiah and the prophecies respecting the Messianic Kingdom. As the belief in the omnipresence and omnipotence of Jehovah developed, it was found to be impossible to confine His jurisdiction to this world. With the fuller apprehension of the nature of God, and the recognition of the apparent triumph of the wicked in this life, it was realized that even those who made their bed in Sheol could not escape the supreme Lord of Creation (Ps 39 3-7, 73 2 ff., 139 7-12; Job 19 21-27: cf. 14 13-15). So far from the dead not praising Him, devout Jews became more and more convinced that beyond the grave they would be guided and upheld by Jehovah, and eventually received by Him in glory.

The Resurrection of the Body.—In addition to the growth of this belief in the individual relationship between God and the faithful that transcends even death itself, the community as a whole looked more and more towards the time when Jehovah's world of moral order should be established in a new heaven and a new earth wherein righteousness prevailed. Nothing short of the fulness of the whole earth was the inheritance of the Lord of all the world, and sooner or later the Divine Kingdom must be set up and death abolished (Is 24-27: esp. 25 7, 8, 26 11-21). But this implied that the faithful would pass eternity in the restored kingdom on earth and not in Sheol, while those who had already crossed the veil would return with joy and be reinstated in their physical

bodies.' Thus by the year 300 B.C., when the apocalyptic chapters (24-27) included in the composite Book of Isaiah probably were written, it was definitely asserted that 'the dead shall arise: the inhabitants of the dust shall awake and shout for joy' (Is 26 19). The apocalyptic literature was largely a product of the sufferings and persecutions of the faithful under Antiochus Epiphanes in the 2nd century B.C., and at such a time the earlier prophecies of the restoration of the nation under the figure of a resurrection (Ezek 37; Hos 6 1, 2; Is 53) would have a special significance, and readily be taken up and literalized. Surely Jehovah could not leave the soul of His faithful servants in Sheol, nor suffer them to see the pit (Ps 16 10 f.), and although the Psalmists seem to have reached the conclusion that immortality for the righteous meant the conscious enjoyment of God's favour and a vision of His presence by a rather different line of thought from the writers of the Messianic apocalypses, they prepared the way for the enunciation of a doctrine of rewards and punishments after death implied in the conception of a general resurrection which was first definitely affirmed in the 2nd century. 'Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt' (Dan 12 2).

Rewards and Punishments after Death.—Here the resurrection is extended to the wicked as well as to the righteous, but nothing is said about their future punishment, nor is it clear that a general judgement is implied. When the Jews interpreted immortality in terms of a resurrection, it was the elect of their own nation that they usually seem to have had in mind (Ps 26 14). It is evident, however, that men were now beginning to think along wider lines. If the mission of the Suffering Servant was to make many righteous (Is 53 11), and the unfaithful Israelites were to be destroyed in the valley of Hinnom outside Jerusalem (66 24)—doubtless the beginning of the conception of Gehenna as a place of torment—it is but a step to the inference that rewards and punishments will be meted out at the final scene when 'the judgement is set and the books are opened.' Thus Sheol tended to be transformed from a non-ethical abode of those who had had no real relations with Jehovah in this life into a place of punishment in which penalties, remedial or eternal, are incurred at the great world-judgement, when all men shall be judged by God according to their works (Enoch 1-36, specially 22, *c.* 170 B.C.). The hereafter is divided into four divisions, two for the righteous and two for the wicked (cf. Rev 6 9, 10), and after the judgement it is thought an age of bliss and happiness on earth, a sort of Messianic Kingdom, will be established for the righteous, while the wicked will be punished in an 'accursed valley' on earth, or, in the case of those in the second division, destined to remain in Sheol for ever (Enoch 5 7, 8, 10 17, 19, 21, 26 1, 27).

The apocalyptic conception of immortality betrays some traces of Persian influences, but the doctrine of the resurrection in Daniel differs from the Mazdean (Iranian) belief in that it is confined to martyrs and apostates, and not the common heritage of all men. Again, Sheol is still a godless region, whereas in Mazdeism it is the abode of the good and evil deities, and judgement in Daniel is at the beginning and not at the close of the Messianic Kingdom. Therefore the assertion that the apocalyptics derived their doctrine of the last things from Mazdeism has to be treated with very much reserve, for, to say the least, the borrowings are as yet unproven. Similarly, while Greek culture certainly penetrated Judaism from the 3rd century B.C., the Hellenic conception of the immortality of the soul (*psyche*), and the philosophical speculations regarding transmigration, made little impression on the Hebrew doctrine. No doubt the Psalmist's view of an after-life independent of an earthly kingdom was strengthened by the nation's intercourse with Greek thought, and the Alexandrian-Jewish writers may have borrowed from this source the idea of the soul as naturally immortal (Philo, *De Execrat.*, 6, 8, 9; Wisd 3 1-9; 2 Enoch). But the doctrine of the resurrection of the body belongs essentially to Hebrew psychology. The cold intellectual theory of Plato and Aristotle, that that which survives death is merely the power of abstract thought, the divine principle of pure intelligence which is absorbed into the divine mind, made no appeal apparently to the later Jews who conceived of the continuance of human personality in its entirety.

True, the Sadducees would have nothing to do with this later hope of the resurrection, but they merely maintained the old negative tradition about the future life, denying equally the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body, or at least the *authority* of these doctrines (cf. Ac 23 8). The Pharisees, on the other hand, when the apocalyptic movement

initiated by the Hasidim reappeared after the Maccabæan revolution, championed the oral Law against the Sadducees, and strenuously affirmed the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous (1 Enoch 90 [30, 33, 38]). Some thought that the soul would rise from Sheol to a state of incorporeal blessedness, others believed that the souls of good men were removed into other bodies, while the wicked were, punished eternally (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, II, ix, 14; cf. *Ant.*, xviii, 1, 3). It is sometimes suggested that the Pharisees held the theory of reincarnation, but, as Glazebrook has pointed out, it is more probable that some believed in the assumption of a spiritual body, others in an incorporeal sphere of blessedness. Be this as it may, clearly the time was ripe in the Græco-Roman world at the dawn of the Christian era for the proclamation of the resurrection to eternal life in terms intermediate between the Greek theory of the survival of the soul as a disembodied spirit, and the Jewish notion of the reanimation of the physical body. This the Catholic Church achieved in postulating an hereafter in which the individual takes his place in a real body which is the perfect instrument and expression of spirit, a body entirely subservient to the requirements of the emancipated spirit (1 Cor 15 [44] ff.; Rom 8 [11]).

Conclusion.—If the application of the comparative method to the Old Testament history of Israel, and the placing of the documents in their true chronological position, reveal one thing more than another, it is the unique character of the Hebrews and their religion. There is nothing in any of the contemporary religious developments to be compared to the Jewish conception of the One God, ethical, benevolent, the sole Creator and Controller of the universe. While this theology only found explicit expression at a comparatively late period, it was undoubtedly implicit in the exclusive claim to allegiance which Jehovah made upon His worshippers from the beginning. Moreover, He was always a moral Deity, and demanded the same characteristics from His people. Notwithstanding the many primitive Semitic doctrines and practices condoned and sometimes encouraged in Israel, the religious standard was always higher than that of the surrounding nations. Legend may be inextricably blended with history, and actions revealing defective morality are of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament narratives, but a conception of man's relationship to God and his neighbour has been preserved and handed down in this literature which has commended itself to the human conscience in all time, and which virtually constitutes the basis for the moral and spiritual progress achieved by Christianity. It is just this permanent contribution to the religious and social thought of the civilized world that is brought out so clearly by the scientific study of the Old Testament.

Again, modern scholarship has shown that it was in Israel that a profound belief was fostered of God's overruling guidance of historical events in accordance with His eternal purposes. Thus, in contrast to the religion of the surrounding nations, a progressive revelation can be discerned in Israel, a continual upward development in the knowledge of God, from very lowly ideas of a covenant between the nation and its tribal deity, to the lofty prophetic and Messianic expectations which found completion in Christ as the Ideal Suffering Servant, at once Son of God and Saviour of mankind, and His mystical Body, the Church, filling up that which was lacking in the apocalyptic kingdom of the King-Messiah; from crude and imperfect notions of holiness, to a type of character which is not essentially changed but only invested with supreme lustre and power in the sinless holiness of Jesus Christ; from imperfect tribal aspirations to the realization of the perfect union with God established through the tabernacling of the Divine Logos among men in His Church.

A new conception of worship and the relation of God and man arose in the post-exilic period, though in a sense it was the natural development of that which had gone before. The original revelation of Jehovah to His people was associated with Sinai, 'the mount of God,' but whether the centralization of worship in a single sanctuary was striven for before the Exile it is difficult to say until the vexed question of the date of Deuteronomy is decided.* In any case the ideal was not attained until post-exilic times. With the rise of the Priestly school, the elaborate system of sacrificial worship and ceremonial observance was established, requiring the offering of more than two thousand lambs, bullocks, rams, and goats annually for the public obligatory sacrifices. As the central sanctuary at Jerusalem became more and more the scene of objective worship, the people were gradually weaned away from the polytheistic cults to the acknowledgement of the One Creator, Supreme, Universal, Ethical, who alone can hear and answer

* But see p. 148*a*.—A. G.

the cry of sinful man, and who only is worthy to receive the worship of His creatures. Thus in Jehovah ethical ideals and objective worship found their place, and the people as a whole were led to look towards a time when His world of moral order should be established in a new heaven and a new earth wherein righteousness prevailed. The struggling new state with its meagre temple was a poor substitute for the greatness and glory that the nation seems to have enjoyed under David and Solomon, and hope predicted that its former prosperity would be restored (Zech 3 [8]-4 [14], 14 [16]; Jl 3 [21]). The success of the Maccabæan revolt against Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, appears to have turned their thoughts to a personal Messiah who should be a greater leader than Simon Maccabæus, and carry on his work to victory. In this way probably a large minority in Israel came to think that the world-age was about to break up in a divine supernatural intervention, and with it there would be a general collapse of all human kingdoms, the divine visible kingdom alone remaining. Over this the Messiah would reign. In certain apocalyptic circles a pre-existent supernatural man, destined to come in the clouds with power and great glory to exercise judgement as the agent of God (Dan 7 [13]), was identified with the 'Anointed' of Jewish expectation (Enoch 46 [1] ff., 48 [2], 59 [26]; 2 Esd 13). It is this latter conception which our Lord appropriated to Himself in the title 'Son of Man.' With the popular notion of a national Messianic King He would have nothing to do, but He modified the conception by combining it with the idea of the Suffering Servant and the Son of Man. This unique self-revelation of God in human terms is summed up in the Sonship of Jesus, conscious of His complete union with the Father who had delivered all things unto Him (Mt 11 [27]). As God Incarnate He was both the Messiah-King and God made manifest, reconciling the world unto Himself, for in Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead. In every stage of His life He was exactly what that stage required, while in His complete life He revealed, once and for all, what God essentially and eternally is, as well as what He wills His children to become. The Incarnation is therefore the culmination of the divine disclosure to Israel in the self-giving of the Eternal Son.

Bibliography

Barton, G. A. A., *A Sketch of Semitic Origins*, 1902. Breasted, J. H., *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, 1912. Charles, R. H., *Eschatology* (Jowett Lectures, 1913). Cook, S. A., Articles in *Cambridge Ancient History*, 1923: vol. i, chap. v, 'Semitic Monotheism'; vol. ii, chap. xiii, 'Pre-Israelite Palestine in the Amarna Period.'; and vol. iii, chaps. xvii, xviii, xix, xx, 'The Religion of Israel,' etc. (full Bibliographies are given in these volumes); Article in *The People and the Book*, ed. A. S. Peake, 1925 (chap. ii). Frazer, J. G., *Folklore in the Old Testament*, vols. i, ii, iii, 1918. Gore, C., *Belief in God*, 1921. Gray, G. B., *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, 1925. Hall, H. R., *Ancient History of the Near East*, 6th ed., 1924. Jastrow, M., *Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*, 1911; *Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions*, 1914. King, L. W., *The Seven Tablets of Creation*, 1902; *Babylonian Religion and Mythology* (Schweich Lectures, 1916); *History of Sumer and Akkad*, 1910; *History of Babylon*, 1915. Langdon, S., *La Poème Sumerien du Paradis du Deluge, et de la Chute de l'Homme*, 1919 (Paris, Leroux); *The Babylonian Epic of Creation*, 1923. Otto, R., *The Idea of the Holy*, 1921. Pinches, T. G., *The Old Testament in the Light of the Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, 1908. Pedersen, Johs., *Israel: its Life and Culture*, 1926. Radin, P., *Monotheism among Primitive People*, 1924. Smith, W. R., *The Religion of the Semites*[3], 1927.

THE MYSTICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

By Darwell Stone

Mystical interpretation explains the additional or allegorical or spiritual sense which is held to underlie the literal significance of persons or events or things or sayings. The principle of it was recognized by St. Paul in his phrase 'which things have a further meaning' (Gal 4 [24]); and such an interpretation of the Old

Testament was used with some freedom in the New Testament. The first two chapters of the Gospel according to St. Matthew supply important instances. The words 'a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel' (Is 7^{14}), originally referring to a maiden about to be married and a sign of a contemporary national deliverance of Judah from the kings of Syria and Israel, are explained to be significant of the birth of our Lord from a virgin (Mt $1^{22, 23}$). The words of Hosea, 'I . . . called my son out of Egypt' (Hos 11^{1}), originally a description of the Exodus, are applied to the sojourn of our Lord in Egypt when His Mother and St. Joseph fled there to escape from Herod (Mt 2^{15}). The words of Jeremiah, 'A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping, Rachel weeping for her children; she refuseth to be comforted for her children, because they are not' (Jer 31^{15}), originally depicting Rachel the mother of Joseph and Benjamin hearing from her grave her descendants passing by into captivity or visited with death, and weeping for their lot, are interpreted of the massacre of the children at Bethlehem in Herod's attempt to kill our Lord (Mt $2^{17, 18}$). St. Paul understands the command in Deuteronomy, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn' (Dt 25^{4}), to involve a precept for the maintenance of apostles (1 Cor 9^{9-11}), and in the Epistle to the Galatians expounds an elaborate argument based on the mystical interpretation of historical events in the lives of Hagar and Sarah, Ishmael and Isaac (Gal 4^{21-31}). In the Epistle to the Hebrews the details of the earthly Jewish tabernacle are held to have their indications of the heavenly offering of our Lord (Heb 9). These instances illustrate a whole method of using the Old Testament in the New Testament which depends on mystical interpretation.

It is not likely that this method of interpretation was originated by the writers of the New Testament. There are faint traces of it in the protocanonical and deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament themselves. Hosea (12^{4}) shows an inclination to lay stress on the spiritual meaning of the struggle of Jacob with the angel (Gen 32^{24-30}), and the Book of Wisdom emphasizes the spiritual bearing of the recorded history of mankind and of Israel (10-12). But outside these books there is much more. There is no reason to suppose that the later Rabbinic writings are misleading in their presentation of a Palestinian system of mystical interpretation; and the Alexandrian Philo early in the first Christian century refers to his predecessors in the elaborate method by which he expounded the spiritual meaning of the Old Testament. So far as there was any difference between Palestine and Alexandria in this matter, the difference may have been that in Palestine the tendency was to regard the events in the Old Testament as actual occurrences susceptible of a further meaning, and in Alexandria the tendency was to make little or nothing of the event itself in comparison with the truth conveyed by it. Josephus, writing about A.D. 90, may well have been representative of the more moderate kind of Jewish exegesis. He speaks of Moses in the Pentateuch as hinting at some things in riddles, as describing others in allegory, and as telling others in plain words (*Ant.*, Pref. 4); and he explains the details of the tabernacle and its services as having mystical significance, so that the holy of holies, for instance, was representative of heaven (III, vii, 7).

In adopting the principle of mystical interpretation, then, the fathers of the Christian Church had behind them the background of Jewish methods, of which a moderate use had been made in the New Testament. By many of the fathers, including those of different times and places and temperaments, such interpretation was developed to a very great extent. The writer of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, an Alexandrian book written not earlier than A.D. 70 and possibly a good deal later, affirms that in the Old Testament 'the good Lord manifested all things to us beforehand' (vii, 1); and he gives abundant instances of this manifestation in regard both to our Lord and to Christian life and conduct. The details of the Levitical sacrifices and of the Day of Atonement with the Rabbinic comments on them are interpreted as significant of the details of our Lord's passion; the tree and the streams of the first Psalm denote the Cross and that baptismal water into which 'we go down full of sins and filth, and from which we come up bearing fruit in the heart, having our fear and our hope on Jesus in the spirit'; in the brazen serpent is shown 'the glory of Jesus, that in Him and unto Him are all things'; the book given to Jesus (Joshua), and the writing in it that 'the Son of God will cut up by the roots all the house of Amalek in the last days' (Ex 17^{14} expanded), indicate the Incarnation; the regulations in the Old Testament concerning food are commands for moral life. The *Epistle*

of St. Clement of Rome, written about A.D. 96, is a document of a very different character from the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the events recorded in the Old Testament which are mentioned in it are used chiefly as examples of moral life; but the more definite form of mystical interpretation is not absent, for the line of scarlet thread bound in the window of Rahab 'showed beforehand that through the blood of the Lord there should be redemption to all who believe and hope on God' (xii, 7). St. Justin Martyr, writing soon after A.D. 155, and, like St. Clement, at Rome, regards the eight persons who were saved in the ark as signifying the eighth day, on which our Lord rose from the dead, the ark itself the means of salvation from the flood as showing 'the mystery of the Cross,' and the water which held up those who were saved as the sign of the regeneration accomplished by Christ through water and faith and the wood on which He died (*Dial.* 138); and treats much else from the Old Testament in a like manner. Two chapters attached to the *Epistle to Diognetus* in the only manuscript of that Epistle, which perished in the burning of the Library at Strassburg during the Franco-German war of 1870, have been ascribed with much probability to Hippolytus of Rome writing early in the 3rd century, though they have also been thought to be the work of Pantænus of Alexandria late in the 2nd century. The tree of knowledge and the tree of life in the garden of Eden are here described as depicting what is found in the garden which consists of faithful Christians; the two trees are planted near one another because 'there is no life without knowledge, nor sound knowledge without real life'; and the right use of the trees, as distinct from that wrong use which ruined our first parents, means the gathering of 'the harvest which God desires, which no serpent touches and no deceit infects.' Clement of Alexandria, the helper and successor of Pantænus in the great school of theology at Alexandria, lived from about A.D. 150 to about A.D. 215. His writings are full of a mystical use of Holy Scripture. In one passage he states clearly the different ways in which Holy Scripture is to be understood. 'We are to take,' he says, 'the sense of the law in four ways'; and he explains the three ways which are additional to the literal meaning as 'exhibiting a symbol or laying down a precept for right conduct or declaring a prophecy' (*Str.*, I, xxviii, 179). Thus he regards Holy Scripture as possessing the literal and the mystical and the moral and the prophetical sense. This principle of interpretation pervades the whole of Clement's writings. An instance of the application of it to details may be seen in his comments on the robe of the Jewish high priest. 'The three hundred and sixty bells which are suspended from the robe are the space of a year, the acceptable year of the Lord, proclaiming and declaring the most great manifestation of the Saviour. Then, the broad gold mitre signifies the royal authority of the Lord, since the Saviour is the head of the Church. The mitre that is on the head, therefore, is a sign of most princely rule; and elsewhere we have heard it said, the head of Christ is God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Moreover, there is the breastplate of the ephod, which is the symbol of work, and of the oracle, which signifies the Word by which it was made and is the image of heaven, which was made by the Word and is subject to Christ, the head of all things, and moves in the same way and in like manner. . . . As the Lord is above all the world, yea, above the intellectual world, so the name engraved on the plate has been accounted to be above all rule and authority, and it was engraved both because of the written commandments and because of the perceptible manifestation. And the name of God is expressed, since, as the Son sees the goodness of the Father, the Son works, being called God the Saviour, the first principle of the universe, who was imaged forth from the invisible God first and before the ages, and who fashioned all things that came into being after Himself. Further, the oracle manifests the prophecy which by the Word cries out and proclaims, and the judgement which is to be, since it is the same Word which prophesies and judges and determines all things. And they say that the garment of the robe prophesies the dispensation in the flesh, because of which He was seen in closer relation to the world' (*Str.*, V, vi, 37-39). Clement believed the use of mystical interpretation to be derived from the traditional methods of the Church, though it had been known and used far more widely than by Christians; the principles underlying it were evidently operative in his whole system of thought; in actual exposition he employed it sparingly. Origen, the successor of Clement in the school of theology at Alexandria, gave it a wider scope; and he went beyond Clement in explicitly teaching what Clement apparently believed, that in some passages of Holy

Scripture the literal sense is not to be understood at all. Origen defines three senses—the literal, the moral, and the spiritual—corresponding to the body and soul and spirit in the nature of man. The passages which have a literal and historical signification are more numerous than those which are only spiritual. It is historically true that 'Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and their wives were buried in the double cave at Hebron, that Sichem was given as a portion to Joseph, and that Jerusalem is the metropolis of Judæa, where the temple of God was built by Solomon' (*de princ.*, IV, iii, 4). In such cases the moral and mystical interpretations are in addition to the literal sense, and explain the moral and spiritual meanings of actual facts. But in other cases the moral and spiritual senses are the only ones which are to be understood. If the right use of reason, the enlightened reason of the Christian soul, shows that a literal sense would be physically or morally or spiritually impossible, then that which is repugnant to the enlightened conscience is not to be received. 'Who that has understanding,' he says, 'will suppose that the first and second and third day, and the evening and the morning, were without sun and moon and stars, or that the first day was without sky? Who is so foolish as to suppose that God, in the way of a man who is a husbandman, planted a garden in Eden eastward, and that He made in it a tree of life visible and palpable, so that he who should taste the fruit with his bodily teeth would obtain life, or again that one was partaker of good and evil by eating that which was taken from this other tree? And, if God is said to walk in the garden in the evening, and Adam to hide himself under a tree, I do not suppose that anyone doubts that these things are said figuratively by means of a history which is external and not literally told, and that they are significant of certain mysteries. . . . Those who are not wholly blind can collect countless such instances recorded as if they had happened, but which did not literally happen' (*de princ.*, IV, iii, 1). Origen has been thought by some writers to distinguish three different forms of the spiritual meaning, the allegorical and tropological and anagogical, or two forms, the allegorical and anagogical; but probably this is a mistake arising from his using many different terms all to denote the spiritual sense (see C. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, 136, ed. 1; 174, ed. 2). In the three senses which he unquestionably regards as different, it is not always easy to distinguish exactly the moral and the spiritual sense. An instance of the distinction may be seen in the interpretation of 'the little foxes which spoil the vines' (Ca 2^{15}) as signifying in the moral sense the sins which harm the individual soul, and in the spiritual sense the teachers of heresy who afflict the Church (*in Cant.*, iv, 92-94 de la Rue). In connexion with his method of interpretation Origen explains what he believes to have been the purpose of God in Holy Scripture. 'In the first place,' he says, 'it must be pointed out that the aim of the Spirit, who by the providence of God through the Word who was in the beginning with God illuminated the ministers of truth, the prophets and apostles, was chiefly to make known ineffable mysteries concerning the affairs of men . . . in order that he who is capable of being taught may by searching and by giving himself to the depths of the meaning in the words become partaker of all the doctrines of His counsel. And among those matters which relate to souls . . . the doctrines concerning God and His only-begotten Son are necessarily laid down as chief, of what nature He is, and in what manner He is Son of God, and what are the causes of His having come down to take human flesh and complete humanity, and what is His activity, and upon whom and when it is exercised. . . . Now, while there were these and like objects present to the Spirit who enlightened the souls of the holy ministers of the truth, there was a second aim for the sake of those who were not able to bear the toil of discovering such things, namely to conceal the doctrine about the above-mentioned subjects in phraseology setting out a narrative which contained an announcement concerning the material world and the creation of man, and the descendants of the first men until they became many, and other histories. . . . Since the chief aim was to announce the spiritual connexion in the things that have been done and that ought to be done, where the Word found actual events in history which could be adapted to these mystical senses He made use of them, hiding from the multitude the deeper meaning; but where in the narrative of the development of spiritual things there did not follow, already indicated because of the mystical meaning, the performance of certain events, the Scripture wove into the history an event which did not happen, sometimes what could not have happened, and sometimes what could have happened and did not' (*de princ.*, IV, ii, 7-9).

A more moderate use of mystical interpretation, also at Alexandria, may be seen in the writings of St. Athanasius, who was Bishop of Alexandria from A.D. 328 to A.D. 373, the great champion of the Catholic doctrine about our Lord against Arianism. In most of his writings the records in Holy Scripture are regarded and used as strictly and literally true, but as possessing a further meaning besides their literal sense. The words 'Thy life shall hang before thee' (Dt 28 [66]), originally describing the misery of the Jewish nation during the Exile, are interpreted of our Lord on the Cross (*de incarn.*, xxxv, 2; *or. c. Ar.*, ii, 16). The phrase 'the fountain of wisdom' (Bar 3 [12]) is understood to show that God is the source of the Being of the only-begotten Son (*de decret.*, 15). The verse 'The Lord possessed (or formed: LXX created) me in (or as) the beginning of his ways' (Pr 8 [22]) is frequently explained as denoting the Incarnation; and in one passage (*or. c. Ar.*, ii, 18-67) this interpretation is expounded at great length. In his earliest work, written about A.D. 320, St. Athanasius approaches more nearly to the methods of Origen. He calls Eden 'that place which holy Moses in a figure named a garden' (*c. gent.*, ii. 4); and he interprets the description of the Fall metaphorically (*op. cit.*, iii, 3, 4).

It has been noticed already that the use of mystical interpretation was not confined to Alexandria, but was found as early as the 1st and 2nd centuries at Rome also. It was not absent from Antioch, in some respects the home of literal interpretation; but when found there it was the accompaniment of a fixed belief in the historical actuality of recorded facts held to have happened as recorded, though susceptible of an additional meaning. At Antioch the mystical interpretations were themselves more restrained than at Alexandria, and especially than those in the writings of Clement and Origen; and also the histories of the Old Testament were held to express literal truth. St. Chrysostom may be taken as the best representative of this more guarded use of the method. He distinctly allows the metaphorical interpretation of such anthropomorphic expressions as 'God walking'; but apart from metaphors of this kind he understands literally all the statements in the early chapters of Genesis. The description of the Fall is quite literally explained, so that the serpent is understood to be an actual serpent used as an instrument by the devil; the fruit is that of an actual tree; and the eating of the fruit and the subsequent events happened as described. Thus these chapters are understood not only as the record of historical facts, but also as literal and exact descriptions. From the history thus affirmed considerations as to conduct are derived, and the details of the narratives are made a basis for moral teaching (*in Gen. hom.*, xvi, xvii). St. Chrysostom's comments on Isaiah afford some illustrations of his attitude towards the mystical interpretation. Commenting on the words 'Thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water,' he says that 'some, not understanding the ineffable wisdom of God, have given a mystical interpretation to this saying,' supposing that one so great and lofty as the prophet would not concern himself with the frauds of money-changers or with traders' tricks; and so these have interpreted the silver to mean the words of God, and the wine His teaching. Of this St. Chrysostom remarks: 'I do not scorn this explanation, but I hold the other (that is, the literal) to be more true' (*in Es.* on 1 [22]). A little later in the same book, commenting on the 'song of my beloved touching his vineyard,' he maintains that Holy Scripture itself always shows if a passage is to be understood allegorically only. The addition in this place, 'For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant,' shows how the passage is to be understood; and this is an instance of the universal practice in Holy Scripture. 'This is everywhere the custom of Scripture: when it speaks allegorically, it gives also the interpretation of the allegory' (*op. cit.* on 5 [7]). Further on, commenting on the live coal from the altar, with which the lips of Isaiah were touched, St. Chrysostom writes: 'There are some who say that these things are the symbols of future mysteries, that the altar and the fire laid upon it are the power of ministering, and the coal placed on the mouth the cleansing of sins; but we keep hold of the history' (*op. cit.* on 6 [6, 7]). With St. Chrysostom, then, any mystical interpretation is kept in strict subordination to the historical sense; and Origen's method of accepting only a spiritual signification of many passages is definitely disallowed.

Instances from the West are in the writings of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine. St. Ambrose was Bishop of Milan from A.D. 374 to A.D. 397. He held that Holy Scripture contains natural truth and moral precepts and mysteries of faith; and that the moral precepts and mysteries of faith are often expressed in the higher

sense which is everywhere connected with the narration of events. Without denying the literal character of the history, his purpose in his voluminous writings about Holy Scripture is always to bring out the mystical significance. Every event and circumstance, every detail and word, are given a spiritual meaning besides their ordinary sense. To mention a few out of innumerable instances, the words spoken to Eve that her husband should rule over her (Gen 3^{16}) show 'the mystery of Christ and the Church, for the future turning of the Church to Christ is pointed out, and the Church's devout service under the Word of God, which is far better than the freedom of this world' (*de Paradiso*, 72); the history of Isaac and Rebecca indicates the relation between Christ and the Church and between Christ and the Christian soul, and teaches how the Church beholding our Lord and knowing the true joy that is in Him desires to be united to Him (*de Isaac et anima*, 7); the words 'I sat down under his shadow with great delight, and his fruit was sweet to my taste, he brought me to the banqueting house, and his banner over me was love' (Ca $2^{3, 4}$) denote that 'He who surmounts the things of earth, and for whom the things of the world are dead (for the world is crucified to him, and he to the world), flees from and despises all that is under the sun. . . . As the vine its vineyard, so the Lord Jesus as the eternal vine embraces His people with arms of love' (*op. cit.*, 28, 29); the words 'I am a rose of Sharon, a lily of the valleys: as a lily among thorns, so is my love among the daughters' (Ca $2^{1, 2}$) tell that 'the Church, which loves Christ, is wounded by love' (*op. cit.*, 30). St. Augustine, who was born in A.D. 354 and died in A.D. 430, was Bishop of Hippo in Numidia. His way of treating Holy Scripture may not be wholly consistent throughout the long series of his writings, but its main features do not alter. He maintains that in the account of Creation in Genesis there is a symbolic presentation with a metaphorical use of language of such a kind that the series of days is an artificial arrangement which does not imply anything as to succession of time. He appears to regard the account of the Fall as an exactly literal history; but before beginning to comment on it he says: 'If in the words of God, or of any person assumed to the prophetical office, anything is said which cannot be literally understood without absurdity, certainly it ought to be understood to have been said in a figure for some signification; yet it is not right to doubt that it was said' (*de Gen. ad lit.*, xi, 2); and he lays down as a general principle of his interpretation: 'In the narrative of events which have happened, we enquire whether all things are to be accepted only in a figurative sense or whether they are also to be asserted and defended as literal occurrences' (*op. cit.*, i, 1). He has no doubt that the figurative or mystical interpretation is always lawful; the question as to which there may be some doubt is how far in some cases this interpretation supplies the only meaning that is to be received. For the most part he views all the records in the Old Testament as narratives of actual historical fact, and considers the mystical interpretation to be a further meaning. A few specimens of his exegesis may be given. He comments on the saying, 'Thy teeth are like a flock of ewes that are newly shorn, which are come up from the washing, whereof every one hath twins, and none is barren among them' (Ca 4^{2}), with the explanation: 'How gladly do I behold the saints when I see them as the teeth of the Church separate men from errors and transfer them into its body. . . . With great joy also do I recognize the sheep that are shorn, having laid aside as fleeces the burdens of the world, and coming up from the washing, that is from baptism, all bearing twins, that is the two commandments of love, and that none of them is barren of that holy fruit' (*de doct. Christ.*, ii, 7). He expounds the verse, 'Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the rock' (Ps 137^{9}), by the interpretation, 'Who are the little ones of Babylon? They are evil desires at their birth. . . . When desire is born, before evil habit has gained strength against thee, while it is still small, . . . dash it. But be on your guard lest, when it is dashed, it die not. Dash it against the rock. And the rock was Christ' (*Enarr. in Psalm.*, cxxxvi [cxxxvii], 21). That Achish the king of Gath was intolerant of the presence of David, whom he thought to be mad (1 S $21^{14, 15}$), signified the departure of those who, when our Lord spoke of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, were offended (*in Psalm.*, xxxiii [xxxiv], *Enarr.*, ii, 8). The last two instances are representative of the way in which St. Augustine and other fathers see our Lord everywhere depicted in the events and phraseology of the Old Testament.

There are thus considerable differences in fathers of different dispositions and different localities in their use of mystical interpretation. Origen and St. Chrysos-

tom may be regarded as representing widely different degrees of it, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine as intermediate between these; but the principle itself was ordinarily accepted in the early Church. Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia, who was born at Antioch about A.D. 350 and died in A.D. 428, was less favourable to the principle even than St. Chrysostom, though the extent of his rejection of it seems to have been exaggerated; and his treatment of the Old Testament writings supplied one of the reasons which led to his condemnation after his death by the Fifth Œcumenical Council in A.D. 553 (*Conc. Constant.*, ii, coll. iv, nn. 21-24, 63-71). Yet he regards histories contained in the Old Testament as typical of events in the life of Christ, and words in the prophecies and the psalms as having in Christ a fuller significance than their original meaning (see *e.g. in Psalm.* on 15 [16][11]; *in Joel.* on 2[28-32]; *in Ion.*, procem.). The widespread character of the interpretation, and the agreement even as to certain details, may be illustrated from the fact that theologians so different as Rufinus of Aquileia, writing in Palestine about A.D. 390, and Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, preaching at Constantinople in A.D. 429, interpreted the passage 'This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, neither shall any man enter in by it, for the Lord, the God of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut' (Ezek 44[2]) of the perpetual virginity of the holy Mother of our Lord (Rufinus, *In Symb. Apost.*, 9; Proclus, *Orat.*, i, 10).

Through the later patristic period and the Middle Ages the general characteristics of the mystical interpretation remain unaltered. It is more restrained in one writer and fuller in another; but the adoption and use of it are very wide. Among the liturgical writers Robert Paululus (about A.D. 1178) elaborately explains the mystical significance of the Levitical rites. For instance, he says: 'The golden altar (in the Jewish tabernacle) signifies the altar of faith in the heart that is purged by penitence, and bright and clear with the testimony of a good conscience. . . . On this altar the priest, now dead to the world but living to God, no longer the old Melchizedek, flesh born of flesh, but the new man, spirit born of spirit, offers the invisible offering of flesh and blood through the oblation of earthly food. . . . Beyond the veil was the ark of the covenant, and on it the mercy-seat. . . . The ark signifies the manhood of Christ, which is beyond the veil, because Christ has ascended beyond the heaven and sits on the right hand of the Father. . . . The mercy-seat on the ark is the propitiation of God on Christ. . . . Or the mercy-seat is the mercy of God by which He is propitious to His people. . . . To this ark, to this mercy-seat, the new priest . . . earnestly desires to approach. . . . The priest with his mind raised to heaven, but recognizing his own weakness, seeing with the eyes of his heart the angels standing on the mercy-seat as ready to aid, prays that his sacrifice may so be uplifted thither that he himself may be joined and united to God, and through spiritual union may be made one spirit with Him' (*de cærem. sacr. off. et observ. eccl.*, ii, 27[18]). Among the schoolmen St. Thomas Aquinas (born A.D. 1226, died A.D. 1274) distinguishes the historical or literal from the spiritual or mystical sense, and divides the mystical into the allegorical, the tropological or moral, and the anagogical senses; and maintains that, as 'God is the Author of Holy Scripture,' 'it is in His power not only to adapt words to express meaning, as man also can do, but also to adapt things themselves' (*Summa Theol.*, I, i, 10). This division of the mystical sense into three had already become a commonplace; and it was expressed in the lines—

> 'Littera scripta docet: quid credas allegoria:
> Quid speres anagoge: quid agas tropologia';

or—

> 'Littera gesta docet: quid credas allegoria:
> Moralis quid agas: quo tendas anagogia.'

Durandus of Mende (born about A.D. 1230, died A.D. 1296) gave a clear illustration of the ordinary teaching: 'Jerusalem is understood historically of that earthly city to which pilgrims go; allegorically of the Church militant; tropologically of every faithful soul; anagogically of the heavenly Jerusalem that is our country' (*Rat. Divin. Offic.*, procem.). The interpretation passed into the services of the Church, as when in the East the bush on the mount which burned and was not consumed (Ex 3[2]), and the furnace in which the fire touched not, nor hurt nor troubled (*Song of the Three Children*, 27), were understood to signify the holy Mother of our Lord who was unconsumed by the Divine Fire in her womb; or as when in the West the downsitting and uprising of the Psalmist (Ps 139[2]) were understood of the resurrection of our Lord following His passion and death and burial, and the words of the Book of Wisdom, 'the spirit of the Lord hath filled the world'

(Wisd 1 [7]), were regarded as signifying the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost.

The 16th century brought a change. Among those Christians who remained in communion with the see of Rome the use of the mystical interpretation was retained, and a high value was attached to it by many; but among the Protestant bodies and in the Church of England it came to be little valued or used except for a limited acknowledgement that some words and persons and events in the Old Testament were prophetical or typical of our Lord. It was not altogether excluded from the English Prayer Book. In the administration of baptism the ark of Noah and the passage of the Red Sea were mentioned as significant of baptism; and the use of Old Testament lessons and the recitation of the psalter suggested and required, possibly to an extent which was not realized in the 16th century, the mystical interpretation of what was thus used.

This interpretation is closely bound up with the permanent value of the Old Testament. If the Old Testament is to fulfil its purpose as 'written for our admonition' (1 Cor 10 [11]), something much more than its merely literal and historical meaning is needed. Many difficulties about Holy Scripture have been in part due to an effect produced by retaining the theory of verbal inspiration which the fathers held, and rejecting the co-ordinate theory of mystical interpretation by which it was lightened. The interpretation is suggested also by the authority of the New Testament; for there is nothing in the more moderate use of it which goes beyond the methods used by St. Paul and in the First Gospel. It is in harmony with the analogy of nature and grace. It recognizes that the same God spoke in the Old Testament as in the New Testament and in Christian times. It sees in our Lord One who sums up in Himself all that is best in human life wherever presented, and in the Christian Church that supernatural people of God to which the divinely chosen nation of Israel led.

Moreover, it affords the justification for the reading of the Old Testament and the recitation of the psalter in Christian worship. If the Old Testament histories are regarded as histories only, they lose their interest for those who worship, and in some cases may even be repellent. The act of Jael or the slaughter of the Amalekites or the massacre of the prophets of Baal may easily be uninteresting or disconcerting in themselves. But, if in such incidents we may see with St. Augustine (*c. Faust.*, xii, 32) the Church conquering the devil by the Cross of Christ, or with St. Ambrose (*de vid.*, 46-49) the victory over sin through faith and prayer, they have not only interest but also spiritual value. The Psalms viewed on the surface may often seem dull or unmeaning or unchristian. For instance, the imprecatory psalms have been a stumbling-block to many. But, if the denunciations in these psalms are understood, as in the ancient Church, to be expressions of God's judgements upon sin, and of the Christian's resolve to exterminate what is wrong in himself, they will be seen in a different light. And it is not only for the imprecatory psalms that the mystical interpretation has its use. There are, indeed, some psalms which can be said devotionally in their simple obvious sense; but there are many of which the merely historical meaning can make but little appeal. 'They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture' (Ps 22 [18]) can have little meaning for many unless mystically understood of our Lord. Even when the simple obvious sense affords material for devotion, there may be a far fuller meaning for those reciting them if the mystical interpretation is realized. 'Then said I, Lo I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me: I delight to do thy will' (Ps 40 [7, 8]) may mean much as uttering the personal devotion of the Christian worshipper: it will mean more if by the mystical interpretation the supreme dedication of Christ also is in mind. Without such an aid to appreciation, few worshippers are likely to find any appropriateness in, for instance, the use of the proper psalms for Christmas Day (19, 45, 85, 89, 110, 132) in the services for that festival. In the judgement of the present writer, the Church is not likely to be able to retain the reading of the Old Testament and the recitation of the psalter in public worship unless the use of mystical interpretation is to some extent recognized. Those who in recent years have assailed the public use of particular lessons and particular psalms have failed to see what the problem really is.

This is not to say that the use of the mystical interpretation has never passed into an abuse, that there have never been exaggerations. Certainly Origen in the ancient Church, and not a few in later times, have gone beyond what right reason could approve. But here, as so often, the abuse does not destroy the possibility of rightful use. If such interpretation may run wild and be unreason-

able when not held in due restraint, it possesses when properly handled such real spiritual value as might be expected from the use of it in the New Testament and its place in the tradition of the Church.

It is probable that different minds will always differ as to the extent to which the mystical interpretation may rightly be used, and as to the particular passages to which it may be applied. The recognition of deep spiritual principles expressed in the law of worship, or in the denunciations of God's enemies, or in the providential guidance of nations and individuals is obviously distinct from such explanations as that the thorns mentioned in Gen 3[18] signify the crown of thorns which was placed in mockery on the head of our Lord, and that the tree spoken of in Jer 11[19] signifies the wood of the Cross (e.g. Rufinus, *In Symb. Apost.*, 22). The broader and more general lines may well afford instruction to many, while some specific interpretations may be for the devotional enjoyment and edification of the few.

The usual opinion of theologians has been that the mystical sense, however valuable it may be to illustrate or enforce truth otherwise known, cannot rightly be used to supply arguments for the proof of doctrine. St. Augustine, notwithstanding the high value which he attached to the mystical sense, came near to such an opinion when he said that it was impudence for anyone 'to interpret anything set in allegory on his own side unless he had also clear evidence by the light of which what is obscure might be made plain' (*Ep.*, xciii, 24). St. Thomas Aquinas gave distinct expression to this principle in his statement that 'all the senses are founded on one, that is the literal, from which alone, and not from those sayings which are by way of allegory, can an argument be drawn' (*Summa Theol.*, I, i, 10 ad 1); and, though the principle has not always been maintained by writers on doctrine, so high an authority on Roman Catholic theology as Perrone thought it 'the common opinion of theologians and interpreters that it is only the literal sense which can supply the theologian with arguments for the proof and defence of dogma' (*Prælect. Theol.*, ix, 159, ed. 1843).

APPENDED NOTE

By Charles Harris

The allegorical method of interpreting Holy Writ, inherited by the Church from the Synagogue, was not a hindrance to the propagation of Christianity among the educated classes of the Empire, but rather an assistance; for most if not all of the contemporary schools of philosophy, except the Aristotelian, had long been accustomed to interpret allegorically the poems of Homer and Hesiod, which were so generally venerated that they may be spoken of with little exaggeration as 'the Bible of the Greeks.' Allegorical interpretation was applied not only to these writings, but also to nearly all mythological stories, Greek, Egyptian, and Oriental, with which the Greeks were conversant. A good example of the current exegesis is afforded by Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris*, written by a cultured philosopher, priest, and historian, who flourished in the sub-apostolic age. It is only necessary to read this work in order to become convinced that the advanced allegorism of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and even of the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, would have attracted rather than repelled the ordinary educated heathen reader.

Allegorical interpretation began very early in Greece—as soon, in fact, as the progress of philosophy and science and the consequent spread of more enlightened religious and moral ideas had rendered the coarse, immoral, and childish cosmogonies, theogonies, and mythologies of the popular religion unacceptable to educated minds. The first to interpret Homer in an allegorical manner is said to have been Theagenes of Rhegium, who wrote about 525 B.C. He accounted for—and excused—Homer's unworthy stories about the gods by the far-fetched theory that these divinities were merely personifications of the elements and of certain cosmic forces, and that the poet's objectionable stories must be understood to be allegorical descriptions of well-known natural and cosmical processes. A little later, Pherecydes 'the theologian,' one of the instructors of Pythagoras, wrote a work in two books in which he interpreted the Greek mythology as a whole upon similar principles. The Pythagoreans, Democritus, Metrodorus of Lampsacus (who wrote diffusely upon Homer), and the whole Cynic school followed their lead. In the age of Socrates and Plato, the Sophists were prominent exponents of allegorism—not, however, Plato himself or Socrates. The Platonic Socrates ridicules it in the *Phædrus* ('This sort of crude philosophy will take up a great deal of time: I have no leisure for such enquiries,' 229), and attacks it vigorously in the *Republic* ('These discreditable [Homeric]

tales must not be admitted into our state, whether they are supposed to have an allegorical meaning or not. For a young person cannot judge what is allegorical and what is literal,' ii, 378).

In later times it was chiefly the Stoics who systematized and popularized allegorism. Their founder Zeno, followed by Cleanthes, and their second founder Chrysippus, professed to find the entire Stoic philosophy adumbrated in the myths of Homer and Hesiod—very much as at a later date Clement, Origen, Ambrose, and Augustine were accustomed to deduce almost the whole system of Catholic Christianity by allegorical interpretation from the Old Testament. The Stoic method of interpreting the ancient myths was popularized among the Romans by the learned archæologist Varro, an older contemporary of Cicero. The more ancient allegorical commentaries of the Stoics now survive only in fragments, but we still possess two entire works of this nature belonging to the period of the Empire: viz. *A Compendium of Greek Theology* by Cornutus, an attractive treatise in which the popular myths are interpreted in strict accordance with Stoic principles, and *Homeric Allegories* by a Stoic philosopher named Heraclitus or Heraclides. The latter work gives a definitely ethical interpretation to the *Odyssey*, representing its hero, the wily Ulysses, as the pattern of all the virtues and the enemy of all the vices. Heraclitus's idealization of the Homeric heroes may be compared with the idealistic treatment of the patriarchs and other notable characters of the Old Testament by such writers as Philo, Origen, and Ambrose.

The Christian Fathers were only legitimately developing the Rabbinic tradition when they identified the Solomon of *Canticles* with Christ, and the Shulamite with His Church, and interpreted the whole work as a mystical description of the purely spiritual love of the Redeemer for His Bride.

All this method of mystical interpretation, whether Hellenic, Jewish, or Christian, is alien and repellent to the modern mind. But it requires more consideration than it has recently received. Modern anthropology finds in crude nature-myths, cosmogonies, and theogonies the germs of philosophy and science. Psychology is busy finding in dreams and myths imaginative symbols of profound rational significance, and interprets them accordingly. The suggested interpretations do not always carry conviction to those outside. But to-day there would be general agreement that the creations of the primitive mind must be studied with respect. There was 'something in them' more than their creators knew. Then coming to a later stage of human development we have come to recognize in national legends imaginative representations of really important truths of history. When we pass to consider the action of the inspiring Spirit of God, especially in the Old Testament, we are faced with the fact that myth and symbol and legend and ceremony have been as truly the subject or vehicle for inspiration as history or prophecy. Again, the love songs of *The Canticles* were admitted into the canon because they were mystically interpreted as reflecting the mutual love of Jehovah and Israel. And no one can deny that from Hosea downward this is an admitted truth. 'This mystery is great: but I speak concerning Christ and His Church.' All these considerations seem to point to the need for a fresh treatment of mystical interpretation which shall distinguish between its arbitrary and its rational use.

PART II
THE APOCRYPHA

CONTENTS

Subject.	*Author.*	*Page.*
Environment Social, Political, Intellectual, and Religious, of Israel from Maccabees to our Lord	Edwyn Bevan	1
I. Esdras	J. C. H. How	30
II. (IV.) Esdras	W. O. E. Oesterley ...	32
Tobit	H. St. J. Thackeray ...	42
Judith	N. D. Coleman	58
The Rest of the Chapters of the Book of Esther ...	J. C. H. How	63
The Wisdom of Solomon	C. Harris	64
The Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus	W. O. E. Oesterley ...	79
Baruch	H. St. J. Thackeray ...	102
The Epistle of Jeremy	H. St. J. Thackeray ...	111
Additions to the Book of Daniel	N. D. Coleman	117
The Prayer of Manasses	N. D. Coleman	124
I. and II. Maccabees	J. W. Hunkin	126

THE APOCRYPHA

ENVIRONMENT SOCIAL, POLITICAL, INTELLECTUAL, AND RELIGIOUS, OF ISRAEL FROM MACCABEES TO OUR LORD

By Edwyn Bevan

(I) **The Jewish State in Palestine: (i) History**—(1) *Simon* (143-135).—At the time when the nationalist and religious fight of the little Jewish community in Southern Palestine against the Greek Seleucid kings of Syria ended by the priestly house of Hashmon establishing itself as an independent power in Jerusalem and the environment, a great change was passing over the whole Mediterranean world. Within the memory of men still alive the chief powers of Greece and Western Asia had been the three Greco-Macedonian dynasties which had arisen out of the wreck of Alexander's empire in the early part of the 3rd century B.C.—the house of Antigonus in Macedonia, the house of Seleucus in Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia, and the house of Ptolemy in Egypt. And now a new non-Greek power which had arisen in the West, the Republic of Rome, had intruded with Italian armies into the countries of the Eastern Mediterranean, had destroyed the Antigonid kingdom of Macedonia, had thrust the Seleucid power back out of Asia Minor, and made its will predominant even in countries beyond the sphere of its government. There was still a Seleucid king in Antioch and a Ptolemy in Alexandria, but they reigned now under the shadow of a stronger power, knowing themselves unable to resist any demand which Rome cared really to press. Rome's influence acted everywhere to encourage elements of disintegration in the Eastern kingdoms, to keep them in a state of unsettlement and prevent the formation of healthy, vigorous governments. And while the Macedonian royal houses had thus been reduced by the outside power, they were simultaneously falling to pieces by inner decay. Quarrels between brothers and cousins, between mothers and sons, in these houses were almost incessant during the hundred years or so which would still elapse before Rome definitely took over the government of these lands and made Syria and Egypt provinces of the Roman Empire. From 143-142 B.C., when Simon the Hasmonæan succeeded in freeing Jerusalem from the Seleucid king's garrison, to 63 B.C., when Pompey, having annexed Syria to Rome, brought the Jewish Hasmonæan kingdom to an end, was a period of transition. Greco-Macedonian rule was passing away in the Nearer East; Roman rule had not yet come. It was an interval during which smaller powers could lift their heads to assert a temporary and precarious independence. Amongst the smaller powers was the Hasmonæan Jewish state. For eighty years there were once more Jewish sovereign princes reigning in Jerusalem, just as there had been in the great days of old, before the kingdom of the house of David had been destroyed by Babylon. The head of the little Jewish state, when that state was a subject state under the Persian kings and under the Greek kings of Egypt, had been the High Priest; he was civil as well as religious head. And when the Jewish state became independent under a member of the Hasmonæan family—the family that is called after a certain Hashmon from whom they were descended—its internal constitution remained, so far as we know, much as before. Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabæus, in 153 B.C., ten years before independence was won, contrived to have himself appointed High Priest by Alexander Balas, the pretender who momentarily occupied the Seleucid throne—an unworthy beginning to the Hasmonæan dynasty. After the murder of Jonathan in 143 by another pretender to the Seleucid throne, he was succeeded in the High Priesthood by his brother Simon.

Within a few months of Simon's accession, the Seleucid king Demetrius II was obliged to recognize the independence of the Jewish state:

'The yoke of the heathen was taken away from Israel. And the people began to write in their instruments and contracts, In the first year of Simon the great High Priest and Captain and Leader of the Jews' (1 Mac 13 [41, 42]). It was not long before the Jews got rid of the

last relic of Seleucid supremacy—the garrison in the Citadel of Jerusalem. In May, 142 B.C., the Jews made a triumphal entry into the Citadel 'with praise and palm branches, and with harps, and with cymbals, and with viols, and with hymns, and with songs: because a great enemy was destroyed out of Israel' (1 Mac 13 [51]).

Simon the Hasmonæan ruled as High Priest. But the house of Hashmon had ousted the family which had held the office of Aaron since the return from Babylon and appeared the legitimate line. Onias III (Hônyah), the High Priest of the old line, had been murdered in Antioch shortly before 170, and his son, the younger Onias, some time between 164 and 162, had taken refuge in Egypt, where he was allowed by the favour of Ptolemy VI to erect an imitation of the Jerusalem Temple on a smaller scale at Leontopolis and exercise there the High Priestly functions which he could not exercise at Jerusalem. The house of Hashmon, belonging as it did to 'the sons of Joarib' (1 Mac 2 [1]: cf. 1 Ch 24 [7]), held a high rank in the priestly aristocracy, but it could so far base its right to the High Priesthood only on the grace of a particularly disreputable Gentile king. It was natural that, after independence was won, Simon should desire a better title: 'in the third year of his High Priesthood,' September, 141 B.C., the High Priesthood was established upon him by a resolution passed in 'a great congregation of priests and people and princes of the nation and of the elders of the country.' In default of appointment by *vox Dei* ('Simon should be their leader and High Priest for ever, until there should arise a trustworthy prophet'; 1 Mac 14 [41]), the house of Hashmon would have to be satisfied with a title based on *vox populi*. Simon's official title was probably 'High Priest and General (Hebrew *sagan*, Greek *strategos*) and Prince of the People of God (Hebrew *sar 'am El*, Greek *ethnarches*).' Some silver coins have been found with archaic lettering which seem probably to be coins struck at Jerusalem under Simon. They do not have his name on them, but on the obverse (in Hebrew) 'Shekel of Israel,' and on the reverse 'Jerusalem the Holy.' There are also year-numbers on them; these, T. Reinach (*Jewish Coins*, 1903, 13-18) believes, take as their era the year 139-138 B.C., in which the Seleucid king Antiochus VII conceded to the Jewish state the right of striking its own silver money (1 Mac 15 [6]).

The end of Simon, the last surviving brother of the hero Judas, the first independent ruler of Judæa since the liberation, was not edifying. The old warrior was assassinated at a feast, when drunk, by his son-in-law, who aspired to supplant him (February, 135 B.C.). But the murderer's plan miscarried: Simon's son, John Hyrcanus, was able to assert his right to his father's place as High Priest and chief of the state.

(2) *John Hyrcanus* (135-104).—Soon after the accession of John there came a tremendous blow to the newly liberated Jewish state. Antiochus VII, nicknamed Sidetes, who had got possession of the Seleucid inheritance in Syria in 138 B.C., showed a vigour and ability which lifted the kingdom from its decline. He made it part of his task to bring back to subjection the Jewish state which had broken away. Within a few months of John's accession an army led by a Seleucid king once more invaded Judæa. Antiochus laid siege to Jerusalem, and after holding out for more than a year, the city was starved into submission (134 B.C.). John Hyrcanus had to agree to terms which made the High Priest once more the vassal of a Gentile overlord. Some of his Greek courtiers had urged Antiochus to violate the Temple and annihilate the Jewish state for good. But he was satisfied with making it a client state. He did not reimpose tribute, except for those districts which the Jews had occupied in recent years outside the proper limits of Judæa. Nor did he put a garrison in the Citadel. But Hyrcanus had to agree to pay an indemnity of 500 talents, and in the future to pay tribute for the recent Jewish annexations: the new ring-wall built round Jerusalem was pulled down. Also the Jews had to furnish a contingent to the Seleucid army. Finally, from now onwards the Jewish state ceases to coin silver money.

At the moment it must have seemed as if the freedom of the Jewish state had been only a brief episode, destined to pass away like a dream. Had Antiochus Sidetes lived longer, that might have been so. But in 129 B.C. he was killed in an attempt to recover the provinces beyond the Tigris from the Parthians. The Seleucid kingdom again fell into confusion, and the Jewish High Priest regained his independence. It was the Seleucid restoration under Antiochus Sidetes which proved to be a dream. For the following sixty-six years a free Jewish state existed in Palestine.

Judas Maccabæus and his brethren had risen to power through a movement

whose inner force was at the outset genuine religious zeal—fidelity to the Law of God and opposition to heathen world-power. They had been the leaders of the party in Israel who loved the name of *Hasîdîm* (Saints). But the house of Hashmon in possession of the power showed anything but a saintly character. One discerns no moral or spiritual superiority in this Jewish dynasty over the other princely houses of the time—the same worldly ambitions, the same ruthless family feuds, the same crimes. The pious in Israel came to regard this family of prince-priests with abhorrence, as usurpers who defiled the sacred things they handled.

In the rise of the Hasmonæan dynasty there are three concurrent processes to be traced: one is the advance of the Hasmonæan chief to royalty; a second is the progressive territorial expansion of the Jewish state; a third is the growth of hostility between the house of Hashmon and the party of strict religion.

John Hyrcanus did not yet call himself king. His bronze coins bear the inscription 'Jehôhanan, the High Priest, and the Commonwealth (*hever*) of the Jews,' or 'Jehôhanan, the High Priest and Chief of the Commonwealth of the Jews.' Jewish coins have, of course, no portrait, but representations of inanimate things only—an olive wreath, a flower, an anchor, a star, a horn of plenty. John Hyrcanus died in 104 B.C. and was succeeded by his son, called Judah by his Jewish subjects and Aristobulus by the Greeks.

(3) *Aristobulus I* (104-103).—Aristobulus secured his power like the most heathenish of heathen princes, by having his mother and one of his brothers killed and keeping his other three brothers in prison. His title on his coins is the same as his father's: they bear the inscription 'Jehûdah, High Priest, and the Commonwealth of the Jews.' But when he received Greeks he wore a 'diadem'—a ribbon tied round the head—the sign of royalty for the Greeks, and was addressed as 'King.' He was reputed, Josephus says, a 'friend of the Greeks'—'philhellene'—he, the great-nephew of Judas Maccabæus who had led the national revolt against Hellenism and all its works.

(4) *Jannæus Alexander* (103-76).—Aristobulus died after only one year's reign, and was succeeded by his brother Jonathan, known by the popular shortened form of his name, Jannai, Latinized as Jannæus. He too had, beside his Hebrew name, a Greek name for the Greeks, Alexander. Jannæus Alexander took the final step and had himself formally called 'King.' Some of his coins indeed follow the precedent of his father and brother and are inscribed 'Jehônathan, the High Priest, and the Commonwealth of the Jews,' but others have on one side the legend (in Hebrew) 'Jehônathan the King,' and on the other side (in Greek) 'Of King Alexander.' Thus, five centuries after King Zedekiah had been carried away captive, there were again kings of pure Jewish race reigning as sovereigns in Jerusalem.

But not kings of the house of David: not even of the tribe of Judah: king-priests of the tribe of Levi. To some it seemed irregular. Even the possession of the High Priesthood by members of the house Hashmon seemed a breach of order. But the adherents of the new dynasty could point to the figure of Melchizedek in the Law—a priest by individual standing, not by inherited right in some sacred line. 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek' was the word of authority which a psalmist of the time could represent as said to his lord, the Hasmonæan chief, by Jehovah (Ps 110)—a priest who was at the same time a warrior king, to whom Jehovah promised victory over all his enemies. In another document of the time, the *Testaments of the Patriarchs*, which has come down to us in a Greek translation, composed, Dr. Charles thinks, under John Hyrcanus between 109 and 107 B.C. (*Apocr. Pseudep. of the Old Testament*, ii, 290), we read: 'Draw ye near to Levi in humbleness of heart, that ye may receive a blessing from his mouth . . . because him hath the Lord chosen to be king over all the nation. . . . And bow down before his seed, for on our behalf it will die in wars visible and invisible, and will be among you an eternal king.' (*Testament of Reuben*, vi, 10-12)

(5) *Territorial growth of Jewish State.*—The second process spoken of just now was the territorial expansion of the Jewish state. At this point we must survey the world which surrounded Judæa. Palestine, except in Judæa and in the towns and villages of the Samaritans, had a Gentile population. Along the coasts were the peoples who had been there in the days of the old Israelite kingdom, the Phœnicians in the north and the Philistines in the south. In the interior since the captivity there had been immigration of various stocks from the east. In the Lebanon, and perhaps in the neighbouring region of Galilee, a tribe of warlike Arab nomads, renowned bowmen, called Ituræans, had come to settle. East of the

Jordan, opposite Jerusalem, the population wast still Ammonite. In the Arabah, south of the Dead Sea, once the country of the Edomites, the powerful Arab people of the Nabatæans had established themselves, with their capital at Petra, whose ruins are still the wonder of travellers—

'A rose-red city half as old as time.'

The Nabatæans had grown rich on the profits of the trade-route between the Persian Gulf and Gaza, and Petra was a meeting-place of merchants. The Edomites, driven from their old seats, now occupied the open country south of Judæa, covering the region of Hebron as far north as the neighbourhood of Bethsur. All this country had now the name of Idumæa, after its Edomite inhabitants.

The Jewish territory attached to Jerusalem extended in 142 B.C. to a radius of some twenty miles from the city. North of Judæa was the country of the Samaritans. In blood the Samaritans were the descendants of the old Israelite population, with a mixture of Gentile blood owing to the colonists brought into the country by the Assyrians after the suppression of the northern Israelite kingdom. A noticeably large proportion of these colonists had been transported from the town of Cuthah in Babylonia, for which reason the Jews in later times habitually called their Samaritan kinsmen 'Cuthæans,' a name of contempt. The Book of Kings tells us that after the introduction of these heathen colonists the mixed population had a religion mixed of Israelite and heathen elements (like the Jews at Elephantine in the 5th century). But in the 2nd century B.C. that was long a thing of the past. The Samaritans were now as opposed to idolatry as the Jews, and had accepted as their scriptures the five 'Books of Moses,' made authoritative at Jerusalem after Ezra. The other sacred books of the Jews they rejected. They had their rival temple on Mount Gerizim, which they asserted to be the only legitimate one. The head of the Samaritan community, as of the Jewish, was a High Priest who claimed to be descended from Aaron. There was a Samaritan Dispersion, much smaller, of course, than the Jewish, outside the Holy Land: Samaritan villages were found in Egypt. To-day, even after 2,000 years, a small Samaritan community still exists in Palestine.

The language of all these peoples inhabiting Palestine was Aramaic, except in the Greek cities. Aramaic was at any rate the *lingua franca* which had become general in the Nearer East under the Persian Empire. The Jews now usually spoke Aramaic, not Hebrew, though the use of Hebrew was to some extent kept up by the Rabbinic schools. Although the Nabatæans were probably Arab in blood, the language of Nabatæan inscriptions and coins is Aramaic. But all Eastern traditions, of language or custom, had now lost their worldly prestige under the predominance of Hellenism, the culture of the great powers. Since Alexander the chief royal courts in the Nearer East had been those of Greek kings. But the most powerful means of Hellenization in these countries was the Greek cities. Alexander had, as a matter of deliberate policy, settled numbers of Greeks and Macedonians in city communities all over his kingdom, and the Greek Seleucid kings who inherited his empire in Asia had carried on the work. Sometimes a new Greek city rose on a spot where before there had been no city at all: sometimes an old Oriental town was transformed, given a Greek citizen-body and a new Greek name. The number of Alexandrias, Antiochs, Seleucias, Laodiceas distributed over Nearer Asia is the despair of the modern historian. Once established, the Greek city, in lands far from Greece, carried on the regular forms of Greek political life—with a senate and a popular assembly, which met to pass resolutions and sometimes inscribe them on stone or bronze. As in a Greek city, the citizen-body was divided into tribes, with tribal cults and festivities. Its social life centred in the gymnasium, which often served somewhat the purpose of a university for the young men. A theatre was also a necessity, in which Greek guilds of actors performed Euripides or Menander under an alien sky. The public buildings showed the familiar forms of Greek classical architecture. The citizens wore Greek dress.

The prestige of Greek culture made the old cities of Syria and Palestine transform themselves into cities of Greek type, even when the transformation was not carried out by command of the kings. In Palestine Samaria had been converted into a Greek city and settled with Greek and Macedonian soldiers by Alexander the Great. Samaria, it should be clearly understood, was not in these centuries a city of the Samaritans. The Samaritans lived in the towns and villages round Samaria, but Samaria itself was a Greek pagan city. When Palestine was under the Greek kings of Egypt, the Ptolemies, the old Akko on the coast had been con-

verted into Ptolemais, the seat of government, and the old Rabbath-ammon east of the Jordan into Philadelphia—called after Queen Arsinoë Philadelphus. That the old native names nevertheless persisted in native speech may be seen by the fact that Akko is to-day Acre, and Rabbath-ammon Ammân, the capital of Transjordania. Other Greek cities in Palestine were Philoteria on the Sea of Galilee, called after a sister of Ptolemy II; Seleucia in Gaulonitis, called after Seleucus I; Gamala, Hippus and Gadara in the hills east of the Sea of Galilee, the last of which produced three prominent men of letters, Menippus the satirist, Meleager the poet, and Philodemus the Epicurean; further south in the Jordan valley, where the great road crosses it, you find the old Beth-shan become Scythopolis (Beisân again to-day), and on the east side opposite a city named after Pella in Macedonia. On the coast, south of Ptolemais, you have Strato's Tower (destined one day to become Cæsarea) and Apollonia. Damascus had been converted into a Greek city since the time of Alexander the Great: in the 2nd century B.C., the old Phœnician cities, Tyre, Sidon, Berytus, Aradus, had become Greek in type and largely Greek in language; so had the old Philistine cities, Gaza, Ascalon, Azotus. The poet Antipater (born about 165 B.C.) came from Tyre or Sidon.

These Greek cities dotted about in Eastern lands were centres from which Hellenism radiated everywhere and reduced the old native traditions of culture to a lower grade. The rich and ambitious among the native peoples everywhere turned into Greeks, for the Greeks were ready enough to accept one as a Greek who took on their culture. Anyone who aspired to literary fame wrote in Greek. Only the poorer classes in the cities outside the privileged citizen-body still talked Aramaic, and the native people of the country villages. To some extent in Mesopotamia Aramaic was still kept up as a literary language; it was used, as we have just seen, for their inscriptions by the Nabatæan kings. Some day, the later form of Aramaic, Syriac, was destined to be the medium of a Christian literature, but if any popular pagan literature in Aramaic was produced in the centuries between Alexander and the 3rd century A.D., it was beneath the notice of the Greek-educated class and all knowledge of it has perished.

In this world, yielding everywhere to the prestige of Hellenism, the Jews and Samaritans formed a strange exception. At Jerusalem too the immense attraction which Hellenism exerted had been felt; there, too, large numbers of the rich and ambitious had desired to convert Jerusalem into a Greek city, as Damascus and Tyre and Gaza had been converted. Only the faithful had opposed, and then the attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to carry through Hellenism with a high hand had provoked the violent reaction which had ended in the establishment of an independent Jewish state. Once established, the Hasmonæan High Priests, as we have seen, proved as full of worldly ambitions as any heathen dynast, but they could not altogether abjure the cause by which they had risen. Jerusalem remained a Jewish city, without gymnasium, without theatre, using Aramaic in its public business, Aramaic or Hebrew in its legal schools, Hebrew in its temple ritual, Hebrew and Aramaic in its synagogues. Outside Judæa in all that part of the Holy Land which was pagan—Galilee and the country east of the Jordan—small Jewish communities existed at the time of the Maccabæan revolt in dispersion amongst the heathen. Since the pagan population of Palestine had taken sides with the Seleucid government against the Jews, these scattered groups of Jews had been exposed to attack by the neighbours. Many of them had been brought to Jerusalem by Judas Maccabæus. At that date it was a case of concentrating, not of extending, the Jewish sphere.

But already under Jonathan the reverse movement of expansion began. Alexander Balas in 147 B.C. made over to Jonathan the Philistine city of Ekron and its territory. Two or three years later Demetrius II allowed the Jews to annex the three Samaritan districts of Ephraim, Lydda, and Ramathaim. Shortly before the murder of Jonathan (143 B.C.) Simon had put Jewish garrisons in Joppa and in Adida, and one of his first acts after Jonathan's murder was definitely to annex Joppa, driving out the pagan inhabitants and replacing them by Jews. A few months later Simon took Gazara (Gezer) and did the same thing as had been done at Joppa. It was these annexations beyond the borders of Judæa for which John Hyrcanus was compelled by Antiochus Sidetes to pay tribute. When, after the death of Antiochus, John recovered his independence, he resumed the forward policy. East of Jordan he conquered Medaba. To the north he attacked the Samaritans, took Shechem, and destroyed the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim. The Temple was never

rebuilt; the words ascribed to the Samaritan woman in St. John, 'Our fathers worshipped in this mountain,' rightly use the past tense; though the Samaritans continued to kill their Passover lambs on the sacred site. To the south he conquered the Idumæan towns, Adora and Marissa. And then he took a new departure in regard to the conquered population. The Idumæans were not driven out, as the inhabitants of Joppa and Gazara had been; they were compelled to accept circumcision and become Jews. In the last years of John's pontificate, a Jewish force commanded by his sons took the Greek city of Samaria, which they utterly destroyed, turning the watercourses over the site. An attempt had been made by one of the pretendants to the Seleucid throne, Antiochus IX, Cyzicenus, to raise the siege of Samaria: on the day of his defeat by John's sons, it was said that a *bath-qol* ('daughter of the Voice,' i.e. a voice from heaven) came to the High Priest in the Temple, telling him of the victory. Just before the fall of Samaria, another Greek city, Scythopolis (Beth-shan), was surrendered to the Jews.

The brief pontificate of Judas Aristobulus (104-103 B.C.) was signalized by the conquest of Galilee, and here again the same policy was followed as in Idumæa: the heathen Galileans were compelled to become Jews. (It is possible, therefore, that some of the twelve Apostles were descended from Gentiles, converted forcibly, a century before, to Judaism.) The whole of Palestine west of the Jordan, with the exception of the Phœnician and Philistine seaboard, was now Jewish, or, like the Samaritans, under Jewish rule.

The reign of King Jannæus Alexander (103-76 B.C.) was largely occupied by wars of conquest and marks the height of Hasmonæan power. On the east of Jordan he took the illustrious Greek city of Gadara and the strong fortress of Amathus on the Jordan. Then he attacked the Hellenized Philistine cities, and conquered Raphia and Anthedon and (in 96 B.C.) Gaza itself. Then again he made conquests east of the Jordan, and compelled the Arab and semi-Arab inhabitants of Moab and Gilead to pay tribute. This brought him into collision with the Nabatæan king Obedas I, and he met with a severe defeat which suspended his conquests for some years. In this interval between the break-up of Greek rule in Syria and the coming of Roman rule, when the native peoples of the Nearer East were left for a little while to their own devices, the Nabatæan power was the one which the Jews had most to fear, a state as strong as their own, which made a solid wall against their advance eastwards. Aretas III, the successor of Obedas, stretched his dominion so far that it included Damascus, and soon after 85 B.C. he invaded the south of Palestine, defeated Jannæus at Adida, and compelled him to purchase peace by humiliating concessions. Yet from about 83 to 80 B.C. Jannæus was again victorious east of the Jordan, and conquered Pella, Dium, Gerasa, Gaulana, Seleucia, and Gamala. He died in camp in 76 B.C., besieging a fortress in the country of the Gerasenes. At some period of his reign he had also completed his conquest of the Philistine seaboard, where Ascalon alone of the Hellenized cities maintained its independence. To Greek culture Jannæus was a foe: many of the cities which had been the centres of its diffusion in Palestine Jannæus turned into fields of ruins: the Jewish conquest passed over lands which had once been flourishing like a blasting storm. Nor, in the place of the culture which he destroyed, was Jannæus the man to introduce high conceptions of religion. He was indeed just a savage barbarian, cruel, vindictive, and drunken. The illness from which he died had been brought on by intemperance.

(6) *Breach between Hasmonæans and Pharisees.*—The third of the processes which, it was said, has to be traced in the history of the Hasmonæan dynasty is the growth of alienation between the ruling family and the party of religion. Tradition represents the two parties of Pharisees and Sadducees as already existing in the days of John Hyrcanus. The origin of both is somewhat obscure. The Pharisees were probably a continuation of the Hasîdîm. If in the fight with the Seleucid power the cause for which the pious suffered and died was that of fidelity to the Law, the desire to obey the Law in every minute detail had been quickened by the contest, and led to the formation of a set of people whose occupation in life was to determine in every kind of circumstance what course of action the strict fulfilment of the Law prescribed, and who were determined to bring about, so far as they could, the observance of the Law by the people as a whole, and for this end aspired to be the supreme directors of the community. Since a large number of the people were either prevented by the exigencies of life from devoting time to the study of the Law, or were not sufficiently zealous to observe it with the same

exactitude, these constituted a sinful mass from which the zealots for the Law markedly separated themselves. Hence their name of *Pharisees*, in Aramaic *P'rîshayyâ*, 'the Separated.'

The meaning of the name *Sadducees* is doubtful. The theory most generally accepted connects it with Zadok, the High Priest under Solomon. In any case, the party of the Sadducees seems to have consisted mainly of members of the priestly aristocracy, who wished to limit religion to a discharge of external duties specified in the written Torah, and who disliked all the additions and speculations attached to the Torah by the Pharisees. Now that thorough-going Hellenizers had been exterminated from the Jewish communities, the worldly spirit of the Hellenizers probably passed to these rich and comfortable priests in Jerusalem. Let the Temple ritual be performed according to the requirements of the Mosaic Law, and for the rest a man need not vex himself with excessive zeal. But the Sadducees were in favour of strong government which made the world a more comfortable place for the rich. It was noted that their scale of judicial punishments was a harder one than that of the Pharisees. The Pharisees felt a fear lest the Law might be violated by the condemnation of an innocent man through a neglect of the proper rules of evidence, and they built up these rules into a system which in effect ruled out to a large extent the infliction of the death-penalty. Simeon ben Shetach, the great Pharisaic Rabbi of the days of Jannæus, refused, according to tradition, to condemn to death a murderer who had been found beside the corpse with a bloody sword in his hand, because no actual eye-witness of the murder could be found. God, the Pharisees held, could be trusted to inflict the punishment upon the guilty, and indeed this particular murderer almost immediately—so tradition averred—died by the bite of a snake. Yet where the case was clear and the Law needed to be vindicated the Pharisees could be ruthless enough. Simeon ben Shetach is said to have hanged in a single day eighty women who were found practising witchcraft (at Ascalon, the legend says; but there must be some confusion here, since Ascalon, as we have seen, was the one Philistine city which Jannæus failed to conquer).

It was not only questions of legal practice which distinguished the Pharisees from the Sadducees. It was also their different attitude to beliefs about the unseen world. As people of earnest religion, to whom in this world the cry came at every turn 'Refrain, refrain,' the Pharisees were ready to welcome hopes regarding what lay beyond. Belief in the reward of the righteous after death, and belief in the resurrection of the dead, which the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes had made vivid in the hearts of great numbers, were firmly adopted by the Pharisees. Those imaginations regarding heaven and hell, regarding the coming age when the Lord would be manifested in glory for the deliverance of the righteous and the judgement of sinners, regarding the Anointed One, the King to be—embodied in books which were supposed to be rediscovered writings of some sage in the remote past—Daniel or Enoch or Noah or Baruch—what we now call the Apocalyptic literature—it was in some Pharisaic circles that these imaginations fed devotion. There is no reason to suppose that all Pharisees welcomed the apocalypses: the successors of the Pharisees, the Rabbis of the age of the Mishnah, set little store by this kind of literature, and concentrated upon the study and exposition of the Law. The later Rabbis may represent one section of the Pharisaism before the Christian era. Yet certain ideas which had first been propagated by the Apocalyptic literature—belief in rewards and punishments after death, in personal immortality and the resurrection, in angels and spirits—became an essential constituent of Rabbinic Judaism.

To all these things the Sadducees were opposed. (Yet Leszynsky, *Die Sadduzäer*, has argued that Sadduceeism contained an element of real religion.) Their attitude to Pharisaism was probably rather like that of wealthy and conventional churchmen in the 18th century to the 'enthusiasm' of the Methodists. (As Mr. Claude Montefiore points out in his book *The Synoptic Gospels*, the Sadducees rather than the Pharisees were responsible for the condemnation of Jesus to death. Caiaphas and Annas were Sadducees.)

Josephus names as a third Jewish 'sect,' beside the Pharisees and Sadducees, the people called *Essenes*. Not much need be said here about the Essenes, since there is no mention of them in the New Testament, nor any indication of their influence. The idea has occasionally been put forward that Jesus or John the Baptist came from amongst the Essenes, but that idea to-day is left to cranks and writers of fiction. Yet the Essenes need so far to be taken account of in connexion with the New Testament as their beliefs

at certain points corresponded with things we find in the early Christian writings, and they show therefore that certain ideas were diffused in Jewish circles outside the Christian community.

The Essenes were a sort of monastic order which had various settlements in Palestine, in the desert and near many country towns. The order consisted of both men and women, but allowed no marriage amongst full members, who were pledged to practise absolute continence. They had community of goods, and occupied themselves mainly with agriculture. Members were distinguished by a special white dress. New members were admitted to the order only after a severe novitiate and the taking of tremendous oaths. The teaching of the Essenes was largely concerned with peculiar rules of ritual purity and lustrations. They were especially strict in regard to the Sabbath. Non-Jewish elements entered obviously to some extent into their system of ideas—some of those 'mystical' ideas which floated about in the countries of the Nearer East and had found embodiment in Greece in the Pythagorean confraternities of the 6th century B.C. Persian, Zoroastrian, influence may also have come in. One element in the Essene view which touches New Testament ideas is their condemnation of swearing—'he who cannot find credit without invoking the name of God stands already condemned' (Joseph., *B.J.*, ii, 135)—though they cannot have condemned all oaths, since they required oaths of candidates for admission to the order. Another element of interest is their repudiation of animal sacrifice. They sent gifts to the Temple, but were excluded themselves from it on the ground of their refusal to sacrifice. Since they regarded the Mosaic Law with the greatest veneration, they must have held, as some early Christians did, that the laws of sacrifice were allegories never meant to be taken literally.

One peculiar Jewish religious community, of which knowledge was recovered only recently from two MSS. at Cambridge, is that of the 'New Covenant.' It started in the 2nd century B.C. before the days of persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes as a reform movement in the priesthood at Jerusalem. The opposition was so strong that the body of reformers took refuge in Damascus under the leadership of someone they called 'the Star' or 'the Lawgiver.' The community was apparently still existing in the years immediately before the Christian era. It was especially opposed to the Pharisees and the tradition of the scribes, and claimed to represent the true Israel. Points of interest about this community are that, like Jesus, it forbade divorce. Its manner of life was generally ascetic, and the Messianic hope was prominent in its teaching. (See *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, in Charles, ii, 785 ff.) It seems at one time to have carried on a propaganda in Palestine.

The house of Hashmon had risen to power as the leaders of the Pious against the Hellenists, and it was naturally upon the Pharisees that the Hasmonæan High Priests at first leaned. Yet their real affinities, when once established, were with the Sadducean aristocracy, and it could not fail but sooner or later they would openly change sides. Even in the days of Judas Maccabæus a significant rift had appeared, when Eliakim (Alcimus), having been put in as High Priest by the Seleucid government, had the support of the Pious on the ground that he belonged by descent to the proper line, whilst the party led by the Hasmonæan brethren were against him. The definite breach between the house of Hashmon and the Pharisees came under John Hyrcanus.

The incident, whatever it was, which brought on the breach must have come as the culmination to a growing discontent on the part of some of the Pharisees at John's tenure of the High Priesthood. That the crimes of Judas Aristobulus, his murder of his mother and his brother, shocked the conscience of the Jewish community, might be inferred from the fact, if true, that Aristobulus himself felt bitter remorse at the end of his life. The philhellenism of Aristobulus would also be an offence to the Pharisees. (Schürer conjectures that the phil-hellenism, and Aristobulus's connexion with the Sadducees, were the real offences, and that the crimes attributed to him were inventions of the Pharisees, who wished to blacken his memory. The Greek historians spoke well of him.) But it was under Jannæus Alexander that the alienation between the Hasmonæan king and the Pharisees turned to savage enmity. The stories told later of the quarrel are trivial and puerile. Once on the occasion of the Feast of Tabernacles when Jannæus stood at the altar—tradition told—he was pelted with the citrons which the people carried according to the custom of the Feast. The High Priest set his Gentile mercenary troops on the Jewish crowd, and six thousand of them were cut down. After the defeat of Jannæus by the Nabatæan king Obedas,

when he returned to Jerusalem as a fugitive, the people, under the guidance of the Pharisees, rose against him, and it came to six years' sanguinary civil war—on the one side Jannæus, king and High Priest, with an army of Gentile mercenaries; on the other side the Jewish people under arms. The Jews actually called in the help of one of the Seleucid kinglets, Demetrius III Eukairos, who had got possession of some regions of Syria, against the great-nephew of Judas Maccabæus. Jannæus suffered a heavy defeat and fled to the hills (about 88 B.C.). Then came a revulsion of feeling. Perhaps Demetrius showed signs of wishing to re-establish Seleucid supremacy over Jerusalem; perhaps there had always been a party against calling in the Seleucid, who had been in a minority before, and now got the bulk of popular feeling on their side. Large sections of the Jewish forces began going over to the cause of Jannæus. Demetrius retired, and Jannæus came back. But a part of the Jewish army still carried on the fight, till Jannæus beat them down and re-entered Jerusalem in triumph. He had eight hundred of his captives, no doubt in large part Pharisees, crucified in rows together, so that he could enjoy their dying agonies from his palace-terraces, where he caroused with the women of his harem.

We hear of no further attempt at revolt, after this, on the part of the Pharisees. But it is said that on his death-bed Jannæus advised his wife Salome, to whom he purposed to bequeath the kingdom, to ally herself with the Pharisees. If this is historical, it must mean that Jannæus was conscious that public opinion, which had grown to great volume in favour of the Pharisees after his atrocities, was a force with which it would be good statecraft to compromise. When the kingdom passed in fact to Salome, who also bore the Greek name of Alexandra, there came a brief period when the Pharisees were really in the ascendant. The queen yielded herself entirely to their direction. The later Rabbis looked back upon those nine years of Salome's reign (76 to 67 B.C.) as a time of ideal bliss. 'The grains of wheat were as large as kidneys, the grains of barley like olive-kernels, and the beans like gold denarii,' and the rain fell only, but then in sufficient quantities, at night. Salome could not, of course, inherit the High Priesthood; that she made over to her elder son, Hyrcanus II, a weak and feeble-minded creature. Jannæus's fierce spirit was inherited by the second son, Aristobulus.

(7) *End of the Hasmonæan Kingdom.*—When Salome died, the days of decline began for the Hasmonæan dynasty, and the evil which disintegrated the Jewish kingdom was the same as that which disintegrated, in the last hundred years before the coming of Rome, the other royal houses of the Nearer East—strife within the royal family. Aristobulus tried to oust Hyrcanus from the High Priesthood, and he got the priestly aristocracy on his side. But the people sided with Hyrcanus, and called in the Nabatæans. They did not want to see the kingship and the High Priesthood combined any more in one person. Nabatæan forces together with a Jewish army besieged the temple-hill held by Aristobulus, the priests, and their partisans. There lived in Jerusalem in those days a man of renowned piety called Onias (Honyah), whose prayers, it was believed, could obtain whatever he wished from God. The people sought the miraculous virtue of his prayers against the defenders of the temple-hill. But Onias, the story says, prayed instead that God would listen neither to the prayers of one side, nor to those of the other, since the one side were His priests, and the other side His people.

But while this civil war in the Jewish community was going on, a change came over the whole world situation. The interval between Greek (Macedonian) rule and Roman rule, during which native principalities had had a chance in the Nearer East, came to its end. Rome was there. In 66 B.C. the general of the Republic, Gnæus Pompeius (Pompey), had conquered the Pontic king in Asia and received the submission of the Armenian king Tigranes. A few years before Tigranes had seemed in a fair way to create an Armenian empire which would include Syria and Palestine. Now it was for Pompey to arrange the affairs of these countries, as seemed good to him and to the Senate. In 65 Pompey's lieutenant, Scaurus, came, in advance of his chief, to Damascus. Both Jewish parties tried to buy his support at the price of 400 talents. Scaurus provisionally inclined to Aristobulus, and at the word of the Roman the Nabatæan forces melted away from Jerusalem. But the important thing was to buy the favour of Pompey himself. Aristobulus sent him a vine made of gold worth 500 talents, which was afterwards put in the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol. In 63 Pompey came to Damascus. Now not only Hyrcanus and Aristobulus ap-

peared before him, but representatives of the Jewish people begging that the Hasmonæan kingship might be abolished, and the Jewish state be ruled by a High Priest like those of old.

When Pompey moved south, Aristobulus, finding that what was expected of him was submission, broke away in indignation and shut himself up in one of the strong fortresses, which during the recent times of unsettlement had come to be a feature of Palestine. The one which Aristobulus chose was in the Jordan valley and was called, after his father, Alexandreion. When Pompey followed him there, Aristobulus held him for a little in play, and then rapidly moved to Jerusalem with the intention of holding it against the Romans. But on Pompey's arrival soon afterwards before the city, Aristobulus's nerve failed, and he surrendered his person to the great Roman. The priests still tried to hold the Temple-hill, and it was three months before Pompey could storm it. He did not touch the Temple treasures, but he insisted on entering the Holy of Holies—an outrage which entered deeply into the heart of the people (63 B.C.).

The Hasmonæan kingdom was abolished. Aristobulus Pompey took away with him to Rome, so that the 'King of the Jews' might walk at his triumph amongst the train of captives whom the conqueror of the East brought back to exhibit to the Roman people. Pompey also carried away some thousands of other Jews—priests and partisans of the priests—to live as slaves in the far-away west. At Jerusalem Hyrcanus was left as High Priest and civil ruler. But he was to bear in this latter capacity the title of *ethnarch* only, not that of king. Another power had now arisen in the Jewish community which reduced the feeble representative of the house of Hashmon to a mere figure-head, and for the next sixty years it is this power which dominates Jewish history. Some sixty years before, John Hyrcanus had forcibly incorporated the Idumæans in the Jewish community, and now it was an Idumæan, Antipater, who raised himself, by clever intrigue, to be the power behind the throne. Not only was Antipater a great man amongst the Idumæans but his wife, Cypros, belonged to a powerful Jewish family settled amongst the Nabatæans. This gave Antipater a connexion with the Nabatæan kingdom, the neighbour, as we have seen, with which the Jews had most to reckon.

(8) *Antipater the Idumæan.* — Antipater's policy was to lean upon the Romans. Aristobulus had still a formidable body of partisans: his son Alexander was at large in Palestine, with Jewish bands devoted to him. Three times within a few years after 63, Alexander attempted to recover Jerusalem. On the first occasion he actually succeeded for a moment, and Hyrcanus had to flee. But the steady support of the Roman governor of Syria gave the predominance to Hyrcanus and Antipater. Antipater leant upon the Romans, but this was no simple policy when the Romans themselves became divided. From the war between Pompey and Julius Cæsar which broke out in 49 B.C., to the war between Mark Antony and Octavianus Cæsar, which was ended by the battle of Actium in 31 B.C. the chiefs of the Roman aristocracy were largely engaged in fighting each other with Roman armies over the wide area of the empire. Antipater desired always to be on the side of the winner, or at any rate of the nearer power, but to steer the course was difficult and dangerous. Before the battle of Pharsalus Antipater adhered to Pompey, and Cæsar in Rome set Aristobulus, the 'King of the Jews' free, to go to Palestine and recover his inheritance. Fortunately for Antipater, the Pompeians succeeded in killing him on his way. After Pharsalus, Antipater was, of course, a devoted adherent of Cæsar's and led a Jewish force to his support in Egypt in 47 B.C. Julius Cæsar in power showed marked favour to the Jews, both in Palestine and in Rome. He definitely recognized Antipater as ruler of Palestine, side by side with the High Priest. He exempted the Jewish synagogues all over the empire from the law against associations, and took their religion under the special protection of the Roman government. After the Ides of March, 44 B.C., the Roman Jews were prominent in the crowds which demonstrated in favour of the murdered Dictator.

The predominance of the Idumæan at Jerusalem was not now attached to Antipater's person alone. He had sons ready to make that predominance dynastic—Phasael the elder, Herod the younger. Phasael was given the command under his father in Judæa, Herod in Galilee. In Galilee Herod came into collision with a leader of Jewish guerilla bands, Hezekiah, a forerunner of the Zealots of the 1st century A.D. Herod exterminated the followers of Hezekiah with a strong hand, and killed Hezekiah himself. But Hezekiah commanded the sympathies of a good part of the Jewish people, and

Herod was arraigned before the Jerusalem Sanhedrin on the charge of having put Hezekiah to death without trial. To many no doubt Hezekiah was a patriot, and the house of Antipater agents of the Gentile power. Herod came to Jerusalem and presented himself before the Sanhedrin with an armed following. He escaped condemnation—how precisely, is not clear. But he conceived a vindictive hatred against the priestly aristocracy and obtained from the governor of Syria, Sextus Cæsar, the post of commandant of Samaria and Cœle-Syria, which put considerable forces at his disposals. With these he moved on Jerusalem, to execute vengeance on the Sanhedrin. Only the entreaties of his father made him hold his hand—for a while.

After the murder of Julius Cæsar, Syria came temporarily into the power of one of the assassins, Gaius Cassius. Policy made the house of Antipater for the moment anti-Cæsarian. When Antipater was poisoned by a rival magnate, Malichus, it was the support of Cassius which enabled Antipater's sons to get Malichus killed in turn. Then the anti-Cæsarian cause went down at Philippi, and the house of Antipater was confronted with the victors, Mark Antony and Octavianus Cæsar.

(9) *Herod.*—Herod flew to Bithynia to conciliate Antony. But the Jewish people also saw a singularly favourable moment for shaking off the Idumæan yoke. Three times they sent desperate embassies to Antony as he approached—to Bithynia, to Antioch, and to Tyre—entreating that the house of Antipater might be deprived of its power. Surely it had compromised itself too deeply with Cassius for Antony now to regard it with favour. Yet Herod, a young man of full-blooded vigour and engaging address, succeeded in winning over the jovial soldier, Mark Antony. Phasael and Herod were established with the title of tetrarchs.

Then in 40 B.C. came a strange diversion. Against the invincible Roman power, the Lord raised up, so it seemed, a saviour in the East, the Parthian, to whom more than 100 years later, some of the persecuted Christians would look, as the minister of vengeance on the western Babylon. Parthian armies overran Syria, and in alliance with the Parthians a surviving son of the Hasmonæan Aristobulus, Mattathiah Antigonus, appeared at the head of a Jewish band in Judæa. Jerusalem opened its doors jubilantly to the son of the last Jewish king. Phasael was killed by the Parthians. Herod fled to his fortress of Masada on the Dead Sea, and thence repaired to Rome. The old Hyrcanus had his ears cut off so as to disqualify him for ever for the office of High Priest, and was deported to Babylonia. The coins of Antigonus bear on one side the legend, in Hebrew, 'Mattathiah the High Priest, the Commonwealth of the Jews,' and on the other side, in Greek, 'Of King Antigonus.'

The fact that Antigonus had established himself in Jerusalem as a protégé of the Parthians meant for Herod that he could now count on the support of Rome. He was proclaimed by the Senate King of the Jews, and it was as king that he returned to Palestine. But even though the Parthians had to evacuate the country, Jerusalem clave to Antigonus. Herod, strengthened by Roman forces under Sosius, Mark Antony's lieutenant in Syria, had to lay siege to the city, and for three years it held out against him. The Parthian intervention, although transient, had broken the spell which had held the Jews fascinated before Rome's apparent omnipotence: at any moment, they now felt, something wonderful might happen, God's great deliverance might come. But Herod and the Romans did not relax their pressure, and at the end of the third year, in 37 B.C., the city and Temple had to surrender. Antigonus was beheaded: Herod took up his residence in Jerusalem as King of the Jews. A bronze coin has been found which bears on the reverse 'C. Sosius Imperator' ('Imperator' then meant simply 'victorious general,' not 'emperor'), with the figure of a trophy between a male and female Jewish captive, and on the obverse the head of Antony.

The relation of the new half-Idumæan, half-Jewish dynasty to the old priestly aristocracy, whose hearts clung to the house of Hashmon, constituted the problem of the time. Herod might claim in one way to continue the old line; he took in 37 B.C., as one of his wives, the Hasmonæan princess Mariamne, a granddaughter of Hyrcanus II. But when the question came up of filling the office of High Priest, Herod assumed the right to nominate whom he would, and he did not in the first instance appoint a member of the house of Hashmon. Then the influence of Mariamne secured the appointment of her young brother, a mere boy, Aristobulus, but the acclamations of the people so disquieted Herod that he had Aristobulus drowned. Ultimately Herod fixed upon a family of Egyptian Jews, belonging to the priestly stock—the house of Boëthus—as the family from whom High Priests

should be drawn. Possibly they were connected in blood with the older line, whose representative, Onias, had taken refuge in Egypt. We hear of no attack made by the Jerusalem Rabbis upon the qualifications of Herod's High Priests, but the fact that the High Priest was now a creature of the Idumæan King, who held his office only during the King's pleasure, deprived the office of its old prestige.

In proportion as the priestly aristocracy lost power and prestige, the popular influence of the Rabbis increased; the men who knew and expounded the Law, as expert students, took the place of the priests as the moral leaders of the community.

When war broke out between Octavianus Cæsar and Antony in 32 B.C., the Jewish state being within Antony's sphere of power, Herod showed himself zealous in the service of his overlord. When Octavianus Cæsar proved the victor in 31 B.C. Herod had once more to change allegiance. Fortunately, he had not been fighting directly against Octavian, but had been detached by Antony, at the wish of Cleopatra, to carry on war against the Nabatæans. And once more Herod was successful in ingratiating himself with the winning power.

After this, so far as the ruler of Rome was concerned, Herod had secured his position for good. Octavian—who in 27 B.C. became the Emperor Augustus—not only confirmed Herod in his former possessions, but enlarged his kingdom to dimensions greater than that of the Hasmonæan kingdom at its greatest extent. It included the whole Palestine coast, except Ascalon, and stretched over Batanæa, Trachonitis, the Hauran, right up to the source of the Jordan at the Panium.

Herod was thus much more than King of the Jews: his realm included large Gentile populations and illustrious Greek cities like Gadara. And there was no longer any question of converting these populations to Judaism. Herod aspired to combine in his person the patron of Judaism in Jerusalem and the patron of paganism in the Greek or Hellenized cities of Palestine. Like earlier Hellenistic kings, he wanted to be a founder of Greek cities. Samaria, destroyed under Hyrcanus I, was rebuilt again as a Greek city with the new name, Sebaste, given it in honour of Augustus (the Latin title 'Augustus' the Greeks translated by 'Sebastos'). He founded another new Greek city on the site of Strato's Tower, which by means of great harbour-works built into the sea, to prevent the accumulation of silt, he converted for the time into the chief port of Palestine. This city too he named in honour of the Emperor, Cæsarea. He even built temples for the state-worship of the Emperor, one at each of the two cities just mentioned, and one at the Panium. In Cæsarea he also built a temple to the Fortune of Rome. At Jerusalem itself he excavated a theatre in the hillside, though outside the city walls, and he built an amphitheatre—presumably for gladiatorial shows!—in the neighbouring plain. But his ambition was to present himself as a patron of Hellenism to the Greek world far beyond the limits of his kingdom. He rebuilt at his own charges for the Rhodians the temple of Apollo; he put up public buildings at Nicopolis, near Actium, the city founded by Augustus in memory of his victory; he built colonnades along the principal street of Antioch; a portico in Chios, baths at Ascalon, and he bestowed gifts on Athens, Sparta, Tyre, Damascus and other Greek cities.

His court, housed at Jerusalem in a new palace resplendent with marble and gold, was Hellenistic, not Oriental, in type. Herod himself no doubt wore Greek dress and shaved clean—as the fashion of the Greco-Roman world was from Alexander the Great to the Emperor Hadrian. One of his principal courtiers and agents was the Greek rhetorician and man of letters, Nicolaus of Damascus, from whom we have an amusing account how Herod under his direction studied first philosophy, then rhetoric, then history, throwing himself into each with the same exuberant energy. Nicolaus wrote a history from which a large part of Josephus's account of the reign of Herod is taken.

The religious Jews could not regard Herod as a true Jewish king. Yet it was plain that the rule of someone who conformed as far as Herod did to the Jewish Law, might be a relative good in the circumstances of the time: it might be better than direct subjection to a Roman official. It secured that within Jerusalem itself obvious offences against the Law should be avoided, that no idols should anywhere appear, that the temple-ritual and the processes of law should continue according to the proper order. Herod was also ready to give ample material assistance to the people when drought created famine. And he made his chief bid for popular approval by rebuilding the Temple, presenting himself in the character of a new Solomon. The Temple

courts were extended with the addition of magnificent colonnades in the Hellenistic style, and the central building itself raised to a height nearly twice its former one. The sensibilities of the religious were spared by none but priests being permitted to work as builders on those parts of the Temple legally accessible to the priests alone. Trouble only arose when Herod placed the figure of an eagle over one of the great doors: two Rabbis who led a crowd to tear it down were burnt at the stake. That the Jews were proud of their fine new Temple, when it was once made, may be seen from the way the Galilean disciples of the Lord draw His attention to it in the Gospel and try to elicit His admiration (Mark 13 [1]). Yet it did not make them love Herod. Whilst the donors of this or that bit of decoration added to the Temple had their names remembered in tradition in connexion with their gifts, the connexion of the Temple as a whole with Herod was not willingly called to mind. No doubt Herod's munificence at Jerusalem and elsewhere meant crushing taxation—a thing which had made even Solomon unpopular. But the Jews did not yet have to pay tribute to Cæsar, and Herod's money had on it no image of a human head. There was no Hebrew legend: only, in Greek, 'Of King Herod.' In one respect, Jews could not but recognize Herod's value to Judaism. He used his influence with the Romans to secure protection for the Jewish communities of the Dispersion, when they were threatened by the enmity of the Greek townsmen among whom they dwelt.

The attitude of the religious in Jerusalem under Herod was, as a rule, one of passive non-co-operation rather than of active hostility. We hear of no attempts at rebellion. On the other hand, most of the Pharisees refused to take the oath of allegiance which would have made them recognize Herod as their king. They were allowed to pay a sum of money instead.

We have in the 'Psalms of Solomon' an expression of Pharisaic piety in the days of Herod. The 'Psalms of Solomon' are not pseudonymous, because the composer never claims to be Solomon. Solomon's name was only affixed to the book by a copyist. They speak with feeling of the bloodshed perpetrated by the Romans when Pompey took Jerusalem in 63 B.C., and of Pompey's entry into the Temple, but there is no regret for the fall of the house of Hashmon. There are allusions to Herod as an alien and a transgressor of the Law. 'The king in transgression, the judges in disobedience, and the people in sin' had caused the great drought and famine. The Sanhedrin judges in appearance according to the Law, but its members are hypocrites and grossly immoral. Against the dark present the psalmist sets a picture of the rule of the coming King, a Messiah of the right house, a 'son of David,' who will come to establish righteousness and take away sin—abolish it from the holy community—and reign gloriously in Jerusalem.

No doubt the general tranquillity of the people under Herod, as compared with the rebellions under Jannæus, may be partly due to the fact that Herod's power, supported by a strong mercenary army of Thracians, Germans, and Gauls, and riveted upon the country by his system of fortresses—the Herodeion, the Alexandreion, Hyrcania, Machærus (the royal fortress, east of the Dead Sea, which, according to Josephus, was the prison of John the Baptist, later on, under Herod Antipas), Masada—was greater than that of Jannæus had been, and made any movement of revolt hopeless.

The priestly aristocracy, who had clung to the last representatives of the house of Hashmon, remained quiet after forty-five of their richest men had been put to death by Herod. Soon there were no representatives left of the Hasmonæans, except Herod's wife, Mariamne, Herod's sons by Mariamne, and some distant cousins, the 'sons of Babas.' Old Hyrcanus II, who had come back from Babylonia to Jerusalem, Herod put to death in 31 B.C. for fear Octavian, after Antony's fall, might prefer him.

Then came the intrigues in Herod's polygamous house which darkened his later years and almost drove him mad. Mariamne, whom he passionately loved, he was induced on a false charge to kill (29 B.C.), and, later on (7 B.C.), both his sons by Mariamne. Herod also put to death the 'sons of Babas' (25 B.C.). The only persons after this in whose veins ran Hasmonæan blood were the children of Mariamne's dead children; one grew up to be Agrippa I (the 'King Herod' of Ac 12), another was the notorious Herodias. The villain of the story was Antipater, Herod's eldest son, born him by a woman he had taken to wife before he married Mariamne. Antipater Herod found out in the end, and put to death in 4 B.C., a few days before his own death. He died between March 13 (eclipse of the moon) and April 11 (Passover) in 4 B.C.,

about seventy years old, at Jericho on his return from Callirhoë beyond Jordan, a place of medicinal waters to which he had gone in the vain hope of a cure.

(10) *Archelaus* (4 B.C. to A.D. 6).—The kingdom of Herod was broken up after his death. His own testament had divided it amongst three of his sons by different wives, but the decision lay with Augustus, and all the three sons, as well as other members of the Herodian family, were active in Rome, besetting the Emperor with conflicting claims, as well as an embassy from the Jewish people, entreating that they might be delivered altogether from the house of Herod, and be placed as a community with internal self-government, attached to the province of Syria, under the Roman imperial legate of that province. This request the Emperor refused. It was decided that one son of Herod, Archelaus, should rule Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa, with the title of ethnarch, not of king; Antipas should rule Galilee and Peræa with the title of tetrarch; and Philip, also with the title of tetrarch, the districts of Batanæa, Trachonitis, and the Hauran. But Gaza, Gadara, and Hippos, as Greek or Hellenized cities of distinction, should be detached from the Herodian realm and be annexed to the Roman province of Syria.

The reign of Archelaus in Judæa was marked by bitter antagonism between ruler and people. The moment Herod was dead, before even Archelaus had left for Rome, the crowds of Jerusalem, swelled at the moment by Jews from all lands who had come to the passover feast of 4 B.C., broke into tumult, stoned the royal guards, and were suppressed only by a massacre. Whilst Archelaus was absent in Rome worse trouble occurred. Now it was a Roman procurator, Sabinus, whose oppressions goaded the people into revolt. Sabinus with the troops at his disposal stormed and robbed the Temple. Then, as the nationalist forces grew, the Romans were outnumbered and besieged in Herod's palace. At the same time in Galilee, near Sepphoris, a certain Judas, the son of the Hezekiah whom Herod had killed, raised the standard of independence; another leader of bands, Simon, rose in Peræa, whilst a third, a shepherd of huge stature, called Athronges, ranged the country with his following. It is said that each of them claimed to be king. The iron despotism under which the Jews in Palestine had been living for more than a generation no doubt made them eager to see the king, the Anointed One, who was to save Israel, appear. The atmosphere at that time was charged with Messianic excitement. It was the time when Jesus was born. The insurrections of 4 B.C. were got under by Varus, the legate of Syria, at the price of a good deal of bloodshed. Two thousand Jews underwent crucifixion. Long afterwards in the confused memories of the Rabbis the 'war of Varus' remained as a landmark of Israel's agony between the conquest by Pompey and the war under Vespasian. But when Jesus was a little boy, He must have heard people talk about the events of 4 B.C. as things quite fresh in mind.

(11) *Judæa under Procurators.*—After nine years of Archelaus's rule in Galilee (A.D. 6) Augustus himself was convinced that he was impossible, and banished him to Vienna in Gaul (Vienne). Judæa was put under a Roman official, called a *procurator*, or, in Greek, *epitropos*. (In the New Testament Pilate is called *hegemon*, which is not a title in the technical sense, but means simply 'governor' or 'officer,' the man in command.) Such a procurator was of a lower grade than most of the governors of provinces, who were of senatorial rank, ex-consuls or ex-prætors, and was taken from the order of *equites*. Only a few provinces, either backward and uncivilized ones, or ones of a peculiar character like Egypt, were put under men chosen from this lower order. The term 'procurator' meant really a manager of property, a steward or bailiff, and the Emperor had in all provinces procurators who looked after the Emperor's own possessions in each of them. Sabinus, just mentioned, had been a procurator of this kind. Those procurators were often freed slaves, but the procurators who governed provinces were of the equestrian order. (In A.D. 52 Claudius appointed a freed slave, Felix, as procurator of Judæa; but that was an innovation.) Their title indicated that the province under them was part of the Emperor's estate, and that their prime duty was to see that he got the proper return from it. The procurator himself (not, as in the larger provinces, a *quæstor* under the governor) had to levy the taxes through native agents. But he was not a mere bailiff; his office gave him judicial authority, and command over a body of Roman troops. Palestine was now under two different systems of government: the northern part and the country beyond Jordan was under native princes, Antipas and Philip: Judæa, Samaria, and Idumæa was under direct Roman administration. The procurator of Judæa was in a sort of subordination to the imperial legate of Syria: the legate

did not ordinarily interfere in the administration of Judæa; but if trouble arose in Judæa which the procurator could not control, then his superior, the legate of Syria, stepped in. The procurator's seat of government was not Jerusalem, but Cæsarea, though he might come to Jerusalem at the time of the great feasts. Then he would reside in Herod's sumptuous gilt palace, which came in consequence to be called the 'prætorium' (i.e. the headquarters of a Roman governor or general).

There was now a Roman garrison stationed permanently in Judæa. It seems to have numbered five cohorts of foot (about 3,000 men) and one *ala* of cavalry (480 men?), belonging to the 'auxiliary' troops of the Roman Army. (The suggestion then that the demoniac of Gadara spoke feelingly of a 'legion' of devils because the people of the country had learnt by experience the burden of the Roman legions, will not stand. There were no legions in Palestine.) The 'auxiliary' troops were not composed of men who had the Roman citizenship, as the men of the legions were, but were recruited from provincials: they had lighter armour than the legionaries. The Palestine garrison was recruited mainly from natives of the country other than the Jews, especially men of the two great cities of Sebaste (Samaria) and Cæsarea. These troops were probably part of Herod's old army, taken over by the Roman Government. One cohort was stationed at Jerusalem in the fortress called Antonia, north of the Temple, under the command of a *præfectus* (called in Greek a *chiliarchos*, i.e. commander of a thousand [Ac 21 31]); the bulk of the troops apparently at Cæsarea, with smaller detachments in the various strongholds over the country. From Ac 27 1 we learn that at that date (about A.D. 60) one of the cohorts stationed in Cæsarea had the honorific name *cohors Augusta*.

The first procurator of Judæa was Coponius, appointed in A.D. 6, when Quirinius was appointed for a second time legate of Syria. It was the legate's task at that moment to carry through a census over the whole of his province, including the newly annexed Judæa. This made trouble. The Jews were not yet accustomed to submitting to a Roman census, and the Galilean Judas, together with a Pharisee called Sadduk, headed the bands of nationalist fighters who tried to break the yoke of the Gentiles by force of arms (Ac 5 37). The attempt failed, but a section of the Jewish people continued to believe that an appeal to the sword would some day succeed, and to seize every opportunity of carrying on guerilla warfare against the hated government. This section henceforward was known, in Aramaic, as that of the Qanānayyā, 'the Zealous'—a name which in Greek was sometimes transcribed, in the singular, as *Kananaios* (Mk 3 18), sometimes translated as *Zēlōtēs* (Lk 6 15). One of the Twelve Apostles of Jesus had belonged to this section. That the taxation imposed by the Romans was exceedingly heavy we may learn from the fact that in A.D. 17 the Jews petitioned the Emperor for its alleviation (Tacitus, *Ann.*, ii, 42).

The next three successors of Coponius (A.D. 6 to 9) as procurators of Judæa were Marcus Ambibulus (A.D. 9 to 12), Annius Rufus (A.D. 12 to 15), and Valerius Gratus (A.D. 15 to 26). In A.D. 26 there came, as the fifth procurator, Pontius Pilatus. This relatively obscure member of the equestrian order, when he set out from Rome in that year for the province assigned him in the East, would have been astonished to learn that the appointment was to bring him a fame far beyond that of the Emperor himself, and that in ages to come his name would be repeated every day all over the world. The Emperor was now Tiberius, who had succeeded his stepfather in A.D. 14.

Pontius Pilate, if we judged him only by his conduct on the supreme occasion which was to make his name immortal, we should suppose to have been a man with good dispositions, but fatally weak in yielding to popular clamour. That, however, is not the character given him by his contemporary, Philo of Alexandria, or by Josephus. Philo calls him 'of unbending temperament, implacable harshness coupled with self-willed obstinacy.' Cruelty rather than weakness was what Jewish memory associated with him, and St. Luke gives an indication of this when he mentions Pilate's mingling the blood of certain Galileans with their sacrifices. But a man by nature ruthless might well not like condemning to crucifixion a man whom he believed innocent, and a man by nature obstinate might well give way to popular clamour if what seemed only a minor point—the crucifixion of a deluded Jewish visionary—was involved. To have a Jewish crowd, mad with excitement, yelling round his official seat, was an experience which began quite early for Pilate, within a few weeks of his arrival, and on that occasion too, in Cæsarea, Pilate yielded in the end. The ground of trouble then was that Pilate

had caused the cohort entering Jerusalem as garrison to carry with them their ordinary standards which had on them images of the Emperor. Again, he had the experience in Jerusalem, when he used some of the Temple treasure in order to construct an aqueduct to Jerusalem, which was really needed. That time Pilate got the better of the crowd by ordering his soldiers to bludgeon their heads. A good many were killed.

Some five years after the crucifixion of Jesus (A.D. 35) Pilate set a body of soldiers upon a great crowd of Samaritans who had gathered at the foot of Mount Gerizim, where a would-be prophet had promised to unearth some sacred vessels which had belonged to the Samaritan Temple before its destruction. Numbers of Samaritans were cut down or put to death, after capture, by Pilate. But the Samaritans appealed to Vitellius, the legate of Syria, and convinced him that the crowd had had no seditious purpose. Vitellius sent Pilate to Rome to answer for the atrocity. And so Pilate passes from the scene where he had stood for a moment in the light of history into darkness. What happened to the ex-procurator after this—though ancient legend and modern fiction have made efforts of imagination—is unknown.

(12) *Herod Antipas* (4 B.C. to A.D. 39).—All the time that Archelaus and the first five Roman procurators were ruling in Southern Palestine, the other two of Herod's sons, Antipas and Philip, were ruling in the north and east. Herod Antipas was the son of Herod by a Samaritan woman, Malthake. He was tetrarch of two regions—Galilee west of the Jordan and the Lake of Gennesaret, and Peræa east of the Jordan below Scythopolis—which were not in contact, since the territory of the Greek cities of the Decapolis (Gadara, etc.) was now detached from any Herodian rule, so that to go from Galilee to his castle Machærus on the Dead Sea, Antipas had to cross territory not his. If we combine the Gospel account of John the Baptist's death with what Josephus tells us, we must suppose that the Herodian court was residing in Machærus on that birthday of Herod's when his stepdaughter Salome danced before him. In Galilee Herod created a new city for his capital, Tiberias on the Sea of Galilee, called after the Emperor. It was a city of Hellenistic type with the political forms of a Greek city-state, a stadium, and a royal palace adorned by Greek art and offensive to the Jews because of the representations of men and animals. The citizens of Tiberias were a mixed multitude of Greeks and Hellenized Syrians. Jews commonly avoided the city; there was a belief that beneath its streets and buildings were ancient graves contact with which would defile. In the story of Jesus, Tiberias, the greatest city of Galilee, is not so much as mentioned. Yet some Jews lived in it, since it had, amongst its buildings, a large synagogue. Another town in Peræa which Herod Antipas fortified he called Livias, after Tiberius's mother.

The first wife of Herod Antipas was a daughter of the Nabatæan king Aretas IV. At Rome there lived a son of King Herod's by a wife called Mariamne, not the famous Mariamne, but the daughter of a High Priest who came of an Alexandrine Jewish family; this man was himself called Herod, and had married his half-niece Herodias, a daughter of Aristobulus, the son of the famous Mariamne, consequently by some part of her blood a Hasmonæan. Herodias had borne Herod a daughter, Salome. Once when Herod Antipas was in Rome he proposed to Herodias that she should leave her husband, Herod son of Mariamne, and marry him, Herod Antipas. She agreed, and after Antipas's existing wife, hearing what was afoot, had fled in indignation to her father, King Aretas, Herodias came with Salome from Rome and married Antipas in Galilee. It was this that provoked the earnest denunciations of John the Baptist. The evangelist (Mk 6 [17]) calls Herodias's first husband 'Philip,' but this is probably a slip of memory, due to the fact that Salome later on married her great-uncle Philip, Antipas's brother, the tetrarch of Batanæa. There is no evidence that Herod, son of Mariamne, had Philip as a second name.

Antipas's marriage with Herodias made King Aretas his enemy, and in A.D. 36 it came to war, in which Antipas suffered a severe defeat, and had probably to surrender some of his territory east of Jordan to the Nabatæans. The Romans would not have looked on to see a client-prince despoiled, had it not been that at that moment (A.D. 37) Tiberius died, and Vitellius, the legate of Syria, disliked Antipas. Gaius, nicknamed Caligula, the half-mad creature who succeeded, was a personal friend of another member of the house of Herod. This was a full-brother of Herodias, Herod Agrippa (Agrippa I), to whom Caligula gave the tetrarchy of his late uncle Philip and the title of King. In A.D. 39, when Antipas was in Rome with Herodias, Agrippa, wishing to get his

uncle Antipas out of the way, sent the Emperor accusations against him, including the charge that he was conspiring with the Parthians. Caligula banished Antipas to Lyons. Herodias, as Agrippa's sister, might, if she had liked, have remained in Palestine in the enjoyment of her possessions. She preferred to follow her husband into exile—one creditable action to be set against her crimes. Antipas's realm Caligula made over to Agrippa—as Agrippa had hoped.

(13) *Philip and Lysanias.*—Philip the tetrarch ruled the country east of the Jordan, the old Bashan, from Peræa to the source of the Jordan, from 4 B.C. to A.D. 34, a country with a mainly Gentile population. He has the best reputation of the Herodian princes: Josephus gives him a character of kindliness and justice. Some of his coins have the image of Tiberius, which his father and brother had to avoid to spare Jewish sensibilities. About A.D. 29 Philip, at the age of about fifty, married his great-niece Salome, then a girl of about nineteen. (Since Salome's second husband was her first-cousin Aristobulus, the son of Herod of Chalcis, and since Aristobulus was made by Nero King of Lesser Armenia, we have a portrait of Salome preserved on one of his coins.) Like his father and brother, Philip was a maker of cities. Panias, at the source of the Jordan, he enlarged and refounded as Cæsarea Philippi (Mk 8 [27]). The Bethsaida which stood by the Jordan where it flows into the Sea of Galilee, he rebuilt as Julias. Philip's dominions contained one settlement of Jews destined some day to be of note—a colony of Jews from Babylonia established by King Herod in Trachonitis, under the chieftainship of a certain Zamaris. Jakim, the son of Zamaris, and Philip, the son of Jakim, who were in their turn chiefs of this colony, were the most powerful persons in the lands which made up Philip's tetrarchy.

Luke notices, at the time of John the Baptist's coming forward (A.D. 28), Lysanias the 'tetrarch of Abilene' in addition to the two Herodian tetrarchs. Abila was a town near the ridge of the Antilibanus where it is crossed by the road between Damascus and Heliopolis. Before 36 B.C. almost the whole Lebanon had formed a tetrarchy under Lysanias I, with its capital at Chalcis. Lysanias I was killed by Mark Antony in 34 B.C. at Cleopatra's instigation, because she wanted to get possession of all his principality.

Abilene, the region attached to Abila, was only a small part of the tetrarchy which had been ruled by Lysanias I. In A.D. 28 it must have been ruled by a younger Lysanias, a grandson perhaps of Lysanias I, who although his dominion was so much smaller, was still called 'tetrarch.' No writer outside Luke notices the existence of this petty prince of the Lebanon. But a Greek inscription has been found near Abila (Schürer, *Geschichte d. jüd. Volkes* [4th edition], i, 718), which cannot be earlier than A.D. 14, and may be as late as A.D. 29, and which was put up by someone who calls himself the 'freedman of Lysanias the tetrarch.' It is conceivable that a man aged sixty or seventy in A.D. 16 might have been the slave of someone who had died fifty years before, but it seems more probable that the inscription points to a younger Lysanias, who was also 'tetrarch.'

(II) **Inner Conditions in Palestine.**—Having now surveyed the princes and governors who ruled over Palestine from the establishment of an independent Jewish state to the removal of Pontius Pilate and Herod Antipas, we must see what we can of the inner organization of the Jewish people.

(1) *The High Priests.*—The Jews in Judæa were allowed by the Romans to continue as a community in the main autonomous under their Jewish authorities—an 'aristocracy,' Josephus calls it (*Ant.*, xx, 251). In A.D. 6 Quirinius, the legate of Syria, appointed as High Priest a certain Annas or (as Josephus transcribes his name) Ananos. He held the office from A.D. 6 to 15, and remained after vacating it one of the men of greatest power and standing in Jerusalem. Five sons of his at different times all held the High Priesthood, and Joseph ben ha-Qayyafa (Caiaphas), High Priest from about A.D. 18 to 36, is stated by St. John (18 [13]) to have married Annas's daughter. The old Annas, although no longer formally High Priest, continued to have an influence, which made it possible to speak of him as if he were (Lk 3 [2], Ac 4 [6]). Other aristocratic families indeed besides the 'sons of Annas' often saw the High Priesthood held by one or other of their members, but no family reckoned so many High Priests in its roll as the family of Annas could do when his son, the younger Annas, became High Priest in A.D. 62.

The family left evil associations in Jewish memory. In one passage of the Talmud, which laments concerning the High Priests of the last century before the destruction of Jerusalem, and begins, 'Woe is me for the house of Boëthus,

because of their club!' we find, 'Woe is me for the house of Hanan (Annas) because of their serpent-hissing!' (Schürer, [4th edition], i, 576).

(2) *The Great Sanhedrin.*—It stands to reason that both in pre-Maccabæan days and after the establishment of the Hasmonæan state there must have been a council of notables to act with, and under, the chief of the state, the High Priest, in political and judicial decisions. The priestly aristocracy, who probably largely corresponded with the wealthy class, would naturally furnish most of the members of such a council. But we can only see it dimly in chance references by our books to the 'senate (in Greek, *gerūsia*) of the nation,' or to the 'elders of the people.' At the time of Christ the great council in Jerusalem which was the chief judicial authority, under the procurator, for the Jews of Palestine, was called by the Greek name *synhedrion*, transmuted in Aramaic into *sanhedrîn*. The later Rabbinical books (after A.D. 200) have a great deal to say about the Jerusalem Sanhedrin in the earlier part of the 1st century: unfortunately much of this is simply pedantic legal theory, a description of what, in the opinion of the Rabbis, ought to have been, not a real tradition of what was. There was a tendency to throw back to the Sanhedrin before the destruction of Jerusalem characteristics of the Bêth-Dîn (House of Judgement), which after the destruction of Jerusalem served as a sort of substitute for it—a body of Rabbis which met at Jabneh to pronounce judgements on disputes in the Jewish community, but judgements which could not be enforced, if the parties did not voluntarily submit to them. In the Sanhedrin the preponderant element was drawn from the Sadducæan priesthood, and its president was the High Priest: the Bêth-Dîn of Jafneh was an assembly of Rabbis, presided over by a Rabbi. It is probably true that, like the Bêth-Dîn, the Sanhedrin consisted of seventy-one members, because that was the proper number for a Jewish assembly, after the pattern of the Council in Nu 11 [16]. We do not know how new members were chosen to fill up vacancies. In addition to men of the priestly aristocracy (the 'chief-priests' of the Gospels), the Sanhedrin had a certain number of members who sat in it by virtue of their special knowledge of the Law, men of the class called in the Gospels *grammateis*, 'scribes.' We have no contemporary documents to show what the Jews of the time of Christ called these 'scribes,' when they spoke of them in Aramaic or Hebrew. (The term *sôphrîm* [Hebrew], *saphrayyā* [Aramaic] was confined by later usage to the wise men of an earlier age, but this may not have been so in the time of Christ. Contemporary Rabbis are called in the Mishna *hakāmîm* ['wise men'], and the vocative 'Rabbi' had come to be used as a title in speaking *of* a teacher of the Law.) But we know that when they spoke *to* them, they usually addressed them as 'Rabbi' or 'Rabbûni,' ('My Master'), and sometimes, perhaps, as 'Mari,' 'Maranā' ('My lord,' 'Our lord'). Probably most of the scribes sitting in the Sanhedrin were Pharisees. The Pharisees had behind them a great volume of public opinion, to which the priests had often to conform. A third element in the Sanhedrin consisted of men called 'elders'—men, probably, who, though belonging neither to the priestly aristocracy nor to the class of scribes, had wealth or social position which gave them importance. The area within which the authority of the Sanhedrin could be enforced was limited to the eleven toparchies—Jerusalem, Gophna, Akrabatta, Thamna, Lydda, Emmaus, Pella, Idumæa, Engaddi, Herodeion, Jericho. In Galilee and beyond, its judgements might have moral influence, but had no compulsory force. (It would, therefore, only have been by the local synagogues of Damascus voluntarily acceding to the suggestion of the High Priest that followers of Jesus in Damascus would have been delivered bound to Saul [Ac 9 [2]].) In Judæa, matters of lesser importance might be settled in the local courts outside Jerusalem; graver matters, or matters in which the local courts could not agree, were judged by the Great Sanhedrin—especially, it would seem, religious offences such as blasphemy. How precisely the line was drawn we do not know. The king, and afterwards the Roman procurator, had, of course, a force at his disposal which could override the Sanhedrin. There was nothing to prevent king or procurator from putting to death whom he would: Herod killed, as we saw, forty-five priestly aristocrats, perhaps more than half the Sanhedrin itself. The question how far the Sanhedrin had the power to inflict capital punishment is a difficult one. According to Jn 18 [31], it had not the power in A.D. 30. But how much we are to infer from that statement is doubtful. There are indications on the other side that the Sanhedrin did have the power to inflict the death-penalty on occasions between A.D. 6 and

70. A statement in a Rabbinic book, which has been thought to confirm the statement in St. John (Schürer, ii, 209, note 72), proves on examination incapable of being so used (Juster, ii, 133). The problems raised by the double trial of Christ cannot be solved with our inadequate data.

The punishment of scourging, on the other hand, the Sanhedrin unquestionably could inflict upon Jews in Judæa (Ac 5 [40]). It had its own body of police for effecting arrests (Mk 14 [43]; Ac 4 [3], 5 [17, 18]). (According to St. John, when the Lord was arrested, the Jewish police were accompanied by a body of Roman troops under the præfectus: the Synoptists say nothing about this.) Over Roman citizens it had no jurisdiction, except in the case of a Roman entering the precinct of the Temple forbidden to Gentiles. The Jewish authorities are said in that case to have had the power of inflicting death even on a citizen of Rome (Joseph., *B.J.*, vi, 126).

How far the Sanhedrin was subject to the dictation of the Roman authorities we cannot know. In Ac 22 [30] we find the præfectus of the Roman garrison in the castle Antonia, which commanded the Temple, convoking the Sanhedrin in order to examine St. Paul. One mark of the subjection of the head of the Jewish state to the Gentile power was that, from A.D. 6 to 36, the præfectus kept the festal robes of the High Priest in the castle, and delivered them to him only on the three great Feast Days and on the Day of Atonement (Joseph., *Ant.*, xviii, 90 ff.).

(3) *Local Tribunals.*—Outside Jerusalem, in the Jewish towns and villages of Palestine, local bodies had jurisdiction in such matters as did not require to be brought before the Great Sanhedrin of Jerusalem. In each town there was a council (in Greek *boulē*), which had the power of imprisoning robbers (Joseph., *B.J.*, ii, 273). In Mt 5 [22], the 'judgement' spoken of is probably the judgement of a local judicial body in contrast with the 'council,' i.e. the Jerusalem Sanhedrin. Even the villages had probably village authorities who could exercise police authority and adjudge local disputes. The smallest number of which a local judicial body could consist was probably seven. When Josephus gives as an ordinance of Moses what is found nowhere in the Pentateuch—that in every township there should be seven men to exercise authority with two Levites as coadjutors—he is probably simply ascribing a Mosaic origin to the arrangements he found existing in his own time (*Ant.*, iv, 214). According to the Mishna, a 'small sanhedrin' consisted of twenty-three persons, and such a small sanhedrin might be constituted in any place with a population of 120 (or, according to one Rabbi, 230) or over. But the ideal schemes of the Mishna often do not correspond with any state of things which had ever really existed.

(4) *The Temple Administration.*—The charge of the Temple, its ritual and its order, was left by the Romans to the Jewish priests. The priesthood was divided into twenty-four divisions, which ministered by rotation, each for a week at a time. In Lk 1 [5] the division of Abia was on service when Zacharias had his vision in the Temple. The Levites were divided analogously into twenty-four divisions. In each division the respective functions of subdivisions and of individuals were assigned daily by the casting of lots. The two great sacrifices each day were the 'perpetual (*tamîd*)' burnt-offering, in which the victim was a lamb, offered at dawn on the brazen altar in the court before the doors of the Temple itself, on behalf of the community, and the corresponding burnt offering in the afternoon. The High Priest did not officiate at these sacrifices, unless he desired to do so. He was under no obligation to officiate except on the Day of Atonement, when he offered the sin-offering on the people's behalf. But the daily burnt offering was accompanied by the 'High Priest's meal offering,' which, according to Lev 6 [12-16], the High Priest was bound to offer daily. Even this the High Priest was not compelled by later practice to offer in person: it was enough if he provided the offering and it was offered in his name. As a rule, the High Priest officiated only on Sabbaths and Feast Days. The language of Heb 7 [27]—'who needeth not *daily*, like those High Priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people'—must not be pressed. The sin-offering which the High Priest was bound to offer was an annual, not a daily, sacrifice: the drink offering which the High Priest in theory offered daily was not a sin offering.

The priest next in rank to the High Priest had, in Aramaic, the title *S'gan*. Schürer conjectures that he was identical with the 'captain (*strategos*)' of the Temple spoken of in the New Testament. If so, he would have had command of the Temple guards, with subordinate

s'gānîm under him, and been responsible for keeping order, making arrests, etc. The rank and file Temple guards consisted of Levites. Philo tells us (*De præm. sacerdotum*, 6) that one body of guards was regularly stationed at the gates of the outer court, another at those of the inner court, and another employed on patrol duty all over the Temple area.

Since a great mass of treasure was deposited in the Temple, the priests whose charge it was to watch over these riches and keep account of the Temple funds were officials of importance. They were called in Hebrew *gizbārîm*, and in Greek *gazophylakes*. Their chief had one of the highest places in the hierarchy. The subordinate ministers in this department also will have been Levites.

The revenues of the priesthood consisted in a number of dues which it was a religious duty of the people to pay. The principal one was the *tithe*. A Jew was supposed to pay this tithe on 'everything which served for food or is stored up or grows out of the ground.' The tithe, however, was paid in the first instance to the Levites, and the Levites had to pay a tithe of the tithe to the priests. Yet it is unlikely that the priesthood as a whole was a rich class. The payment of the tithe was left to the conscience of the individual Jew, and though the Pharisees were extremely particular about it (Mt 23^{23}), not a few Jews obviously were negligent. Many of the country priests may have been quite poor men. The priestly aristocracy was no doubt rich, but their riches will have been amassed by other ways than by the dues paid legally to the priests as such, and have consisted largely in great family possessions.

(5) *Taxes and Customs: the Publicans.*—The system of levying taxes and customs by farming out the business by auction to contractors had been common in the Hellenistic monarchies. In Judæa the direct taxes were collected by officials acting for the Roman government, but the system of farming out was maintained for the customs. The contractors had to bind themselves to pay the government a named sum for the several customs, and make their profit on what they could collect over and above that. The system inevitably led to oppressions and illegal demands on the part of the customs-farmers and of their subordinate agents. This, not only the fact that they were collecting money for the Gentile rulers, made the *telōnai*, as they were called in Greek (in Latin *publicani*, whence our New Testament 'publicans'), intensely hated by the Jews. Only those Jews who cared nothing for the good opinion of their society would undertake such a work, and the 'publicans' were in consequence generally people of such a character as made it natural to couple them with 'sinners.' There must have been a custom-house at Jericho, near the frontier between Judæa and the dominions of Herod Antipas beyond the Jordan, where Zacchæus was employed (Lk 19^{2}). The same system for collecting customs was followed in the Galilean dominions of Antipas: the receipt of custom at Capernaum (Mk 2^{14}) will have been for goods imported from the dominions of Philip on the other side of the Lake.

(6) *The Jews of Greco-Roman Times.*—In thinking of the Jews of those centuries—from the war of independence under Judas Maccabæus in the 2nd century B.C. to the rebellion under Bar-Koziba in the 2nd century A.D., we must beware of applying to them the picture of the Jew familiar in later ages. The Jews were not then a people specially connected with trade and finance; it was under the later Christian Roman Empire, when a number of occupations hitherto open to Jews were closed to them, that the Jews concentrated upon the handling of money and developed the extraordinary aptitudes, and sometimes the vices, afterwards associated with their name. In Palestine, the occupations of the Jewish population at that time were mainly agricultural, and though the Jews of the Dispersion were engaged in trade of various kinds, they were not marked out from Gentile traders by any peculiar cunning. 'We are not a commercial people,' Josephus could write at the end of the 1st century A.D. (*Contra Apion*, i, 60). We have in Pagan writers a considerable volume of bad names applied to the Jews; but it is remarkable that they are never attacked in antiquity as usurers. The modern caricature of the Jew often represents him as a man whose back has been bowed by long servitude and by sedentary pursuits. The Jews of those days were especially valued, or feared, as soldiers. The Jews found at Elephantine in the 5th century B.C. are soldiers; the Ptolemies brought masses of Jews from Palestine to settle on the land in Egypt as military colonists; at the end of the 2nd century B.C. Ptolemaic armies are commanded by Jewish generals; the 2,000 Jewish families transported by Antiochus III from Babylonia to Asia Minor are to serve as a military garrison. Jews and

Gauls were especially valued by the Greek kings of the East as mercenaries, both peculiarly reckless fighters. In the war of independence under Judas Maccabæus, Jewish bands broke armies of the government often much superior to them in arms and numbers, just as the fanatical Mahdists of the Sudan did the Egyptian forces sent against them in 1881 and 1882. The thing regularly charged against the Jews by Gentile anti-Semitic writers is not financial cunning, but fierce turbulence. They are a people terrible to control. When the Roman forces in the sixties of the 1st century A.D. came into conflict with the Zealot bands in Galilee, they had not elsewhere met so formidable a foe. The desperate fighting of these men, possessed with a religious madness which made them insensible to death or wounds, gave them a reputation in Rome like that which the Mahdists had in England, when Kipling wrote his poem about Fuzzy-wuzzy who 'broke a British square.' It is probable that when Epictetus gives 'the Galileans' as an instance of the fanatical contempt of death, he is referring not to the Christians, as is commonly supposed, but to the Galilean Zealots who were being talked about in Rome. (The application of the term 'Galilean' to Christians seems to have been an innovation of the Emperor Julian the Apostate: there is no instance of it in the time of Epictetus.) We should picture the Jews of those days as more like Afghans—turbulence, fierceness, cruelty even, combined with the indurated conviction of a monotheistic faith, heroic self-devotion—the *ghazis* of the Indian North-West Frontier, whose charge a bullet-wound which would cripple an ordinary man is often unable to arrest. Then we understand the greatness of the conflict waged between Rome and the Jews from A.D. 67 to 70, the real fear felt by the Roman world for this people ramifying through the Empire, with the possibility that the masses of Jews beyond the Euphrates might join in. Those were no people of bowed backs, no money-lenders and dealers in old clothes, who made the Greco-Roman world tremble in the years before 70, so that the ultimate victory over them seemed the deliverance from a great peril, one of the great actions in the history of Rome.

(7) *Economic Conditions.*—The Jewish people in Palestine, it has just been said, were mainly agricultural—producing grain, vegetables, fruit, wine, oil, honey. Round the Sea of Galilee the fishing industry was predominant; salted fish were exported, hence a town on the seashore had the name Tarichæa (Greek *tarichos*, salted fish). But there was also some manufacturing industry. One town in Transjordania specialized in dyeing; Sepphoris in Galilee was a town of weavers; Nazareth apparently a town of carpenters.

The cultivation of the land was done largely by smallholders, middle-class peasants, living in villages and country towns. There were a few large estates which might be managed by the steward of a rich man often absent, but such large estates were exceptional in Palestine. The younger sons of peasants, unable to inherit the paternal plot, might often work as hired labourers on the estates of richer men. The parable of the Wicked Husbandmen points to the existence of tenant farmers who received seed, implements, and beasts of burden from the proprietor, and had to render him a proportion of the produce.

Richer Jews kept slaves, both fellow-Hebrews and alien 'Canaanites.' The Hebrew slave was in a markedly better position: he had to be liberated at the end of six years, for one thing. The non-Jewish slave had practically no rights, and was completely at his master's mercy, though there might be cases (as in the household of Gamaliel II) where the relations of master and slave were kindly and affectionate. (See Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 174 ff.).

(8) *The Synagogue.*—If worldly power in the Judæa of the time of Jesus belonged still to the Sadducean priesthood who predominated in the Sanhedrin, the Pharisaic scribes had much greater influence over the hearts and minds of the people. In the countries of the Dispersion, where the Jews had no Temple, their religion had found another communal centre in the synagogue. In Palestine, in Jerusalem itself, synagogue worship had established itself side by side with temple worship. The Jew resorted to the Temple to offer sacrifice and join in ritual prayer and praise, but he resorted to the synagogue for instruction in the precepts and the verities of his religion. It was in the synagogue, not in the Temple, that the Law was read and expounded in Aramaic. The Temple was the sphere of the priest, the synagogue the sphere of the scribe. And the decline in the prestige of the priesthood, since High Priests were set up and pulled down at the pleasure of Herod and Gentile governors and the priestly aristocracy had forfeited popular respect by their pride and worldliness, made the influence of the

scribe all the greater. Through the synagogue, too, it is probable that Jewish children received instruction in reading and in the elements of their religion—possibly already in the time of Jesus through the *Khazzān*, the subordinate synagogue official who acted as a kind of sacristan, as was later the case. When the Temple was gone, Judaism could still go on as a communal religion, resting on the synagogue: and when the rule of priests was gone, the scribes, that is, the Rabbis, ruled alone.

(9) *Eminent Rabbis.*—The Rabbinic tradition represented the great teachers from the days of Jannæus to those of Christ as a series of 'pairs.' The 'pair' who covered the early days of Herod (to about 20 B.C.) were Euthalion (in the Mishna written as Abtalion, the first syllable being perhaps pronounced *Av*, and the diphthong at the beginning of the name, in its Greek form, *Ev*—as in modern Greek) and Shemaiah—Pollion and Samaias in our present text of Josephus.

They were succeeded by the much more famous pair, Hillel and Shammai, whose activity extended to about A.D. 20. Hillel was afterwards glorified in tradition as the typical saint of Judaism. He came to Palestine from the Babylonian Jewry as a young man. Although to this extent a stranger, Hillel established his prestige in Jerusalem—it is said by solving a problem which had nonplussed the leading Jerusalem Rabbis of the family of Bathira, the problem what the Law prescribed when the Passover fell on a Sabbath. Already probably in the days of Hillel, the distinction between Halakhah and Aggadah, familiar to later Judaism, was articulated. The rule determined by the Rabbis for action in accordance with the Law, in all imaginable circumstances, was Halakhah ('Walking'): explanations of the Scripture narrative or doctrine about the spiritual world was Aggada ('Showing'). Halakhah was the more important of two: Judaism has always tended to lay a greater stress on action according to the commandment than on a particular form of belief. In the sphere of Aggada the speculations of Rabbis had large liberty to range. The obligatory dogmas were few—practically only the Unity of God, the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, and the Resurrection of the dead. The dogma of the verbal inspiration of Scripture would, of course, have made a good deal of belief obligatory, as afterwards it did in Protestantism, if it had been obligatory to hold an extensive system of beliefs supposed to be the only ones which could legitimately be drawn from Scripture. With the Rabbis, though the text of Scripture was inspired, its words were largely riddles, so that you might make them mean a great variety of things, almost anything that the range and ingenuity of your fancy might suggest. Belief was therefore but little tied down: practice must as far as possible be made uniform.

The teaching of Hillel has come down to us only in a large number of detached sayings and anecdotes, not put into writing in the Rabbinical literature till some 200 years or more after Hillel's time. No doubt a good many of the traditional sayings are authentic or based on authentic sayings, and the anecdotes, if sometimes grotesquely framed, may reflect the real character of the man, as it impressed contemporaries. It was marked by gentleness, patience, large kindliness. One of the most celebrated anecdotes declares that a Gentile enquirer once came to Hillel and asked to be taught the whole Jewish Law, whilst he stood on one leg; Hillel answered: 'What thou wouldest not that they neighbour should do unto thee, that do not thou unto him. That is the whole Law; all the rest is commentary.'

Shammai's teaching regarding conduct according to the Law was as a rule sterner and more rigorous than that of Hillel, though there were certain questions on which Shammai took the more lenient view. When the Feast of Tabernacles happened to coincide with the child-bed of Shammai's daughter-in-law, he insisted, the story says, that the roof of the chamber where she was must be broken up and replaced by branches, so that the infant might, in the very act of being born, keep the Law. On the question of divorce, Shammai and Hillel gave different interpretations of the text in the written Law which prescribes that a man shall give his wife a bill of divorcement 'if she find no favour in his eyes because he hath found some unseemly thing in her' (Dt 24 [1]). What was meant by an 'unseemly thing'? Shammai said that it meant something morally disgraceful: Hillel said that it meant such a thing as her burning her husband's dinner when she cooked it. (Some modern Jews contend that Hillel's phrase is to be understood figuratively; 'burning his dinner' meant being unfaithful to her husband. But it does not appear that this interpretation can be substantiated.)

An eminent Pharisaic teacher of the generation after Hillel, the Gamaliel who appears in Ac 5 as a member of the Sanhedrin, was Hillel's grandson. (He is distinguished as Gamaliel I from *his* grandson, Gamaliel II, who presided over the Beth-dîn at Jabneh after the destruction of Jerusalem.) One Rabbinic book says: 'With the death of Rabban Gamaliel the Elder reverence for the Law ceased, and purity and abstinence died.' The maxim ascribed to him in the *Pirké Abôth* (though this possibly belongs to Gamaliel II) is: 'Make to thyself a teacher; and remove thyself from what is doubtful; and do not often tithe by guesswork.'

(10) *The Tradition.*—Beside the written Law, the 'tradition of the elders' was handed down in the schools of the scribes. The tradition was regarded not as an addition to the Law, but as an explicit declaration of what action in each given set of circumstances would correspond with the mind of the Law. Obviously the Law in writing could contain only a certain number of general commandments, whose applications to the infinite varieties of human life might leave room for great differences of opinion. To reduce this uncertainty debates took place between the teachers of the Law, or a teacher delivered his opinion to his own circle of disciples. The pronouncements of a teacher of recognized authority were carefully committed to memory by his disciples, who in turn, when they became teachers, passed on, word for word, to their disciples what they had heard their masters say. A competent scribe would have his mind stored with an immense number of opinions on points of law pronounced by eminent teachers of his own and previous generations. The opinions would not all agree, but there would be a growing body of consensus which became authoritative. This vast mass of tradition was carried entirely in the memories of men; not till about A.D. 200 did it begin to be written down in the Mishna. When a point of law had once been established by the eminent reputation of some particular teacher or by a general consensus between teachers there was only a duty of submission.

Each teacher of repute had round him a band of disciples. He was not supposed to add anything really new to what he had received. His sole business was to pass on the tradition unimpaired and any pronouncement he might make on a new problem of casuistry purported to be merely a making clear of what had been contained implicitly in the written Law and the tradition of the past. Apart from that a teacher had no authority. One Rabbi of the 1st century A.D. is said to have been praised because he was like a cistern lined with chalk, which never let out a drop. It was held to be wrong for a teacher to take any payment from his disciples: the Law must not be a means of gain. Hence many eminent Rabbis supported themselves by the work of their hands. Hillel was for some time a woodcutter; Joshua ben Chananya was a smith; Nehunya a well-digger; Jehudah a baker, and so on.

Our Lord charged the Pharisees with making void the 'word of God' by their tradition. But it would be a mistake simply to identify the 'word of God' with the written Pentateuch and to suppose that everything in the written Pentateuch was perfect, and everything in the oral tradition was bad. We see to-day that much in the Pentateuch itself was the work of human minds fashioning rules for conduct, not differing essentially from the work of the scribes in a later generation, only law which happened to be written down at an earlier period. And sometimes the tradition really served a beneficial purpose in giving an elasticity to the Law by means of professed interpretation, where the prescriptions of the written Law were impracticable or harsh.

The written Law, for instance, which cancelled all outstanding debts each Jubilee year bore hardly on many poor men, since it made it impossible for them to obtain a loan when a Jubilee was near. The tradition, as shaped by Hillel, modified—or rather circumvented—the Law by the institution of what was called the *prosbol* (Greek *prosbolē*, 'addition'), a form of legal action by which a borrower might give the right to a creditor to exact repayment even in or after a Jubilee year. Or again, whilst the written Law condemned a woman taken in adultery to stoning, the tradition got round this by fixing such rules of evidence as made it almost impossible to secure a conviction: a more humane feeling prevailed, which allowed the husband of an adulterous wife simply to divorce her.

Yet, while sometimes a good motive might lead to prescriptions of the written Law being evaded or mitigated, it might at other times be a low motive—the desire to make things easier for human selfishness. That danger besets all casuistry, and it was such cases, where great moral principles, broadly stated in the written Law, were nullified by the ingenious casuistry of the scribes, which provoked

the Lord's indignation. In regard to the particular case of the honour due to parents and the colliding obligations of oaths ('Corban') the rules laid down in the Mishna agree rather with Jesus than with the scribes whom He denounces in Mk 7. We must suppose that what He denounces was teaching current in His time which the Rabbinic tradition itself later on discarded. So long as it was merely oral, the tradition may have taken a variety of forms which were eliminated before, or when, it was fixed in writing.

(III) **The Dispersion**—(1) *General Survey.*—But the community of Jews in Palestine was only a fraction of Israel. Although of the old twelve Israelite tribes only three survived—Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, the three which had composed the population of the smaller southern kingdom under the house of David, and had been carried captive to Babylonia by Nebuchadnezzar in 597 and 586 B.C.—those three by the 2nd century B.C. had increased to a size exceeding the whole Israelite people in the days of Solomon. They had become, as a subject people, a more important factor in the world, numerically, than Israel had been as a free people under its old kings. Now, outside the narrow limits of Judæa, was the great Jewish Dispersion. Masses of Jews had never returned from Babylonia and continued at the opening of the 2nd century, when Babylonia was still a part of the Seleucid realm, to form a not inconsiderable element in the population of that country, speaking the Aramaic tongue, which was the language of Babylonia, Mesopotamia, and Syria, except amongst the ruling class in the Greek cities (Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, Charræ, Artemita, etc.), who were Greek in blood and speech. At the time of the Christian era, it is calculated that the Jews formed 7 per cent. of the population of the Roman Empire—a proportion about double that of the Jews in the United States to-day. At the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. the penetration of these countries by Jews had already gone some way. In a letter given by Josephus as having been written, towards the end of the 3rd century, by the Seleucid king Antiochus III to the governor of Asia Minor—a letter the genuineness of which has indeed been disputed, but without substantial reason—the governor is instructed to settle 2,000 families of Jews from Babylonia in Lydia and Phrygia. But though the little Jewish state in Palestine included only a fraction of the Jews then in the world, the Jews everywhere looked upon Jerusalem as their Mother, their national and religious centre. At the great annual feasts Jews from all parts of the world came together to worship in the Temple, and offer sacrifice to the Lord at the one place where sacrifice was lawful. Every Jew, wherever he might be domiciled, was expected to pay the half-shekel annually towards the expenses of the Temple worship. Richer Jews of the Dispersion no doubt often made handsome gifts, in the form, it might be, of new decorations added to the Temple building. In the early years of the Christian era we hear of Alexander the alabarch in Alexandria covering some of the Temple doors with plates of gold and silver (Joseph., *B.J.*, v, 205). In 408 B.C. we find the Jewish soldier-settlement up the Nile near Assuan, when in financial difficulties, send a letter to the High Priest at Jerusalem (A. Cowley, *Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra*, S.P.C.K.). (It is true that they seem to have got no answer.) That was a long time before the period we are now considering: but it is probable that at the later period communications between Jerusalem and outlying Jewish groups were even commoner than in the 5th century B.C. It is likely that a judgement of the Jerusalem authorities on any practical question troubling a Jewish community of the Dispersion would have great moral weight, even though it had no compulsory force (Schürer, ii, 206). If the Jewish people, scattered as they were, still held together as a people by their fidelity to one Law, there must have been some real continuous contact between the scattered parts to keep practice everywhere uniform in important respects—a contact which would be naturally maintained through the common meeting-ground, Jerusalem, and the authorities of the Jewish state. Some of the Jews belonging to foreign countries had a synagogue of their own in Jerusalem—the Alexandrine Jews, for instance, and the 'Libertini,' i.e. Jews who had been slaves in Rome. (It is uncertain whether the foreign Jews mentioned in Ac 6 [9]—Libertini, Cyrenians, Alexandrines, Cilicians, Jews in the province of Asia, had one synagogue in common, or several synagogues for the different countries.)

By the time of the Christian era probably every large city in the Roman Empire had its local body of Jews with their synagogue or synagogues. Unlike the Jews of Palestine and the countries beyond the Euphrates under Parthian rule,

whose language was Aramaic, the Jews of Egypt, Asia Minor, and the countries to the West, ordinarily spoke Greek.

(2) *Egypt.*—Outside Syria, Egypt was the country in which the Jewish population was thickest; at the time of the Christian era they are calculated to have numbered a million out of a total population of seven or eight millions. The two ruling races in Egypt at this time were the Roman and the Greek; the native Egyptians who still talked amongst themselves their old Egyptian tongue (on the way to become the Coptic of Christian Egypt) were a subject race. The Jews settled in Egypt talked Greek; a few of them, perhaps those recently come from Palestine, used Aramaic (an Aramaic Jewish papyrus of about 200 B.C. has been found in Egypt); we never hear of Jews learning Egyptian. Most of the Egyptian Jews so far forgot Hebrew that as early as in the first half of the 3rd century B.C. the Pentateuch had to be translated into Greek. A legend arose that it had been translated, at the command of King Ptolemy II, by seventy scribes, who had been confined each in a separate cell, and had all produced an identical translation. This proved to the satisfaction of the Egyptian Jews that the Greek translation was every bit as much inspired as the original Hebrew—which was convenient, since they could use their Greek version without troubling to go behind it. In the course of the next two centuries the rest of the Old Testament gradually got translated in Egypt into Greek for the needs of Jews in Greek-speaking lands. This is the version we call the Septuagint in reference to the legend of the Seventy who had translated the Pentateuch. The Septuagint became the Bible of the early Christians, many of whom accepted as quite true the legend of its inspiration, but when they pressed Jews in controversy with texts cited from it, the Jews came to regard it with disfavour, and early in the 2nd century A.D. a proselyte called Aquila produced another much more literal translation of the Old Testament into Greek, which, it was hoped, would lend itself less easily to the purposes of the Christians. But at the time of Christ the authority of the Septuagint was dominant amongst the Egyptian Jews. Their great writer, Philo of Alexandria (about 20 B.C. to A.D. 40), built his arguments upon the supposition that its minutest letter and particle was divinely inspired. Although the religion of Israel was the main concern of Philo's life, it had seemed to him so unnecessary to enquire what Hebrew the infallible Greek text represented that he never even found out that the Greek term *Kyrios* ('Lord') stood for the Hebrew IHVH.

In language the Jews of the Western Dispersion were thus closer to the Greek townsmen beside whom they dwelt than to their Aramaic-speaking brethren in Palestine and the East. With Greek language there could not fail to go a certain amount of Greek ideas, so that a type of Judaism—Hellenistic Judaism—came to exist with a character distinctly different from Palestinian Judaism. In Palestine the great fight at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes had been against Hellenism, but it was impossible for Jews living in Greek cities and talking Greek to shut out everything Hellenic from their minds. They might keep clear of the vices rampant in Pagan society; they might refuse to take part in idolatry, but many of them attended the schools of Greek philosophers or read Greek books—or even went to see the great Greek dramas acted in the local theatre. (Philo implies that he had witnessed Greek plays.) One notable monument of Hellenistic Judaism in Egypt is the book of the Apocrypha called *The Wisdom of Solomon.* Although the Greek-speaking Jew who wrote it knew the style of Hebrew poetry, perhaps only through the Septuagint version, he was also familiar with the phraseology of the Greek Stoics and made a kind of blend, which is often impressive, of Greek rhetoric and Hebrew poetical forms.

(3) *Philo of Alexandria.*—Our chief monument of Hellenistic Judaism we have in the writings of Philo. One sees him through these, a large-minded, benevolent, and dignified man, if sometimes given a little too much to mellifluous unction, a leading man in his day—the day when Jesus was talking to crowds of poor men in Galilee—in the Alexandrine Jewish community. His brother Alexander was the Rothschild of the time, and held the office of *alabarches* (whatever that may mean) at Alexandria—probably the office had something to do with the levying of taxes or customs in Egypt for the imperial government. Although Philo himself does not appear in the New Testament, his niece by marriage does—the Berenice who with her brother King Agrippa II listens to St. Paul in Ac 26. For Berenice's first husband had been a son of Philo's brother Alexander. (This first husband had died in 41, when Berenice was only thirteen, probably a few months only after the marriage: Philo may well have been still living in Alexan-

dria, when Berenice was there as a girl. If so, there will have been someone whose life-experience included hearing Philo discourse about virtue and Paul discourse about Jesus.) Philo himself, if his denunciations of luxury and praise of the simple life are sincere, must have lived in philosophic poverty: one story says that his wife wore no jewelry. Philo's great task was to show how the Pentateuch, if interpreted by the allegorical method, contained the divine wisdom to which Greek philosophy pointed. He was steeped in the Platonic and Stoic literature, but he used the Greek philosophical ideas and phrases to enforce his teaching that the supreme end of man was to attain to the ecstatic vision of God, and that the way was an ascetic discipline which liberated the soul from bodily appetites and sense-perception. He was free from national narrowness in so far as he addressed himself to man, as man: anyone, Jew or Gentile, who took the right way might become 'Israel,' as Philo interpreted the Hebrew name, 'the man who sees God.' Yet he held fast to the Mosaic Law as giving the best discipline. His writings show us the most systematic attempt, so far as we know, yet made to combine Hebraism and Hellenism. How to do that was Philo's problem just as it was afterwards the problem of the Christian Church, and it was the Christian Church, not the Synagogue, which later on took up Philo's writings and preserved them. Philo's allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, fantastic as it seems to us to-day, was largely embodied in Christian tradition. Philo almost got the status of a Christian Father.

(4) *Constitution and Privileges of Communities of Dispersion.*—The Jewish communities dispersed amongst the cities of the Roman Empire held an altogether peculiar position. They were allowed by the Roman government, as by the Hellenistic kings before the Roman Conquest, a measure of self-government not conceded to any other people. The local communities were probably organized, as a rule, under *archontes*, with an *archisynagogos* at the head. At Alexandria, of the five districts into which the city was divided, two had a predominantly Jewish population. The head of the Jewish community was here called *ethnarches* or *genarches*. Under him was a senate (*gerusia*) whose directing committee had the title of *archontes*.

The city had numerous synagogues. The chief synagogue at Alexandria is represented in Rabbinical literature to have been one of the stateliest buildings of the Roman Empire, in form a basilica, so vast that the people at the extremity of it could not hear the voice of the minister, and a flag had to be waved to show them when to say 'Amen.'

In the Cyrenaïca there was also a great mass of Jews. In the city of Cyrene itself the population was divided into four bodies, one of which was the citizen body, and one of which was that of the Jews. In the smaller city of Berenice we learn from an inscription of the year 13 B.C. that the Jews formed a special *politeuma* (self-governing community) under nine *archontes*.

In Rome the Jews were organized in a number of independent synagogues with distinctive names (Synagogue of the Augustesioi, Synagogue of the Campesioi, etc.), each with its own *gerusia* and *archontes*. Greek was the language of the Roman Jews as it was of the poorer classes in Rome generally, which consisted largely of the descendants of Greek-speaking slaves. (The Christian Church in Rome did not become Latin-speaking till the end of the 2nd century.)

The Jews in Rome lived mainly in the quarter beyond the Tiber, now called Trastevere. They were probably on the whole a poor community. Juvenal depicts the Jewish beggar with his basket (*kophinos*) and hay (iii, 14). But they must also have been a community whose numbers told. In 4 B.C. we hear of 8,000 Roman Jews associating themselves with a deputation from Palestine. Even before that, in 59 B.C., when Cicero was defending a client obnoxious to the Jews, he was obliged (or so he pretends) to lower his voice so as not to excite the crowd of Jews on the purlieus of the court (*Pro Flacco*, 28).

These Jewish communities within the Gentile cities had certain powers over Jews. Jewish tribunals could decide disputes between members of the community. The communal authorities could exact fines. They had even some power of inflicting corporal punishment: five times the authorities of local Jewish communities in Asia Minor or Greece inflicted upon St. Paul 'forty stripes save one' (2 Cor 11 [24]).

The privilege of being able to perform the rites of their religion without molestation was the one the Jews most valued, and the one which the rulers of the Roman Empire repeatedly confirmed. It was a principle of Roman government that the national religions of subject peoples should be respected, and it was as a

national religion that Judaism had the status of a *religio licita* in the Empire. Christianity could not claim the same privilege. On the whole the Hellenistic kings and the Roman emperors protected and favoured the Jews, till the great conflict came under Nero which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem. It was with their Greek fellow-townsmen that the Jews were unpopular. From the point of view of the royal or imperial governments the Jews were useful just because the Greek cities were apt to be fired with ideas of democratic independence, and a people spread through the realm, everywhere on the side of the government, might serve as a binding element. So unwilling cities were sometimes compelled by the Roman rulers to concede to their local Jews privileges which made them immune from attack. The Roman Government even dispensed the Jews from what was in every other case compulsory, because it conflicted with their religion—the obligation to offer worship to the deified Emperor or to his Genius. The Jews were allowed to pray for him publicly in the synagogue instead.

How far the Jews obtained the citizenship in the different Greek cities is obscure. Even at Alexandria, for which we have fullest information, it is a debated question. Josephus definitely states that the Jews resident in Alexandria had been given the status of Alexandrine citizens; and Schürer and Jean Juster held this to be true (Schürer[3], iii, 79 ff.). But on our present evidence it is generally denied (H. I. Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt*, 1924). Probably the truth is that the Jews had privileges given them by the Ptolemies and the Romans which they claimed to be equivalent to citizenship, whilst the Greeks denied that they were citizens because other ordinary characteristics of citizenship the Jews did not possess. The position of the Jews in the Greco-Roman world was so exceptional and anomalous that the regular principles of Greek political life could not determine it. That invalidates Ramsay's argument—that the Jews can never, as citizens, have been members of the same *phyle* (tribe) as non-Jews, because membership in a Greek *phyle* meant participation in idolatrous rites—for exceptional exemption might be conceded to Jews in this matter as exceptional exemption was conceded to them in the matter of Emperor-worship. Individual Jews unquestionably became citizens of Greek city-states or had, like the father of St. Paul, the citizenship of Rome. St. Paul was *born* a Roman citizen (Ac 22 [28]), and must therefore have had the name Paulus from his birth. Every Roman citizen must have a prænomen (personal name) and a gentile name (clan name), and might have a cognomen (family name) as well. Paulus is a *family* name: we do not know what St. Paul's personal name and clan name were; Saul was his name as a Jew. Since by Roman law the slave of a Roman citizen, if freed, obtained Roman citizenship, there must have been a number of Jewish freed slaves, *libertini*, in this class, whose citizenship would be inherited by their children. There were other ways of course besides, in which Jews might become Roman citizens—as the reward, for instance, of some special service rendered to the Emperor.

But for the protection of the imperial government, the citizens of the Greek cities would have given way much more than they did to anti-Semitic rage. The stock charge against the Jews was morose aloofness. In a Greek city, polytheistic rites entered into every department of life, political and social: it was impossible for the Jews, if they were going to keep absolutely clear of idolatry, to take part in a number of the interests and amusements of their fellow-townsmen. That created odium. 'If they come and settle in our midst, and want the privileges of our society, why will they not worship our gods?' was the way in which the Greeks commonly expressed their grievance. A body which remains stubbornly alien in any social *milieu* is apt to be unpopular.

(5) *Jewish Propaganda.*—Yet there were not a few amongst the Greeks who were attracted to this strange people, so sure, among the vagaries of Greek speculation, that they had the knowledge of the true God. In those days the Jewish community was being continually increased by the accession of proselytes, men who 'took shelter under the wings of the Divine Glory.' Amongst the Jews themselves there were some who engaged in active propaganda, who felt that Israel had a missionary duty to the nations, who laboured in writing to dispel the prejudices prevalent in Greek society against the Jews, and to set forth their religion in a way which would commend it to the Greeks. The Greek anti-Semite literature, for instance, was always saying that the Jews had contributed no invention or discovery to culture or art, and so the Jewish apologists had to show that the very inventions and discoveries upon which the Greeks prided themselves had

been derived long ago from Jews. It was Joseph who laid down the laws of scientific agriculture: it was from Moses that Pythagoras and Plato had drawn their wisdom. Or you might try to show, as Philo did, that the Jewish religion was the perfection of that at which Greek philosophy aimed. Unhappily one common mode of propaganda in those days was the fabrication of false documents. Verses were circulated as from Æschylus or Sophocles or Menander inculcating the worship of One God. A little prose-work glorifying the Jews pretended to have been written by Hecatæus of Abdera about 300 B.C. There was an extensive fabrication of sham Sibylline oracles. In the Greek world numbers of oracles in hexameter verse were current, supposed to have been uttered by Sibyls, women-diviners, ages before, and now the Jews made up quantities more, outlining the history of the world with the call of the Jewish people, denouncing polytheism and idolatry, and describing the great judgement and the kingdom of God about to come. Christians afterwards carried on the pious deception and added more oracles asserting the doctrines of the Christian faith. It is very hard for us to-day to understand the state of mind of people sincerely earnest to propagate the truth, who resorted to such methods. Probably they felt that it was so much worse for men to be deceived about the nature of the Divine than to be deceived about the authorship of a particular document, that if you could cure the major deception by inducing the minor one, you were, in the balance, doing God service.

Most of the Jews who adduced sham Sibylline oracles in propaganda may have done so in perfect good faith, even if the authors of the oracles knew them not to be genuine. And the oracles may really have impressed educated Pagans. The Septuagint translation of the Old Testament was in a style so alien to Greek literary tradition, that, if to some Greeks it may have had the fascination of an oracle, to others it must have appeared merely barbarous and uncouth. But the false Sibylline oracles were in proper Homeric language and verse. It is likely that Virgil drew his famous Fourth Eclogue, whose similarity to Hebrew prophecy has exercised speculation, not from the Septuagint, which would probably have repelled him, but from some Jewish Sibylline oracle, composed in the poetic style with which he was familiar. He expressly calls the coming Golden Age the 'age of Cumæan [i.e. Sibylline] song.'

In any case, for one reason or another, numbers in that world were drawn to Israel. In each Greek city the synagogue was a nucleus round which was gathered a company of Gentiles more or less closely attached, who joined in worship of the One God and conformed their lives in some degree to the Law. Some went the whole way and became full proselytes, whose descendants would be merged without distinction in the Jewish community. Others observed only certain Jewish practices—kept the Sabbath, for instance, and abstained from unclean meats. Even far outside the synagogue its influence radiated in odd ways through Gentile society. The superstitious, as the Roman satirists show, were apt to observe some point of the Jewish law, in addition, it might be, to practices belonging to the religion of Isis or Attis. It was especially women who became proselytes. One reason for this was that circumcision was a great deterrent for Greek men. The statement commonly made in older books that full proselytes were called 'Proselytes of Righteousness,' and adherents who did not take on the whole yoke of the Law 'Proselytes of the Gate,' is now quite exploded. The Hebrew term translated 'Proselyte of the Gate' means something quite different, and was never used before the Middle Ages. Another statement still commonly made, that the Gentiles who were attached to the synagogue without becoming full proselytes were called, by a distinctive appellation, 'those who fear God' (Ac 10 [2], 13 [16], etc.), has been questioned by Bertholet (*Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*, 295); he holds that the term, so far as it is a technical one, means 'proselytes' pure and simple. Against Bertholet, see Schürer[3], iii, 126, note 68. The crucial passage is Ac 13 [16], where there are not three classes (1) Jews, (2) Proselytes, (3) Imperfect Adherents, but two only (1) Men of Israel, (2) 'Those who fear God.' Two therefore of the three must be regarded as run together into one in the text in Acts. Schürer holds that (1) and (2) are run together under the term 'Men of Israel;' Bertholet holds that (2) and (3) are run together under the term 'Those who fear God.'

(6) *Liberal Judaism.*—If Gentile society was influenced to this extent by the Jewish communities in its midst, there could not fail to be some influence of Gentile society, of Hellenism, upon the Greek-speaking Jews. We have noticed instances of such influence in the Book of

Wisdom and in Philo. But both the author of Wisdom and Philo continued to observe literally the precepts of the written Law. There came into being, however, at Alexandria and elsewhere, a form of Liberal Judaism which threw over circumcision and Sabbath and distinctions of clean and unclean meats, and maintained that the spiritual truth of which these things were symbols was all that mattered. Philo mentions people of this kind, and it may have been more difficult for him to confute them, in that he himself in expounding the Pentateuch perpetually treats the underlying spiritual truth as the important thing, and often regards the literal meaning as absurd. Yet in matters of practice he adhered punctually to the commandments in their literal sense, and he argues, against the Liberal Jews, that although the spiritual truth is the important thing, it was still necessary to observe the Law in its literal sense as well, lest a man by following a path of his own should become isolated from the community. It must have been a Liberal Jew from whom Strabo (about 60 B.C. to A.D. 21) drew his quite friendly account of Jewish origins. The teaching of Moses had been, according to this, a pure pantheism; the divinity could be honoured only by moral virtue. All the distinctive practices of contemporary Judaism—food taboos and circumcision—were corruptions of the Mosaic religion introduced by superstitious and tyrannical successors of Moses in the priesthood later on (Strabo, xvi, 761).

Philo probably felt rightly that Liberal Judaism, in departing from a religion embodied in the concrete life of a community, was in danger of losing itself altogether in ineffectual vagueness. Yet Liberal Judaism, together with Hellenistic Judaism as a whole, undoubtedly prepared the ground for Christianity. The fierce clinging to all the ancestral embodiment of religion, which made many Jews irreconcilable opponents of the 'Way,' would be found more often probably in Palestinian than in Hellenistic Jews. It was a Hellenistic Jew, Stephen, who infuriated the Jews of Jerusalem by speaking with relative depreciation of the Temple. It is true that one of the most passionate persecutors of the primitive community of believers in Jesus—Saul of Tarsus—was a Hellenistic Jew, yet Saul had studied the Law at Jerusalem in the school of the Pharisee Gamaliel, and he may have drawn from Pharisaic circles in Jerusalem his hatred of the new faith rather than from his original environment in Tarsus. But even amongst the Hellenistic Jews it was no doubt only a small minority who went as far as the Liberal Jews combated by Philo, and the Book of Acts shows how bitter the Jewish communities of the Diaspora were in general against the Christians.

(7) *Disappearance of Hellenistic Judaism.*—It was probably from the Greeks or Hellenized Asiatics more or less already drawn to Judaism that the Christian churches at the outset drew the main part of their adherents—to some extent from Hellenistic Jews. Hegesippus, the Christian writer of the latter part of the 2nd century, was perhaps a converted Jew. (Eusebius says that he was, but Harnack thinks this a false inference of Eusebius.) Many Gentiles, craving a more satisfactory belief than they had in the Pagan traditions, who, before the coming of Christianity, would have been drawn to the Synagogue, were now drawn to the Church. Hence although we still hear of Gentiles becoming Jewish proselytes, the Jewish propaganda was largely driven out of the field by the Christian. It is improbable that at the end of the 1st century A.D. there were attached to the synagogues of the Dispersion those large bodies of Gentile proselytes and semi-proselytes which St. Paul found in the middle of the century. After the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and the suppression of the Jewish rising in the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 135) Judaism changed its character. It became more rigidly self-inclosed, more Rabbinic and Hebraistic. There must for many generations have been Jewish communities in Egypt and elsewhere whose mother-tongue was Greek. As late as the 6th century the Scriptures were read in Greek in the synagogues of Constantinople. But the distinctive type of Hellenistic Judaism which had existed at the beginning of the Christian era ceased to exist. The Jews of the Dispersion now modelled themselves on the Judaism of Palestine and Babylonia. The Greek-speaking Jews ceased to produce any religious literature such as the Book of Wisdom or the works of Philo. Hellenistic Judaism the Rabbinic tradition discarded and forgot: had the Christian Church not preserved some of its literature we should have known practically nothing about it to-day. The last Jewish author of eminence who wrote in Greek was Josephus, the end of whose life almost coincided with the end of the 1st century. The ideas of Josephus largely conform to the type of Hellenistic Judaism,

although he himself was by origin a Palestinian Aramaic-speaking Jew. But Josephus was regarded by the bulk of the Jewish community as a renegade, and it was the Gentile public, not the Jewish, for whom he wrote. It was the Christians who saved his works for a future age.

Bibliography

E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, i, 4, ii and iii, 3 (Eng. tr. made from 2nd edition); A. Schlatter, *Gesch. Israels v. Alexander dem Grossen bis Hadrian*[3]; E. Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests* (1904); R. H. Charles, *Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments* (1914), *Apoc. and Pseudepigrapha*; R. T. Herford, *Pharisaism* (1912), *The Pharisees* (1924); Jean Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*; J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, tr. by H. Danby (1925).

I. ESDRAS

By John C. H. How

Introduction

Contents.—The book called in the Apocrypha 'The First Book of Esdras' contains a version in Greek of (*a*) 2 Ch 35 [1]-36 [23]; (*b*) the whole of Ezra; (*c*) Neh 7 [73]-8 [13], together with a section (3 [1]-5 [6]) which has no parallel in the canonical books.

Title.—Some confusion may be caused by the fact that the book has two different titles in our English documents. In the Bible (AV and RV) it is known as 'The First Book of Esdras,' in accordance with the LXX denomination (Esdras A), the 'Second Book of Esdras' being another apocryphal book of a different character (apocalyptic).

But in the list of Sacred Books in the 39 Articles (VI) it is entitled 'The Third Book of Esdras,' following the Latin tradition, according to which our canonical Ezra and Nehemiah are known as Esdras I. and II., and the apocryphal apocalyptic book as Esdras IV. To avoid confusion the book is often termed simply 'The Greek Esdras.'

The origin of the book is a matter of dispute, but the problem cannot be discussed in the space available. The larger Commentaries (Bissell in Lange, Lupton in Speaker's, and Cook in Charles) and articles in *H.D.B.*, etc., may be consulted. A few points may be noted.

(*a*) The book is quite independent of the LXX version of the canonical Ezra-Nehemiah. Its Greek is of free and idiomatic style in contrast to that of the LXX, which slavishly follows a Hebrew original.

(*b*) It is *not* a translation of our *existing* MT, though it may represent some other (perhaps an earlier and better) Hebrew or Aramaic original. In some passages it may even help in the restoration of the original Hebrew where MT is corrupt.

(*c*) Josephus used this book and *not* the canonical Ezra-Nehemiah as his authority for the history of the period, which would seem to indicate that it was regarded by Greek-speaking Jews as a work of first importance. At the same time it may be noted that Josephus attempts to correct a chronological mistake by substituting Cambyses for Artaxerxes in 7 [6] (see *Ant.*, xi, 4).

(*d*) Some modern scholars regard the book as the *true* LXX version of the original Hebrew of Ezra-Nehemiah, supposing that the present LXX version is really that of Theodotion (cf. similar possibility in the case of Daniel).

The date and place of composition is a matter of great uncertainty (see the larger Commentaries). Perhaps the more probable theory is that the book was written in Egypt amongst Greek-speaking Jews at the end of the 2nd century or the beginning of the 1st century B.C.

Historical Value.—It cannot be claimed that the book has any real historical value independently of Ezra-Nehemiah. The only section (3 [1]-5 [6]) which supplies additional matter to that of Ezra-Nehemiah is itself inconsistent with the rest of the book; and it must be either the one real contribution of the book to the history of the period (indicating the unreliability of the traditional story) or it must be just a popular romance of no historical value. Darius cannot have *both* raised Zerubbabel to the rank of king's cousin and despatched him with full authority to Jerusalem to restore the city and Temple (3-4); and *also* have been quite unaware that Zerubbabel and Joshua and their fellows had any authority behind their action

in Jerusalem, until he discovered that Cyrus has issued a decree on the matter (6 6-23, etc.). The whole history of the period is most complicated (see Introduction, Haggai and Ezra), and it cannot be claimed that 1 Esdras helps to smooth it out. At the most 3-4 might be regarded as evidence of the existence of a tradition that knew nothing of a return of exiles under Cyrus, and also as evidence against the identification of Zerubbabel with Sheshbazzar (see notes on 3 1-4).

The chronological difficulties of Ezra reappear. In 2 16-30 an episode in the reign of Artaxerxes (465-425 B.C.) leads to a cessation of work until the reign of Darius, who ceased to reign (486) twenty years before Artaxerxes began. Josephus indeed gives 'Cambyses' (529-522) in place of Artaxerxes, but it is doubtful whether his text so read or whether he was just correcting a mistake. In 5 73 the work going on in the time of Cyrus (538-529) ceases '*for two years*' until the reign of Darius (521-486). In 7 4 the presence of the name of Artaxerxes creates the same chronological difficulty as in Ezra 6 14, though Josephus omits it—probably as a correction.

It is clear that the book cannot be relied on as an additional authority for the history of the period.

Table showing references to the parallel sections in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah; and Notes on some important points.

(*For further notes on the history, etc., see Ezra-Nehemiah.*)

(*a*) I. 1-58 = 2 Ch 35 1-36 21.
23, 24 are without parallel in 2 Ch.

(*b*) II. 1-5*a* = Ezr 1 1-3*a* (2 Ch 36 22, 23).
II. 5*b*-15 = Ezr 1 3*b*-11.

(*c*) II. 16-30 = Ezr 4 7-24.

Note the change of order from that of Ezra. The chronology is difficult. Josephus substitutes Cambyses for the Artaxerxes of 2 16 (see note in Introduction).

18, 20, 30. Note the mention of the *Temple*. In Ezra the passage is concerned with the building of the *city* walls only (see notes *ad loc.*). In Esdras the mention of the Temple is probably introduced to harmonize the passage with its *present* context out of chronological order.

(*d*) III. 1-V. 6. Peculiar to this book.

III. 1-IV. 62. **The story of the three young men at the court of Darius.**

V. 1-6. **Preliminary to a return of exiles to Jerusalem.**

III. 1-3. Darius is unable to sleep.

4-12. The three pages plan a contest of wits, the winner to receive high honour from the king as reward.

13-17. The king sits in council to adjudicate. Note that the story seems confused.

4-12 seems to have nothing to do with 1-3, and 13-17 seems to describe a different method of conveying the writing to the king from that in 4-13. Josephus smooths over the former difficulty by introducing an audience of the pages with Darius, who suggests the contest.

The story may be a fragment of a larger whole, in which *the* three pages (4) had already appeared. Note that the third page propounds a double thesis (12) regarding women and Truth.

III. 18-IV. 41. The contest proceeds and the third page wins, maintaining that women are the strongest (4 13-22) but Truth is stronger than all (33-41).

The third page is now declared to be Zerubbabel (13). Note the famous utterance on the superexcellence of Truth in 41.

Of Apame (29) nothing else is known, though other ladies of Egyptian and Syrian history bore her name. Bartacus is also unknown. Josephus calls him Rabezakes, perhaps = Rabshakeh, an official title (cf 2 K 18 17).

IV. 42-57. Darius rewards the winner by granting his request that he might proceed to Jerusalem to restore the city and Temple.

Note the reference to a vow by Darius (43), made, according to Josephus, before he came to the throne.

Note also the reference to Cyrus in 44, 57, as having set aside the sacred vessels and vowed to return them. But apparently his vow was not fulfilled, and there is no hint of a return to Jerusalem in his days as recorded in 2 1-15.

IV. 58-63. **The joy of Zerubbabel and his fellow-exiles.**

The story presents a good many problems. Though in some ways similar to the stories in Daniel and Esther, and *perhaps* echoing Gen 2 24 in 4 20, it is not 'Biblical' in tone. It is difficult to harmonize with the account of the return under Cyrus in 2 1-15, and the parenthetic introduction of Zerubbabel in 4 13 gives the impression that he was not the original hero of the story. It should be noticed that in 6 23 Darius seems to be quite unconscious of having despatched Zerubbabel and his fellows to rebuild Jerusalem. A full discussion is impossible in short space. It must suffice to say that we have here probably a popular story adapted to the history of

Zerubbabel. It is possible that the section on Truth (4^{33-41}) was added at the adaptation. Possibly the story was introduced for the purpose of expanding and explaining the allusion to the wisdom of Zerubbabel (or his son) in 5^{6}. The mention of the sea and piracy ($4^{15, 23}$) and a *possible* allusion to the sun worship of Heliopolis (4^{34}) have been regarded as indications that the story hails from Egypt. Though the story cannot be regarded as historical, yet it witnesses to a tradition that there was no actual return of exiles under Cyrus. The references to Cyrus ($4^{44, 57}$) may, however, be interpolations. Josephus omits them. The story also militates against the theory that Sheshbazzar (Sanabassar, 2^{12}) and Zerubbabel are identical. See Introduction to Haggai and Ezra.

V. 1-6. **A body of exiles prepare for a return.**

The section may originally have been independent of the story in 3 and 5, which may have been introduced to explain ^{6}.

V. 5. **Joakim son of Zorobabel.** Not mentioned in any other genealogy (see 1 Ch 3^{19} ff.). It is not clear whether 'who spake,' etc., refers to Joakim or to Zerubbabel. More naturally it would refer to Joakim, but the compiler who introduced 3 and 4 evidently applied the words to Zerubbabel.

(*e*) V. 7-46 = Ezr 2 (Neh 7^{6-73}).

Names, numbers, and totals vary a good deal from those in the canonical books. Note **Nehemias** and **Attharias** (^{40}) for Tirshatha of Ezr 2^{63}. The singular verb in the Greek shows that N. and A. are identical. Attharias is merely a Greek rendering of Tirshatha (see under Ezra). Cf. 9^{49}.

(*f*) V. 47-73 = Ezr 3^{1}-4^{5}.
73*b* a variant of Ezr 4^{24} (?).
VI 1-34 = Ezr 5^{1}-6^{12}.

(*g*) VII. 1-VIII. 96 = Ezr 6^{13}-10^{5}.
IX. 1-36 = Ezr 10^{6-44}.

(*h*) IX. 37 = Neh 7^{73}. Note the omission of Neh 1-7 ^{72}. Josephus follows the order in Esdras, not introducing Nehemiah until after the death of Ezra.

IX. 38 to end = Neh 8^{1-12}.

The ending is abrupt (^{38}), though the English versions obscure the fact by the insertion of 'for the which.' The Greek has (after 'instructed') '*And they were gathered together*,' evidently beginning a new episode (cf. Neh 8^{17}), but the account breaks off suddenly. 1 Esdras may be only a fragment of a longer work now lost.

II. (IV.) ESDRAS

By W. O. E. Oesterley

Name.—In the English versions of the Apocrypha this book is called 2 Esdras, but in the later Latin MSS. the title is 4 Esdras, as in the Vulgate, and comprises only 3-14; while 1, 2 = 2 Esdras, and 15, 16 = 5 Esdras. Hence the title '2 (4) Esdras' in order to avoid confusion. The book is a pseudepigraph; the contents show quite clearly that it was written centuries after Ezra's time.

Date.—The various documents included in the book (for not even is the central portion, 3-14, a unity) were written at different times. The oldest part is the *Vision of the Man Rising from the Sea* (13), which was written not long before the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70; it contains more ancient traditional elements than any other part of the book. The *Eagle Vision* (11, 12) was probably written *c.* A.D. 96. The central portion (3-10), which contains the *Salathiel Apocalypse* (see 3^{1}), belongs in its present form to *c.* A.D. 100, but much of the traditional material incorporated by the writer goes back to pre-Christian times. To this period belongs also the *Ezra Legend* (14). 1, 2 were added by a Jewish Christian later, but not much later, than the rest of the book; like the central chapters, these, too, contain earlier traditional matter. 15, 16 form an appendix to the whole; various indications point to their composition between A.D. 260-270. The whole book has been subjected to corrections and additions by a redactor—quite possibly more than one. 1, 2, 15, 16 are of far less value than the rest of the book.

Language, etc.—The main part of the book (3-14) was without any doubt written originally in Hebrew; but this, like the Greek Version, is not extant. The versions which have come down to us are the Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian, and Latin. Of these the last, which is translated from the Greek, is the most valuable. The text of this has been

used for the following commentary; it is published by Bensly and James, *The Fourth Book of Ezra; the Latin Version edited from the MSS.* (1895). An English translation with commentary has been published by Box, *The Ezra Apocalypse*, Latin text in the Appendix (1911); see also Charles, ii, 542-624, by the same author (1913). The value of this central part of the book lies in its theology and eschatology; the light it throws on the New Testament makes it a work of very high importance.

Esdras Receives a Charge from the Lord (I., II.)

I. 1-3. Genealogy of Ezra (cf. Ezr 7 [1-5]; 1 Ch 6 [3] ff.).—The forms of these proper names vary considerably in the versions.

4-24. Ezra is bidden to declare to the people their sinfulness; they are reminded of God's mercy in delivering them from the Egyptian bondage, and of His favour shown to them during the wanderings in the wilderness, and of how they were finally led into the Promised Land; but in spite of all they have forsaken God.

11. In the east is obviously wrong, as **Tyre** and **Sidon** (which were cities, not provinces) lay to the west; the writer is represented as being in the land of the Medes ([3]). It is clear that the original, probably in Hebrew, was misunderstood.

14. Cf. Ex 13 [21].

15. Cf. Ex 16 [13] ff.

19. angels' bread (cf. Ps 78 [25]).

22. Cf. Ex 15 [22] ff.

24-34. As a result of Israel's backsliding God's mercy is to be withdrawn from them.

26. Cf. Is 59 [7].

29. Cf. Jer 24 [7]; Heb 8 [10].

30. See Mt 23 [37].

31. Cf. Is 1 [13-14].

33. Cf. Mt 23 [38]; Lk 13 [35].

35-37. Israel's possessions are to be given to others who will believe in God though not having heard about Him.

38-40. Read: *And now, father, look around with glory* (i.e. with joy) . . .; someone is represented as addressing Esdras as 'father' of the nation, and bidding him rejoice at the sight of the returning exiles. These verses are quite out of place here after what has preceded; but how they got in and where they came from is difficult to say.

II. 1-9. Israel personified as a mother, but representing God, deplores the backsliding of her children. Esdras, the father of the people, is called upon to bring about their punishment; while the evil nation, Assyria, who shelters the faithless Israelites, is threatened.

10-19. Nevertheless, in His divine mercy, God, through the person of Esdras, gives the promise of restoration to His people.

20-32. An exhortation to the people to do what is right, and the reward which shall follow.

33-39. Esdras tells how he received a charge from the Lord to go to the people and turn their hearts; but they despised the commandment of the Lord. Therefore Esdras turns to the heathen.

40-41. The faithful ones in Sion are now called. Jews and Gentiles are thus sanctified unto the Lord.

40-48. Esdras has a vision; he sees the risen on Mount Sion, and among them the Son of God appears.

The First Vision (III. 1-V. 19)

III. 1-3. Introduction.—The seer, personating Salathiel (=Shealtiel, the father of Zerubbabel: Ezr 3 [2], 5 [2]; Neh 12 [1]), whose name, he says, is also Ezra, transports us mentally to the time of Nebuchadnezzar. This was a device common to the apocalyptic writers, adopted with the object of commending the book to readers. In this particular case the conditions of the time at which the writer lived were paralleled by those of the middle of the 6th century B.C.; the thirtieth year after the destruction of the city (Jerusalem) would be 556 B.C.; the Jews were under foreign domination. When the writer actually wrote Jerusalem had again been destroyed, in A.D. 70, and the nation was again under foreign domination. He wrote thirty years after the fall of Jerusalem, i.e. A.D. 100. His mind is disturbed by the thought of the Holy City being in ruins; the people of God are in adversity, while his enemies are in prosperity. In his perplexity he asks questions of the Most High.

4-36. Whence comes Sin with its consequent Misery? Why is Israel, the Chosen of God, in Sin and Affliction, while the Enemy who does not Acknowledge Him is Prosperous?—The seer begins with an historical retrospect: he recalls the creation of Adam; his sin, which resulted in death coming upon him, and upon the human race; all men continued in sin. Then came the Flood and universal destruction, Noah and his household alone being saved. Through him mankind had another chance, but still sin continued ([1-12]). With the choice of

Abraham a new era begins. It is implied that since mankind was hopelessly involved in sin, God tried another way whereby He might be acknowledged, viz. by the choice of one nation, Israel. So the seer recapitulates the history of his nation: the patriarchs, the release from the Egyptian bondage, and the giving of the Law, David and the city which he dedicated to God. But in spite of Divine mercies—the example of good men, deliverance from bondage, the Law and the Holy City—even this chosen nation was disobedient, sinning as Adam had done: therefore God delivered them into the hands of their enemies. The history is thus brought down to the Babylonian captivity (3[13-27]), which forms the background for the seer's first question: Israel has sinned, it is true, but is Babylon any less sinful? Are its deeds any better than Israel's? Besides, though Israel has sinned, it has at any rate acknowledged God, which Babylon has never done; how is it, then, that Israel is in its present miserable plight, while God's enemies prosper? (3[28-36]).

IV. 1-V. 19. **The Divine Reply: The Human Mind can Apprehend so Little, and God's Ways who shall Fathom?**—The reply of the Almighty is given through the intermediary of the angel (but see 4[36]), Uriel ("Fire of God"), who is introduced suddenly into the narrative without any explanation. The reply, such as it is, does not, however, deal with the seer's perplexity as to the affliction of God's chosen and the prosperity of His enemies; indeed, the angel's words ("... I will show thee the way thou desirest to see, and teach thee whence comes the evil heart") imply that what is in question is the problem of the origin of evil. This the angel undertakes to tell the seer provided he can do three things: weigh the fire, measure the wind, recall the day that is past. He replies, of course, that he can do none of these. Then Uriel taunts him by saying that he has not been asked concerning anything outside of man's experience, but only of things within his cognizance, and yet he can give no answer to these! How then would he be able to understand the things of God? To this the seer can only reply that it would have been better for man never to have been created than, having come into the world and living in sin, to suffer and yet not to know why he suffers (4[1-12]). The weakness of this reasoning is at once apparent, for all suffering was believed to be the visible sign of God's wrath for sin. It is probable that we have here a misunderstanding of the original which was wrongly translated; Box's conjecture as to the Hebrew text underlying the passage is much to be commended: 'It would have been better for us that we had not been created than that we should have entered into life [i.e. have been born] in sins.' For the belief in the pre-existence of the soul here implied, cf. Wisd 8[19-20]; *Apoc. of Baruch*, 3[1]. The angel then illustrates what he has been saying by a parable (4[13-21]). Once upon a time the trees wanted more space, and determined to make war upon the waves in order to gain it. The waves also wanted more space, and determined to make war upon the trees in order to gain it. All in vain, for the fire consumed the trees, and the sand stood up against the waves. The application is that just as the earth is for the trees, and the sea for the waves, so the dwellers upon earth can understand only what is upon the earth, while those above the things that are above. The analogy is not complete, for those above the heavens understand the things of the earth, as the presence of the angel implies; but one must not press the parallel unduly. The main point is that the seer is told that, in seeking to understand things beyond his powers of comprehension, he is treading on forbidden ground. He, therefore, somewhat shifts his ground, and, leaving the problem of the origin of evil, enquires why God's loved people, Israel, are given up to the power of the godless (4[22-25]). The lengthy dialogue which follows resolves itself briefly into this: the solution of the seer's difficulty will appear hereafter when the New Age breaks, and the end of the world is drawing near; the signs proclaiming this will soon become manifest. First, the number of the righteous must be fulfilled; then will come the signs: panic among the peoples of the earth, increase of iniquity, terrors in the sky, on earth, and in the sea; famine and sword, and the disappearance of wisdom and righteousness (4[22]-5[19]).

It will be noticed that here again there is no real solution offered of the difficulty; like the problem of the origin of evil, that of the righteous in adversity and the wicked in prosperity had long been pondered over by the nation's thinkers, but no satisfactory answer was forthcoming. One of the most interesting points about our book is that it shows how these problems were exercising the minds of the thoughtful, and yet how they were unable to solve them.

The Second Vision (V. 20-VI. 34)

V. 20-22. Introduction.—As a preparation for the vision the seer fasts seven days (see 5[13] and cf. Dan 9[3]; *Apoc. of Baruch*, 20[5, 6]), during which, as the sequel shows, he pondered over the enigma of the sufferings of God's chosen people, and is troubled in mind.

23-30. The Seer states the Problem.—By means of a series of figures, the seer touchingly shows how God chose Israel from among all the nations, and gave them the one Law which is above all laws. Why is it, then, that God's 'only one' is dishonoured and trodden down by those who have spurned the promises of the Almighty? If Israel has sinned, why does God Himself not inflict the punishment instead of leaving this to the unrighteous?

31-40. The Divine Reply: Man is Unable to Apprehend the Ways of God Who has Nothing but Love for His People.—Uriel is again sent to reason with the seer, and, as in the previous vision, he puts before him impossible tasks which the seer confesses he is unable to fulfil. The divine messenger then declares in God's name: 'Just as thou art unable to do even one of these things that have been mentioned, even so thou art powerless to discover my judgement or the goal of love that I have declared unto my people.'

41-55. Individualism.—By the 'goal of love' is meant the time when the righteous would be vindicated and come into their own, i.e. the Messianic era. Now, according to the old belief, it was the Israelite nation as a whole who would enter into the joy of that era; but owing to the inadequate conception of the hereafter according to which the shades of the departed passed an aimless and unending existence in Sheol, it was only the generation living at the time of the advent of the Messianic age who would be partakers of its blessings. The apocalyptists, however, following the teaching of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, laid stress on the importance of the *individual*; this, added to their belief in the resurrection, resulted in their teaching that all the righteous individuals in past generations would participate in the blessings of the Messianic age. It is this theme which is introduced in this vision. The seer, representing the older views, asks how it shall be with the past generations in that day; and the angel replies, in effect, that the first shall be as the last, and the last as the first (5[42]), i.e. each righteous individual of every generation will participate in the blessings of the Messianic age. Then, in reply to a further question, he says that the earth has grown old, implying that the end is not far off.

56-VI. 6. The Last Day will Come through the Act of God Alone.—The dialogue is now continued by the apocalyptist and the Almighty Himself; the former says: 'Show thy servant by whom thou visitest thy creature,' i.e. by whose instrumentality the visitation upon the creation will be accomplished; the reference being the end of the world. The reply (6[1-5]) includes fourteen lines in poetical form which in substance contain ancient traditional matter (cf. Pr 8[24-29]), going back in origin to Babylonian Creation-myths. Before the world was created God had planned how all things were to be; and just as He alone in the beginning thought out and accomplished the work of Creation, so He alone will bring about the end of all things. This section, which does not logically belong to the sequence of thought, is no doubt purposely put in by the apocalyptist in order to repudiate any idea of intermediate agency in the work of Creation or in the bringing in of the new age. The doctrine of the unity of God was so jealously guarded by orthodox Judaism that even the thought of the world having been created by the Wisdom of God or by the *Memra* ('Word' of God) was looked upon with suspicion; for there was a tendency to hypostatize Wisdom and the Word, thereby endangering, as was believed, the belief in the Divine Unity. The same would apply to a superhuman Messiah, who, according to some apocalyptists, was to usher in the Messianic age. It is quite possible, too, that the passage was directed against the early Christian belief in the second advent of Christ, and His setting up of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, which was looked for in the near future.

VI. 7-10. The Parting of the Times.—An allegorical way of saying that there will be no interval between the present evil age (=Esau) and the glorious age to come (=Jacob).

11-34. The Signs of the End.—After some introductory words (6[11-20]), the signs which will herald the end are enumerated; among these there is the trumpet sound at which fear will come upon all men; famine; friends will fight against friends; and the waters from springs will cease to flow. There are signs that the text here is incomplete (6[21-24]). Then follows an account of the happiness of the righteous who shall have

survived the Messianic woes (6 25-29). The vision concludes with some words of encouragement to the seer, and the promise of hearing still greater things.

The Third Vision (VI. 35-IX. 25)

35-37. **Introduction.**—For the third time the seer fasts for seven days in preparation for the revelation which he is to receive in the vision.

38-59. **If the World has in Truth been Created for Israel, why has the Nation not Entered into its Inheritance and Taken Possession of the World?**—It will be well to recall briefly the points in the problem with which the seer was confronted; for these three visions belong together and contain in an ascending degree the three outstanding difficulties the solution of which the seer seeks. In the first vision he asks why it is that Israel, the one nation which honours the name of God, is in subjection to those who do not acknowledge Him? The second vision recalls the fact that Israel is the one and only nation chosen by God; if this affliction which Israel is suffering is a punishment for sin, why does God Himself not inflict it instead of the heathen who spurn His covenants? Then, in the third vision, the seer asks why if, as God has said, the world was created for Israel's sake, does Israel not possess its own? It must be remembered that the writer of this book, in emphasizing the privileged position of Israel, is not giving expression to mere national glorification; at the base of all that he says there is, firstly, the incontrovertible fact that the Israelites were the only people who believed in and worshipped the one and only God; and, secondly, and still more important in his eyes, there was the twofold problem, how can the honour and power of the Almighty be vindicated in the eyes of the world if His chosen people are afflicted and despised by the Gentiles? And how is His Name to be borne witness to if the one nation capable of doing so is hindered in its task by its cruel fate? This was what most of all concerned both this and the other apocalyptists; and unless it is realized that solicitude for the honour and glory of God was their pre-eminent aim we shall not be doing them justice.

The seer begins with a long account of the Creation, which in various ways shows acquaintance with the hagaddic exegesis of the Rabbis; echoes of ancient myths are also to be discerned. Of special interest is the mention (6 49-52) of Leviathan and Behemoth, the two primeval monsters of chaos representing the deep, Tehom (=Tiamat in the Babylonian Creation-myth), and the dry land, Behemoth (=Kingu in Babylonian mythology); they are respectively female and male, according to *Eth. Enoch*, lx, 7-9, which agrees with the Babylonian account. This echo of the ancient Creation-myth is based upon a number of references to it in the Old Testament: see especially Is 51 9, 10; Ps 74 12-15, 89 9, 10; Job 7 12, 26 12, 13, 41 1 ff, and others. The account of the Creation is given because, in the words of the writer, 'Thou hast said that for our sakes thou madest this world' (55). The idea of the world having been created for the sake of Israel (cf. 7 11) is not found in the Old Testament, but is an inference drawn from such passages as Ex 4 22; Jer 31 9, where Israel is spoken of as 'the first-born,' and finds expression in other apocalyptic books (e.g. *Assumption of Moses*, 1 12; *Apoc. of Baruch*, 15 7), and in later Rabbinical writings (see e.g. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, 208 f.).

VII. 1-16. **The Wickedness of this World makes the Path to the World to Come Narrow and Dangerous.**—It is pointed out to the seer that through Adam's sin—the results of which have passed on to all men, including the Israelites—the world has become evil, and consequently suffering is widespread. The divine messenger, Uriel, compares the present world with a narrow river which leads to the broad expanse of the ocean (the world to come); or with a narrow and dangerous path, steep, and with fire and water on either side, which leads to the 'city builded and set in a plain country, and full of good things' (another picture of the world to come); and he points out that to attain this goal the narrow path must be followed; so that, although this world was created for Israel's sake (7 11), that inheritance was spoiled when 'Adam transgressed'; and a better inheritance is now in store for them. Therefore the seer is bidden to consider that which is to come, and not to be disquieted about the present transient world (7 15-16).

17-25. **The Fate of the Wicked in this World.**—The subject which is now to be discussed, and which occupies a large part of this vision, is, who shall be worthy to participate in the happiness of the world to come? Those who have despised the Law of God have no part in the new age of peace and joy: 'for the empty are empty things,' *vacua vacuis* (7 25).

26-44. The Coming of the Messiah; His Temporary Kingdom; the Resurrection and the Judgement.—It is probable that this section did not originally stand here as it breaks the connexion between 7^{17-25} and 7^{45} ff.; it comes more naturally after 6^{11-38}, which is also an eschatological section. In [26] the Latin text is corrupt; it should be rendered, '. . . that the city which is not now visible shall be manifested, and the land which is now concealed shall be seen'; the references are to the earthly and heavenly Jerusalem, and to this world and that to come. The word 'Jesus' in [28] is from the Latin text (the other versions read 'Messiah'), and is due to a Christian corrector. The idea of a temporary Messianic Kingdom (400 years) is 'a compromise between the older prophetic view which looked for a final consummation of felicity on the present earth, and the later transcendental view which transferred it to a future age after the destruction of the present order' (Box). In [29] 'Christ' should be 'Messiah'; the assertion that He will die is not in accordance with the usual apocalyptic view, according to which He will, when the Messianic age comes to an end, return to heaven. The account of the general resurrection and the Judgement ($^{31-44}$) is very graphic.

45-74. There are but Few who will be Saved in that Day.—The seer deplores the fact that the coming Age will bring delight to but few, and torment to many, for who is there that has not sinned? To this the divine messenger rejoins that always what is of real value is rare in comparison with what is worthless. The somewhat cutting retort to this cynical doctrine (when applied to men) is to the effect that the beasts, then, are to be envied, 'for it is far better with them than with us, for they look not for judgement, neither do they know of torments or of salvation promised unto them after death,' whereas, whether living or dead, man is tormented! ($^{66-69}$). The angel answers that man is a responsible agent, and has knowingly brought the doom upon himself; besides, he adds: 'For how great a time hath the Most High been longsuffering with them that inhabit the world . . .' (^{74}). In this section we come face to face with a tendency not infrequently met with in the apocalyptic writings, viz. pessimism as regards the world and the generality of mankind. This attitude must not, however, be judged too harshly; the world in general was in a bad state at this time, and what with idolatry, immorality, and tyranny, the apocalyptists had much reason for taking a dark view of things.

75-101. The Intermediate State: Sevenfold Torment and Sevenfold Bliss.—Some interesting speculations regarding the state of the soul after death and before the Judgement. This was naturally a subject of profound thought for the apocalyptists; and it is no matter of surprise to find that they differ in various respects in the presentation of their ideas. Our book offers more detail about the soul's experiences than any other apocalyptic work. The first act after death is to adore 'the glory of the Most High'; this is done by the wicked as well as by the righteous. But the wicked thereupon 'shall wander and be in torments forthwith, ever grieving and sad, in seven ways; these are then described ($^{81-87}$). The righteous, on the other hand, 'shall rest in seven orders,' meaning, as the context shows, joyful emotions. These are enumerated in $^{91-98}$.

102-115. There is no Intercession for the Wicked in the Day of Judgement.—The seer now asks whether it will not be possible for relations and friends to intercede for one another in the Day of Judgement. He is told that this cannot be, 'for then shall all bear everyone his own righteousness or unrighteousness' (^{105}). But he urges that Abraham and others made intercession for the wicked; why, then, will it not be possible in that day? The reply is that in the Day of Judgement all accounts will be closed: 'then shall no man be able to have mercy on him that is cast in judgement, nor to thrust down him that hath gotten the victory' (^{115}).

116-131. What Use is the Promise of Immortality to Man who has Inherited Sin?—Since there is no hope for men who are sinners through their descent from Adam, to what purpose, the seer asks, is the promise of happiness and immortality? A promise made to those who, through the sin of Adam, are sinners and therefore unable to fulfil the conditions required, seems a mockery! The reply of the angel to this pertinent query is feeble and unconvincing; he says that 'this is the condition of the battle' (^{127}), and adds that the sorrow over the destruction of the wicked will be less than the joy at the salvation of the righteous.

132-VIII. 3. How can the Perdition of so Many be Reconciled with the Mercy of God?—In bearing witness to the mercy and longsuffering of God (cf. Ex 34^{6-7}) the seer implicitly suggests the question how these divine attributes are to be reconciled with the perdition of the great

mass of mankind. The reply is in the form of a similitude: just as there is much mould of which earthen vessels are made, but little dust from which gold comes, so 'many are created, but few shall be saved' (8 2-3).

4-19. The Problem is Insoluble; how can God Abandon His Wonderful Creation of Man to Eternal Perdition? As regards Man in General, God knows Best, but what about Israel?—The seer begins to despair of being able to fathom the problem by which he is beset; and small wonder, for the answers to his questions throw but little light on the subject. He makes an appeal, however, to God; and in declaring the marvel of workmanship that man is, he says: 'If therefore thou shalt lightly and suddenly destroy him which with so great labour was fashioned by thy commandment, to what purpose was he made?' (14). Pointed as his question is, the seer does not think that as regards man in general this is his concern; but as to his own people, Israel, he pours out his grief and asks God to hearken to his prayer on their behalf (17-19).

20-40. Ezra's Prayer and the Divine Answer.—The first part of this section, the prayer itself (20-36), has, on account of its beauty and depth of feeling, been used as a separate liturgical piece, under the name 'Confessio Esdræ'; it occurs among the *Cantica* in some of the Vulgate MSS., and is also found in MSS. of the Mozarabic Liturgy. The form is liturgical; it begins with a very beautiful ascription of praise (20-23); then follow the petitions; prayer is made that God will not look upon the sinners, but upon the righteous; that He will not destroy the wicked, but that He will rather consider the good deeds of those who have kept the Law, and loved Him. The implication seems to be that the divine mercy may be shown on the wicked for the sake of the good deeds of the righteous (24-33). The seer then pleads that men are too insignificant and worthless for God to expend displeasure and wrath on them (34-35). Finally, there is a concluding cry for mercy on those who 'have no store of good works' (36). Then follows the divine reply: God will do as the seer has asked, and not concern Himself about the wicked, or with their death, judgement, and destruction; but He will rejoice over the righteous (37-40). The real point of the prayer, *mercy* on the wicked, is ignored.

41-45. Man is Compared with the Seed of the Husbandman.—In this comparison the fact is again emphasized that only a few of the great number of created men will escape destruction. It is in vain that the seer pleads that much seed perishes because it has received too little or too much rain, i.e. that it is the misfortune, not the fault, of many who perish; in vain, too (as the next section shows), that he asks for mercy, therefore, on their behalf.

46-62. The Divine Answer, telling the Seer that he is Numbered among the Blessed, and bidding him think of his own Salvation, not of the Sinners, whose Fate is according to their Deserts.—The seer is told of the joys that await him and other righteous men: Paradise is opened; the tree of life is planted; the blessed time is prepared; delights await them; the city, i.e. the heavenly Jerusalem, is built; rest, good works, and wisdom, have been made for them; Death and Hades are no more; sorrows have passed away; and the treasures of immortality are made manifest. Of these things the seer is told to think, but not of the sinners; for them there is the Judgement and punishment.

63-IX. 12. The End, and the Signs which will Precede It.—This section breaks the main subject of the dialogue; it was probably inserted by the redactor. The seer desires to know when the end of the present age will come, and is informed that when a certain number of signs, of which he has been told, have taken place, then the time is near when 'the Most High will visit the world which was made by him.' The signs are then described; they will be followed by the punishment of those who have despised God and His laws, but the righteous will be saved. It will be noticed that punishment is here said to follow immediately after the death of the wicked; elsewhere it is stated that full retribution will not come until after the resurrection. Discrepancies of this kind, which are not infrequently met with in the apocalyptic writings, are sometimes due to different authorship, as here, or else to a change of view in one and the same writer. In speculations of the kind presented in this literature consistency of view is hardly to be expected.

13-22. The Fate of the Wicked.—Once more the seer, though told not to concern himself with the matter, deplores the coming perdition of the great majority. But again it is declared that their fate is deserved, since the evil state of the world is due to the sinfulness of men. Finally, the seer is told that even the few who will be saved will owe their salvation solely to the love and mercy of God, 'for

with great labour have I made them perfect.'

23-25. Conclusion of the Vision.—The conclusion of the third vision while leading on to the fourth. Fasting and prayers will prepare the seer for further revelations.

The Fourth Vision (IX. 26-X. 59)

26-28. Introduction.—After seven days, sitting among the flowers of the field of Ardat, and eating nothing but the herbs of the field, the seer once more addresses the Most High. What the name Ardat means (even its correct form is uncertain, its spelling varies in the different Latin MSS. and in the other versions) is not known; quite possibly it is some cryptic name associated with eschatological speculations. The locality of the 'field of Ardat' is also uncertain, though from 3^{1} it was presumably supposed to be in the neighbourhood of Babylon.

29-37. The Law and its Abiding Character.—The seer desires to place in contrast the abiding character of that which is divine and the transient nature of all else. The Law was given by God, it is from Heaven; therefore it is eternal; but Israel who received it, but did not keep it, will perish. 'We that have received the Law shall perish by sin, and our heart also which received it. Notwithstanding, the Law perisheth not, but remaineth in its glory' (9^{37}).

38-X. 59. The Vision: Zion's Lament.—In his vision the seer sees a woman lamenting; he asks her the cause of her grief; she tells him that for thirty years she has borne no child to her husband, though she has prayed day and night for one. At last, after these thirty years, God heard her prayer, and she gave birth to a son. Great was her joy, and she and her husband called their neighbours together and gave praise to the Almighty. She brought him up, and nourished him with great care. In due time she took him a wife, and made a feast. But it came to pass that when he entered his wedding chamber, he fell down and died. Therefore, said the sorrowing mother, she would no more return to her city, but would remain here in the field and neither eat nor drink, but mourn and fast till she died. Then the seer rebukes her, saying that she has lost but one son, while Zion, the mother of us all, is full of sorrow and much humbled. And he bids her return to her city and her husband. But she refuses, and determines to die where she is. Then he implores her to be prevailed upon for the sake of the sufferings of Zion, and to be comforted because of the sorrow of Jerusalem. A pathetic account of the desolation of Jerusalem and of the nation follows (10^{21-23}); and the seer concludes: 'Thou therefore shake off thy great heaviness, and put away from thee the multitude of sorrows, that the Almighty may be merciful to thee again, and the Most High may give thee rest, even ease from thy travails.' And as he spoke the face of the woman began suddenly to shine and glitter with great brightness, and she cried out with a great cry so that the earth shook. Then he looked, and behold, the woman was no more there, 'but there was a city builded, and a place showed itself from large foundations'; and he was afraid. Then the angel Uriel comes to him and tells him that the transfigured woman is Zion, i.e. the heavenly Zion (10^{44}). After giving a detailed, though less important, interpretation of other parts of the vision, the angel concludes by telling him that further visions will be vouchsafed to him.

The Fifth Vision (the Eagle Vision) (XI. 1-XII. 50)

XI. 1-XII. 3*a*. The Vision.—The seer, in a dream, sees an eagle with twelve wings and three heads, coming up out of the sea; she spread her wings over all the earth, and the winds and clouds were gathered against her. Out of her wings grew other little wings, eight in number (as added in 11^{1}); the head in the middle one was greater than the two others. With outspread wings this eagle flew over the earth, and all things under the heavens were subject unto her. And she bade her wings not to watch all at the same time, but to take turns and rest. But the heads were to be kept until the end. Then a wing arose on the right side, and reigned over all the earth and disappeared; after that another wing reigned for a long time and then disappeared; so with the rest of the wings. All the little wings, likewise, arose; some of them reigned, but very quickly disappeared, others did not reign at all. Finally, only the three heads at rest and six little wings remained. Two of these latter divided themselves from the rest, and remained under the head that was on the right side; the other four remained where they were: one of them tried to reign, but very soon disappeared; then another quickly vanished; before the other two could arise and try to reign, the middle head awoke and united itself to the other

two heads, and devoured the two wings. The middle head then reigned over the earth with much oppression; but, like the wings, it also suddenly disappeared. Then the two remaining heads reigned over the earth; but the right-hand one devoured that on the left (11 [1-35]). 'Then,' the seer proceeds, 'I heard a voice, which said unto me, Look before thee and consider the thing which thou seest.' And he sees a lion which speaks with the voice of a man, and upbraids the eagle for her cruel oppression, at the same time announcing her approaching destruction; while the lion is speaking the last head of the eagle disappears, and the two little wings which had detached themselves and gone over to it rose up to reign; but 'their kingdom was small and full of uproar,' and they disappeared. 'Then the whole body of the eagle was burned, so that the earth was in great fear.'

XII. 3*b*-39. **The Interpretation of the Vision.**—The vision represents history veiled in symbolic garb, and its interpretation is by no means always clear; nor does it always harmonize with the content of the vision, though this is to be accounted for by the fact that the redactor made alterations in order to bring the vision into agreement with the course of history as viewed from his, chronologically later, standpoint. In the main, though there are differences of opinion with regard to some of the details, most authorities interpret the vision in the following way: The *Eagle* is the Roman Empire. The *Sea* is the Mediterranean. The *Twelve Wings* are Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vindex, Nymphidius, Piso. The second wing, which ruled a long time (11 [13-17]) symbolizes Augustus, who reigned for over fifty years. The *Three Heads* are Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian; the middle head, which is greater than the other two, symbolizes Vespasian. Who are meant by the *Eight Smaller Wings* is uncertain. The *Two Little Wings* are possibly Mucianus, proconsul of Syria, and Tiberius Alexander, prefect of Egypt. The two heads that remained (11 [34-35]) are Domitian and Titus, of whom the latter is said to have been murdered by the former. That this interpretation is not satisfactory in some particulars is recognized; a somewhat different one is suggested by Box, 265 f.; see also Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 99 ff. (1877).

40-51. **Conclusion of the Vision.**—The seer's compatriots came to him, fearing that he had forsaken them because he had tarried so long. He reassures them, saying that he had been occupied in praying 'for the desolation of Zion'; he sends them home again, while he remains in the field seven days.

The Sixth Vision (the Vision of the Man from the Seat) (XIII. 1-58)

XIII. 1-13*a*. **The Vision.**—The seer tells how in his dream-vision he sees the wind stirring up the waves of the sea; and from the heart of the sea there arises a man who 'flew with the clouds of heaven'; to whichever part of the earth he turned all hearts were filled with terror, and whoever heard his voice fainted away with fear. Then he sees a great multitude of men gathered from all parts of the earth to make war on the man who arose from the sea. This man then cuts out for himself a great mountain upon which he flies; at this the multitude of men who had gathered against him are terrified, but nevertheless prepare to attack him. On their approach he does not even raise his hand or take hold of any weapon, but from his mouth there issues a fiery stream, and his tongue shoots out a storm of sparks, and burns up all the approaching multitude; and immediately nothing is left of them but the dust of ashes and the smell of smoke. Then the man comes down from the mountain and calls to him another multitude of men, and these are peaceful; they come to him, and some are glad, but others are sorrowful.

13*b*-24. **A Redactional Interpolation.**—The interpretation of the vision would naturally follow here, but it is postponed by a redactor who desires to offer some reflections of his own; these are, of course, put into the mouth of the original writer. He begins by asking for an interpretation of the vision, but this is not touched upon; instead of this, he thinks about those who will survive and those who will not survive 'in those days' ([16]), which in the next verse are spoken of as 'the last days.' As this is an obvious reference to the advent of the Messiah, it will be clear that the redactor implies the Messianic character of the vision, though this has yet to be explained in the interpretation of it (see [25] ff.). This is sufficient to show that this section does not belong to the original form of the vision. In comparing the lot of those who will be alive when the Messiah comes with that of those who will have died beforehand, it is said that although those who survive will encounter perils, yet this is preferable to passing away as a cloud out of the world,

and not seeing what will happen in the last times. The whole question of the lot of those who died before the opening of the Messianic age was a very controversial one. This redactor's point of view was thoroughly unsatisfactory. To the more enlightened apocalyptists there was no difference between those who were alive and those who were not at the coming of the Messiah (see note under 5 [41-55]).

25-58. The Interpretation of the Vision.—Here, too, the redactor's hand has been busy, with the result that the interpretation does not always run parallel with the vision itself. Some of the most interesting features in the vision are passed over in the interpretation; e.g. no explanation is given as to why the man rises from the sea, or of the significance of the sea, or why he flies with the clouds of heaven, or how he gets from the sea to the clouds. These are all ancient mythological *traits* of which the original significance is not touched upon, either because it was not known by the writer, or because these features were adaptations of some earlier eschatological scheme. The interpretation as given in these verses is as follows: The man from the sea is the Messiah 'whom the Most High hath kept a great season,' i.e. who was pre-existent ([25-26]). The mountain which he cuts out for himself is Mount Zion ([35-36]). The fiery stream which issued from his mouth is the Law; the flaming breath is the torment wherewith the ungodly shall be tormented; the sparks are the rebukes of the Messiah which shall be heaped upon the wicked ([35-38]). The peaceful multitude are the ten tribes ([40]). In [51-58] the seer is told that the interpretation is given to him alone because he has forsaken evil ways, and has sought out the Law, and ordered his life in wisdom.

The Seventh Vision (an Esdras Legend) (XIV. 1-48)

XIV. **1-18. The Lord's Commands to Esdras.**—While Esdras is sitting under an oak the voice of the Lord comes to him from a bush, telling him how He had shown Moses many wonderful things, some of which he was told to publish, others to keep secret; by the former the writer means the Law, by the latter the apocalyptic tradition. Esdras is commanded to keep secret all that he has seen and heard, for he is soon to be taken away from men, i.e. he will be taken to heaven to dwell with the Messiah. He is then told that the world is growing old, therefore he is to prepare himself and give a final message to his people.

19-26. Esdras Prays for Inspiration to Restore the Scriptures.—As he is to be taken away from his people, Esdras, fearing that there will be nobody to instruct and guide the generation to come, prays for inspiration to re-write the Law, which had been lost during the Captivity; the Law is used in a wide sense to include all the Scriptures, for it is described as containing 'all that hath been done in the world since the beginning' ([22]). The Lord grants his request; he is told to prepare many tablets, and to take five scribes who can write swiftly; the Lord will then 'light a lamp of understanding' in his heart, which shall not be put out until he has finished his task; this is to be begun on the morrow.

27-36. The Last Words of Esdras.—Before beginning his work Esdras gathers the people together and tells them how their fathers received the Law, but were unfaithful; not only so, but they, too (those to whom he is speaking), have done unrighteously and not kept the ways of the Lord. But if they rule over their understanding and keep their heart aright they shall live, and after death shall obtain mercy; 'for after death shall the judgement come, when we shall live again; and then shall the name of the righteous be manifest, and the works of the ungodly shall be declared.' He says that now nobody is to come near him for forty days.

37-48. The Restoration of the Scriptures.—Esdras now retires 'into the field' with his five companions. The cup 'which was full, as it were, with water, but the colour of it was like fire,' ([39]) is the cup of inspiration containing the fire of the Spirit. Having drunk this his heart uttered understanding, wisdom grew in his breast, his spirit retained its memory, and his mouth was opened. Within the forty days the work is completed; it consists of ninety-four books: of these, twenty-four are the books of the Old Testament, which he is bidden to publish openly, for both the worthy and unworthy may read them; but the other seventy (by them are meant the apocalypses which were secret books) are to be delivered only to those who are wise among the people. Esdras obeys the Lord's command.

An Appendix (XV., XVI.)

XV. **1-27.** The prophet (presumably Esdras is meant, but his name is not mentioned) is told to write down the words which God speaks to him. These are to the effect that the cruel nation (cryptically

called Egypt, but Rome being meant) shall no longer tyrannize over God's people, but shall soon suffer destruction; so, too, shall other nations who have persecuted God's chosen ones.

28-63. The seer sees a horrible vision in which punishment is meted out to the wicked, Assyria and Babylon being especially mentioned; but these again are only used cryptically, the reference being to nations in power at the time when the book was written. The fiercest denunciations are uttered against 'Asia.'

XVI. 1-39. A further denunciation against Babylon, Asia, Egypt, and Syria for their wickedness is added; the punishment is described in detail.

40-51. God's people are warned as to what is coming upon the earth owing to the wickedness of men; it will be a hard time for them too.

52-54. But soon iniquity will be taken away, and righteousness shall reign. Nevertheless, let no man say he has not sinned, for God knows the thoughts and hearts of men.

55-72. The power and wisdom of God are described; therefore sin cannot be hidden from Him.

73-78. God's chosen are known to Him, and though evil days are coming, they need not fear, for God is their guide. It is only those bound with their sins against whom woe is pronounced.

TOBIT

By H. St. John Thackeray

Introduction

The book is a pious romance in praise of almsgiving and illustrating its resultant blessings, other topics being interwoven into this main theme. The Jewish writer has not scrupled to incorporate, in a modified form, older non-Jewish folklore derived from various quarters. The numerous editions in which the work has come down to us attest its popularity; it must have held in Jewish households much the position once held by Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* in our own.

Sources.—The author has freely drawn upon Oriental legends. Babylon, Persia, and Egypt seem to have contributed items to his romance, though the older material has been so worked up that direct dependence cannot always be traced.

(*a*) The use of the *Story of Ahikar* is patent. The tale of this Grand Vizier of Sennacherib and his ungrateful adopted son Nadan, who plotted his benefactor's ruin and met with just retribution, was ancient and widespread; its popularity with Jewish readers in Egypt is shown by its appearance among the Aramaic papyri of the 5th century B.C. discovered at Elephantine. In *Tobit* the Vizier (Achiacharus) figures as Tobit's nephew (1 ^{21}); while the fate of his graceless pupil (here called Nadab) is hinted at (14 ^{10} S text). But not only are the names of the hero and villain of the older story taken over; the counsel of Tobit to Tobias and that of Raphael to both are in part based on the sage maxims of the Vizier (4 ^{17}, 12 ^{7}).

(*b*) *Magian Material.*—Various features of Magianism have been noted, and the late Dr. J. H. Moulton ingeniously reconstructed a specimen of the Median folk-tale which may have served as the model (*Early Zoroastrianism*, 332-340). The main parallels are the name of the demon Asmodaus (3 ^{8} = *Æshma Dæva*) and the stress laid on consanguineous marriages and on burial. The last-named feature possibly also explains the otiose introduction of the dog as the travellers' companion (5 ^{16} = 6 ^{2} S, 11 ^{4}). To the Oriental the dog is not man's friend but the scavenger, and his introduction here is thought to be a relic of the Magian tale in which he accompanied the hero on his rounds in search of the unburied dead and disposed of the corpses in the customary Persian manner. It has been suggested that the Magian story may have been brought to Egypt by the army of Cambyses (Charles's *Apocrypha*, i, 194).

(*c*) The Egyptian *Tractate of Khons.*—While the demon in *Tobit* bears a Magian name, Egypt apparently furnished the model for the story of his exorcism. The tractate of Khons or Bentres *stele* of *c.* 500 B.C. relates how the princess Bentres of Bakhtan (probably = Ecbatana, the home of Sarah in *Tobit*), sister of the Mesopotamian consort of Rameses II, was possessed by a demon, and how it was exorcized by Khons, the 'double' of the healing God of Egyptian Thebes, who, in response to an appeal from the prince of Bakhtan, was sent to her assistance. The work has been called a 'puff advertisement' of the marvellous healing

power of Khons, and *Tobit* has been regarded as a rival propaganda treatise, illustrating Jehovah's sovereignty over unclean spirits. The features common to the two stories are the demoniacal possession of a lady of high station, her home (probably), the supernatural relief sent from afar, and the father's reluctance to part with the agents of his daughter's deliverance; the flight of the demon 'into the uppermost parts of Egypt' (Tob 8 [3]) is also perhaps significant (Charles's *Apocrypha*, i, 187 f., with Naville, *Old Egyptian Faith*, 249 ff.).

(*d*) *Fable of the Grateful Dead.*—The possibility of the connexion of *Tobit* with a cycle of folk-tales of uncertain antiquity, mainly indigenous to Germany but paralleled in other European countries, is more remote. The outline of the fable runs thus (in Canon Simpson's words, Charles's *Apocrypha*, i, 188): 'The corpse of a debtor . . . was rescued from his murderers and buried at great personal sacrifice by a traveller or itinerant merchant, whom the dead man's spirit, appearing in human form, afterwards delivered from mortal peril, bestowing on him a bride and rescuing him from death by drowning; the supernatural being only revealed his own identity at the end of the series of adventures to the surprise alike of the merchant and of the reader.' The kernel of the story is older than Cicero (*De Divinatione*, i, 27). Obvious discrepancies between the Semitic and pagan forms of the story are explicable as due partly to changes which it has undergone since the date of the author of *Tobit*, partly to deliberate modifications introduced by himself.

(*e*) *Old Testament.*—These foreign fables have all been freely handled by a pious Jew whose mind is steeped in his own Scriptures. The parallels to the Old Testament, Genesis in particular, are evident. The journey of Tobias to the Mesopotamian region, whence he brings back a kinswoman as his bride, has its prototype in the narratives of the patriarchal marriages (Tob 5 [16] *v.n.*); the meeting of Anna and Tobias (11 [9]) recalls the meeting of Joseph and Jacob; the duty of burial is more emphasized in Genesis than in any other Scriptural book. These reminiscences are occasionally made more pointed in the later B text (7 [1]). Allusion is made to a prophecy of Nahum (14 [4] S; or Jonah, B).

Text.—The book is extant in numerous versions and recensions: Greek (three recensions), Latin, Aramaic, Hebrew (various forms), Syriac, and Ethiopic. The intricate problem of the interrelation of these texts and of the language in which the work was originally composed cannot here be discussed. But one fairly certain conclusion has emerged from recent criticism, viz. that whatever was the original language, *the nearest approach to the original text is preserved in the Greek codex Sinaiticus* (S). The shorter Greek text contained in codex Vaticanus (B) and other MSS, forming the basis of our English versions is now regarded as a condensation of the fuller S text. The main function of a modern commentary is to vindicate the claims of the longer recension, and all important readings of S are quoted below.

The three Greek recensions have been denoted R^s, R^v, and R^c. (1) R^s: The main representative is codex S, sometimes standing alone, but constantly supported by one or more of the versions, old Latin, Aramaic, and one form of the Hebrew. This recension preserves the purer forms of proper names and the simplicity and redundancy of Semitic speech; all indications point to its comparative originality. (2) R^v: The main representative is codex B; other allies are codex A (Alexandrinus), a Syriac version of the first half of the book attributed to Paul of Tella (7th century A.D.), and the Ethiopic. R^v is a deliberate curtailment of R^s; it shows no trace of Semitic parentage, while it often betrays dependence on the Greek, or on a corrupt form of the Greek, of the S text. (3) R^c is a compromise between the two foregoing, 'an attempt to combine the improvements of R^v with the ancient and well-established R^s' (Simpson). This recension survives for a large part of the book (6 [7]-13 [8]) in the three Greek minuscules 44, 106, and 107 (of Holmes and Parsons), and doubtless once extended to the whole book; a fragment of 2 is preserved in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (1076).

Original Language.—The rival claimants here are Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew. The evidence preponderates in favour of a Semitic original and one written in Aramaic rather than Hebrew. The forms Ather, Athoureias (14 [4, 15] S text) for Assyria are pure Aramaisms. Jerome knew the work only in Aramaic ('librum Chaldæo sermone conscriptum'), and in one day's labour translated it into Latin with the help of a secretary who dictated it in Hebrew. But in all probability the original text is to be sought neither in Jerome's exemplar nor in the extant Aramaic.

Date and Place of Composition.—Various historical and chronological errors, together with some knowledge of post-exilic events, betray the hand of the later romancer. The work is certainly post-exilic and probably pre-Maccabæan. That it is *pre-Herodian* may be inferred from 14 [5]. A partial return from exile and the rebuilding of the temple on a smaller scale than before are there 'foreseen.' The house, 'not like the first,' to be erected by this earlier company is the historical temple of Zerubbabel (cf. Hag 2 [3]). A first and a second temple are within the writer's ken: the rest is fancy. For the more splendid temple of the future is to be reared by the whole nation returning in a body to Palestine. Of the erection (and destruction) of Herod's temple the author is ignorant. That the work is *pre-Maccabæan* may be inferred from the absence of any allusion to the period of Greek domination and the Hasmonæan rising. It betrays the more liberal attitude to the Gentile world of the peaceful age preceding the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes—the age which produced *Ecclesiasticus*, with which work *Tobit* has much in common. If, as appears, it was written in Egypt, the account of the marriage of Tobias to his relative Sarah may possibly have been inspired by a desire to substitute a more edifying story for the scandalous tale, still fresh in the minds of the author and his readers, of the marriage with his niece of the apostate descendant of another Tobias, Joseph the tax-collector (*c.* 230-220 B.C.: Jos., *Ant.*, XII, iv, 6). A date between 200-170 B.C. may therefore be hazarded.

Though the scene is laid in the Eastern Diaspora, the imperfect knowledge of Eastern geography displayed excludes that quarter as the *place of writing*. All indications point to Egypt. The breadth of culture and the fusion of pagan and Jewish legends are characteristic of an Alexandrian Jew. One of the main sources of the work, the *Story of Aḥikar*, was, we know, current among the Jews of Egypt; and the work may have been intended in part as a counterblast to the Egyptian *Tractate of Khons*. The fish, whose organs were used for medicinal purposes, has been identified with the crocodile; Robertson Smith regarded this conjecture as practically proved by the statement in an Arabic work that 'the smell of the smoke of a crocodile's liver cures epilepsy, and that its dung and gall cure leucoma' (*Encycl. Brit.*, art. 'Tobit').

Commentary

I. 1. Tobit: Hellenized form (in S Tobith) of Hebrew Tobi ('my goodness'), which is probably an abbreviation of Tobiyah, Tobiah ('goodness of Jahveh'). The latter name in its Greek form, Tobias, is reserved in this book for the son.

Gabael + 'the son of Raphael, the son of Raguel' (S).

2. Enemessar = Shalmaneser.

Thisbe of Galilee, else unknown, distinct from Elijah's home in Gilead.

on the right hand, i.e. south.

Kedesh Naphthali bore with Hazor, etc., the brunt of the first Assyrian invasion (*c.* 734 B.C.), when it was captured by Tiglath-pileser (2 K 15 [29]).

Galilee: 'Upper Galilee' (S).

Asher: not the tribe, but Hazor mentioned with Kedesh in 2 K *l.c.*

3. went: B 'went before,' i.e. among the first batch of prisoners; S adds 'in the captive band.'

4. Tobit's apparent claim to have witnessed in youth the rebellion of the ten tribes under Jeroboam, which occurred upwards of 200 years before his captivity, is inconsistent with the age of 158 years assigned to him in 14 [11].

5. the heifer Baal: S reads 'the calf which Jeroboam king of Israel made in Dan (and) on all the mountains of Galilee'; the Biblical account mentions only two calves, in Dan and Bethel (1 K 12 [28] f.).

6-8. On the subject of the tithes the B text practically conforms to ordinary Jewish practice, as attested by Josephus, *Ant.*, iv, 8, 22 (§ 240). That system, based on the Pent. as a whole, included three tithes: a 'first tithe,' a tax of one-tenth of all edible vegetable products collected by the ministry for its own support (Nu 18 [21-24]); the 'second tithe' of the same products, which, together with the cattle tithe (Lev 27 [32] f.), furnished a feast for the owner and his guests at Jerusalem (Dt 14 [22-27]); and the 'poor tithe,' set apart every third year for charity (Dt 14 [28] f., 26 [12]). The last, in the original intention of the law probably only a particular use of the tithe every third year, was in later years made at least by some a 'third tithe,' falling twice in every seven years, in the third and sixth years of the sabbatical cycle' (*E. Bi.*, iv, 5105).

S differs from B in mentioning a cattle tithe, ignored by B, and in *merging the second or 'feast tithe' and the third or 'poor tithe' into one*; it further particularizes where B generalizes. This text runs: 'Having the firstfruits, *and the first produce* (or perhaps "and the firstlings";

B omits), and the tenths of *the cattle* (B "of the [vegetable] produce"), and the first shearings of the sheep, I used to go to Jerusalem and give them to the priests, the sons of Aaron, for the altar; and the tenth of *the wine and the corn and olives and pomegranates and of the rest of the fruits* (B simply "the tenth of the produce") to the sons of Levi who ministered at Jerusalem. And the second tenth I *tithed in money for the six years* (B "I sold away": cf. Dt 14[24] f.), and went and spent it each year at Jerusalem, and gave *it* (B "and the third [tenth] I gave") unto the orphans and the widows and proselytes who attached themselves to the children of Israel; I brought it and gave it unto them in the third year, and we did eat it according to the decree which was decreed concerning it in the law of Moses,' etc. (B simply 'to whom it was meet'). Though obscurely expressed, the meaning of this seems to be: 'The second tithe I converted into money for the six years out of the seven, excluding the sabbatical year. Every year of the six I took this money to Jerusalem and spent it on a feast; every third year this feast took the form of a charitable feast for widows and orphans,' etc. In other words, S represents the 'poor tithe' as a particular use of the second tithe every third year, in accordance with what appears to have been 'the original intention of the law.' This text is doubtless more original than that of B, which has condensed and brought it into conformity with contemporary practice.

8. my father's mother: S 'the mother of Hananiel our father.'

10. And . . . Nineveh: a condensation of the prolix S text, 'After the carrying away captive to Assyria, and when I was carried away captive I went to Nineveh.'

12. because (*kathoti*): read with S *And when* (*kai hote*) *I remembered . . . the Most High gave me . . .*

13. Reminiscent both of Joseph (Gen 39[4. 21]) and of Daniel and his companions who thrived on their frugal fare (Dan 1[9. 15]).

was his purveyor: terser than S 'used to buy for him everything for his use.' Cf. Joseph's position under Potiphar and Pharaoh (Gen 39[5], 41[48]).

14. into Media: on his master's business, as S states, adding 'and bought for him thence until he died.'

at Rages of Media: S 'purses in the land of Media.' Rages or Rhagæ lay in the extreme east of Media, on the confines of Parthia, S. of the Caspian; modern *Rhey*.

ten talents of silver: according to the Attic standard some £2,000; if the older Babylonian standard is intended, twice this amount.

15. The usurper Sargon is here omitted. The true order of succession was Shalmaneser, Sargon (722-705 B.C.), Sennacherib.

18. from Judæa: +S 'in the days of the judgement which the king of heaven wrought upon him for the blasphemies wherewith he had blasphemed' (cf. 2 K 19[6]).

20. left unto me: +S 'which was not confiscated to the royal treasury.'

21. five and fifty days: the figure is variously given as 50 (B), 40 (S), 45 (other texts). It apparently indicates the interval that elapsed after the confiscation of T.'s property, not after Sennacherib's return from Judæa. According to Babylonian evidence Sennacherib lived for twenty years after his Judæan campaign (701-682 B.C.).

two . . . sons: Adrammelech and Sharezer (2 K 19[37]).

Sacherdonus: Hellenized form of Esarhaddon.

Achiacharus: Aḥiḳar, the hero of an older story, here represented as Tobit's nephew: see Introduction.

22. came: S 'came down' or 'back' from hiding in the hills.

next unto himself: rather *a second time* (cf. Is 61[7], LXX). He had, according to S, previously held the appointment 'under Sennacherib king of Assyria' (words omitted by B).

my brother's son: +S 'and of my kindred,' i.e. apparently on the mother's side also.

II. **1. Now when:** S 'And when Sarchedon (= Esarhaddon) was king.'

seven: S omits, reading 'which is (the) holy (feast) of weeks.'

dinner: the midday meal.

2. The feast was an occasion for the entertainment of 'the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow' (Dt 16[11]: cf. the Pentecost Psalm, 68[10], 'prepare . . . for the poor'). S reads more verbosely: 'And the table was set for me, and abundant victuals were set for me, and I said to Tobias my son, My child, go, and whatsoever poor man thou shalt find of our brethren, of the Ninevite captives, who is mindful (of God) with his whole heart, bring him, and he shall eat together with me; and lo, I will tarry for thee, child, until thou come.' That the fuller text is the older and is derived from a Semitic original is indicated by the unusual word for 'together' ('in com-

mon'); this occurs six times in the S text of Tobit and nowhere else in LXX; B usually suppresses it, but has once retained it (9 6).

3 f. B again condenses. S, in Semitic style, has: 'And Tobias went to seek some poor man of our brethren, and returned and saith, Father. And I said unto him, Here am I, my child. And he answered and said, Father, behold, one of our nation hath been murdered and cast out in the market place, and hath but now been strangled on the spot. (4) And I sprang up and left my dinner, before I had tasted it, and took him up from the street, and put him in one of the chambers until the sun should set and I should bury him.'

4. **until the sun was set**: when the feast ended (cf. Mk 15 42; Jn 19 31).

6. **the prophecy . . . said**: S 'the word of the prophet which Amos spake against Bethel, saying.' The quotation from Am 8 10, 'And I will turn your feasts . . . and all your *songs* into lamentation,' is rendered more appropriate by its context (3), 'the dead bodies shall be many: in every place have they cast them forth.' For B 'mirth(s)' S has 'ways' (*hodoi*), probably a corruption of 'songs' (*ōdai*).

8. **He is no longer afraid**: S 'Is he no longer afraid? for already he has been (*v.l.* "I had been") sought for,' etc.

9. **I returned from burying him**: S 'I washed myself'; B substitutes a verb of similar sound.

being polluted: inserted by B; not in S.

uncovered: B has the verbal adjective associated with the uncovering of the head on account of uncleanness (Lev 13 45 LXX; Ep. Jer 30); S uses the participle without such connotation and adds 'because of the heat.' The changes here introduced by the B text are instructive. In S Tobit sleeps in the open because of the weather conditions; in B the reason is ceremonial, the prescribed ablution after contact with a corpse not having been performed.

10. **I went . . . helped me not**: S 'I used to go to the physicians to be healed; and the more they anointed me with the medicaments, the more mine eyes were blinded by the films, until they were totally blinded. And I was impotent in mine eyes four years, and all my brethren did grieve for me.' Cf. Mk 5 26, 'had suffered much of many physicians . . . and was nothing bettered but rather grew worse,' with the parallel in Lk 8 43, 'who could be healed of no man'; like Luke, the B text of Tobit condenses, avoiding the slur on the physicians.

until I went: S 'for two years until he went.' S, with its two notes of time in this verse, is clearly original. The blind Tobit is not likely to have left Nineveh, whereas the court minister would have many calls upon him. He had returned in time for the wedding feast of Tobias (11 18).

11. **And**: + S 'at that time.' After his patron's departure, the support of Tobit falls upon his wife.

spin: rather *work for hire*.

12. **and gave her . . . a kid**: S is much more detailed: 'And on the seventh of Dystrus she cut off the web and sent it to the owners, and they gave her her wages in full, and gave her (for the hearth?) a kid of the goats.' Dystrus is the Macedonian month corresponding to the Hebrew Adar, the last month in the Jewish ecclesiastical year; the 7th of Adar would be a week before Purim, when it was customary to send gifts to the poor (Est 9 22). 'For the hearth' is doubtless corrupt. Canon Charles makes the brilliant emendation 'for a banquet' (*hestiatoria* for *hestia*).

14. **thou and all thy works are known**: Greek 'all (read with S "these") things are known with thee.' The exact sense of Anna's petulant remark is not clear; perhaps 'you profess to know what charity means, and ought to understand that others also may be charitable.' We have another family quarrel in 10 6 f.

III. **Two simultaneous prayers for death from victims of slander, Tobit at Nineveh (1-6) and Sarah at Ecbatana (7-15); both prayers are heard, and Raphael is sent to heal the sufferers (16 f.).**

1. S (fuller) 'And I was deeply grieved in soul and groaned and wept; and I began to pray with groanings.'

2. **All thy ways are mercy** (B 'mercies') **and truth**: after Ps 25 10.

and thou judgest . . . for ever: S 'thou judgest the world'; the words inserted in B, 'true and righteous judgement,' are probably an echo of 5.

3. **Remember**: S prefixes 'And now, O Lord.'

4. **A proverb of reproach**: B condenses the fuller expression of S, 'a proverb and a by-word and a reproach.' Cf. Dt 28 37; Jer 42 18.

5. **many . . . fathers**: rather *Thy many judgements are true in exacting from me the penalty of my sins*, etc.

6. **released**: + S 'from the face of the earth'; omitted by B to avoid repetition of 'earth.'

become earth: Gen 3 19.

the everlasting place: the 'long home'

of the preacher (Ec 12 [5]). At the end of the verse S adds tautologically, 'For it is more profitable for me to die than to see much distress in my life, and not to hear reproaches.'

7. Raguel: cousin of Tobit (7 [2]). The name is identical with Jethro's synonym, Reuel = 'friend of God.'

Ecbatana: in Western Media, called Achmetha in Ezr 6 [2]; modern *Hamadan*.

was reproached by her father's maid-servants: S 'heard reproaches from one of,' etc. The singular is preferable, but probably the original had *immah*, 'her mother,' which was read as *âmah*, 'a servant' (Charles's *Apocrypha*); the taunt comes more naturally from the mother, and this reading produces a closer parallel between the stories of Sarah and Tobit.

8. seven husbands: cf. Mt 22 [25] ff.

Asmodæus or (in B, which here preserves the more primitive form) **Asmodaus**, the Parsi *Æshma Dæva*, the demon of violence and wrath in the later Avesta (Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, 251).

they said: S 'the maid said' (see [7]).

Dost thou not know that thou stranglest: S 'It is thou that slayest,' B 'Dost thou not know' (*ou sunieis*) probably comes from a reading 'Art thou not she?' (*ou su ei*).

hast had no profit of: so speciously the first hand of B (*ônasthês*) but the reading of S 'hast not been named of' (*ônomasthês*) is clearly original.

10. S has a fuller text, abbreviated by B: 'In that day she was grieved in her soul and wept; and she went up into her father's upper room (cf. [17]) and desired to hang herself. And again she considered and saith, (Nay), lest they reproach my father and shall say unto him, Thou hadst one beloved daughter and she hanged herself because of her calamities; and I shall bring down my father's old age with sorrow to Hades (a reminiscence, in both texts, of the Joseph story, Gen 42 [38], etc.). It is more profitable for me not to hang myself, but to beseech the Lord that I may die and no longer hear reproaches during my life.' The last words are the exact counterpart to Tobit's last words in [6] (S).

11. And . . . the window: S 'At the self-same time she stretched forth her hands to the window and prayed'; B excises the Semitic note of time and the outstretched hands (1 K 8 [22]). For prayer at the window cf. Dan 6 [10].

holy and honourable: reverential addition of B text (cf. Dt 28 [58]); not in S.

14. B substitutes 'Lord' for S 'Master,' again reverentially, and 'sin' for 'uncleanness.'

15. son: S 'kinsman.' The stress laid on endogamy or next-of-kin marriage in Tobit (cf. 4 [12] f.) is probably a relic of the Magian story lying behind it.

that I should keep myself: cf. Naomi's words (Ruth 1 [11-13]).

command . . . reproach: S simply 'now hear my reproach,' but the 'command' affords a closer parallel to Tobit's prayer ([6]), and is probably original.

16. And: 'At the self-same time' (cf. [11] S).

the great God: so the Aramaic and Syriac texts; S 'God'; B 'the great Raphael.' The original perhaps had 'the Great One,' i.e. the Most High.

17. B 'improves' and abbreviates the S text, writing 'to scale away' (S 'remove'), omitting 'from his eyes that he might see with his eyes the light of God,' writing 'to bind' (S 'to loose from her'), omitting (after 'inherit her') 'above all who wished to take her,' (after 'return') 'from the courtyard,' and writing 'came down from her upper chamber' for 'she also came down from the upper chamber,' which implied that Tobit did the same.

IV. begins the story of the journey of Tobias (1-12) with a statement of its object ([1-3]) and instructions of Tobit to his son ([3-21]). These Polonius-like paternal admonitions, largely on the blessings of almsgiving, are based on older sources, including the teaching of Aḥiḳar. The parallelism of clauses suggests translation from Semitic.

1. the money: 1 [14].

3. S, with Semitic circumstantiality, has 'And he called Tobias his son, and he came unto him. And he said, Bury me well and honour thy mother and forsake her not all the days of her (B 'thy') life, and do that which is pleasing in her sight, and grieve not her spirit in any matter.'

5. our God: omit S.

righteousness: S 'acts of righteousness.'

7-19. Through some accidental cause S omits most of this, reading ([6]) 'For they that do truth shall be prospered in their works; and to all them that do righteousness ([19a]) the Lord will give them good counsel, and whom the Lord will he humbleth,' etc.

9. layest up a good treasure: literally 'treasurest a good deposit'; cf. 1 Tim 6 [17] ff.

10. alms delivereth from death: cf. Pr 11 [4] 'righteousness delivereth from death' with Ecclus 29 [12] 'alms . . . shall

deliver thee out of all affliction' and 40^{24}.

the darkness: cf. 14^{10} S 'Nadab entered into the darkness of eternity because he sought to kill Aḥikar.' An echo of the Magian story behind *Tobit* and of the Zoroastrian picture of Ahriman as prince of darkness.

12 f. Endogamy (another Magian feature) is inculcated on the model of the patriarchs, who are designated 'prophets' in the broader sense. The reference to Noah's wife is unscriptural and rests on tradition; cf. *Jubilees*, iv, 33: "Noah took to himself a wife . . . the daughter of his father's brother.' Sarah was Abraham's half-sister, Rebekah was Isaac's 'second cousin'; Leah and Rachel were similarly related to Jacob.

13. trouble: literally 'instability.'

in naughtiness is decay: 'in unprofitableness (or "idleness") is loss' (or 'diminution' of income). Tobit had set his son an example of the right use of his talents by his deposit with Gabael.

the mother of famine: a metaphor common to proverbs of all ages, as in our 'Necessity the mother of invention.'

14-19. Miscellaneous injunctions on the prompt payment of wages—the negative form of the golden rule—drink—almsgiving (again)—offerings at the tomb of the just—seeking counsel of the sage—continual blessing of God and prayer.

14. tarry: 'tarry a night'; after Lev 19^{13}; cf. Dt 24^{14} f.

15*a*. An early occurrence of the negative form of the golden rule (Mt 7^{12}). It is attributed to Hillel in the form 'What to thyself is hateful to thy neighbour thou shalt not do; this is the whole law, and the rest is commentary,' and recurs in the Didache (1^{2}).

17. Pour out thy bread: add, with Syriac and other texts, 'and thy wine,' the verb 'pour' being extended to bread by the figure called zeugma. The allusion is to the pagan practice of carrying food and libations to the tombs and is taken from the *Story of Aḥikar*, ii, 10 (Syriac A text, Charles's *Apocrypha*, ii, 730): 'My son, pour out thy wine on the graves of the righteous rather than drink it with evil men.' In our author's time it appears to have been a matter of dispute whether such offerings were right and obligatory or to be banned as pagan (cf. the contemptuous allusion to 'messes of meat laid upon a grave' in Ecclus 30^{18}).

18. In Polonius vein, 'Give every man thy ear, but few thy voice: Take each man's censure, but reserve thy judgement' (*Hamlet*, i, 3).

19. as he will: B erroneously 'as they will'; S (resuming after the lacuna) 'unto the nethermost Hades,' keeping closer to the model, Hannah's song ($1\,S\,2^{7}$): cf. 13^{2} S.

V. **The preparations for the journey.** As usual S is circumstantial, B concise, excluding what it mistakenly regards as superfluities.

2. seeing I know him not: S 'from him, seeing he knoweth me not and I know not him? What token shall I give him that he may recognize me and trust me and give me the money? And the roads to Media I know not to journey thither.'

3. And he gave him the handwriting: S has interesting details: 'Then answered Tobit and said unto Tobias his son, His note of hand he gave me, and a note of hand I gave him, and I (Old Latin "he") parted it in two, and we took each of us one (part), and I put (it) with the money, and now, lo, it is twenty years since I left this money in trust.'

a man: S 'a trusty man.'

I will give . . . whiles I yet live: S 'We (i.e. thy mother and I) will give . . . until thou return.' B ignores the share of Anna the wage-earner (2^{11}), apparently interpreting 'we' as 'I, or, if I die, my wife.'

4. a man: +S 'who would go with him into Media and knew the way well; and he went out.'

which was an angel: S 'the angel standing before him.'

he knew it not: S 'he knew not that he was an angel of God. (5) And he said unto him, Whence art thou, young man? And he said unto him, Of the children of Israel thy brethren, and I am come hither for labour.'

5. Can I . . . well?: S 'Knowest thou the way to go to Media?' B slightly expands the question in compensation for the drastic curtailment of the reply (6).

6. S has geographical details omitted by B; an abridgement perhaps due to the confusion of names in the former text, which the Latin enables us to correct. S runs: 'And he said unto him, Yea, I have often been there, and am skilled in and know all the ways. Many a time I went to Media and lodged with Gabael our brother who dwelleth in Ecbatana (read with Latin "Rages": cf. 1^{14}) of Media; and it is two regular days' journey from Ecbatana to Garræ (read "Rages"); for it lieth in the hill country, but Ecbatana in the midst of the plain.' These 'two days' journey' took Alexander's army eleven days to traverse (Arrian, iii, 20).

7. and I will tell my father: S 'young

man, until I go in and show my father; for I have need that thou go with me, and I will give thee thy hire.'

8. Go and: S 'Behold, I wait, only.'

one which will go with me: S 'a man of our brethren the children of Israel.'

know: + S 'what is his family and.'

9. And he called him: S 'And Tobit went forth and called him, and said unto him, Young man, my father calleth thee.'

and they saluted one another: S gives a fuller salutation, adding the conversation arising therefrom, clearly original: 'and Tobit saluted him first. And he said, Much cheer to thee! And Tobit answered and said unto him, What cheer have I any more, I that am a man impotent in the eyes and see not the light of heaven, but lie in the darkness like the dead who no more behold the light? Alive among the dead am I (cf. Ps 88 [5]): the voice of men I hear and themselves I see not. And he said unto him, Be of good cheer: it is nigh with God to heal thee: be of good cheer. And Tobit said unto him, Tobias my son would go unto Media; canst thou go with him and lead him? And I will give thee thy hire, brother. And he said unto him, I shall be able to go with him, and I know all the ways, and ofttimes have I gone to Media and traversed all its plains and mountains, and all its ways I know.'

saluted: B has the ordinary Greek word for 'greet,' S a rare word, found nowhere else in LXX except Tob. 7 [1], where it stands in *both* texts; B has there retained a rarity which it has here altered. This, like the unusual word for 'together' (2 [2] note), again betrays that B is secondary and derived from a Greek text resembling that of S. S writes 'saluted *first*,' as in 7 [1]; this is a mark of courtesy honourable to the recipient: cf. Jos., *Ant.*, xi, 331 (Alexander the Great salutes the High Priest first), xii, 172. Tobit unconsciously assumes the position of an inferior. The cognate noun denotes salutation of persons of rank.

10. family: so S and A (*patrias*); B erroneously 'native place' (*patridos*). The normal text places the larger unit (tribe) first, then the smaller; S has the reverse and less natural, but older, order.

11. Seekest thou . . . with thy son?: S simply 'What need hast thou of a tribe?'

13. thy tribe and family: S 'the truth and thy family.'

Jathan . . . Shemaiah: S 'Nathan . . . Selemias.'

and offered . . . increase: omit S; an amplification in B probably from 1 [6] f.

in the error of our brethren (cf. 1 [4] f.): S 'thy brethren are good men.'

14-16. B abridges and adapts the reiterated assurances and leave-takings in S, neatly working up one into a condition for higher wages; substituting for another 'so they consented' (apparently reading *eudokia*, 'approval,' for *eulogia*, 'blessing'); and replacing the third by a mention of the dog, which in S comes later. S runs: 'And he said unto him, I give thee a drachma a day as wages, and those things that be necessary for thee, as unto my son; and go with my son, and I will add somewhat to thy wages. And he said unto him, I will go with him, and fear thou not; we shall go safe, and safe shall we return unto thee, because the way is secure. And he said unto him, A blessing upon thee, brother. And he called his son and said unto him, Child, prepare what is needful for the journey, and go forth with thy brother. And God which is in heaven preserve you there and restore you to me in safety, and may his angel accompany you with deliverance, child. And he went forth to go upon his journey, and he kissed his father and mother, and Tobit said unto him, Farewell.'

16. his angel: so Gen 24 [7] (Abraham sending his servant to seek a wife for his son).

and the . . . dog with them: S inserts below (6 [1]). Here alone in Scripture the dog, usually the scavenger, appears as man's friendly companion; in the older Magian story he perhaps played a more gruesome part (see Introduction).

18. Be not greedy . . . to money: literally 'Let not money (i.e. the deposit with Gabael) come (or "be added") to money.'

refuse or 'offscourings' (1 Cor 4 [13]). 'The recovery of your money will be no compensation for the loss of your son.'

20. Take no care . . . shall see him: S 'Have no care; our child shall go in health, and in health shall he come unto us, and thine eyes shall see (him) in the day when he shall come unto thee in health; have no care, fear not for them, sister.' This fuller text, with the final 'sister' addressed to the wife, finds a close parallel in a passage in *Jubilees*. There Isaac, comforting Rebecca on Jacob's departure, says: 'My sister, weep not on account of Jacob my son; for he goeth in peace and in peace will he return . . . we shall see him in peace. Fear not on his account, my sister,' etc. (*Jubilees*, xxvii, 14-17).

VI. **The journey to Ecbatana.**

1. S reads 'And the young man went forth

and the angel with him, and the dog went forth with him and journeyed with them (B has already incorporated this in 5^{16}); and they journeyed both (together) and one night came upon them, and they lodged by the river Tigris.' Their starting-point was Nineveh, which itself lay on the east bank of the Tigris; but here the allusion must be to one of the tributaries of that river, the upper or lower Zab. Herodotus (v, 52) calls all three streams the Tigris. The travellers left the river at Nineveh and, striking out across the desert, reached the Zab at even. The S text, 'there fell upon them one night,' implies what the distance would certainly require, that this was not the only night *en route*.

2. to wash himself: B 'to bathe' indicates complete immersion; S has 'to wash his feet.'

the young man: S 'the foot of the young man, and he cried out.' The reading of the Aramaic and Hebrew texts, 'and devoured the young man's *bread*,' is an attempt to lessen the improbability of the story.

4. put them up safely: S 'put them by thee, and cast away its inwards; for its gall and heart and liver are for a useful medicament.'

5. they roasted the fish and ate it: S 'and he roasted part of the fish and ate it and left part thereof salted,' thus representing the angel as partaking of no food (cf. 12^{19} and Jg 13^{16}), and Tobias as making provision for the long journey ahead. B removes both details.

both: + S 'together' (2^{2} *v.n.*).

to Ecbatana: S 'to Media,' i.e. to its western frontier; Ecbatana is still some way off (9 [^{10}] S).

7. if a demon . . . vexed: S 'make thou a smoke before a man or woman who hath an attack of a demon or an evil spirit, and every attack will flee from him, and they shall nevermore abide with him.'

8. to anoint a man, etc.: S adds an alternative method of treatment, reading 'to anoint a man's eyes upon which white films have come up, or (the conjunction, omitted by S, is inserted by two cursives) to blow into them upon the white films and they become well' (cf. 11^{11} S and the anointing in Jn 9^{6}).

9. But . . . to Rages: read with S 'And when he had entered into Media and was now drawing nigh to Ecbatana.' The travellers were bound for Rages to recover the money from Gabael (1^{14}); Ecbatana, the home of Raguel (3^{7}, 7^{1}), lay on the route, but nuptial events there prevented Tobias from continuing the journey, which Raphael subsequently completed alone (9). The geography of S is clear and consistent; that of B obscure and confused. Regardless of other geographical notices, he here makes *both* travellers reach Rages after passing or merely halting at Ecbatana (^{6}).

10. the angel said . . . Brother: S preserves the fulness of Semitic speech: 'Raphael saith unto the young man, Brother Tobias. And he said unto him, Here I am. And he said unto him,' etc.

an only daughter: 'only' is omitted both by B and S; the fact is stated more fully by S in the next verse.

10 (I will speak)-12 (end): S is more diffuse: 'And he hath no male son nor daughter save Sarah alone, and thou art next of kin to her above all men to inherit her, and the things that belong unto her father it is right for thee to inherit; and the maid is prudent and courageous and exceeding honourable (or "fair"), and her father is an honourable man. And he said, It is right for thee to take her; and hear me, brother, and I will speak to the father of the maid this night that we may take her to be thy bride. And when we return from Raguel (B perhaps correctly "from Rages"; so S below) we will celebrate her marriage. And I know that Raguel can in no wise withhold her from thee or betroth her to another—to incur death according to the judgement of the book of Moses—and because he knoweth that to thee the inheritance appertaineth, to take his daughter before any man. And now hear me, brother, and let us speak concerning the maid this night, and we will woo her for thee; and when we return from Rages we will take her, and let us lead her back with us to her home.' 'According to . . . Moses': the death penalty is not prescribed in the Law (Nu 36^{6}).

13. in the bride-chamber . . . (14) lest: S 'in their bridal-chambers; even in the night when they went in unto her they died. And I have heard them say that a demon slayeth them. And now I fear—for her he harmeth not, but whosoever would approach her, him he slayeth, (and) I am my father's only child—lest,' etc.

16. shalt make a smoke: S 'the smell shall go forth.'

17. cry . . . have mercy on you: S 'pray and supplicate the Lord of heaven that mercy and deliverance may be extended to you.' B seems to dislike the phrase 'Lord of heaven,' replacing it here and in 7^{12} by 'the merciful God.'

prepared . . . from the beginning: S 'set apart for thee before the world was.'

children of her: + S 'and they shall be to thee as brothers. Take no heed.'

these things, he loved her: S 'the words of Raphael, and that she was his sister of the seed of his father's house, he loved her exceedingly.'

VII. **The arrival at Raguel's house and negotiations for the marriage.**

1. Sarah's meeting of the travellers is peculiar to the normal text, and is a reflection of the patriarchal stories in which the daughter of the house plays a similar part (Gen 24 [15], 29 [9]). That the words 'But Sarah met them' are an insertion appears from the latter half of the verse in B, which runs: 'and *he* (the sequel shows that Raguel is meant) saluted him (Tobias) and *he them*, and *he* (Raguel) brought them into the house'; the RV 'and she . . . and *they her*, and she . . .' comes from the apparently manipulated A text. The older form of the narrative is preserved in S, viz.: 'And when he came into Ecbatana, he saith unto him, Brother Azarias, lead me straight to Raguel our brother. And he led him to the house of Raguel, and they found him sitting by the door of the court; and they were first to salute him (see on 5 [9]). And he said unto them, Much cheer to you, brethren, and ye are well come in health; and he brought them into his house.'

2. **Tobit my cousin**: S 'Tobias my brother,' i.e. kinsman. The two names were probably interchangeable (1 [1]); B avoids confusion by substituting the form commonly used of the father and stating his exact relationship to Raguel.

3. **Raguel**: S 'Edna.' B thinks it more seemly for the paterfamilias to take the initiative; possibly the original named no speaker.

7. S 'And he spake and said unto him, A blessing upon thee, lad, son of a noble and good father. Oh, miserable calamity, that a man righteous and almsdoing should have been struck blind! And he fell on the neck of Tobias his brother and wept.' Tobit's blindness had now lasted for some years (2 [10] S), and it is natural that the news should have reached his cousin; B assumes that Raguel hears of it now for the first time.

8. **And they received . . . before them**: S 'And he killed a ram of the flock and received them gladly.' B transposes the clauses, and represents mother and daughter as taking part in the preparation of a more copious repast.

But T. said: B omits the preliminary ablutions mentioned in S, which runs: 'And when they had bathed and washed their hands and laid them down to dine, T. said.'

8. **Speak . . . (9) said to Tobias**: S 'Speak unto Raguel that he give me Sarah my sister. And Raguel heard the word and said unto the young man.' That Raguel should overhear the whispered words is perfectly natural; B thinks it fitting that the angel should fulfil his promise (6 [12]) and 'communicate' (a literary word) the matter.

10. **for . . . my child**: S is as usual prolix: '. . . this night; for there is no man to whom it appertaineth to take Sarah my daughter save thee, brother; and likewise I too have no power to give her to any other husband than thee, because thou art my next of kin.'

11. **seven men**: + S 'of our brethren'; they were kinsmen of the bride (cf. 4 [12]) but not 'next of kin.'

But . . . be merry: S 'And now, child, eat and drink and the Lord will work in you,' or 'will deal (mercifully) with you.'

I will taste nothing, etc.: cf. Gen 24 [33] (Eliezer and Laban).

make covenant and enter into covenant: literally 'fix and be fixed with me,' with the fulness of legal language. S has 'I will eat nothing from here, nor will I drink until thou settle my affairs.'

12. B abbreviates Raguel's speech; the fuller text of S runs: 'I do so; and she is given unto thee according to the decree of the book of Moses, and from heaven it hath been decreed that she be given unto thee. Take thy sister. From henceforth thou art her brother and she is thy sister; she hath been given unto thee from to-day even for ever. And the Lord of heaven (see on 6 [17]) shall prosper you (two), child, this night, and may he extend to you mercy and peace.'

13 f. Probably the oldest record of a Jewish marriage contract and accompanying ceremonies. B inserts the detail of the sealing, but condenses the rest, including the title of the instrument. S has (after 'Sarah') 'and she came unto him. And he took her by the hand and gave her unto him and said, Take her according to the law and according to the decree that is written in the book of Moses, to give (her) unto thee to wife. Have her and lead her away to thy father in sound health; and the God of heaven prosper you with peace. And he called her mother and told her to bring a book, and he wrote an instrument of a book of cohabitation, even that he gave her to him to wife according to the decree of the law of Moses.'

17. **she did**: S 'she went and spread the bed in the chamber.'

wept: + S 'for her.'

received the tears of her daughter: read with S 'wiped away her (own) tears.' The Greek word in the B text (*apedexato*) is clearly a corruption or correction of that in S (*apemaxato*), assisted by the mother's consoling words, which suggest that the daughter also was in tears.

18. and earth: added in the B text, which objects to the phrase 'Lord of heaven' (6 [17]).

favour (*charin*): read with S *joy* (*charan*). Another indication of the dependence of B on an older *Greek* text allied to that of S.

daughter: + S 'and she went out.'

VIII. **1. their supper . . . her**: S 'eating and drinking, they desired to sleep and led the young man away and brought him into the chamber.'

2. as he went: an insertion of B (om. S).

took . . . smoke: S 'took the liver of the fish and the heart out of the bag which he had and put them upon the ashes of the incense.' B transposes the mention of the incense to the beginning, as the first item in the procedure, omits one detail (the bag) as unnecessary, and inserts another (the fumigation) for clearness.

3. The text is a neat condensation of that of S and its allies, viz. 'And the smell of the fish baffled him (i.e. the demon), and the demon ran away into the upper parts of Egypt; and Raphael went and fettered him there and bound him forthwith.' The wilderness was the traditional home of demons (Mt 12 [43]); the selection of Upper Egypt in particular perhaps 'expresses the author's conviction that Egypt, where he was compelled to live in exile, was the veritable dumping-ground of wickedness and sin' (Simpson).

4. But . . . together: S 'And they (i.e. apparently the bride's parents or her women attendants) went forth and shut the door of the chamber.'

pray . . . us: S 'pray and make supplication to our Lord that he may work mercy and deliverance upon us' (a Semitic phrase characteristic of the S text: cf. 6 [17] and the next note).

5. S prefixes 'And she arose, and they began to pray and make supplication that deliverance might be wrought for them.'

holy and glorious: a reverential addition, not in S.

for ever: read, with some cursives, *for all the generations of the ages* (cf. 1 [4]). For **thy creatures** S has 'thy creation to all the ages.'

6. gavest: S 'madest,' as in Gen 2 [18], quoted below; B avoids the repetition of 'make.'

7. with her: + S 'together' (2 [2] note).

9. digged: S 'called his servants (to come) with him, and they went and digged'; certainly an original feature, eliminated by B.

10. die: + S 'and we become a derision and a reproach.'

11. And: + S 'when they had finished digging the grave.'

12. let them see: S 'let her go in and see.'

13 f. The fuller S text preserves one picturesque detail: 'And they sent the maidservant, *and lit the lamp*, and opened the door, and she went in and found them sleeping and slumbering together. And the maidservant came forth and informed them that he was alive and that there was nothing amiss.'

15. Raguel . . . saying: S 'they (both parents) blessed the God of heaven and said.'

And let thy saints . . . thine elect: this 'quartette' of worshippers is omitted in S, probably accidentally, the eye of the scribe passing from the first 'let them bless' to the second.

17. mercy: + S 'and salvation,' which B replaces by inserting 'in health' below; the balance of clauses confirms the originality of S.

18. the grave: + S 'before the morning came,' a detail in harmony with the mention of the lamp ([13]).

19-21. The banquet is extended to twice the usual length of seven days (cf. 11 [19]; Jg 14 [12]). The preparations for it, with Raguel's words to Tobias, are condensed in B. S reads: 'And he bade his wife make many loaves. And he went to the herd and fetched two oxen and four rams, and bade despatch them, and they began to make ready. And he called Tobias and said unto him, For fourteen days thou shalt not stir hence, but shalt remain here eating and drinking at my house, and shalt gladden my daughter's sore afflicted soul. And (of) all that is mine take forthwith the half and go in health to thy father, and the other half when I and my wife die is yours. Be of good cheer, child, I am thy father and Edna is thy mother. Thy people now are we and thy sister's; from henceforth are we (thine) for ever. Be of good cheer, child.'

IX. **Raphael's journey from Ecbatana to Rages** (1 [14]) **to recover Tobit's deposit.** The author's acquaintance with the geography is vague; a march which occupied Alexander's army eleven days is reduced by Raphael to 'two regular days' journey' (5 [6] S). With this reckon-

ing Raphael, having started when the fortnight's feast had already begun, could be back in Ecbatana with Gabael before it was half over.

2. a servant: S 'four domestic servants.' S has previously mentioned Raguel's large establishment (8 [9]).

3 f. S 'For thou knowest that my father will be counting the days, and if I tarry one day I shall sorely grieve him; and thou seest what Raguel hath sworn, and I cannot transgress his oath.' B transposes the clauses and abbreviates.

5. S is again fuller: 'And Raphael went on his way and the four servants and the two camels to Rages of Media, and they lodged with Gabael, and he (Raphael) gave him his bond; and he made known to him concerning Tobias, Tobit's son, that he had taken a wife and that he invited him to the wedding. And he arose and counted out to him the bags with their seals, and they placed them together' (many MSS. add 'on the camels').

6. and Tobias blessed his wife: the text seems here to have been so drastically abridged as to become unintelligible to copyists; an older text behind B perhaps had 'and he (Gabael) blessed Tobias and his wife.' S gives the blessing in full, in language closely parallel to Raguel's greeting of Tobias in 7: 'And they entered the house of Raguel and found Tobias reclining at meat; and he sprang up and greeted him. And he (Gabael) wept, and blessed him, and said unto him, Honest and good (lad, son) of an honest and good man, just and a doer of alms. The Lord give thee the blessing of heaven, and unto thy wife and thy father and the mother of thy wife. Blessed be God that I have seen Tobias my cousin like him.' For 'thy father' we should probably read with some MSS 'the father'; the omission of Raguel the host would be strange. 'My cousin' has perhaps been influenced by 7 [2]; we are not told elsewhere that Gabael was a relation of Tobit.

X. **The sorrowing parents and the setting out of Tobias on his homeward journey.**

1. made his count every day: S 'day by day kept counting the days, how many he would spend in going and how many in returning.'

2. detained: so correctly S; the Greek word was corrupted or emended into 'shamed,' i.e. disappointed in not receiving the deposit, whence the marginal reading (after BA).

3. was sorely grieved: S 'began to grieve'; B avoids the repetition of the Semitic 'began,' which it retains in the next verse.

4. seeing he tarrieth long: S 'and is no longer among the living.'

5. I care for nothing: an illegitimate rendering of B text, *ou melei moi* ('I care not' or 'Care I not?'); read with S *Woe is me* (*ouai moi*).

6. in good health: + S 'Doubtless distraction hath befallen them there; and the man who went with him is trusty and one of our brethren. Grieve not for him, sister; soon will he be here.' As Rendel Harris has pointed out (*American Journal of Theology*, 1899, iii, 549 ff.), the S text is supported by the parallel in *Jubilees*, xxvii, 17 (the comforting of Rebecca by Isaac for the absence of Jacob), viz. 'Fear not on his account, *my sister*, for he is on the upright path and he is a perfect man; and *he is faithful* and will not perish. *Weep not*'; see on 5 [20] above.

7. Hold thy peace: + S 'from (i.e. at) me,' a Semitic expression.

she went out . . . her son Tobias: S graphically 'she leapt up and kept scanning the road by which her son had gone, day by day, and would hearken to none, and when the sun set she would come in and mourn and weep all night long and have no sleep.'

until: S begins a new sentence, reading 'And when the . . . days . . . were expired . . . Tobias entered into him and said, Send,' etc.

to see me: + S 'And now I pray thee, father, that thou send me away that I may go to my father; already have I told thee how I left him' (referring to 9 [4]).

10. servants (lit. 'bodies'), **cattle, money:** a condensation of the S text: 'menservants and maidservants, oxen and sheep, asses and camels, raiment and silver and chattels.'

11. S has 'And he sent them away in peace, and he embraced (or "took leave of") him, and said unto him, Farewell, child, begone in peace; may the Lord of heaven prosper you (plur.) and Sarah thy wife, and may I see children of you before I die.' The B text confines the allusion to future offspring to Edna's mouth ([12]).

12. Honour . . . now: S 'Go to thy father-in-law, for from henceforth they are,' etc.; B is reminiscent of the fifth commandment and explicitly names both parents.

thy parents: + S 'as they that begat thee; go in(to) peace, daughter.'

of thee: + S 'as long as I live.'

he kissed her: S 'he took leave of them and let them go.

that I may rejoice: omitted by S, which reads 'Before the Lord I commit,' etc.

Vex her not: S, always prolix in saluta-

tions, adds 'all the days of thy life. Child, farewell (lit. "into peace"); henceforth I am thy mother and Sarah (is) thy sister. May we all be prospered alike all the days in our life. And she kissed them both and sent them away in peace.'

XI. **The home-coming and Tobit's recovery of his sight.**

1. After . . . blessing God: S 'And Tobit departed from Raguel in peace, and rejoicing and blessing the Lord of heaven and earth, the King of all.' 'King of the universe' is a frequent phrase in Jewish liturgies.

And he blessed . . . wife: in place of this S has an obscure clause: 'And he (=Raguel, apparently) said unto him, Mayest thou be prospered to honour them (thy parents) all the days of their life.'

And he went . . . Nineveh: S 'And when they drew nigh to Kaserein which is over against Nineveh.' The place-name (which appears in other texts as Cæsarea, Kasri, Charan, or Akris) cannot be identified, but clearly some locality in the neighbourhood of Nineveh stood in the original text; B cuts the knot by omission. S similarly marked the stages on the outward journey more precisely than B (6 5, 9).

2. Knowest thou not . . . thou didst leave: read, with S 'Thou knowest how we left.'

3. the house: +S 'while they are coming.' And they went both together, and he said unto him.'

4. And the dog went after them: S strangely reads: 'And the Lord went with them behind him (Raphael) and her son' (i.e. Tobias, Anna's son, though she is not mentioned till the next verse). 'The dog' (previously mentioned in 5 16, 6 1 S) is clearly right; 'the Lord' is a scribal error, due to confusion of abbreviated forms of the two Greek words.

7. said: +S 'before he drew nigh to his father,' continuing below (7 f.), 'that his eyes will be opened; stuff the gall of the fish into his eyes, and the medicament will draw up and scale off the white films from his eyes, and thy father will recover his sight and behold the light.' B condenses, replaces the vernacular 'stuff' by 'anoint,' and inserts the action of rubbing.

9. they wept both: S 'she wept.' The scene and Anna's words recall the meeting of Joseph and Jacob (Gen 46 29 f.).

10-13. saw his son: S, preserving the Semitic style and the clearly original detail of the breathing (cf. 6 8), reads: 'And Tobit arose and stumbled on his feet and went forth by the door of the court. And Tobias went to him, with the fish's gall in his hand, and he breathed into his eyes and took hold on him and said, Courage, father! And he (Tobias) threw the medicament upon him and gave it to him; and he (Tobit) peeled off (the films) with both his hands from the corners of his eyes.'

14. said: +S 'unto him, I see thee, child, the light of mine eyes (cf. 10 5), and he said.'

thy name for ever: S 'his great name,' adding at the end of the verse, 'May his great name be (upon us and) blessed (be all the angels) to all ages' (the bracketed words are perhaps interpolated).

15. and didst have mercy on me: S omits, the implicit antithesis in 'And lo I see' being more effective.

rejoicing: +S 'and blessing God in his whole body'; the allusion to the rejoicing of all the members is Semitic: cf. Ps 35 10, 'All my bones shall say.' The rest of the verse, compressed in B, runs in S: 'And Tobias showed his father that his journey had prospered and that he had brought (the) money, and how he had taken Sarah, the daughter of Raguel, to wife, and, Behold, she cometh and is hard by the gate of Nineveh.'

16. and they . . . sight: S 'And when those in Nineveh saw him going and striding with all his strength and led by no man's hand, they marvelled' (cf. Ac 3 9 f.).

17. B, as usual, curtails the salutations in S, but courteously extends a blessing to the bride's mother: for 'and thy mother' S has 'and blessed is Tobias my son and blessed art thou, daughter.'

And there was . . . his brethren: S 'on this day was there joy to all the Jews.'

18. S reads 'And Aḥikar and Nabad (read Nadab as in 14 10 S) his nephews came rejoicing unto Tobit.' That Aḥikar, the Grand Vizier of Sennacherib, was Tobit's nephew we have already been told (1 21 f.). Here we are introduced to the second principal character in the *Story of Aḥikar*, viz. Nadan (as he is there called), the ungrateful nephew and adopted son of the Vizier. S has preserved, but for the final consonant, the correct name of this renegade, which in B has been corrupted here to Nasbas and in 14 10 to Adam. 'Nephews,' if the plural in S is right, may be used to cover a nephew's nephew.

19. S omits the verse, but opens 12 with 'And when the wedding (feast) was ended.' 'Seven days' was the usual length for the feast (8 19).

XII. **The offer of wages, and the self-revelation, maxims, commission, and ascension of Raphael.** The Aramaic has a different ending: Raphael goes his way without entering the house, Tobit sends

Tobias after him, and, on his failing to find him, recognizes that the stranger was Raphael.

2. Father: S adds here 'How much shall I give him as wages?' and at the end of [3] 'How much further should I give him as wages?'

3. my money: S correctly *the money with me*; the deposit was Tobit's money, a point which is missed in the abbreviated text.

4. due unto him: +S 'child, to take the half of all that he had when he came.'

5. that ye have brought: S 'that thou hadst when thou camest, as thy wages, and go in peace.'

6. and magnify him and give him thanks: S omits, probably through homoioteleuton.

It is good: S, probably through misunderstanding of a Semitic text, joins 'good' (interpreted as a neuter *plural*) with the preceding clause, reading 'for the good things which he hath done with you, to bless and hymn his name.'

showing forth . . . the works of God: S 'The words (=*debarim*="acts") of God show forth to all men with honour.'

7. the secret of a king: Raphael's maxims in this and the following verses, like those of Tobit above (4 [17] note), are based on earlier collections of proverbs, both Scriptural and such as those contained in the *Story of Aḥikar*. This maxim about 'keeping close the secret of a king,' repeated in [11], finds a parallel in the first of the *Proverbs of Aḥikar* in the Armenian version of that work (ii, 1, ed. Charles): 'Son, if thou hear any word in the royal gate, make it to die and bury it in thy heart, and to no one divulge it.'

8. with fasting . . . with unrighteousness: S 'with truth and alms with righteousness than riches with unrighteousness.' The substitution of 'fasting' (in conjunction with prayer) for 'truth' looks like a gloss, comparable to the addition 'and fasting' in Mk 9 [29]. But the true text is perhaps to be sought elsewhere. An important group of cursives reads 'with fasting, and alms with righteousness is above both'; this order of comparative merit (alms—fast—prayer) is more tersely expressed in the so-called 2nd Epistle of Clement (16): 'Better is fasting than prayer, and alms than both.' Rendel Harris, upholding this reading, considers that 'behind 2 Clem lies a text of LXX of earlier type than that of either B or S' (*Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, iii, 546 f.); for the form of comparison cf. Ecclus 40 [18] ff.

2. Alms doth deliver from death: repeated from 4 [10].

shall purge: S 'purgeth'; after Pr 15 [27] LXX (Heb 16 [6]), 'by alms and acts of faith sins are purged away': cf. Ecclus 3 [30].

and righteousness: omit S.

10. After Pr 8 [36] (20 [2]); S for life retains the LXX *psyche* (B has the more Hellenic *zoe*), and for **sin** reads 'work sin and unrighteousness.'

11. Surely: S 'I will show you all the truth (cf. 7 [10]) and will surely,' etc. B, abbreviating, destroys the parallelism of clauses.

12. bring the memorial: cf. Ac 10 [4] (the angel to Cornelius), 'Thy prayers and thine alms are gone up for a memorial before God' (Rev 8 [3] f.).

the Holy One: S 'the glory of God.'

I was with thee: omit S.

13 f. thy good deed (see 2 [1] ff.) . . . **And now:** S 'then was I sent unto thee to try thee; and at the same time,' etc. B obliterates the 'temptation' as not consonant with God's nature (Jas 1 [13]); some cursives write 'and temptation came upon thee.'

15. I am Raphael, etc.: cf. Lk 1 [19], 'I am Gabriel that stand in the presence of God.'

the seven holy angels: S omits 'holy,' a reverential insertion in the B text comparable to its mention of 'the saints' and the alteration of 'the Lord' to 'the Holy One' here as in [13]. This is apparently the earliest reference in Jewish literature to seven archangels; the *Book of Enoch*, xx (Greek text) gives the names: cf. Rev 1 [4], 8 [2]. The Magian colouring of *Tobit* favours the theory that the origin of this belief is to be sought in the seven (originally six) Amshaspands of later Zoroastrianism.

present the prayers of the saints: S 'stand by': cf. Lk 1 [19]; Rev 8 [2]. The B text is derived from [12].

16 ff. Cf. the scene of Manoah and the angel (Jg 13 [16] ff.), perhaps in the author's mind, and the linguistic parallels, referred to below, with the New Testament records of the Resurrection and Ascension, which, though remarkable, are insufficient to establish literary dependence.

17. Be not afraid: Mt 28 [5. 10].

Ye shall have peace: S 'Peace be unto you': cf. Jn 20 [19. 26].

18. I came: B has no verb; S reads 'I, when I was with you, was not with you of any favour,' etc., and for the last clause (omitting 'wherefore') 'him bless ye every day, him praise.' B unites 'all the days' to the next verse.

19. S reads 'and behold me that I have eaten nothing, but a vision hath appeared to you.' Cf. the Jerusalem Targum on

Gen 18 [8], 19 [3] (of the angels who appeared to Abraham and Lot), where 'they did eat' is replaced by 'it appeared to him as though they ate.' Here the contrast to the New Testament record (Lk 24 [41-43]) is marked.

20. And now: +S 'bless the Lord upon the earth and.'

because: S 'behold.'

I ascend to him that sent me: cf. Jn 16 [5], 20 [17].

write . . . been done: cf. Rev 1 [11]. S has 'write all these things which have happened unto you. And he ascended.'

22. S 'And they blessed and praised God for these his great works, how the angel of God had appeared unto them': cf. Lk 24 [53].

XIII. **Tobit's song of thanksgiving** or 'prayer for rejoicing,' a title suggestive of suitability for wider use: cf. the 'prayers' of Hannah (1 S 2) and Habakkuk (Hab 3), associated with certain Jewish festivals, and the thanksgiving of Judith (Jdth 16) and the 'prayer of Jesus the son of Sirach' (Ecclus 51) appended to other apocryphal books. Tobit's prayer opens with exhortation and consolation to his fellow-exiles ([1-6]) and closes with a glorious picture of the New Jerusalem ([7-18]). The opening recalls Hannah's prayer; the final portion is based on passages in Deutero-Isaiah. The Aramaic text omits the whole chapter, the Hebrew presents it in a shorter form.

1. And Tobit . . . for rejoicing: S omits this preface.

2. to Hades and bringeth up again: after 1 S 2 [6]. S reads 'to Hades in the depths of the earth (cf. 4 [19] S and Ps 139 [15]), and he bringeth up from the great destruction.'

there is none that shall escape his hand: cf. Judith's song (16 [14]), 'there is none that shall resist thy voice.'

3 ff. Israel must learn to acknowledge God's greatness while still in captivity, before she can hope for release (cf. Bar 3 [7]), with an underlying idea that the dispersion can be turned to account for the conversion of the heathen. The latter thought is emphasized in the Vulgate.

3. us: S 'you.'

4. there declare: S 'And there he hath shown you.'

and God is our Father: S 'and he our God and he our Father, yea he (is) God.' The repeated pronoun is emphatic.

5. again show mercy: S reads 'will show mercy unto you all,' and omits 'and will gather us.'

6. Cf. Dt 30 [1-3].

to do truth: a Johannine phrase.

see what he will do: S 'now see what he hath done.'

with your whole mouth: B 'with your whole body,' probably correctly (cf. 11 [15] S).

6 I in the land-10 the everlasting King: accidentally omitted in S, the scribe's eye passing from the first occurrence of 'the everlasting King' to the second.

to a nation: the principal MSS. have 'nations'; the reference is doubtless to the Jewish nation, not to the Assyrians, and the singular is right.

7. the King of heaven: so [11, 16] S, 1 [18] S; Dan 4 [37]; the B text, which usually avoids the kindred phrases 'God of heaven,' 'Lord of heaven,' is here clearly original.

9. the holy city: rather *city of (the) Holy One.*

10. with goodness: rather 'well,' i.e. *lustily.*

that he may: or 'may he' (B text).

miserable: the MSS. add 'unto (S "and") all the generations of eternity.'

11. many nations: S prefixes 'A bright light shall shine unto all the ends of the earth' (cf. Is 60 [3]; Bar 5 [3]). On the coming of the Gentiles *Tobit* is in line with Deutero-Isaiah; *Baruch*, with vindictive memories of the year A.D. 70, ignores them.

to the name of the Lord God: S (as restored) 'and the inhabitants of all the extremities of the earth to thy holy name.'

12. that hate thee: S 'that shall speak a hard word, cursed shall be all they that demolish thee and pull down thy walls, and all that overthrow thy towers and set on fire thy habitations': cf. Bar 4 [31] ff.

love thee: S 'fear thee.'

13. Rejoice: S 'Then go.'

the Lord of the righteous: read with S *the Lord of eternity.*

14. They shall rejoice: S 'And blessed shall they be that shall rejoice.'

all they that sorrowed: S 'all the men that shall sorrow.'

when they have seen . . . for ever: S 'and shall see all thy joy for ever.'

15. Let my soul bless: or perhaps 'My soul doth bless.'

16-18. A picture of the new Jerusalem based on Is 54 [11] f. (60 [18]): cf. Rev 21 [18] ff.

16. shall be builded: +S (the first word emended from the Latin) 'again as his house for all the ages. Happy shall I be if the remnant of my seed come to see thy glory and to give thanks unto the King of heaven. And the gates of Jerusalem shall be builded.'

and precious stones; thy walls: read *and* (+ all S) *thy walls with precious stone.*

and towers . . . gold: S 'The towers of Jerusalem shall be builded with gold and their battlements with pure gold.'

18. And all . . . give praise saying: S 'And the gates of Jerusalem shall utter songs of gladness, and all her houses shall say Halleluia.' An echo of Is 60 [18], where the author of Tobit perhaps read 'Thy walls shall cry (for "thou shalt call thy walls") Salvation and thy gates Praise.'

Blessed . . . for ever: S appears to put this final benediction into Tobit's mouth, reading 'Blessed is the God of Israel; and the blessed shall bless the name that is holy for ever and aye.'

XIV. The chapter is absent from one of the Hebrew texts and condensed into an encomium on almsgiving in the Aramaic. The longer and older S text is also condensed in B.

1. S reads 'And the words of Tobit's thanksgiving were ended, and he died in peace, being an hundred and twelve years old, and was buried gloriously in Nineveh.' B inserts the death and burial in their chronological place below ([11]) and gives the age as 158 years.

2. eight and fifty: S '62.'

lost his sight: S 'became maimed in his eyes.'

after eight years he received it again: S 'after he had recovered his sight he lived in prosperity.'

feared . . . unto him: S 'still continued to bless God and to give thanks for the greatness of God.'

3. Now . . . said unto him: S 'And when he was dying he called Tobias his son and charged him, saying.' The 'very' (lit. 'greatly') before 'old' in B is due to corruption of 'greatness' in [2] S; the mention of 'his sons' B ('his six sons,' or possibly 'his grandsons' A, 'his seven sons' Lat.) is a 'context supplement' drawn from the allusion to 'children' in [9] S.

Behold . . . this life: an addition in the B text in the style of Jos 23 [14]; S omits.

4. The S text is fuller and names another prophet: 'And depart into Media, for I believe the word of God upon Nineveh, even what Nahum spake, that all (those) things shall be and shall befall Ather (=Asshur, Assyria) and Nineveh; and whatsoever the prophets of Israel spake, whom God sent, all shall befall; and nothing shall be minished of all the words, and all shall come to pass in their seasons. And in Media shall be deliverance rather than among the Assyrians and in Babylon; wherefore I know and believe that all that God hath spoken shall be accomplished and shall be, and there shall not fall to the ground a word of those sayings. And our brethren which dwell in the land of Israel (?) shall be held to account for (?) all (lit. "shall be reckoned of all"), and shall be carried captive from the good land, and all the land of Israel shall be desolate, and Samaria, and Jerusalem shall be desolate, and the house of God in grief and burned up for a time.'

The B text substitutes the better-known prophet Jonah (3 [4]) for Nahum (3 [7]) (as was acutely divined by Grotius before the discovery of codex S); and omits here and below ([5]) allusions to Israel and Samaria. In S the form 'Ather' indicates translation from Aramaic.

5. the land: +S 'of Israel,' which throughout contemplates a return of the ten tribes; the outlook of the B text seems confined to Judah.

not like to the former: Ezr 3 [12]; Hag 2 [3]

until . . . fulfilled: S 'until the time when the time of the seasons be fulfilled': cf. Ac 3 [21]. The basic narrative foretold two rebuildings of the Temple, on a humbler and a grander scale; ultimately it is to become 'an house of prayer for all peoples.'

from . . . captivity: lit. 'from their captivities'; S 'from their captivity all of them.'

for ever . . . building: lit. 'unto all the generations of the age gloriously'; S omits.

the prophets: +S 'of Israel.'

6. all the nations: +S 'which are in the whole earth, all' (again emphasizing the universality of the coming Kingdom of God).

bury their idols: S 'all shall leave their idols, those that cause them to err after their false error.' For the casting away of idols cf. Is 2 [20].

7. And all the nations . . . exalt his people: S 'And they shall bless the everlasting God in righteousness. All the sons of Israel that are delivered in those days, remembering God in truth, shall be gathered together and come to Jerusalem, and shall dwell for ever in the land of Abraham with safety, and it shall be delivered over to them.'

showing mercy to our brethren: S 'and they that do sin and unrighteousness shall cease from all the earth.' For the B text cf. the reference to almsgiving in [9] (S) below.

8 f. The B text transposes the two verses, restricts the address to Tobias (but see [3] above), and repeats the reference to the fulfilment of prophecy. S includes other 'children' and a reference,

doubtless original, to almsgiving, reading: (9) 'And now, children, I charge you, serve God in truth and do what is pleasing in his sight; and upon your children it shall be enjoined to do righteousness and alms, and that they be mindful of God and bless his name at every season in truth and with all their strength. (8) And now, child, depart thou from Nineveh and abide not here.'

10. And bury . . . Nineveh: S 'In whatsoever day thou buriest thy mother with me, in the self-same day abide not in the borders thereof; for I see that there is much unrighteousness therein, and much guile is wrought therein, and they are not ashamed.'

See . . . perished: S 'See, child, what things *Nadab* did unto Aḥiḳar that reared him. Was he not brought down alive into the earth? And God paid back the dishonour upon his face; and Aḥiḳar came forth into the light and Nadab entered into the darkness of eternity, because he sought to slay Aḥiḳar. *Because I did alms* he came forth from the snare of death which Nadab had set for him, and Nadab fell into the snare of death and it destroyed him.'

Here the superiority of the S text is manifest. Nadab (or Nadan) is the villain of the *Story of Aḥiḳar*, who sought to slay his adopted father, and met with the fate of Judas, swelling up and bursting asunder; while his intended victim escaped by being concealed in a subterranean chamber ('cast into darkness in the pit beneath,' 4 17 Syriac text). The author of Tobit works this into his narrative by attributing Aḥiḳar's escape to the almsgiving of his relative Tobit (1 21). The other texts are unfamiliar with the Aḥiḳar story; for Nadab B has 'Adam' (probably a corruption of Nadam), and A 'Aman,' identifying the culprit with Haman, the villain of the Book of Esther. Both MSS (B and A), moreover, through some confusion of text (perhaps for ME of the S text reading MC = Manasses), have introduced a reference to the repentance of King Manasseh.

the snare of death: Ps 18 5; Pr 14 27.

11. and how . . . magnificently: S 'and what unrighteousness doeth, that it slayeth.' And behold my soul fainteth. And they laid him upon the bed and he died; and he was buried magnificently.' The age is inserted here by B, above (1) by S.

12. and his sons: omit S.

13. he grew old: S correctly *he sustained their old age.*

substance: S retains the Semitic 'house.'

14. The age of Tobias is variously stated as 127 years (A), 107 (B), 117 (S).

at Ecbatana of Media: S 'in renown.'

15. heard of: S 'saw and heard of.'

Nineveh (1): +S 'and saw her captivity led into Media.'

Nebuchadnezzar and Ahasuerus: S 'Achiacharus (corrupt; due to the repeated mention of that name in 10) the king of Media,' adding 'and he blessed God for all that he had done unto the children of Nineveh and Athuria' (= Assyria).

Nineveh (2): + S 'and blessed the Lord God for ever and ever.'

JUDITH

By N. D. Coleman

The first part of Judith (1-7) consists of an elaborately conceived historical and geographical setting for the daring episode (8-15) which follows. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that the Song of Judith (16) is older than the narrative; it mentions Persians and Medes (16 10) instead of Assyrians (1-15), but that is probably due to the author's kaleidoscopic view of history. The impossibility of identifying the events recorded with any known history of the last six centuries B.C., the free use of well-known names, and the character of its contents, all combine to stamp Judith as an historical romance. It is one of the best examples of old Jewish story telling.

Unhistorical Character.—The orthodoxy of Judith is unimpeachable; it must therefore have been its unhistorical character that excluded it from the Jewish canon and grouped it with the 'allowed' books. The MSS. generally place Judith alongside Esther and Tobit, works of a similar character, though Esther won its way into the canon. Josephus is silent about Judith (cf. his silence about Job); how could a reputed historian expect educated readers to believe that Nebuchadnezzar (king of Babylon 605-562 B.C.) reigned in Nineveh as king of the Assyrians after the Return *c.* 536 B.C. (cf. 4 3 and ctr. 5 18 with 1 1)? It is impossible to square Judith with 2 K 24-25, Jer 39-40, or

secular history. Unlike Daniel, Judith does not claim to be a contemporary record, but then Daniel, notwithstanding its inaccuracies, does not so openly offend historical sense.

The Eastern Church (Origen, Athanasius, etc., also Jerome), following Jewish rather than primitive Church usage, distinguished between canonical and uncanonical books, and assigned to the latter a secondary value; in some cases Judith was recommended for the moral instruction of catechumens before they attempted the more serious study of Scripture. The Western Church (Clem. R., Hilary, Aug.) in accordance with LXX tradition often included Judith and Tobit as canonical. This quasi-canonical position assigned to Judith (cf. codices B, ℵ, A) has often induced Christians to defend its historicity. To complicate the question there is a shorter form of the story in which the historical and geographical difficulties disappear. But this form, although it is in Hebrew, is so late in date that it is best regarded as a rewriting of the fiction so as not to offend historical probability and to make plain the bearing of the narrative on actual events. A local Palestinian tradition may possibly be embedded in Judith; thus Gaster asserts 'a Judith must have existed.' There are elements in the book which might conceivably belong to the time between Nehemiah and the 2nd century. Perhaps there existed a Jewish Book of Famous Women in which Judith found a place.

Maccabæan Origin.—But the name Judith (=Jewess, or the feminine counterpart of Judas the Maccabee, but cf. Gen 26 [34]) suggests an ideal figure. Luther described Judith as an artful tragedy or poem, and Grotius treated its characters as symbolic. Ball ingeniously equates each proper name in Judith with some historical person in the Maccabæan age: Nebuchadnezzar is Antiochus Epiphanes, Assyrians are Syrians, Nineveh is Antioch, Arphaxad is Arsaces of Persia (=Media), Holofernes is Orophernes, king of Cappadocia in 158 B.C. In support of this it may be urged that Judith is mentioned in the Maccabæan Calendar under the Feast of Hanukkah (Dedication); and in the *Midrash la-Hanukkah* the enemies of the Jews are the Javanim (Greeks) whose king is Olofernes. Further the Vulgate identifies Joacim the High Priest as Eliacim, the Hebrew form of Alcimus (1 Mac 7 [5], 9 [54]). Indeed, there are many parallels between Judith and 1 and 2 Maccabees, as for instance the importance assigned to the Greek cities and coast towns (2 [28], 4 [5]: cf. 1 Mac 5 [15, 68], 10 [69-86]), the guerilla warfare of the Jews encamped on the heights (5 [1], 7 [10]; cf. 1 Mac 1 [53], 2 [28] f.; 2 Mac 5 [27]), the prominence of the name Simeon (9 [2]: cf. 1 Mac 2 [1], 14 [35]; 2 Mac 3 [4] f.), the allusions to the Sanhedrin (4 [8], etc.: cf. 2 Mac 1 [10], 4 [44]), the use of festal garlands (3 [7], 15 [12, 13]: cf. 1 Mac 13 [37, 51]; 2 Mac 10 [7], 14 [4]), the reference to Samaria (4 [4]: cf. 1 Mac 11 [28, 34]), the hostility of the Edomites (7 [8]: cf. 1 Mac 4 [61], 5 [3, 65]; 2 Mac 12 [32]), the exhibition of the victim's head (14 [1]: cf. 2 Mac 15 [35]). Again the description of Nebuchadnezzar's claim to worship (3 [8], 6 [2]) is more suitable to Antiochus than to Nebuchadnezzar. Jewish tradition significantly links Judith with the family of Judas Maccabæus by making her the daughter of the High Priest Johanan or Mattathiah (*Megillath Taanith*, 6, in Zunz).

The most acceptable theory of the origin of Judith is that it is a paraenetic story written to encourage prayer and to strengthen faith in 'a saviour of them that are without hope' (9 [11]: cf. also 8 [18-24]); a worthy product of the heroic period of Jewish history when not only brave deeds were done, but great literature was produced and liturgical precedents originated. While allowing an implied reference to the Maccabæan wars, it is unnecessary to press all the details to fit that period. The historical framework is quite independent: apart from Nebuchadnezzar the typical oppressor, the book is founded on the historical campaign of Artaxerxes Ochus, king of Persia, against Phœnicia and Egypt *c.* 350 B.C. Diod. Sic., xxxi, 19 (cf. xvi, 47) mentions the names Holofernes and Bagoas in connexion with it, though he is silent about the other events mentioned in Judith, recording that Holofernes died in his own country. These names are Persian, and other features of Persian suzerainty are introduced (2 [7], 5 [2], 13 [6], 16 [10]).

The narrative depends largely on the Old Testament, and shows a remarkable knowledge of the Psalter; the main plot is modelled on Sennacherib's campaign against Jerusalem (2 K 18) when he cut off the water-supply (cf. 2 Ch 32 [3]; Jth 7 [6] ff.), and the description of Jerusalem as the virgin daughter of Zion who laughs the enemy to scorn (2 K 19 [21]: cf. also Jael in Jg 4-5 and Esther) may have contributed something to the figure of Judith. Sennacherib's campaign was remembered as an encouragment in Maccabæan times (2 Mac 8 [19], 15 [22]: cf. 1 Mac 7 [38] f.).

Geography.—The author has been less careless about his geography than his history. He is well acquainted with Palestine, and has some knowledge of parts beyond. Many place-names cannot be identified, but they have probably been mutilated by translation. Bethulia is the crux, as it is strange that a place of such strategic importance (4 [6], 7 [20], 8 [11]) should be otherwise unknown. It is clearly distinguished from Jerusalem, and Torrey's identification of it with Shechem (Nablus) is the only satisfactory solution. The part played by Bethsura in 1 Maccabees offers a parallel, but its southern position makes it impossible. To some extent Bethulia may be idealized, as *Bethulah* means virgin; others connect it with Bethel on Mount Gerizim.

Date.—The date turns largely on internal evidence except that Clem. R.'s reference to Judith supplies a *terminus ad quem*, and dismisses theories of a Trajanic date; Clem. implies that Judith was no recent composition of Christian times. Its warlike Pharisaism, so unlike the pacificism of the Assumption of Moses and the Psalms of Solomon, and its suggestion of Israel's political importance demand a date at least before the Roman intervention in 63 B.C. On the other hand, the representation of the High Priest's supreme control of the Jewish State and the indications of a developed liturgy (cf. 8 [6]) preclude a date much earlier than 100 B.C. Further, the author was probably acquainted with Esther and Daniel. Thus Judith affords a valuable source for the study of early Pharisaism.

Ball suggests a date about 79-70 B.C., but his idea that Judith is a veiled compliment to Salome is too fanciful. Those who regard the shorter form of the story as historical and original would date it about the middle of the 2nd century, and the longer (LXX) form about the middle of the 1st century B.C.

Original Language and Versions.—The LXX is the earliest extant form of Judith, and it exists in three recensions: (1) B, ℵ, A; (2) codices 19, 108 (Lucian's text); (3) codex 58 (the source of the Old Latin and Syriac).

Apart from Origen's statement (*Ep. ad Afric.*, followed by Fabricius and others) that Judith did not exist even in the Hebrew Apocrypha, which probably means that Origen's Jewish informants rejected Judith, it has always been held that the LXX is a translation from Hebrew. Cowley says 'the translation is so literal that it can be put back into Hebrew with ease, and in some cases becomes fully intelligible only when so retranslated': see notes on 2 [2, 21], 3 [8, 9], 6 [6], 8 [21], 9 [2], 11 [23], 14 [13], etc.

Achior (5 [5]) is perhaps a mistake for Ahihud (=Friend of the Jews, Nu 34 [27]), due to the common confusion of *d* and *r* in Hebrew. His speech is introduced with the double object of encouragement and propaganda; he becomes a proselyte in 14 [10].

The Vulgate is peculiar and independent of the LXX. Jerome confesses that owing to great variations in the MSS. he made a hurried translation from the 'Chaldee' text, and he seems to have used the Old Latin as a basis. The Chaldee was probably a free Aramaic Midrash of Judith which identified Bethulia with Jerusalem, as the Vulgate does not always clearly distinguish the two. It omits about one-fifth of the LXX story and makes homiletical additions, appending the note (which is evidently no part of the true text; cf. Est 9 [27, 28]): 'The day of the festival of this victory is received by the Hebrews in the number of the holy days, and is observed by the Jews from that time until the present day.' Ball and others prefer the Vulgate as original in some places.

There are several late Hebrew forms of the story: Jellinek gives two, and Gaster gives another from the Chronicle of Jerahmeel, and there are others. The longer form approximates to the LXX; the shorter (which has points of contact with the Vulgate) represents Seleucus as besieging Jerusalem, and Judith daughter of Ahitob murders Seleucus on the 18th of Adar, which is established as a feast. Gaster claims that this is the original story, because it seems more historical and explains difficulties in the longer account; thus the reason for Judith's visit to the fountain was because she was in her impurity (Lev 15 [13-28]). Its title ('A tale. Our teachers taught "The 18th of Adar, the day in which Seleukos came up"') points to an unknown minor Jewish festival, perhaps Nicanor's Day, the 13th of Adar (1 Mac 7 [49]). All that we know is that Judith was read at the Feast of Ḥanukkah, which lasted eight days from the 25th of Chisleu. The shorter form, believed by many scholars to be the older, is more probably a later manipulation of the impossibilities of the original romance. The extant Hebrew forms are all derivative, and the Jews themselves have never treated Judith as historical. It is always possible, however, that the Hebrew archetype of LXX was based upon some less elaborate local tradition of which no trace has been preserved.

Bibliography

See books, etc., cited under *Pr. of Manasses* (substituting Löhr in *Kautzsch*; Cowley in *Charles*); Nestle, *Marginalien*; Schürer, *Gesch.*, iii; Zunz, *Die gottesd. Vorträge*; Jellinek, *Bet-ha-Midrash*; Scholz, *Das Buch Jth.*; Gaster in *P.S.B.A.*, 1894; Wünsche, *Aus Israels Lehrhallen*; Duncan, 'A Hebrew Political Romance' (*Bibl. World*, 1894); E. Bevan, *House of Seleucus*.

I. **1. Arphaxad:** a typical name (cf. Nebuchadnezzar); unknown as a king of Media. Deioces fortified Ecbatana *c.* 700, and Cyrus destroyed it in 550 B.C. (Herod., i, 98). Perhaps it is a mistake for Astyages (Ashdahak), the common title of the Median dynasty.

5. Ragau: the plain of Ragæ, called Rages in Tob 1 [14].

6. Hydaspes: unknown except as an Indian river; Fritzsche suggests the Choaspes. Cowley places the semicolon after Hydaspes. **Chelod** may be a corruption of 'Chaldeans.'

9. Betane may be Beth-anoth (Jos 15 [59]). **Chellus:** Chalhul (Jos 15 [58]). **Tahpanhes** is the site Tell-el-Daffaneh near Kantara (*v.* Jer 43 [7]; Ezek 30 [18]).

12. the two seas: the two arms of the Nile, or the Red Sea and Mediterranean.

II. **2. communicated with them.** The strange Greek is probably Hebraistic for 'laid before them.' **concluded the afflicting:** Fri. takes as mistranslation for 'revealed all the evil that he would command to be done to the land'; **ended in** [4] also should be *revealed.*

7. earth and water: a sign of submission demanded only by the Persians (Herod., vi, 48-49).

21. Bectileth: unknown; near Taurus. **encamped** (journeyed), and **left hand** (north) are both Hebraisms.

28. Sur: *v.l. Soud* suggests in Hebrew an unknown fishing port; but it may be Dor (cf. 1 Mac 15 [11]) or a dittography of Tyre. **Ocina** (? Acco, Jg 1 [31]) is unknown. **Jemnaan:** Jamnia, evidently before Rabbinic times.

III. **1. they:** inhabitants of Hellenized cities are in the author's mind; note their behaviour in [7], and cf. 15 [12-13]; 1 Mac 13 [37. 51]; 2 Mac 10 [7], 14 [4].

8. borders: possibly a mistranslation for 'high places.' **all their tongues . . . as god:** ? from Dan 3.

9. Dotæa: Dothan. Fri. takes ridge as a mistranslation of 'plain' in Hebrew.

IV. **4. Konæ:** A (and Old Latin) *komas*, so read (*its*) *villages.* **Belmaim . . . Betomesthaim** are all unidentified. The alliance with Samaria sounds unhistorical, except as described in 1 Mac 11 [28. 34].

V. **6-8. This . . . days:** perhaps depends on a Midrash of Gen 11 [31]-12 [5].

7. which were may refer to 'fathers' or 'gods.'

8. God of heaven: ? from Dan 2 [28], 4 [37] (cf. Tob 10 [11]); **knew** may = 'came to ac knowledge.'

10. until . . . grown up: AV correct *while they were nourished.*

16. the Shechemite: added to the list in Jos 12 on account of recent rivalry.

VI. **1. Moab.** Cowley accepts *v.l.* 'Ammon,' as Achior was an Ammonite; but perhaps Moabites are introduced as traditional enemies. Some MSS. read **Moab** for **Ammon** in 7 [17].

4. burn them up: the *lectio ardua*; variants are 'tread them under foot' and 'overwhelm them.' Fri. conjectures for *katakausomen, katapausomen* ('bring them to a standstill').

6. multitude: Greek *laos* (people); Fri. conjectures 'spear'; Cowley thinks Hebrew was 'the sword of my army and (the sword) of my servants.'

12. on the top of the hill: ? mistakenly named beforehand by dittography.

VII. **2. a hundred and seventy thousand:** other readings in ℵ are 8,000 and 120,000; Syriac 172,000. **baggage, and:** B reads 'baggage of.' **3. Cyamon** is unknown.

12. fountain of water may be *Ras-el-Ain.*

18. Ekrebel: perhaps Akraba. **Chusi** is Quzeh. **Mochmur** is Makhueh. All are near Nablus (Shechem).

20. four and thirty days. The number varies in the MSS. It is improbable that Bethulia could be so completely blockaded and Jerusalem not molested.

28. that he do not. If correct 'he' probably means God; but perhaps 'that ye do as we say (i.e. surrender)' ought to be read.

VIII. **1. heard:** 'was living in the city' (58 Old Latin, Syriac) perhaps original. **Ox:** ? corrupt for Uz or Uzzi.

6. joyful days: ? anniversaries or minor festivals (*v.* 58 Old Latin, Syriac). The observance of eves is first noted here and in the title of Ps 92: cf. Mk 15 [42]. The joyous side of the Jewish Sabbath is here prominent.

10. maid: Greek *'abra*; derivation uncertain, may be Semitic: it means *socia* or *sodalis*, favourite and confidential slave. **Ozias and:** omitted by ℵ, A, B; Chabris and Charmis are called priests, not 'elders of her city,' in the Midrash.

16. turned by entreaty. The *v.l.* 'to be wavering (or undecided)' is also found in LXX of Nu 23 [19].

21. Judæa shall sit. The verb varies in the MSS: 'be turned,' 'called' (mistake by itacism), 'captured' (gloss). Fri. conjectures 'burned' or 'consumed'; Cowley thinks 'solitary' has dropped out (cf. Lam 1 [1]).

27. tried . . . scourge. Note the conception of suffering as a trial not vindictive (cf. Zech 13 [9]; Pr 27 [21]; Ps 12 [6], 66 [10]; Heb 12 [6]; 1 P 4 [12]).

IX. **2. girdle:** Greek *mitran*, which is Grotius's emendation, and which occurs in 10 [3], 16 [8], and generally in LXX with the meaning 'head-dress.' Here all MSS. have *mētran* (womb), as again later in the verse where one MS. has *parthenian* (virginity); but the phrase 'open the womb' is used only of Jehovah. Cowley suggests Hebrew *'ervath* (nakedness) was misread as *'ăṭereth* (crown, chaplet).

3. bed . . . blood: text corrupt; Cowley simplifies by omission, and translates 'thou gavest their rulers to slaughter and their bed to blood.'

X. **1-XI. 5.** Modelled on the Greek Est 5 [1-15] (Ball).

X. **5. fine bread:** Greek 'pure' or 'clean' bread; only *kosher* food is taken: cf. 11 [13], 12 [2, 19]; unclean food was 'an occasion of stumbling' as in New Testament times. Some MSS. add 'cheese,' which was eaten at some Jewish festivals.

13. be lacking: this late use of *diaphōneō* (=perish) is normal in the colloquial papyri.

21. canopy: Greek *kōnōpion* means mosquito-net.

23. was come: Old Latin and 58 'stood' (a Hebraism).

XI. **8. feats of war:** or 'campaigns.'

23. witty in thy words. Cowley suggests 'goodly in form' (Est 2 [7]) in Hebrew was misread as 'and thou speakest well,' as some MSS. have 'if thy God do as thou sayest' for the following words.

XII. **7. washed herself:** Greek *ebaptizeto*; rarely used in LXX. This ritual use of the word is not earlier than the two last centuries B.C. Proselytes were baptized.

XIII. **2. lying along:** Greek 'fallen headlong' or 'prone.'

4. bed: some MSS. 'head.'

17. Blessed . . . God: the common late Hebrew formula.

18. Blessed . . . earth: cf. Jg 5 [24]. **directed . . . head** may be a Hebraism.

XIV. **1.** The Vulgate may be right in prefixing [5-10] (Achior's complete conversion): [10] controverts Dt 23 [3].

13. the slaves: cf. [18]; unnecessary to read 'the Hebrews'; no doubt a pun was implied in the original Hebrew; cf. Vulgate 'the mice.'

14. outer door: Greek 'curtain.'

XV. **6. dwelt:** Hebraism 'remained behind.'

12. branches: Greek *thyrsous*, wands used by devotees of Bacchus (*v.* 2 Mac 10 [7]). Cf. the Greek custom of using olive garlands in [13].

XVI. **2. and praise:** A has 'new' (song) (cf. [13]). The Song occupies a similar position in Judith to that of Tobit's Prayer in Tobit (cf. Ex 15 [3] LXX; Jth 9 [7]).

3. in his armies: Greek 'into his camps.' Cowley suggests a confusion of the Hebrew *el* ('unto' or 'God'), so read 'God when he encamped among you.'

11. lowly . . . weak: the Israelites as the Ḥasidim. **were terrified:** some cursives and versions (probably correctly) 'cried aloud' (in triumph). The next three verbs **they crouched, they cried out, they fled** refer to the enemy (cf. the poetic Jg 5 [27]).

12. sons of damsels, i.e. mere children, or people who are slaves (cf. 14 [13, 18]). **battle:** Greek *parataxeōs*=disposition.

14. it builded them: ℵ 'they were builded' suggests Hebrew 'created' (cf. Ps 33 [6-9], 104 [30]).

15. with the waters: possibly the Hebrew was 'like the waters.'

16. all sacrifice: cf. Ps 51 [16-19].

17. Woe: cf. Jg 5 [31]. The eschatology (based on Is 66 [24]) is later than Mal 4 [5]: cf. Ecclus 7 [17]; Enoch 98 [3], 103 [8].

19. gift unto the Lord: *anathēma*=a devoted thing (cf. Jos 7 [1] ff.).

20. three months: exaggerated.

24. Judith acts in obedience to Nu 27 [11].

25. Implies a long period of peace (cf. Jg 5 [31]).

THE REST OF THE CHAPTERS OF THE BOOK OF ESTHER

By JOHN C. H. How

(1) In the LXX version of Esther certain sections appear which have no original in the MT of the canonical book. In our Apocrypha they are found collected together out of their context and denoted as '10 4-13, 11-16,' as if they were to be read consecutively after 10 3 of the canonical Esther. This arrangement is confusing. It is due to Jerome, who abstracted from the Greek version all the passages having no Hebrew original, and placed them at the end of the book, as a sort of appendix, in his Latin translation.

In order to make the sections intelligible we must rearrange them and read them in relation to their context in the canonical book.

In the notes which follow guidance will be found for doing this.

(2) There can be little doubt that these sections are 'additions.' Attempts have been made to defend them as translations of the original Hebrew now lost. But no really satisfactory reason has been produced for their *omission* in the canonical Hebrew; and the Greek in which they are written does not savour of a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic. Further, certain inconsistencies between the Greek additions and the shorter MT appear which suggest that they are due to another hand (e.g. 12 1-6 [Greek], and 2 21-23 and 6 1-3, two variants of Mordecai's discovery of a plot to murder the king, and the recognition it received).

(3) It is significant that the religious tone which is lacking in the canonical book appears quite prominently in the Greek version (cf. 10 4-13, 11 10, 12, 13 8 ff., 14 1 ff., 15 8, 16 15, 16, 18 ff.). The Name of God is freely used, and even the pagan Persian king shows deep reverence for the God of the Jews. It may well be that part of the purpose of the Greek additions was to supply the religious deficiencies of the Hebrew version. In part, however, they are an illustration of a constant tendency to elaborate the short story as it appears in the canonical book. It was a theme that appealed to a graphic and imaginative writer or story-teller. In later years, and well into the Middle Ages, the process of elaboration went on, as the Jewish Targums on Esther show.

(4) The note contained in 11 1 and appended to 10 4-13 (the *end* of the full Greek version) probably only applies to the *translation* of the original (short) Hebrew. When the Greek additions were made the note was probably moved to the end of the whole work. If it is reliable (which some hesitate to believe), it gives us a date for the translation of the Hebrew into Greek, viz. 114 B.C. (see note on 11 1). The rest of the Greek was no doubt composed and added later, but how much later it is impossible to say. It is clear, however, that Josephus (A.D. 90) knew the Greek additions, and used them in his history (*Ant.*, XI, vi), though quite freely as if he did not regard them with the reverence due to canonical Scripture. It is interesting to note that in his account of Mordecai's discovery of the plot (*Ant.*, XI, vi, 4) he follows the Hebrew version of the story rather than the Greek variant in 12 1-6.

Bibliography

Swete, *O.T. in Greek*, Introduction; Gregg in Charles's *Apoc. and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.*, i; Streane, *C.B.*, §6; Paton, *I.C.C.*, §§14, 20; Bissell, *The Apoc. of the O.T.*; Fuller, *Speaker's Commentary*.

A. (i) X. 4-13. **The interpretation of Mordecai's dream** (see 11 2-12).

The two dragons (11 6) are Haman and Mordecai, the protagonists of rival peoples, the Gentile nations and the Jews, the righteous nation (11 7). The river is Esther (11 10). The Jews are exalted from humiliation (11 11).

7. two lots: suggested no doubt by Est 3 7. God also was drawing lots, and the Jews are selected for favour in the divine decision; an idea perhaps connected with the use of Urim and Thummim (see 1 S 14 41, 42).

(ii) XI. 1. **The conclusion of the Greek version of Hebrew Esther**—a subscription vouching for its accuracy. Current in Egypt, it was taken from a Hebrew original under the guidance of an Egyptian Jew in Jerusalem (see Introduction (4) above).

fourth year, etc. The reference is shown to be to Ptolemy VIII, as he alone of the Ptolemies was married to a Cleopatra as early as the fourth year of his

reign. The date is thus 114 B.C. for the Greek version.

The Epistle: probably the whole Hebrew book of Esther, and not merely Mordecai's decree. **Phrurai**: RV=Purim. **interpreted**, i.e. translated.

[*Note.*—A (i) and (ii) follow on from the canonical book (10 [3]), being (alone of the additions) in their correct position relative to what precedes, but out of order in relation to what follows. They are the *conclusion* of the whole book. The additions which follow must be fitted into the canonical book as indicated in the notes. Probably A (ii) was originally appended to the Greek translation of the canonical Hebrew book, and was later moved to its position at the end of the amplified Greek version: see Introduction (4).]

B. (i) XI. **2-12. Mordecai's dream**: see under A (i).

2. In the second year, i.e. 484, one year prior to Est 1 [3]. **Artaxerxes** must be identified with Xerxes (see 1 [1]).

12. until night seems to lead on to 12 [1-6], as if Mordecai's discovery of the treachery of the two eunuchs occurred that night. But in 2 [21] the discovery appears to have been made later (see 2 [16]). Lucian's Greek version attempts to harmonize, rendering (instead of *until night*) *until the day in which Mordecai slept in the court of the king*.

(ii) XII. **1-6. Mordecai's discovery of the eunuch's plot.** See 2 [21, 22] and previous note.

5. Mordecai is promoted to court service, and receives pay for this service, *not* for his disclosure of the plot. In 6 [3] it is stated that Mordecai had received *no* reward for his loyalty.

6. The beginning of Haman's jealousy, but the exact cause of it is unknown.

Bugean: so LXX in 3 [1] and 9 [10]. Attempts have been made to explain this as a corruption of *Agagean* (see 3 [1]), or as= *bully* (Homeric Greek).

[*Note.*—If the date in 11 [2] be accepted, B (i) and (ii) must be regarded as the *beginning* of the full book of Esther, and be taken as *preceding* Est 1 [1]. But note the chronological difficulty in 11 [12].]

C. XIII. **1-7. The letter of Artaxerxes** (see 1 [1], 11 [2]). Follows on from 3 [13] in LXX.

6. fourteenth: read *thirteenth* as in 3 [13], etc.

D. XIII. **8-17. The prayer of Mordecai.** Follows on 4 [17] in LXX.

8. Note the introduction of the divine Name, not mentioned in canonical Esther at all.

E. XIII. **18-XIV. 19. The prayer of Esther.**

F. XV. **1-16. The queen's interview with the king.**

1. third day: see 5 [1]. The section is a graphic elaboration of the episode of 5 [1-3].

13. angel of God: cf. 1 S 29 [9], 2 S 14 [17], etc., omitted by Josephus and Jewish Midrash, probably as unsuitable in reference to a pagan king.

G. XVI. **1-24. The king's decree.** Follows 8 [12] in LXX.

10. a Macedonian: so also in the LXX of 9 [24]. Seems to point to a date when the Greek (Macedonian) power was hated by the Jews, and the title would at once suggest a malicious enemy.

14. No hint of this motive appears in the canonical Esther.

THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

By Charles Harris

Value of the Book.—By general consent Wisdom occupies the foremost place among the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Even when compared with the 'Wisdom' group of the Old Testament canonical writings it takes rank as a work of real distinction, not only from the literary and poetic, but also from the philosophical and theological standpoint. The reader finds himself carried away by the fervour and splendour of the author's descriptions of Wisdom, which is represented as on the one hand a personal or quasi-personal attribute of God, and on the other as His saving, all-sufficing and beatifying gift to man, offered indeed to every human being, but only in fact bestowed on the righteous, in response to their earnest and persistent prayer.

Other outstanding and arresting features of the book are the author's earnest advocacy of an exalted standard of morality both individual and social, which stands out in strong relief against the dismal background of Naturalism, selfish Hedonism, and Libertinism, which

he paints in such lurid colours; his scathing denunciations of the apostate Jews of Alexandria (mostly belonging to the wealthy and cultured classes), who had become not merely Pagans, but *disreputable* Pagans, adhering to a debased form of Epicureanism which respectable heathen opinion condemned; and his sustained attack upon polytheism and idolatry (especially as practised in Egypt), which he treats as the chief source of the moral and spiritual degradation of the human race, very much after the manner of St. Paul in the opening of the Epistle to the Romans.

Its Interest for Christians.—For Christians the book possesses special interest as being the earliest important attempt to achieve a working synthesis between the truths taught by Moses and the Prophets ('Revealed Religion'), and the best elements of heathen philosophy ('Natural Religion').

The Christian Church undertook nearly from the beginning, and is still at work upon, a very similar task; consequently, it cannot but regard with veneration and gratitude the unknown author who earlier than Philo (perhaps a whole generation earlier) opened up the still fruitful path to comprehensive truth, which was afterwards trodden by the pioneers of Catholic theology.

In the opinion of nearly all recent authorities, the influence of Wisdom on the chief New Testament writers has been both extensive and direct. Grimm and certain other critics doubt or deny this; but at any rate it is beyond question that the sympathetic and 'welcoming' attitude towards Gentile thought evinced by our author was also adopted by St. Paul and St. John, who incorporated into their theologies, among other philosophic conceptions, that of a Mediator between God and creation, and that, not in the form given to it by Philo, but very nearly in that which is elaborated in the Book of Wisdom.

Consciously or unconsciously the apostolic example was followed by practically all the theologians of the ancient Church—not only by those who, like Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, adopted a friendly and welcoming attitude towards heathen philosophy, but also by those who, like Tertullian, were more or less hostile (in theory, at least) to Gentile culture altogether.

There are some who profess to see in the gradual infusion of Gentile elements into what was at first an almost entirely Hebraic religion, nothing but a progressive deterioration and corruption of the truth of the Gospel; but such a view is illiberal and biassed. Christianity, just because it claimed to be the one true and universal religion, was logically bound to claim also the possession (in principle, at least) of all fundamental truth. The very moment that it entered the Gentile field, it was bound to take notice of the culture and especially the philosophy of heathenism, to appraise its value, and in due time to define its attitude towards it. It was obvious to every educated Christian that the teaching of the great heathen philosophers—Plato in particular—could not be dismissed as undiluted error. It contained much that harmonized with, supplemented, and gave intellectual support to the traditional faith inherited from the Apostles and prophets. This element the Church gradually assimilated, and thus became in large measure the depository and guardian, not only of the truths of Revealed Religion, but also of the best traditions of the philosophy of ancient Greece.

Christian theology borrowed not only, like the author of Wisdom, from Heraclitus, Zeno, Chrysippus, and Plato, but also from Plotinus, and (especially in medieval times) from Aristotle.

Those who regard such borrowing as blind and indiscriminate, either in the case of 'Solomon' or of the Christian Church, are seriously in error. What happened in nearly all cases was that the congruous was assimilated, and the incompatible and contradictory rejected. 'Solomon,' for example, accepted from Heraclitus and the Stoics their belief that the world is ordered by an immanent principle of 'Wisdom,' 'Intelligence,' or 'Reason'; from the Stoics their doctrine of the four cardinal virtues; and from Plato his teaching about the immateriality and immortality of the soul, probably also its pre-existence.

But he refused to accept (or at least he nowhere alludes to) Plato's most original and characteristic doctrine, that of transcendental 'Ideas'; and decidedly negatived the view which, whether actually entertained by Plato or not, was certainly that of the Platonic school, that matter and by consequence the human body, are fundamentally and inherently evil.

With still more decision did he reject the materialistic views of the Stoics, who maintained that matter is the only real existent, and attributed a material nature even to the human soul, and to God; as also the Naturalism and Hedonism of

the Epicureans, who regarded the destiny of man as bounded by his present earthly life. These views he rightly regarded as destructive of the traditional faith of Israel.

In a similar manner the Christian Church was decidedly critical in its acceptance of the principles of Gentile philosophy. Even what it accepted it usually modified profoundly. The heathen conceptions of the divine immanence were definitely safeguarded against pantheism. Moreover, the Church flatly rejected as impious a large number of current philosophic theories, e.g. all those which substituted 'necessity' or 'fate' for Providence, or gave countenance to the delusions of astrology, or denied human freewill, or regarded the world as naturally evolved or generated, not created.

The Church seems to have gone dangerously far in its acceptance of the view common to all the schools of heathen philosophy, that God is 'impassible,' i.e. incapable of suffering, and some of the Fathers use language difficult to reconcile with a practical belief in the Incarnation and Passion of our Lord. But though among the ancient Fathers there is almost complete agreement *in words* with the heathen philosophers on the subject of the divine 'impassibility,' it is obvious that a religion which proclaims as its central feature the Passion and Death of the Son of God, and further rejects as impious the Docetic interpretation of these events, cannot hold this doctrine in precisely the Gentile sense. For a review of ancient opinion see J. K. Mozley, *The Impassibility of God*.

Upon the whole it seems fair to say that Catholic theology, while continually appropriating new ideas and expanding old ones, was jealously conservative of its past, and remained true to apostolic tradition.

Its Influence on Christian Theology.—Wisdom approximates more closely than any other Old Testament book to the New Testament doctrine that 'God is love.' In the canonical Old Testament literature God is predominantly King and Lord. 'Solomon' makes His love the primary motive of creation, representing Him as the loving Father of all His creatures, longsuffering and patient even in His dealings with the desperately wicked: 'Thou lovest all things that are, and abhorrest none of the things that thou didst make; for never wouldest thou have formed anything, if thou didst hate it. . . . Thou sparest all things because they are thine, O Sovereign Lord, thou lover of men's lives' (11^{24-26}). In a similar spirit, Wisdom, God's Representative and Mediator, is spoken of as 'philanthropic' and 'beneficent' (1^{6}, 7^{23}). Even the corrupt and entirely incorrigible Amorites of Canaan are represented as objects of God's love and mercy. He spared them, bringing His judgements upon them by little and little, that they might be led to repent ($12^{8, 10}$).

Wisdom speaks, almost in the New Testament manner, of the truly righteous man as being, in a specially privileged and intimate manner, the 'son' or 'child' of God ($2^{13, 16, 18}$). So close is the resemblance of the famous passage, 2^{12-20}, which speaks of the persecution of the typically righteous man, who 'vaunteth that God is his Father,' and is 'condemned to a shameful death,' to the New Testament account of the Passion (see especially Mt 27^{43}; Jn 19^{7}), that many of the Fathers regarded it as an inspired prediction of that event, and several modern commentators have maintained that the author was actually a Christian, and took as the original of his moving portrait no other than Christ Himself. It is more probable that the author had in view some particular and typical Jewish martyrdom, and was also influenced by Glaucon's description in Plato's *Republic* (ii, 361) of the binding, scourging, and crucifixion of the perfectly just man who is esteemed unjust: 'Let him be the best of men, and let him be thought the worst, then he will have been put to the proof, and we shall see whether he will be affected by the fear of infamy and its consequences. And let him continue thus to the hour of death, being just and seeming to be unjust. . . . He will be scourged, racked, bound, will have his eyes burnt out; and at last, after suffering every kind of evil, he will be impaled (*or* crucified).'

The doctrines of the immortality and strict immateriality of the human soul, unknown to the ancient Jews, but accepted by the Christian Church as cardinal articles of belief, find their earliest certain expression in Jewish literature in the Book of Wisdom (3^{1} ff.). This book also anticipates later Christian belief about the intermediate state by teaching that souls do not pass to their eternal reward immediately after death. Nothing is expressly said about the intermediate condition of the wicked; but it is affirmed that the souls of the righteous rest in joy and peace under the protection of God until the final judgement. Then, and not till then, both the righteous and

the wicked will be judged according to their works, and receive their eternal recompense. There is no mention in the book of a personal Messiah, but it is stated that from the time of the judgement there will be an eternal (Messianic) kingdom, in which the righteous will occupy a position of supreme authority (4 17-5 23; cf. 2 22-3 10, 18). Since the resurrection of the body is not mentioned, most critics consider that the writer rejected it. There are, however, important considerations on the other side (3 7 *v.n.*)

The book has exercised a powerful influence—probably both direct and indirect—upon the development of the doctrines of the Person of Christ and of the Trinity. The author anticipates Christianity in teaching that both Creation and Salvation, though acts of God, are *mediated*—and that, not through any created being, however exalted (as in the system of Arius), nor through inferior divinities (as in the ordinary heathen cosmogonies), nor through a 'demiurge' or a hierarchy of 'emanations,' or 'æons' projected from the divine substance (as in many Gnostic systems), but through a personal or quasi-personal agent or mediator ('Wisdom'), who shares God's indivisible essence, manner of being, moral attributes, omnipotence, and omniscience. This Mediator does not become incarnate nor make atonement for sin, but in other respects his functions closely resemble those of the Logos in St. John's theology, and of the Son of God in St. Paul's. Both these writers clearly regard the creation of the world and the salvation of man as mediated through a being personally distinct from God, and yet consubstantial with Him (Jn 1 3, 10, 18; 1 Cor 8 6; Col 1 16). In agreement with New Testament doctrine, and in opposition to the general trend of Philo's philosophy, 'Solomon' teaches that the work of the Mediator does not exclude, but rather effects God's intimate contact with, action upon, and immanence in the world. Through the Mediator, God Himself (not any inferior being) creates, blesses, saves, reveals Himself, and hears and answers prayer. In spite of the denials of certain critics, who credit the author with a doctrine of extreme transcendence, this is the clearly expressed teaching of the first or philosophical part of the work (see e.g. 1 2, 6, 9, 14, 2 23, 3 1, 5, 9 1-9) as well as of the second. It is quite true that nearly all the references to 'mediation' occur in the first part; but this is natural enough. Here 'Solomon,' speaking as a philosopher, naturally employs metaphysical terms; in the second part, speaking as an historian, he prefers to use popular and scriptural language.

Certain proof of St. Paul's use of Wisdom is afforded by Eph 6 11 ff. compared with Wisd 5 17 ff., where the crucial word *panoplia* ('whole armour'), which does not occur in Is 59 17 (which is the original source of both passages) is used both by 'Solomon' and St. Paul. Other close coincidences are Wisd 13, 14, cf. Rom 1 20-29; Wisd 11, 12, cf. Rom 9; Wisd 3 8, cf. 1 Cor 6 2; Wisd 3 8, cf. 1 Cor 6 2; Wisd 9 15, cf. 2 Cor 5 1-9. Hebrews contains clear reminiscences of Wisdom. Most recent authorities also maintain its influence upon St. James and St. John.

Relation to Ecclesiastes.—It would be a mistake to regard Wisdom as (in its primary intention at least) a reply to Ecclesiastes. Had the 'Preacher' never written a line, our author would still have penned his scathing indictment of the apostate Jews of Alexandria, and attempted to refute their ungodly and immoral principles.

On the other hand, the extraordinarily close coincidences both in thought and language between Wisd 2 and Ecclesiastes lend considerable probability to the supposition that the freethinking apostates attacked by our author claimed for their unworthy philosophy the general support of the Wise King in whose name Ecclesiastes appeared. Ecclesiastes, as it stands, does not go the whole way in support of their position. Its author (or an interpolator), in spite of repeated denials of God's providential care and moral government of the world (1 2, 3 18-22, 4 1-3, 7 15, 8 10, 9 2-6, etc.), clings pathetically to an attenuated and ineffectual theism. Nevertheless it might be plausibly contended that the atheistic apostates were only carrying to their logical conclusion the principles laid down by the author of Ecclesiastes. They probably argued that a God who does not punish the wicked or reward the righteous either in this world or in the next, is not a God in the religious sense at all—at any rate, not a God whom they were prepared to worship. They would probably have admitted that Ecclesiastes does not expressly sanction sinful pleasures, but, on the other hand, would have contended that, in the absence of any effective moral government of the world and, above all, of a judgement to come, there is no real reason for refraining from them. That Ecclesiastes can be plausibly quoted in favour of the maxim

'live for pleasure,' is undeniable (Ec 9^{7-10}).

Our author opposes to the unorthodox and half-Epicurean Solomon of Ecclesiastes a virtuous and orthodox Solomon, who insists upon God's wise and providential government of the world, upholds a lofty and austere standard of morality, and teaches with conviction the immortality of man and the reality of rewards and punishments beyond the grave. In issuing his book in the name of Solomon, he simply followed the example of the author of Ecclesiastes, whose misrepresentations of the teaching and character of that monarch he desired in this manner to correct. To write pseudonymously was in his age a common and well-understood literary practice, and one not at all likely to deceive contemporaries.

It should be remembered that, when Wisdom was written, Ecclesiastes had not yet attained a canonical or even authoritative position. Both its orthodoxy and its canonicity continued to be disputed among the Jews until the close of the 1st century A.D., or even later. It is probable that a few orthodox additions to it were made when it was finally admitted into the sacred canon.

Unity of the Book.—In 1860 Grimm wrote: 'The unity of the book is unquestionably guaranteed as well by the uniform character of its diction in all its parts as by the unity of the author's situation and tendency,' and since that date a clear majority of critics (in some cases, however, with considerable hesitation) have acknowledged the unity of authorship. In 1900 Siegfried went so far as to pronounce it 'the well arranged production of a single author.' This judgement, however, is only strictly appropriate to the first part (1-9), which is far better arranged and written than the second.

In every part of the book there prevails the same extensive vocabulary, abounding in poetic and rare compound words, some of which seem to have been coined by the writer himself. One extraordinary blunder (the use of *metalleuo*, 'to mine,' in the sense of 'to change') is found in both parts of the book (4^{12}, 16^{25})—an almost incontrovertible proof of unity of authorship. Both parts are characterized by rhythmical parallelism, by an awkward and puzzling omission of proper names, and by allusions to the doctrines and speculations of Greek philosophers.

It is true that, so far as subject-matter is concerned, there is not much coherence or connexion between the two parts. The first is an attack upon apostates and an encomium on wisdom; the second 'a Midrash in glorification of the Jews,' and a vigorous onslaught upon idolatry. But the inclusion of what seem at first unrelated subjects in a single book is readily explained from the historical situation of the writer. The two most portentous evils of the day were, in his opinion, the apostasy and Epicurean agnosticism of certain of his fellow-countrymen, and the degrading idolatry of the surrounding heathen population. It was therefore perfectly natural that he should include considered refutations of the positions of both in a book which was mainly practical in aim.

It is often urged against the unity of authorship that the second part (10-19) contains but little teaching about wisdom—in fact, nothing at all after 11^{1}. But in reality it is implied, not only in 10, but throughout the second part, that theism and righteousness are most closely associated with wisdom, and idolatry and unrighteousness with folly; and that the issue of the former is eternal life, and of the latter eternal death. Such teaching forms a natural sequel to the fuller and more explicit teaching about wisdom in the first part.

Original Language.—Practically all recent critics acknowledge that the original language of the book was Greek. This was already perceived long ago by St. Jerome, who wrote: 'This book . . . is not found among the Hebrews; indeed its very style savours of Greek eloquence.'

Relation to Greek Philosophy.—Grimm, Heinisch, Gregg, and some others regard the author's acquaintance with Greek philosophy as superficial and second-hand: but the majority of recent critics credit him with a wide, accurate, and to a large extent first-hand knowledge of Greek philosophical literature. Perhaps only his first-hand knowledge of Plato's *Phædo* and *Republic*, and of Xenophon's *Memorabilia Socratis* can be definitely proved (see above, and on 2^{12-20}, 9^{15}, 11^{17}); but from these instances, and from others which are highly probable, we are entitled to infer that he was acquainted with a considerable number of philosophic writings of various schools, and that his frequent allusions to philosophical doctrines and free use of philosophical terms are in not a few instances the result of his study of original authorities.

His relation to the philosophy of Heraclitus, which was especially popular

at Alexandria, and was very widely studied by educated Christians until it fell into disfavour in the middle of the 3rd century because it was supposed to favour the heresy of Noëtus (Überweg), is variously estimated. Our decision must depend largely on the view we take of the real tendency of the teaching of this 'obscure' philosopher. If we follow Zeller in regarding him as a materialist and a denier of the soul's (personal) survival of death, it will seem to us unlikely that the author of Wisdom was to any appreciable extent influenced by him. If, on the other hand, we follow Diels and certain other recent authorities in regarding him as 'the profoundest thinker before Plato, and the joint founder with him of the Idealism which under the influence of Plato and Christianity has prevailed over other systems,' we are likely to recognize Heraclitean influence in many parts of our book.

A renewed study of the fragments of Heraclitus and of his interpreters has led the present writer to the view that the more favourable estimate of his teaching is the nearer to the truth, and that the indwelling 'Reason' (Logos), 'Intelligence' (Gnome), 'Divine Law' (Nomos), or 'Wisdom' (to Sophon), which he believed to animate and direct the universe, approximated more to a personal Providence than to an impersonal law or power. Similarly it seems probable that he believed, like the Stoics, in the human soul's *personal* survival of death, at least until the next great conflagration, which in his belief would consume the universe, and out of which a new and similar universe would in due course arise.

The following sayings of Heraclitus would especially appeal to 'Solomon' as being in harmony with his own line of thought: 'Wisdom consists in one duty, and only one—to understand the Intelligence which governs all things.' 'One, the only Wisdom, does not wish, and yet again does wish, to be called by the name of Zeus (God).' 'The human mind has no clear understanding or aims, but the divine has.' The departed heroes of earth are 'watchers of the living and the dead.' 'There awaits men after death what they neither hope nor think.' 'While we live our souls are dead in us, but when we die our souls are restored to life.'

Upon the whole, it seems likely that the author's doctrine of Wisdom has been considerably influenced by that of Heraclitus; though there is this important difference, that for 'Solomon' Wisdom is an attribute of a God who is distinct from and transcends the universe, whereas for Heraclitus 'Wisdom' or the 'Logos' or 'God' is identical with the universe, and is conceived of somewhat materialistically as an ever-living fire, 'kindled by measure, and extinguished by measure.'

The exact doctrine of Heraclitus as to the nature of the soul finds expression in the statement of the apostates, 'Reason is a spark kindled by the beating of our heart' (2^{2}). They wrongly interpreted this saying in a completely materialistic sense, and as implying the dissolution of the soul at the death of the body.

Heraclitus's doctrine of the metabolism or transmutation of the elements is several times made use of by Solomon to explain the miracles of the Exodus (16^{21}, $19^{6,18}$).

In 2 the apostates are represented as advocating the Epicurean ethical principle that pleasure is the *summum bonum*; and as denying with Epicurus the providential government of the world and the immortality of the soul.

The doctrine of an all-pervading World-Soul, or Logos, which, as we have seen, was held by Heraclitus, was inherited by the Stoics, and probably interpreted by them in a more decidedly materialistic manner (see above). Our author, while not adopting their view, shows sympathy with it, and applies to the 'Wisdom' of God, which he regards as immanent in the world, many of the technical terms applied by the Stoics to the World-Soul (see on 1^{7}, 7^{22b} ff.). In 14^{3} and 17^{2} he uses the usual Stoic term for Providence, *Pronoia*, which does not occur in this sense either in the canonical Old Testament (LXX) or in the New Testament.

Distinctively Stoic is the doctrine found in 8^{7}, that Wisdom is the root or source of the four cardinal virtues.

In 6^{17-20} the author makes use of the Sorites, or Chain-argument, a favourite method of reasoning among the Stoics.

The author's debt to Plato (with which we have already dealt to some extent) is large. Besides the doctrines of the soul's immateriality, immortality, and pre-existence, already alluded to, he derives from him the doctrines of the creation of the world out of 'formless matter' (see on 11^{17}); and of 'the weighing down' of the soul by the mortal and corruptible body (9^{15}).

There seems no allusion in the book to the distinctive doctrines of Aristotle.

Doctrine of Wisdom.—Although the author develops his doctrine on philosophical lines, he bases himself on the Old Testament, taking as his starting-point

the bold personification of Wisdom in Pr 8 [22] ff., where it is stated that she was begotten or created by God 'in the beginning of his way, before his works of old, and was set up from everlasting'; and that she was present at the creation of the world, certainly as a witness, perhaps also as an agent or co-operator ('a master-workman').

In our book the poetical metaphors of Proverbs have become philosophy and metaphysics. Wisdom appears, no longer as the poetical personification of a divine attribute, but as a real hypostasis, distinct yet inseparable from God, sharing His unique substance, nature, omnipotence, and omniscience, mirroring His moral as well as His metaphysical perfections, and acting as His agent, not only in Creation, but also in Providence and Grace—always, however, in such a manner as not to exclude, but rather to secure His contact with and action on the world. All that is done by Wisdom is also spoken of as done by God Himself (see especially 7 [21]-8 [8]).

As to the personality or quasi-personality of Wisdom, Drummond correctly sums up the position in the epigram, 'Wisdom is personal, but not a person.' Since, however, only a person can (strictly speaking) possess personal attributes and exercise personal functions, it follows that 'Solomon' (though not always using consistent language) approximates more nearly to the personal than to the impersonal view of her nature. If she is not in this book already a person, she is far advanced in the direction of becoming one.

Human wisdom (an imperfect reflection of the Divine Wisdom) is represented by 'Solomon' as both theoretical and practical. Theoretical wisdom is knowledge of philosophy and of the various sciences (e.g. physics, chronology, astronomy, pharmacy, history), insight into proverbs and dark sayings, and a capacity to foresee the future (see especially 7 [15-22]). Practical wisdom comprises prudence in managing the ordinary affairs of life and skill in arts and crafts; also and more especially the knowledge of the divine will, whence wisdom is described as the source of the cardinal virtues (8 [7]), and sometimes the conception of it expands into that of righteousness in general (10). Wisdom confers the noblest joys, comforts in sorrow and grief, bestows honour and fame even in generations to come, is better than riches (though she often bestows them on her friends), is absolutely necessary to rulers for the performance of their responsible duties, and above all leads to immortality, beatitude, and fellowship with God (see especially 8 [16-18], 7 [8-11], 8 [10-11], 6 [1-9, 20-25], 6 [18-19], 7 [14, 27-28]).

Authorship and Date.—Although not a few of the Fathers assume the Solomonic authorship of Wisdom, its pseudonymous character was widely recognized even in early times. The Muratorian fragment (*c.* A.D. 200) ascribes it to the friends of Solomon, other early authorities to Philo. Origen, Jerome, and Augustine recognize that it is not the work of the famous king.

Nearly all modern critics are agreed that the author was an orthodox Hellenistic Jew, resident in Alexandria, or at least Egypt. His general Alexandrian philosophical outlook, and his sustained polemic against the Egyptians, both point to Egypt as his home.

The date of the book is clearly earlier than Philo. In the age of Philo (born about 15 B.C.) the doctrine of the 'Logos' (under that name) was already firmly established among the Jews of Alexandria, and yet our book contains no mention of it. 'Solomon's' doctrine of 'Wisdom' has, it is true, many affinities with the Logos-doctrine of Philo (for which it helped to prepare the way); but it is quite distinct from it, and obviously earlier.

The undoubted use by 'Solomon' of the LXX version of Ecclesiastes renders it unlikely that the date of his book is much earlier than 100 B.C. We are indeed ignorant of the precise dates, both of the original and of the LXX version of this work; still it is a late production, and it is quite unlikely that the Greek translation appeared much before *c.* 150-100 B.C. The allusions to persecution in Wisdom render it impossible to date it in the period of the earlier Ptolemies, whose policy was uniformly favourable to the Jews. The allusions to king-worship do not indicate (as some have contended) that the book was written under the Roman Empire. From the days of Alexander the Great, Greek rulers frequently claimed and received idolatrous homage from their subjects. The Rosetta Stone—to quote no other ancient authority—affords convincing evidence of the wide prevalence of the worship of the Ptolemies in ancient Egypt.

Analysis of the Book.—The book is divided into two very distinct and in many ways contrasted parts. The first (1-9) is mainly philosophical and hortatory; the second (10-19) mainly historical. The second part is far inferior to the first in literary merit, in arrangement, and in interest—at least to the modern reader.

A detailed analysis is given in the course of the commentary.

Bibliography

For textual study Feldmann's *Textkritische Materialien* (1902) is necessary. The leading commentaries are C. L. W. Grimm, 1860 (still the fullest and best), Farrar (contains many illustrative quotations), Siegfried in Kautzsch's *Die Apokryphen des A-T* (notes brief but to the point), Gregg (brief but valuable), Holmes in Charles's *Apocrypha* (strong on points of criticism), Goodrick (well informed and very full). The philosophy is treated fully in Drummond's *Philo Judæus*, and more technically in Heinisch's *Die griech. Phil. im B. der Weisheit*; more briefly in Schürer's *History of the Jewish People*, and Oesterley's *Books of the Apocrypha*. On the relation to the New Testament, St. John Thackeray's *Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, and T. H. Bindley's article in *Theology*, September, 1925, may be consulted.

THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

The title reads thus in nearly all MSS. and Versions. The Vulgate, however, has simply *The Book of Wisdom*, probably because St. Jerome regarded the work as pseudonymous. The Syriac calls it *The Great Wisdom of Solomon*, but expresses doubt as to the authorship.

Part I. I.-IX. Solomon exhorts the rulers of the earth to seek wisdom and follow righteousness. The doom of apostates and freethinkers. The eternal reward of the righteous.

I. 1-16. Rulers are exhorted to seek God and His wisdom. Lawless deeds, murmuring, and blasphemy lead to spiritual death. Wisdom ensures immortality.

1. Judges of the earth. Solomon, as the head of a great empire, and possessing a world-wide reputation for wisdom, is naturally introduced as addressing the rulers of *the earth*. It is clear, however, from 2, that the writer has mainly in mind *apostate Egyptian Jews*, who occupy an influential position in the state, and persecute those Jews who remain true to their religion. We read of numerous apostates in Palestine in the age of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Mac 1 [11-15], etc.). Philo several times alludes to apostates in Egypt, who ridicule the Jewish Scriptures (*De Conf. Ling.*, ii; *Mos.*, i, 6). His own nephew, Tiberius Alexander, apostatized completely to heathenism, and was rewarded by being made procurator of Judæa about A.D. 46, and subsequently of Egypt.

7. The Stoics affirmed of the Soul of the World precisely what is here affirmed of Wisdom, viz. that it pervades the whole world, and holds all things together (cf. Col 1 [17]; Heb 1 [3]). **every** (human) **voice.**

13-15. Except in certain historical narratives of Part II. (16 [13], 18 [16, 20]), 'death' and 'life' mean normally, in this book spiritual death issuing in eternal misery, and spiritual life issuing in a blessed immortality. Physical death is practically ignored by the author as having no moral significance—scarcely even reality—at least for the righteous. Only in the eyes of the foolish do the righteous seem to die (3 [2]). In reality they 'live for ever' (5 [15]). Even in this life they partake in some measure of the divine immortality, so that for them there is no death. Proof that in this passage spiritual death is mainly thought of, is supplied by [11] ('a mouth that belieth destroyeth the soul,' i.e. spiritually); also by the contrast ([15]) between death and 'righteousness,' which latter 'is immortal.' Righteousness (i.e. the righteous man) is certainly not immortal in the physical, but only in the spiritual sense. Conversely, the 'death' thought of must be mainly (though probably not exclusively) spiritual.

Remark.—It seems clear that this passage, as also 2 [24], contains at least a passing allusion to physical death, and implies the view that the present harmful activities of the physical world result from Adam's sin. The rabbinical view was that only after the Fall did the earth produce poisonous insects and reptiles.

II. 1-10. The false reasoning of the apostate Jews. Their denial of providence, immortality, and judgement. Their greedy pursuit of riotous pleasures. Their persecution of the righteous even unto death. The direct reference of this chapter to Ecclesiastes is beyond question (cf. 2 [1] with Ec 2 [23]; 2 [2] with Ec 3 [19]; 2 [4] with Ec 1 [11], 2 [16], 9 [5]; 2 [6-10] with Ec 9 [7-9]).

2. chance. The Epicureans held that the world was formed (and is now controlled) by a fortuitous concourse of material atoms. **while our heart beateth,** etc. Rather, *Reason is a spark kindled by the beating of our heart.* Heraclitus's view of the material or quasi-material nature of the soul finds here clear and accurate expression (see Introduction).

5. no putting back of our end. Our death can no more be postponed than the shadow of a sundial can be put back.

6 ff. Though Epicurus bade his followers live for pleasure, his own manner of life was temperate and somewhat

austere. It is clear that the riotous living of the apostates was a 'corrupt following' both of Epicurus and of 'the Preacher' on whose authority they relied.

9. Let none of us, etc. Read, with Feldmann, *Let there be no meadow without traces of our proud revelry.*

11. 'Might is right.'

12 ff. 'The righteous man' is the faithful Israelite who protests by his life, and perhaps also by his words, against the apostasy, injustice, and persecuting policy of the highly placed freethinkers. The numerous close parallels between this passage and the New Testament narratives of Christ's Passion have caused it to be widely regarded as a prophecy of that event. For its relation to Plato's *Republic*, see Introduction.

12. sins against the law (i.e. of Moses) **. . . sins against our** (i.e. the Jewish) **discipline.** We have here clear proof that the author really has in view *apostates from Judaism*, not ordinary heathen rulers and judges.

13. servant. Rather *child* (see [16, 18]). The emphasis on 'sonship' in this chapter shows that already before the coming of Christ, the way was being prepared for the full Christian conception of God's Fatherhood, and the special sonship of the righteous.

20. This verse implies that actual executions of Jews who had remained faithful to the Law (similar to those in Palestine under Antiochus Epiphanes: 1 Mac 1 [41] ff.) had taken place in Egypt. We need not, however, suppose that they were recent. A persecuting policy has been attributed to Ptolemy Philopator, 222-205 B.C. (the details, however, are obviously legendary); and on better evidence to Ptolemy Physcon (146-116 B.C.). Josephus (*Against Apion*, ii, 5) speaks of Cleopatra's hostility to the Jews; but our book is probably somewhat earlier than her reign (52-30 B.C.).

II. 21-III. 9. But a future life of glory is in store for the righteous, who at the judgement will triumph over the ungodly, and thereafter reign for ever over the nations in the (Messianic ?) Kingdom of God.

23-24. We have here the earliest quite certain reference to the Devil as the tempter of Eve. His 'envy' was of the privileged position of the human race (as in the Slavonic *Enoch*). The 'death' here spoken of is primarily, perhaps exclusively, spiritual; but the author probably believed (1 [14] *v.n.*) that physical death followed as a consequence. Whether the author held that the Fall of Adam weakened and corrupted his own nature and that of his descendants, is an open question. The fact that Adam repented and was saved (10 [1-2]), does not prove the negative; because it is expressly stated that his repentance was due, not to nature, but to grace. The fact that the physical consequence of the Fall (the death of the body) affected not only Adam, but all his descendants, may easily have suggested to the author that the Fall had permanent spiritual consequences of an undesirable kind. Unfortunately he nowhere gives clear expression to his views on the subject (see on 1 [14] and 12 [11]). **and they,** etc. Translate, *And they that are of his following experience it* (viz. death). The righteous do not really 'experience' death, for it is to them only a joyful transition to a happier state of existence. The ungodly, however, do really 'experience' it, for it is to them a penal and horrifying transition to eternal misery.

III. 1-6. An interval is clearly implied between the death of the righteous (also, by natural influence, of the wicked) and the coming Judgement ('the day of their visitation'). During this period the souls of the righteous are at peace under the protection ('in the hand') of God, and suffer no torment. Palestinian evidence for the doctrine of an Intermediate State is found in the contemporary or slightly later 2 Maccabees, which represents Maccabæus as praying for the souls of certain of his fallen soldiers who had been guilty of superstitious practices, He arranged to have a sacrifice of propitiation on their behalf offered at Jerusalem 'that they might be released from their sin' (12 [38-45]).

7. their visitation. The coming Judgement is represented as a visitation of mercy and reward for the righteous (see [9], cf. Ps 106 [4-5]); but of wrath and punishment for the ungodly. **Like sparks among stubble.** Cf. Obad [18]. The righteous will be the instruments of God's wrath, which will consume the wicked. **They shall judge.** Under God, the righteous will reign over the universe in the eternal (Messianic) kingdom (cf. 1 Cor 6 [2]; 'We shall judge [i.e. rule] angels'). No personal Messiah is here mentioned. God alone is the King.

Remark.—Although the Resurrection of the Body is not alluded to here or elsewhere, it cannot be *confidently* affirmed that the author rejected it. He teaches that at the Judgement the souls of the righteous will pass from a state of peaceful quiescence to one of great activity, and

he may quite possibly have regarded the Resurrection as *implied* in this transition. Had he believed, with Plato, in the immortality of the soul alone, he would probably have represented the souls of the righteous and the wicked as entering upon their eternal reward *immediately after death*, instead of waiting for a future judgement. The author certainly did not believe in the resuscitation of the mortal and 'corruptible' body which 'weigheth down the soul' (9 [15]). But he may have believed, like St. Paul, in the resurrection of a glorious and spiritual body—such a body as, according to ordinary Jewish belief, was possessed by the angels in heaven, and which Christ Himself seems to have assigned to the risen righteous (Lk 20 [36]).

III. 10-IV. 6. **The ungodly and their offspring will be punished; but the righteous, even though childless, will be rewarded.**

10. **even as they reasoned.** They reasoned that death is the end of all. So it is, replies the author, but eternal death really means, not annihilation, but eternal misery.

13. **Happy is the barren** (wife) **who is undefiled** (i.e. free from serious sin), **she who hath not** (like the wicked wives of the ungodly) **conceived in transgression.** There is no praise here of voluntary celibacy, and hence no reference (as some suppose) to the celibate sect of the Essenes.

14. **the eunuch.** Hebrew tradition regarded numerous offspring as a signal mark of the divine favour, and childlessness as a reproach. Eunuchs, as necessarily childless, were regarded and treated with contempt. Our author sharply challenges tradition in this matter. Cf. Dt 23 [1], Is 56 [4], Ac 8 [27].

15. **adulterers . . . unlawful bed.** These expressions, as also 'children unlawfully begotten' (4 [6]) are better understood as referring to mixed marriages between Jews and idolaters, than to adultery proper.

18. **the day of decision,** i.e. the Day of Judgement. Obviously the writer does not believe in the annihilation of the wicked.

IV. 6. **when God searcheth them out,** viz. at the Day of Judgement. The allusion is to the children of mixed marriages, who, having been brought up as idolaters, will be condemned as such through their parents' fault.

7-V. 14. **The premature death of the righteous ushers in their eternal blessedness. The confusion and remorse of the ungodly at the Judgement.**

10. **he was translated.** Rather *he was removed*. The case of the righteous man, whose life is cut short by persecution, is compared to that of Enoch, who was also 'removed' (by translation) from earth, before reaching his natural term of life (Gen 5 [21-24]). The RV wrongly assumes that Enoch, not the righteous man, is the subject. Hence the mistranslation.

13. Compare the rabbinical eulogy of a Rabbi who died young: 'In the twenty-eight years of his life he has learned more than others learn in 100 years.'

14-16. There seems a dislocation of the text. The passage can be made to read connectedly, and to yield good sense, if [16] is placed after [14].

20 ff. The scene is the Last Judgement.

V. 13. **ceased to be,** i.e. we died spiritually.

14. **foam.** Read *a thin spider's web*.

15-23. **The future bliss of the righteous and the misery of the ungodly at the Judgement.**

18-20. This passage is certainly referred to in Eph 6 [11-17] (see Introduction).

20. **And the world,** etc. A favourite thought of the author. See [17], 16 [17-24], 19 [6].

23*c*. **And so shall lawlessness . . . princes.** The writer returns abruptly to the rulers addressed in 1 [1] ff., thus preparing the way for the following section.

VI. 1-11. **Further admonitions to rulers. God's strict inquisition into the life and administration of princes.**

4. **law.** Rather *the* (Mosaic) *law*, because the persons really addressed are Jewish apostates.

10. **hallowed.** Rather *accounted holy*.

12-20. **Wisdom seeks man, and is readily found** (cf. Pr 8).

17-20. A good example of the logical figure Sorites (or Chain-argument), which was largely employed by the Stoics.

18. **incorruption.** *Moral* incorruption is meant, not (as the word sometimes signifies) immortality, though this, of course, follows as a result.

21-25. **Solomon promises to initiate the princes into a knowledge of Wisdom.**

VII. 1-22*a*. **Solomon's wisdom came to him, not by nature, but by grace. God gave it him in answer to his earnest prayer. Its supreme value.**

1. **first formed.** Greek *protoplastos*, a word apparently coined by the author on the basis of Gen 2 [7] (LXX). It recurs in 10 [1]. The term is applied technically to Adam by St. Irenæus (*c.* A.D. 180), and by many subsequent Fathers.

2. **months,** i.e. lunar months.

3. kindred, or *trodden by the feet of all.*

11. Cf. Mt 6 [33], 'and all these things shall be added unto you.'

14. commended, etc. Rather, *being commended to Him by the gifts* (i.e. good qualities) *which come through discipline.*

15-22. Wisdom taught Solomon philosophy and all the sciences.

17. Philosophical or metaphysical knowledge is spoken of; also physics.

20. the violences of winds (i.e. meteorology), or perhaps *the powers of spirits* (i.e. angelology and demonology, of which Solomon was supposed to have special knowledge: cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, viii, 2).

22*a*. artificer. Wisdom is not a mere witness, but God's active agent in creation.

22*b*-VIII. 1. The nature, source, attributes, and activities of Wisdom. This magnificent passage is the dogmatic centre of the work. Its Stoic colouring is very marked. Many of the Stoic epithets and descriptions of the Soul of the World are here applied to Wisdom ('quick of understanding,' *noëron*, [22]; 'loving towards men,' *philanthrōpon*, [23]; 'penetrating,' *chōroun*, [23]; 'pervadeth,' *diëkei*, [24]; 'ordereth,' *dioikei*, 8 [1]; possibly also 'effulgence,' 7 [26]).

22. There is in her, or (adopting a probably better reading) **she is a spirit.** The latter reading harmonizes well with 9 [17], where Wisdom is identified with the Holy Spirit. **alone in kind:** lit. 'only begotten' (*monogenes*), a term applied by Philo to the Logos, and by St. John to the Son of God. It means here 'the only one of its kind.' **manifold:** Wisdom is one, yet manifold in its operations, as the Stoics represented the World-Soul to be. **distinct:** i.e. giving clear guidance. **unharmed:** i.e. impassible. Impassibility was attributed to God by all the ancient philosophers.

23. all-powerful, all-surveying: Wisdom is omnipotent and omniscient, like God. **most subtil:** i.e. (practically) entirely immaterial. Our author rejects the Stoic doctrine that the human soul and God are material.

25. breath: a metaphor for *spiritual emanation* or *outflow.*

26. effulgence (Greek *apaugasma*), rather *reflection*, as the parallelism with 'mirror' shows. Wisdom is a 'reflection' of God, but a real, substantial, and energetic, not an empty and ineffectual one, such as appears in a mirror. Similarly in Heb 1 [3], the Son is 'the reflection (*apaugasma*) of [God's] glory, and the very image of His substance,' a form of expression probably derived from this passage. The consubstantiality, eternity, moral perfection, and personality (or at least *quasi*-personality) of Wisdom here find luminous expression.

27. remaining in herself: i.e. unchanged in her own nature. Herself unchanged, she is the cause of all change. **prophets:** the author apparently regards prophecy as still continuing. Probably he believed (as did certain of the Christian Fathers) in the 'ethnic inspiration' of the great heathen philosophers (Grimm). The expression 'friend(s) of God' does not occur in the LXX, but it is a commonplace of Greek philosophy that 'the wise are friends of God' (Plato, Xenophon, Philo, Epictetus, Diogenes Laertius). See Jas 2 [23] (Mayor's note).

VIII. 2-21. Solomon loved Wisdom from his youth, and sought her for his bride. Heinisch (*Die griechische Philosophie im B. der Weisheit*, 32-35) prints in parallel columns a portion of the speech of Virtue in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, ii, 1, 32 f., and of Wisd 8 [2-18], pointing out their extremely close resemblances, which, he thinks, prove literary dependence.

3. to live with God. The Greek suggests that Wisdom is the *bride* of God Himself. Philo in the same spirit calls God the *husband* of Wisdom (*De Cherub.*, 13, 14).

6. If earthly understanding (wisdom) works with efficiency and success, much more does the Divine Wisdom.

7. understanding, or 'prudence,' or 'wisdom' (*phronesis*). Our author here follows Chrysippus the Stoic in making Wisdom the root or source of the four cardinal virtues. Plato merely co-ordinates them.

13. immortality: viz. of remembrance and fame.

19-20. Most modern critics consider that these verses teach or imply (1) the conscious and personal pre-existence of the human soul; (2) the assignment to each soul at birth of a 'defiled' or 'undefiled' body in accordance with its moral conduct in the pre-existent state. (The author's frequently reiterated assertion that everything created by God is good, enables us to infer that he held with the Rabbis that all souls were created good originally, and that the evil in them is due, not to the divine predestination, but to their own abuse of free-will.) There is no very strong antecedent objection to assigning the doctrine of pre-existence to 'Solomon.' It was widely accepted by the Palestinian Rabbis, who located the pre-existent souls in receptacles in the seventh heaven. Its vogue among the Hellenists of Alexandria may be inferred

from its confident adoption by Philo. It is ascribed by Josephus to the Essenes. The disciples hazard the conjecture that a certain man may have been born blind as a penalty for sin committed by him before his birth (Jn 9 [2]); and it is noticeable that our Lord, while correcting their supposition, refrains from condemning the pre-existence theory itself. Many Christian scholars have naturally been unwilling to recognize in a book which has been widely regarded as sacred and inspired, a doctrine which the Church ultimately rejected; but it is the duty of critics to be guided strictly by the evidence, which upon the whole seems to favour the usual critical opinion. Certain scholars, however (notably F. C. Porter and Gregg), strongly maintain that this passage only implies the *impersonal* pre-existence of the soul. But the more obvious meaning is that Solomon's soul was morally good before birth, and on this account received as a reward an 'undefiled' body. It should be noticed, however, that our author, while adopting the Platonic doctrine of the soul's pre-existence, rejects the associated doctrine of the essentially evil nature of the body. His statement that Solomon's body was 'undefiled' is emphatic.

19. of parts: rather *of a good disposition.*

20. nay rather. [19] might be misunderstood to mean that *the body* is the seat of human personality. Solomon therefore explains that from the philosophical point of view the soul and the 'ego' are identical.

IX. 1-18. **Solomon's prayer.**

1. by thy Word (Logos). As the parallelism suggests, the Logos *may* here be hypostatized, and identified with Wisdom as the mediator of creation (cf. the vivid personification of the Logos, 18 [15]). But perhaps the author was only thinking of such Old Testament passages as Ps 33 [6].

4. sitteth: Wisdom shares God's omnipotence.

8. a copy. The writer is thinking more of Ex 25 [9. 40], 1 Ch 28 [11-19], than of the Platonic doctrine of pre-existent 'ideas,' though the influence of the latter need not be excluded (cf. Heb 8 [2-5]). The Talmud, like 'Solomon,' regards the Temple as existing before creation (i.e. in the mind of God). **guard me with her glory:** i.e. guide me safely with her light.

15. This verse merely teaches that the corruptible earthly body is a *hindrance* to the heavenward aspirations of the soul, not that it is positively evil, and a source of sin. We cannot argue from the form of expression used here that the author rejected the doctrine of the Resurrection. St. Paul uses precisely similar language of the 'earthly tabernacle' in which we 'groan' (2 Cor 5 [1-10]); yet he certainly expected to receive at the Resurrection an incorruptible, glorious, and spiritual body, which would aid rather than hinder the activities of his soul. The present passage is obviously based on Plato's *Phædo*, 81*c*; but does not fully adopt its doctrine.

17. Here Wisdom and the Holy Spirit are expressly identified. **and through Wisdom, etc.** A noble close to the first part, and a suitable introduction to the second.

Part II. X. 1. to end. Historical illustrations of the consequences of wisdom and folly, monotheism and idolatry, righteousness and unrighteousness. In style, arrangement, and interest to the modern reader, this part is markedly inferior to the first. Its rhetoric sometimes degenerates into bombast. A narrow particularistic spirit sometimes shows itself. The polemic against the Egyptians is extreme and bitter. Yet there are passages even in this part, which both in style and subject-matter are reminiscent of the author of the first at his best. The generous philosophic Universalism of the first part is not entirely forgotten, and sometimes finds worthy expression.

X. 1-21. The work of Wisdom from Adam to Moses.

1. alone: and therefore requiring to be protected by Wisdom. Observe that, in accordance with Hebrew tradition, Adam is said to have been called by God to repentance, and to have responded. This does not necessarily imply that the nature of Adam was not weakened by his sin.

3. an unrighteous man: i.e. Cain. The habitual suppression of proper names is clear proof that the book was intended mainly for the Jews.

4. Noah is meant.

5. The reference is to Abraham and the sacrifice of Isaac.

6-9. Lot's deliverance from Sodom.

7. fruit: for the apples of Sodom see Josephus, *B. J.*, iv, 8, 2.

10-12. Jacob, Esau, Laban. Observe that Jacob's wrestling with the angel is treated both as history and as parable. Our author never, like Philo, treats history as merely allegory.

13-14. Joseph.

15-21. Moses and the Exodus.

XI. 1-14. Israel in the wilderness. Water, used by God to plague the Egyptians, becomes a source of blessing to Israel.

Consternation of the Egyptians at the news.

7. **them**: i.e. the Israelites.

13. The Egyptians hear of the miracle of the stricken rock, and are confounded.

14. **For him**, etc. Adopting a preferable reading, translate: *For him* (Moses) *who long before was rejected in hatred, they left off mocking.*

15-20. The plagues of frogs and lice were a punishment for the Egyptians' worship of irrational animals.

17. **out of formless matter**: the phrase is Platonic. The Jews believed in creation out of nothing: the Greeks in the eternal existence of formless, undifferentiated matter (*Hyle*), and in its gradual arrangement (either through intelligence or through change) into a cosmos or orderly world. It cannot be *certainly* affirmed that 'Solomon' held the Greek theory. He may have identified Plato's 'formless matter' with the primeval chaos of Gen 1 [2], which the LXX describes as 'invisible and unarranged'; and nevertheless have believed that it had been created at an earlier date by God. Even Philo, who certainly held the Platonic theory, sometimes speaks inconsistently. The word here translated **created** often means simply 'to arrange.'

18-19. The mythical basilisk was supposed to kill by its glance or breath.

21-XII. 2. God is not only Almighty, but also loving and merciful. Love is the motive of creation. God loves all His creatures, even the heathen. He overlooks sins, and punishes by little and little, that men may repent.

23. Cf. Rom 2 [4]; 2 P 3 [9-25].

25. **called**: i.e. *created*.

XII. 1. God's Spirit dwells even in the heathen, convicting them of sin (cf. Jn 16 [8]).

3-11. God's patience with the corrupt and incorrigible Canaanites.

4. **hating them**: but only in so far as they practised the abominations described. There is no real contradiction here of the author's doctrine of God's universal love expressed in 11 [24].

5-6. Slightly amend the text, and render: **merciless slaughterers of children, and cannibal banqueters on men's flesh and blood.** The charges of infanticide are well supported (see 2 K 3 [27], 16 [3]; Ps 106 [34-38]), but no other authority accuses the Canaanites of cannibalism.

11. **a seed accursed from the beginning.** The curse on Canaan is alluded to (Gen 9 [25]). There is no reference to the doctrine of original sin, which, though perhaps implied, is practically ignored in this book (1 [14], 2 [23-24] *v.n.*).

12-18. God's leniency is due to His mercy, not to lack of power to punish.

16. **For thy strength is**, etc. The meaning is: *For thy omnipotence enableth thee to work righteousness continually.*

19-22. God's mercy to Israel and their enemies teaches Israel a lesson of universal benevolence and clemency.

when we judge: viz. our fellow-men (particularly our enemies). **when we are judged**: viz. by Thee.

23-27. Further reflections on the punishment of the Egyptians through the instruments of their sin (for the principle see 11 [16]).

24*b*. Juvenal, *Sat.* xvi, is a sustained invective against the irrational worship of animals by the Egyptians (Farrar).

25. Childish follies were chastised with childish punishments (the earlier plagues).

27. **the last end**: i.e. the destruction of the firstborn, and the drowning of Pharaoh's hosts in the Red Sea.

XIII.-XV. A long digression on the origin, nature, and effects of polytheism and idolatry.

XIII. 1-9. The least culpable form of false worship is the worship of nature and the heavenly bodies. The author's lenient judgement (6) is surprising; but Philo uses very similar language; and Grafe (translating *stoicheia* in Gal 4 [3] as 'heavenly bodies') attributes the same leniency to St. Paul. The idea that God can be known through His works is Hebrew as well as Greek (Ps 19 [1]; Is 40 [26]; Rom 1 [20]). The argument here used from the imperfect beauty of natural objects to a Supreme and Perfect Beauty (i.e. God) is entirely Greek, and especially Stoic. Plato, however, gives it its classical expression in his *Symposium*.

10-19. The folly of image-worship. An expansion of Is 40 [19] ff., 41 [7], 44 [9-20], 46 [1-7].

XIV. 1-11. The idols carried on ships do not preserve the voyagers. It is God's providence and care which guides them to port.

1. **a piece of wood**: i.e. an idol placed at the prow or stern of a ship. St. Paul's ship (Ac 28 [11]) sailed under the protection of Castor and Pollux.

2. **even wisdom**: tr. *by his own wisdom* (*v.l.*).

3. **providence**: Greek *pronoia*, a Stoic technical term.

6. **proud giants**: see Gen 6 [1]. The author's inference is also drawn by the author of 3 Mac 2 [4].

7. **the wood** is, of course, the Ark; but many Fathers not unnaturally interpret it mystically or literally of Christ's cross.

The righteousness spoken of is that of the godly descendants of Noah.

12-21. The origin of idolatry.

12. fornication: probably literal, see 23^{b-26}.

15. 'Solomon' somewhat modifies the theory of Euhemerus that idolatry arose from the worship of deceased heroes.

16-20. The worship of kings and conquerors *in their lifetime* here spoken of (^{17}) long antedated the establishment of the Roman power in the East. Lysander was the first Greek to be so worshipped. Alexander, and not a few of his successors, were similarly honoured (see Introduction).

22-31. The gravest moral evils and scandals result from idolatry. Cf. Rom 1^{24} ff.

XV. **1-6. Monotheism demands a high moral standard.**

2. Ideally the true Israelite (like the true Christian) does not sin (see 1 Jn $3^{3, 6, 8}$).

5. Cf. the well-known story of Pygmalion, who fell in love with the statue of the Cyprian Aphrodite.

7-17. Folly of the maker of clay idols.

7. clean uses, etc. Cf. Rom 9^{21}; 2 Tim 2^{21}.

11. 'soul' and 'spirit' are here clearly identified, as in the opening verse of the *Magnificat*, and generally in the Gospels; not, however, in St. Paul's Epistles.

15. Based on Ps 115^{4-7}, 135^{15-17}.

18-XVI. 4. Small unclean animals worshipped by the Egyptians were used to plague them. Small clean animals (quails) provided exquisite food for the Israelites. Among the deities of the Egyptians were apes, lions, crocodiles, serpents, dogs, cats, ibises, hawks, wolves, fishes, and perhaps beetles.

XVI. **5-14. The Israelites were plagued by serpents, but for their admonition.** The author is careful to point out that there was no healing virtue in the brazen serpent (alluded to as the 'token of salvation' [^{6}]; 'that which was beheld' [^{7}]). It was God 'the Saviour of all' who healed those who by this punishment were put in remembrance of the oracles of His Law ($^{6, 11}$); see Nu 21^{6-9}.

8. It is assumed that the Egyptians heard the news.

15-29. Fire, hail, and tempest from heaven destroyed the crops of the Egyptians. The Israelites were fed miraculously with manna from heaven.

15. strange rains: see Ex $9^{18-22, 24}$. On the absence of rain in Egypt cf. Dt 11^{10-11}, and Philo, *Mos.*, i, 20: 'Only the ports along the seacoast are ever moistened with a few drops of rain.'

17. Philo also makes allusion to this marvel: 'Compact thunderbolts, of appalling appearance, ran hither and thither through the hail; and, for all the opposition between their natures, neither did the rain quench the fire, nor the fire melt the hail' (*Mos.*, i, 20). **for the world,** etc.: cf. 5^{17-23}, 19^{6}.

18. creatures: i.e. the frogs and flies. But these, according to Ex $8^{13, 31}$, disappeared after the plagues.

20. angels' food. So both LXX and Vulgate correctly paraphrase the Hebrew expression 'bread of the mighty' (Ps 77^{25}). **every taste:** St. Jerome, adopting the Rabbinical legend here alluded to, writes: 'If a man desired apples, pears, grapes, bread, flesh, he had the taste of them in the manna' (on Ps 147; cf. Augustine, *Epist.*, 118). **For thy nature:** adopting a preferable reading, translate: *For its nature* (*or* substance). The sweet-tasting manna symbolized and suggested the sweetness of God as experienced by the soul. **tempered** (*rather* transformed) **itself:** 'Solomon' finds an explanation of the apparent transformations undergone by the manna in the Heraclitean (and Stoic) doctrine of the transformation of the elements (cf. ^{25}).

22. snow and ice: a poetical expression for the manna, as 19^{21} clearly shows. **fire:** i.e. of cookery, Nu 11^{8}.

27. by fire: when baked in the oven or boiled.

28. Prayer before or at sunrise was, as Grimm shows, a Jewish practice, so that there is no reason to suppose here a reference to the practice of the Therapeutæ, or Essenes.

XVII. **1-XVIII. 4. While the Egyptians suffer the horrors of the plague of darkness, the Israelites have light.** Of the many 'Midrashic' additions here made to the Scripture narrative, some perhaps are derived from tradition, but the majority come from the writer's own vivid imagination.

2. lawless men: viz. the Egyptians.

5. Philo similarly states that the darkness mysteriously put the fires out, or made their light invisible (*Mos.*, i, 21). Josephus relates that the air became thick and suffocated many (*Ant.*, ii, 14, 5; cf. Ex 10^{21}).

6a. **a fire self-kindled:** probably some spectral and terrifying phosphorescence only occasionally visible through its momentary coruscations.

6b. Translate: *And in terror at the sight* (viz. the fire), *on which they could not* (steadfastly) *gaze, they deemed what they saw* (of it) *to be worse* (than it really was).

7. Read: *And the mockeries of magic art lay low, and shameful was the rebuke of (the magicians') vaunts of understanding.* The magicians who had contended with Moses now failed to help them.

11. conscience (*suneidesis*). Its first mention in the Bible. The word occurs frequently in the New Testament (not, however, in the Gospels). Philo more than once discusses the nature of this faculty at length.

21*b*. the darkness: i.e. 'the outer darkness' of hell.

XVIII. 1*c*. Read: *Envied them* (the Israelites), *because they had not suffered* (as the Egyptians had).

4*c*. In spite of his nationalism and particularism, the author clearly looks forward to the conversion of the whole Gentile world to the Jewish faith. Similarly Philo speaks of Israel as the priest and prophet of humanity.

5-19. As the Egyptians wickedly took counsel to slay the new-born babes of the Israelites, so, in requital, their own firstborn sons were slain, and their hosts drowned in the Red Sea, through a babe who was rescued from the water (Moses).

5*b*. and saved: Place a comma here, and continue: *To punish them, thou tookest away from them their* (or possibly *a*) *multitude of children.*

6. our fathers: i.e. the patriarchs who, being prophets, knew beforehand of the oppression of Israel, and the punishment of the oppressors. oaths: i.e. God's gracious promises, confirmed by oath to the patriarchs and their posterity.

8. By the same means: i.e. the slaying of the firstborn sons, which summoned the Israelites to draw near to God and seek His protection by smearing their lintels with blood, and keeping the Passover.

9. the sacrifice: viz. of the Passover (Ex 12 [27]). secretly: i.e. in their own homes. That they, etc. Read: *That the saints* (i.e. they themselves and their posterity) *would partake alike in the same good things and the same perils, they singing meanwhile their fathers'* (i.e. the patriarchs') *songs of praise* (or possibly *songs in praise of the patriarchs*). 'Solomon' unhistorically attributes to the age of the Exodus the later custom of singing psalms at the Passover.

13. God's son: see Ex 4 [22]; Hos 11 [1].

14-19. The personification of **thine all-powerful Word** (Logos) in this passage is so dramatic and vivid that there is much to be said for the supposition of Eichhorn, Gfrörer, Burton, and Fairweather, that the Logos is here hypostatized as in Philo and St. John. (In this case, however, the Logos and Wisdom are to be *identified*, not distinguished.) But probably it is safer, even here, to follow Grimm, who regards the meaning as similar to that of such Old Testament passages as Hos 6 [5, 11]; Jer 23 [29]; Ps 147 [15] ff.

16*c*. Cf. 1 Ch 21 [16].

20-25. Israel in the wilderness was also visited with death, but the plague was soon stayed by the intercession of Aaron (Nu 16 [44-50]).

22. by word: i.e. his intercession.

24. Similarly Philo states that the High Priest's robe and its adornments were intended to represent the universe and the four elements. Thus the blue robe symbolized the air; the flowers on it the earth; the pomegranates water; the scarlet dye fire (*Mos.*, iii, 12, 13). the people feared. Read he (i.e. the destroyer) feared.

XIX. 1-5. For the Egyptians there was no intercession. Wrath came upon them to the uttermost.

6-12. The whole creation fought for Israel.

6. was fashioned again: another allusion to the Heraclitean doctrine of the transmutation of the elements (cf. 16 [21], and below, 19 [18]).

13-17. Creation fought against the Egyptians.

18-22. The miracles are explained by the transmutation of the elements.

21. ambrosial food: i.e. the manna.

22. The ending is abrupt, but not unsuitable.

THE WISDOM OF JESUS, THE SON OF SIRACH, OR ECCLESIASTICUS

By W. O. E. Oesterley

The former title is that found in most Greek MSS., and presumably represents the name of the original Hebrew book. The second comes from the Old Latin Bible, and was adopted by St. Jerome in his translation of the Bible. It received this title because, being much used in the early Church for instruction in conduct of life, it became a Church, or ecclesiastical, book in a special sense, among the other *libri ecclesiastici*.

The Greek prologue, written by the author's grandson, belongs to the year 132 B.C.; the original book itself may, therefore, be dated about a couple of generations earlier, 190-180 B.C.

The writer was a scribe of the older type, not that of the later Pharisaic kind; his ethical teaching was less concerned with legal observances than with human conduct in its widest range. His book is thus a moral guide-book to right living; but though ethics is the predominant feature the religious element is by no means lacking, and there are many passages in the book which reveal the living faith and deep piety of the author. It is probable that the book gives a *résumé* of the writer's oral teaching, for we learn from 51.[23] that he had his own 'house of instruction' (*Béth ha-Midrash*), to which he bade the unlearned come.

Ben-Sira, the Hebrew form of the author's name, possessed a profound knowledge of human nature, and it is exceedingly interesting to notice how often his sayings are as applicable to-day as they were over two thousand years ago. The insight he gives us into the ways of thought of men and women of his day, the clear glimpses we get of the social conditions and of Jewish life generally in the 2nd century B.C., mark his book, quite apart from its other elements, as one of the most important of its kind in existence. Details of home life; the relations between husband and wife, father and son, father and daughter, master and slave, physician and patient, debtor and creditor; the methods of merchants and hucksters; the account of dinner-parties and musical entertainments, and of proper behaviour thereat; of lending and borrowing; of suretyship; of rich and poor; of beggars; of the evil results of luxurious living; these and a host of other subjects give us an insight into the conditions of human society which is of great interest.

Ecclesiasticus is one of the most notable products of the 'Wisdom Literature'; and, while largely influenced by the Book of Proverbs, it is in one respect a development of this in that it expands the simple form of the proverb into what are the beginnings of an essay.

Ben-Sira's teaching on Wisdom is based upon and runs largely parallel to that of Proverbs; a comparison between Pr 8 and Ecclus 24 will show this so far as the origin and essence of Wisdom are concerned, as well as the quasi-personification imputed to it. Further ideas concerning it are also similar, as can be seen by a general comparison between the two books. Thus, wisdom is conceived of in a very wide sense and includes mental activity in every direction—cunning, craft, caution in word and act, business capacity, aptitude in craftsmanship, cleverness, discernment, self-control, discretion, learning, wise dealing, right living, all culminating in the fear of the Lord. For behind all there is a religious background in so far that every form of wisdom is seen to be the gift of God, varying indeed in content and scope, but yet a divine endowment. Further, Ben-Sira teaches that there is only one way whereby a truly wise life can be lived, viz. by living in accordance with the divine commandments; hence his identification of Wisdom with the Law. To him worldly wisdom is the same in kind, only less in degree, as divine wisdom; the indissoluble connexion between religion and everyday life is thus assumed, and is illustrated on every page of his book.

Ben-Sira's teaching on Wisdom is thus identical with that of the latest portion of Proverbs (1-9, written about half a century before Ecclesiasticus); the only advance upon it, within Judaism, is to be found in the Wisdom of Solomon (1-9, *c.* 50 B.C.),* where the Jewish-Hellenistic writer identifies Wisdom with the Holy Spirit of the Lord, as well as with the Word (in the Jewish sense) of God.

Regarding the *life beyond death* Ben-Sira's teaching is that found normally in the OT; he has no hope of immortality, not even for the spirit (see 17 [27, 28, 30, 32],

* But see p. 708.—A. G.

10 [11], etc.); in one sense only does he contemplate the idea of a man 'living' after death, and that is by being remembered because of a good life lived in accordance with Wisdom: 'his memorial shall not depart, and his name shall live from generation to generation' (29 [9]). There can be no doubt that already before the time of Ben-Sira the idea of the immortality of the spirit had, owing to Greek influence, penetrated into Palestine (cf. the earliest portions of the Book of Enoch, 12-36, 93, which belong approximately to his time). The reason why Ben-Sira did not assimilate this belief was because he was conservative in his ideas; as such, moreover, he was opposed to the teaching of the Apocalyptists, one of whose main tenets was the belief in immortality. This may well have hardened him in his position of traditional orthodoxy; some of his sayings about death read like polemical utterances (see 40 [11], 41 [3, 4]). Possibly this had something to do with Ben-Sira's somewhat detached attitude towards the *Messianic Hope*. Through the teaching of the Apocalyptists Messianic conceptions had become closely connected with belief in a future life. Ben-Sira does, however, refer implicitly to the Messianic time; at any rate, such an interpretation is possible in such passages as 42 [18, 19], 44 [21], 45 [26], 47 [11, 12], 48 [10, 24, 25], 49 [12], and in [8] of the Psalm that comes after 51 [12] in the Hebrew; this runs 'Praise him that causeth a horn to sprout forth unto the house of David, for his mercy endureth for ever.' This is the only passage in the book in which a personal Messiah is referred to; and even here we cannot be certain that a personal Messiah is meant, because the expression about a horn sprouting forth is used symbolically for prosperity (see [15] of the same Psalm). But there is another important consideration. In the Hebrew of 45 [23-25] Phinehas is mentioned alongside of Moses and Aaron as 'the third . . . and he made atonement for the children of Israel. Therefore for him too he established an ordinance, a covenant of peace to maintain the sanctuary; that to him and to his seed should appertain the high priesthood for ever.' Then reference is made to David and Aaron, who, in a chronological list of Israel's worthies, are quite incongruously mentioned together. The object of this, however, is clear, for it is said of David that 'the inheritance of the king is his son's alone,' while of Aaron it is said that 'the inheritance of Aaron belongs to his seed,' i.e. a distinction is made between the royal and the priestly line in order to show that since the former had ceased and only the latter continued, the high priest, of the house of Zadok, was both ecclesiastical and political head of the people, and therefore it was from this line that the Messiah would come. This was not the generally accepted belief concerning the Messiah who, it was held, would come forth from the house of David (see further below on the Sadducean standpoint in Ecclesiasticus).

Regarding the doctrine of *angels* there is, at any rate in the Hebrew form of the book, only one certain mention of them, in 42 [17], where the 'holy ones' (not 'saints') are spoken of. For the 'holy ones' as a name for the angels see Dt 33 [3]; Job 5 [1]; Ps 89 [7], and often in the apocalyptic writings. It is possible that they are also referred to in 43 [26], but the Hebrew text is quite uncertain. Although there is only this one reference, Ben-Sira must have believed firmly in their existence, for he had the greatest reverence for the Scriptures, and especially for the Pentateuch, where they are often mentioned (e.g. Gen 16 [1] ff., 28 [10] ff.; Nu 20 [16], 22 [22] ff.).

Demons are not spoken of, but it is probable that they are implicitly referred to in 39 [28-31] (see *Ecclesiasticus* in the *C.B.*, 262 f.). The belief in them was universal in Ben-Sira's day. On the other hand, he probably did not believe in the devil (in spite of 21 [27]) as the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon did (2 [24]).

Though one cannot speak of Ben-Sira as a Sadducee (the Sadducees and Pharisees as opposed parties did not emerge until after the Maccabæan wars, *c.* 125 B.C.), yet he must certainly be regarded as representing the *Sadducean standpoint*; for the schools of thought which these two parties came to stand for existed long before the parties themselves crystallized. The specific Sadducean standpoint of the book is to be seen (1) in its traditional conservative attitude towards belief in a future life; (2) the remarkable fact that Ezra is not mentioned among the Fathers of old, although only second in importance to Moses in the eyes of the bulk of the people by Ben-Sira's time. As the scribe *par excellence* and the true spiritual forebear of those of the Pharisaic school Ezra would not be regarded with favour. (3) The teaching respecting the Messiah represents also the Sadducean standpoint, for this regarded the Pentateuchal Law as the supreme authority in all things. There is, however, nothing in the Pentateuch which speaks of the Messianic ruler as belonging to the house of

David; therefore Aaron and his seed were held to be that whence the Messiah would come. It was, as we have seen, with Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, that God had made the eternal covenant; and therefore, as Ezekiel had prophesied (44 [15] ff.), the sons of Zadok, whose descent is traced from Eleazer, the elder son of Aaron (1 Ch 6 [4-15, 50-53], 24 [6]), were to be the rulers of the people, and the Messiah must be of priestly blood (cf. Ex 19 [6]). Cf. [9] of the Psalm which comes after 51 [12]: 'Give thanks unto him that chooseth the sons of Zadok for priests.' Finally, there is the significant fact that in the Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, 100*b*) the book of Ben-Sira is placed side by side with the 'books of the Sadducees' on the *Index expurgatorius* (see Taylor, *Pirke Aboth*, 'Sayings of the Jewish Fathers,' 115, 2nd edition).

A striking thing about our book, bearing in mind that its subject is Wisdom, is the reverence shown for the *Temple worship* and for the sacrificial system. In a long passage (50 [1-24]) which eulogizes Simon the high priest, Ben-Sira delights in recording the details of the Temple ritual. The duty of reverencing the priests is emphasized in 7 [29-31]; the need of supporting the ministers of the Lord is insisted upon in 45 [6-22]; and Ben-Sira's whole-hearted approval of the sacrificial system is plainly indicated by his references to the varieties of sacrifice (see 7 [31], 34 [18-20], 35 [1-11]). It is also noteworthy that he insists upon the right spirit in worship (see e.g. 34 [18-26], 35 [1] ff., [12]).

On the subject of *Sin* he is instructive: he combats a theory as to the origin of its existence, according to which it was created by God (15 [11-20]); his argument is that it is a man's own *Yetser* ('inclination' or 'purpose') which causes him to sin, and a very strong emphasis is laid on man's freewill. But he falls into the very error he is combating by saying that the *Yetser* was created by God (15 [14], 33 [7-15], 37 [3]). Elsewhere he seeks the origin of sin in woman (25 [24]); but this is only in passing, and he evidently does not take the idea seriously, for his real conviction and teaching is that the origin, like the committing, of sin is due to man himself (cf. 17 [30-32], 21 [27, 28], and elsewhere).

On the doctrine of *Grace and Freewill*, which is indissolubly connected with that of *Works*, Ben-Sira's teaching is, in essence, the same as that of Rabbinical Judaism, though less directly expressed. While the action of divine grace is fully believed in and is at times explicitly mentioned, man's freewill receives far more emphasis; on his own initiative he can multiply his good works and bring about his own justification in the sight of God.

Ben-Sira's book gives a wonderfully clear insight into the social conditions of his time. Life had plenty of attraction, at any rate for the fairly well-to-do. That there was considerable wealth is evident from the frequent reference to the subject of riches. Their possession is a thing to be thankful for, but to be rightly used. Conviviality, and a fitting demeanour during social functions, receives much attention; self-control on such occasions is particularly insisted upon, though moderation in eating and drinking is urged not so much on account of excess being wrong as on account of its disagreeable consequences.

A remarkably good section is devoted to the subject of physicians. It is God Almighty who gives wisdom to the physician, who as God's minister is to be made a friend of by men. It is pleasant to learn that the physician makes his diagnosis a subject of prayer; to behave badly to him is a sin against God.

We get, further, some interesting details about trades in Ben-Sira's day; as a scribe occupied with higher things he regards tradesmen with some disdain, but there is a noble appreciation of manual work in the vivid account of the various crafts given in 38 [24-30], and a just homage is paid them in [31, 32] and [34]. Merchants and hucksters seem to have been incorrigibly dishonest.

We also get a good glimpse of home life, one of the glories of the Jewish race in all ages. The way in which Ben-Sira speaks of a good wife gives the impression that there was no lack of such. Filial and parental duty receive much emphasis.

Up to about thirty years ago no Hebrew form of the book, with the exception of a few quotations in Rabbinical writings, was extant. But in 1896 and following years about two-thirds of it in Hebrew, parts of four different Hebrew MSS., were discovered in Cairo. These MSS. are all late, belonging to the 10th and 11th centuries, and contain many scribal errors; but that they rest on a genuine Hebrew text is undoubted. In very many instances the Hebrew offers a demonstrably superior form to that of the Greek text of which the RV is a translation.

Bibliography

Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (1906); Oesterley in *C.B.* (1912), and, in conjunction with Box, *The Book of Sirach*, in Charles's *The Apoc. and Pseudepigrapha of O.T.*, 268-517 (1913).

The Hebrew text is published by Smend separately from his above-mentioned work; for the Syriac text see Lagarde, *Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace* (1861), who has also edited the Latin text in '*Mittheilungen . . .*,' i, *Codex Amiatinus* (1884); and the Greek text is published by Swete, *The O.T. in Greek*, ii (1896).

The Prologue.—This was written by the author's grandson as an introduction to the Greek translation of his grandfather's work. His reference at the beginning to 'the law and the prophets,' and the works of 'the others that have followed in their steps,' of which he speaks three times in the prologue, is the earliest evidence we have of the threefold division of the Hebrew Scriptures.

I. 1-10. The Origin of Wisdom.—Wisdom originates from God with whom it existed before the creation of heaven and earth; but it came into existence through the creative act of God, and it is to be seen in all His works. Some measure of wisdom is granted to all men, but to those who love God it is given without measure. Ben-Sira, in common with the writers of the Wisdom literature generally, never uses wisdom in the sense of pure knowledge; it always has a definitely religious content. Although used in a very wide way, and covering all that would come under the term worldly wisdom, it is not for that reason the less religious in its nature; for though the moral precepts and sage counsels with which the book abounds may be different enough from divine wisdom, yet all emanate from the same source; all are ultimately to be traced back to the Giver of all good things; and all, therefore, partake in some degree of a religious nature. This, in brief, is the view of all the Wisdom writers.

11-20. The Fear of the Lord.

22-30. The Exercise of Wisdom.—Wisdom is exemplified by the practice of such virtues as long-suffering, self-control, obedience, and humility.

26 expresses concisely the complementary doctrines of freewill and grace, though the reverse order to that in which they are mentioned would have been more logical.

II. 1-6. Serving the Lord.—A further example of the highest form of wisdom.

6. Another instance of the author's sane balance between grace and freewill.

7-11. The reward of those who fear the Lord. Eternal gladness in [9] is in reference to the permanent joy which is the lot of those who fear the Lord, not to happiness hereafter, which would not accord with Ben-Sira's undeveloped belief; his point of view on this subject is that found normally in the OT.

12-14. A threefold woe against the unfaithful.

15-18. How the fear of the Lord is manifested in practice. We have here an example, often occurring in this book, of a certain lack of order in the treatment of the subject-matter; this section would come more naturally in conjunction with 1 [11-20] and 2 [7-11]. That sections dealing with the same subject are not kept together, but scattered in a somewhat haphazard way, suggests that, for some reason or other, Ben-Sira was prevented from presenting his work in the final shape intended.

III. 1-16. Filial Duty and its Reward.

1-7 are wanting in Hebrew.

1*a* is corrupt in the Greek; Syriac, Latin 'Hearken, ye children, unto the judgement of your father.' This section gives a wonderful insight into what has always been one of the most striking characteristics of Jewish home life. The teaching that the keeping of the fifth commandment makes atonement for sin [3] is noteworthy. It is in accordance with the Jewish doctrine that the observance of legal precepts is meritorious. With such teaching we must contrast that given in Lk 17 [10].

7. With Latin read *He that feareth the Lord honoureth his father, and serveth his parents as masters.*

8. With this verse the Hebrew text, so far discovered, begins; it differs very often from the Greek, from which the RV is translated; we can here only mention the more important differences. The Hebrew is in most cases to be preferred.

17-25. On Humility.

17 should run *My son, when in prosperity walk humbly, and thou wilt be loved more than the giver of gifts*, i.e. the rich man who is not proud is loved more than the rich man who dispenses alms in the pride of wealth.

19 is not found in the best Greek MSS., nor does it occur in the Hebrew; it runs 'Many are exalted and esteemed, but the mysteries (of God) are revealed to the lowly.' This is evidently a variant of [20]; in this verse the Hebrew has *For many are the mercies of God, and he revealeth his secret to the humble*; this is to be preferred (cf. Ps 25 [14]; Pr 3 [32]). By the 'secret' of God is meant the intimate converse with Him whereby the knowledge of divine things is revealed. The Hebrew of [23] is 'Meditate upon that

which thou art able (to understand), and meddle not with that which is hid,' i.e. which is beyond thee (cf. Dt 29 [29]).

23*a* should be *With that which is beyond (thee) have nought to do.*

26-31. Men reap what they sow.

26*b* should run *But he that loveth the things that are good shall walk in them*; so Hebrew.

30. The teaching that almsgiving atones for sin should be noted; it is an illustration, of which many occur in this book, of the doctrine of the efficacy of works; contrast with it Gal 2 [16]; Eph 2 [9].

IV. 1-10. Duties to the Poor and Afflicted.

5*a* is wanting in Hebrew. For [6] Hebrew has ' When the bitter in spirit crieth in the anguish of his soul, his Rock (i.e. his Maker) hearkeneth unto the voice of his cry.' It is possible that the Hebrew word for ' Rock ' is a mistake for ' He that formed him '; but God is often spoken of as the ' Rock,' symbolizing enduring strength, in the Psalms; the epithet is also used in Jewish liturgical prayers. It must be noted that in this section, which is addressed to the wealthy, Ben-Sira does not condemn the rich as such; he shows, rather, that they can be a blessing to the community.

11-19. The reward of those who seek Wisdom. The Hebrew of [13] is ' they that take hold of her shall find glory from the Lord, and they shall abide in the glory of the Lord.'

20-31. Precepts for practical life. The Hebrew of [22] is ' Respect no man to thine own hurt, and be not ashamed [if it is] to thy stumbling '; the meaning is that a man must not be afraid of offending another so long as he is doing what is right; and even if it results in his harm, he will have nc cause to be ashamed.

V. 1-3. Wealth is a false security. Hebrew ' Trust not in thy wealth, and say not, I have power.' Cf. 1 Tim 6 [17]: ' Charge them that are rich in this present world, that they be not high-minded, nor have their hope set on the uncertainty of riches.'

4-8. Warnings against the abuse of divine longsuffering are addressed to careless worldlings who, though believing in the existence of God, thought of Him as being little concerned with man and his affairs. The frame of mind represented by such was doubtless one of the results of contact with Greek culture which greatly influenced many Jews at this time (cf. 1 Mac 1 [11-15]).

9-VI. 1. Against hasty speech and slander.

V. 9, 10 are addressed to time-servers who speak for the sake of pleasing, not for the sake of truth.

11. Hebrew has ' Be swift to hear, but slow in reply ' (cf. Jas 1 [19]).

14. For whisperer Hebrew has ' master of two (tongues),' i.e. one who is inconsistent in speech.

VI. 2-4. Self-control. A warning against lustful passions; this is quite clear in the Hebrew, which reads in [2]: ' Fall not into the power of thy soul, lest thou consume thy strength,' or ' lest it (i.e. lustful passion) consume thy strength like a bull.' It then continues ([3, 4]): ' It will devour thy leaf (figurative for youth), and destroy thy fruit (figurative for offspring), and will leave thee as a dried-up tree. For unbridled passion destroyeth the possessor thereof, and maketh him the sport of his enemy.'

5-17. Friendship, the true and the false. The sage counsels here given are among the most valuable of the book.

18-37. The Search for Wisdom.

30. Hebrew ' An ornament of gold is her yoke, and her fetters a cord of blue ' (see Nu 15 [38]).

VII. 1-3. The Avoidance of Sin.—For the metaphor in [3] cf. Job 4 [8]; Pr 22 [8]; Gal 6 [8].

4-7. An Exhortation to cultivate Humility.—This section offers a good instance of the way in which Ben-Sira develops the proverb into a miniature essay; this is markedly the case in [6, 7], which expatiate upon the proverb ' Seek not to be a judge '; Hebrew has ' ruler.'

8-10. A Warning against spurious religion.

8. **Bind not up sin twice** does not quite bring out the force of the Hebrew ' Conspire not to repeat sin '; taken with the next clause, for which Hebrew has ' For of the first thou art (still) guilty,' the meaning seems to be that it is folly to suppose that repeated sins count as one because the second is of the same nature as the first; each individual sin will be punished unless repented of. Equally wrong is it to suppose that the mere offering of gifts on the altar atones for sin ([9]). The only true atonement, according to Ben-Sira, is to be active in good works ([10]). The Hebrew for almsgiving is lit. ' righteousness,' for, according to Jewish teaching, this was the highest form of righteousness.

11-17. Precepts for right conduct of life.

13*b*. Hebrew ' For its consequence will not be pleasant.'

14. **Repeat not thy words in thy prayer** (cf. Mt 6 [7], ' vain repetitions ').

15 emphasizes what was always taught

by the Rabbis, the honourableness of labour. Rabbi Gamaliel (end of 1st century A.D.), grandson of the Great Gamaliel, said: 'Excellent is Torah study together with worldly business . . . all Torah without work (i.e. manual labour) must fail at length and occasion iniquity.'

17. Hebrew 'Humble thy pride altogether, for the hope of man is worms.' Ben-Sira's view of the Hereafter is well illustrated by his words 'the hope of man is worms,' i.e. he has nothing to look for after the grave.

18-21. Duties to friend, wife, and slave. A thing indifferent (18) should be 'gain' (Hebrew).

19. Hebrew 'Reject not,' the reference being to divorce. With 21b cf. Ex 21 2; Dt 15 12-15; the reference is to the freedom to be granted to a slave after six years of service.

22-25. Duties to cattle and to children. The haphazard way in which various duties are jumbled together in the latter half of this chapter justifies the belief that Ben-Sira had not been able to arrange his subject-matter in final form.

23. Hebrew *If thou hast sons, correct them; and give them wives in their youth*; this is to be preferred, the advice being in accordance with Jewish custom; marriages were arranged by the fathers.

24 is clearer in Hebrew: 'If thou hast daughters keep their bodies (pure), and be not indulgent to them.' Daughters were looked upon as far less important than sons; it was one of the father's chief concerns to get them married. This is what Ben-Sira has in mind when he says (25) 'Let thy daughter go out, and sorrow (i.e. worry) will go out,' meaning, 'Get thy daughter married, and there will be no more worry.' Greek '. . . and thou shalt have accomplished a great matter' is a paraphrase.

26-28. Duties to a wife, and to parents. Cast her not out of Greek (26) is explanatory of Hebrew 'abhor her not' (cf. Lev 21 7, 14).

27, 28 illustrate what has always been a beautiful trait in Jewish home life, viz. filial duty.

29-31. Duties to God and the priesthood. As the special ministers of God the priests are mentioned three times in close connexion with Him; in reverencing them God Himself was indirectly honoured. With 31 cf. Nu 15 20 f.; Lev 5 6; Ex 29 27; Dt 18 3.

32-36. Duties to the poor, to the departed, to mourners, and to the sick. In 33, 'And for a dead man keep not back grace,' the Greek tones down the Hebrew, 'And also from the dead withhold not kindness'; this undoubtedly refers to something more than burial rites; it refers to some remnant of the cult of the dead (cf. Tob 4 17, and see also Dt 26 14, Hos 9 4, Jer 16 7, etc.). That there can be no reference here to prayers for the departed is certain on account of Ben-Sira's want of belief in immortality. In later days, when the doctrine of resurrection was believed and taught, such prayers were naturally offered; they are still used, no doubt in an elaborated form, in the Jewish Sephardic ritual.

35. The visitation of the sick was often insisted on by the Rabbis; confession with prayer for forgiveness played an important part; it was taught that these might well help towards recovery (cf. Jas 5 13-16).

VIII. **1-3. Against Quarrelling.**

2. Strive not with a rich man, lest haply he overweigh thee (Hebrew 'lest he weigh thy price, and thou be destroyed') means that the rich man can pay a larger bribe; the reference is to the corrupt administration of justice so characteristic of the East. With 3 cf. Pr 26 20, 21.

4-19. Precepts for guidance in daily life. Read perhaps 'Associate not with a fool, lest he despise (thy) sound (words).' With 6 cf. *Pirke Aboth*, iv, 28: 'He who learneth from the aged, to whom is he like? To one who eateth ripened grapes, and drinketh old wine.'

10. Kindle not . . . means 'Do not use the methods of the wicked lest you be contaminated by their example.'

11. Hebrew 'Be not enraged because of the scorner, lest he use thy mouth as an ambush,' i.e. 'Do not lose your temper with a scorner (i.e. one who scoffs at religion), lest you give your case away by speaking hastily or unadvisedly.'

12. mightier = *wealthier*; the danger of lending to one who is richer than you are is that, when he refuses repayment and you sue him, his more ample means will enable him to offer a larger bribe, so that the case will go against you. It is another reference to the maladministration of justice.

13. above thy power should be, as Hebrew shows, *one who is more excellent than thou*, i.e. in a better social position.

14*b*. Hebrew has 'For he will judge according to his good pleasure.' In 12-14 Ben-Sira throws a lurid light on the state of judicial procedure in his day.

19*b*. Hebrew 'And drive not away from thee prosperity'; the meaning is that if you publish your private affairs before the world you will suffer for it.

IX. 1-9. **Of conduct towards women.**

5. **Lest haply thou be trapped in her penalties:** the reference is to Dt 22 [28, 29]. With [6b] cf. Pr 6 [26], 29 [3].

8*b* refers to the beauty of another woman not his wife.

9*d*. **into destruction** refers to the adulterer's punishment (Lev 20 [10]; Dt 22 [22]). With the whole verse cf. *Pirke Aboth*, i, 6: 'Hence the wise have said, Each time that a man prolongs converse with a woman he causes evil to himself, and desists from words of the Torah, and in the end he inherits Gehinnom.'

10-16. **Of conduct towards men.**

10. Just as the quality of wine is not fully appreciated until it has matured, so the value of true friendship cannot be estimated until time has proved its worth.

11. Hebrew 'Envy not a godless man, for thou knowest not what his day (shall bring forth).'

12. **the grave:** Greek *Hades*.

13. **snares** refers to the dangers which beset the ordinary man in the neighbourhood of a ruler. **Upon the battlements of the city:** Hebrew text has *upon nets*; this seems the better reading, as it is a good parallel to 'snares.'

14. **Guess:** Hebrew better *Take counsel with*; in the next clause Hebrew has 'Converse with.'

17-X. 18. **The Art of Ruling.**—The subject-matter of these verses is somewhat confused; but in the main they seem to be addressed to rulers. The Hebrew of [17] may with some probability be rendered 'By the cunning-handed a work of art is formed, so must a ruler over his people be wise in speech.' The general sense would thus be that just as an artist must be skilful with his hand in order to produce a work of art, so must a ruler be wise in speech in order to rule well.

X. 1. **Judge** is 'ruler' in Hebrew; the titles are used synonymously in Hos 7 [7]; Am 2 [3]; Ps 2 [10].

4*b*. Hebrew has 'And he will set over it the man for the time,' i.e. the right man at the right time; cf. with the whole verse Wisd 6 [3].

5. **Scribe** should be, as in Hebrew, *ruler*, lit. 'statute-maker.'

6. Hebrew (emended) has 'Render not evil to a neighbour for any transgression (cf. Lev 19 [17]), and walk not in the way of pride.'

6*a*. Syriac 'From all sins and lying keep far away'; this certainly suits the context better; the general sense would then be that every form of sin is to be avoided, and especially pride; this is further empnasized in what follows.

7*b*. Hebrew 'And to both of them oppression' (which results from pride) 'is unrighteousness'; lit. an unfaithful act.

8*b*. Hebrew *Because of the violence of pride*; this is clearly better.

9. Read with Hebrew *How should dust and ashes* (i.e. man) *be proud, whose entrails decay* (even) *in his life-time?* The two following verses comment further on this.

10. Read with Hebrew *The ravage of disease mocketh the physician; a king to-day, to-morrow he dies.* The meaning of the first clause is uncertain; it may be '(Even) a slight disease mocketh ...'

12*a*. Read with Hebrew *The beginning of pride is when a man becometh shameless.*

13*a*, *b*. Hebrew 'The gathering-place of pride (or arrogance) is sin, and its source bubbleth over with depravity,' i.e. pride issues from sin which is thought of as a poisonous spring pouring forth noxious water.

19-25. **Honour to whom honour is due.** Note the catechetical form in [19] which is characteristically Jewish. The text is uncertain: see RVm.

26-29. **Wrong and right self-esteem.**

30-XI. 1. **Wisdom, not wealth, brings honour.**

XI. 2-13. **Warnings against hasty judgements.**

2*a*. Hebrew 'And abhor no man (who is) unlovely in his appearance.'

4*a*, *b*. Greek is a misunderstanding of Hebrew *Mock not at the dress of the wretched, nor despise those whose days are sorrowful.*

5. Read with Hebrew *Many oppressed have sat on a throne, and those never thought of have worn a crown.*

10*b*. Hebrew 'He that hasteneth to increase (riches) shall not go unpunished'; and in [10d] 'And though thou seek thou wilt not find': a warning against making the attainment of wealth the one object in life.

14-28. **All things are in the hand of God.** In contrast to this frame of mind of the dissatisfied man [24] represents that of the over-confident.

28. **in his children** is a misunderstanding of Hebrew, which has *in his latter end*; i.e. a man's circumstances at the time of his death proclaim what kind of a life he has really lived.

29-34. **Beware of evil companionship.**

31. **For he lieth in wait** Hebrew has 'the backbiter turneth good to evil' (cf. Pr 16 [28], 28 [8], 26 [20, 22]).

XII. 1-7. **Practise discrimination in benevolence.**

3. Greek is a misunderstanding of Hebrew *No good* (cometh) *to him who succoureth a wicked man, and it is no good work he hath wrought.*

8-XIII. 1. **False Friends.**

8*a*. Read with Hebrew *In prosperity a friend is not known*, i.e. when things go well with a man everyone is friendly, but one cannot say who are the real friends; this is illustrated in ^{9a}, which Greek misunderstood; read with Hebrew *When a man is in prosperity even an enemy is friendly.*

11*c*, *d*. The meaning is that just as the danger of rust on a (metal) mirror can be avoided by constantly polishing it, so the dangers of false friendship can be avoided by constant vigilance.

15. Hebrew 'As long as thou standest [i.e. while prosperity lasts] he doth not show himself (as he is); but if thou stumble he no longer restraineth himself.'

XIII. 1*a*. Hebrew 'Whoso toucheth pitch, it cleaveth to his hand'; a summary of what has been said.

2-20. **Like consorteth with like.**

21-23. **The world's treatment of rich and poor contrasted.**

22*a*. is fallen should be, with Hebrew, *speaketh*; the rich man has but to open his mouth and everyone agrees with what he says.

22*b*. For and men rebuke him withal the Hebrew has realistically: 'and they raise (the cry) Yah, yah!'

24-XIV. 2. **Some miscellaneous proverbs.**

XIII. 25 states the truth that a man's moral and spiritual state is reflected from his heart in the expression of his face (cf. Pr 15 ^{13}).

XIV. 3-19. **The uses of wealth.**

3 means that one who cavils about trifles in expenditure is unfitted to possess riches, while to the envious man they are no good because he always wants to have what belongs to others.

4. Greek paraphrases; the meaning is that the miser who deprives himself of things in order to hoard up money is simply storing up that which others will enjoy.

7, 8 are not extant in Hebrew.

9*b*. Read with Hebrew *And he that taketh his neighbour's portion* . . .

20-27. **The Blessedness of him who seeks Wisdom.**

26*a*. Read with Hebrew *He buildeth his nest in her foliage.*

27. Greek paraphrases; Hebrew 'Seeking refuge from the heat in her shade, he dwelleth within her habitations.'

XV. 1-10. **Wisdom can be attained only by the righteous, not by sinners.**

1. Hebrew prefixes 'For'; this section is connected with the preceding one which tells how Wisdom must be sought; now it is told how Wisdom will receive those who seek her. The Law is identified with Wisdom (cf. 1 ^{26}, 19 ^{20}, 21 ^{11}, 24 ^{23}).

2*b*. **a wife married in her virginity:** read with Hebrew *a youthful wife.*

3. Cf. Pr 9 $^{2, 5}$. Hebrew has *water of knowledge*, which is better since Wisdom dispenses it.

5*b*. Cf. 21 ^{17}; Pr 24 ^{7}.

6. Read with Hebrew *Joy and gladness shall he find, and she shall cause him to inherit an everlasting name.*

8. Hebrew 'Far is she from mockers, and untruthful men do not think about her'; mockers, or scoffers, refers to those so often mentioned in Proverbs (e.g. 14 ^{6}) who were defiant and cynical freethinkers.

10. Greek is wrong; Hebrew *In the mouth of the wise* (this is where the emphasis comes) *praise is uttered, and he that is mighty in her* (i.e. Wisdom) *shall teach her to others.* To be able to teach others was an honour highly prized by the godly Jew.

11-20. **On Freewill.**

11. Greek is a paraphrase rather than a translation of Hebrew: 'Say not, From God is my transgression, for that which he hateth he made not.' The words are spoken against those who in their speculations as to the origin of sin were led to argue that since God created all things sin must have been created by Him. Ben-Sira shows the foolishness of this conclusion by pointing out that God who is good cannot have created what is the direct antithesis of goodness.

13*b*. Read with Hebrew *And he will not let it come nigh them that fear him.*

14*b*. Hebrew has 'And placed him in the hand (i.e. power) of his *Yetser*'; this word means 'form' or 'framing,' referring to what is formed in the mind, i.e. imagination or purpose; in the OT it is used sometimes in a good sense (Is 26 ^{3}; 1 Ch 29 ^{18}); at other times in a bad sense (Gen 6 ^{5}, 8 ^{21}); in accordance with this the doctrine arose in later times of a good and a bad *Yetser* which every man possesses. Usually, however, *Yetser* is used in an evil sense of a bias or inclination towards sin; and that is how Ben-Sira uses it here. In this and the following verses he puts forth what was the usual and orthodox doctrine of sin; the main stress is laid on human freewill, but in ^{18} there is possibly the thought of what we should call divine grace. For ^{19a} Hebrew has 'And the eyes of God behold his works'; and for ^{20b} 'Nor hath he strengthened men of lies,' i.e. their wickedness is not to be imputed to Him.

XVI. 1-5. **The curse of ungodly children.**

1*a*. For **multitude** read with Hebrew *sight* (lit. 'beauty': cf. 41 [5, 6]).

3*b*. For **condition** read *end*; but the Hebrew word can also mean 'gain,' as in Ps 19 [11] ([12] in Hebrew), which would explain the Greek rendering.

3*c* is fuller in Hebrew: 'For better is one that doeth the will (of the Lord) than a thousand (godless children); with the Greek cf. Ps 84 [10].

4*b*. **shall be made desolate** refers to the city in Hebrew; this makes better sense.

6-14. **The righteous wrath of God against the wicked.**

17-23. **Man's insignificance will not enable him to escape punishment for sin.**

17*d*. Hebrew 'And what am I among the mass of the spirits of all the children of men?'

18, 19 are either parenthetic, being some thoughts suggested by the mention of God in the preceding verses, or more probably they are out of place; for they read strangely in the middle of the sceptic's ideas ([17, 20-22]); they would come far more appropriately after [23], where, following the rebuke of the sceptic's way of thinking, they would be Ben-Sira's own confession of faith.

18*b*. Hebrew omits 'shall be moved when he shall visit.'

19. Hebrew, with some slight emendations, reads 'When he treadeth upon them they shake (cf. Ps 18 [7]), and when he visiteth them they tremble; yea, the bottoms of the mountains, and the foundations of the world, when he looketh upon them, tremble greatly' (cf. Ps 104 [32]).

20. The sceptic's words are now continued; from this point Greek has gone hopelessly astray; we must read with Hebrew *In truth, unto me he will not have respect; and as for my ways, who will mark them?*

21. 'If I sin no eye beholdeth it, or if I deal untruly in all secrecy who will know it?'

22. 'My righteous dealing who declareth it? And what hope (is there)? For the decree is distant.' This last means that the decreed reward for righteousness is such a far-off and uncertain thing that it is not worth hoping for.

23 expresses what Ben-Sira thinks about the attitude of mind represented in the preceding verses; Hebrew runs 'They that lack understanding think these things, and a man of folly thinketh thus' (cf. Ps 14 [1], 53 [1] [in LXX 13 [1], 52 [1]]).

24-30. **Wisdom as seen in Creation.** Hebrew is extant only in [24-26*a*].

26*a*. Hebrew 'When God created his work in the beginning.' *From this clause to* 30 [11] *only a few fragments of Hebrew are extant.*

XVII. 1-14. **God's gifts to man.**

5 is omitted by all Greek MSS. but cursive No. 248; this MS., however, often preserves readings based on Hebrew not found in other MSS.; it reads 'They (i.e. men) received the use of the five powers (i.e. senses) of the Lord; but as a sixth he also accorded them the gift of understanding, and imparted, as a seventh, speech (*logos*), the interpreter of his powers.' While in this case 248 has certainly not preserved what stood in the original Hebrew, the verse is interesting as showing the influence of Stoic philosophy.

11. It is better to read *He set before them* (so the Syriac: cf. Dt 4 [44]) *the covenant* (so the Syriac; it is a better parallel to Law in the next clause). By **the law of life**, i.e. the Law of Moses, is meant, not a law of how to live, but the Law which gives life. With [13] cf. Ex 19 [16-20].

14. **All unrighteousness** refers to all the prohibitions of the Law, but especially to idolatry, the serving of other gods; this verse is thus a summing-up of the two great commandments in regard to God and man (cf. Mt 22 [36-40]).

15-24. **God's recompense to those who serve Him.**

16 is omitted by most Greek MSS., but 248 reads 'From their youth up every man was towards evil, neither were they able to make their hearts (to be) of flesh instead of stone' (cf. Ezek 11 [19]).

17. Before this verse 248 inserts 'At the separation of the peoples of the whole earth' (cf. Gen 6 [5], 7 [21]; Dt 32 [8]). This verse is important as it illustrates the Jewish conception of the relationship of God to Israel on the one hand, and to the world in general on the other. By their acceptance of the Law the Israelites became God's 'peculiar people'; they were, therefore, His particular care. On the other hand, since He was the God of all the world, His interest in other races could not be denied (cf. the Midrash *Sifre*, 40: 'God doth not provide for Israel alone, but for all men'). The belief was therefore held that He deputed other spiritual beings to look after other races in the same way that He looked after Israel; thus in the *Targum of pseudo-Jonathan* to Gen 11 [7, 8] it is said that every nation has its own guardian angel

who pleads the cause of the nation under his protection before God' (*Ecclesiasticus* in the *C.B.*, 118): cf. Dan 10 [13, 20, 21].

25-32. An exhortation to turn to God and forsake sin.

27*a*. Syriac better *For what pleasure hath God in all that perish in Hades?* In common with the usual teaching in the OT Ben-Sira implies that the shades of the departed in Sheol are incapable of praising God (cf. Ps 6 [5], 30 [9]; Is 38 [18]).

30. Syriac is to be preferred: *For it is not like this in man* (i.e. only God has such mercy and forgiveness), *nor is* (his) *thought like the thoughts of the children of men.*

31*b*. Greek has evidently misunderstood Hebrew; Syriac reads *So is the man who hath the inclination* (*Yetser*) *of flesh and blood*; the meaning is therefore: If the sun, the brightest thing in the world, loses its brightness (viz. at the close of each day), how much more will man, with all the temptations to which flesh is heir, lose the brightness of what is good, with which, as a child of God, he is endowed!

32. The Syriac is again to be preferred: *He looketh upon the hosts of heaven, and on men who are dust and ashes.*

XVIII. **1-14. The works of God are past finding out; the insignificance of man, and the magnanimity of God.**

2*b*. Latin reads 'And thou shalt glory in his mercy'; a second clause is needed.

3 runs thus in 248: 'And there is none other beside him, who governeth the world with the palm of his hand; and all things are obedient unto his will. For he is the king of all things, and by his power he separateth among them that which is holy from that which is common.' While the first part of this may well represent something in the original Hebrew, the latter part ('For he is the king . . .') reads like a gloss.

8*b*. Render with Syriac *What is his loss and what is his gain?* i.e. neither is worth consideration; this accords better with the context.

9. In 248 occurs a second clause: 'And eternal is the sleep of each (which is common) to all'; although the Syriac does not give this, it probably represents something in Hebrew, as the verse requires a second clause.

15-18. The right spirit in giving alms.

15 means that he who gives alms must not humiliate him to whom they are given.

16. Read with Syriac *Just as the rain assuageth the scorching heat, so a word changeth* (the character of) *a gift.*

17*a*. Read with Syriac *For there is a good word which is better than a gift.*

19-29. The need of foresight in various circumstances of life.

19. Read with Syriac *Before thou fight seek thee a helper; before thou art ill, seek thee a physician.*

30-XIX. 3. An exhortation to self-control.

XIX. 4-12. A warning against too much talking.

5. Read *He that hath pleasure in wickedness shall be brought to destruction*; for the second clause 248 has: 'He that averteth his eye from pleasures crowneth his life'; and for [6*b*]: 'And he that controlleth his tongue liveth without strife.' Though Syriac does not have these sayings it is quite possible that they represent something in the original.

7*b*. Syriac has the better text: *Then will none reproach thee.*

9 is difficult; if it is connected with [7] and [8], as we should expect, the best sense will be got by regarding [7*b*] and [8*b*] as parenthetic, and, with the help of Syriac, reading: *Never repeat what is told—then will none reproach thee; Speak not of it to friend or foe—unless it be a sin* (not to do so), *reveal it not; Lest he who hear thee hate thee, and regard thee as an evil-doer.*

13-17. The Duty of Friendship.

13*a*. Syriac *Reprove a friend, that he do no evil*, is probably better, so too—

14*a*. Syriac . . . *that he speak* (no evil).

18-30. The Difference between Wisdom and Craft.

23*b*. Greek has gone astray; read with Syriac *And there is a fool who is without sins*, i.e. the simple-minded man who is guileless.

XX. 1-8. A Time for Silence and a Time for Speech.

2. Read with Syriac *He that reproveth a sinner getteth no thanks, but let him that maketh confession be spared humiliation.*

3 is a later comment on this and forms no part of the original.

4-7. Hebrew is extant; Greek agrees in the main with it.

9-17. Things are not always what they seem.

9. Sometimes adversity is for good, and sometimes prosperity is for evil.

13. Hebrew is extant, though corrupt.

15*d*. 248 and Syriac: '. . . to God and man.'

17. Two clauses are added by 248: 'For he hath not received it (i.e. his possessions) honestly, and what he hath not is likewise indifferent to him.'

18-20. Unseasonable Speech.

19. Greek seems to have missed the meaning of the Hebrew, of which Syriac, with its (to us) obscure but pointed allusion, has evidently preserved the essence: *As the fat tail of a sheep* (the allusion is to Ex 29 [22]) *eaten without salt, so is the word not spoken in season.* The fat tail was part of the offering of the 'ram of consecration' which went to the worshipper and was eaten at the sacrificial meal: 1 S 9 [24] *v.n.*

20. A wise sentence is lit. a 'parable' (cf. Pr 26 [7]).

21-23. Sin unintentionally avoided, and intentionally committed.

21. Because of poverty the occasion for sinning is absent.

22*b*. By a foolish countenance: better in Syriac *through his want of frankness*; the reference is to one who is silent through nervousness or shyness, and whose silence is misinterpreted or taken for hypocrisy.

23. Some people have not the strength of mind to refuse a request to a friend, and finding later on that they cannot fulfil their promise, they make him an enemy.

24-26. A liar's punishment.

26*a*. For disposition read with Syriac *end.*

27-31. The reward of the wise, whose wisdom must be manifest.

27*b*. will please: better in Syriac *ruleth.*

28*a*. heap, i.e. of corn.

29. Cf. Dt 16 [19] LXX.

32 is omitted by most Greek MSS. by Syriac; 248 reads 'Better is persistent patience in seeking the Lord than a masterless charioteer of his own life.' This is an early gloss referring in cryptic terms to the superiority of the Pharisee over the Sadducee.

XXI. **1-10. Warnings against sin.**

5*b*. Read with Syriac *And it ascendeth unto the presence of the eternal Judge.*

7. Read with Syriac *The wise discerneth him that is before him, and spieth out the sinner in a moment.*

8*b*. For against winter 248 and Syriac read *for his sepulchral mound,* which is better.

9*b*. For a flame of fire 248 reads *destruction,* which is to be preferred, for 'a flame of fire'=Gehenna and implies a development of belief in the future life not held by Ben-Sira.

10*a*. with stones should be *without stones* (cf. Is 62 [10], 'Gather out the stones,' whereby the way was made smooth); stone-paved roads were unknown in Palestine in Ben-Sira's day.

11-28. The contrast between the wise who are godly and the fools who are godless.

11*a*. the intent thereof should be, as in Syriac, *his natural tendency* = *Yetser,* which Greek misunderstood.

11*b*. the end, i.e. the highest form, or consummation of.

12*b*. cleverness, lit. 'craftiness.'

13*a*. For **a flood** read with Syriac *a spring of water.*

15*c*. Read with Syriac *If a foolish man beareth it he mocketh at it.*

18*a*. Read with Syriac *As a prison-house is wisdom to a fool.*

20 and **21** are in the wrong order.

22 and **23** are preserved in Hebrew in an ancient Jewish ethical treatise; they are out of order in Greek, and should run: [22a] *The foot of a fool hasteth into a house,* [23b] *but it is good manners to stand outside;* [23a] *the fool through the door looketh into a house,* [22b] *but the cautious man demeans himself humbly.*

25*a*. On the basis of 248 and Syriac read *The lips of babblers* (only) *repeat what others say.*

27. Satan should be *adversary,* as this is all that the Hebrew word meant: see Nu 22 [22, 32]; 1 K 5 [4], 11 [25].

XXII. **1-2. The Contemptibleness of Sloth.**

1*b*. Greek has missed the point of the comparison; read with Syriac *Everyone fleeth from the stench thereof.*

3-6. The Curse of Evil Children.

3*b*. foolish is not expressed in Greek; the point is that any daughter was looked upon as a loss; the ambition of every Jew was to beget sons.

4*a* was misunderstood by Greek; read *A prudent daughter is a treasure to her husband*; a good daughter is likely to make a good wife.

4*b*. I.e. she who brings shame will not find a husband, which is a grief to her father.

5*a*. Syriac reads *mother* instead of **husband,** obviously correctly, as it has just been said that this kind of daughter will not find a husband.

7-18. The type of man that is a fool.

12. Seven days: see Gen 50 [10]; still observed by all orthodox Jews.

13*b*. For **one that hath no understanding** Syriac reads *one that is a pig,* rightly, as the context shows.

13*d*. in his onslaught is lit. in Greek 'in his shaking'; Syriac 'when he shaketh himself,' in reference to the pig after wallowing in the mire.

18. Pales: a better reading is *small stones*; these were placed on walls (and

still are), so that when a jackal jumped on the wall to get into the garden or vineyard the stones were displaced and made a rattling noise in falling, thus giving warning to the watcher. A high wind would also blow these small stones down, as they were in an exposed position.

19-26. On Friendship.

24 is evidently out of place.

25. Read with Syriac *Be not ashamed of a friend who becometh poor, and hide not thyself from . . .*

26. Read *. . . unto him because of thee . . . will beware of thee.*

27-XXIII. 6. On Self-control.

XXIII. **1-5** differ considerably in the Greek MSS. and in the versions; their clauses are out of order; read as follows: [2] *O that one would set scourges over my mind, and a rod of correction over my heart; that they spare* (me) *not for my errors, and overlook not my sins.* [3] *That mine ignorances be not multiplied, and that my sins abound not, and cause me to fall in the sight of mine adversaries, and mine enemy rejoice over me.* [1] (=[4a]) *O Lord, Father, and God of my life,* [4b] *give me not a proud look;* [5] *and turn away concupiscence from me.*

6. For **greediness** read *lust of the flesh.*

7-15. Control of the Tongue.

8*b*. Read with Syriac *And the fool stumbleth through his mouth.*

12. For **that is clothed about,** read *that is to be compared with.*

13. Gross rudeness in the Greek refers to impure talking.

14*d*. **Custom:** better *manner of speech.*

16-27. Warnings against Impurity.

16*d*. **. . . will never cease . . .:** read with Hebrew *. . . he ceaseth not till the fire consumeth him.*

XXIV. **1-34. The Praise of Wisdom.**

1*b*. For **her people** Syriac reads 'the people of God,' showing that the Israelites are meant. With [3] ff. cf. Pr 8 [22-9 12].

3. Covered the earth . . .: cf. Gen 1 [2], 2 [5, 6]; in early Jewish theology the Holy Spirit is often identified with Wisdom.

4*b*. **the pillar of the cloud,** i.e. the *Shekhinah* of later Jewish teaching. The cloud of glory was believed to be the dwelling-place of the Most High.

8. Wisdom is here identified with the Law; it is to this that the verse refers.

9*b*. Syriac reads 'The memorial of me shall never cease': cf. Ex 13 [9. 16]; Dt 6 [8], 11 [18].

20, 21. From these verses are derived several lines in the well-known hymn of St. Bernard of Clairvaux:

> 'Jesu dulcis memoria,
> Dans vera cordi gaudia;
> Sed super mel et omnia
> Eius dulcis præsentia . . .
> Qui te gustant, esuriunt;
> Qui bibunt, adhuc sitiunt.'

XXV. **1-2. Three beautiful and three hateful things.**

1*a, b*. Read with Syriac and Latin *Three things hath my soul desired; and they are lovely in the sight of God and men;* it is Ben-Sira himself who speaks here, not Wisdom.

2*c, d* is extant in Hebrew; Greek adds 'lacking understanding.'

3-6. The beauty of wisdom among the aged.

7-11. Ten types of men who are blessed.

13-15. The most calamitous of ills.

15. Read *There is no poison above the poison of a serpent;* in Hebrew the word for 'head' (*rosh*) also means 'poison.' For **enemy** read with Syriac *woman.*

16-26. The evil of a wicked woman.

17-22 and **23***c, d* are extant in Hebrew.

17. Hebrew reads 'The wickedness of a woman maketh black her countenance' (a later hand added 'of a husband'); 'and darkeneth her face like a bear's' (the later hand changed this to '. . . his face to a bear's').

XXVI. **1-4. The Joy of a Good Wife.**

1, 2*a*, 3 are extant in Hebrew.

2*a*. Read with Hebrew *A worthy wife cherisheth her husband.*

5-12. The Curse of a Wicked Wife.

13-18. The Joy of a Good Wife.

13. bones: cf. Pr 15 [30].

17. in ripe age: read *upon a stately figure.*

18*b*. Read *So are beautiful feet upon firm heels.*

19-27. In 248 and Syriac, added later.

28. Three things which cause grief. These are: a soldier in poverty, a wise man despised, and a good man turned sinner.

29-XXVII. 3. The Temptations of Trade.

XXVII. **1***a*. **A thing indifferent:** read *gain.*

1*b*. **. . . will burn away his eye,** i.e. will be unscrupulous in his dealings (cf. Pr 28 [27]).

2. I.e. by hook or crook one will try to get the better of the other.

4-7. On estimating the worth of men.

8-10. Reward and Retribution.

11-15. On Varieties of Speech.

12. Observe the opportunity: better *watch closely the time,* i.e. do not waste time in the company of fools.

14*a*. Syriac, with one word emended, has 'The oath of the godless maketh . . .'

16-21. Against Betraying Secrets.

16. Cf. Pr 20 [19], 25 [9].

17*a*. For **Love** Syriac has 'Prove.'

17*b*, *c* form one clause; it means that one who has betrayed a friend's secrets has finally broken the friendship; it is therefore useless to follow after him.

18*a*. Read with Syriac *inheritance* for **enemy.**

20. Syriac reads 'For he hath fled like a gazelle out of the net, and like a sparrow out of the snare' (cf. Pr 6 [5]).

22-24. The Hatefulness of Insincerity.

22. **that winketh with the eye,** implying insincerity.

22*b*. A better reading seems to have been preserved in 248: *And he that knoweth him keepeth far from him.*

23*c*. **writhe (with) his mouth,** i.e. alter his speech.

25-29. Nemesis.

25*a*. **For casteth it on his own head** Syriac reads 'it will return upon him.'

25*b*. Latin seems to have preserved the best reading: *And a deceitful blow apportions wounds to the deceiver.*

30-XXVIII. 7. On Forgiveness; Vengeance is the Lord's.

XXVIII. 8-12. Warnings against Quarrelling.

8*b*. Syriac is better: *Keep far from strife, and sins will keep far from thee.*

10*b*. Read *According to the grounds of the strife, so will it increase.*

10*c*. **Strength** should be *position* or *rank*, according to Syriac.

13-26. The mischief wrought by an evil tongue: cf. Jas 3 [1-12].

14. **A third person's tongue:** better *the third tongue*, a regular expression in Rabbinical literature for the slanderer because he makes mischief between two people.

15. **Hath cast out brave women:** the reference is to divorce; a man casts out from his house a noble wife through the tongue of slander; in 7 [26] the same Greek word is used in reference to divorce.

16. The reference is to the husband.

XXIX. 1-13. On Lending and Borrowing.

2. That no mention is made of interest on loans is in accordance with Biblical and Rabbinical teaching.

11. Syriac is to be preferred: *Lay up for thyself a treasure of righteousness* (i.e. alms) *and love, and it shall profit thee more than all that thou hast.*

14-20. Concerning Suretyship.

14. Contrast Pr 6 [1] ff., 17 [18].

18*c*. **Mighty=wealthy.**

XXX. 1-13. The Training of Children.

10*a*. For **laugh not with him,** which is both unnatural and against the habit of Jewish fathers, read with Syriac *do not deal with him according to his pleasure,* i.e. do not let him have his own way.

13*a*. Hebrew 'Discipline thy son, and make his yoke heavy.'

13*b*. **Be an offence against thee:** the text of Hebrew is corrupt, but the margin has 'lest he lift himself up against thee.'

14-20. The Blessing of Good Health.

21-25. An exhortation to put away sorrow, and to be cheerful.

21*b*. Hebrew reads 'And cause not thyself to stumble in thine own counsel,' i.e. do not make yourself miserable through introspective brooding.

23*a*. Hebrew 'Beguile (lit. "entice") thy soul and soothe thine heart.'

25 begins a dislocation of chapters in all the Greek MSS.; in the archetype from which all are derived, two pairs of leaves, containing respectively 30 [25]-33 [13*a*] and 33 [13*b*]-36 [16], were inadvertently transposed. The right order is preserved in the Syriac, Latin, and Hebrew. The AV and RV also have the right order, thanks to the influence of the Vulgate.

25. Read with Hebrew *The sleep of a cheerful heart* (i.e. of one with a cheerful disposition) *is in place of dainties* (evidently suggested by Pr 15 [15], 'he that is of a cheerful heart hath a continual feast'), *and his food goes up upon him* (i.e. agrees with him).

XXXI. 1-4. The Worries of Wealth and Poverty.

1*a*. Hebrew 'The watching of riches . . .,' i.e. one of the worries of wealth is the need of constantly keeping an eye on it.

2. Read with Hebrew *Anxiety about food* (i.e. about obtaining it) *driveth away sleep; even as a sore disease doth it dissipate slumber.*

4*a*. For **in lack of substance** Hebrew has 'for the need of his house'; but another reading is 'to the lessening of his strength.'

4*b* means that he cannot even rest in peace because every cessation of labour means increased poverty.

5-11. The evil and good in wealth.

5*b*. Read with Hebrew *And he that followeth after gain erreth thereby.*

6*a*. Read with Hebrew *Many there are who have bound themselves* (i.e. enslaved themselves) *to gold.*

6*b*. Greek misread Hebrew *And have put their trust in pearls* (or 'corals').

8*b*. Read with Hebrew *And that hath not gone astray after mammon.* Mammon is not used in a bad sense here any more

than 'the rich' in 8^a, the stress being laid on 'that hath not gone astray after'; it is the ordinary Aramaic word for 'wealth' and occurs often in early Jewish literature.

12-24. **'Instruction concerning Food and Wine together.'** This is the Hebrew title to the section.

12*a*. Hebrew 'My son, if thou sittest at a great man's table'; in the next clause Greek is a literal rendering of Hebrew 'Open not thy throat upon it.'

15*b*. Read with Hebrew *and be mindful of thyself regarding the things thou dislikest* (lit. 'hatest'), i.e. even if food which is distasteful be placed before you, remember your self-respect and do not betray your dislike of it.

16*b*. **Lest thou be hated,** i.e. despised, as one form of Hebrew expresses it.

25-31. **The Use and Abuse of Wine.**

26. Read with Hebrew *Like a furnace which trieth the work of a smith, so is wine in the quarrelling of scorners,* to which is added an explanatory couplet not part of the text: 'The man of understanding proveth the work of the worker, so (doth) strong drink (try) the hearts of the wicked.'

XXXII. 1-13. **On Behaviour at a Banquet.**

2*a*. Read with Hebrew *Prepare for their wants* (first), *and then recline,* and—

2*c*. *and enjoy* (the) *esteem* (as a reward) *for thy well-ordering.*

14-17. **The contrast between the godly and the sinful man.**

17*b*. Read with Hebrew *and wresteth the Law to suit his need,* i.e. makes his own interpretation of the Law so as to justify his conduct.

18-24. **The Need of Forethought.**

18*a*. For **will not neglect** read with Hebrew *hideth not.*

18*b*. Read with Hebrew *And a scorner will not receive instruction.*

XXXIII. 1-3. **The Observance of the Law.**

2*b*. Read with Hebrew *And is tossed about like a ship in a storm.*

3*a*. Read with Hebrew . . . *discerneth the word;* probably 'of the Lord' is understood.

4-6. **A Warning against thoughtlessness.** Hebrew is wanting from here to 35^{10} inclusive.

7-15. **Divine Preferences in Nature and Man justified.**

7*a*. Syriac is to be preferred: *Why is one day distinguished from another?* The context points to the distinction between festivals and ordinary days.

12*b*. The reference is to the priesthood; **it was the priests' special privilege to** 'come nigh' to the Lord to minister before Him: see Ezek 40^{46}, 42^{13} and elsewhere for the phrase.

13. The order of the clauses is more logical if read thus: 13^a, 13^c, 13^b, 13^d.

16-18. **The Author's Claim to be a Teacher.**—Had Ben-Sira been able to co-ordinate his material and arrange it in final form these verses would no doubt have been placed at the beginning of his book where they logically belong.

16*a*. Read with Syriac *And I came last.* The next three clauses=30^{25} in Greek.

16*c*. Read *I made progress* for **I got before them.**

19-23. **On Retaining one's Independence.**

24-31. **On the Treatment of Subordinates.**

24*b*. **Discipline**=chastisement.

26*b*. It is most improbable that **racks and tortures** represents the Hebrew: see $29-31$, and cf. Ex $21^{2-6, 20, 21, 26, 27}$ for the relationship between masters and slaves. There is reason to believe that 'stocks and chastisement' would reflect the Hebrew more accurately.

29*b*. Syriac has '. . . that is not according to the Law.' The order of the clauses in $30, 31$ is more logical in Syriac; read 30^a *If thou hast an only servant, let him be as thyself,* 31^b *for like* (the loss of) *thyself, so will be thy loss* (of him). 31^a *If thou hast an only servant, treat him as a brother,* 30^b *and fight not against thine own blood.* . . . Ben-Sira's utilitarian ideas concerning a fellow-creature are redeemed by his humanitarian teaching; Jewish ethics on the subject are thus seen to be of a higher order than Roman.

XXXIV. 1-8. **The Vanity of Dreams and Divinations.**

1. Read with Syriac *He who seeketh vanity findeth delusion, and dreams elate fools.*

2*b*. Read with Syriac *So is he who trusteth in dreams.*

3*a*. Read with Syriac *A dream of the night is like a mirror.*

5*b*. Syriac has 'As thou hopest (so) doth thy heart see,' i.e. the wish is father to the thought.

6. Ben-Sira's exception would be necessitated by such passages as Gen 37^5 ff.; Jg 7^{13} ff.

7*b*. For **they have failed** Syriac has *they have stumbled in their paths,* which is better.

8. Wisdom and the Law are again identified (cf. 24^{23}).

9-17. **Wisdom and the Fear of the Lord: the test of experience.**

11*b*. Read with Syriac *And many things have befallen me;* **this forms a better parallel.**

12*b*. **these things**, i.e. those mentioned in the previous verses.

13*a*. **Spirit**=the principle of life (cf. Is 38 [16] in LXX). **shall live**, i.e. shall continue living, so Syriac.

14*a*. For **shall not play the coward** read with Syriac *shall not lose courage*.

15*b*. For **To whom doth he give heed ?** read with Syriac *On whom doth he trust*.

18-26. Unacceptable Sacrifices.

18. Read, with a slight emendation (cf. Syriac) *The sacrifice of the unrighteous man is a mocking offering ; and unacceptable are the oblations of the godless*.

25. Cf. Nu 19 [11].

26. Fasting was a means of atonement for sin, according to Jewish teaching.

XXXV. 1-11. **Acceptable Sacrifices.**

1*a*. **He that keepeth the law . . .** This does not mean that the Law is observed by offering sacrifices, but that he who fulfils the commandments of the Law is thereby offering an efficacious substitute for sacrifices. This is brought out by the paraphrastic rendering of Syriac: 'If thou hast done that which is written in the Law thou multipliest the service (of God)'; at the same time caution is needed, so far as this particular chapter is concerned, in using the Syriac to elucidate the Greek, for throughout the chapter alterations have been made in a Christian direction. On the other hand, there is evidence to show that for some centuries before Christianity the importance of sacrifices was minimized in certain circles. In this, as in other matters, Ben-Sira's attitude is a well-balanced one; for, while in [1-3] he extols spiritual sacrifices, in those which follow he shows his belief in the need of the sacrificial system.

1*b*. **Peace offering:** see Lev 3.

2. **offereth fine flour :** see Lev 2. **thank offering :** see Lev 7 [12].

6. **sweet savour :** see Lev 1 [6], 3 [5].

7. **the memorial :** see Lev 2 [1-3].

8. **firstfruits :** see Dt 12 [11] in LXX, and cf. Ex 29 [27]; Dt 26 [2]; Pr 3 [9]. From [9] to 38 [27] Hebrew is extant.

9. For **in every gift** Hebrew has 'in all thy works.' After [10] Hebrew adds in the margin 'A lender to the Lord is he that giveth to the poor, and who hath power of recompense if not he ?' This may well be intended to be part of the text; it occurs in the same form in the text of Syriac.

12-20. The Helper of the helpless, and the Avenger of the oppressed.

12. Read with Hebrew *Bribe not, for he will not receive, and trust not in a sacrifice of extortion ; for a God of judgement is he, and with him there is no partiality*.

XXXVI. 1-17. **A Prayer to God for Israel.** With this prayer should be compared some of the sections of the prayer known as *Shemôneh 'Esreh* (the 'Eighteen Benedictions') in the Jewish Liturgy; there are also parallels between it and other parts of the Liturgy.

1. Hebrew begins 'Save us, O God of all.'

3. For **the strange nations** Hebrew has 'a strange nation,' i.e. the Greek nation; the Hellenistic spirit was beginning to have an evil effect upon many Jews.

4. Read with Hebrew *As thou didst sanctify thyself* (or *show thyself holy*) *in us* (i.e. so far as we were concerned) *in the sight of them, so glorify thyself in them* (i.e. in regard to them) *in our sight*. Just as in time past God vindicated His holiness by punishing His chosen people in the very sight of the heathen for sinning against Him (see e.g. Ezek 28 [25]), so now let His glory be shown by punishing this 'strange nation' in the sight of His people.

5*b*. Cf. Is 45 [14].

8*a*. Read with Hebrew *Hasten the end, and ordain the appointed time*; 'the end' and 'the appointed time' are almost technical eschatological terms—they certainly had become so by the middle of the 2nd century B.C.: cf. Dan. 11 [27, 35]—and refer to the end of the present age and the inauguration of the Messianic era. The passage is one of but a few references to the Messianic hope contained in the book; the Apocalyptists with their eschatological teaching were only just beginning to assert themselves.

8*b*. Read with Hebrew *For who may say to thee, What doest thou ?* (cf. Is 45 [9]; Ac 1 [7, 8]); times and world-happenings are in the hands of God to determine.

9. Hebrew omits.

10. Ben-Sira seems to be pointing, though in a cryptic way, to some enemy ruler. Hebrew reads 'Bring to nought the head of the princes of Moab, that saith, There is none beside me'; by using a quotation (Nu 24 [17] from LXX) he is able to veil his actual allusion. There the word is 'corners,' but this is rendered 'princes' in the versions, and evidently that was also the sense in which Ben-Sira understood the word.

12*b*. Hebrew has, more definitely, *Israel, whom thou didst surname Firstborn*.

14. Read with Hebrew *Fill Zion with*

thy majesty, and thy temple with thy glory.

15*b*. Read with Hebrew *And establish the vision spoken in thy name* (cf. 1 K 8 [20]).

16*b*. Better *and let thy prophets be proved trustworthy* (=Hebrew).

17*a, b*. Read with Hebrew *Hear the prayer of thy servants, according to thy good favour towards thy people.*

18-20. Some Miscellaneous Proverbs.

21-26. A good wife is a blessed possession.

21. Corrupt in Hebrew and wanting in Syriac. The point of it is that while a woman has to accept any man for her husband (the matter was arranged by the father), a man can make his own choice; this latter is implied by [21*b*], 'Yet is one woman (daughter) more pleasant than another.'

22*b*. Read with Hebrew *And excelleth every delight of the eye.*

23*a*. Hebrew has 'If, moreover, she possesseth a soothing tongue.'

23*b*. He who is the husband of such a wife is happy beyond ordinary human experience.

24*a*. Read with Hebrew . . . *the best* (or *highest*) *possession*; in the next clause read *a pillar of support.*

25*b*. Hebrew: '. . . no wife is a wanderer and homeless.'

26. Read with Hebrew *Who trusteth an armed band, that rusheth from city to city? So is the man that hath no nest, but resteth* (where he can) *when evening falls.*

XXXVII. **1-6. On Friendship, false and true.**

2*b*. Hebrew reads 'A deeply loved friend who changeth into an enemy.'

3. Neither Hebrew nor Greek represents what was probably the original reading; this can, however, be obtained with reasonable certainty by utilizing both and rendering *O wicked imagination* (*Yetser ha-ra'*), *wherefore wast thou formed* (*created*), *to fill the face of the world with deceit?* The Hebrew reads 'Alas, saith the wicked, wherefore was I formed? . . .' and the Greek 'whence comest thou rolling in . . .' was apparently substituted for the original 'wherefore wast thou created' (the two Greek words are rather similar); so that while originally both Hebrew and Greek spoke of the creation of the 'evil tendency,' the text of each was altered so as to avoid the implication that the 'evil tendency' was created by God

4*a*. Greek misunderstood Hebrew: *Evil is the friend that looketh to the table* (of another), *but . . .*; the reference is to the type of 'friend' whose friendship only lasts as long as he can sponge on the hospitality of another.

5. Greek is meaningless; it looks as though in the first clause it followed a variant of [4*a*] in Hebrew; in [4*b*] it more or less follows Hebrew, which reads 'A good friend (is he who) fighteth with the enemy, and taketh hold of the shield against the adversary.'

6 is a continuation of this theme in Hebrew: 'Forget not a friend during a conflict, and forsake him not when thou takest the spoil.'

7-15. On Counsellors, true and false.

14. Read with Hebrew *The heart of a man declareth* (to him) *his opportunities better than seven watchmen on a watch-tower.* However excellent it may be to be guided by the counsels of others, there are occasions when a man is his own best guide.

16-26. On Wisdom, true and false.

17, 18*a*. Read with Hebrew *The roots of the heart's deliberations send forth four branches.*

21. Omitted in Hebrew and Syriac.

24, 25. Hebrew transposes, reading 'The life of a man is days but few, but the life of Jeshurun days innumerable. He who is wise to himself shall have his fill of enjoyment, and all who see him account him happy.' For 'Jeshurun,' which is original, Hebrew has another reading 'Israel'; the former is a poetic name for Israel, and means 'upright one,' an ideal conception of the nation personified (cf. Dt 32 [15], 33 [5, 26]; Is 44 [2]).

27-31. On Moderation in eating and drinking. With this section cf. 31 [19-22].

XXXVIII. **1-15. On Doctors and their Patients.**

1*a*. Hebrew has 'Make a friend of the physician . . .'; the words 'with the honours due to him' only occur in Greek.

2*a*. Hebrew has 'It is from God that the physician getteth wisdom.'

7. Read with Hebrew *By means of them the physician assuageth pain.*

8. **Works** refer, as in [6], to those of God; the apothecary, like the physician, is only an instrument in the hand of God.

9-11 deal with what, according to Jewish teaching, was the sick man's duty to God, viz. prayer, repentance, and atonement.

14. The meaning is brought out more clearly in Hebrew: *For he also maketh supplication to God to make his diagnosis successful, and* (so too) *the treatment* (lit. healing), *that it may bring about recovery.*

15 probably means that the man who sins against God will be punished by sickness (cf. 1 Cor 11 30), and will thus require the aid of a physician.

16-23. On Mourning for the Dead.

16. The Greek paraphrase obscures the point; Hebrew has *and hide not thyself when he becomes a corpse*, i.e. when the body is ready for burial. The reference here is to relatives who sometimes hid themselves before a burial in order to escape the expense entailed by extravagant funeral fashions.

18*a*. **death**: Hebrew 'harm'; i.e. if one gives way to overmuch sorrow the health is affected.

19. Hebrew omits; in the second clause we should probably read *and a life of affliction is hurtful to the heart.*

20. Read with Hebrew *Then let thy heart be no more occupied with him; dismiss the remembrance of him*, (yet) *remember* (thine own) *end.* Ben-Sira's advice (which cannot appeal to us) is that sorrow, in moderation, is to be exhibited at the death of a friend; but when once the body has been interred, sorrow is to cease and the very memory of the friend is to be put away. In his better moments, however, Ben-Sira expresses worthier thoughts (see 41 11-13).

21*a*. Greek entirely misses the meaning; read with Hebrew *Remember him not, for he hath no hope*; Ben-Sira's lugubrious belief regarding the Hereafter is pointedly expressed in these words.

24-34. Though inferior to the vocation of the Scribe, the vocation of the Craftsman is honourable.

24*a*. Hebrew has 'the wisdom of the scribe increaseth wisdom'; the reference is to the constant increase of the sum of knowledge treasured up by scribal tradition (see 39 1-11).

XXXIX. **1-11. The Scribe's Activities.**

1*a*. Syriac rightly adds *to the fear of the Lord* at the end of the clause.

1. **the dark sayings of parables** (cf. Wisd 8 8).

2, 3. The reference is all to Oral Tradition.

9*b*. For **it** Syriac, rightly, *his name.*

11. Greek is difficult to understand; comparing it with Syriac, we may conjecture that the original ran approximately: 'If he continue (living) he shall be accounted happier than a thousand; and when he rests (i.e. dies) his name sufficeth (to hold him in remembrance).'

12-35. A Hymn of Praise for the creative works of God.

15*c*. Hebrew is extant, with the exception of a few verses, from here to the end of the book.

15*c, d*. Read with Hebrew *With songs of the harp and of stringed instruments; and thus shall ye say, with a shout*; then begins the Hymn proper, to which these verses are introductory.

16*b*. Read with Hebrew *And for every need he provideth in its time.*

17*a*. Read with Hebrew *None may say, This is worse than that.*

31*b*. This clause does not occur in Hebrew, but looks like a variant of the second of the two clauses added to 30 in Hebrew.

34. Cf. 21. 'It is clear from the context that the writer means to teach that no one is justified in saying that one created thing is worse than another, because each thing is indispensable for its own special purpose; one thing may be relatively more important than another, but from the point of view of its *raison d'être* each created thing is equal because of its being indispensable. The particular object for which any given thing exists makes it from that point of view at least as important as anything else in the world. . . . Ben-Sira is apparently attacking heterodox teaching which had come under his notice' (*C.B.*, 264 f.).

35. Cf. Ps 145 21. **For the Lord** Hebrew has 'the Holy One,' a frequent expression for God in post-biblical Jewish writings.

XL. **1-11. The troubles which are the lot of all men.**

1*a*. **Great travail** means *constant toil.*

9 enumerates the evils upon all flesh (and upon sinners sevenfold more) pointed to in 8. The list of evils differs a little in Hebrew.

10. Greek paraphrases Hebrew: 'Evil was created for the wicked man, and because of him destruction departeth not,' or (with a slight emendation) 'is imposed.'

11*b*. Greek has evidently misread Hebrew: *And that which is from on high* (returneth) *on high.*

12-17. Injustice shall be destroyed.

12. Hebrew omits.

13, 14. Greek and Hebrew are obscure; render perhaps: 'Wealth unjustly gotten is like a swiftly flowing torrent, and like a watercourse swollen (lit. "mighty") in a thunder-storm; when it riseth rocks are rolled away, even so doth it (i.e. dishonest gain) come suddenly to an end.'

15. Read with Hebrew *A branch* (sprung) *from violence hath no shoot in it, for the root of the godless is on the point of a crag.* The meaning is that 'the evil man has no posterity, he is like the seed which fell on a rock.'

16. A further comparison illustrating how the wicked are swept away without posterity, the want of which was always regarded by the Jews as a dire calamity.

17. Read with Hebrew *But kindness shall never be moved, and righteousness abideth for ever.*

18-27. The Joys of Life compared; the greatest of all is the Fear of the Lord.

18*a*. Hebrew 'A life of wine and strong drink is pleasant' (lit. 'sweet'); the sentiment is somewhat offensive, but cf. [20]. Ben-Sira has some indelicate ideas here and there. But it is possible that the text has suffered corruption, for the second clause speaks of the finding of a treasure being above *both*, whereas a 'life of wine and strong drink' is only one thing; and in all the verses which follow the first clause always mentions two things.

20. Hebrew 'Wine and strong drink rejoice the heart; but better than both is the affection of lovers.'

23*b*. Read with Hebrew *But better than both is a discreet wife.*

27*b*. Is 4 [5].

28-30. A Beggar's Life is no Life at all.

30. Read with Hebrew *In the mouth of an insatiable man begging is sweet; but inwardly it burneth as fire.*

XLI. 1-4. **Concerning Death.**

1*a*. For **in his possessions** Hebrew has 'in his habitation.'

1*b*. Read with Hebrew *To him that is at ease and prospereth in all*; and in—

1*c*. . . . *strength to enjoy luxury.*

2*a*. The interjection in Hebrew is one expressive of satisfaction, equivalent to our 'Hail!' In [1] it expresses regret. Hebrew 'Hail, Death; how welcome is thy decree to a man of sorrows failing in strength, that stumbleth and knocketh against everything, that is broken and hath lost hope.'

3. Read with Hebrew *Fear not Death,* (it is) *thy destiny; remember that the former and the latter share it with thee,* i.e. those who lived before thee and those who will come after.

3*c* in Greek belongs to [4*a*] in Hebrew, **This is the sentence:** Hebrew has 'portion.'

4*a*. Read with Hebrew *And how canst thou withstand* (lit. 'despise') *the decree of the Most High?* The text reads 'Law' (Torah) for 'decree'; but Torah is never used in this connexion; the text must, therefore, be emended.

4*b*. In Hebrew the numbers are in the reverse order.

4*c*. Read with Hebrew *In Sheol there are no reproaches concerning life,* i.e. men will not wrangle about the length of time they lived in this world when they are in the next.

5-13. The contrast between the end of the ungodly and the honour in which the name of the righteous is held.

14-15. Wisdom must be manifested.

16-XLII. 8. 'Instruction concerning Shame.' This title occurs in Hebrew.

XLII. 2*a*. For **his covenant** read with Hebrew *the statute,* i.e. individual commands of the Law.

3*b*. Read with Hebrew *and of the division of an inheritance or a property.*

4*a*. Read with Hebrew *of the small dust of the scales and balance*; after this Hebrew has another clause, omitted in Greek, 'and of testing measure and weight' (lit. 'ephah and stone').

4*b*. Read with Hebrew *Of buying, whether much or little.*

5*a*. Hebrew is somewhat mutilated, but we should probably read *And of profit from dealings with a merchant.* The remainder is omitted in Hebrew.

6, 7. The construction of the sentences changes.

6. With a little necessary emendation Hebrew reads *For an evil wife a seal* (used metaphorically; she must be kept close); *and where many hands are a key* (to keep them from taking things).

7*a*. Read with Hebrew *Upon what is deposited make a reckoning* (or perhaps *a mark*).

9-14. The Care of Daughters.

15-XLIII. 33. In Praise of God, the Lord of Nature.

XLII. 15. Hebrew has a fourth clause: 'And the work in which he delighteth is according to his decree.'

16, 17. Greek paraphrases Hebrew: 'The rising sun is revealed over all (things), and the glory of Jehovah (is revealed) over his works. (Even) the holy ones [i.e. the angels] of God are unable to recount the wondrous works of his might; (yet) God hath given strength to his hosts to stand in the presence of his glory.'

22 has fallen out in Hebrew.

24. Read with Hebrew *They are all different one from another, but he hath not made any one of them superfluous.*

1*a*. For **the pride** read with Hebrew *the beauty.*

1*b*. Read with Hebrew *And the vault of heaven poureth out light* (emended).

2*a*. Following the marginal reading of Hebrew, read *The sun when he goeth forth poureth out heat.*

2*b*. Read with Hebrew *How awe-inspiring is the work of Jehovah!*

3*a*. Read with Hebrew *At noontide*

he scorcheth (lit. 'causeth to boil') *the world.*

4. The difficult Hebrew may be tentatively rendered ' (Like) a glowing furnace which causeth the metal to become heated, (so) the sun's dart setteth the mountains ablaze. The rays from the sun scorch the inhabited earth, and with its light it dazzleth the eyes.'

6*b*. Read with Hebrew *To rule over periods* [i.e. to mark the division of periods, the months], *and to be an everlasting sign.*

8*a*. Read with Hebrew *Month by month she reneweth herself.*

8*c, d*. Read with Hebrew *A beacon for the hosts on high, she paveth the firmament with her brightness.*

13. Greek has misunderstood Hebrew, which reads *His power sendeth out the lightning, and maketh bright its flashes in judgement.*

16, 17. Some Greek cursives, 248 and others, follow the order of Hebrew, which, partly emended, reads: [17a] 'The voice of his thunder maketh the earth to be in anguish; [16a] By his strength he shaketh the mountains, [16b] and the fear of him stirreth up the south wind, [17b] and the whirlwind to the north, and hurricane and tempest. [17c] Like birds he sprinkleth his snow, and like locusts settling is the coming down thereof.'

18*a*. Read with Hebrew *The beauty of its whiteness dazzleth the eyes.*

19*b*. Read with Hebrew *And he causeth flowers to bloom like sapphires*; the reference is to the sparkling hoar-frost on shrubs.

20. Read with Hebrew *The cold of the north wind he causeth to blow, and hardeneth the pond like a bottle* [i.e. the glass of which the bottle is made; the reading is from the margin, the text itself is mutilated]; *upon every gathering of waters he spreadeth a crust, and the pond putteth on as it were a breastplate.*

21. As in so many cases in this section, Greek (where it has not misunderstood Hebrew) gives a paraphrase; read with Hebrew *The produce of the mountains it drieth up as with scorching heat* [i.e. the effect of the chilly north wind is like that of the hot sirocco, the east wind]; *and* (it drieth up) *the sprouting verdure as a flame.*

22. Hebrew again is much clearer than Greek: *The healing of all* (these) *things is the dropping from the clouds,* (namely) *the dew which speedily refresheth the parched ground.* The fall of dew in Palestine is far more copious than in Europe.

24*a*. Read with Hebrew *They that go down to the sea tell of its wide extent* (lit. ' end ').

25. Read with Hebrew *Therein are marvels, the wonders of His works; all manner of living things and monsters of the deep.*

26. Read with Hebrew *For his own sake he maketh his work to prosper, and by his word he worketh his pleasure.*

28*a*. Read with Hebrew *We will still magnify, though we cannot fathom.*

30. Read with Hebrew *Ye that magnify Jehovah, lift up your voice, as much as ye are able, for there is yet more! Ye that exalt him, renew your strength, and be not wearied, though ye cannot fathom (him).*

31. This verse has fallen out in Hebrew.

32*b*. Read with Hebrew *And I have seen . . .*

XLIV.-L. **24. 'The Praise of the Fathers of Old.'**—This title is given in Hebrew. This long section offers an historical retrospect in praise of OT heroes, and ranges from Enoch to Nehemiah, together with an appendix in praise of the high priest Simeon, the son of Jochanan (cf. Pss 78, 105, 106, 135, 136; Wisd 10; 1 Mac 2 [51-60]; 3 Mac 6 [4-8]; Ac 7; Heb 11).

XLIV. 1-15. **General Introduction.**

1. Read with Hebrew *Let me now sing the praises of men of piety, of our fathers in their generations* (i.e. in their chronological order).

2. Greek is, as so often, a paraphrase; it gives the general sense of Hebrew, but not accurately. Hebrew has *Great glory did the Most High allot unto them, and they were great from the days of old.*

16-18. **Enoch and Noah.**

16. The Greek, **Enoch pleased the Lord . . .**, is taken from Gen 5 [24] LXX. Hebrew has 'Enoch was found perfect, and he walked with Jehovah and was taken.' In the next clause Hebrew has 'A sign of knowledge [i.e. of the Lord] to . . .'

17. Greek is a paraphrase; read with Hebrew *Noah the righteous was found perfect; in the time of destruction he became the renewer* [the Hebrew word for 'renewer' is very difficult to render in English; it contains the idea of substitution]; *for his sake there was a remnant, and because of his covenant* [i.e. the covenant made with him] *the Flood ceased.*

19-23. **Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.**

21*c, d*. These lines have fallen out in Hebrew.

22*b*. Read with Hebrew *The covenant of all his ancestry he gave him.*

23b. The margin in Hebrew of this line seems to offer the right text: *And he gave him the title of Firstborn* (cf. Ex 4 [22]; Hos 11 [1]).

23f, g belong to the Moses section.

XLV. **1-5. Moses.**

2. Hebrew text is mutilated, but the last word of [2a] is 'Elohim' (God), which Greek apparently understood in the sense of 'angels' (wrongly translated 'saints' in RV); the clause was probably based on Ex 4 [16]: '. . . and thou shalt be to him as God'; or 7 [1]: 'And Jehovah said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god unto Pharaoh.'

6-22. Aaron.

7b. Read with Hebrew *And bestowed upon him his majesty* (see Nu 27 [20]; 1 Ch 29 [25]).

7c. Read with Hebrew *And blessed him with his glory.*

8. Greek is again a paraphrase of Hebrew: *And he clothed him with the perfection of adornment, and adorned him with beautiful vestments—the breeches, the tunic, and the robe.*

23-26. Phinehas.

23c. Hebrew, which is paraphrased in Greek, runs: 'And he stood in the breach for his people [see Nu 25 [11]; Ps 106 [23, 30]; while his heart prompted him . . .' (cf. Ex 25 [2]). The fact that Phinehas is placed beside Moses and Aaron 'as a third' is worth noting.

24. Greek is inaccurate; read with Hebrew *Therefore for him also he established a decree, a covenant of peace to maintain the sanctuary; that to him and to his seed should belong the high priesthood for ever.*

26c, d. Read with Hebrew *that your prosperity may never cease, nor your power, for perpetual generations.* The reference here is to Simeon, the son of Onias (see 50 [1] ff.), who would be regarded as the descendant of Phinehas, and thus the living representative of the seed of Aaron.

XLVI. **1-10. Joshua and Caleb.**

1. Read with Hebrew *A mighty man of valour was Joshua, the son of Nun* [cf. Jos 4 [14]], *a minister of Moses in the prophetical office* [cf. Ex 33 [11]], *who was created that he might be, according to his name* (Joshua means 'Jahweh is salvation'), *a great salvation for his chosen ones; to take vengeance upon the enemy, and to give an inheritance unto Israel.*

2. Read with Hebrew *How glorious was he when he stretched forth his hand, and brandished his javelin against the city* (i.e. Ai: see Jos 8 [18, 26]).

3. Read with Hebrew *Who was he* (that was able) *to stand before him* (cf. Jos 1 [5]), *when he fought the wars of Jehovah?* (cf. Jos 10 [14] and the ancient 'Book of the wars of Jehovah' referred to in Nu 21 [14]).

5b. Read with Hebrew (reconstructed text) *When he was in sore straits* (and) *his enemies* (were) *round about him.*

5c, d. Read with Hebrew *And the Most High answered him with hailstones and bolts* (cf. Jos 10 [11]).

6b. Greek is corrupt; though Hebrew is mutilated it must have run approximately: 'He cast them down (i.e. the hailstones and bolts) upon the hostile people' (see Jos 10 [11]).

6c. **And in the going down,** i.e. the steep pass of Beth-horon.

6d, e. Read with Hebrew *That all the nations devoted to destruction might know that Jehovah was watching their fighting* (cf. Jos 10 [14]).

7c-e. Read with Hebrew *In that they stood firm when the congregation broke loose, to turn away wrath from the assembly, and to cause the evil report to cease* (cf. Nu 14 [1] ff.).

8a, b. Read with Hebrew *Wherefore also they two were set apart from among the six hundred thousand footmen* (cf. Nu 11 [21], 14 [38]).

9c. Read with Hebrew *To cause him to tread upon the high places of the land* (cf. Dt 33 [29]; Jos 14 [12]).

10a. For **the children of Israel** Hebrew has 'the seed of Jacob.'

11-12. The Judges.

12a. **May their bones flourish again. . . .** The same curious expression recurs in 49 [10]; it does not imply belief in a resurrection such as the Jews held in later days, in which Ben-Sira did not believe; he, therefore, must have used it in a metaphorical sense, meaning 'May their memory flourish.' But it is certain that in very much earlier days the Semites believed in the possibility of the return of the dead; they would, therefore (so it would have been held), require their bones; hence the custom of pouring water on graves, and prayer for rain on them, in order to preserve life in them. The idea of life residing in the bones, doubtless on account of their hardness and long resistance to decay, is widespread among uncultured peoples. The expression must therefore be regarded as a vestige witnessing to some early superstition (cf. Is 66 [14]; Jer 8 [1, 2]; and the horror of burning bones in Am 2 [1]).

12b. Read with Hebrew *And may their name sprout afresh* (cf. Job 14 [7]) *for their children.*

13-20. Samuel.

13. Greek is corrupt. Hebrew has six lines: 'Honoured by his people and beloved by his Maker was "he that was asked for" [a play on the name Samuel] from his mother's womb; a Nazirite of Jehovah in the prophetical office, Samuel, a judge, and one who ministered in the priest's office. By the word of God he set up the kingdom, and anointed princes over the people.'

14. Read with Hebrew *By means of the commandment* [reconstructed text] *he commanded the congregation* [cf. 1 S 7 [3] ff.], *and visited the tents of Jacob* (emended text).

15. Hebrew is much mutilated.

16. Cf. 1 S 7 [5] ff.

18. Greek misunderstood Hebrew in part, which reads *And he subdued the strong places of the enemy, and destroyed all the princes of the Philistines.*

20*a*. Read with Hebrew *Moreover, after he died he was enquired of* (cf. 1 S 28 [7] ff.).

20*b*. For his end Hebrew has 'his way,' i.e. his destiny.

XLVII. **1-11. David.**

1*b*. Read with Hebrew *To stand in the presence of David.*

3*b*. Hebrew has '. . . as with calves of Bashan'; but the parallelism 'kids' makes it probable that in this instance Greek (=Syriac) has the better reading.

4*d*. Read with Hebrew *And broke the pride of Goliath.*

6, 7. Greek seems to have misunderstood Hebrew, which reads 'Therefore the daughters sang of him [cf. 1 S 18 [6, 7]; Ps 68 [12] in Hebrew], and honoured him with (the name of "the slayer of) ten thousand." *When he had put on the diadem he fought and subdued the enemy round about.* And he put cities among the Philistines [this last clause is corrupt; we should perhaps read "And he destroyed the cities of the Philistines"], and brake in pieces their power [lit. "horn"] unto this day.'

12-22. Solomon.

12. Greek inaccurate; read with Hebrew *And for his sake* [i.e. David's] *there stood up after him a wise son who dwelt in safety.* Solomon's prosperous reign is regarded as due to his father, who was, unlike his son, faithful to the God of Israel. We have thus formulated here what in later times became an accepted doctrine of Judaism, viz. the 'merits of the fathers' (*Zekûth Abôth*). 'The thought of the solidarity of Israel often finds expression in Rabbinical writings; Israel is one self-contained organism, all the component parts of which are dependent upon each other in spiritual things, so that whatever may be lacking in righteousness to one can be supplied by others who are more righteous. Naturally, those who were regarded above all others as righteous were the patriarchs of old, whose good deeds were so great and so many in number that some of them could be imputed to men of later generations, whose lives were not so rich in well-doing; cf. e.g. the words in the Midrash *Shir ha-shirim* ("Song of Songs") on 1 [5] ("I am black, but comely"): "The congregation of Israel says, I am black through my own deeds, but comely through the work of my fathers." It is said of Solomon that before he sinned he had accumulated much merit; but after he sinned all the blessings which he received were due to the merits of his fathers (Midrash *Qoheleth rabba* to 1 [1]); it is precisely the same thought which lies at the base of the verse before us' (Box and Oesterley in Charles's *Apoc. and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.*, i, 497). There is an echo of this doctrine in Rom 11 [28]: '. . . but as touching the election they are beloved for the fathers' sake'; but St. Paul does not use the idea so as to suggest any accumulation of merit or its transference from one to another.

13*c*, *d*. Read with Hebrew *Who prepared a house for his Name, and set up a sanctuary for ever.*

15*b*. Read with Hebrew *And didst gather parables like the sea* (emended text).

16 has fallen out in Hebrew.

23-24. Solomon's Successors.

23. The Hebrew text is much mutilated.

23*c*. Greek has misunderstood Hebrew, which reads in reference to Rehoboam (though he is not mentioned until the next line): *Great in folly and lacking in understanding.*

23*e*. Read with Hebrew *And then arose . . . of him let there be no memorial . . .*

24, 25. Greek either had a different text or has become corrupt; read with Hebrew *To drive them* [i.e. Ephraim: cf. 2 K 17 [22, 23]; Jer 27 [10]] *from the land. And their sin became very great, and they sold themselves to do all manner of evil* (cf. 1 K 21 [20]).

XLVIII. **1-11. Elijah.**

2*a*. Greek paraphrases; read with Hebrew *And he broke for them the staff of bread.*

4*a*. Read with Hebrew *How terrible wast thou, Elijah!*

5*b*. Read with Hebrew *. . . according to the good pleasure of Jehovah.*

10*a, b.* Read with Hebrew *Who art ready for the time, as it is written* [i.e. in Mal 4 5, 6 (3 23, 24 in Hebrew)], *to still wrath before the fierce anger of God.* The words 'for the time' refer to the expected advent of the Messiah; this is one of the very few passages in which Ben-Sira makes any reference to the Messianic Hope.

12-16. Elisha.

12 is much mutilated in the three first lines in Hebrew, but the last three lines are clear; Hebrew has six lines, of which Greek is a poor and incomplete paraphrase. For 12*c, d* of Greek, read with Hebrew *In double measure did he multiply signs, and marvellous was all that went from out his mouth. All his days he moved before no man* [cf. 2 K 3 13-15, 6 15, 16, 30 ff.], *and no flesh exercised authority over his spirit.*

17-25. Hezekiah and Isaiah.

XLIX. **1-3. Josiah**

1*a-c.* Greek paraphrases Hebrew, which reads *The name of Josiah is as sweet-smelling incense, that is well mixed, the work of the apothecary. The memorial of him is sweet in the palate like honey.*

2*a.* Greek is either corrupt or read a different text; read with Hebrew *For he was grieved at their backslidings.*

3. Read with Hebrew *And he gave his heart wholly unto God, and in the days of violence he practised piety* (cf. 2 K 23 3, 25).

4-7. Jeremiah; Judah's evil kings.

4*d.* Read with Hebrew *The kings of Judah, until their end*; the reference is probably to the end of their succession; this is implied in Greek.

6. Read with Hebrew *And so the Holy City was burned, and the ways thereof laid waste, through Jeremiah* (cf. 2 K 25 9; Jer 36 30, 31).

7*b.* Read with Hebrew *And he a prophet formed from the womb*; but with Greek *he was sanctified* (cf. Jer 1 5).

7*c, d.* Greek has followed LXX of Jer 1 5, 10, while Hebrew has followed the Hebrew text.

8-10. Ezekiel and the Twelve Prophets.

8. Greek is a paraphrase; read with Hebrew *Ezekiel saw a vision, and described the different beings of the chariot* (see Ezek 1 1 ff.).

11-13. Zerubbabel, Joshua the son of Josedek, and Nehemiah.

11, 12 are much mutilated in Hebrew.

12*a.* Jesus is the Greek form of Joshua.

12*c.* Read with Hebrew *And set up on high the holy Temple.*

13*b-d.* Read with Hebrew *Who raised up our ruins, and healed our breaches, and set up the gates and bars.*

14-16. A Final Reference to the Early Heroes.

14*a.* Read with Hebrew *Few like Enoch have beeen created on the earth.*

L. 1-24. Simeon, the son of Jochanan, the High Priest.—This section should begin with 15*b* of the preceding chapter; Hebrew reads 'Great among his brethren, and the glory of his people (was),' then follows 1 of this chapter.

1*a.* The Simeon here mentioned was the second of this name; he lived at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. Onias is the Greek form of Jochanan (=John).

1*b.* Read with Hebrew *In whose time the House* [i.e. the Temple: cf. Ezek 40] *was renovated.*

3. Read with Hebrew (emended text) *In whose time* [lit. 'generation'] a *reservoir was built, a water-cistern like the sea in abundance.*

5*a.* Read with Hebrew . . . *when he looked forth from the tabernacle* (lit. 'tent'). The reference is to the ritual on the Day of Atonement.

8*c.* Read with Hebrew *As a sprout of Lebanon in the days of summer.*

12*d.* Read with Hebrew *Like young cedar-trees in Lebanon*; the reference is to the brethren, i.e. the officiating priests standing round the high priest.

14*b.* Hebrew, more accurately, *And arranging the rows of wood of the Most High,* i.e. the wood for kindling the burnt sacrifice.

20*d.* Read with Hebrew *And he glorified himself in the Name of the Lord,* i.e. because he was privileged to utter the Holy Name, which was unlawful for anyone else.

21. Read with Hebrew *And again they* [i.e. the congregation] fell down (now) *to receive the pardon of God from him,* i.e. absolution from the high priest.

22*a.* It is on this line that Martin Rinckart's well-known hymn 'Nun danket alle Gott' is founded ('Now thank we all our God').

23. Read with Hebrew *May he grant you wisdom of heart, and may there be peace among you.*

24. Hebrew reads differently: *May his mercy be established with Simeon, and may he raise up for him the covenant of Phinehas; may one never be cut off from him* [i.e. may there never be wanting one to continue the succession of the Aaronic high priesthood]; *and as for his seed, (may it be) as the days of Heaven.* The omission of this in Greek was due to the fact that when Ben-Sira's grandson

made his translation the 'covenant of Phinehas' had come to an end.

25-26. Three Detested Nations.—A fragment of a later addition.

27-29. Subscription to the Book.

27. Read with Hebrew *Wise instruction and apt proverbs of Jeshua, the son of Eleazar, the son of Sira.*

29*b*. Read with Hebrew *For the fear of the Lord is life.*

LI. 1-12. A Prayer of Jesus, the Son of Sirach.—This title occurs in Greek, but not in Hebrew or Syriac. It is not a prayer in the sense of petition; but in the Jewish Church the characteristic notes of prayer are 'praise and thanksgiving to God for mercies vouchsafed, the former element being emphasized by the doxology which concludes every prayer; actual petitions, though frequent, take a subordinate position' (see further the present writer's *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, 52 f. [1925]). It will be seen that these characteristics are illustrated in the Prayer of Ben-Sira.

1. In Hebrew the first and second clauses are transposed. For **God my Saviour** Hebrew has 'God of my salvation,' as in Ps 18 [46], 25 [5].

1*c*. Read with Hebrew *I will declare thy Name, O Strength of my life* (cf. Ps 27 [1]).

2. In Hebrew every clause of this verse re-echoes the Psalms; it varies in a number of minor particulars from Greek, so that it will be best to quote it in full: 'Thou hast redeemed my soul from death (Ps 49 [15], 55 [18], 56 [13]), thou hast kept back my flesh from the Pit (Job 33 [18]), and from the power of Sheol hast thou delivered my feet (Ps 25 [15], 49 [15]); thou hast rescued me (Ps 144 [7, 11]) from the slander of the people, from the scourge of a slanderous tongue (Ps 15 [3]), and from the lips of them that turn aside unto lies (Ps 40 [4]); thou hast been on my side against them that rose up against me (Ps 3 [1], 56 [9]).

3*a*. **and greatness of thy name** does not occur in Hebrew: it overloads the clause.

3*b*. Read with Hebrew (slightly emended) *Out of the snare of those that watch for my stumbling.*

3*d*. Hebrew 'Out of . . . didst thou save me.'

6*a*. Read with Hebrew *And the arrows of a deceitful tongue* (cf. Ps 52 [2]). The reference to a king in Greek is difficult to account for; it may have been through a text corruption; or possibly it was an explanatory gloss, the writer thinking of a concrete case in which somebody, perhaps Ben-Sira himself, was slandered to the Seleucid ruler.

7. Read with Hebrew *And I turned about on every side . . . and I looked for one to uphold . . .*

8*b*. For **thy working** read with Hebrew *his mercies.*

10. Read with Hebrew *Yea, I cried, O Jehovah, my Father art thou* (adding 'For thou art the Hero of my salvation'), *forsake me not in the day of trouble, in the day of waste and desolation.*

11*b*. For **with thanksgiving** Hebrew reads *in prayer.*

It will be noticed that this Psalm of Thanksgiving is saturated with the phraseology of the Psalms; e.g. [1]= Ps 138 [1, 6]; cf. Ps 88 [3]. A point of special interest about it is that in phrases as well as words there are a number of parallels between it and the most important prayer of the Jewish Liturgy, called *Shemôneh 'Esreh* ('the Eighteen Benedictions'), which dates from long before Christian times. The questions of the authenticity and integrity of this Psalm cannot be dealt with here. It must suffice to say that, as a whole, it probably did not form part of the book as penned by Ben-Sira, but that it was inserted, in whole or in part, not very long after. [6-9] differ slightly in structure from the rest, and may quite possibly have belonged to the original book; the mention of the choice of the sons of Zadok for the priesthood ([9]) necessitates a date prior to 153 B.C., because it was just about this time that the ancient high-priestly house was driven out by the powerful family of Tobias. The rest of the Psalm must be regarded as having been added later, but not much later.

13-30. A Poem describing how Ben-Sira acquired Wisdom, and sought to teach others. This poem is an acrostic, each verse beginning with the letters of the Hebrew alphabet in their order. The Hebrew text is mutilated in parts.

13. For the last clause read with Hebrew *In my youth I made supplication with prayer.*

14, 15*a*, *b* are obliterated in Hebrew.

15*c*. For **I tracked her out** read with Hebrew *I learned wisdom.*

17. Read with Hebrew *And her yoke was glorious unto me, and to my teacher do I give thanks.*

18. Hebrew is much mutilated here.

19. Greek seems to represent a different text from our present Hebrew, which reads 'My soul longed for her, and my face will I not turn from her.' In the next line the text is obliterated; but

instead of what Greek has in 19d Hebrew has these three lines: 'And for ever and ever I will not go astray from her. My hand opened her gates, and I entered unto her, and looked upon her.'

23. Read with Hebrew *Turn in* . . The **house of instruction**, of which this is the earliest mention, is the technical name for a place ('house') where instruction in the Law, Scriptures, Ethics, etc., was given. Great scholars had their 'houses' to which their followers resorted for learning.

26*b*. Read with Hebrew *And her burden let your soul bear.*

26*c*. For this line Hebrew has the two following: 'She is nigh unto them that seek her; and he that is intent (upon her) findeth her.'

28. Read with Hebrew (slightly emended) *Hearken to my teaching*, (though yè be but) *few, and much silver and gold will ye acquire thereby.*

29. The rendering of Greek seems to be due to a misunderstanding of Hebrew, which reads: *May my soul delight in my Yeshibah, and ye shall not be put to shame in singing my praise.* The *Yeshibah* (= 'Academy') was a larger place of assembly than the *Beth ha-Midrash.*

30. For **before the time cometh** Hebrew has 'in righteousness.'

The overloaded subscription in Hebrew has evidently come from more than one hand; it runs: 'Blessed be Jehovah; and praised be his Name to generations. Thus far the words of Simeon the son of Jeshua', who is called Ben-Sira. The Wisdom of Simeon, the son of Jeshua', the son of Eleazar, Ben-Sira. May the Name of Jehovah be blessed from now and unto eternity.'

BARUCH

By H. St. J. Thackeray

Contents.—The book falls into four portions: an introduction, followed by three liturgical sections—a general confession, a sermon, and a series of canticles of consolation.

(1) **Introduction** (1 1-14).—The book, we are told, was written by Baruch in Babylon at the time of the capture and conflagration of Jerusalem, and was read by him to king Jehoiachin and the other Jewish captives previously deported from Palestine. Moved by the reading, the exiles wept, fasted, and prayed, and made a collection of money, which they then sent to their brethren in Jerusalem, together with the book and a covering letter, asking them (*a*) to purchase offerings and offer them upon the altar; (*b*) to pray for the life of their conquerors, Nabuchodonosor and his son Baltasar, in order that the exiles might find favour in their sight, and for the penitent exiles themselves; and (*c*) to read the accompanying book in the Lord's house 'on the [or "a"] feast day and on [the] days of solemn assembly' (literally 'days of season').

(2) **A Form of General Confession.**—1 15-3 8, comprising (*a*) pure confession (1 15-2 10); (*b*) a prayer for mercy (2 11-35), leading up to (*c*) a more poignant and personal petition, ending on the note, 'Though penitent, we are still in exile' (3 1-8). As the covering letter mentions only confession (1 14), 'the book' of the exiles must end here; to it, without connecting links, are appended the following:

(3) **A Homily on Wisdom** (3 9-4 4).—Why is Israel still in exile? Because she has forsaken the fountain of wisdom. Learn where true wisdom is and is not to be found. Three types of men who have failed in the quest: the rich, the wise of this world, the mighty giants of old. Man has failed, but the omniscient creator of the boundless universe has found her. Wisdom indeed is none other than the Law that endureth for ever, of which Israel is the privileged recipient. The preacher appeals to Jacob to turn and lay hold on wisdom as revealed in the Law, and not to surrender her glory to 'another' and her blessings to an alien nation, and felicitates the race which can claim to be the sole possessors of the knowledge of the will of God. (The text of this sermon is probably, 'Let not the wise man glory,' etc.: Jer 9 23 f.)

(4) **Seven Cantos of Consolation** (4 5-5 9), in the style of deutero-Isaiah, opening thus:

(1) 4 5. 'Be of good cheer, my people'	Addressed by mother Zion to her exiled children.
(2) 4 21. 'Be of good cheer, O my children'	
(3) 4 27. 'Be of good cheer, O my children'	
(4) 4 30. 'Be of good cheer, O Jerusalem'	God's response, through the seer, to the bereft mother.
(5) (6) (7) 4 36, 5 1-5. 'O Jerusalem'	

In the first three cantos the notes of penitence and sorrow still mingle with expressions of comfort and hope; the last four are all consolation, promises to Jerusalem of retaliation on her foes with glorious visions of a return to Palestine under God's leadership.

Unhistorical Character of Narrative.—Various errors stamp the introductory narrative as unauthentic. Baruch, to our knowledge, was never in Babylon; he is last heard of in the Book of Jeremiah (43 [6] f.) as accompanying his master to Egypt, where he probably ended his days. Again, the writer is dependent on the Book of Daniel, and follows it in a manifest error in representing Belshazzar as the son of Nebuchadnezzar (1 [11]); the use of that book probably brings his date down to the Maccabæan age. In his mention of the capture and the burning of Jerusalem as contemporaneous (1 [2]), he has perhaps confused two distinct events, separated by an interval of ten years (2 K 25 [1-9]).

Unity.—The work is clearly composite. It consists of two main parts, each comprising two subdivisions. Part I (Introduction and Confession) is unmistakable prose; Part II (Homily and Consolations) is in the style of Hebrew poetry. These two parts show a diversity both of style and of tone. Thus, if we take the criterion of the Divine titles, we find that the word 'Lord' occurs some 40 times in Part I, never in Part II, which employs instead 'God,' 'the eternal,' 'the holy one.' With regard to tone, there is a difference of attitude towards Israel's oppressors: in Part I the exiles exhort their brethren to pray for their Babylonian rulers, while Part II ends with fierce imprecations upon the foe. The history of the composition of the book can only be conjectured, but it seems probable that Part I once formed a distinct work, to which the poems were subsequently appended. The introduction (which contains later interpolations) leads up to the Confession, and foreshadows nothing further (1 [14], 'to make confession'). That the 'book' sent by the exiles to their brethren at Jerusalem was limited to the Confession is further borne out by the oldest Latin version (*b*), which bridges the abrupt transition to Part II at 3 [8] by the insertion of a sentence which suggests that the translator may have known Part I as a separate work: 'And when she [Jerusalem] had finished *the book of the exiles' prayer*, the spirit accepted the voice of Jerusalem, and spoke saying, Hear, O Israel,' etc. The two poems, though united by a few links, may be the work of separate hands. Yet, composite as the book is, it has, as will appear, been welded into a whole with a unity of its own; the editor who added the poems incorporated the older work in a larger scheme.

Original Language.—Part I is undoubtedly a translation from Hebrew. In 3 [4] the phrase 'the *dead* Israelites' is an error due to misreading of the Hebrew '*men* of Israel' (the two words are indistinguishable in an unvocalized text), and other peculiarities in vocabulary (e.g. the Greek words translated 'oblation,' 1 [10], 'multitude,' 2 [29]) and syntax point to the same conclusion. Moreover, the Syro-hexaplar, or Syriac version of Origen's text of the Septuagint, expressly notes that three phrases in 1 [17] and 2 [3] are 'not in the Hebrew'; the validity of this evidence has, however, been disputed. Whether Part II is also derived from a Semitic original is more difficult to determine. The originality of the Greek of the second poem has been supported by the apparent dependence of the concluding verses (4 [36] ff.) on the extant Greek version of the Psalms of Solomon; and indications of translation are not conspicuous as in Part I. But even here there is one phrase (5 [6], 'borne as a royal throne' for 'borne as *on* a royal throne') which it is difficult to explain except as a literal version of the Hebrew; and the characteristic parallelism of Hebrew poetry is well marked throughout both poems. The dependence of Part II on the Greek Psalter of Solomon is analogous to the dependence of Part I on Greek versions of Jeremiah and Daniel; the translator seems to have availed himself of earlier versions. A Hebrew original may therefore probably be assumed for the whole book.

Design for Liturgical Use.—The book is expressly stated to be designed for liturgical use on certain occasions not precisely defined. The exiles write (1 [14]): 'And ye shall read this book which we have sent unto you, to make confession in the house of the Lord, upon the day of the feast and upon the days of solemn assembly' (literally 'season'). Provision is here made for a double use of the book: (*a*) on a feast day; (*b*) on a series of days. But an important old Latin version reads: 'at legetis librum quem misimus ad vos in domo Domini in die sollenni'; here provision is made for the use of the book on one 'solemn day' only. This shorter and probably older text bears out what has been said as to the composite nature of the book, and suggests that there have been two stages

in its history. A shorter work designed for reading on a single annual festival has been expanded to adapt it for serial use during a particular season in the Jewish Church calendar. The 'season' intended can be identified with some certainty; the festival is less easy to fix.

The Season of the 9th Ab.—The 9th of Ab (approximately our July) was the traditional date of the double burning of the Temple: on that same date, it was said, Solomon's temple was burnt by the Babylonians and, some six and a half centuries later, Herod's temple was burnt by the Romans. The fast for the first catastrophe was observed, along with other fasts for the national calamities of that time, throughout the exile (Zech 7^{5}, 8^{19}, 'the fast of the fifth month'); with the return from exile and the rebuilding of the temple it was possibly discontinued (*ib.* 7^{3}), but the second catastrophe afforded an overpowering stimulus to its revival on an extended scale. It was probably shortly after A.D. 70 that the cycle of sabbaths was instituted, of which the 9th Ab was the pivot: the fast was preceded by three sabbaths of punishment or penitence, and followed by seven sabbaths of consolation. We owe our knowledge of this cycle mainly to the so-called *Pesikta* (or 'Book of Selections') of Rab Kahana, a series of homilies on the lessons for the principal feasts and fasts in the Jewish calendar.

Now the framework of Baruch curiously fits this cycle. Both cycle and book have for their cardinal theme the burning of the temple; both begin with penitence and end with consolation; in both the penitential and consolatory portions are connected respectively with passages from Jeremiah and deutero-Isaiah; lastly, to the seven sabbaths of consolation correspond seven cantos of consolation in Baruch, while, though this cannot be pressed, the confession in Baruch falls into three sections, answering to the three sabbaths of penitence.

The parallelism may be shown thus:

THE AB CYCLE.	BARUCH.
3 sabbaths of punishment: lessons drawn from Jer 1 and 2, Is 1.	1^{15}-3^{8}: A general Confession in 3 sections: largely based on passages in Jeremiah.
The 9th Ab: lesson drawn from Jer 8-9 (ending 9^{23} f., 'Let not the wise man glory,' etc.).	3^{9}-4^{4}: A sermon on true wisdom (based apparently on the text Jer 9^{23}).
Reading of Scripture forbidden except:	Material based on:
(*a*) Job.	(*a*) Job.
(*b*) Passages not usually read.	(*b*) The deutero-canonical Wisdom of Ben Sira.
(*c*) Lamentations.	
(*d*) Jeremiah (threatening passages).	
7 sabbaths of consolation:	5-5^{9}—7 cantos of consolation:
3 in the month of Ab (fasting continued).	3 semi-penitential: mother Zion speaks.
4 in the month of Elul (advent of the New Year).	4 all consolation: God's response.
Lessons based on deutero-Isaiah, beginning:	Based on deutero-Isaiah:
(i.) 40^{1}. 'Comfort ye my people.'	4^{5} (i.) 'Be of good cheer, my people.'
*(ii.) 49^{14}.	4^{21} (ii.)
(iii.) 54^{11}.	4^{27} (iii.)
(iv.) 51^{12}. 'I, even I, am your comforter.' Doom of oppressor; reprisals.	4^{30} (iv.) 'He that named thee will comfort thee.' Doom of oppressor; reprisals.
(v.) 54^{1}.	4^{36} (v.).
(vi.) 60^{1}. Zion's brightness draws the nations.	5^{1} (vi.) Zion's brightness shown to the world.
*(vii.) 61^{10}.	5^{5} (vii.).

The particular *feast day* intended in the exiles' letter (1^{14}) is uncertain. The confession which follows seems more suitable to a fast than to a feast; but neither the Greek word nor its Hebrew equivalent (*ḥag*) will bear that sense, and the vaguer *dies sollennis* of the Latin is the normal term for a festival, and is not equivalent to *jejunium*. But the Jewish calendar contained one day which ranked alike as feast and fast, and meets the requirements—that of the New Year. Perhaps we may go further. It has been conjectured, with much probability, that the date contained in 1^{8}, 'the 10th of Sivan' (where the Syriac has the important variant, 'the 10th of Nisan'), is a misplaced gloss on 1^{14}; the two readings are guesses at the occasion which the writer left undefined, and the Syriac seems to have preserved the correct interpretation. The Palestinians kept their New Year feast in the autumn, but the Babylonians, from whom they borrowed it, kept it in the spring, during the opening days of Nisan. Our book appears to have originated in the eastern dispersion (see below), where the old Babylonian custom may have been retained. The exiles' request for prayers for their rulers (1^{11}) favours this suggestion; for at the Babylonian feast the fate of the king's life for the coming year was believed to be determined.

* The ideas in these passages recur in the Baruch cantos, but in a different order.

Date.—The book, as we have seen, is composite, and has passed through more than one edition. The date of the final edition can be approximately determined; the earlier history is obscure. On several grounds Part II (3 ^{9}-end) cannot be earlier than the last quarter of the first century A.D. (i.) The concluding cantos (4 ^{36} ff.) are apparently dependent on the *Greek* version of the Psalms of Solomon; that indicates a date not earlier than *c.* A.D. 50. (ii.) The oppressor so fiercely denounced, whose city is to be burnt and desolated in reprisal for the fate of Jerusalem (4 $^{30-35}$), can be no other than Rome; the verses reflect the Jewish thirst for vengeance after A.D. 70. (iii.) The preceding homily also appears to hint at the destruction of the Temple: the true house of God is the broad universe (3 ^{24}), the Law remains for ever (though the Temple is gone, 4 ^{1}); and then follows an unmistakable allusion to Christianity, the rival religion which is beginning to appropriate the privileges of Judaism (4 ^{3}).

To fix the date of Part I is more difficult. The question turns mainly on the relation of the General Confession (1 ^{15}-3 ^{8}) to the Book of Daniel, and to the Septuagint version of Jeremiah, and on the correctness of the view which identifies Nabuchodonosor and his son Baltasar (1 ^{11}) with Vespasian and Titus. The Confession appears to make use of a Greek version of Dan 9; this would imply a date not earlier than the end of the 2nd century B.C., but it has been maintained that Baruch here uses, not Daniel, but an ancient form of prayer which has been incorporated in Daniel. Besides the parallels with Daniel, there are numerous parallels with the LXX of Jeremiah, and here Baruch presents such marked resemblances to the style of the second of the two translators of that book as to suggest identity of hands, i.e. that the Confession in Baruch was already attached to the Hebrew Jeremiah when that work was translated into Greek. Imitation will hardly account for all the phenomena (see *J.T.S.*, IV, 261; the writer here reverts to his former view, which he was inclined to abandon, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 87). Kneucker's identification of the Babylonian monarchs with Vespasian and Titus, though attractive, creates difficulties, and brings the dates of Parts I and II too close together. The Confession appears to be the nucleus of the book, and to have been attached to the Hebrew Jeremiah before the beginning of our era.

Place of Writing.—Whatever may have been its earlier history, the book in its final form seems to have been compiled in the neighbourhood of Palestine, probably in N. Syria. Kneucker's view that 'Babylon' means Rome, and that the work is of Roman origin, is most improbable; all indications point to the East. The origin of the cycle of sabbaths is traced either to Babylon or to Palestine; that of the *Pesikta*, which uses it, either to Palestine or to a neighbouring community of the Dispersion. The book makes use of a Palestinian production like the Psalter of Solomon, and possibly of a Greek version of Daniel allied to that cited by the writers of the NT. The only record of the liturgical use of the work comes from the region of Syria and Mesopotamia (see next paragraph).

Evidence for Liturgical Use.—Jerome states that the Hebrews neither read nor even possessed our book (*apud Hebraeos nec legitur nec habetur*, Prol. to trans. of Jeremiah); but he was referring to Palestinian practice only. We have, on the contrary, two pieces of evidence showing that, about the time when Jerome wrote this, Baruch was actually being used in Jewish worship by the Dispersion in Upper Syria. (1) The author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (latter part of the 4th century) writes: 'For even now on the 10th of the month Gorpiæus they [the Jews] assemble and read the Lamentations of Jeremiah in which it is said [here he quotes Lam 4 ^{20}] *and Baruch* in which is written [here he quotes Bar 3 $^{35-37}$]; and when they read they wail and lament, as they suppose for the desolation wrought by Nebuchadnezzar, but in reality they involuntarily rehearse the mourning which will hereafter befall them'—namely, at the second coming of Christ. The parallel passage in the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, an older work used by the author of the *Constitutions*, names as the day of the Jews' mourning the 9th of Ab, and says nothing about Baruch, mentioning only the reading of Lamentations. These statements cannot here be discussed; it must suffice to say that the 10th Gorpiæus (in the Syro-Macedonian calendar) and the 9th of Ab (in the Hebrew calendar), mentioned by the respective writers, are probably identical; Josephus and some rabbinical authorities dated the double burning of the Temple on the 10th, not the 9th of Ab. (2) In a Palm Sunday sermon ascribed to Ephraim Syrus, but probably of a rather later date, the preacher, in the course of a diatribe on the Jews, refers to a fast being held simultaneously by them, in

which they are represented as singing a portion of our book. 'To-day let the synagogue sing this song among the people: "*He hath brought upon me a great mourning*: the Lord hath *left me desolate*, and the Lord hath forgotten that I am his heritage, and hath reckoned me as a stranger and as *a widow that is bereaved*" ' (cf. Bar 4 [9, 12, 19]; *Select Works of St. Ephrem* in the Oxford *Library of the Fathers*, 1847, 61 ff.). Palm Sunday at the time and place when this sermon was delivered would approximately coincide with the 10th of Nisan; this Syriac homily thus remarkably confirms the interpretation given above of the Syriac variant 'on the 10th of Nisan' in Bar 1 [8]. Here, then, we have positive evidence for the liturgical use of portions of Baruch by Syrian Jews both on the 9th (or 10th) of Ab and at the spring New Year.

From the same region we have evidence for the reading of the book in the *Christian* services; the Syro-hexaplar indicates the points at which the lessons began and ended.

I. 1. **And these are the words,** etc. After Jer 29 [1]. Baruch's genealogy is here traced back beyond his grandfather, Mahseiah, the oldest ancestor named in Jer (32 [12]).

2. A vague date. Jerusalem was first captured by Nebuchadnezzar in 597 B.C., and again captured and burnt by Nebuzaradan in 587 B.C.; **the fifth year** should apparently be reckoned from the latter date. No month is named, but probably the words 'in the fifth month' have dropped out of the text (cf. 2 K 25 [8]). **On the seventh of the month.** So 2 K 25 [8], but in Jer 52 [12] on the tenth; the anniversary of the double burning of the temple by Babylonians and Romans was ultimately kept on the 9th of the month (Ab).

4. **The river Sud.** Unknown. The Syriac has 'the river of Sur'; D and R in Hebrew are constantly confused. If these words were inserted in the later edition of Baruch they may give a clue to the place where it was produced; at Sura on the Upper Euphrates, south of Edessa, there was an important academy of Jewish learning *c.* A.D. 200, and perhaps earlier. Other indications point to this region (see Introduction).

7. **Joakim.** Unknown to the Biblical narrative; Seraiah was the chief priest in 587 B.C. (2 K 25 [18]; Jer 52 [24]).

8. **He,** i.e. Baruch. A further departure from the Biblical story, which knows nothing of any return of the captured Temple vessels before the time of Cyrus (Ezr 1 [7]; **Hananiah and the false prophets** were denounced for predicting their early restoration, Jer 27 [16], 28 [3]), or of the making of other vessels by king Zedekiah. **the tenth day of Sivan.** The Syriac has 'the tenth of Nisan.' Both texts are probably misplaced glosses on [14], guesses at 'the day of the feast' there unspecified (see Introduction).

10-14. **The letter of the exiles in Babylon to Jerusalem conveying the money collected and the book of confession to be used in worship.**

11. After Jer 29 [7], where the prophet directs the exiles to pray for Babylon; cf. Ezr 6 [10], where Darius makes provision for the returned exiles to 'pray for the life of the king and of his sons.' **Baltasar.** Belshazzar, son of Nabonidus, not, as incorrectly stated here and in Daniel, son of Nebuchadnezzar. **As the days . . . earth.** From Dt 11 [21]; cf. Ps 89 [29]; Ecclus 45 [15].

12. **will give us strength:** Ps 29 [11]. **Lighten our eyes.** Cf. 3 [14], 'the light of the eyes,' and Ps 19 [8]. **Under the shadow.** Metaphor taken from the tree in Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Dan 4 [12]).

14. **This book:** i.e., as shown by the purpose indicated, 'to make confession,' Bar 1 [15]-3 [8]. **The day of the feast:** perhaps the feast of the spring New Year. **And on the days of the solemn assembly:** literally '. . . of season,' i.e. of the season mentioned in [2]. The words, which are omitted in one old Latin version, were probably added when the work was re-edited in an enlarged form, including Part II. The days are the 9th Ab and the sabbaths preceding and following it (see Introduction).

15-III. 8. **A form of General Confession,** including (*a*) the confession proper (*todah*), 1 [15]-2 [10], and (*b*) the prayer for mercy (*tehinnah*), 2 [11]-3 [8]. The first half, down to 2 [19], is modelled on Dan 9, or possibly on an older prayer incorporated in Daniel; large use is also made of Jeremiah, which forms the basis of the latter half of the prayer, from 2 [20] onwards, and occasional use of Deuteronomy.

15. Dan 9 [7]; the refrain is repeated below (2 [6]).

16. **and to our priests . . . prophets.** The spiritual leaders of the nation, not named in Daniel, are here, as in Jer 32 [32], included in the general denunciation.

19. Based, excepting the final clause, on Dt 9 [7]. **dealt unadvisedly.** The Greek means 'acted off-hand' or 'on the spur of the moment'; but the Hebrew may have contained the word 'rebelled' (Dan 9 [5]), which would easily become corrupted to 'hastened.'

20. After Dt 29 [20].

22. **to serve**: literally 'to work for' (so 2 [21]); a rendering of a Hebrew word, which means both 'to work' and 'to serve,' characteristic of the Greek translator of the second half of Jeremiah (see Introduction).

II. 1, 2. After Dan 9 [12] f.

2. **to bring . . . such as.** Omitted by the oldest MS. (cod. B) and perhaps an insertion from Dan 9 [12]; in which case the verse should begin, 'There hath never happened,' etc.

3-6. The model in Dan 9 [13], which runs straight on, 'As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us' (=Bar 2 [2, 7]), is broken by the insertion of these verses, which, however, appear to be a translation from the Hebrew and to belong to the original edition of Baruch.

3. Such cannibalism had been threatened in the law (Lev 26 [29]; Dt 28 [53]) and by Jeremiah (19 [9]). It is not recorded as having occurred at the Babylonian siege of Jerusalem (see, however, Lam 4 [10]); but Josephus, in his account of the Roman siege, describes with horror such an incident as an unheard-of thing, unrecorded either among Greeks or barbarians (*Bell. Jud.*, VI, iii, 3 f.).

4. In the style of the Greek version of Jer 42 [18] (and 32 [37]).

5. **cast down . . . exalted**: literally 'below and not above'; a reversal of the promise in Dt 28 [13] ('the head and not the tail . . . above and not beneath').

6. The refrain of Dan 9 [7] repeated (Bar 1 [15]).

7. The best MSS. insert a second relative pronoun; with this text the verse must be connected with [6], and be translated '(according to) what the Lord hath pronounced against us, (namely) all these evils *which* have come upon us.'

8-10 follow Dan 9 [13] f., [10] except that in [9] 'all the works which he hath commanded us' replaces 'all his works which he doeth'; the penitents emphasize the righteousness of the commandments which they have neglected.

11-III. 8. The 'supplication' ([19]) or prayer for mercy. 'Deliver us from captivity, not for our sake, but for thine own, that the whole world may recognize thy power and that we who, though in deep anguish, are still alive, may praise thee.' The prayer includes two free paraphrases of Scripture, from 'the prophets' and 'Moses'; appeal is made from the threat of the prophets ([21-23]), acknowledged to be just, to the merciful promises of the Law ([29-35]). Dan 9 still remains the model down to [19].

13. **for we are but a few left.** From Jer 42 [2].

15. **Israel and his posterity** replaces 'thy city and thy people' in Dan 9 [19].

16. **look down . . . house**: Dt 26 [15].

17. **the dead.** Cf. Ps 115 [17] f., 'The dead praise not the Lord,' etc.

18. The verse is dependent on Dt 28 [65], 'there shall be no rest for the sole of thy foot: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart and failing of eyes and a pining of soul'—a parallel which indicates an error in Baruch, the Greek translator having misread his Hebrew original. **that is greatly vexed**: literally 'vexed for the greatness'; the Hebrew probably had *we haregel* ('and the foot'); the translator misread this as *'al-hagodel* ('upon the greatness'). Restore *But the soul of him that is vexed and the leg which goeth*, etc. **the hungry soul.** So Aquila read 'famished' for 'pining' (soul) in Dt *loc. cit.*

19. **the righteousness.** Rather *the righteous acts.* Here the confession in Daniel ends; the remainder of the exiles' prayer is mainly based on Jeremiah.

21-23. A paraphrase of various passages in Jeremiah (27 [11], 7 [34], 33 [10] f., 48 [9]) ascribed to 'the prophets' in general.

23. **from without J.** The Hebrew doubtless had *beḥuṣoth*, 'in the streets of (Jerusalem),' a word constantly misread by the Greek translator of Jeremiah as *baḥuṣ*, 'outside.'

24. **made good thy words**: Bar 2 [1] (after Dan 9 [12]). **the prophets**: another generalization; the reference is to Jer 8 [1], with the substitution of 'place' for 'graves.'

25. An extension to others of the doom pronounced on Jehoiakim alone (Jer 36 [30]); **pestilence.** The Greek word *apostole* is that rendered in the NT 'apostleship' literally a 'sending out,' it is here strangely used, as in Jeremiah LXX, as the equivalent of the Hebrew *deber*, 'pestilence,' apparently meaning 'a visitation' (of God).

26. **the house . . . thy name**: Jer 32 [34], 34 [15]. **laid waste.** The Greek has merely 'hast thou made as it is this day,' a vague phrase not implying total destruction; the exiles assume that there is still a building available for worship and an altar for offerings (1 [10, 14]). The writer of Part II, after the events of A.D. 70, would probably have used a stronger expression.

27 ff. The exiles turn from 'the prophets' to the more merciful promises of 'Moses.' The passage attributed to the lawgiver ([29-35]) begins with a paraphrase of verses in Deuteronomy, but reverts to reminiscences of Jeremiah.

28. in the day, etc. Cf. Dt 27 [3, 8].

29. A loose allusion to Dt 28 [62], 'Ye shall be left few in number . . . because thou didst not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God.' **this very great multitude.** The Greek has picturesquely 'this great, numerous buzzing (crowd).' The noun *bombesis*, 'buzzing,' found here only (the cognate verb is used in Jer LXX), represents a Hebrew *hamon*, which means a 'murmur' (especially of a crowd) and then the crowd itself.

30. The promise of liberation in consequence of penitence in exile is based on Dt 30 [1] ff.

31. they shall know . . . Lord. Ezekiel's characteristic phrase. **will give them a heart and ears:** a gift once denied (Dt 29 [4]).

32. praise me in . . . their captivity. Cf. 3 [7]. The lesson of praisegiving in adversity is the prerequisite to release.

34 f. Reminiscences of Jer 30 [3], 29 [6], 32 [40], 31 [33].

III. 1-8. A closing impassioned appeal. 'Though penitent we are still in exile.'

1. troubled spirit: Ps 143 [4], 61 [2]. 'Troubled' should rather be *languid* or *listless* (from exhaustion); the verb (*akedian*) is the parent of the word 'accidie,' the besetting temptation of the mediæval saint.

2. for thou art . . . mercy upon us. The repeated *miserere*, with the preceding words, is omitted, probably accidentally, by our oldest MS.

3. sittest as king for ever. Cf. Ps 29 [10], 'The Lord sitteth as king for ever,' and for the contrast between God and man Ps 90 [4] ff., 102 [24].

4. the dead Israelites. The margin indicates the error of the Greek translator who confused two Hebrew words indistinguishable in an unvocalized text. A clear proof that this portion of Baruch had a Hebrew original; cf. 2 [18].

5. at this time or 'season,' i.e. the special occasion for which this General Confession is designed (1 [14]).

7. put thy fear in our hearts: Jer 32 [40]. The marginal readings in this verse should be followed.

8. for a reproach . . . penalty. After Jer 42 [18].

III. 9-IV. 4. **A homily on the theme, Where shall wisdom be found?** (cf. Job 28). Probably it was designed for the 9th Ab, and its text was taken from the close of the second lesson for that day, Jer 9 [23] ('Let not the wise man glory,' etc.), with its three types of the vainglorious: the wise, the strong, the rich. The preacher takes these three classes successively, the rulers and the rich (3 [16-21]), the worldly-wise ([22] f.), the strong ([26-28]), and shows how all have failed in the quest; note the repeated refrain in [20, 23, 27]. True wisdom is to be found only in the Law; Israel is urged to cherish her precious privileges and not to surrender them to others. The preacher makes large use of Job and of the apocryphal wisdom of Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus), because these were among the few books the study of which was permitted on the fast day. The whole should be compared with St. Paul's discourse on false and true wisdom in 1 Cor 1 [18]-2 [5].

9. Hear, O Israel. Recalling the *Shema* (Dt 6 [4] ff., 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord'), the customary preface to a discourse on solemn occasions in the Synagogue.

10. The preacher takes up the penitents' closing words ('We are yet in captivity,' [8]), and asks them to consider what is the reason for their condition. **waxen old.** Cf. Ps 6 [8] LXX, 'I have waxed old among all mine enemies'; the words suggest a much longer period of captivity than the four or five years mentioned in the Introduction (1 [2]).

10 f. defiled, etc. Cf. Ps 88 [3-5].

12. The answer is supplied by Jer 2 [13], 'They have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters.' A similar question and answer occur in the lesson for the 9th Ab (Jer 9 [12] f.), 'Who is the wise man? . . . wherefore is the land perished? . . . Because they have forsaken my law.'

13. for ever: lit. '(for) the age,' as in 3 [3], another link with the closing paragraph of the Confession.

14. An echo of Pr 8 [14], 3 [16]. The preacher has his three categories in mind: the wise, the strong, the rich; length of days being parallel with riches in Pr 3 [16]. **the light of the eyes.** Cf. in the exiles' letter, 'lighten our eyes' (1 [12]).

15. Who hath found . . . ? After Job 28 [12, 20]. **her treasuries:** Pr 2 [4]; cf. also Col 2 [3] (the words of a compatriot who was happier than our author in his quest).

16-21. Here the preacher passes to the three types of men named in his text, and first the rich. With them are linked the princes ('the rulers of this age,' 1 Cor 2 [6, 8]) and, as intermediate between the rich and the wise, the skilled metal-workers and craftsmen who minister to the rich. A second and third generation have come and gone and failed to find wisdom.

16 f. ruled the beasts . . . had their pastime with the fowls. Alluding to Nebuchadnezzar, whose lordship over the

beasts of the field and the fowls of the air was perhaps proverbial (see Jer 27 [6]; Dan 2 [38]; Judith 11 [7]). In the two last passages he appears as the protector of the beasts; here, like his predecessor Nimrod, as the mighty hunter. The monarch for whose life the exiles besought their brethren's prayers (1 [11]) is here an example of the futility of earthly greatness. **hoarded up**: Ps 39 [6]. **wherein men trust**: Ps 49 [6] (a Psalm very similar in tone to this sermon) and Mk 10 [24] (RV text).

18. past finding out: vainly rivalling in their cleverness Him whose understanding is indeed past finding out (Is 40 [28] LXX).

20. seen the light: a characteristic phrase of Job (3 [16], etc.); yet they are fated to join the generation of their fathers who 'shall never see the light' (Ps 49 [19]).

21. their way. The marginal reading, though weakly supported, is probably right.

22 f. Secondly, the worldly wise. The examples of earthly wisdom are confined to the eastern (Biblical) world; Greek learning is ignored. **Teman**: a district in Edom proverbial for its sages (Jer 49 [7], 'Is wisdom no more in Teman?'), and the home of Job's counsellor, Eliphaz.

23. Agar: a general term for Arabia. **Merran and Teman.** The repetition of Teman is improbable; read *Midian and Tema*, and cf. Job 6 [19], 'the caravans of Tema.' Aramaic inscriptions 'testify to the existence of a highly developed culture among the ancient Arabs of Tema' (*Encyc. Bibl.* s.v.). **in the land.** Rather 'on the earth' (cf. [16, 20]); there is a contrast throughout between the wisdom of earth, 'of this age,' and the true wisdom (cf. 1 Cor 1 [20] ff.).

24 f. The third category, the strong, is introduced by an exclamation on the boundless immensity of **the house of God**, here apparently meaning the universe (cf. 2 [16], 'thy holy house' = heaven). *Circumspice* the preacher seems to say; God's house is not the ruined temple, but the broad universe (cf. the retort of the Jewish leaders to the exhortations of Titus during the last siege: 'the world is a better temple for God than this one,' Jos., *B.J.*, V, xi, 2). **his possession**, or with another reading (the alteration of one vowel), 'his creation'; cf. Ecclus 16 [17], 'a boundless creation.'

26-28. As his example of the strong men the preacher selects the primeval giants or Nephilim, renowned in Hebrew folklore (Gen 6 [4] LXX; Nu 13 [32] f., for their stature; Ezek 32 [27]; and for their downfall Ecclus 16 [7]; Wisd 14 [6]; 3 Mac 2 [4]).

26. There: in this mighty universe, possibly alluding to folklore concerning the giants' birthplace.

27. did not God choose. Cf. Ecclus 16 [7], 'He was not pacified toward [Hebrew, 'did not bear'] the giants of old, who revolted in their strength,' with 1 Cor 1 [26] ff. (not the wise, the strong, the highborn, but the foolish, the weak, the lowborn '*did God choose*,' the last words being thrice repeated.

29 f. Wisdom was not brought down from heaven by the progenitors of the giants, nor has man ascended thither and secured it. The verses are based on Dt 30 [12] f., but with a different application (Deuteronomy says there is no need to search far for what is nigh, Baruch there is no use in searching far); but the idea had become proverbial; cf. the words of Agur in Pr 30 [4], 'I have not learned wisdom . . . Who hath ascended up into heaven and descended?'

30. for choice gold: Job 28 [15] ff.

31. Concludes the negative side of the sermon; cf. Job 28 [13].

32-IV. 4. But the omniscient creator of the universe has found her and given her to Israel. Wisdom is no other than the Law; let us hold fast our blessed privilege. The preacher's peroration is modelled on Job 28, 38, and Ecclus 24 (the praise of wisdom).

32. he that knoweth . . . found her out: Job 28 [23] f. LXX. **prepared . . . for evermore**: Ps 78 [69]. **four-footed beasts**: Gen 1 [24] f.; there is a latent contrast between the creator and the 'lords' of the beasts (3 [16]).

33. sendeth forth . . . goeth: Job 38 [35] (of the lightning). **obeyed . . . with fear.** Rather '. . . *with trembling*' (Job *ib.* [34] LXX).

34. The stars are the morning stars of Job 38 [7], and their 'watches' come from Ecclus 43 [9] f.; but the author adds a beauty of his own to this picture of these outposts of the celestial army answering *Adsumus* to their names.

35 ff. After Dt 33 [26] LXX ('There is none like the God *of the beloved one*,' Hebrew 'of Jeshurun') and Ecclus 24 [8] ff. ('Let thy tabernacle be in Jacob and thine inheritance in Israel . . . and so was I established in Sion').

37. The verse, which is often quoted by the Fathers as a witness to the doctrine of the Incarnation, is suspected of being a Christian interpolation. But it is in keeping with the context, with the passage from Ecclus, on which it is based, and with Rabbinic teaching, according to which the Torah pre-existed with God

long before its promulgation to mankind (Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, ed. 2, 15).

IV. 1. Cf. Ecclus 24 [23], where the personified Wisdom is identified with the Torah with the same abruptness. **the law that endureth for ever.** 'Of the holy Scriptures the Law alone will continue for ever' (Weber *ib.* [19], with other Rabbinic parallels). **to life . . . shall die:** Pr 8 [35] f.

2. **Turn:** Hos 14 [1], 'O Israel, return . . .' (another lesson read on the 9th of Ab). **take hold:** Pr 4 [13].

3. A veiled allusion to Christ and the growth of Christianity. The Christians were already appropriating the Greek Old Testament for their own purposes and were soon to appeal to this very book (3 [37]).

4. **Happy are we:** Dt 33 [29]. **The things that are pleasing. . . .** The race has not lost its proud claim to be the sole possessors of the knowledge of God's will (Rom 2 [18], 'knowest the will').

5-20. **The first of the seven cantos of consolation with which the book closes, designed to fit the cycle of seven sabbaths of consolation following the 9th Ab** (see Introduction). A prefatory word from the seer or preacher, reiterating the reason for Israel's captivity ([5-8]), is followed by Mother Zion's first address to her children ([9-20]).

5. **Be of good cheer, my people.** After Is 40 [1], 'Comfort ye my people' (the lesson for the first sabbath of consolation); the verb, which in the Hebrew is transitive, being here, as in the Vulgate, *consolamini*, taken as intransitive. **the memorial of Israel,** i.e. Israel the remembered one. Israel had forgotten God ([8]), but He had not forgotten her ([27]), is the pervading thought of these opening cantos.

6. **Ye were sold:** Is 50 [1], 52 [3]. Josephus mentions the selling of vast numbers of the inhabitants and of the territory of the Jews in the Roman war (*B.J.*, III, x, 10, VI, ix, 3, VII, vi, 6).

7 f. After Dt 32 [16-18], but in place of 'the Rock that begat thee . . . God that gave thee birth' (LXX, 'brought thee up'), Israel has here two nurses or instructors: the infant was reared by the Eternal Father, and trained by Mother Zion.

9. **Ye women.** Rather 'Ye *cities*' (or 'neighbours'); cf. [14, 24]; and in the lesson for the corresponding sabbath Is 40 [9], 'Say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God.' Mother Zion addresses her daughter cities, perhaps also the surrounding Syrian and other foreign cities, which have escaped captivity and are taunting the exiles.

12. **Let no man rejoice** as Edom did at the visitation of Judah and Jerusalem (Ob [12]; Ps 137 [7]). **A widow.** The image of the desolate widow (cf. [19]) comes from Is 49 [21] LXX, 'I am childless and a widow . . . I am left alone' (lesson for the second sabbath of consolation).

because . . . ([13]) **statutes.** From Job 34 [27] LXX.

15. **he hath brought** as foretold by Moses, Dt 28 [49] f. (LXX).

20. **the sackcloth of my petition:** probably alluding to the mourning of the 9th Ab, which in parts of Palestine was continued until the end of the month. **as long as I live:** literally 'in my days' (cf. Ps 116 [2]); but here again it seems probable that there is an allusion to the 'days of season' (1 [14]), i.e. the Lenten and Advent season for which the book is designed.

21-26. **The second, and** [27-29] **the third, address of consolation. Mother Zion bids her children follow her example of patience and prayer.**

22. **that he will save you.** Or, with the Latin, 'your saviour'; the construction of the Greek reading (literally 'your salvation') is peculiar. **mercy . . . Saviour.** After Ps 24 [5] LXX, 'He shall receive mercy [Hebrew 'righteousness'] from God his saviour.'

24. **they that dwell about S.:** the neighbouring cities (see [9]). **from our God.** The text is preferable to the margin, as closer to the model, Is 52 [10], 'All the ends of the earth shall see the salvation from our God.' **glory and brightness:** Is 60 [2] f., 'His glory shall be seen upon thee . . . thy brightness.'

25. **tread upon their necks.** After Dt 33 [29] LXX (Hebrew 'upon their high places').

26. **my delicate ones:** Dt 28 [56] (of the delicate lady accustomed to ride in a litter or carriage); the 'rough ways' are soon to be levelled (Is 40 [4]).

27. **shall be remembered.** In the lesson for the second sabbath of consolation 'Zion' herself had 'said, The Lord hath forgotten me' (Is 49 [14]). Hence the repeated assurance that she is remembered (4 [5], 5 [5]).

28. **return and seek:** Is 55 [6] f

29. **everlasting joy:** Is 35 [10].

30-35. **The fourth word of consolation** introduces a new Speaker ([34], 'I will take away') and a new tone; Mother Zion now becomes the recipient of divine promises of a glorious future. The month of mourning (Ab) is past; the fourth sabbath of consolation falls within the month of Elul, the month of advent preceding the

New Year. The canto is plainly modelled on the lesson for that sabbath (Is 51 12 ff., 'I, even I, am he that comforteth you'); reprisals form the topic of both.

30. he that called thee by name. Rather *he that named thee*; cf. Is 62 2 for 'the new name.'

31, 33. thy fall, thy ruin. Another link with the lesson, the two Greek words occurring in the LXX of deutero-Isaiah only in 51 17. 19. 22.

32. she that received. Rather, probably, 'she (or "the city") that carried off.' There seems to have been confusion between the two senses of the Hebrew *lāqaḥ*, which means both to 'receive' and to 'take captive.' The writer is thinking not of Babylon and the other cities of Mesopotamia to which the Jews were deported by Nebuchadnezzar, but of Rome and the cities of Syria, Asia or Italy, to which captives were carried or sold in A.D. 70. thy sons: another echo of the lesson (Is 51 20).

35. After Is 13 19-22 (Babylon is to share the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah). The fire perhaps refers to the burning of Rome under Nero; her next fire will not so soon be quenched.

The three final cantos (4 36 f., 5 1-4, 5-9) are more closely linked to each other than those which precede; they lack the introductory 'Be of good cheer,' but are marked off by the repeated invocation, 'O Jerusalem.' They have another link in the parallel which they present to the eleventh of the Psalms of Solomon, a psalm which was perhaps known to and expanded by our author.

36 f. Canto 5: vision of the gathering children, based on Is 60 4 (cf. 43 5, 49 18) and parallel with Ps. Sol. 11 3. toward the east. Cf. 5 5. Great expectations had been entertained at the outbreak of the first war with Rome of a rising of the Babylonian Jews: 'The whole eastern empire was in the balance . . . the Jews hoped that all their countrymen beyond the Euphrates would join with them in revolt': Jos., *B.J.*, I, Proem (2); these hopes were partly realized in the later revolt in which the Jews of Mesopotamia took the lead.

V. 1-4. Canto 6: Zion's investiture (based on Is 52 1, 61 10), the world-wide display of her splendour (Is 60 3, 'Nations shall come to thy light,' etc.), her new names (cf. Is 60 18).

5-9. Canto 7: reiterated vision of the gathering children, carried in state, with nature subservient to their triumphal procession.

5. Arise: Is 51 17.

6. as (on) a royal throne: The marginal reading is inferior. The picture is based on Is 49 22 (the children borne on the shoulders); cf. 60 4, 66 12. The ellipse of 'on,' possible in Hebrew, suggests translation.

7 f. The picture of subservient nature is based partly on Is 40 4 ('Every valley'), partly on Jewish Midrash. Cf. Ps. Sol. 11 6 f., 'The hills fled before their entering in, the woods gave them shelter as they passed by. Every tree of sweet savour did God make to spring up before them'; Commodian, *Carm. Apol.*, 956 ff., 'All things are green before them, all things rejoice; creation itself delights to welcome the saints: in every place fountains spring up spontaneously . . . the clouds provide shade for them that they be not molested by the sun, and lest they be wearied the very mountains prostrate themselves.'

THE EPISTLE OF JEREMY

By H. St. J. Thackeray

(1) **Position.**—In the English and Latin Bibles this Epistle follows Baruch without break as the sixth chapter of that book. In reality it is a distinct work. In the Greek MSS., which preserve the older tradition, it is separated from Baruch by the canonical book of Lamentations. These three works—Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremy—there form a little trilogy appended to the Book of Jeremiah, just as Susanna and Bel were attached to the Book of Daniel.

(2) **Character of Work.**—The work is a tirade against the folly of idolatry. It professes to be a letter addressed by Jeremiah to the Judæan exiles on the eve of their deportation to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, warning them of the length of the captivity awaiting them ('seven generations'), of the idolatry which they will witness, and that they must not be tempted by these sights to follow the practice of their captors; God's angel is with them and will protect them and answer their prayers. Then follows a homily showing by a variety of arguments the impotence for good or ill of these gods of wood and silver and gold.

The arguments are not apparently arranged in any logical order, but the homily is broken up into portions by a refrain repeated eleven times, conveying with slight variations in expression the general sense, 'This shows that they are no gods'; in the first three instances and in the last the refrain is amplified by the words, 'therefore fear them not' (16, 23, 29; 30, 40, 44, 49, 52, 56, 64; 69).

(3) **Original Language.**—The rather florid and rhetorical style, somewhat similar to that of the so-called 4th book of Maccabees, has convinced most commentators that the book was written in Greek. This widespread opinion has been seriously shaken, if not overthrown, by the late Dr. C. J. Ball, who long ago in the *Variorum Apocrypha* pointed out one convincing instance where an obscurity in the Greek may be explained by a confusion between two Hebrew words, indistinguishable in spelling and pronunciation. In 72 we read (RVm), 'And ye shall know them to be no gods by the purple and brightness [RV text 'by the bright purple'] that rotteth upon them.' These renderings are unwarranted attempts to extract sense out of the Greek, which means 'by the purple and *marble* that rotteth upon them'; there is no authority for translating *marmaros* by 'brightness.' But this is nonsensical; marble does not rot. The difficulty, as Dr. Ball acutely pointed out, is at once removed by the recognition that the translator has confused *shēsh*, 'marble' (Song of Songs, 5 15) and *shēsh*, 'fine linen.' Linen does rot, and the combination of 'purple and fine linen' is familiar in the parable of Dives and Lazarus and elsewhere. Dr. Ball followed up this discovery in his edition of the epistle in Dr. Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (1913), and found many 'places where the strange phraseology of the Greek can only be accounted for by assuming that the writer of it supplied the wrong vowels to some Hebrew word which he was translating, or mistook some Hebrew consonant for another resembling it, or could only guess at the meaning of a corrupted text.' If Dr. Ball's emendations do not always appear convincing, it may be said that he has established his main contention beyond doubt. The Greek must therefore be regarded as a paraphrastic rendering of a lost Hebrew original. The lost Hebrew may have been known to Origen; at any rate he is quoted as including among the twenty-two canonical *Hebrew* books 'Jeremiah with Lamentations *and the Epistle* in one [volume]' (*ap.* Eus. *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, 25).

(4) **Relation to Jeremiah** (10).—The Bible contains other tirades against idolatry, notably Is 44 9-20, Ps 115 4-8, Ps 135 15-18, Wisd 13 10-15 19; but our Epistle, as is natural, has the closest affinity to the passage on idolatry included in the prophecy to which it forms an appendix (Jer 10 1-16). Indeed, as Cornill has remarked (on Jer 10 11), the Epistle may be described as a paraphrase of that passage. The following are the most striking parallels; it is noticeable that they are confined to the beginning and end of the Jeremiah passage, and do not extend to the intermediate verses (6-10), which are absent from the LXX.

Jeremiah 10.	Epistle of Jeremy.
2. Learn not the way of the nations.	5. Beware therefore that ye in no wise become like unto the strangers.
2. Be not dismayed at the signs of heaven: for the nations are dismayed at them.	67. Neither can they shew signs in the heavens among the nations.
5 (RV margin). They are like a pillar in a garden of cucumbers.	70. As a scarecrow in a garden of cucumbers.
Here the Epistle gives to the rare Hebrew word *tomer* in Jeremiah a meaning which has been adopted by Driver and other modern commentators.	
5. They must needs be borne, because they cannot go.	4. Borne upon shoulders. 26. Having no feet, they are borne upon shoulders.
5. Be not afraid of them.	5. Neither let fear take hold of you because of them. 16, 23, 29, 65. Fear them not.
5. For they cannot do evil, neither is it in them to do good.	34. Whether it be evil that one doeth unto them or good, they are not able to recompense it. 64. They are able neither to judge causes nor to do good unto men.
11. The gods . . . shall perish. 15. In the time of their visitation they shall perish.	72. They themselves afterward shall be consumed.
12 f. God's power over nature (rain, vapours, lightning, wind).	60-63. God's power over nature (heavenly bodies, lightning, wind, clouds).
14. Every goldsmith is put to shame by his graven image.	27. They also that serve them are ashamed. 39. They that minister unto them shall be confounded.
14. For his molten image is falsehood, and there is no breath in them.	8. Yet are they but false. 44. Whatsoever is done among them is false. 50. They are false. 25. Things wherein there is no breath.

That our Epistle is dependent on Jer 10 is further confirmed by the Aramaic *Targum* of Jonathan on that chapter, which, in curiously similar fashion, has constructed on the basis of one of its verses a letter of Jeremiah to the exiles in Babylon, telling them how to meet temptations to idolatry and putting into their mouths arguments to prove the futility of the idols. Jer 10 [11] is peculiar in being the only verse in Jeremiah which is written in Aramaic; it was 'probably originally a marginal note . . . intended as a reply which might be used by Jews living in heathen countries, when invited to take part in idol-worship' (Driver). That verse runs:

'Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, shall perish from the earth and from under these heavens.'

Now in the Targum this is expanded as follows (the parallels with the Epistle are quoted for comparison):

Targum on Jer 10 [11].	Epistle of Jeremy.
'*This is a copy of an epistle which Jeremiah the prophet sent to the remnant of the elders of the captivity who were in Babylon.* Now if the peoples among whom ye are say unto you, Serve idols, ye house of Israel, thus shall ye answer and thus shall ye say unto them: The idols which ye serve are idols (delusions) in which there is no use; *they cannot bring rain from heaven* and they cannot produce fruits from the earth; they and their worshippers shall perish from the earth and shall be consumed from under these heavens. And thus shall ye say unto them:	1. A copy of an epistle which Jeremy sent unto them which were to be led captives into Babylon. . . .
[53]. Neither can they . . . give rain unto men.	
[6]. But say ye in your hearts, O Lord, we must worship thee.	
[12]. We worship him who made the earth,' etc.	

The Targum on this verse is thus, as it were, our Epistle in miniature. It takes the form of a letter, it emphasizes the general impotence of the idols, and names one particular instance of this impotence, also mentioned in our Epistle, viz. their inability to send rain. We see the conception of a warning letter to the exiles against idolatry taking shape: the germ is the Aramaic note which has crept into the text of Jeremiah; in the Targum this is expanded into a brief letter; and lastly (though, chronologically, probably older than the Targum) comes our full-fledged Epistle.

(5) **Relation to Babylonian Tammuz Worship.**—The writer of the Epistle vividly depicts the idolatry which he denounces and appears to have witnessed the rites which he ridicules. And it is the idolatry of Babylon only which he has in view; there is no allusion, e.g., to the Egyptian deification of animals satirized in the Book of Wisdom. Moreover, though he speaks of 'gods' in general, and only once mentions a name (Bel, [41]), he appears throughout to have one deity of the Babylonian pantheon particularly in mind, the god Tammuz—the god of the spring vegetation—the mourning ceremony for whose death (cf. Ezek 8 [14]) was held at midsummer in the month to which he gave his name. Our Epistle contains an unmistakable reference to one scandalous incident in the Tammuz ritual, besides numerous other hardly less striking parallels.

(i) In [43] we read of the prostitutes who sit in the ways with cords about them, until the cord is broken by a passer-by to indicate his selection of a paramour. This practice is mentioned by Herodotus (I, 199), Strabo (XVI, 20, 745), and Lucian (*De dea Syria*, 6). Herodotus, who gives the fullest description of 'this most disgraceful of Babylonian customs,' mentions the crowns of rope which the women wear on their heads, and tells us that these rites were paid to the goddess Mylitta, 'the Assyrian name for Aphrodite,' i.e. Ishtar the consort of Tammuz (L. W. King in *Encycl. Bibl.*, art. 'Babylonia,' § 26). Strabo similarly mentions the rope worn on the head and connects the rite with 'a certain feast of Aphrodite.' Lucian describes a similar ceremony as forming part of the mourning for Adonis (=Tammuz) held at the temple of Aphrodite at Byblos, and adds a detail which throws light on the chaplet of cord, viz. that the prostitution is the penalty imposed on the women who refuse to shave their heads in token of mourning for the dead Adonis.

(ii) The Tammuz ritual was essentially a funeral ceremony, a 'wake' as the Irish call it; and that is just what is described in our Epistle. '*The offerings are set before them as if they were dead men*' ([27]); 'and in their temples the priests (?) bear the litter [probably a misrendering of the Hebrew, which, in Dr. Ball's opinion, had "weep"], having their clothes rent, and *their heads and beards shaven* and nothing upon their heads; they roar and cry before their gods *as men do at a dead man's wake*' ([31] f.). Just so, in Lucian's words (*op. cit.*), 'after beating of the breast and

lamentations they first *make offerings to Adonis as to a dead man* . . . and *they shave their heads* as the Egyptians do for the dead Apis.'

(iii) Women played the principal part in the mourning for Tammuz (cf. Ezek 8 [14] and the analogous women's festival in Jg 11 [40]). So here it is the women who set meat before the gods ([30]), who, though unclean, touch their sacrifices ([29]), and who receive the perquisites from the priests ([28. 33]).

(iv) The image of Tammuz was washed, anointed, and dressed up in gay apparel. A fragmentary hymn runs thus: 'Wash Tammuz with pure water, anoint him with good oil, clothe him with red sparkling raiment.' (Zimmern, *Der babylonische Gott Tamuz* in *Abhandlungen*, etc., Leipzig, 1909, XXVII, 734). For the wiping and polishing cf. [13] and [24] of our Epistle; for the dressing up, [9], 'as for a virgin that loveth to go gay'; and for the purple raiment, [12. 72]; the subsequent disposal of the garments is mentioned in [33].

(v) Tammuz was a god of healing, and demoniacs were brought to him to be cured, but 'in this doctrine there seems to be no reference to immortality or deliverance from eternal sleep in Sheol' (Langdon, *Tammuz and Ishtar*, 33-36). So in our Epistle a dumb man is brought to Bel to be cured ([41]); yet these gods 'can save no man from death . . . they cannot restore a blind man to his sight' ([36] f.). As healer Tammuz carries a double axe (Langdon, 36); cf. Ep Jer [15], 'he hath a dagger in his right hand and an axe.'

(vi) The dying and rising god also represented the element of fresh water; as 'lord of the flood'—that is, of the springs rising out of the earth—he was credited with powers of irrigation (Langdon, *ib.* 6). Yet, retorts our Epistle, these gods cannot 'give rain unto men' ([53]).

(vii) The comparison of the idols to 'crows between heaven and earth' ([54]) suggests images suspended from the roof of the temple; cf. 'if they fall to the ground' ([27]). With this we may perhaps compare the story of Tammuz the prophet, quoted by Dr. Aldis Wright from Kimchi and Maimonides (Smith, *D.B.*, art. 'Tammuz'): 'On the night of his death there were gathered together all the images from the ends of the earth to the temple of Babel, to the golden image which was the image of the sun. Now this image was suspended between heaven and earth, and it fell down in the midst of the temple, and the images likewise [fell down] round about it, and it told them what had befallen Tammuz the prophet.'

(6) **Relation to Jewish Fast of 17th Tammuz.**—Of the three appendices to the Book of Jeremiah—Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle—the two first have been found to have a liturgical origin and to be associated with a Jewish fast. Lamentations from time immemorial has been used on the 9th of Ab; Baruch appears to have been designed for use on that fast-day and on the sabbaths which immediately preceded and followed it. There is therefore an *a priori* probability that the third booklet of the trilogy had a similar origin and is connected with a Jewish fast. Nor, after what has been said in the last section, is it difficult to identify the fast to which this Epistle is most closely allied; the prominence given to the Tammuz ritual is significant. For the blackest of the Jewish national fasts, after the 9th Ab, was that of the 17th Tammuz, the fast of the fourth month dating back to the time of the exile (Zech 8 [19]); and it has been shown that the association of this day with the capture of Jerusalem 'represents merely the attempt to give an ancient festival a worthier interpretation' and that 'the day was originally connected with the Tammuz cult' (Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 682).

But, though this disgraceful origin was concealed, idolatry still held the prominent place among the avowed associations of the fast-day. Of the five misfortunes which tradition connected with the 17th Tammuz (T. B., *Taanith*, IV, 6), two relate to idolatry, viz. the breaking of the tables of the Law (in consequence of the worship of the golden calf) and the setting up of an image in the temple; one relates to the capture of the city by Nebuchadnezzar; two are desecrations analogous to those mentioned, the burning of the Law by Apostomus, and the cessation of the daily sacrifice during the Roman siege.

Like Baruch, our Epistle is dependent on a chapter of Jeremiah. The sermon which forms the central portion of Baruch had for its text Jer 9 [23] f., the closing verses of the *Haftarah* or second lesson for the 9th Ab; the Epistle has been found to be dependent on the passage almost immediately following (Jer 10), and to be reminiscent of Tammuz worship. The obvious inference is that, as Jer 9 was the *Haftarah* for 9 Ab, so *Jer 10 was probably the Haftarah for 17 Tammuz*. We have no information about the ancient lessons peculiar to 17 Tammuz. What we do know is that the lessons common to all fast-days in-

cluded portions* of Exodus 32 and 34, and Isaiah 55^{6}-56^{8}; and that the special Psalm for 17 Tammuz in both modern rituals, and therefore of high antiquity, is 79 (Oesterley, *Psalms in Jewish Worship*, 170). Of these three passages, the first lesson from Exodus, with its reference to the breaking of the tables (34^{1}), was clearly selected as appropriate to 17 Tammuz; and it is interesting to note that an allusion to the Exodus passage stands in the forefront of our Epistle. 'For mine angel is with you and he careth for your souls' (Ep ^{7}) is an echo of Ex 32^{34}: 'Behold mine angel shall go before thee: nevertheless . . . I will visit their sin upon them.' Again, Ps 79 (*Deus, venerunt*) is not only wholly appropriate to this fast, but ^{6}f. are either a quotation from, or are quoted in, Jer 10^{25}; commentators are uncertain on which side the indebtedness lies, but this seems to be a case of the influence of one portion of the festival service upon the other. On the other hand, the *Haftarah* from Isaiah, beyond the mention of the rain which accomplishes God's purpose (55^{10} f.; cf. Ep. Jer ^{58} with the Targum on Jer 10^{11}), has no connexion with the thoughts associated with 17 Tammuz. For that fast, as for 9 Ab, the lesson is likely to have been drawn from Jeremiah, the censor of the nation, and no more appropriate passage could be found in the whole book than Jer 10 with its two subjects, (i) the folly of idolatry ($^{1\text{-}16}$), and (ii) the end of the siege ('Gather up thy bundle . . . thou that abidest in the siege'), and the departure of the exiles for Babylon ($^{17\text{-}25}$). It is generally recognized that the first part of this chapter is an interpolation, the work 'probably of one living in the latter part of the Babylonian captivity' (Driver), and that the genuine matter in the second part has been worked over. The close of the lesson for 9 Ab (Jer 9^{23} f.) is also an interpolation. The suggestions here made are (1) that the original lesson for 17 Tammuz was drawn from Jer 10, a genuine utterance of the prophet being amplified by the passage on idolatry, and (2) that our Epistle is a homily based on that lesson, just as the central portion of Baruch is a sermon based on Jer 9.

(7) **Date.**—There is no sure criterion for determining this. Commentators have suggested a date about 100 B.C., finding in the references to the putting down and setting up of kings ($^{34, 56}$; cf. ^{48}) allusion to political disturbances when the Seleucid dynasty was tottering to its fall; but this argument has little force. The recognition that the Epistle is a translation enables us to postulate a considerably earlier date for the original Hebrew; and the character of the work, which seems designed to meet an actual need rather than as an academical polemic against idolatry, suggests a period nearer to the exile. The tantalizing prediction in ^{3}, that the exile will last 'for seven generations' would afford a clue if we knew what the author meant by a generation. If, with the late Dr. Ball, we allow 40 years to the generation, the work might be dated at about the time of Alexander the Great.

1. Modelled on Jer 29^{1}, Jeremiah's letter to the exiles predicting a captivity of 70 years.

2. **seven generations**: an extension of the period of 70 years named by Jeremiah. A large colony of Jews remained in Babylon after the return under Zerubbabel and Ezra; the writer of this Epistle looks for a restoration on a larger scale, but intentionally uses a vague phrase to indicate the date. A generation might mean 33 years (Herodotus, II, 142), a century (Gen 15^{13} with ^{16}), or possibly 70 years.

4. **borne upon shoulders** in festal procession (cf. ^{26}; Jer 10^{5}; Is 46^{7}).

7. **mine angel.** After Ex 23^{23} ff., 32^{34} (see Introduction, § 6). **and I myself do care.** Read with margin, 'And *he* (emphatic) *careth*.' The angel is regarded as protector and intercessor; but idolatry cannot escape the visitation of God (Ex 32^{34}).

8. Cf. Ps 115^{4} f., 'They have mouths but they speak not.'

10. **convey**: archaic for 'steal,' 'filch,' as in Shakespeare: 'O good! Convey? conveyers are ye all' (*Rich. II*, iv, 1).

11. **common**: literally 'on the roof' (of the temple) or perhaps 'in the brothel.'

14 f. **sceptre, dagger, axe.** Images which grasped anything in the hand were forbidden by one school of Rabbis; 'only those which grasped in the hand a staff, a bird or an orb' by another; while the severest school forbade the use of all images because they were worshipped once a year (Mishna, *'Aboda zara*, III, 1).

17, 19. Cf. Ps 115^{5}, 'Eyes have they but they see not.'

18. **the courts**: prisons in the palace (Jer 32^{2}).

19. **candles**: lamps. **More than for themselves**: more than the priests need for themselves; or perhaps, with another reading, 'many for them' (the gods).

* Ex $32^{11\text{-}14}$ and $34^{1\text{-}10}$; there is thirteenth-century authority for reading the whole passage Ex 32^{11}-34^{10} on 17 Tammuz: Elbogen, *Der jüd. Gottesdienst*, 164.

20. their hearts are eaten out, being as rotten as those of their makers (Is 44 [20], LXX = Wisd 15 [10], 'their heart is ashes'). But the connexion of thought is not clear, and Dr. Ball suggests that the Hebrew text had 'And they say in their heart, He licketh up!', comparing Bel [6] ff. for eating as proof of the idol's existence.

24. Notwithstanding the gold . . . they will not shine. Rather *For the gold . . . they will not make to shine*; the Greek verb is here causative.

25. The Greek order is more forcible: 'At all cost are they purchased [i.e. the highest prices are paid for them]—things wherein there is no breath.' For the last words cf. Jer 10 [14]; Ps 135 [17].

26. whereby . . . nothing worth: 'displaying . . . their own worthlessness,' i.e. impotence to walk; cf. [4], Is 46 [7], and Ps 115 [7], 'Feet have they but they walk not,' though the images in the Ep. appear to lack the lower limbs. Another rendering, 'exposing . . . their own shame' (of indecent figures) is possible, but, in view of the allusions elsewhere to drapery, improbable.

27. as if they were dead men: Ps 106 [28]. For the probable allusion here and in the sequel to Tammuz worship see Introduction, § 5.

31. sit on seats: meaning uncertain. The Greek verb elsewhere denotes 'ride in a chariot' (a sense obviously unsuitable here); the rendering in the text has no authority, though the cognate noun may mean 'seat.' The marginal rendering, 'bear the litter' (the bier of Tammuz), is attractive, but equally lacks authority. Ball suggests that the Hebrew had JBKU, 'they weep,' misread by the translator as JRKBU, 'they ride.' **Clothes rent,** etc.: customs forbidden to Jewish priests (Lev 21 [5, 10]).

34 ff. neither set up a king, etc.: cf. [53]. Unlike Jehovah (1 S 2 [6-8]; Ps 75 [7], 146 [7-9]) these gods can do nothing.

41. intreat him to call upon Bel. The Greek is ambiguous; the meaning probably is 'intreat Bel that he (the dumb man) may speak.'

43. For this notorious scandal of the Tammuz cult see Introduction, § 5 (i). The burning of bran to a goddess as part of the magical rites to secure a lover is mentioned in Theocritus (Idyll II, 33, 'Now will I burn the bran and mayest thou, Artemis, move hell's adamantine gates') and elsewhere.

45 f. 'The work of men's hands' (Ps 115 [4]; Is 40 [19]) and of short-lived craftsmen (Wisd 15 [8] f.) cannot be expected to survive.

48. Thus Amenophis, king of Egypt, on the invasion of his country, sent for the sacred animals, and instructed the priests to conceal the images of the gods as securely as possible (Manetho, quoted by Josephus, *Apion*, I, 26, 244).

53. set up a king: [34]. The inability of the idols to give rain is a standing argument; Jer 14 [22] (an old lesson for the fast of 9 Ab) and the Targum on Jer 10 [11] (possibly the lesson for the fast of 17 Tammuz), 'They cannot bring rain from heaven.' The Jew had an intense belief in the efficacy of prayer and fasting in times of drought (Jas 5 [16] ff.).

54. as crows, i.e. dead crows hung up to scare their fellows ([70]). See Introduction, § 5 (vii).

59. a king that sheweth his manhood in defending his people in war-time (cf. [48. 56]). But this first comparison is rather incongruous with the inanimate objects—vessel, door, pillar—which follow, and the translator perhaps misread his original; Ball suggests that the Hebrew ran, 'a stick in the hand of a mighty man.'

60-63. In contrast to the useless idols, nature obeys God's behests and fulfils its appointed functions (Jer 10 [12] f.; Ps 135 [6] f.); for the obedience of the light and the stars cf. Bar 3 [33] f.

64. Jer 10 [5], 'They cannot do evil, neither is it in them to do good.'

67. signs in the heaven: eclipses, comets, etc., at which the nations are dismayed (Jer 10 [2]).

70. a scarecrow. The Greek properly means an amulet or safeguard against witchcraft. It is used here to render the Hebrew *tomer* in Jer 10 [5] (RV 'palm tree'), of a post set up in a cucumber patch (Is 1 [8]), a mere sham protection against birds.

72. by the bright purple. An attempt to restore sense to a phrase which literally means 'from the purple and marble'; a clear case, as acutely detected by Dr. Ball, of a translator's confusion of the two meanings of the Hebrew *shēsh* (Introduction, § 3). The original doubtless had *from the purple and fine linen.*

ADDITIONS TO THE BOOK OF DANIEL

By N. D. Coleman

Relation to the Canonical Daniel.—With the growth of *haggadah*, Daniel, who was already the type of ritual exactitude and of successful resistance to idolatry, began to rival Joseph and Solomon as the pattern of wisdom. The shorter canonical Daniel was probably the nucleus, but it would not be long before its haggadic character suggested further development. Daniel in one place looks like a reduced book, for the narrative (Song of the Three, $^{1, 23-27}$) connected with the Prayer of Azariah fills a hiatus between Dan 3^{23} and ^{24}, and may belong to the original nucleus. But the two liturgical pieces (Prayer of Azariah and Song of the Three), together with Sus., Bel, and the Dragon, are probably later additions of separate origin.

Textual Problem and Church Usage.—The additions are not found in the Hebrew Bible, but the Greek versions LXX and Theodotion include them as integral parts of the text of Daniel; so also the Old Latin, Vulgate, Syriac (but not the original Syriac). Like Esdras, Daniel was treated with great freedom by the Greek translator, possibly because its canonical position was not yet established, though the vagaries of the LXX may be due to an archetype other than MT. The LXX proper only survives in the 9th-century cursive codex Chisianus with the sole check of the Syro-hexaplaric version; it is paraphrastic, and is characterized by Midrashic expansions of the additions. These features are absent from the version attributed to Th., which at an early date supplanted the LXX in the Church. In Sus., however, Th. sometimes has a longer text than LXX; the divergences between the two versions in Sus. and Bel almost presuppose different traditions. All investigators have been puzzled by the relation between LXX and Th. of Daniel; Th. is best regarded as a critical revision of LXX, but from a different archetype. It is fairly certain that the basis of Th. is earlier than Theodotion, even if he is dated under M. Aurelius rather than Commodus (Swete, *Introd.*, 46-48), since there are many quotations of Daniel in a text very like Th. between A.D. 50 and 150. There is also evidence of the LXX Daniel, especially in the earlier Old Latin and in Justin and Cyprian, who show a mixed text (LXX and Th.). It is noteworthy that even though Th. is a more literal version, yet it does not omit the additions in its desire to be faithful to the Hebrew.

All the early Fathers used the enlarged Daniel, and treated the whole as canonical, as the Roman Church still does. The frescoes in the catacombs are evidence of the popularity of the additions in the early Roman Church, and were perhaps inspired by the commentary of Hippolytus. The only protest comes from Julius Africanus, who criticizes the contents of Sus. and assumes from the paronomasia in the Greek, and the fact that 'this section is not contained in the Daniel received among the Jews,' that it 'is plainly a more modern forgery.' Jerome speaks of the additions as 'apocryphal fables,' yet, 'because they are to be found everywhere,' retains them in an appendix. Origen had regarded them as fables, but his allegorical method and his knowledge of their haggadic treatment by the Jews enabled him to value them as Church documents. Origen's principle was: 'Thou shalt not remove the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set up'; he therefore defends the canonicity of the additions against Africanus. The heathen philosopher Porphyry's attack on the historicity of Daniel seems to have repeated the criticism of Africanus on Sus. Polychronius refused to comment upon the Song of the Three because it had no Hebrew original.

Original Language.—The view that 'the apocryphal literature was mostly written in Greek by Hellenizing Jews' must be revised in the case of these additions. There is no evidence of the use of Th. among the Jews, and it is often assumed that the testimony to the additions is almost solely Christian. Origen and Jerome, who both preferred Th., could find no Hebrew originals, but from what Origen was told by certain Jews he hints at the suppression of the originals by Jewish elders responsible for the Palestinian canon. Origen's inclusion of the additions in his Tetrapla suggests that Th. (and possibly Symmachus, *v.* Kay) knew a Hebrew archetype. The matter of additions 2 and 3 is just conceivable as Hellenistic composition, but the additions generally do not read like Alexandrine productions. Semitic forms of them do

exist, but they are either dependent on Th., or too free to be the archetype of LXX or Th. The additions are all found in Josippon (the 10th-century Hebrew Josephus), and Gaster claims to have discovered the original Aramaic of the Song and of the Dragon in a late MS. at the Bodleian. These forms contain some features unparalleled in LXX and Th. The Bodleian MS. also preserves a Hebrew Sus. which is so independent that it is either copied from an earlier Hebrew account, or more probably is a version from Syriac, as there is no trace of such an account in Hebrew in earlier times; whereas Syriac was rich in variant forms of the Susanna story. Josephus has a curious reference (*Ant.*, x, 11, 7) to 'the several books that D wrote and left behind him' as still read in his time. The variation in the position of Sus. in LXX (Dan 13) and Th. (Dan 1) suggests that these stories originally had a separate circulation. May not Josephus have been referring to these separate pieces? It is true that in writing of the Three Children and the Furnace (*Ant.*, x, 10, 5) he ignores addition 1, but if the growing tendency to postulate Semitic originals for the additions be correct, Palestine would be their most likely place of origin, and Josephus would probably know of their existence, but would treat them as uncanonical. He speaks apologetically even of the canonical Daniel to his Roman readers. All the additions may be said to illustrate the remarks of Josephus (*Ant.*, x, 11, 7), who claims that Daniel is a standing witness against the Epicureans who 'are in error casting Providence out of human life,' as if 'the world went on by mechanical necessity.' Each addition mentions an angel through whom human injustice is redressed.' The date and original language of the additions may be connected with the patriotic revival of Hebrew in Palestine after the Maccabæan triumphs, especially at the beginning of the 1st century B.C.

Bibliography

See books, etc., cited under *Pr. of Manasses* (substituting Rothstein in *Kautzsch*; Bennett, Kay, Davies, in *Charles*); Swete, *Introd.*; Origen, *Ep. to Julius Africanus*; Burkitt, *Old Latin and Itala*; Daubney, *Three Adds. to Dan.*; Schürer, *Gesch.* iii; Brüll, *Das Apokr-Sus.* in *Jahrb.*; Scholz, *Judith and Bel*; Julius, *Die gr. Dan.-Zusätze*; Gaster in *P.S.B.A.*, 1894.

Addition 1: The Song of the Three Holy Children.—If the narrative part of this addition (1-23-27) belongs to the original nucleus of Dan 3 its original language was Aramaic, unless Dan 2^{49}-7^{28} is an Aramaic version of a lost Hebrew narrative. Bennett maintains a Hebrew original 'probably for the bulk of our addition, and certainly for the Pr. of Az.' The liturgical pieces depend upon the Psalter and other Scriptural models (*v.* Dan 9^{4-19}; Bar 1^{5}-3^{8}: cf. also Singer's *Hebr. Pr. Bk.*, 37-57, 270-273), and they would probably be composed in Hebrew, the pre-Christian language of devotion in Palestine. Ball believes that the Prayer and the Song are by the same author, but the despondent tone of the Prayer and the condition indicated in 5, 9, 14, 15 suggest an author who contemplates the Maccabæan persecution at a date before the rededication of the Temple, while the jubilant Song reflects the success of the Jewish state and the ordered ritual of the Temple cultus (31, 62, 63, 68). Perhaps both belong to early Maccabæan times, but were edited at a later date with a view to their inclusion in Daniel; the distinction between 'thy servants' and 'them that worship thee' in 10 indicates the development of synagogue worship and proselytism. The Prayer's silence as to the peril of the Three and its general references to the national situation, together with the fact that it is put into the mouth of Azariah instead of the first-named Hananiah of Dan 1^{7} ff., all favour the authorship of some unknown Maccabæan Azariah. The Song may be an expansion of Ps 148: cf. also Ps 104 and the *Shemoneh 'Esreh*. It has little to connect it with the Three, and less if the closing verses are an editorial addition. The difference in the order of the names Ananias, Azarias, and Misael in 66 from the unvarying Hananiah (Shadrach), Mishael (Meshach), and Azariah (Abednego) of Dan 1-3 proves that the Song was not an original part of Daniel. The author of 1 Mac 2^{59} perhaps knew the Song, as he agrees with its order. The later Rabbinic literature preserves numerous references to the story of the Three.

Jer 29^{22-23} is a proof that the king of Babylon resorted to roasting criminals in the fire. This was also the practice of Asshurbanipal according to his records. There is also a Persian tradition of a martyr who came unhurt out of a fiery furnace. The two wicked elders mentioned in Jer 29^{22} (*v.* Sus.) formed with Joshua the High Priest a trio who were put to the test of fire which Joshua alone survived. Ball says: 'In such legends it is possible to see a literal application of Scriptural passages like Ps 66^{12}: "We

went through fire and water, and thou broughtest us out"; Zech 3^{2}; "Is not this man (Joshua) a brand plucked out of the fire?"; and Is 43^{2}: "When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burnt."'

The Benedicite (Song, $^{35\text{-}66}$) forms a worthy link between Jewish and Christian worship.

1, 2. And . . . fire: RV follows Th.; only important LXX variants will be noted. Here LXX has 'Thus then prayed Hananias and Azarias and Misael, and sang praise to the Lord, when the king commanded them to be thrown into the furnace. And Azarias stood up and prayed thus and opened his mouth and gave thanks to the Lord (together with his companions in the midst of the fire, the furnace being brought to an exceeding great heat by the Chaldeans).' The words in brackets may be a later addition.

9. lawless enemies and most hateful forsakers: Jewish Hellenizing apostates during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (Jos., *Ant.*, xii, 7, 1; 1 Mac 2^{15}: cf. Is 30^{1}; Wisd 12^{4}, 15^{18}; Ac 21^{21}); scarcely applicable to the Chaldeans. The king is Antiochus.

12. Abraham that is beloved of thee: elsewhere (e.g. 2 Ch 20^{7}; Is 41^{8}) the Greek renders the Hebrew active participle by the passive (cf. Jas 2^{23}).

14. O Lord: *despota* (Master) is rarely used in the earlier LXX. **kept under . . . in all the world:** the Hebrew letters *mēm* and *bēth* may have been confused, so read 'and are lower than all the earth.'

15. Neither is there at this time prince . . . or place to offer. The lack of leadership and suspension of sacrificial worship find their closest parallel in Ps 74^{9}; 1 Mac 4^{46}, 9^{27}, 14^{41}: cf. Hos 3^{4}; 2 Ch 15^{3}; Is 3^{1} ff., 9^{15}; Ps 40^{6}. 'To offer' is *karpōsai*, which means 'to bear or enjoy fruit,' but in LXX seems to mean 'offer fruit or sacrifice' (cf. Lev 2^{11}). Deissmann thinks it means 'burn' in LXX.

17. that we may wholly go after thee. The infinitive *ektelesai* of Th. is untranslatable unless another verb (e.g. 'grant') is supplied. RV assumes a Hebraism which is more idiomatically rendered in all other LXX passages (Nu 14^{24}, 32^{11}; Dt 1^{36}; Jos $14^{8\text{-}14}$) by *akoloutheō*. Here LXX reads *exilasai* ('make thou atonement') which looks like a correction, especially as LXX also has the gloss *kai teleiōsai opisthen sou*. Schleusner accepts the variant in Th. *ektelesthai* and emends to *ekteleistho*, 'let it be offered or performed,' *opisthen* becoming *emprosthen*, 'before.' Fritzsche conjectures a noun *exilasis*, 'our propitiation before thee.' Marshall thinks all the readings point to the Hebrew root *shālam*, which is patient of all the meanings. The obscurity of the Greek versions favours this or Ball's suggestion of confusion between Hebrew *kālīl* ('whole' or 'perfect'), and *kālal* ('to perfect' or 'finish'); e.g. the Ethiopic runs 'so be our sacrifice before thee today, and let it be perfect with thee.'.

23. And . . . wood. Th. has contracted LXX's fuller 'And when they had cast the three all at once into the furnace, and the furnace was red hot, according to the heating of it seven times as much; and when they had cast them in, they who cast them in were above them, while the others were kindling underneath them naphtha, and tow, and pitch, and brushwood.' Naphtha is the Persian *naft*, a natural petroleum used for lighting, and found in Babylonia and elsewhere.

27. a moist whistling wind: lit. 'a whistling wind of dew.' Not a naturalistic explanation, but a miracle within a miracle. For dew cf. Dan 4 and 5.

31. in the temple of thine holy glory. There is no need to assume the same author as for ^{15}; the whole tone of the Song is one of joyfulness at the restoration of the Temple worship. The LXX seems right in transposing ^{32} and ^{33}, which contemplate the Shechinah and Cherubim as symbolic of heaven. The language may be ideal (cf. Ezek 1).

36 and 37 are transposed by LXX.

39. O all ye powers of the Lord. Th.'s *v.l. dunamis* (host) may have arisen by itacism, as 'powers' are often referred to in the Talmud; 'of the Lord' should be omitted (cf. Ps 103^{21} LXX). Probably a general reference to the celestial powers.

43. winds: Greek is *pneumata* for *anemoi*; ctr. *pneumata* (spirits) in ^{64}. Evidently translation Greek.

45-51. LXX order is $^{45, 46, 49, 50, 47, 48, 51}$. RV omits ^{45} as a doublet of ^{48}, and ^{46} which is partly a doublet of ^{50}.

55. fountains: LXX prefixes 'shower and.'

57. whales: sea-monsters: cf. Jon 1^{17}; Job 3^{8}, 26^{12}; Ps 104^{26}; Gen 1^{21}.

62 and 63. priests . . . servants. The higher and lower orders of temple officials; the latter would be Levites or Nethinim. In both cases omit 'of the Lord' with LXX and Th. (codex Vat.).

64. O ye spirits and souls of the righteous. According to Theodoret, Grotius, and popular Church usage this refers to the Blessed Departed in Paradise. Regarded critically the verse has been taken by most moderns as referring to the living *ḥasidim* because all the neighbour-

ing verses plainly speak of the living. Also compare the Old Testament use of *ruaḥ* and *nephesh*, which certainly do not refer to the dead, but to the higher and lower parts of man's immaterial being (Gen 1 [20, 24], 9 [10-16]; Ps 86 [2], 97 [10]; Judith 7 [27]; 1 Th 5 [23]; Heb 4 [12]). But the impetus given to the development of eschatology by the Maccabæan persecution makes it not improbable that the Song includes mention of the slain martyrs whose fate was otherwise an insoluble enigma. The Great War similarly turned men's thoughts to the state of the fallen. Pharisaism would soon adapt its terminology to the doctrine of a future life (cf. 2 Mac 7 [12, 23], 12 [43-45]; Wisd 3 [1]; 1 P 3 [19]; Heb 12 [23]; Rev 6 [9], 20 [4]). At any rate the use of the Song as a Church canticle rightly suggests the inclusion of the departed in this all-embracing hymn. The Latin *spiritus*, as applied to the dead in the Roman catacomb inscriptions, would serve to fix this interpretation.

65. **holy and humble of heart.** Bennett: 'Hebrew *ḥāsîd* and *'ānāv*. . . technical terms for members of the nationalist party which insisted on the strict observance of the Law' (cf. also Mt 11 [29]; Ps 34 [18]).

66. **O Ananias, Azarias, and Misael.** [66-68] are perhaps a later addition.

Addition 2: The History of Susanna.—If there is any factual reality beneath this artistic fiction, it may possibly be found in the behaviour of the two elders Ahab and Zedekiah mentioned in Jer 29 [20-23]; this explanation of Sus. was given to Origen by a learned young Jew. Jewish tradition in the Talmud and Midrash preserves different accounts of the story, one of which represents the elders as seducing Jewish women with the promise that they would give birth to the Messiah, while another substitutes Babylonian ladies and even the wife of Nebuchadnezzar for the Jewesses, and a prophet for the Messiah. Still another (probably the original) account centres round the queen of Jehoiachin who is compared to a lily (Shoshannah, cf. Song of Songs, 2 [1]), which is unknown in the Old Testament as a proper name (though *v.* Lk 8 [3]), and which may have suggested the heroine's name in Sus., the husband's name Joacim being identified with Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) by Hippolytus and some moderns.

All the versions treated Sus. as history, but allegorical interpretation prevailed in the Church. The catacomb frescoes show that S. was a type of the persecuted Church; she is represented as a sheep between two wolves with the inscription: 'Susanna, Seniores.' Hippolytus says: 'S. is a type prefiguring the Church; Joacim her husband prefigures Christ.'

The original form of the Sus. story seems to have been composed in the time of Alexander Jannæus (106-79 B.C.) in order to encourage legislative reform in favour of the Pharisaic contention that anyone bringing a false charge of a capital offence should himself suffer the death penalty even though his victim had not so suffered. The name of Simon ben Shetach is generally associated with this reform (*v. Pirke Aboth*, i, 9; *Jerus. San.*, vi, 3); he insisted on a closer cross-questioning of witnesses.

Most scholars had followed Africanus in assuming that the paranomasiæ in the Greek of [54-59] proved the Greek text to be certainly original, but it is highly probable that there was a Hebrew original which was suppressed because the Jews found Sus. an encumbrance and because Christians interpreted it of the Church. R. Akiba excluded it from the canon *c.* A.D. 90. The variety of the early Syriac and Greek forms as well as the revisions of Sus. by Symm. and Th. strongly favour a Hebrew original.

The LXX is shorter and more primitive than all the other versions of Sus. But it must be remembered that the LXX is a copy of Origen's edition, which was the common text of his day *with certain additions*. Sus. [1-5] are marked as an addition in LXX, and they seem to have been repeated from Th. The LXX may formerly have had an introduction which located the story in Palestine, though the Haggadist was often indifferent to topography and chronology. It is alleged that Daniel was absent from the original plot of the LXX story, for it ends with an eulogy not of D., but of the *neōteroi*. The LXX gives little about the garden scene, and emphasizes the trial. 'Do not suppose that elders cannot lie,' and double questions addressed to the elders are among the peculiarities of the LXX. Th. was probably made from a second Hebrew edition which removed certain features in LXX objectionable to Jews, added fresh details, and extended the story, possibly locating it in Babylon and identifying the youth as Daniel, though it is more likely that the youthful D. was the judge from the first by reason of his name ('El is my Judge'). The Vulgate translates Th., while the Old Latin has two forms (LXX and Th.). Syriac has at least four forms; one (? the Harklean) gives a distinct tradition, probably an adaptation of Sus. to the Gospel history in some details.

Scriptural parallels to Susanna are 1 K 3 [16-28], the *pericope adulteræ* Jn 7 [53]-8 [11], and the triumphs of Esther and Judith, if not of Jael.

5. the ancients: Greek *presbuteroi*; ctr. the *neōteroi* of [62] in LXX, and of [45] in LXX and Th. These technical terms suggest Palestinian conditions in the 1st, not Babylonia in the 6th, century B.C. (cf. Ac 5 [6, 10]; 1 P 5 [5]). Both terms designate officials. **such . . . that:** a Hebraism.

17. washing balls: cf. Est 2 [3, 9, 12]; cosmetics rather than soap (Jer 2 [22]). The Greek may mean soap, perfumes, or medical ointments.

32. unveiled: cf. Nu 5 [18] LXX.

34. laid their hands upon her head: cf. Lev 24 [14]; Dt 13 [9], 17 [7]. Tr. *Sanhedrin*, i, 3: the symbolic act of witnesses before the stoning (cf. Lev 20 [10]; Dt 22 [21, 22]; Jn 8 [5]). It is unlikely that the Jews in Babylonia would be allowed to exercise the death penalty.

37. Then a young man: LXX adds 'as we came round the stadion, we saw this woman dallying with a man.' The stadion in Jerusalem was a product of the Hellenizing policy of Antiochus Epiphanes, and was regarded as exercising an immoral influence.

45. the holy spirit of a young youth: LXX 'there came an angel of the Lord; and as it had been commanded him, the angel bestowed a spirit of discernment upon a young man, (this) being Daniel.' Syriac (? Harkl.) gives: 'And straightway the Holy Spirit abode upon young D., who was twelve years old' (cf. Dan 4 [8], 5 [11]; Dt 34 [9]; Is 11 [2]). The Mishnah (*San.*, vi, 2) allows an opportunity for retrial even at the moment before the stoning (cf. Jos 7 [19]).

48. without examination indicates the need of legal reform.

50. the elders: not the witnesses, but their colleagues on the bench; the representatives of the people.

53. the innocent and righteous shalt thou not slay. Africanus argues from this citation of Ex 23 [7] that Sus. cannot be inspired as it needs to depend on Scripture.

54, 59. mastick tree . . . holm tree: mastick, i.e. *Pistacia lentiscus*, a shrub yielding resin and berries; 'holm,' i.e. evergreen oak, or a smaller shrub with prickly leaves and berries. Both Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents have been attempted for the paranomasiæ in the Greek. The Syriac has for 'mastick' *pāstēqā* (pistachio tree) with the verb *pĕsaq* (to cut off), and for 'holm' *rummānā* (pomegranate tree), with *rumchā* (a sword). Dan 5 [25-28] has a paronomasia.

55, 59. lied against thine own head: LXX has 'soul' (Hebrew *nephesh*), which more often stands for 'self' or 'person,' but cf. 1 S 28 [2] for 'head.'

56. seed of Canaan, and not of Judah: LXX 'Why is thy seed perverted like that of Sidon, and not like that of Judah?' The same exclusive bias is seen in [57], which invidiously contrasts the daughters of Israel and Judah. Sidon was a Hellenized city of bad repute (cf. 1 K 16 [31]; Jer 25 [22]; Jl 3 [4]; Mt 11 [21]; Mk 7 [24-31]).

62. law of Moses: Dt 19 [16-21]. LXX omits 'of Moses.' The Pharisees and Sadducees differed in applying it. Here note the Pharisaic penalty for the motive. According to LXX the culprits are gagged and hurled into a chasm. LXX closes: 'Therefore the young men (*neōteroi*) are beloved of Jacob by reason of their sincerity. And as for us, let us watch over young men that they may become men of worth; for so will young men be God-fearing, and there will be in them a spirit of knowledge and discernment for ever.' This emphasizes the didactic rather than the historical purpose of Sus. 'Sincerity' (*aplotēs*) is either unbiassed simplicity in judgement or singleness of heart in faithfulness to the Law and rejection of all syncretism (cf. 1 Mac 2 [37, 60]; Wisd 1 [1]).

Addition 3: Bel and the Dragon.—This addition consists of two companion stories whose object is to satirize idol worship. These vivid narratives must have enjoyed great popularity as polemics against heathen religion in the period 100 B.C.-A.D. 100, and even in Christian times. The variety of its forms shows that the Dragon was the more popular of the two, and it may have been in the mind of the author of Revelation (12 [7, 8], 13 [4]). The author of the addition probably got his idea from Jer 50 [2], 51 [33-44]; cf. Lam 3 [53-55]; Hab 2 [18]. It is disputed whether his material is historical or mythical. In allowing that his narrative gives a faithful picture of the paraphernalia used in contemporary pagan worship (cf. the two snakes kept at the temple of Æsculapius in Arist., *Plutus*, 734 [cf. 690], and the greediness of the priests, 668-683; Valerius Maximus also speaks of a sacred serpent kept in the temple of Æsculapius at Epidaurus, i, 8), it is unnecessary to deny with Witton Davies all connexion with the primeval Babylonian myth of Tiamat, to which there are numerous Biblical references, and which evidently formed part of Hebrew folklore. There is no

reason to suppose that either the Babylonians or the Old Testament prophets took it literally. Primeval chaos or the Great Deep is represented as a female principle (Tiamat) who wages unceasing war against Marduk, the god of light. She appears on the seals and cylinders as a winged monster with a serpent's head and neck, a lion's body, eagle's talons, and a scaly tail. This myth undoubtedly lies at the root of the Babylonian worship of Bel-Merodach (Marduk), who represented the opposite principle. It is not enough to substitute the Canaanite Baal for Bel, who had become a solar deity, and was compared with Jupiter by Greek and Roman writers (cf. Diod. Sic., ii, 8, 9; Pliny, xxxvii, 19; Cic., *De Nat. Deorum*, iii, 16). Traditions of Babylonian worship derived from the Jewish exiles were probably still alive when this addition was composed. There are references to the temple of Bel in Herod., i, 183; Strabo, xvi, 1; Arrian, *Exp. Alex.*, vii, 17; Diod. Sic., ii, 9; and *Abodah Zarah*, 11*b*. The Midrashic literature has the stories of Bel and the Dragon in Aramaic (*Bereshith Rabbah*: cf. Bab. Talm., *Bechoroth*, 8*b*), and refers to 'vessels bearing the forms of the sun, the moon, or a dragon.' R. Joshua ben Levi is said to have found a seal-ring whereon was the image of a dragon which he compelled an adult pagan to desecrate by breaking. The Talmudic stories of huge serpents are not unrelated to the Babylonian myth, and the slaying of Tiamat by Merodach is similar in some respects to Daniel's slaying of the Dragon.

It is obvious that the immediate reference in the Dragon is to a live serpent; Homer uses *drakōn* and *ophis* as synonyms. In the East the serpent was often symbolic of evil (cf. Gen 3 [1]; Job 26 [13], 40-41; Ps 74 [13, 14], 104 [26]; Is 27 [1], 51 [9]; Ezek 32 [2]; Am 9 [3]. But what was an object of fear came to be worshipped, so the serpent was also regarded as possessing wisdom and beneficent power. Thus Egyptian religion made use of serpents and other animals (Ex 7 [8-12]; Nu 21 [8-10]; 2 K 18 [4]), though in Egyptian mythology the great dragon Apepi resembles Tiamat. There is plenty of evidence for the use of the serpent form in Babylonian worship, and it would not be rash to assume in lack of direct evidence the existence of live serpents in Babylonian temples. But if these haggadic additions to Daniel partake of the nature of Hebrew Wisdom literature there is no need to locate the cultus exactly. Fritzsche thinks that the story was composed in Egypt, and many believe it to be a Greek composition of universalistic tendency, written perhaps as Jewish propaganda (cf. *Sib. Orac.*) with very little to stamp it as Jewish. Gaster's claim to have discovered the original Aramaic of Theodotion is not proven, but a Semitic original for the whole of addition 3 may be postulated and the reign of Antiochus VII (Sidetes) (139-128 B.C.), who adopted the persecuting policy of Epiphanes, has been suggested for its date; if so, it was probably added to Daniel in the early part of the next century.

The introduction of the prophet Habakkuk at [33] is so unexpected that it has been conjectured that [33-39] do not belong to the original narrative. The LXX preface to Bel and the Dragon is 'from the prophecy of Habakkuk the son of Jesus of the tribe of Levi,' which may indicate that both stories were once attached to the roll of Habakkuk. Perhaps the legends of the two heroes were definitely linked from the first in the case of this piece of haggadah.

LXX differs in many details from Th., especially in introducing D. as 'a certain man, a priest by name Daniel, son of Abal' ([2]). Dan 1 [3, 6] shows that D. was not a priest, and there has probably been a confusion with the Daniel of Ezr 8 [2] and Neh 10 [6]. Th. either removed this confusion or wrongly identified the priest with the hero. Th. also dates the addition by adding unhistorical references to Astyages and Cyrus ([1]), and makes D. destroy not only the image but the temple of Bel ([22]). The variations in the different versions of the Dragon story are too numerous to mention.

1. **received**: Herod., i, 130 shows that Cyrus took the kingdom by force.

2. **Daniel**: LXX's 'D. son of Abal' perhaps for Hebrew *Hebel*; Epiphanius says Sabaan was D.'s father.

3. **forty sheep**: so Th.; 'four' in LXX; 'forty rams' in Syriac of Walton's Polyglot. For **wine** LXX (alone) has 'oil.'

4. **his own God**: LXX '(the) Lord,' representing *adonai* for the Tetragrammaton.

5. **idols made with hands**: LXX omits. It is curious that the title 'living God' is absent from [5, 6, 24, 25] and Dan 6 [20] in LXX, but is implied in LXX of Dan 6 [26]; Th. has the title in each case.

7. **laughed**: read by both LXX and Th. in [19], but here LXX omits and reads: 'Let no one by any means mislead thee by false reasoning, for this is within of clay and without of bronze: and I swear by the Lord the God of gods that this never did eat anything' (cf. Dan 2 [32-34]).

8. these expenses: LXX 'the things prepared for Bel,' i.e. sumptuous offerings. For **his priests** LXX has 'the overseers of the temple.'

10. temple of Bel: lit. 'house of Bel' (Th.), which is more Semitic than LXX's *eidōlion* (cf. 1 Esd 2 [10]; 1 Mac 1 [47]; 1 Cor 8 [10]).

11. mixed wine: either spiced (Pr 9 [2, 5]; Is 5 [22]; Mk 15 [23]) or less probably diluted according to the widespread economical custom (Is 1 [22]). **seal:** LXX adds 'the bolts of the temple.'

14. strewed. Other MSS of Th. read 'they shook through a sieve' (or 'they shook'). LXX's reading is doubtful, 'to sprinkle (or shake) all the temple with ashes'; 'strewed' seems a correction. **shut the door:** LXX wrongly 'sealed the temple,' either by dittography or by misreading Hebrew *sātham* (shut) as *ḥātham* (seal). **king's signet:** LXX adds (cf. Dan 6 [17]) 'and with the signets of certain priests of high rank,' and that D. 'ordered his friends to cast all out of the temple' (cf. Mt 21 [12]).

15. Now: LXX has the Hebraistic 'it came to pass' removed by Th., Ctr. [18], where a double Hebraism (not in LXX) is found in Th.

16, 17. the king: in LXX Daniel takes the initiative, and more details are given about the examination of the seals. Marshall thinks that 'look at your seals' (LXX) is similar in Aramaic to 'are the seals whole (safe)' in Th.

18. door: LXX and Th. have 'doors'; perhaps a Hebraism for the dual (a two-leaved door). **no deceit at all:** a Hebraism in Th. absent from LXX.

19. Behold now the pavement: LXX 'Come look at the guile of the priests.' Marshall notes the similarity of Aramaic 'threshold' and 'see the guile.'

22. delivered Bel into Daniel's power: cf. Dan 2 [12], 6 [24]. Xerxes destroyed Bel's temple according to Strabo, xvi, 1; Arrian, *Exp. Alex.*, vii, 17: cf. Herod., i, 183. The policy of Cyrus differed greatly from the account here.

23. in the same place. The Vat. MS. of Th. omits; perhaps an editorial connecting link.

27. pitch, and fat, and hair: LXX prefixes 'thirty minas of.' **lumps:** LXX 'a lump.' The different versions vary the ingredients of the bolus, some adding nails or iron combs (Josippon and Chron. of Jerahmeel), which look like an embellishment from Job 41 [7]. LXX and Th. give only three ingredients, of which pitch is the chief. Marshall points out that in Aramaic *za'ăphā* (storm-wind), by which Bel-Merodach destroyed Tiamat, resembles *zeipha* (pitch) in sound in the same way that Ba'al resembles Bel. **the gods ye worship:** Greek *sebasmata* (cf. Ac 17 [23]); LXX has the verb 'ye worship these (things).'

28. against the king: LXX 'against Daniel.' **the king is become a Jew:** possibly a proselytizing feature.

29. Absent from LXX. The following verses ([30-32]) differ greatly in LXX and Th. 'Here as elsewhere,' says Ball, 'it would be easy to decide in favour of the priority and higher originality of the LXX text, even in the absence of external evidence.'

32. two carcases: Greek *sōmata* means living persons here. **which then ... devour Daniel:** added by Th. (cf. Dan 3 [19]); LXX adds that this mode of death was chosen that D. 'might find no burial,' which perhaps indicates a date after the persecution of Epiphanes (cf. 2 Mac 9 [15]).

33. bowl: LXX adds 'an earthen jar of mixed wine' and 'on the sixth day.' Habakkuk is not called 'the prophet' in LXX.

34. the angel of the Lord. There is no definite article before 'angel' in LXX or Th., which may betray the Hebrew construct state. The definite article appears in [36].

36. with the blast of his breath: peculiar to Th. Fri. says of *pneuma*, 'neither the Holy Spirit, nor the wind, but the breath of an angel'; cf. Vulgate *in impetu spiritus sui*; but Davies omits 'his' and takes as 'with the swiftness of wind'; *Bereshith Rabbah*, 'by might of the Holy Spirit'; Walton's Syriac, 'the angel put his hand on the head of Habakkuk' (cf. Dan 9 [21]; Hab 3 [14]; Ezek 8 [3], 47 [5-7]; also 1 K 18 [12]; 2 K 2 [11, 16]; Mt 4 [1]; Mk 1 [12]; Gospel according to the Hebrews).

39 (end). LXX adds 'but the Lord God remembered Daniel.'

42 (end). Vulgate adds a fitting moral from Dan 6 [26, 27], though it is improbable that the Persian king would decree universal worship of the God of Israel.

THE PRAYER OF MANASSES

By N. D. Coleman

This prayer, which has been deservedly called 'one of the best pieces in the Apocrypha,' was never part of the Jewish canon. It has indeed been held that it is a late composition of the 3rd century, as it is first found in the *Didascalia* incorporated into the *Apostolical Constitutions* (ii, 22). Nestle holds that from this source it came to be included among the liturgical additions to the Psalter found in some LXX MSS. The majority of scholars have assumed the Greek text to be original. Porter (*H.D.B.*) claims that 'the Greek nowhere requires a Hebrew original, though it cannot be said to exclude its possibility," and Ryle describes its language as a good specimen of the *koine*.

But it is generally admitted that the prayer is Jewish in origin, and further study will probably endorse the judgement of Ball, Charles, and Oesterley, who postulate a Hebrew or Aramaic original. This theory depends not only upon one or two obscurities in the Greek which are elucidated by translation into Hebrew, but upon the liturgical character of the fragment; if it is a Hellenistic composition, it is an excellent imitation of a Hebrew *tephillah*.

There is little to connect our prayer with Manasseh except its title and context in *Ap. Const.*, and there is a suspicion of glosses to render the connexion more definite; on the other hand, these features omitted by codex A add no precise reference to M. If the story of M.'s penitence is untrustworthy, the prayer found by the chronicler in his sources, *The History of the Kings of Israel* and *The History of the Seers* (2 Ch 33 [12] f.), must have been a penitential psalm composed or adapted to fit M.'s case. It is commonly assumed that the Greek prayer is a counterfeit of the lost original mentioned in 2 Chronicles, but it must be recognized that the original was probably itself a counterfeit.

Between 2 Chronicles and the *Didascalia* the only references to a prayer of M. appear to be the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (64 [8]), the Talmudic Tractate *Sanhedrin* (x, 2) and Julius Africanus (*c.* 221) as reported by St. John Damasc. (*Paral.*, ii, 15): 'While M. was reciting a psalm his bonds burst asunder, iron though they were, and he escaped.' There seems to have been a considerable literature in circulation among the Jews which supplemented the canonical narratives of M.'s reign. Ball gives an account of this Rabbinical material which speaks of M.'s religious innovations and captious explanations of Scripture, his incest, his murder of Isaiah (cf. also the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*), etc.

Perhaps we may seek the origin of a prayer of M. as well as the reason for its suppression in the traces of what must have been a burning controversy as to the official verdict on M.'s reign. The prayer was possibly used to rehabilitate the character of M., and it would not be long before the efficacy of the prayer came to be questioned. Both the Mishnah and Tosefta (*San.*) declare that M. has no share in the world to come, and in answer to R. Jehuda's assertion to the contrary, with a citation of 2 Ch 33 [13], it is reasserted, 'He was restored to his kingdom, but not to life in the world to come.' The same view is reflected in *Ap. Bar* 64: 'M. was at that time named "the impious," and finally his abode was in the fire. For though his prayer was heard with the Most High, finally, when he was cast into the brazen horse and the brazen horse was melted, it served as a sign unto him . . . that thenceforward he might know by whom finally he should be tormented.' Now it was in the Maccabæan age that the Jewish doctrine of a future life was plainly promulgated, and we may tentatively suggest that this formative period in the development of the Jewish liturgical canon was responsible for the relegation of the prayer to the limbo of unwanted material. The admission that our prayer is Jewish in conception goes some way towards a case for identifying its substance with the lost *tephillah*. Its present form is Hellenistic, but what of its substance? It is unaffected by Christian doctrine, and it is significant that it bears no trace of the fiery trial of the Maccabæan persecution; it rather resembles the older psalms. Porter admits that the eschatology is early, and that its doctrines of forgiveness and of the merits of the patriarchs are rooted in Old Testament teaching. The date provisionally assigned to it by Fritzsche and others is Maccabæan; Ryle will only say 'earlier than the 3rd century,'

and Charles, while favouring an earlier Jewish origin, thinks evidence is lacking to define the date exactly. But this very lack of features that can be dated almost favours a pre-Maccabæan date (cf. notes), unless a Sadducæan origin is possible. The lack of Jewish testimony to the prayer is easily explained by the canonical estimate of M.'s syncretistic policy. Jeremiah (15 [4]; cf. 2 K 23 [26]; Ezek 8; Jer 2 [30]) declares that, even after Josiah's reforms, M.'s sins still remain to be expiated. It must be noted that the only sources of information about M. come from his opponents. The prayer may be an early liturgical confession used by M.'s adherents who could appeal to his long and prosperous reign as a sign of God's favour. When the hope of a future life emerged, such an argument was discounted and a prayer which did not procure salvation in a future life, bearing the name of M., would fall into disuse. It would be left for liberals like R. Jehuda to hand down this uncanonical *tephillah*, and the Eastern Church must have inherited it through Rabbinic channels. Oesterley (*Jewish Background of Liturgy*, 76) quotes the prayer as early evidence for the Jewish liturgical order: Ascription, Confession, Prayer for Forgiveness, Prayer for Grace, Doxology.

Bibliography

Text: Swete, LXX, iii, 824-826; Nestle, *LXXstudien* iii, 6 f. (1899). Commentaries: Fritzsche in *K.E.H. Apokr.*, i, 157-164 (1851); Ball in Wace's *Sp.*, ii (1888); Ryssel in *Kautzsch*, i (1898); Ryle in *Charles*, i, 612-624 (1913). See also articles in *J.E.*, *H.D.B.*, *E.B.*, *E.Bi.*, and Oesterley, *Books of the Apocr.*, 404-410 (1914).

ornament: *cosmos* translates Hebrew *tsābā'*, host, in Gen 2 [1]. It may refer to the stars, or (Ryle) to the splendour and orderliness of the universe, 'array.'

bound the sea: cf. the parallel 'deep' (i.e. abyss). See on Job 38 [8-11]. A definite correction of the popular Babylonian myth of Tiamat.

terrible and glorious Name. The magical efficacy attributed to the Divine Name by the Rabbis is often taken as indicating a late date (cf. Tob 8 [5]; Bar 3 [5]), but see also G. B. Gray, art. 'Name' in *H.D.B.*: 'We have a right in ambiguous cases to adopt the higher interpretation suggested by Old Testament usage rather than that suggested by popular Jewish and Greek superstition' (cf. Gen 32 [29]; Ex 3 [13], 23 [21]; Dt 28 [58]; Jg 13 [17-18]; 1 S 17 [45]). The use of the Tetragrammaton (or of its first letter) in Is 44 [5] may be compared with the legend of miracles wrought by Solomon's engraved seal. But the ideas of authority and ownership often implied by 'name' are indicated by the parallelism ('commandment'). For seal cf. Job 9 [7].

whom . . . before thy power. A Hebraism translated by Charles 'before whose power all things shudder and tremble.'

bringing evils upon men. Greek *of the evils of men*; alleged to be indebted to LXX of Jl 2 [13] and Jon 4 [2], where Hebrew has the singular; generally taken as calamities. But *kakiai* means *wickednesses*, and 'repentest' may be pregnant —'repentest of visiting for' as Hebrew *shūbh* means 'to draw back or refrain from judgement' (Jer 4 [28]; cf. Lam 2 [8]; Ezek 18 [8, 17]; 2 Ch 12 [12]). The plural in the LXX may be due to liturgical influence.

Thou, O Lord . . . saved. Omitted by codices A and T, but found in *Ap. Const.* and the Latin. Not a mere gloss; it emphasizes a Jewish tendency to regard repentance as granted or withheld by God (cf. Ex 7 [3]; Wisd 12 [19]; Ac 5 [31], 11 [18]; 2 Tim 2 [25]). 'Repentance and forgiveness'—Greek '*forgiveness of repentance*,' a difficulty avoided by all the versions. Charles suggests a Semitism and displacement, 'promised forgiveness to them that have sinned against Thee that they may repent,' which restores the balance of clauses; but *ṣelīḥath teshūbāh* or *ṣelīḥāh liteshūbāh* would sufficiently explain the Greek 'the forgiveness due to repentance.' Possibly the more usual *teshūbāh liṣelīḥāh* (rep. leading to remission of sins) was transposed in translation. The *metanoia* is not Christian, but an earlier conception.

The God of the just. This phrase does not occur elsewhere, but cf. 1, 'righteous seed,' which assumes the doctrine of a remnant. 'The just . . . which have not sinned' implies an idealization of the past contradicted by 2 Esd 8 [35]. The late Jewish doctrine of a treasury of accumulated merit in the Fathers available for sinners is not appealed to here; the appeal is by contrast (cf. Gen 17 [17-19], 22 [18]; Ex 32 [13], and the integrity passages in the Psalms; see S. and H., *Romans*, 330). Ezek 14 [14] protests against extravagant ideas of the patriarchs, and yet suggests their peculiar sanctity, if not their sinlessness. The Jewish idea of *Yetzer* did not necessarily involve actual experience of sin.

I am bowed down. The Syriac inserts, 'And now, O Lord, I am justly punished and deservedly afflicted; for lo! I am in captivity.' 'I cannot lift up mine head' is codex T's reading, and the negative is a correction. The verb *ananeuō* is of doubtful meaning; it normally means 'to shake (the head)' in denial, and Fri. translates 'so that I shake (my head) over my sins': but it may be a synonym of *anakuptō* 'to lift up the head' or 'look up,' and a Hebraism is possible, 'more bowed down than to lift up (my head) by reason of my sins.' The confession is restrained; no legendary or other details are introduced.

into the lower parts of the earth: cf. Ps 63 [9]; no more than Sheol is intended. The penitent fears an early grave as a penalty for sin.

the God of them that repent. A beautiful title only found here.

I. AND II. MACCABEES

By J. W. Hunkin

Title.—The name Maccabæus was in the first instance a name given to Judas the third son of Mattathias (1 Mac 2 [4]). It is probably derived from the Hebrew *makkēbah*, a small hammer. Judas *the Hammer* was the champion of Judaism, as Charles *the Hammer* was the champion of Christianity, and saved the West from the Saracens (A.D. 732).

Theme.—The two books of the Maccabees taken together give an account of the struggle of the Jews for liberty, chiefly for religious, but also for political, liberty, in the 2nd century B.C. The two narratives are independent of each other. In 2 Maccabees the story opens in the time of Seleucus IV (187-176 B.C.), and is carried down to the defeat of Nicanor on 13 Adar, 161. 1 Maccabees begins with the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, 176, and ends with the death of Simon, 135. The interest of the writer of 2 Maccabees is concentrated upon religion. That of the other writer is wider, and is centred upon the achievements of the Maccabæan family, *by whose hand deliverance was given unto Israel* (5 [62]). It was S. T. Coleridge who said that the story of the Maccabees was inspiring enough to be inspired.

In the Church.—From about the end of the 4th century A.D. August 1 was kept by the Church as the festival of the Maccabæan martyrs, marking their birth by death. The festival was spoken of with honour by such writers as Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen (whose homily on the Maccabees is well known), Augustine, Leo, and Cæsarius of Arles. It still finds a place in the Roman Missal, but as secondary to the commemoration of St. Peter *ad Vincula* and St. Paul. Lections from 1 and 2 Maccabees are found in the Sarum Missal and Breviary, but no English lectionary contained passages from these books until the revised lectionary of 1922, in which twenty-seven lessons were taken from 1 Maccabees and four from 2 Maccabees, although the Homily against Gluttony and Drunkenness referred to 1 Mac 16 [16]. The old mediæval romances and artists placed Judas Maccabæus among the Nine Worthies with Joshua, Alexander, Arthur, Charlemagne, etc. Raphael's great picture in the Vatican of the expulsion of Heliodorus from the Temple, and Handel's oratorio *Judas Maccabæus* are the two most famous instances of the use in art of subjects from these books. Ciseri's picture at Florence of the Mother and her Seven Sons (2 Mac 7), and Handel's *Alexander Balus* (*sic*) with its somewhat shapeless plot, may also be mentioned; and it is interesting to note that a figure of the Mother (2 Mac 7) is included in the design for a window in the south transept of the new cathedral at Truro.

Manuscripts and Versions.—Dr. Swete, in his edition of the LXX, prints the text of codex Alexandrinus (A), as neither 1 Maccabees nor 2 Maccabees is contained in codex Vaticanus (B).

In the case of 1 Maccabees the readings of codex Sinaiticus and codex Venetus (V) are recorded in the margin: and, on the whole, the combination of the two last is to be followed; though occasionally (e.g. 1 Mac 1 [2], 3 [18]) it is A which preserves the true text. There are a number of cursives, of which one of the most interesting is 55. Syriac and Latin versions exist. They are translations from the Greek, the Latin generally being nearest to the Sinaiticus and furthest from A. 2 Maccabees is not contained in codex Sinaiticus. Dr. Swete again gives the readings of V in the margin, and these are very often to be adopted, though from time to time (e.g. 6 [18]) the text of A is to be preferred. Again there are Latin

and Syriac versions (the latter less literal than the Syriac version of 1 Maccabees).

Historical Value.—There can be no doubt that 1 Maccabees is our main source for the history of the Jewish people during the period which it covers. The attempt of Niese to prove the superiority of the account given in 2 Maccabees is unconvincing (see I. Abrahams, *J.Q.R.* [1900-1901]; 508 ff.); but he has placed his finger on certain weaknesses in 1 Maccabees, and has shown that, in spite of all its romancing, 2 Maccabees, used with caution, is of considerable value for supplementing and checking the facts recorded in the first book.

The general attitude of the writer of 1 Maccabees resembles that of Ben Sirach (see e.g. 2 [51]). He believes (12 [15]) 'in a God who helps those that help themselves' (G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i, 206); he records no miracles, nor does he hold out any hope of a resurrection. He is sensible and practical, e.g. in his recognition of the necessity for at least defensive warfare on the Sabbath (2 [41]). He has a high regard for the priesthood.

In marked contrast to all this the writer of 2 Maccabees emphasizes his belief in miraculous interventions and in the resurrection of the body; and he is much stricter in his view with regard to the observance of the Sabbath. On the other hand, he deals far less gently with the priests (2 Mac 4 [14], 6 [1-11]). His standpoint, in short, is that associated later with the Pharisees. But to regard 1 Maccabees as a Sadducean work and 2 Maccabees as a Pharisaic counterblast to it, as Geiger and Wellhausen do, is to overstrain the evidence.

1 Maccabees gives a plain straightforward narrative with frequent dates. In 2 Maccabees we have a composition upon an historical theme written by a man who has 'evidently been through a Greek school of language and literature and attained a proficiency in the art of rhetoric' (G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii, 299). The style of 1 Maccabees is reminiscent of the OT; the style of 2 Maccabees reminds us of Polybius and the Greek journalese of the day. Instances of the superior accuracy of 1 Maccabees are found in his account of the part played by Mattathias, and of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes. With regard to the latter 1 Maccabees agrees better than 2 Maccabees with Polybius; and Mattathias, who is never mentioned in 2 Maccabees, is recognized in the Rabbinic tradition (which is independent both of 1 and 2 Maccabees) as a great figure in the struggle.

On the other hand, 1 Maccabees never mentions the apostate High Priest Menelaus, and refers to the Hellenizing Jews (*the ungodly*: 1 [43], 2 [44], etc.) as briefly as possible. Cf. 1 Mac 1 [14, 15] with 2 Mac 4 [7-17]; 1 Mac 1 [54-64] with 2 Mac 6 [1-11]. Both writers, it may be added, exaggerate, e.g. in numbers (1 Mac 10 [74], 11 [47], 15 [13]; 2 Mac 5 [14], etc.). Even at Arbela Alexander the Great had no more than 50,000 men (Arrian, *Alex.*, iii, 12). For a table of the contents of the two books shown in parallel see Moffatt in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, i, 126, 127.

The Chronology of 1 and 2 Maccabees.—The Seleucid era began on 1 Dios (October to November), 312 B.C. After a careful examination of the dates given in 1 and 2 Maccabees, Schürer comes to the conclusion that in 1 Maccabees the reckoning is from 1 Nisan (March to April), 312, and that in 2 Maccabees it is doubtful whether the author follows the same method as 1 Maccabees, or uses the ordinary Seleucid calendar (*Gesch.*[4], i, 32-40).

Recently the problem has been re-examined by W. Kolbe (*Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte* [1926], 18-44), and by U. Kahrstedt (*Syrische Territorien in hellenistischen Zeit* [1926], 118-132). According to the former both books reckon from 1 Nisan, 311 B.C. According to the latter, while 2 Maccabees, based on a non-Palestinian source (the work of Jason of Cyrene), uses the ordinary Seleucid era, in 1 Maccabees two sources are used, each with a different system: the one an account of the Maccabæan uprising down to 153 (when Jonathan becomes High Priest), which reckons according to a year beginning in the spring; and the other, used for the later part of the narrative, which follows the common Seleucid calendar and begins the year in autumn.

Kahrstedt indeed suggests (p. 128) that in the spring of 166 the Seleucid year was actually given up in Palestine and was replaced by a national year. If such a change took place, then it might account for the difference between the reckoning of the duration of persecution in Dan 7 [25], 9 [26] and 1 Mac 1 [54], 4 [52] (*ibid.* 130).

However that may be, it seems clear that a year beginning in spring is assumed (1 Mac 10 [21]), and that the summer of the 150th year (1 Mac 6 [20, 49]) is the summer of 163.

Thus we shall follow Schürer's dates, bearing in mind the possibility of an error of a year, especially after 153.

Maccabæan Psalms.—After their victories, we are told, the Maccabæan troops

used to sing songs of thanksgiving (1 Mac 4 [24]). What songs were these? Were songs composed for such occasions?

Among Christian scholars Theodore of Mopsuestia seems to have been the first to suggest that some of the Psalms may be, in their primary sense, Maccabæan, e.g. Ps 83 (cf. 1 Mac 5).

Recent study has carried the suggestion a good deal further. Among the Psalms which may with the most probability be regarded as, at least in their present form, Maccabæan are the following: 44, 60, 74, 79 (quoted 1 Mac 7 [17]), 83, 110, 118.

It is in the liturgical pieces of the fourth and fifth books of the Psalter that Maccabæan work is most likely to be found. In some cases the song may have been newly composed; in many others an older poem may have been revised, and to a greater or less degree adapted to the occasion.

Bibliography

E. R. Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests* (1912), and *The House of Seleucus*, ii (1902); E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalten Jesu Christi* (4th edit., 1901), with its valuable bibliographies; E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii (1921); J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (8th edit., 1921); U. Kahrstedt, *Syrische Territorien in hellenistischen Zeit* (1926); W. Kolbe, *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte* (1926); I. Abrahams, in *J.Q.R.* (1921), 508 ff. (review of Niese's *Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbüchen*); G. F. Moore, in *Harvard Theological Review* (October, 1924), 307 ff., *The Rise of Normative Judaism*; F. M. Abel, in *Revue Biblique* (1923-1926), *Topographie des Campagnes Machabéennes*; W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization*, vi (with bibliography), 1927; E. Kautzsch (1 Maccabees) and A. Kamphausen (2 Maccabees), in Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A.T.* (1900); Grimm's work on 1 and 2 Maccabees, in *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A.T.* (1853-1857), has been a storehouse for later commentators: Rawlinson, *Sp., Apocrypha*, ii, (1888); Fairweather and Black, *C.B.* (1906); Oesterley in Charles, *Apoc. and Pseud.* (1913).

I. MACCABEES

Original Language.—There is general agreement among scholars that 1 Maccabees was originally written in a Semitic language, probably Hebrew. Semiticisms are numerous, e.g. 2 [40], 4 [2], 10 [88], etc. 1 [29] may be referred to as a striking instance of a probable misunderstanding of an original Hebrew text.

Character and Contents.—The writer is a plain and sober historian who occasionally lapses into what is almost poetry. His style is modelled upon the OT, and reminiscences of OT narratives colour his own.

After a short introduction (1 [1-9]), he plunges into his theme, which is the achievement of Mattathias and his sons, for whom he has conceived a profound admiration (5 [62]). 1 [10-64] sets out the cause, and 2 [1-70] the beginning, of the struggle undertaken by the family. In 3 [1-9 22] the struggle is traced to the death of Judas. It is under the leadership of Judas that religious liberty is won. The next section (9 [23-12 53]) continues the account to the death of Jonathan. Jonathan is the first of the family to be High Priest. He is nominally the Seleucid governor, but practically he is an independent prince. The last section (13 [1-16 24]) brings us to the death of Simon and the accession of John Hyrcanus. It is under Simon that the yoke of the heathen is taken away (13 [41]).

Though he never mentions the name of God, the writer is a loyal and conservative Jew, full of zeal for the Law, the Scriptures, and the Temple. He almost ignores the Hellenizing section of his people, partly perhaps because he does not realize its strength, but partly also because he cannot bear to think of it (13 [46, 47] *v.n.*). On the other hand, he takes a great interest in the military exploits of Judas and his brothers (see I. Abrahams, *Campaigns in Palestine*, Lecture 2), and he traces their campaigns with an intimate knowledge of the country which shows that he is a Palestinian himself. His knowledge of the world outside Palestine is slight and vague (8 [12-16], 15 [23] *v.n.*).

Chapters 14-16.—Josephus follows 1 Maccabees pretty closely to the end of 13, and then ceases to do so. Largely on this ground some scholars have argued that 14-16 are an addition to the original book. But in view of Josephus's habits of compilation such an inference is far from safe (G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, i, 205), and in style and manner these chapters are in harmony with the rest (*E.B.*, iii, 2864).

The Documents Quoted.—Letters: 5 [10], 8 [22], 10 [17, 25], 11 [30, 57], 12 [6, 20], 13 [36], 14 [20], 15 [2, 16]. Inscription: 14 [48].

For a discussion of the genuineness of these documents see Kautzsch (*Apok. u. Pseudepig.*, 26 ff.); Wellhausen,

Schürer, E. Meyer, *op. cit. passim*; also Oesterley (Charles, *Apoc. and Pseudepig.*, i, 61 ff.): see further the notes below on the passages in question. In general it may be said that the quotations give a *prima facie* impression of substantial accuracy as to fact, and often even as to wording. But whether, in any particular instance, the writer is actually copying a document, or whether he is reconstructing one out of the information he has gathered and his knowledge of the form such a document would naturally take, it is not easy to determine.

Date.—In 13 [28] we are told that the sepulchre built by Simon at Modin had *seven pyramids* for his father and mother and his four brethren. One therefore was intended for himself, but there is no record of his being buried there. We can, however, hardly draw the inference that this is because the book was written immediately after his death (135). 'Unto this day' (13 [30]) implies the lapse of a considerable number of years; and 16 [23, 24], 'the rest of the acts of John . . . behold, they are written,' at least suggests that the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-105) is over.

More important is the fact that the Romans are regarded as faithful allies and their friendship is considered eminently desirable (8 [1], 12 [1], 14 [40]). The writer could hardly have known of the desecration of the Temple by Pompey in 63.

Thus the date of the composition of his book probably lies between 100 and 70 B.C.

I. 1-9. Alexander the Great and his successors.

1. the land of Chittim: 8 [5] (more correctly) *Kittim*. See Jer 2 [10]; and cf. Ezek 27 [6] and Gen 10 [4]. Used in general of Greek-speaking coast-lands and islands: here and in 8 [5] the reference is to Macedonia (cf. the reference to the Roman navy in Dan 11 [30]). **the Persians and the Medes:** cf. 6 [56]. **Greece,** i.e. the Greek Empire (cf. [10], 6 [2] and Zech 9 [13]).

2. kings of the earth: cf. Ps 2 [2], etc.

3. ends of the earth: an OT expression. Alexander reached the Hyphasis (Beas) in the Punjab. **the earth was quiet:** 11 [38, 52]; cf. Jg 3 [11] LXX. **he was exalted:** 16 [13]; cf. Ezek 28 [5] LXX.

4. they became tributary unto him: cf. Jg 1 [33].

6. servants: Greek *paidas*; cf. 1 S 19 [1] LXX and the well-known *basilikoi paides* of Alexander's army. **which had been brought up with him:** the Greek word is not found elsewhere (Deissmann, *B.S.*, 311). **he divided unto them his kingdom while he was yet alive:** this appears to be the earliest witness to a story frequently repeated by ancient writers, but certainly unhistorical.

7. Alexander died in the early summer of 323.

9. all: an exaggeration; five only in fact, and the first not before 306. **diadems:** the diadem, a blue band with white spots worn round the tiara of the Persian king, was adopted by Alexander and afterwards by his successors. **they multiplied evils in the earth:** cf. Gen 6 [5] LXX.

10-40. The first part of the reign of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes).

10. Seleucus IV was murdered by his minister Heliodorus in 176-175. His elder son Demetrius, his rightful heir, was away in Rome, whither he had been sent to take the place of his father's brother Antiochus as a hostage. Heliodorus intended to rule himself, but made a formal proclamation of the accession of the child Antiochus, a younger son of Seleucus. On this the uncle Antiochus, with the assistance of Eumenes king of Pergamum, descended upon Antioch, drove off Heliodorus, had his little nephew put out of the way, and ascended the throne as Antiochus IV (*Epiphanes*). On the reckoning of the date see the Introduction. **came forth:** cf. Is 11 [1]. **Epiphanes:** *theos epiphanes, the god manifest*, i.e. in time of need. The title had been assumed by Ptolemy V, who manifested himself as the rescuer of Egypt from insurrection (196). See Meyer, *op. cit.*, ii, 139. **reigned:** *became king* (cf. 2 K 15 [10], etc.).

11-15 describe the activity of a Hellenizing party among the Jews (cf. 2 Mac 4 [7-20]).

14. place of exercise: Greek *gymnasium*.

15. they made themselves uncircumcised (cf. 1 Cor 7 [18]), i.e. by means of a surgical operation, in order not to be mocked by Gentiles when they appeared stripped in the gymnasium. So they **forsook the holy covenant** (Gen 17 [10]; Ex 24 [3-8]); and cf. [63]; Dan 11 [28-30]. **sold themselves to do evil:** like Ahab, 1 K 21 [20].

16-19 describe Antiochus's successful invasion of Egypt, 170-169, when Ptolemy VI (Philometor, 181-145) was only sixteen years old.

17. elephants: cf. 6 [30]; 2 Mac 11 [4], 13 [2]. One of the conditions laid down by the Romans after the battle of Magnesia was that the Seleucids should no longer use elephants in war. It seems,

however, that this condition was soon disregarded (Dio *ap.* Zonaras, ix, 25).

20-28 describe Antiochus's spoliation of the Temple. No reason for it is given here, but apparently, owing to a false rumour that Antiochus had died in Egypt during the expedition of 170-169, there had been an outbreak of rebellion against the High Priest Menelaus, who had with the king's authority established himself in Jerusalem: see 2 Mac 5^{5} ff.

20. the hundred and forty and third year: 170-169 (cf. Dan 11^{28} ff.).

21. the golden altar: 1 K 7^{48}. **censers:** 1 K 7^{50}. **the veil:** cf. 4^{51}.

22. crowns: no doubt votive offerings.

23. hidden treasures: including 'the sacred treasure which is called *Corban*' (*B.J.*, II, ix, 4), and sums deposited for safe keeping (2 Mac 3^{10-12}).

25-28 are made up of poetical phrases taken largely from the OT: cf. $^{32-40}$, 2^{8-12}; 2 Esd 10^{22}.

29. after two full years: 1 Maccabees does not mention the famous rebuff given to Antiochus on his second expedition into Egypt by the Roman ambassador Popillius Laenas. **full years:** lit. *years of days*, a Hebraism (cf. Gen 41^{1}). **a chief collector of tribute:** Apollonius, according to 2 Mac 5^{24}; perhaps the Apollonius of 3^{10}. His title may be a mere misunderstanding of the Hebrew corresponding to *mysarch*: 2 Mac 5^{36} *v.n.* (Meyer, ii, 157).

33. the city of David: on the hill south of the Temple. Here the Syrians apparently designed a new town and built a strong citadel (Greek *akra*) to be its acropolis. On the position and history of the *Akra* see Schürer, i, 247, and Abel, *R.B.* (1926), 520-526. It was garrisoned with Syrian troops (*a sinful nation*, ^{34}; cf. Is 1^{4}), and thence Apollonius terrorized Jerusalem (cf. Dan 11^{30} ff.).

37-40. Another poetical lament like that in $^{25-28}$: cf. especially Ps 79.

41-64. The Edict of Antiochus and its application to Judæa (cf. Dan 11^{31} ff.).

Antiochus was a man of large ideas and restless energy, and being foiled by Rome, —outrageously foiled, as it seemed to him and to the Greek world in general—in his ambitions with regard to Egypt (Dan 11^{30}), he decided 'that his one chance was to make of his empire a united people in culture and religion, which could alike only be Greek' (W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 171). It was, so far as we know, only in Judæa that he met with opposition. Here, in spite of the Hellenization which had been going on ($^{11-15}$ above), there rapidly developed a great patriotic movement of resistance, first passive (^{63}, 2^{31-38}), and then active (2^{39} ff.). There is no reason to suppose Antiochus specially hostile to the Jews as a nation. He probably thought he was but siding with one section of the people as represented by the great family of the Tobiads, as against another represented by the Oniads; and Menelaus may well have informed him 'that there would be no difficulty.' 'What he had in mind was Rome' (Tarn).

42. laws: *usages*, the reference being in this case to religious usages.

43. his worship: *his form of worship* (cf. 2^{19}; Ex 12^{25} LXX), possibly the worship of himself as a manifestation of Zeus. See E. Bevan, *House of Seleucus*, ii, 154 ff. According to *Ant.*, XII, v, 5 the Samaritans addressed him in a letter as the Manifest God (*Theos Epiphanes*).

47. temples: cf. 5^{43}; 2 Mac 10^{2}, etc.

49. change: cf. Ac 6^{14}.

51. overseers: Greek *episkopous*.

53. Israel: i.e. all true Israelites (cf. 3^{2}).

54. Chislev: i.e. roughly December. The writer uses one word for the sacred altar, *thusiastêrion*, and another, *bômos*, for the heathen altar. The *abomination of desolation* (Dan 11^{31}, 12^{11} LXX) refers to a small Greek altar built upon the original great Jewish altar.

55. Like an ordinary Greek city Jerusalem was to have little shrines in porch and street.

56. books of the law: rolls of the Pentateuch (cf. Diodorus, xxxiv, 1).

58. month by month: cf. 2 Mac 6^{7}.

59. 25 Chislev (December), 168 B.C. Perhaps the day was chosen as the day of a festival in honour of Dionysus (2 Mac 6^{7}) held in connexion with the winter solstice. Who superintended these sacrifices but Menelaus the High Priest himself? (cf. 2 Mac 5^{16}).

61. houses: read with A *families*.

62. Cf. Ac 10^{14}. No wonder St. Peter hesitated!

63. Cf. 2 Mac 6, 7.

64. Cf. 2 Ch 24^{18}, etc.

II. The beginning of resistance: Mattathias and his sons.

1. Simeon: Josephus, *Ant.*, XII, vi, 1 adds *the son of Asamoneus*: hence Hasmonæan as the name of the family frequently in Josephus and Talmud (in the Mishna: *Middoth*, i, 6). **Joarib** 1 according to 1 Ch 24^{7} the founder of the first of the twenty-four courses of priests. **Modin:** mod. *Medieh*, about seven miles east-south-east of Lydda.

2. Gaddis: cf. *Gaddi*, Nu 13^{11} = *my fortune*.

3. **Thassi**: perhaps *the zealous*.

4. **Maccabæus**: see Introduction.

5. **Avaran**: perhaps *beast-sticker* (cf. Arab. *khawara*). **Apphus**: so Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, vi, 1); i.e. probably *artful*. The Greek MSS. here read *Sapphus* (the S is probably a mistaken repetition of the last letter of the preceding word).

7. **the holy city**: so first in Is 48 [2]. *Jerusalem the holy* is the inscription on the reverse of the well-known 'thick' shekels (probably of the revolt of A.D. 66-70). The epithet was adopted by many cities in the 2nd century B.C., e.g. by Tyre and Sidon in 163.

8-12. Again poetical language echoing OT phrases: see 1 [25-28] above.

8. **that was glorious**: read *adoxos* for *endoxos*, and translate *dishonoured* as the sense requires (so the Latin of codex Sangermanensis).

9. **vessels**: 1 [23]. **infants**: 1 [61]. **young men**: cf. 2 Mac 5 [24].

10. **palaces**: the word is also used to denote crown or kingdom, or even royal treasury.

11. **bondwoman**: cf. Lam 1 [1, 6].

12. **holy things**: better *sanctuary* (AV) as usual in 1 Maccabees, e.g. 3 [51], 4 [36], etc.

18. **the king's friends**: 10 [65], 11 [27]; 2 Mac 8 [9]; so Greek writers had spoken of the officials of the Persian king, then of officials of Alexander the Great, and then of those of the succeeding Hellenistic rulers. The title is frequently met with in the Egyptian papyri (Deissmann, *B.S.*, 167). **gifts**: 1 K 9 [16] LXX; 2 Mac 3 [2].

19. **in the house of the king's dominion**: i.e. simply *within the king's dominion*.

24. **reins**: the kidneys as the seat of the emotions (cf. Ps 73 [21], etc.). **according to judgement**: as required by the Law (Dt 13 [9]).

26. Nu 25 [7, 8, 14].

28. **the mountains**: cf. the wilderness [(29)] the steep bare ridges east and south of Hebron called in the OT *the Jeshimon* (i.e. devastation). See G. A. Smith, *H.G.*, 312 ff., and cf. *B.J.*, VI, vi, 1[3].

29. **justice and judgement**: *righteousness and judgement* (cf. Ps 89 [14], 97 [2]).

30. On the north edge of Jeshimon there was scrub and coarse grazing for cattle.

31. **secret places**: where e.g. David and his men hid (1 S 24 [3]).

37. **innocency**: *integrity* (cf. Ps 26 [11], etc.). **without trial**: better *wrongfully*, as in 15 [33] (cf. Ps 69 [4]).

40. **one said to another**: lit. *a man said to his neighbour*, a Hebraism.

42. **Hasidæans**: Hebrew *Hasidim*, i.e. *godly men* (Ps 12 [1]), in Psalms generally translated *saints*, e.g. Ps 149 [1]. They are so named here, in 7 [13], and in 2 Mac 14 [6]. Their object was the strict and loyal observance of the Law in the face of Hellenizing tendencies. We gather from this passage that as a party they were already in existence before 168. We hear no more of them, at all events by that name, after the time of Alcimus (7 [13]). Their place is taken and their tradition and general attitude inherited by the Pharisees, who are first mentioned in connexion with John Hyrcanus (*Ant.*, XIII, x, 5).

44. **sinners in their anger, and lawless men in their wrath**: a poetical tag; the *sinners* and *lawless* are the apostate Jews.

47. **the sons of pride**: a Hebraism for *the proud* (cf. Ps 89 [22]), the reference being to the arrogant defiance of God by the Syrians and their adherents (cf. 1 [3, 21]).

48. **neither suffered they the sinner to triumph**: lit. *and gave not a horn to the sinner* (cf. 1 S 2 [1]; Ps 18 [2]).

51. **an everlasting name**: cf. 6 [44]; Ecclus 15 [6], 41 [12, 13].

61. Cf. Ecclus 2 [10]. **him**: the name of God being avoided (cf. 3 [18]).

65. **Simon**: here *Symeon* (cf. Ac 15 [14]), elsewhere always Simon. **alway**: lit. *all the days* (cf. Mt 28 [20]).

66. **Maccabæus**: 5 [24, 34].

70. **the hundred and forty and sixth year**: 167-166. **great lamentation**: 9 [20], 13 [26]; cf. Gen 50 [10].

III. 1-IX. 22. **The struggle under Judas.**

III. 1-9. **In praise of Judas.**

In this panegyric the writer again resorts to poetical language. He uses balanced couplets of a more or less rhythmical character. By extracting a couplet from [1] and [2], omitting [7e] as a gloss, taking [9b] with [6c], and omitting *and* eight times, Dr. C. F. Burney reconstructed in Hebrew an acrostic poem beginning with ten letters: JHUDH HMKBY, i.e. Judas the Hammer (*J.T.S.* [1919-1920], 319 ff.). This is ingenious, but very uncertain. The writer may simply be using poetical language from the OT as before (see 1 [25-28]) without attention to exactness of poetical form.

3. **a giant**: no doubt Hebrew *gibbor*, i.e. mighty warrior, hero (cf. Is 3 [2] LXX). **warlike harness**: cf. 1 S 8 [12] LXX, etc.

4. **like a lion**: cf. 2 Mac 11 [11]; 2 S 1 [23], etc. **for prey**: cf. Am 3 [4].

5. **the lawless**: probably refers to the apostate Jews, 1 [43, 52], etc. **burnt up**: e.g. 5 [5, 44] (cf. Ps 97 [3]).

7. **his memorial is blessed for ever**: cf. Pr 10 [7] (not LXX).

10-26. Defeat of Apollonius and Seron.

10. **Apollonius**: 1 [29] *v.n.* **Samaria**: according to *Ant.*, XII, vii, 1 Apollonius was governor of Samaria. On the enmity of the Samaritans see Neh 4 [1, 2]; cf. Ecclus 50 [26].

12. **spoils**: A reads *weapons*. Equipment of all kinds was much needed for Judas's irregulars (cf. 4 [6]).

13. **commander of the host of Syria**: this title appears to be taken from 2 K 5 [1] (Naaman).

15. Lit. *ana there were added* (cf. 2 [43]; Dan [Th.] 11 [34]) *and went up with him*, which probably represents Hebrew '*they assembled themselves and went up with him*' (Guillaume).

16. **the ascent of Bethhoron**: the most convenient of all the ascents from the maritime plain to Jerusalem, but the road is rough and steep. Down it Joshua chased the Amorites (Jos 10 [10-14]; cf. also 1 S 14 [31]).

17. Judas was weak in commissariat.

18. **shut up in the hands**: a Hebraism for *deliver into the power of*; cf. 4 [31], etc.; cf. 1 S 17 [46]. **to save by many or by few**: cf. 1 S 14 [6], but note heaven for *the Lord*. Similarly he himself ([22]), avoiding the name of God (cf. [60], 4 [24], etc.).

22. **discomfit**: better *crush*, and so 4 [14], 5 [7], 7 [42], etc.

24. Such a victory was to be expected. 'Men filled with religious enthusiasm are likely to perform prodigies against merely professional soldiers' (Bevan, *House of Seleucus*, ii, 298).

27-60. Antiochus commissions Lysias to stamp out the rebellion. Judas and his men prepare for the struggle.

29. **plague**: better *harm*.

30. **with a liberal hand**: cf. Dan 11 [24]. On Antiochus's extravagance see Polybius, xxvi, 1.

31. **Persia**: 6 [1]; 2 Mac 1 [13], etc., used of the eastern parts of the Seleucid Empire in general (=*Persia and Media*, 6 [56]).

32. **honourable**: better *distinguished*. **over the affairs**: cf. 2 Mac 13 [23], etc.; Polybius, v, 41 (see *B.S.*, 306).

33. **his son**: afterwards Antiochus V, Eupator. 34. **elephants**: 1 [17] *v.n.*

35. **their memorial**: cf. 12 [53]; Dt 32 [26]; Ecclus 10 [17], etc.

37. 165 B.C. **the upper countries**: cf. 6 [1]; 2 Mac 9 [23, 25]. Upper perhaps=inland (cf. Ac 19 [1]).

38. **Ptolemy**: cf. 2 Mac 4 [45], 8 [8], 10 [12]. **Nicanor**: cf. 7 [26] ff.; 2 Mac 8 [9], 14, 15. **Gorgias**: cf. 2 Mac 10 [14], 12 [32] ff. **friends**: 2 [18].

39. In 2 Mac 8 [9], 20,000 is given as the total number sent.

40. **Emmaus**: now '*Amwas*, on the road between Joppa and Jerusalem (about fourteen miles from Jerusalem as the crow flies, the same distance as Jericho: *R.B.* [1925], 35).

41. **fetters**: so Syriac and the parallel account in *Ant.*, XII, vii, 3; the Greek and Latin MSS. have *servants* (i.e. *paidas* for *pedas*). **Philistines**: so Syriac. Greek and Latin MSS. have *strangers*, the usual LXX rendering of *Philistines* (cf. 4 [22, 30], 5 [66]).

43. **raise up the ruin**: cf. Am 9 [11].

45. Another outburst of poetical language, largely from the OT.

46. **Mizpeh**: i.e. Mizpah, associated with Samuel (1 S 7 [5, 6]), probably on the hill now called Neby Samwil, four and a half miles north-west of Jerusalem, less probably Tell Nasbeh, about nine miles north of Jerusalem (*R.B.* [1923], 506, 507).

48. The text seems to be at fault. A slight emendation of what was probably the Hebrew original would give for the second clause, *which the Gentiles were seeking in order to work upon them the likenesses of their idols*. Another emendation of the first clause would give instead of 'the book of the law,' which would have no special connexion with the Temple at Jerusalem, [50, 51] (cf. however Diodorus, xxxiv, frag.), 'the veils': cf. 4 [51]. See *J.T.S.* (October, 1927), 43 ff.

50. **these men . . . them**: the pronouns in the Hebrew may have referred to the things mentioned as well as to the Nazirites.

54. **trumpets**: 5 [31], 6 [33], 9 [12, 13].

56. **were fearful**: cf. Jg 7 [3]. **the law**: Dt 20 [5] ff.

58. **in readiness against the morning**: Ex 34 [2].

60. Again the name of God avoided: cf. [18].

IV. **1-21. The defeat of Gorgias**: cf. 2 Mac 8 [8] ff.

2. **men of the citadel**: lit. *sons of the citadel*, a Hebraism; according to *Ant.*, XII, vii, 4 they were renegade Jews.

3. **Emmaus**: 3 [40] *v.n.*

6. **three thousand**: so Josephus; according to 2 Mac 8 [16], 6,000. **armour**: lit. *coverings* (cf. 6 [2]). As to the shortage cf. 2 Mac 8 [27, 31].

10. Cf. 3 [18, 60], etc. **if he will have us**: cf. Ps 22 [8]; Mt 27 [43].

12. **strangers**: 11 [68].

15. **Gazara**: so Josephus, i.e. Gezer (Jos 10 [33]; 12 [12]), Tell Jezer, excavated at the beginning of this century. From

Emmaus to Gezer was about five miles. **Azotus**: Ashdod (1 S 5[5], etc.); mod. *Esdud*. **Jamnia**: Jabneel (Jos 15[11]), mod. *Yabneh*. The three places are close together. **the plains**: i.e. the maritime plain. **Idumæa**: here used rather vaguely = the west (in [29] and [61] below, the south) of Judæa. The MSS. A and V actually read Judæa.

18. mountain, i.e. the highland of Judæa.

22. Philistines: cf. [30] and 3[41] *v.n.*

23. sea purple: the famous Tyrian dye (cf. Ezek 27[7]).

24. heaven, i.e. God: 3[18] *v.n.* **because *his mercy* is good, because his mercy endureth for ever**: a couplet first found in Jer 33[11], frequent in post-exilic Psalms, e.g. Ps 106[1], 107[1], etc.

28-35. The defeat of Lysias: 2 Mac 11[1-15].

Kolbe (81, following Procksch) regards this passage as a doublet of 6[28-62] (2 Mac 13[1-23]), composed in order to counterbalance Lysias's success by inventing a previous success of Judas against him. But Kolbe gives no solid reason for rating the historical value of our sources so low.

28. next year: i.e. 165-164.

29. Idumæa: [15]; cf. 2 Mac 11[5] and *Ant.*, XII, vii, 5. The Idumæans seem (2 Mac 10[15]) to have been hostile to Judas and his party, and therefore friendly disposed to the Syrians. Hence Lysias chooses to operate from the south. **Bethsura**: Bethzur (Jos 15[58]), mod. *Beit Sur*, a little north-west of Hebron, a strategic position commanding the road from Jerusalem.

30-31. Another outburst of poetical language (cf. 1[25], etc.).

30. Saviour of Israel: cf. Is 43[3], 49[26]. **mighty man**: Goliath (1 S 17[51]).

35. that he might come again: 6[28] ff.

36-61. The re-dedication of the Temple.

37. Mount Sion: the Temple mount (cf. 1[33]).

38. gates: cf. 2 Mac 8[32]. **shrubs growing in the courts**: this is somewhat surprising, for the Temple was, at least at first, turned into a place of sacrifice to Zeus (1[54]; cf. 2 Mac 6[4] ff.). Perhaps, however, a little later it was allowed to fall into disrepair, and the main heathen altars were built elsewhere, in the market-place (2 Mac 10[2]; cf. 1 Mac 1[55]), and in the Akra which was intended to be the acropolis of a new Greek city (1[33]), but see also Introduction. **the priests' chambers**: Ezek 42[13, 14]; cf. Ezr 10[6]; Neh 3[30], etc.

40. the solemn trumpets: *the signal trumpets* (Nu 31[6]; cf. 3[54]).

41. the citadel: the Akra (1[33]).

42. blameless priests: *priests without blemish* (contrast 1[15] and 2 Mac 4[14]).

43. the stones of defilement, i.e. the stones of the small altar which had been erected (1[54]) upon the great altar of burnt offering.

46. the mountain of the house: Jer 26[18], etc. **a prophet**: cf. 9[27], 14[41].

47. Ex 20[25]; Dt 27[6].

49. the vessels: taken away by Antiochus Epiphanes (1[21, 22]). **of burnt offerings**: this must be omitted as a slip on the part of some scribe (Vulgate and Syriac omit).

51. loaves: so Lev 24[5-9]. **veils**: perhaps the veil at the entrance of the Holy Place, and the veil between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies. But see *J.T.S.* (October, 1927), 44, 45.

52. The first Feast of the Dedication on 25 Chislev (December), 165, exactly three years after the first sacrifice upon *the idol altar* (1[59]).

54. harps and lutes and cymbals: cf. 1 Ch 25[6]; 2 Ch 5[12]. A lute was a stringed instrument.

55. unto heaven: [24].

56. eight days: cf. 1 K 8[66]. **sacrifice of deliverance and praise**: cf. the LXX rendering of Lev 7[11, 12].

57. with crowns of gold and small shields: cf. the decoration of gilded shields and crowns in the synagogues of Alexandria (Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 20).

59. The Feast of Hanukkah, mentioned Jn 10[22], and called by Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, vii, 7) *Lights*, was observed for the first four centuries by the Church as well as by the Synagogue. Among the Jews this feast is still very popular. See 2 Mac 1[9], 10[6, 7].

60-61. The Temple mount is fortified, for a Syrian garrison still holds the Akra.

61. they fortified Bethsura to keep it: omit *to keep it* (with MS. 55) as a slip, probably a repetition of *to keep it* in the previous clause.

V. Razzias carried out by Judas and Simon in outlying districts.

Jewish communities in outlying districts being now attacked by their Gentile neighbours, Judas and Simon go to the rescue. Some are actually brought back ([45-54]) to settle in Judæa.

3. Ps 83, very likely written or re-written during this period, seems to reflect the general situation. **Akrabattine**: cf. the ascent of Akrabbim, Nu 34[4] (i.e. *of the scorpions*), a high ridge somewhere south-west of the Dead Sea. **children of Esau**: i.e. the Edomites (Gen 36[8]).

4, 5. Cf. 2 Mac 10[18-23].

4. wickedness: *malice*. **Bæan**: Nu 32[3] LXX; cf. *Jub.*, xxix, 10, i.e. appar-

ently Baal-meon. **snare and stumbling-block**: cf. Ps 69 [22].

5. **destroyed them utterly**: a Hebraism frequently found in LXX. **burned . . . the towers**: cf. Jg 9 [49. 52].

6. **passed over**: i.e. over the Arabah to the district north-east of the Dead Sea. **a mighty band**: 11 [15]; lit. *a mighty hand*, another Hebraism (e.g. Nu 20 [20]). **Timotheus** (cf. 2 Mac 8 [30]): note the Greek name of this Ammonite leader.

8. **and seized Jazer**: Nu 21 [32], 32 [3] (with Bæan LXX); Jos 13 [24. 25]; somewhere near Heshbon (Jos 21 [39]; 1 Ch 6 [81]; Is 16 [8]). It may be that the capture of Jazer is here placed too early. In 2 Mac 10 [32] ff. Timotheus is represented as being slain at the capture of this place. **villages**: cf. [65]; lit. *daughters*, another Hebraism (e.g. Jg 1 [27]).

9. **Gilead**: the country between the Arnon and the Yarmuk on the east of Jordan (Nu 32 [29], etc.; cf. *Jub.*, xix, 9, 10).

10. **Dathema**: unidentified.

13. **the land of Tubias**: the land of Tob (Jg 11 [3], etc.), in Gilead north of the Yarmuk (so Meyer, ii, 134); cf. 2 Mac 12 [17]. On the possibility of connecting this with Arak el-Emir, Casphor ([26]) with Heshbon, etc., and locating the whole campaign [34] ff. near Ammon, see Abel in *R.B.* (1923), 515 ff. But some of the places mentioned would seem to be farther north.

14. **other messengers**: cf. Job 1 [16-18].

15. **Ptolemais**: the Acco of Jg 1 [31], etc., destroyed by Ptolemy I, 312 B.C., the city that rose again out of the ruins being called Ptolemais; but the old name did not die out, and eventually it replaced the new—so now *Acca*. **Tyre** had to some extent recovered from its destruction by Alexander the Great, 332. **Galilee of the Gentiles**: cf. Is 9 [1]; Mt 4 [15].

23. **Arbatta**: the name is spelled variously in the MSS., and the place is unknown.

24. **three days' journey**: probably about sixty miles.

25. **the Nabathæans**: friendly (9 [35]) Arabs whose capital was Petra. Their ancestor was supposed to be Nebaioth, the eldest son of Ishmael (Gen 25 [13]; so *Ant.*, I, xii, 4).

26, 27. The text seems to require emendation. Read, with Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, 212), for **were shut up in**, *were gathered together from*, and for **strongholds** (cf. [65]), *stronghold*, i.e. Dathema ([10]).

26. **Bosora**: possibly=Bozra, Jer 48 [24] (in the land of Moab), but this seems too far south: perhaps Bostra (mod. *Busra eski Sham*). **Bosor**: possibly=Bezer, Dt 4 [43] (in the territory of Reuben), but this again seems rather too far south: perhaps *Busr* (*el-Hariri*). **Casphor**: cf. Caspin (2 Mac 12 [13] ff.), possibly (G. A. Smith in *E.B.*, i, 707) *Muzeyrib* on the Haj road (cf. *Arabia Deserta*, i, 4). **Alema and Maked**: otherwise unknown. **Carnaim**: cf. Carnion (2 Mac 12 [21]), probably=Ashteroth-karnaim (Gen 14 [5]; Am 6 [13] *v.n.*), possibly *Sheikh Sa'd*.

29. **by night**: [50]; night operations were a special feature of Judas's campaigns (2 Mac 8 [7], 12 [6]).

31. Trumpets were used also by the Syrians (cf. 6 [33], 9 [12]; 2 Mac 15 [25]).

33. **three companies**: cf. Jg 7 [16]; 1 S 11 [11]. **trumpets . . . prayer**: cf. Jg 7 [18].

35. **Mizpeh**: Mizpah in Gilead (Jg 10 [17]).

37. **these things**: lit. *these words*, a Hebraism. **Raphon**: probably=Raphana according to Pliny (V, xviii, 74), one of the cities of the Decapolis. Abel suggests *Tell es-Sihab*. **the brook**: *the wady*.

39. **Arabians**: cf. 2 Mac 12 [10].

40. **mightily prevail**: a Hebraism (LXX 2 Ch 32 [13]).

41. **Judas attacks**: his usual policy.

42. **scribes**: i.e. the *officers* of Dt 20 [5] ff. (cf. 2 Ch 26 [11]). A similar use of the word is found in papyri of 2nd century B.C. (*B.S.*, 110).

43. **the temple**: the sacred precinct of the goddess Atergatis (2 Mac 12 [26]).

45. **from the least unto the greatest**: another Hebrew expression.

46. **Ephron**: cf. *Gephyrun* (2 Mac 12 [13]), no doubt the Gephrus of Polybius, V, 70, captured by Antiochus the Great, probably in the Wady *el-Ghafr*. The road must have passed through the city with precipices towering up on either side.

52. **the great plain**: i.e. of Esdraelon. **Bethshan**: Scythopolis (2 Mac 12 [29]; Jg 1 [27] LXX; *Ant.*, V, i, 22, XII, viii, 5), mod. *Beisan*.

54. Wellhausen suggests (*Isr. u. jüd. Gesch.*[8], 247) that Ps 68 may have been composed for this occasion.

58. **Jamnia**: 4 [15] *v.n.* 61. Cf. [19].

63. **the man Judas**: cf. *the man Moses* (Ex 11 [3]; Nu 12 [3]).

66. **Philistines**: 3 [41] *v.n.* **Samaria**: must be a mistake for *Marisa* (so *Ant.*, XII, viii, 6), i.e. Mareshah, Tell Sandahannah, about thirteen miles north-west of Hebron (Jos 15 [44]; Mic 1 [15], etc.), in the neighbourhood of which are the famous burial-places adorned with animal frescoes belonging to this period, discovered in 1901.

67. Presumably *they* must be read for **he**: cf. 2 Mac 12 [34. 39. 40].

68. **Azotus**: 4 [15] *v.n.*; cf. 10 [84]. **images**: cf. 1 S 5 [3].

VI. 1-17. **Antiochus Epiphanes dies, and is succeeded by his son Antiochus V (Eupator)**: cf. 2 Mac 9.

1. **in Elymais**: and so Polybius, xxxi, 11; i.e. in Elam (Ezek 32 [24], etc.; cf. Tob 2 [10]). **a city**: unknown; according to 2 Mac 9 [2] Persepolis; but this must be wrong as Persepolis was not in Elymais. Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, ix, 1) takes Elymais as the name of the city, but a city of that name is unknown.

2. **the temple**: *of Nanæa*, according to 2 Mac 1 [13] (a Babylonian goddess, identified with Ishtar, the chief centre of whose worship was Erech); according to Polybius (xxxi, 11) *of Artemis*; according to Appian (*Syr.*, 66) *of Aphrodite*. **shields**: lit. *coverings* (cf. 4 [6]).

5. 3 [23] (Seron), 4 [14, 22] (Nicanor and Gorgias). 6. 4 [34, 35]. 7. 4 [43-61].

10. **friends**: 2 [18] *v.n.* **sleep departeth from mine eyes**: cf. Gen 31 [40]. **care**: cf. Ecclus 42 [9].

13. According to Polybius (xxxi, 11) Antiochus 'was driven mad, as some say, by some manifestations of divine wrath in the course of his wicked attempt upon this temple.'

14. **Philip**: according to 2 Mac 9 [29] his foster-brother.

15. Special care was necessary, for Demetrius, the son of Seleucus IV, Antiochus's elder brother (1 [10] *v.n.*), was now grown to manhood.

16. 164-163 B.C.

17. **called his name**: a Hebraism (cf. Mt 1 [21]). **Eupator**: 'because,' says Appian (*Syr.*, 44), 'of the virtue of his father.'

18-63. **The struggle for the Akra and for Bethsura ends in a treaty.**

18. **hurt**: by attacking those who went to the Temple to offer sacrifice (*Ant.*, XII, ix, 3).

20. 163-162. **mounds to shoot from**: Ezek 4 [2]. 21. **ungodly men**: cf. 1 [11].

23. **willing**: *well-pleased*.

29. **from other kingdoms, and from isles of the sea**: the kingdoms along the coast-line of Asia Minor, and the Greek-speaking islands of the Ægean and the Mediterranean are meant.

30. **the number**: so Josephus; no doubt exaggerated, as also in 2 Mac 13 [2], where different figures are given. **elephants**: 1 [17] *v.n.*

31. The Syrians seem to have made a detour to approach Bethsura and Jerusalem from the south, possibly in order to keep on more open and level ground for the manœuvring of their elephants (I. Abrahams, *Campaigns in Palestine*, 30).

32. **Bethzacharias**: north of Bethsura, about one-third of the way to Jerusalem, mod. *Beit Zakariya*.

33. **at full speed**: lit. *in its onset*. **trumpets**: 5 [31].

34. **the blood of grapes and mulberries**: cf. Gen 49 [11], poetical language suggesting, apparently, the purpose of this display, viz. to excite the animals by something corresponding to the sight of blood.

35. **coats of mail**: cf. 1 S 17 [5]. **cunning contrivances**: simply *contrivances*, some special kind of girth.

37. **two and thirty**: read, probably, without changing the consonants of what was presumably the Hebrew text (Fairweather), *two chosen men*. For a similar confusion between these two Hebrew words see 1 Ch 11 [11]; cf. 2 S 23 [8].

39. The writer may mean that the shields were made of brass ornamented with gold; but note the exaggeration.

43. **Eleazar**: 2 [5].

47. **they**: i.e. Judas and his army ([42]). In 2 Mac 13 [22] this defeat is regarded as a victory.

49. **he came out**: must be a slip for *they came out*. **Sabbath**: i.e. a Sabbatical year (Ex 23 [10, 11], etc.). According to this the summer of 163-162 fell in a Sabbatical year (which always began in autumn: Schürer, i, 214), and this is confirmed by the fact that the summer of 37 B.C. also fell in a Sabbatical year (*Ant.*, XV, i, 2: see Schürer, i, 35).

51. **pieces**: lit. *little scorpions*.

52. **they also**: i.e. the besieged.

53. **they that fled**: 5 [23, 45].

55. **Philip**: [14].

56. **Persia and Media**: cf. 1 [1], 3 [31] *v.n.*

58. **the right hand**: cf. 11 [50, 62]; similarly in an inscription at Pergamum, quoted *B.S.*, 251. This was a Persian rather than a Jewish practice (see Lightfoot on Gal 2 [9]).

59. The treaty secures religious liberty for the Jews.

60. **the saying pleased the king**: cf. 8 [21]; 2 Ch 30 [4] LXX.

VII. **Alcimus the Hellenizing High Priest is supported by Bacchides and Nicanor: Nicanor is defeated and killed.**

1. 162-161. **Demetrius I (Soter)**: 1 [10] *v.n.* **a city by the sea**: Tripolis on the coast of Syria (2 Mac 14 [1]; *Ant.*, XII, x, 1). **a few**: twelve men and three boys (Polybius, xxxi, 22); contrast 2 Mac 14 [1].

2. **the house of the kingdom**: in Dan 4 [30] ([27]) LXX of Babylon, so here = Antioch, the royal city.

5. **lawless and ungodly**: the Hellenizers as 1 [52], 2 [44], etc. **Alcimus**: his Hebrew

name was Jakim (*Ant.*, XII, ix, 7; cf. 1 Ch 8 [19]); according to Josephus he was already High Priest (cf. 2 Mac 14 [7]). If so, he desired to have his office confirmed: and this is suggested by the language of [9].

7. how he hath punished them and all that helped them: rather with MS. 55 and Kautzsch, by a very slight emendation of the common Greek text, *let him punish them* (i.e. Judas and his brethren, [6]) *and all that helped them* (cf. [9]).

8. So Josephus, XII, x, 2. 2 Maccabees says nothing of Bacchides (but cf. 2 Mac 8 [30]). **friends**: 2 [18] *v.n.* **the river**: Euphrates, as Ex 23 [31]; Is 8 [7], etc. **the country beyond the river**: probably still, as in the official language of the old Persian Empire, *the country west of the river*, i.e. Cœle-Syria (cf. 10 [69]).

12. a company of scribes: cf. 2 [42] *a company of Hasidæans.* Here (not as in 5 [42]) professional students of the law, probably to be closely connected with the Hasidæans mentioned in the next verse.

13. Hasidæans: 2 [42] *v.n.*

14. One that is a priest: a Hebraism, e.g. Lev 21 [9] LXX.

17. Ps 79 [2, 3] abbreviated. The Psalm was probably written or rewritten between 168 and 165.

19. Bezeth: Josephus calls the place *Berzetho* (*Ant.*, XII, x, 2). Possibly just north of Jerusalem where later the suburb *Bezetha* (*B.J.*, V, iv, 2) lay. According to some, mod. *Bir ez-Zeit*, a little north-west of Bethel (see Schürer, i, 222 note); according to others, mod. *Beit Zeita*, near Bethzacharias. **pit**: *cistern.*

21. Alcimus was hard put to it to retain the High Priesthood.

24. coasts: *borders.*

26. Nicanor: 3 [38]; according to Polybius (XXXI, 22) and Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, x, 4) a close personal friend of the king's.

27-30. Cf. *Ant.*, XII, x, 4. 2 Mac 14 [19-22] has a different story.

28. see your faces: a Hebraism.

31, 32. Cf. 2 Mac 14 [16, 17].

31. Capharsalama: unidentified. See Schürer, i, 217, 218 note, and Abel's interesting conjectures, *R.B.* (1924), 376.

32. into the city of David: i.e. into the Akra (1 [33]) which had been all along held by the Syrians.

33. elders: 1 [26], 11 [23]. **for the king**: the custom of offering sacrifice for their Gentile rulers went back to the Persian period (Ezr 6 [10]).

37. Cf. 1 K 8 [38, 43].

39. Bethhoron: 3 [16].

40. Adasa: not certainly identified; according to Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, x, 5), 30 stadia (three and three-quarter miles) from Bethhoron; according to Eusebius, near Gophna (mod. Jifneh). G. A. Smith and Abel (*R.B.* [1924], 377 ff.) suggest mod. Khirbet 'Adasa, although 60 stadia from Beit 'Ur (Bethhoron). See Schürer, i, 218 note.

43. Adar: roughly March. **the first to fall**: contrast *Ant.*, XII, x, 5, 'at last Nicanor himself fell fighting gloriously.'

45. Gazara: 4 [15]; the distance appears to be a little over twenty miles. **the solemn trumpets**: 4 [40].

46. these . . . on those: fugitives . . . on their comrades.

47. hanged them up: *stretched them out.*

49. Nicanor's day was still kept in Josephus's time (*Ant.*, XII, x, 5), and is mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud (*Meg.*, ii, 66*a*). Later it ceased to be observed; largely, perhaps, because the more popular Feast of Purim fell on the following day (14 Adar).

VIII. Judas's treaty with Rome.

Cf. the treaty between Rome and Astypalæa recorded in an inscription of 105 B.C. (Hicks, *Man. Gk. Hist. Inscriptions*, 347-349). The historical character of the narrative has been attacked, e.g. by Niese, but on insufficient grounds (Schürer, i, 220, 221). That Judas should approach the Senate for protection against Demetrius, whose accession was unfavourably viewed at Rome ([31] *v.n.*), is by no means improbable; cf. Rome's friendly answer to Timarchus, a satrap in arms against Demetrius (Diod., xxxi, 27*a*).

1-16 reflect, probably with considerable accuracy, the general impression Rome was making upon the Nearer East. Note the incorrectness of some details ([8, 15, 16]).

1. amity with all such as come unto them: the *friendship* of the Romans had a well-recognized diplomatic significance, and was bestowed especially upon small states struggling to break free from large empires. It was a deliberate part of the Roman policy to disunite the East.

2. the Gauls: probably the Gauls of Upper Italy, subjugated 190 B.C. (Polybius, ii, 14-34). Note **brought them under tribute**, and the reference to Spain ([3]).

3. Spain: taken from the Carthaginians 201 B.C., but even now not properly subjugated. **mines**: Pliny, *H.N.*, xxxiii, 21.

5. Philip III, king of Macedonia, was defeated by the Romans in 197, and Perseus his son and successor in 168, when Macedonia (**Chittim**, 1 [19] *v.n.*) became a Roman province.

6. Antiochus III (the Great) was crushed by the Romans at the battle of Magnesia, 190. **Asia**: 11 [13], 12 [39], 13 [32]; thought of by the writer as Asia Minor and the

regions beyond. **a hundred and twenty elephants**: fifty-four according to Livy, xxxvii, 39.

7. took him alive: this is a mistake; Antiochus escaped. **a great tribute**: 15,000 Euboic talents; 3,000 at the time, and 1,000 a year for twelve years (Polybius, xxi, 17). But the payment fell into arrears, and the last was actually made in 173 (Livy, xlii, 6), i.e. in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. **and a parcel of land, to wit**: or possibly, by a slight emendation in the original Hebrew, *of their appointing* (2 Ch 31 [13]). The Romans were to choose whom they would (Appian, *Syr.*, 38).

8. A mistake: the possessions to be surrendered lay on the west of the Taurus only (Livy, xxxviii, 38). Moreover, the dominions of Antiochus III never included India. **Eumenes II**, king of Pergamum (197-158), had given valuable help to the Romans during the campaign against Antiochus.

9-10. The writer seems to be thinking of the overthrow of the Achæan League, 147-146 (some years after the death of Judas), when the Romans used the greatest severity and Greece was reduced to a Roman province. If so, the captain referred to is L. Mummius, and the word *Greece* is used in a narrower sense than in 1 [1, 10], 6 [2].

11. of the kingdoms and of the isles: 6 [29].

12-16. This idealizing picture of the Romans is not free from inaccuracies.

13. kings: e.g. Eumenes I and II of Pergamum. **exalted**: cf. 11 [16].

14. purple: cf. 14 [43]; Jg 8 [26]; Xen., *Cyrop.*, I, iii, 2, etc.

15, 16. The Senate did not meet each day; it did not consist of exactly 320 men; and there were, of course, two consuls and not one. But it was easy for Orientals to make such mistakes. They would, for example, 'never be brought into contact with more than one consul at a time' (Rawlinson).

17. Eupolemus: probably the scholar of that name, a Palestinian Jew, who wrote on OT subjects in Greek about 158 (Schürer, iii, 474-477): cf. 2 Mac 4 [11]. **Accos**: cf. 1 Ch 24 [10]; Neh 7 [63], etc. (*Hakkoz*), a name in a priestly family. **Jason**: cf. 12 [16].

18. take the yoke: cf. [31], 13 [41].

20. people: cf. [29], 12 [6] *v.n.*

21. well pleasing: cf. 6 [60].

22. For the custom of preserving copies of treaties on tablets of bronze cf. Polybius, iii, 26.

23-28. Cf. Polybius, iii, 22, 24, 25. 'A specimen of the sort of treaty which Rome was at all times ready to conclude with any independent power, beyond the line of her frontiers, but within the sphere of her activity' (Rawlinson). It was part of the Roman policy to weaken the Seleucid Empire by encouraging little states within it to seek independence.

23. Good success . . .: a usual Roman formula.

28. food . . . as it hath seemed good unto Rome: here and in [26] the sense seems to be *items on the Roman list of 'contraband of war'* (Rawlinson).

30. The addition of such a stipulation as to future modifications of a treaty by mutual agreement was not unusual.

31. It had been against the wishes of Rome that Demetrius had become king (Polybius, xxxi, 19-23).

IX. **1-22. The last campaign of Judas.**

1. he sent . . . a second time: in the original a Hebraism. Cf. 10 [88] (*yet more*).

2. Gilgal: Josephus has *Galilee* (*Ant.*, XII, xi, 1), and Galilee seems to give the best sense. Cf. Jos 12 [23], where Gilgal (Hebrew) becomes Galilee in the LXX. Arbela (*Test. Jud.*, 6) is mod. Khirbet Irbid, near a wady in the steep sides of which are caves only to be reached by steps (Hebrew *m'silloth*), and **Mesaloth** must refer to these. Cf. *B.J.*, i, 16, which describes how Herod the Great cleared these caves of robbers.

3. first month: i.e., no doubt, Nisan (April), 161. This seems surprisingly soon after the death of Nicanor on the 13th of the previous month (7 [49]).

4. Berea: Abel suggests *el-Bireh*, about ten miles north of Jerusalem (*R.B.* [1924], 383). Some MSS. read *Beērzath*, and Josephus (*Ber*) *Zētho* (*Ant.*, XII, xi, 1), which may be Bir ez-Zeit near Gophna (Schürer, i, 222).

5. Elasa: Abel suggests Khirbet el-Assy just south-west of el-Bireh. Others have advocated Il'asa just north-west of Upper Bethhoron, but this would scarcely have been a point of vantage for Judas (Abel, *loc. cit.*, 384).

7. waxed faint: 3 [17] *v.n.*

10. glory: in the sense of *reputation*.

12. in the right wing: the position chosen by Alexander the Great in his battles with the Persians (Arrian, *Alex.*, I, xiv, etc.). **trumpets**: cf. 3 [54], 5 [31], 6 [33].

13. the earth shook: cf. 2 S 22 [8].

15. unto the mount Azotus: Josephus has *as far as a mountain called Eza*; Abel suggests *towards el-Aṣur*, a hilly *massif* about 6 miles away.

19. Modin: 2 [1]. **20.** Cf. 13 [26].

22. the rest of the acts: cf. 16 [23]; 2 K 10 [34], etc.

23-73. Jonathan, the successor of Judas, contends, and finally comes to an agreement, with Bacchides.

23. The language echoes Ps 92 [7]. **the lawless:** 7 [24. 25].

24. Very likely the paraphrase of Josephus (*Ant.*, XIII, i, 1) gives the sense: *A famine also assisted their wickedness, and afflicted the country, till not a few, by reason of their want of necessaries . . . deserted their country, and went over* (Josephus uses the same word: cf. 2 S 10 [19] LXX) *to the Macedonians.*

27. no prophet: 4 [46], 14 [41].

31. rose up in the stead: 3 [1].

33. Tekoah (mod. *Teku'a*) lay on a height five miles south-east of Bethlehem. **the wilderness:** 2 Ch 20 [20], i.e. land fit only for rough grazing and not for the plough. **the pool:** i.e. *the cistern* (2 Ch 26 [10]). **Asphar:** cf. Arabic *aṣfar*, 'yellow,' perhaps (Abel, *R.B.* [1925], 197) Khirbet Bir ez-Za'feran (*cistern of Saffron*), a little south of Tekoah; or possibly Bir Selhub (G. A. Smith, *E.B.*, 343).

34 is taken up again in [43], and perhaps should be omitted here. It may have been inserted to make it clear that [43-48] assume that Bacchides is on the east side of the river.

35. brother: John ([36, 38]). **Nabathæans:** 5 [25]. **baggage:** 5 [13].

36. Jambri: cf. the name Ya'amru found in a Nabatæan inscription (*R.B.* [1925], 197: cf. also *E.B.*, 2317). **Medaba:** about twelve miles east of the north end of the Dead Sea, where ruins are still to be found (cf. Jos 13 [9], etc.).

37. Nadabath: possibly to be sought in the region of *Arḍ el-Ḥadab* (*R.B.* [1925], 200).

39. his friends: Jg 14 [11]; Mt 9 [15]; Jn 3 [29].

43. unto the banks: i.e. apparently on the east side of the river ([48]).

44. as yesterday and the day before: cf. Gen 31 [2]; the danger was greater than ever before.

45. Except at certain points the Jordan is difficult to cross, with its muddy bottom at a depth of, it may be, 12 feet, and the thickets on its clay banks. Jonathan evidently found himself cut off on the marshy ground not far from the point where the Jordan enters the Dead Sea.

46. cry unto heaven: 3 [18, 50], 4 [10].

50. The Jewish territory is encircled with Syrian forts. **Jericho** (possibly Dok, 16 [15]; but cf. Strabo, XVI, ii, 40), on the approach to Jerusalem from the east. **Emmaus** (3 [40]), a position of similar strategic importance on the west. From these two points the Roman legions finally converged on Jerusalem in the war of A.D. 70: *B.J.*, V, i, 6; ii, 3 (*R.B.* [1928], 204). **Bethhoron** (3 [16]) watched the region of Modin, and **Bethel** (*Beitin*) the old road up from Jericho (*R.B.* [1925], 205). **Timnath** (probably *Tell Tibneh*, about ten miles north-west of Bethel: Jos 24 [30]; *Test. Jud.*, 7; *Jub.*, 34), **Pharathon** (according to the *Sepher Yashar* the name of the king of Hazor: 1 Mac 11 [67]; cf. 2 S 23 [30], and *Test. Jud.*, 7), OT Pirathon (Jg 12 [15]), probably Far'ata, just over six miles south-west of Nablus (*R.B.* [1925], 206), and **Tephon** (=Thaphuah: cf. *Test. Jud.*, 3) were probably outposts on the north.

52. Bethsura: 4 [29]. **Gazara:** 4 [15], behind Emmaus, guarded the Shephelah. Several of the round towers discovered there by Macalister (*The Excavation of Gezer*, i, 256) may have been the work of the Syrian general. **the citadel:** 1 [33].

54. May, 160. **Alcimus:** 7 [5], **the wall:** probably the *Soreg*, the breastwork separating the court of the Jews (the inner court) from the court of the Gentiles.

55. Alcimus becomes paralyzed.

58. lawless: 7 [5] *v.n.* **in security:** Lev 25 [19].

61. they that were of Jonathan's part: the Greek has simply *they*, which Josephus interprets of Bacchides and his men (*Ant.*, XIII, i, 5), angry at being misled (cf. [69]).

62. Bethbasi: perhaps Bir Beit Bassa, about three miles east-south-east from Bethlehem (*R.B.* [1925], 214). This is not so deep in the wilderness as Asphar ([33]), but rather on the edge of the agricultural land. Jonathan is now more confident.

65. a few men: Is 10 [19] LXX.

66. Odemera: Abel (*R.B.* [1925], 215) sees in these Bedouin the ancestors of the Ta'amireh, a clan still to be found in the neighbourhood of Bir Beit Bassa.

67. Obscure, but the sense seems to be that Jonathan and his forces, presumably now strengthened, return to attack Bacchides who is still engaged in besieging Bethbasi.

70. captives: [72].

73. Michmash: Muhmas, about seven and a half miles south-east of Bethel, solidly established on a rock on the outskirts of the wilderness. Here Jonathan set up a kind of independent government and proceeded, so far as he could, to stamp out the Hellenizers. But a Seleucid garrison still held the Akra at Jerusalem, with whom Jonathan had had to lodge hostages, and he was not allowed to raise troops (10 [6, 7]).

X. Jonathan supports Alexander Balas, a new claimant to the Seleucid throne, and is rewarded by him.

1. 153-152. The last date mentioned was 160-159 (9 [54]). Of the intervening period the writer evidently knows little. **Alexander Epiphanes**: commonly called Balas (a Semitic name or nickname), handsome and genial; probably an impostor (so Polybius, xxxiii, 18), but supported by Ptolemy Philometor and other kings, and recognized by Rome. **Ptolemais**: 5 [15].

12. **the strongholds**: 9 [50-52], but cf. 11 [41].

14. **at Bethsura**: 4 [29]; also in the Akra at Jerusalem ([32], 11 [20]), as Josephus adds at this point (*Ant.*, XII, ii, 1).

15-21. **Alexander Balas outbids Demetrius.** 17. **letters**: *a letter* (12 [5] *v.n.*).

18. **brother**: cf. 11 [30]. **greeting**: the regular Greek form of salutation (Ac 15 [23], etc.).

19. **we**: cf. [25], 11 [31], etc.

20. **high priest**: the High Priesthood had apparently remained vacant for seven years (?) since the date of Alcimus (9 [56]). **a purple robe and a crown of gold**: cf. 8 [14]; Est 8 [15]; Dan 5 [7]. **take our part**: cf. Mk 8 [33].

21. **the seventh month . . . at the feast of tabernacles**: Lev 23 [34]; it is clear that the writer regards the year as beginning in the spring (i.e. with 1 Nisan). **the hundred and sixtieth year**: 153-152.

26. **your covenants**: 9 [70-72].

28. **immunities**: 13 [37]; see [29].

29. **tributes**: 3 [29], very likely poll-tax (see Schürer, i, 229, 230). **customs of salt**: 11 [35] (see Wilcken, *Gr. Ostraka aus Ægypten*, i, 141 ff.). **the crowns**: 11 [35], a money payment, instead of the crown of gold required as a present to a sovereign (2 Mac 14 [4]: cf. *Ant.*, XII, iii, 3).

30. **governments**: in 11 [28] *toparchies*: see 11 [34]. **Samaria and Galilee**: perhaps reckoned as one political unit; in [38], 11 [34] Samaria only is mentioned.

31. **holy**: so on the coins of several cities (e.g. Tyre and Sidon) about this time (2 [7] *v.n.*). **free**: cf. the title *Autonomous* similarly on several series of city coins of this period. **the tenths and the tolls**: i.e. the Temple revenues were not to be taxed (cf. 2 Mac 11 [3]).

33. **all**: i.e. all government officials (cf. 2 Ch 8 [8-10]).

35. **exact from**: *bring a suit against.*

38. **than the high priest's**: note that the High Priest had no king's officer over him.

39. **Ptolemais**: not in Demetrius's possession ([1]).

40. **fifteen thousand shekels of silver**: about £3,200, the shekel being=4 drachmas (for the calculation see on 2 Mac 3 [11], 4 [19]): cf. Ezr 6 [9], 7 [21], etc.

41. **the overplus**: what this surplus is is not clear. It may perhaps be the balance under a certain head of revenue which, when administrative and other charges had been paid, had formerly (probably, i.e., before Antiochus Epiphanes) been allocated to the Temple. **the works of the house**: 1 Ch 23 [4] LXX, etc.

42. **five thousand shekels**: about £1,067. **uses of the sanctuary**: 2 Esd 7 [20]; perhaps by the change of a single letter in the Hebrew (Charles) read *dues* (Lev 27 [2], etc.). **this also is released**: [31].

43. The Temple and its precincts to have the right of asylum (not for involuntary murderers only as Ex 21 [14], etc., but also for debtors).

44, 45. Cf. [10, 11]. 45. **in Judæa**: cf. 9 [50-52]. 46. **had afflicted them**: 7-9.

49. Cf. *Ant.*, XIII, ii, 4. According to Josephus **the army of Alexander** which **fled** was only the right wing; the left wing defeated Demetrius's right wing, and in the struggle Demetrius himself was killed.

51-66. **The marriage of Alexander Balas.**

51. Ptolemy VI, Philometor, 181-145.

54. **thy daughter**: Cleopatra ([57]). As queen she was given half the tribute of Cœle-Syria, Antiochus collecting it and handing it over to her (see E. Cuq, *Syria*, viii [1927], 150-155).

57. 151-150 B.C.

58. Ps 45 may have been written or edited as an epithalamium on this occasion.

61. **pestilent fellows**: cf. 1 S 30 [22] LXX. **transgressors**: 1 [11]; the extreme Hellenizers were still opposed to the Maccabæan family (cf. 11 [21]).

62. Cf. [20].

63. **princes**: the word is translated *commander*, 3 [13] (Seron).

65. **chief friends**: evidently a high rank of *friend* ([16]: cf. 2 [18]). **captain**: military commander over the troops in Judæa, although another governor retained command in the *Akra* at Jerusalem. **governor of a province**: *Meridarch*, a title which goes back to the Ptolemies (*Ant.*, XII, v, 5), i.e. civil ruler over a division of Cœle-Syria. Jonathan practically had these powers already ([6, 21, 38]). Alexander merely confirmed them and added formal titles.

67. 148-147 B.C. Demetrius II (Nicator) lands in Cilicia (is this a copyist's error for Seleucia? Bevan, ii, 301) with mercenary troops (*Ant.*, XIII, iv, 3) to win back the Syrian throne.

69. **Apollonius**: governor of Cœle-Syria, a friend of Demetrius I (Polybius, xxxi, 19, 21). **Cœle-Syria**: 2 Mac 3 [5-9] (cf. Polybius, v, 80; Diod., xix, 59; 1 Esd 2 [17];

Ant., XIV, iv, 5); Southern Syria, except Phœnicia (probably=*the country beyond the river*, 7 [8]: cf. 11 [60] with *Ant.*, XIII, v, 5). **Jamnia**: 4 [15].

70. Thou alone: *Thou quite alone.* Apollonius regards Jonathan's opposition as mere insolence.

71. the power of the cities: i.e. of the centres of civilization as opposed to the wild mountainous districts ([70]).

72. fathers: Apollonius apparently means *predecessors* engaged in the struggles against Demetrius's father and his father's predecessor, e.g. 6 [47], 9 [18] (perhaps the two occasions referred to).

73. flint: *shingle.*

74. ten thousand: no doubt an exaggeration. Josephus estimates the *great host* of [77] at 8,000 (*Ant.*, XIII, iv, 4).

75. Joppa: Jos 19 [46]; mod. Jaffa, three and a half miles from Jamnia ([69]). See 14 [5]. **77. Azotus**: 4 [15].

78. he: i.e. Jonathan.

79. privily: in a wady (*Ant.*, XIII, iv, 4).

80. knew: *learned.* **cast their darts**: *shot their arrows* (1 S 20 [36] LXX, etc.).

81. the people stood still: in a square defended by their shields and armour (*Ant.*, XIII, iv, 4).

82. the phalanx: i.e., of course, the infantry.

83. Dagon: 1 S 5 [1-5], whose name occurs on the Tell el-Amarna tablets.

84. burned: cf. 5 [44].

86. Ascalon: Jos 13 [3]; Zech 9 [5], mod. 'Aṣḳalan, on the coast, twelve miles north of Gaza. **with great pomp**: [58] (cf. 11 [60]).

88. yet more: a Hebraism (cf. 9 [1]).

89. a buckle of gold: cf. 11 [58], 14 [44]. **Ekron**: mod. 'Akir, about twelve miles north-east of Ashdod.

XI. The fall of Alexander Balas: [1-19].

1. the king: Ptolemy VI, 10 [51]. **as the sand**: cf. Jos 11 [4], etc.

7. Eleutherus: mod. Nahr el-Kebir, a river (torrential in winter) forming the boundary between Phœnicia and Syria (Strabo, XVI, ii, 12).

8. Seleucia: the port of Antioch, about five miles north of the mouth of the Orontes (cf. Ac 13 [4])

9. Demetrius: apparently still in Cilicia, [14] (see on 10 [67]).

10. he sought to slay me: Josephus has a story of an attempt on the part of a friend of Alexander's to assassinate Ptolemy at Ptolemais (*Ant.*, XIII, iv, 6).

12. was estranged: cf. Ecclus 12 [18]. **to Demetrius**: so Livy, *Ep.*, 52.

13. So Diod., xxxii, 9. **Asia**: 8 [6] *v.n.*

15. a strong force: 5 [6]. **put him to flight**: on the plain near Antioch (Strabo, XVI, ii, 8).

16. exalted: cf. 8 [13].

17. Zabdiel: the name occurs in a Palmyrene inscription (G. A. Cooke, *N.S.I.*, 272). **sent it to Ptolemy**: similarly Pompey's head was brought to Julius Cæsar, and Cicero's to Antony (Plutarch).

18. I.e. the garrisons ([3]) were slain by the inhabitants.

19. 146-145 B.C.

20-53. Jonathan obtains good terms from Demetrius II, whom subsequently he supports against Tryphon.

20. the citadel: 1 [33] *v.n.* **engines**: 6 [31, 52], 9 [64], 15 [25].

21. men that transgressed the law: 10 [61] (cf. [25]).

26. as his predecessors: see especially 10 [61-65].

27. confirmed to him the high priesthood: cf. 7 [9]. **the high priesthood**: 10 [20]. **among his chief friends**: 10 [65].

28. provinces: *toparchies* (cf. 10 [30], 11 [34]). **and**: must be corrected to *from* (10 [38]). The mistake is probably due to a slight corruption or misreading of the original Hebrew. **three hundred talents**: i.e., no doubt, silver talents, about £97,500.

29. after this manner: cf. 2 Mac 1 [24].

30. brother: 10 [18]. **the nation of the Jews**: 10 [25].

31. Lasthenes: the Cretan who had raised the mercenary army with which Demetrius had landed in Cilicia (*Ant.*, XIII, iv, 3). **kinsman**: cf. 10 [89].

32. his father: for this use of the word see e.g. *Ant.*, XII, iii, 4, where Antiochus the Great in a letter thus addresses Zeuxis, a general in his service; similarly Antony Lepidus (Plut., *Antony*, 18): cf. Gen 45 [8]. Lasthenes was evidently in some official position, perhaps either governor of Cœle-Syria (cf. 10 [69]), or 'grand vizier' (Fairweather).

34. governments: *nomes.* **Aphærema**: i.e. Ephraim (2 S 13 [23]; 2 Ch 13 [19]; Jn 11 [54]), near Bethel, probably mod. et-Taybeh. The district intended is probably that between the Jerusalem-Shechem road and the Jordan. **Lydda**: OT Lod (1 Ch 8 [12]; Neh 7 [37], etc.), mod. Ludd, between Joppa and Jerusalem; this *nome* probably included Gezer and Modin. **Ramathaim**: 1 S 1 [1], *a double hill*; according to some mod. Rentis; according to others, mod. er-Rima, between Lydda and Shechem, probably the Arimathæa of Mk 15 [43], etc. **instead of**: the text does not appear to be quite in order, but the sense must be that of 10 [30]; so Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII, iv, 9.

35. **the tenths and the tolls**: 10 [31]. **the saltpits**: by the Dead Sea (cf. 10 [29]; Ezek 47 [11]; Zeph 2 [9]). **the crowns**: 10 [29] *v.n.*

37. **set up**: cf. 8 [22].

38. **was quiet before him**: [52], 1 [3]. **from the isles**: chiefly from Crete (10 [67], 11 [31]).

39. **Tryphon**: *the rake*, adopted as a surname by Diodotus, one of the two men who ruled Antioch under Alexander Balas (Diod.). The surname is found in inscriptions and on coins. **Imalcue the Arabian**: cf. [16]; the name occurs in a Palmyrene inscription (Schürer, i, 234). **Antiochus the young child**: cf. Livy, *Ep.*, 52.

41. **the citadel**: 1 [33], etc. **the strongholds**: apparently reoccupied (10 [12-14]).

46. **passages**: *thoroughfares* (cf. Dt 13 [16] LXX, etc.).

47. **a hundred thousand**: plainly an exaggeration; so, too, no doubt, [45]. For this reign of terror see Diod., xxxiii, 4.

50. **right hand**: 6 [58] *v.n.*

53. **in all that he spake**: i.e. in all that he had promised.

54-74. **Jonathan sides with Antiochus VI against Demetrius.**

57. **the four governments**: Judæa and the three nomes mentioned in [34].

58. **golden vessels**: cf. 1 Esd 3 [6]; Xenophon, *Anab.*, I, ii, 27. **purple**: 10 [20] *v.n.*

59. **captain**: *stratēgos*, i.e. the king's governor of the whole territory from the *Ladder of Tyre* in the north (which separated the territory of Tyre from that of Ptolemais) to *the borders of Egypt* (probably to the *Wady el-Arish*). The Ladder of Tyre is mod. el-Mushaḳḳah, which ends in Râs en-Naḳurah, the cliff descending sheer into the sea, and shutting off the Bay of Acre from the plain to the north. It is ascended by a steep path cut in zigzags (Rawlinson). This appointment of Simon did not of course involve any formal concession of land to the Jews.

60. **took his journey beyond the river**: i.e. *travelled* through the territory known as *the country beyond the river* (the Euphrates, 7 [8]), otherwise Cœle-Syria (note **the forces of Syria** mentioned: cf. [62] and see on 10 [69]). **Ascalon**: 10 [86] *v.n.*

61. **Gaza**: about fifteen miles south-west of Ascalon (and two and a half miles from the sea), the most southern of the five strong cities of the Philistines (1 S 6 [17]). It resisted Alexander the Great for five months (332 B.C., Arrian, *Alex.*, ii, 26 f.). **shut him out**: cf. 10 [75]. **burned the suburbs**: cf. [4].

62. **hostages**: cf. 9 [53]. **Damascus**: about 120 miles north-east of Jerusalem and 200 miles south of Antioch.

63. **princes**: *commanders* (cf. 3 [13]). **Kedesh**: Kedesh Naphtali (Jos 20 [7], etc.) in Upper Galilee, mod. *Ḳades*, four miles north-west of Lake Merom. **office**: 13 [15, 37] (cf. Polybius, iv, 87).

65. **Bethsura**: see on 4 [29]. Demetrius had failed to keep his promise to withdraw its garrison ([41, 42, 53]).

67. **Gennesareth**: the lake of Galilee, the earliest passage in which this name occurs (cf. *B.J.*, III, x, 8). **the plain of Hazor**: Jos 11 [1], etc. **Hazor**: probably mod. Tell Huraibeh.

70. **Absalom**: cf. 13 [11]; perhaps the Absalom of 2 Mac 11 [17]. **Chalphi**: or *Alphæus* (cf. Mt 10 [3]).

71. **rent his clothes**: cf. 3 [47], 4 [39].

74. **three thousand**: according to *Ant.*, XIII, v, 8 two thousand.

XII. 1-23. **Jonathan sends ambassadors to Rome and to the Spartans.**

Meyer (ii, 262) compares the deputation sent by the Chaldean astrologers to Rome in 139, and by Athens in 153 (consisting of the Heads of the Philosophical Schools).

1. **men**: [16], 14 [22]. **confirm and renew**: 8 [17] ff.

2. **into the senate house**: cf. 8 [19].

4. **they**: i.e., of course, the Romans.

5. **letters**: [19]; rather *letter* (cf. 10 [17], 14 [20], 15 [1]). There seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the existence of diplomatic relations between the Jews and the Spartans, or for denying the substantial genuineness of this letter ([6-18]). See Schürer, i, 236 with the references there given (particularly Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*, 28-30).

6. **Jonathan the high priest, and the senate of the nation**: cf. the inscription on the earliest Jewish coins inscribed with the name of a ruler (John Hyrcanus): John the High Priest and the *heber* (=senate? but see on 14 [28]) of the Jews. **the senate**: the *gerousia* (2 Mac 4 [44], 11 [27]), or council of elders (cf. 1 [26], 14 [20, 28]). The first mention of it in Josephus occurs in connexion with the reign of Antiochus III (the Great) (*Ant.*, XII, iii, 3). There may be a reference to it in 2 Ch 19 [8]. Later it became known as the Sanhedrin (first mentioned by this name [*Ant.*, XIV, ix, 4] in connexion with Hyrcanus II). **people**: 8 [20, 29], 14 [20, 25], 15 [17] (see on 2 Mac 11 [16-38]).

7. **Onias**: Onias I seems to be intended, a contemporary of Areus I of Sparta (309-265 B.C.).

8. **the man**: according to *Ant.*, XIII, v, 8 named Demoteles.

9. **the holy books**: cf. 1 [56], etc.

15. **help which is from heaven**: e.g. 3 [18-23], 4 [30-34, 55].

16. **Jason**: very likely the Jason mentioned in 8 [17].

20-23. Perhaps an attempt on the part of the writer to reconstruct an original document which had disappeared; and he may well have succeeded in recovering the general sense of it.

22. **of the stock of Abraham**: there is some other evidence of the belief in this period that the Jews were related to the Spartans and also to the Pergamenes (*Ant.*, XIV, x, 22); Schürer, i, 237.

23. **your cattle and goods are ours**: cf. 1 K 22 [4].

24-38. **Further successful campaigns.**

24. **princes**: *commanders* (11 [63]).

25. **the country of Hamath**: the higher valley of the Orontes, Ba'albek to Hamah (cf. Nu 13 [21], etc.).

27. **sentinels**: *pickets*.

28. **in their camp**: add (as in margin) with the Syriac, some cursives, and *Ant.*, XIII, v, 10, *and retired*.

29. **the lights**: *the camp-fires*, Xen., *Cyrop.*, VII, v, 10, and cf. Lk 22 [56].

30. **Eleutherus**: 11 [7] *v.n.*

31. **Zabadæans**: cf. *Megillath Taanith*, 33 (Schürer, i, 238). The name perhaps survives in the district, some fifteen miles north-west of Damascus, around *ez-Zebedani*.

33. **Ascalon**: 10 [86] *v.n.* **Joppa**: 10 [75], 14 [5] *v.n.*

36. **the walls**: Antiochus Eupator had ordered them to be pulled down (6 [62]). **so that it might be all alone**: with the object of starving the garrison into surrender (13 [49]).

37. **the brook**: the wady Kidron. **Chaphenatha**: for various suggestions as to the meaning of this word (not found elsewhere) see *R.B.* (1926), 219, 220. Dalman proposes 'the double'; Abel 'unfruitful palm trees,' or possibly 'famine wall.'

38. **Adida**: OT *Hadid* (Ezr 2 [33], etc.), mod. *el-Hadithe*, about four miles east-north-east of Lydda, situated on a height (*Ant.*, XIII, vi, 5) dominating the north of *the plain country*, i.e. the Shephelah (2 Ch 28 [18], etc.), *the lowlands*, the region of low hills between the coastal plain and the central range. Vespasian made it a fortified camp during the siege of Jerusalem (*B.J.*, IV, xi, 1).

39-53. **Jonathan entrapped by Tryphon.**

39. **Tryphon**: 11 [39], 13 [31] *v.n.* **stretch forth his hand**: cf. 2 S 1 [14].

40. **Bethshan**: 5 [52] *v.n.*

41. **forty thousand**: the largest Jewish force yet mentioned in 1 Maccabees.

45. **Ptolemais**: cf. 10 [39].

49. **the great plain**: i.e. of Esdraelon (5 [52]).

50. **had perished**: apparently a false report (13 [23]).

XIII. 1-30. **Simon succeeds Jonathan in the leadership, defeats Tryphon, and erects a family sepulchre at Modin.**

4. **have perished**: Eleazar, 6 [46]; Judas, 9 [18]; John, 9 [36, 42], and now Jonathan, 12 [50], but see 13 [23]. **I am left alone . . . I am not better**: cf. the words of Elijah 1 K 18 [22], 19 [4].

7. **the spirit . . . revived**: cf. Gen 45 [27] LXX.

8. **our leader**: 9 [30]; cf. 14 [35] which, taken with 13 [36], seems to imply that Simon was at the same time accepted as High Priest. **10. the walls**: 12 [36, 37].

11. **Absalom**: cf. 11 [70] *v.n.* **Joppa**: a garrison had already been placed there (12 [33, 34]), and see 14 [5].

13. **Adida**: 12 [38] *v.n.*

14. **was risen up**: cf. 9 [31].

15. **treasure**: *treasury* (cf. 2 Mac 3 [12]). **offices**: cf. 11 [63].

16. **a hundred talents of silver**: about £32,500 (2 Mac 3 [11] *v.n.*).

19. **dealt falsely**: cf. 2 K 4 [16] LXX.

20. **he went round about by the way**: cf. 2 K 3 [9]. **Adora**: OT *Adoraim* (2 Ch 11 [9]); *Dora* in *Ant.*, XIII, vii, 2, mod. *Dura*, about five miles west-south-west of Hebron. **marched over against him**: i.e. parallel with him, keeping on the hills, always between him and Jerusalem.

22. **a very great snow**: Abel compares the heavy fall of snow in the same region on the night of February 10-11, 1920. **Gilead**: 5 [9] *v.n.*

23. **Bascama**: Abel suggests mod. *el-Jummaiza* (*the Sycamore*), a valley at the north-east end of the Dead Sea.

25. **the bones of Jonathan**: cf. 1 S 31 [13]. **Modin**: 2 [1] *v.n.*

26. **great lamentation**: cf. 2 [70] (for Mattathias), 9 [20] (for Judas).

27. **a monument**: cf. 2 S 18 [18]. Perhaps the little cupola of Sheikh el-Gharbaoni, with its sacred tree, to-day marks the site (Abel, *R.B.* [1923], 499).

28. **seven pyramids**: cf. the three pyramids of the tomb of Helena of Adiabene, north of Jerusalem on the road to Cæsarea.

29. **arms**: Greek *panoplies*, i.e. like the ordinary Greek trophy consisting of a helmet and coat of mail. **ships**: 14 [5] *v.n.*

30. **unto this day**: Josephus says that the monument was still preserved in his day (*Ant.*, XIII, vi, 6).

31-53. **Tryphon having murdered the young king Antiochus (VI), Simon makes a treaty with Demetrius (II) and captures the remaining Syrian fortresses, Gazara and the Akra at Jerusalem.**

31. The death of Jonathan took place probably in 143-142, and that of Antiochus VI a little later in 142, i.e. before Demetrius's campaign in Media (1 Mac 14 [1]), although Josephus, Appian, and other authorities place it after this. The evidence of the coins supports the chronology of 1 Maccabees (see Schürer, i, 242). Tryphon, as the inscriptions on his coins show, did not profess to be the Seleucid royal line. He claimed, apparently, to have been unanimously elected, according to the ancient Macedonian custom, by free Macedonian soldiers in open assembly (cf. 11 [3 9]): hence perhaps the Macedonian helmet on the reverse of his coins (E. T. Newell, *The Seleucid Mint of Antioch*, 73). **dealt deceitfully**: cf. Lev 19 [16] LXX.

32. reigned in his stead: his reign, as his coins show, ran into four years. **Asia**: 8 [6] *v.n.*

33. strongholds: cf. 9 [50].

34. Demetrius: when Antioch had opened its gates to Tryphon and Antiochus VI in 144, Demetrius had retreated to the cities of the Phœnician coast, where he continued to rule for another six years. **immunity**: cf. [16, 39].

36-40. There is no reason to doubt the substantial genuineness of this letter.

36. elders: 12 [6] *v.n.*

37. The golden crown and the palm branch: cf. 2 Mac 14 [4]. **officers**: 11 [63] *v.n.* **immunities**: cf. 10 [28-35].

38. things we confirmed: 11 [30-37].

39. faults committed: i.e. political faults, e.g. the fault of siding with Alexander Balas (10 [47]). **the crown**: 10 [29] *v.n.* **any other toll**: cf. 10 [29, 30].

40. enrolled: cf. 10 [36], also 11 [47] (contrast 11 [38]).

41. the hundred and seventieth year: 143-142. The exemptions just enumerated practically meant that the Jews were now a free people.

42. In the first year: the extant copper coins of Simon (15 [6] *v.n.*) are dated according to this new era. Similarly Tryphon discarded the use of the Seleucid era and substituted one of his own. His Phœnician coins bear the dates 1 to 4. **the great high priest**: the first title actually occurring on the coins is that of John Hyrcanus, and is simply (*John*) *the High Priest*.

43. Gazara: mod. *Tell Jezer*; so the parallel account in Josephus (*Ant.*, XIII, vi, 7; *B.J.*, I, ii, 2); and this must be right, although all the MSS. read *Gaza*, which was not captured till 96 B.C. The conquest of Gazara by Simon is recorded in 14 [7], and is implied in 14 [34], 15 [28], 16 [1] (cf. also 13 [48] with 13 [53]). No doubt Simon claimed to be acting as *strategos*, appointed by the government at Antioch (11 [59]) against Demetrius II. Gazara is virtually the key of Judæa.

46. according to our wickednesses: cf. Ps 103 [10]. Note the apostasy implied in the next two verses.

47. was reconciled: cf. 2 Mac 11 [14].

48. made it stronger . . . and built therein a dwelling-place for himself: remains of a Maccabæan castle at Gezer (i.e. Gazara) were discovered by Professor Macalister (*The Excavation of Gezer*, i, 209), and on one of the stones an imprecation had been scrawled in Greek calling down fire 'on the palace of Simon.'

49. from buying and selling: 12 [36] (cf. 13 [21]).

50. pollutions: cf. [48].

51. 23 Iyyar, i.e. May 23, 142. **palm branches**: cf. 2 Mac 10 [7]; also Jn 12 [13]. **harps and cymbals**: cf. 4 [54]. **a great enemy**: 1 [36].

52. that day: included in the list of Jewish feast-days in *Megillath Ta'anith*; but it has long ceased to be celebrated (Oesterley): cf. 4 [59], 7 [49]. **that was by the citadel**: i.e. the side facing the Akra. This strengthening of the Temple mount as against the Akra is also referred to by Josephus (*Ant.*, XIII, vi, 7), though he ascribes to Simon work that was probably done later (see Schürer, i, 247).

53. John: John Hyrcanus, afterwards High Priest (16 [23, 24]). **a man**: cf. 5 [63].

From this point onwards Josephus no longer follows 1 Maccabees as he has done hitherto (Meyer, ii, 263); see Introduction.

XIV. **1-15. Demetrius disappears in Parthia: the beneficent rule of Simon.**

1. 141-140: 13 [31] *v.n.*

2. Arsaces: Mithridates I; Arsaces, the name of the founder of the Parthian Empire, being assumed by all the Parthian kings. **Persia and Media**: 6 [56] (cf. 3 [31]), now under the Parthians.

3. took him: actually by treachery (Justin, XXXIV, i, 3 f.). **in ward**: after about ten years Demetrius regained his freedom and reigned again in Antioch, 129-126.

4. all the days of Simon: but see 15 [40] ff. **his glory**: cf. 15 [32].

5. By capturing Joppa and Gazara Simon secured a trade connexion with the sea which was evidently regarded as an acquisition of importance (cf. 10 [76], 12 [33] ff., 13 [29]). **isles of the sea**: 6 [29].

6-15. Cf. the pæan in praise of Judas 3 [3-9].

6. enlarged the borders: cf. Ex 34 [24] LXX.

7. Gazara: 13 [43] ff. **Bethsura**: 11 [65, 66]. **the citadel**: 13 [49] ff.

8. the land gave her increase, and the trees of the plains their fruit: cf. Lev 26 [4] LXX.

9. the ancient men sat in the streets: cf. Zech 8 [4].

12. Cf. Mic 4 [4].

14. those of his people that were brought low: *the lowly of his people* (cf. Is 14 [32], 49 [13] LXX). **the law he searched out**: cf. Ps 105 [45], i.e. with a view to administering it. **took away**: rather *destroyed* (3 [20], etc.). Cf. for the word Ezek 14 [8], and for the fact 9 [73].

16-24. The 'entente' with Rome and with Sparta is renewed.

16. The writer seems to think of Sparta as more distant than Rome. For his lack of geographical knowledge see on 15 [23].

18. tables of brass: 8 [22] *v.n.* **with Judas**: 8 [17-30]. **and Jonathan**: 12 [1-23].

20. letters: *letter* (12 [5] *v.n.*). Apparently the Spartans take the initiative in writing, and refer to the embassy sent by Jonathan (12 [2] ff.). **The rulers**: *The Ephors*. **the high priest . . .**: cf. 12 [6].

22. public records: *archives*. **Numenius . . .**: 12 [16].

23. public records: perhaps an official history.

24. In the case of Rome it is Simon who takes the initiative. **a great shield of gold of a thousand pound weight**: cf. 6 [39] *v.n.* A pound (Greek *mna*) is over 15 ounces (troy).

25-49. The High Priesthood is formally declared to be vested in the house of Simon.

Simon had already been accepted as High Priest and ruler (13 [8, 42]); his High Priesthood is now pronounced hereditary.

27. copy of the writing: as Wellhausen points out (*Isr. u. jüd. Gesch.*, 257) the construction of the following verses is not quite in order. Meyer (ii, 265) suggests that this may be due to their being re-translated from the Hebrew, which was itself a translation from a Greek original. Note especially the repeated *and . . . and . . . and*. The decree proper seems to begin [41], and the general style of it is similar to that of the numerous honorary decrees of the period. **Elul**: cf. Neh 6 [15]; September, 141 B.C. **the third year**: cf. 13 [42].

28. in Asaramel: or, according to MS. A, in Saramel. The word is evidently a transliteration from the Hebrew. *Wĕ* (read by mistake *bĕ*) *sar'am'ēl* (=and prince of the people of God) is a suggestion adopted by some of the older scholars (for other suggestions see Fairweather, Oesterley, and Schürer, i, 249). But 1 Maccabees avoids mentioning God, and such a title is not actually found in inscriptions or on coins; nor is *sar israel, prince of Israel*, the attractive reading of the Syriac version. Perhaps the original read *beheber israel, in the congregation* (?) or *senate* (?) of *Israel*. This would be in accordance with one of the earliest forms of inscription on the coins (*John*, i.e. John Hyrcanus, *High Priest, beheber hayehudim*, i.e. *with the senate* [?] *of the Jews*). If so, then **in a great congregation . . . country** might be taken as a second paraphrastic rendering of the same Hebrew words which had crept into the text. **priests and people**: the balance of the sentence would be greatly improved by reading *of the* before **people** instead of *and*, thus: *of priests of the people, and of princes of the nation, and of the elders of the country*. This would correspond with the composition of *the senate* (12 [6] *v.n.*), which was never an elected but always an aristocratic body.

29. Joarib: 2 [1] *v.n.*

30. gathered to his people: an OT phrase, e.g. Gen 25 [8].

33. the cities of Judæa: 13 [33]. **Bethsura**: 11 [65, 66].

34. Joppa: 12 [33, 34]. **Gazara**: 13 [43-48]. **which is upon the borders of Azotus**: perhaps a gloss introduced by the translator who noticed that Gazara and Azotus were mentioned together in 4 [15]. They are about seventeen miles apart, but their *districts* may have been contiguous.

35. the faith of Simon . . .: *the faith which he kept to his nation*. **made him their leader and high priest**: 13 [8] *v.n.*

36. city of David: 13 [49-51]. **hurt unto its purity**: 1 [37, 59] (cf. 2 Mac 6 [1-7]).

37. and fortified it: 13 [52] *v.n.*

38. king Demetrius confirmed: 13 [36].

40. and brethren: this word is not actually used in 8 [20], 14 [18], 15 [17].

41. and that: the sense seems to require the omission of *that* (although the word is omitted in MS. 71 only). For the connexion see [35]. **for ever**: the office is thus declared to be hereditary in his family; cf. Ps 110 [1, 4]. The Psalm contains an acrostic oracle on the name Simon. **a faithful prophet**: to divert the High Priestly office to the family of Joarib (2 [1]) was felt to be so grave a step that although the exigencies of the time seemed clearly to require it, yet it must be taken with this explicit proviso (cf. Ezr 2 [63]). Faithful prophets had for a long time been wanting (9 [27]: cf. 4 [46]).

43. instruments: cf. 13 [42]. **in purple**: 8 [14] *v.n.* **gold**: [44].

47. governor: *ethnarch*, 15 [1] (cf. 2 Cor 11 [32]), the formal title of Simon as a vassal of the Seleucid king.

49. the treasury: cf. 2 Mac 3 [6], etc. (Jn 8 [20]).

XV. 1-14. **Antiochus VII (Sidetes) claims the Syrian throne and seeks the support of Simon.**

1. Antiochus, son of Demetrius I and younger brother of Demetrius II, was popularly known as *Sidetes*, from the place of his upbringing, Side in Pamphylia. When he heard that his brother was taken prisoner in Media, he set out for Syria, and was welcomed and acclaimed king. He reigned 138-129, and was the last strong Seleucid. **isles of the sea:** 6 [29] *v.n.* Antiochus is said to have been at Rhodes (Appian, *Syr.*, 68) when the news of his brother's imprisonment reached him.

3. pestilent fellows: 10 [61], 15 [21]. **ships of war:** on the bronze coins of Antiochus VII occur figures of a ship's prow and of the caps of the Dioscuri.

5. gifts: cf. 10 [28].

6. leave to coin money: such a grant would probably refer not to silver, but only to bronze coinage. It appears that Antiochus is only confirming a right which Simon had already assumed, for the bronze coins attributed to him are dated in the year 4, i.e., reckoning from 13 [41] (143-142), in 140-139, a year earlier than this communication from Antiochus (see *B.M. Catalogue of Greek Coins, Palestine*, xciv). The fine 'thick' shekels formerly attributed to Simon are now assigned by many numismatists to the revolt of A.D. 66-70 (*B.M. Catalogue*, xc-xciii; *Num. Chr.* [1916], 251-259).

7. free: 10 [31] *v.n.* **arms . . . strongholds:** cf. 13 [33], 14 [10, 43].

8. owing to the king: cf. 10 [43], 13 [15, 39].

10. 139-138 B.C.

11. he came, as he fled, unto Dor, which is by the sea: rather as in margin, *he came unto Dor, fleeing by the way which is by the sea.* **Dor:** mod. *Tanṭurah*, 9 miles north of Cæsarea, an ancient Phœnician town (cf. Jos 11 [2], etc.).

13. The numbers are probably exaggerated (cf. 10 [74], 11 [47]).

15-24. The result of the mission to Rome.

15. Numenius and his company: 14 [24].

16-21. Josephus, who has ceased to follow 1 Maccabees (13 [53] *v.n.*), records a decree of the Senate in similar terms (*Ant.*, XIV, viii, 5), which he dates in the time of Hyrcanus II (55 B.C.). Lucius Valerius is named as consul, and of the three names of the Jewish ambassadors one is Numenius the son of Antiochus, and another Alexander the son of Jason (cf. 12 [16], 14 [22]). It looks as though Josephus has misplaced his account. He himself mentions Numenius the son of Antiochus, and Antipater the son of Jason as ambassadors to the Romans in the time of Jonathan (*Ant.*, XIII, v, 8), about 145, in a passage parallel to 1 Mac 12 [6-23]: cf. also *Ant.*, XIII, ix, 2, and see Schürer, i, 251, 252.

16. Lucius: probably Lucius Calpurnius Piso, one of the consuls in 139. **Ptolemy:** Ptolemy Euergetes II (Physcon), 145-116.

17. the old friendship and confederacy: 8 [17]. **18. shield:** 14 [24] *v.n.*

22. Attalus: king of Pergamum. **Arathes:** *Ariarathes* of Cappadocia. **Arsaces:** of Parthia (14 [2] *v.n.*).

23. Sampsames: probably the town on the Black Sea between Sinope and Trebizond. **Delos and Samos:** islands in the Greek Archipelago. **Caria:** in the south-west corner of Asia Minor, capital **Halicarnassus**, with **Myndos**, on the sea near by, and with **Cnidus**, a famous town on a promontory of the same name. **Sicyon:** on the north coast of the Peloponnesus, west of Corinth. **Lycia:** in the south of Asia Minor, next east of Caria, containing **Phaselis**, a large seaport. **Pamphylia:** also in the south of Asia Minor, next east of Lycia, with **Side**, a well-known port. **Aradus:** an island and city on the coast of Phœnicia. **Gortyna:** an inland town of Crete. **Cyrene:** capital of Libya on the North African coast, west of Egypt. These countries and cities are not arranged in any recognizable order. The writer of 1 Maccabees seems to think of them as being dependent on, or allied with, Rome. His information is evidently vague, in spite of its apparent exactness.

25-41. Antiochus reverses his policy towards the Jews.

25 resumes the narrative of [13, 14]. **the second day:** with the best MSS. omit day, and translate *the second time.*

28. Joppa and Gazara: 14 [34]. **the citadel:** 13 [49-51]; 1 [33] *v.n.*

29. many places: cf. 10 [89], 11 [61], 12 [38].

31. five hundred talents: about £162,500.

32. cupboard: *sideboard.*

35. a hundred talents: about £32,500.

37. Orthosia: mod. *Ard Arthusi*, on the coast a few miles north of Tripolis.

38. Cendebæus: perhaps the name is formed from Canduba, a town in Lycia (Schürer, i, 255) (cf. Sidetes above). **chief captain:** *epistratēgos*; the word occurs here only in the LXX; it is found in Strabo (798) as the title of a Roman officer in Egypt.

39. Kidron: probably mod. *Katra*, on an eminence about four miles south-east

of Jamnia, about seven and a half miles north-east of Ashdod, and about nine miles from Gazara.

40. **Jamnia**: 4 [15] *v.n.*

XVI. 1-10. **Cendebæus defeated** (cf. the rather different and much shorter account in *Ant.*, XIII, vii, 3).

3. **by his mercy**: i.e. by God's mercy (cf. 3 [18], 4 [24], etc.). **heaven**: cf. 4 [24].

4. **out of the country**: John Hyrcanus later employed foreign mercenaries (*Ant.*, XIII, viii, 4). **twenty thousand**: cf. 12 [41]. **horsemen**: the first mention of the use of cavalry by the Maccabees. **Modin**: 2 [1].

5. **brook**: *wady* (5 [37], etc.).

6. **he**: apparently John is intended (cf. [1] and 13 [53]).

7. **the horsemen in the midst of the footmen**: probably they were too weak to be placed in their more usual position on the wings.

8. **trumpets**: 3 [54], etc. **the stronghold**: i.e. Kidron (15 [41]).

10. **towers**: cf. 2 K 17 [9], 18 [8]. **Azotus**: 10 [77, 84] *v.n.* **two thousand**: MS. A 1,000.

11-24. **Simon and two of his sons are murdered. John escapes and succeeds his father.**

11. **captain**: *governor*. **the plain of Jericho**: a particularly fertile area.

13. **his heart was lifted up**: cf. 1 [3].

14. February (cf. Zech 1 [7]), 135.

15. **the son of**: cf. Is 8 [6]. **Dok**: the stronghold was probably erected on the Jebel Karantal (the name is preserved in a fine spring, 'Ain Duk, two and a half miles away), and some of its stones may have been used in building the first Chapel of the Temptation (Abel, *R.B.* [1926], 530).

16. **had drunk freely**: cf. Gen 43 [34]; 1 K 16 [9]. **and his two sons**: according to *Ant.*, XIII, viii, 1 they were slain with their mother some months later.

17. **iniquity**: faithlessness (2 Mac 15 [10]; Polybius, III, 78, etc.).

23, 24. **the rest of the acts . . . are written in the chronicles**: cf. 2 K 10 [34], etc. (**acts**: lit. *words*; **chronicles**: lit. *days*). Josephus gives an account of the reign of John Hyrcanus in *Ant.*, XIII, 8-10. On a MS. at Lyons, destroyed in the 16th century, which was said to contain a history beginning with the accession of John, see Schürer, iii, 201. This history was very likely no more than a reproduction of Josephus's account.

II MACCABEES

Character and Contents.—2 Maccabees is an abridgement (2 [23]) of a history in five books by a Hellenistic writer, Jason of Cyrene. Jason's work may very likely have gone beyond the victory of Judas over Nicanor, the last incident related in 2 Maccabees, at least to Jonathan's assumption of the High Priesthood in 153 B.C. (Meyer, *Ursprung u. Anfänge*, ii, 457). But the main purpose of the epitomist was to promote the observance of the Feast of the Dedication (10 [8]) and Nicanor's Day (15 [36]), and it is not unnatural that he should stop where he does.

The epitomist not only shortens: he admits that he also adorns (2 [29]), i.e. he rewrites the history in a more rhetorical form. In fact, it becomes in his hands a species of religious melodrama in the artificial and extravagant style cultivated, apparently, by many of the literary men of Alexandria at this period. Moreover, he certainly amplifies the religious and miraculous elements (2 [21]). It is noteworthy that apart from the introduction (1 [1]-2 [18]) and preface proper (2 [19-32]) and the epilogue (15 [37-39]), the abridgement falls into five sections: 3 [1]-3 [40], 4 [1]-7 [42], 8 [1]-10 [9], 10 [10]-13 [26], 14 [1]-15 [37]. A digression containing a highly coloured account of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (9 [1-29]) is an obvious interruption in the narrative. The account given in the Introduction (1 [12] ff.) is different. If the former comes from Jason, the latter may be the work of the epitomist (Niese, Meyer, and others), or of a later editor (W. Kolbe, who would attribute the inclusion of the four letters in 11 to the same hand).

Date.—Meyer (455) and others think that the date of the letter given in 1 [10] is the date of the abridgement; but this is not at all clear. A safer indication is found in 15 [37]: 'the city having from those times been held by the Hebrews.' This certainly suggests a date before the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C.

The book appears to have been used by Philo (*Quod omnis probus liber*, 13), as well as in 4 Maccabees and Hebrews (11 [35] ff.). 125-75 B.C. would seem to be safe limits for the date, but it is difficult to be more exact.

The work of Jason of Cyrene is of considerable historical value. His accuracy with regard to titles (e.g. 3 [7], 5 [24], 12 [2]) has often been remarked. No doubt he wrote in a florid style rather similar to that of his epitomist, and his narrative already (2 [21]) included accounts of supernatural manifestations. But there seems to be no reason why we should not, with the majority of modern scholars, assume the date of his history as *c.* 130 B.C., although the positive evidence is extremely scanty.

Doctrine.—The writer believes very strongly in divine intervention and retribution. Manifestations come from Heaven (2 ^{21}), e.g. that of the splendid horseman (3 ^{25}), the mounted angel (11 ^{8}), and so on. God chastens with calamity (6 $^{12-17}$: cf. 5 ^{17}, etc.), and again and again retribution in kind overtakes the sinner (4 $^{16, 26}$, 5 ^{10} *v.n.*, 9 ^{5} f., 13 ^{8}).

In his confident belief in the resurrection of the body the writer may be contrasted with the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon, and is evidently in touch with popular Palestinian Judaism (G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i, 208). It is on the ground of belief in the resurrection that he defends the sacrifice of Judas at Adullam (12 $^{43-45}$), as to the original purpose of which he is very likely under a misapprehension. His own idea that such a sacrifice might be 'propitiation for them that had died, that they might be released from their sin,' is quite unparalleled in the Jewish literature of the period. His belief in the intercession of the glorified saints (15 ^{14}) is not so surprising. With regard to his emphasis on the observance of the Sabbath, see Introduction to 1 and 2 Maccabees above.

Style.—The style of 2 Maccabees has been compared with that of Polybius, but it is more turgid and rhetorical. It sometimes reminds one of Wisdom (there are half a dozen or more words common to 2 Maccabees and Wisdom which are hardly found elsewhere in the LXX, e.g. 2 Mac 7 ^{27}, Wisd 11 ^{14}; 2 Mac 9 ^{7}, Wisd 2 ^{9}; 2 Mac 9 ^{7}, Wisd 5 ^{11}; 2 Mac 10 ^{17}, etc., Wisd 8 ^{1}; 2 Mac 12 ^{22}, Wisd 18 ^{18}; 2 Mac 13 ^{18}, Wisd 16 ^{2}). It is the style of a Hellenistic Jew (probably of Alexandria), a *littérateur* of somewhat coarse taste: but from time to time he has a noble story to tell, and then (e.g. 6 ^{18}-7 ^{41}) the reader almost forgets him.

Translation.—The committee which revised the AV of 2 Maccabees included Hort, Milligan, Moulton, and Westcott. The RV accordingly maintains a very high level of scholarship, and its renderings of passages where the Greek text is corrupt are particularly valuable.

Bibliography

Rawlinson, *Sp.*, *Apocrypha*, ii (1888); Moffatt in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, i, 125-154 (1913), with useful references to other works. More recently E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii, 454-462 (1921), and W. Kolbe, *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte* (1926). On MSS. and Versions, Use in the Church, Comparison with 1 Maccabees, and Historical Value, see Introduction to 1 and 2 Maccabees.

I.-II. 18. Opinion is divided as to whether we have here three pieces, or two, or one. Kolbe (118), who argues strongly for the unity of the section, would read 148 (i.e. 164 B.C.) with MSS. 55 and 62, instead of 188 in ^{10a}, and would regard 169 in ^{7a} an an interpolation (113); in which case the whole piece purports to be written in Chislev 164 (^{18}). Niese, who also regards this section as a unity, retains 188 in ^{10a}, and takes this (125-124 B.C.) as the date of the epitomist himself. The majority of scholars make a division after ^{10a} (so, e.g., Torrey, Kamphausen, Moffatt). It seems easiest, however, to divide as follows (with Meyer and others):

I. 1-7*a*. A letter (144-143 B.C.) to the Jews in Egypt who were being persecuted under Ptolemy Euergetes II.

7*b*-10*a*. A second letter (125-124 B.C.), recommending the Egyptian Jews to keep the Feast of Dedication. This is one of the chief objects of 2 Maccabees as a whole.

10*b*-II. 18. A free composition of the epitomist, supposed to be written (^{18}) in Chislev 164-163 B.C.

I. 1-7*a*. This letter (which may be genuine) has, strictly speaking, nothing to do with what follows. It is introduced (Meyer, ii, 455) partly as an illustration of the relation between the Palestinian and the Egyptian Jews, and partly because the persecution of the latter under Euergetes II is regarded as a kind of parallel to the persecution of the former under Antiochus Epiphanes ($^{7b, 8}$).

1. Lit. *health and peace*; a combination of Greek and Hebrew idiom (Rawlinson).

7*a*. **Demetrius**: the Seleucid king Demetrius II (Nicator), 146-138 (and again 129-126).

7*b*-10*a*. This again may be a genuine letter.

7. **Jason**: 4 ^{7} ff. **the holy land**: so Philo (*Leg. ad Cai.*, 42). **the kingdom**: Jason's supplanting of his brother was tantamount to revolting against the divinely ordered state (2 ^{17}).

8. 1 Mac 4 ^{50} ff., 2 Mac 10 ^{3}, where, however, we find no special mention of the porch (1 K 6 ^{3}).

9. The Feast of the Dedication (Jn 10 ^{22}) in Chislev (December), celebrated for the same number of days as the Feast of Tabernacles (October), and on similar lines: see 1 Mac 4 ^{59}.

10*b*-II. 18. Clearly not a real letter, but a composition such as was practised in

literary academies at Alexandria and elsewhere.

I. 10. **Aristobulus**: no doubt Aristobulus the Peripatetic philosopher, tutor to Ptolemy VII (Philometor 173-146 B.C.), and head of the Jewish community in Alexandria (Eusebius, *Præp. Ev.*, vii, 13, etc.), is intended. **the senate**: 4[44], 11[27]; 1 Mac 12[6] *v.n.*

11. **men arrayed**: or perhaps with a slight change in Greek *as one arrayed*. Cf. the emphatic *himself* ([12]).

12-16. The death of Antiochus: but the account is plainly inconsistent with that in 9[1-16].

12. **against the holy city**: for the construction cf. Zech 14[3] LXX.

14. **Antiochus Epiphanes**: 1 Mac 6[1, 2] *v.n.* **Friends**: 1 Mac 2[18] *v.n.*

16. **the prince**: some such emendation as 'the prince and *those with him*, and hewed *them* in pieces' is needed.

18. The Greek text appears to require emendation, but the sense is probably given by the words supplied in the RV. The writer regards the feast as commemorative of two dedications, that of Nehemiah as well as that of Judas: hence his long insertion here ([18b-2 15]). **he had builded both the temple and the altar**: this is not in accordance with OT (cf. 2[13]).

20. **to us**: perhaps to be omitted as the result of a corruption in the Greek text (Rawlinson).

21. **thick water**: see [36].

23. **Jonathan**: the writer is probably thinking of Jonathan the grandson of Eliashib (Neh 12[11]), whose High Priesthood must accordingly be dated at least a generation after Nehemiah.

24. Cf. Dan 9[4]: fifteen epithets (cf. eleven in the prayer of Manasseh). See *B.S.*, 298.

25. **almighty**: *all-sovereign* (and so throughout 2 Maccabees).

27. **Dispersion**: Ps 147[2]; Jn 7[35], etc.

31. **to pour on great stones**: so A (with a slight emendation), but if [35] be interpreted as in the English version, it is better to read with the other MSS: *that great stones should enclose*.

35 is obscure, but the translation of the English version seems to give the most probable meaning (note the imperfect tense).

36. **Nephthai**: i.e. naphtha, an inflammable mineral oil found in Persia. The writer apparently connected the word with some root meaning *cleanse*. *naptar apanar* was a Zend epithet for sacred elemental water possessing purifying qualities (Moffatt). What lies behind this story may be the discovery of some forgotten store of oil or naphtha in the Temple. See J. E. Hanauer, *P.E.F.Q.R.* (1902), 389 ff.

II. 3. **from their heart**: an echo, perhaps, of Jer 31[33], but apart from this the writer seems to have quite failed to grasp the teaching of the historical Jeremiah.

8. Better . . . *cloud, as in the days of Moses it was made visible, and when Solomon besought that the place might be consecrated greatly.*

9. *And it was also declared how he, in his wisdom, offered a sacrifice of dedication, and of the finishing of the temple.* **declared**: the records, supposed to have been consulted by the writers of the letter, referred to two previous occasions on which sacrifices had been consumed by miraculous fire.

10. As Moses also prayed . . . (Lev 9[23, 24]), even so prayed Solomon also (2 Ch 7[1]).

11, 12. Better . . . *it was consumed. Likewise also Solomon kept.* . . .

12. **eight days**: 2 Ch 7[8, 9].

13. **letters of kings about sacred gifts**: e.g. Ezr 7[11-26]. 14. Cf. 1 Mac 1[56, 57].

17. **kingdom**: *royal dominion* (cf. 1[7]).

18. **promised through the law**: e.g. Ex 19[6]; Dt 30[1] ff.

19-32. **The preface of the epitomist.**

19. **the great temple**: 14[13, 31].

21. **the manifestations that came from heaven are** 'the staple of the Book' (Westcott), 12[22] *v.n.* **the religion of the Jews**: the first occurrence, so far as is known, of the word *Judaism* (8[1], 14[38]; Gal 1[13]). **barbarous**: 10[4]; not merely in the sense of *not speaking Greek* (see Bury, *The Hellenistic Age*, 24 f.).

22. **renowned all the world over**: 3[12] (cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Cai.*, 29); but Philo was referring to the Temple of Herod the Great. **gracious**: *propitious* (7[37], 10[26]).

23. **Jason of Cyrene**: otherwise unknown (see Introduction).

28. **and again having no strength to fill in the outlines of our abridgement**: but the Greek particle indicates a contrast. Hence it is better to translate (cf. AV), *but labouring to follow the outlines of our abridgement.*

29. **and again**: *but.* **must seek**: i.e. need only seek.

31. **a laboured fulness in the treatment**: *a thoroughgoing treatment of the subject.* **that would bring a writing into a new form**: i.e. *who simply recasts material.*

32. **only adding**: *having only added.* **thus much**: [19-31].

III. **The attempt of Heliodorus to rob the Temple is frustrated by a miracle.**

1. **Onias III** (son and successor of Simon II): highly respected and conservative; an opponent of Hellenizing influences (4 [2], 15 [12]).

3. **Seleucus IV** (Philopator), son of Antiochus III, the Great, reigned 187-176 B.C., and was succeeded by Antiochus IV (Epiphanes). **Asia:** 1 Mac 8 [6] *v.n.* **all the costs:** similarly Antiochus the Great (*Ant.*, XII, iii, 3): cf. Ezr 6 [8, 9], 7 [20-23]; 1 Mac 10 [39]).

4. **Simon:** probably the Simon of the famous family of Tobias (*Ant.*, XII, iv, 10; see Meyer, ii, 133). **guardian of the temple:** perhaps *sĕgan* (*captain of the temple*: Ac 4 [1]), or possibly *temple-treasurer* (*Ant.*, XX, viii, 11).

5. **son of Thrasæus:** or perhaps by a slight emendation (Hort) *of Tarsus*. **Cœle-Syria:** 4 [4], 8 [8], strictly the valley between the Libanus and the anti-Libanus, but here, as commonly, of Southern Syria in general (1 Mac 10 [69] *v.n.*).

7. Such news was specially welcome because of the heavy payment of war indemnity to Rome, which had been a great drain upon the resources of the Seleucid Empire (1 Mac 8 [7] *v.n.*). **Heliodorus**; probably the Heliodorus of Appian (*Syr.*, 45), and of the inscriptions at Delos (Deissmann, *B.S.*, 303 ff.), which show that his official title (**chancellor**, *vizier*) is correctly given.

9. **of the city:** probably, as in MS. V, *and by the city* (cf. 4 [22]).

11. **Hyrcanus:** probably the Hyrcanus of *Ant.*, XII, iv, 2-11, another member of the Tobias family, the ruins of whose stronghold still remain at 'Arak el-Emir. The family were probably connected with the Tobiah of Neh 2 [19], etc. (see Schürer, i, 194, 195; Meyer, ii, 134). Much light would probably be thrown on the events of this period if we could discover more about the intrigues of this great family and of the rival family of Onias. It would seem that the latter remained constantly loyal to Egypt. **son of:** i.e. not necessarily *son of*, but *of the family of*. **400 talents of silver:** about £130,000, according to the calculations of A. R. S. Kennedy, *D.B.*, iii, 42 ff., allowing for the fact that the Mint quotation for gold to-day is 84s. 11½d. per ounce. **200 talents of gold:** on the same reckoning, about £725,000. Thus the total is about £855,000.

14. **entered in:** rather *was about to enter in* (imperfect).

15. **and looking toward heaven, called upon him:** *and called to heaven, upon him* (cf. 1 Mac 3 [50], 9 [46]). **the law:** Ex 22 [7] f.

19. **the virgins that were kept in ward:** cf. 3 Mac 1 [18]; Philo, *De spec. leg.*, 31.

24. **Sovereign of spirits:** 1 En 37 [2], etc. **presumed:** cf. 1 Mac 1 [21].

25. **complete armour of gold:** cf. 11 [8].

31. **the Most High:** cf. Dan 4 [34]; this could mean other deities beside Jehovah, notably Zeus (*Tarn*, 180).

32. Is the historical basis of the whole story some device by which the Temple officials managed to impose upon the credulity of Heliodorus? Cf. Herod., viii, 37-39; Pausan., x, 23.

34. **vanished out of sight:** cf. Lk 24 [31].

40. Cf. 7 [42], 10 [9], 13 [26], 15 [37].

IV. **Intrigues with regard to the high priesthood.** Onias is replaced by Jason, and Jason by Menelaus, both extreme Hellenizers. Onias is murdered.

1. **slandered:** *proceeded to slander* (imperfect).

4. **danger:** *grievous character*. **Apollonius:** cf. 3 [5]. **son of Menestheus:** Hort's emendation supported by [21] and certainly to be accepted.

7. **Epiphanes:** 1 Mac 1 [10] *v.n.* **Jason:** according to Josephus he had assumed this Greek name, chosen probably as being similar to his Hebrew name Joshua (*Ant.*, XII, v, 1). **supplanted:** see [34] ff.

8. **360 talents:** about £117,000 (3 [11] *v.n.*). **80 talents:** about £26,000.

9. **a hundred and fifty:** nearly £49,000. **place of exercise:** 1 Mac 1 [14]. **a body of youths:** Greek *Ephēbia*, an institution, of course, characteristically Greek. **citizens of Antioch** (cf. [19] *v.n.*): a title which carried with it certain privileges; granted also, e.g., to Ptolemais (Schürer, ii, 113 f.).

10. **brought over:** *proceeded to bring over* (imperfect).

11. **royal ordinances:** referring probably to those of Antiochus the Great (*Ant.*, XII, iii, 3), allowing the Jews to be governed by their own laws. **Eupolemus:** 1 Mac 8 [17] *v.n.*

12. **the citadel:** [47], 5 [5]; not the citadel built by Antiochus (1 Mac 1 [33]), but probably the citadel adjoining the Temple on the north (Neh 2 [8], 7 [2]: see Schürer, i, 198 note). **the Greek cap:** Greek *the petasus*, broad-brimmed, and associated with Hermes, the god of the gymnasium; hence offensive to strict Jews.

13. **Greek fashions:** *Hellenism* (cf. 2 [21]).

14. **after the summons of the discus:** i.e. when the discus-throwing had been announced.

16. The instruments of their punishment were to be the very people whose customs they were so eager to adopt (see Introduction).

18-20. Games, modelled upon the Great Games of Greece, played an important part in the Hellenizing of the Hellenistic

Empires. Jason did not scruple to send a small contribution to the Games at Tyre in honour of the Tyrian god Melkart whom the Greeks identified with their own Hercules. The envoys themselves, however, felt that so definite a contribution to a heathen god would be unfitting. With Jason's contribution cf. that recorded in an inscription in Iasus on the coast of Caria of 'Nicetas son of Jason a Jerusalemite' (possibly therefore a son of this Jason), to the Dionysia (Schürer, i, 195 note).

19. sacred envoys: not merely ambassadors, but persons sent to present an offering on the occasion of some religious function (Meyer, ii, 146). **Antiochians:** it is very possible that Jerusalem, like so many other places (Tarsus, Edessa, Ptolemais, etc.), had received the name Antioch as its official name. **300 drachmas:** a small sum (about £16), showing that those who were sufficiently keen Hellenizers to subscribe to such a fund were few.

20. on account of present circumstances: better as margin (with MS. V) *thanks to the bearers*.

21. The enthronement of Ptolemy: VI (Philometor), 173 B.C. **ill affected:** Egypt was apparently planning to recapture Palestine. **took thought:** *proceeded to take thought* (imperfect).

22. Jason's servility. Antiochus takes the initiative against Egypt.

23. Menelaus: according to Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, iv, 10) a brother of Jason; but Josephus is probably wrong. Menelaus is almost certainly (Meyer, ii, 133) a member of the Tobias family (3 [4] *v.n.*).

24. The exact sense is uncertain. The rendering of RV text is probably as good as any.

26. Retribution: see Introduction.

29. Lysimachus: Marti suggests that Jason, Menelaus, and Lysimachus are the three pitiless shepherds of Zech 11 [8]. **deputy:** [31] and 14 [26]; cf. 1 Ch 18 [17]; a court title, e.g. in Egypt (*B.S.*, 115). **who was over the Cyprians:** i.e., presumably later, when for a short period Cyprus passed (168 B.C.) from Egypt to Antiochus Epiphanes.

30. Mallus: in Cilicia, not far from Tarsus. **as a present:** for the practice cf. Cicero, *In Verr.*, iii, 33.

33. Daphne: a sacred precinct (the chief temple being that built by Seleucus I to Apollo and Artemis), some ten miles in circumference, five miles south-west of Antioch on the Orontes.

34. The murder of Onias III seems to be referred to in Dan 9 [26], 11 [22]. Here 2 Maccabees is to be preferred to Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, v, 1), and the story fits in with the account of Andronicus from Polybius (Diodor., XXX, vii, 2: Meyer, ii, 149). **to kill:** so e.g. Xenophon, *Cyrop.*, VII, v, 30. This sense is apparently required by [35]. **being persuaded to use treachery . . . suspected by him:** the Greek is clumsy, and may be corrupt, but the general sense is sufficiently given by RV. **despatched:** an unexampled meaning for the Greek word, but plainly the meaning required: cf. [35] (Niese emends the text).

36. in the city: RV., not as RVm.

42. beside the treasury: as the scene of his crime (cf. [38]).

45. defeated: *left in the lurch*.

47. Scythians: commonly regarded as extremely savage (Herod., IV, 64; Hippocrates, *De Aere Aqua et locis*, 47). **uncondemned:** cf. Tit 2 [8].

50. cleaving to: rather, as margin, *growing in*.

V. Antiochus Epiphanes profanes the Temple and oppresses the Jews.

1. his second inroad: perhaps the writer regards the coming of the Seleucid army into Palestine, mentioned in 4 [21, 22], as the first (Bevan, ii, 298). Otherwise his statement conflicts with that of 1 Mac 1 [20], which is supported by Dan 11 [28].

2. the city: i.e. Jerusalem (cf. 4 [39], etc.).

8-10. Apparently a compressed summary of Jason's subsequent adventures, the writer's effort both to compress and at the same time to emphasize the moral resulting in awkward Greek.

8. fleeing: i.e., presumably, having escaped from Aretas. **butcher:** 7 [39] *v.n.*

9. near of kin: 1 Mac 12 [21] *v.n.*

10. For the idea that evil deeds are requited in kind see Introduction; 4 [25], 9 [5] f., 13 [8]: cf. Nu 5 [27]; Wisd 11 [16]; *Test. Gad*, v, 10; *Jubilees*, iv; 31.

11-23. Cf. 1 Mac 1 [20-28].

14. These figures are no doubt greatly exaggerated. According to Josephus the number of prisoners was about 10,000 (*Ant.*, XII., v, 4), and Josephus's own numbers are often excessive. **sold:** cf. [24]; 1 Mac 3 [41]; 2 Mac 8 [10, 11].

16. other kings: cf. Ezr 7 [19].

18. Heliodorus: 3 [26].

20. reconcilation: cf. 7 [33], 8 [29]; 2 Cor 5 [19].

21. 1,800 talents: presumably silver talents, i.e. about £585,000.

23. at Gerizim: i.e., of course, over the Samaritans.

23, 24. And having a malicious mind toward the Jews he sent: as MS. V and RVm.

24. lord of pollutions: probably an

official title=*commander of the Mysians*, i.e. of the corps of Mysians in the Seleucid army (Polybius, xxxi, 3): cf. 1 Mac 1 [29]. Very likely the writer is more than hinting at the abusive sense the word may also have (cf. 6 [2] *v.n.*), and the epithet applied to Jason (4 [13]). **Apollonius**: perhaps the Apollonius of 3 [5], 4 [4, 21].

27. Rhetorical exaggeration (Rawlinson). Cf. 10 [6]; contrast 1 Mac 2 [30]. Judas's father and brothers are not mentioned, and the retirement to the mountains (1 Mac 2 [28] *v.n.*) appears to be placed too early. **Maccabæus**: see Introduction to 1 and 2 Maccabees.

VI. **The Jewish religion to be rooted out: the martyrdom of Eleazar**: cf. 1 Mac 1 [41-64]; Josephus, *Ant.*, XII, v, 4.

1. an old Athenian: a temple to Zeus Olympios was being erected at Athens at Antiochus's expense (Polybius, xxvi, 1), and the king may well have chosen an Athenian to enforce the worship of the same deity at Jerusalem ([2]).

2. Zeus Xenios: Zeus was often worshipped under this title (Pausan., III, xi, 11, etc.). But Josephus has *Zeus Hellenios* (*Ant.*, XII, v, 5), and *Zeus Xenios* may perhaps be a misrepresentation (Meyer, ii, 159). The writer no doubt sees in the title an allusion to the mixed character of the Samaritans.

5. the place of sacrifice: *the altar*. **abominable things**: e.g. swine's blood (Diod., xxxiv, 2).

7. every month: examples of a monthly celebration of a royal birthday are collected by Schürer, *Z.N.T.W.* (1901), 48-52. **and when the festival of the Dionysia came round**: i.e. at least once a year, probably in the autumn. Sculptures in Palestine seem to show that Dionysus (Bacchus) was popular there (Meyer, ii, 160). **ivy**: sacred to Dionysus.

8. Ptolemy: presumably the Ptolemy of 4 [45].

11. Philip: 5 [22]. **all burnt together** (cf. Dan 11 [33]): i.e. probably suffocated in the caves, brushwood having been piled at the entrances and set on fire (Rawlinson). **that most solemn day**: cf. 8 [26, 27]; *Jubilees*, ii, 17-33.

12-17. Digression: the writer desires to 'vindicate the ways of God to man'; these punishments were not to destroy but to chasten (cf. Pr 3 [11, 12]).

18-31. Eleazar, the prototype of Jewish martyrs.

19. instrument of torture: [28]; the word is very rare in this sense (referring probably to some kind of bastinado: cf. [30]); the verb formed from it is used in Heb 11 [35] (tortured).

23. and the grey hairs which he had reached with honour: *and the distinction he had attained, and his grey hair* (MS. V). **education**: *manner of life*.

30. I might have been delivered: cf. Heb 11 [35]: 'tortured, not accepting their deliverance' (cf. [19] above)—almost certainly a reminiscence of this passage.

31. virtue: 15 [12]; moral excellence.

VII. **The martyrdom of seven brothers with their mother.**

3. the king: the introduction of Antiochus (who certainly could not have been present on the occasion: cf. 5 [21]) adds to the rhetorical colouring of the story.

4. scalp: cf. Herod., iv, 64. **cut off his extremities**: cf. Xenophon, *Anab.*, I, ix, 13.

5. fry in the pan: the word which occurs here only in LXX is found again in *Apoc. Pet.*, 20.

7. mocking: cf. Heb 11 [36].

8. the language of his fathers: i.e. Aramaic (cf. [21, 24, 27]).

11. heaven: 1 Mac 3 [18] *v.n.* **these back again**: the resurrection of the *body* (Dan 12 [2]).

14. resurrection unto life: Dan 12 [2].

17. torture thee: cf. 9 [5-28].

18. for our own doings: cf. [32, 33]; 6 [12-17] *v.n.*

21. her womanish thought with manly passion: a commonplace of rhetoric.

22. I know not how: cf. Ec 11 [5]. **spirit and life**: cf. Jn 6 [63]. **brought into order the first elements**: the language is rhetorical. For the thought cf. Job 10 [8-12]; Ps 139 [13-16].

23. generation: cf. Wisd 19 [10]. **ye contemn your own selves for his laws' sake**: cf. Lk 14 [26].

24. suspecting: not understanding, because the language spoken was Aramaic (cf. [8, 21, 27]). **Friend**: 1 Mac 2 [18] *v.n.*

28. made them not of things that were: cf. *Apoc. Baruch* (Syriac), xxi, 4; Heb 11 [3].

29. butcher: 5 [8]; the usual word for the common executioner.

36. As RVm, accepting Hort's emendation (which involves only the omission of a single letter), *having endured a short pain, have now drunk of ever-flowing life under God's covenant.* Note that eternal life for the individual is here included under God's covenant.

37, 38. The martyrs suffer as members of a sinful nation (cf. [18, 32]). It is the old conception of the nation's solidarity (G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i, 548). In 4 Mac 6 [27-29] a further step is taken and the sufferings of the martyrs are regarded as vicarious and as an expiation for the nation's sin.

VIII. **The revolt of Judas: his initial successes.**

1. Maccabæus: 5 [27]. **six thousand:** according to 1 Mac 4 [6] Judas mustered no more than 3,000 men some months later for his encounter with Gorgias.

2. they kept calling upon the Lord (imperfect). **profaned:** 6 [4].

3. the city . . . suffering ruin: 1 Mac 1 [31]. **4. infants:** 6 [10]; 1 Mac 1 [61].

5. at once: 1 Mac 3 [10-26].

6. Cf. 1 Mac 3 [8]. **villages:** reading according to MS. V. **most important:** strategic (cf. [31], 14 [22]).

7. nights: e.g. 12 [6]; 1 Mac 5 [29, 50]. **loudly talked of:** cf. 1 Mac 3 [25, 26].

8. Philip: 5 [22], 6 [11]. **Ptolemy:** 4 [45, 46], 6 [8] (cf. 1 Mac 3 [38]).

9-29. Cf. 1 Mac 3 [38]-4 [25]. The two accounts are apparently independent. 1 Maccabees gives greater military detail (but note 2 Mac 8 [21-23]), 2 Maccabees a longer speech and thanksgiving ([16] ff., [27] ff.). Lysias is not mentioned in 2 Maccabees, and Nicanor assumes a more prominent position. In 2 Maccabees the discrepancy between the two forces is less, but the number slain is greater than in 1 Maccabees. Thus, although 1 Maccabees is no doubt our main source for the events described, the more rhetorical account in 2 Maccabees seems to be founded upon a valuable and independent source; and the historian will do well to use it (with due caution) to supplement the other.

9. Nicanor: 1 Mac 3 [38]: cf. 2 Mac 14 and 15. **Chief Friends:** 1 Mac 10 [65] *v.n.* **twenty thousand:** 47,000 (1 Mac 3 [39] and *Ant.*, XII, vii, 3). **Gorgias:** 1 Mac 3 [38], etc.

10. But the last instalment of this tribute was paid some years before (in 173): 1 Mac 8 [7] *v.n.* **two thousand talents:** about £650,000 (for the calculation see 3 [11]).

11. the cities upon the sea coast: especially the Phœnician cities, famous for slave-dealing (cf. Ezek 27 [13]). Nicanor apparently expected 180,000 captives (cf. 1 Mac 3 [41]). **slaves:** lit. *bodies*; cf. Gen 34 [29] LXX, etc., and in the papyri.

13. Cf. 1 Mac 3 [56].

15. 1 [2] *v.n.*; cf. Greek Dan 3 [34] (prayer of Azarias); *Test. Levi*, 15; *Asher*, 7. **called them:** cf. Dan 9 [19]; Ecclus 36 [12]; Bar 2 [15]; Jas 2 [7].

16. Still 6,000: cf. [1]. **at the enemy:** rather (by the omission of a single letter in MS. A) *at the bonds* (1 Mac 3 [41]).

18. at a beck: cf. *Apoc. Baruch* (Syriac), xxi, 5. **the whole world:** cf. 1 Jn 2 [2], 5 [19].

19. Sennacherib: 2 K 19 [35]; cf. 15 [22]; 1 Mac 7 [41].

20 refers to some engagement otherwise unknown in which 8,000 Jews, employed, evidently, by one of the Seleucids, took part in the defeat of a superior number of Galatians. **six thousand:** a mere slip; read 8,000 with MS. V. **the hundred and twenty thousand:** must be a gross exaggeration. According to Livy, xxxviii, 16, the Galatians never brought into the field more than about 20,000 men.

22. Joseph: here (and perhaps in 10 [19]) a mistake for John (1 Mac 2 [2]); cf. 1 Mac 9 [36].

23. and moreover Eleazar also; then, having read aloud: rather with the Vulgate (correcting slightly the principal Greek MSS.) *he also appointed Eleazar to read aloud*; cf. the part assigned to the priest before an engagement in Dt 20 [2]. The watchword is a play on the name Eleazar (*God has helped*).

24. nine thousand: 3,000 (1 Mac 4 [15]).

25, 26. The reason given in 1 Mac 4 [16-18] is that Gorgias with another undefeated detachment of Syrians was still in the neighbourhood, and nothing is said about the Sabbath.

27. gathered the arms: [31], and cf. 1 Mac 4 [6]. **blessing and thanking:** 10 [38], 11 [9], etc.; 1 Mac 4 [24]. **had caused a beginning of his mercy to distil upon them:** so Vulgate, but the best Greek MSS. simply *had appointed a beginning of mercy for them.*

30-33. We should have expected a section corresponding to 1 Mac 4 [28-34], but it is deferred to 11 [1-15].

30. Timotheus: cf. 1 Mac 5 [6]. **Bacchides:** cf. 1 Mac 7 [8]. **twenty thousand:** apparently a favourite number with our author (Rawlinson), cf. [9], 10 [17, 23, 31]. **strongholds:** cf. Bethsura, 1 Mac 4 [61].

31 ff. With this account of the coming to Jerusalem that of the rededication of the Temple ([10]) should be connected. 9 breaks into the narrative (note especially 10 [9]). If that is so there is no reason to suppose that the sources used here did not put the rededication before the death of Epiphanes (as 1 Mac 4 [36] ff.).

32. phylarch: probably an officer rather than Phylarches, a proper name.

33. gates: cf. 1 Mac 4 [38]. **who** (adding a single letter to the best Greek MSS.): probably plural. **an outhouse:** *a little house.*

34. thrice-accursed: 15 [3]; Addition to Esther, 16 [15].

35. having, as he thought, had the greatest possible good fortune, though: or with Vulgate (by a slight emendation of the best Greek MSS.) *having fared disastrously because.*

IX. **The miserable end of Antiochus Epiphanes:** 1 Mac 6 [1-16] (cf. 2 Mac 1 [12-16]).

1. Persia: 1 Mac 3 [31] *v.n.*

2. Persepolis: this is probably incorrect (1 Mac 6 [1] *v.n.*). **rob a temple:** 1 Mac 6 [2] *v.n.*

3. Ecbatana: capital of Media, too far north if his route was direct to Babylon (1 Mac 6 [4]), but Epiphanes may have visited it during his expedition; apparently it bore for some time the name *Epiphaneia* (Meyer, ii, 218). **news:** cf. 1 Mac 6 [5-7].

5. In 1 Mac 6 [8-13] the king's death is brought on through grief. Polybius (xxxi, 11) ascribes it to a divine visitation: cf. *Ant.* XII, ix, 1.

6. Retribution: see Introduction and 5 [10].

7. rude insolence: Wisd 2 [9]; 3 Mac 2 [3]. **as it rushed along:** Wisd 5 [11]. **fell from his chariot:** a reference to some such fall was probably contained in the sources used by the epitomist: an echo of it is found in Granius Licinianus. Otherwise the story seems to consist very largely of rhetorical embroidery (cf. 2 [29]).

8. the waves: 5 [21] (cf. Is 51 [15]). **the mountains:** cf. Is 40 [12]. Antiochus seems to have regarded himself as a manifestation on earth of Zeus (see Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, ii, 155 f.).

9. turned with loathing from: lit. *was weighed down by*, not a very appropriate word: cf. 13 [9]; Wisd 2 [4]. **worms:** a punishment specially associated with persecutors of God's people who claimed divine honours for themselves (cf. Ac 12 [23]; Herod., iv, 205; Plut., *Vit. Artax.*, 16).

11-29. Some such expression of regret as that in 1 Mac 6 [12, 13] may perhaps have been found by the epitomist in his source, together with the letter [19-27]. See below.

11. every moment: perhaps to be omitted as due to dittography (Niese).

12. arrogantly: the reading of RVm (with MS. V) is probably the more original.

15. Athens: so all the MSS., but strange and conceivably a slip for *Antioch*.

18. the letter below: no doubt copied from a source, for a letter composed by the epitomist himself would have had a very different tone ([13-18]). Bevan and Niese regard it as substantially genuine, and as intended for the Hellenizers, the **worthy Jews** ([19]), who are regarded as being in command of the situation. But it is to be noted that if the single word *Jews* be omitted the letter reads very naturally as a letter addressed to the citizens of Antioch. Very likely this is what it originally was. Jason of Cyrene got hold of a copy and included it in his work; and either he or the epitomist took it as referring to the Jews (cf. Meyer, ii, 461).

19. fellow-citizens: [15]. 'In his capital city he wished to live as a simple citizen in the midst of free people' (Meyer, ii, 142). **general:** so in condescension. **much joy and health and prosperity:** an unusual salutation (Rawlinson)—a Greek (*joy*) and Latin (*health*) element, together with a third (*prosperity*).

20. in heaven: 1 Mac 3 [18] *v.n.* Perhaps it was this phrase that led to the idea that the letter was intended for the Jews.

23. my father: Antiochus III (the Great) in 187 B.C., but no other author states that on that occasion he *appointed his successor*. **the upper country:** 1 Mac 3 [73] *v.n.*

25. my son Antiochus: i.e. Eupator (1 Mac 6 [15]). **whom I often committed and commended to most of you:** this does not really apply to the Jews (see on [18]). **what is written below:** this has not been preserved.

28. mountains: at Tabæ (Polybius, xxxi, 11), which is in a mountainous region.

29. Philip: evidently not Philip the Phrygian (5 [22]). **foster-brother:** a court title in general use throughout the Hellenistic kingdoms, e.g. in an Inscription at Delos (200-150 B.C.). See *B.S.*, 312. **fearing the son:** but cf. 1 Mac 6 [55, 56, 63]; 2 Mac 13 [23]. **betook himself:** but according to Josephus (*Ant.*, XII, ix, 7) he was captured and put to death.

X. **1-8. The purification of the Temple and the institution of the Festival of the Dedication:** 1 Mac 4 [36-61].

1. the city: but not the Akra (1 Mac 4 [41]).

2. and also the sacred inclosures: 1 Mac 1 [47].

3. cleansed: 1 Mac 4 [43]. **another altar:** 1 Mac 4 [47]. **stones:** i.e. *flints*. **two years:** a mistake for three (1 Mac 4 [52]).

5. 1 Mac 4 [52-54].

6. eight days: 1 Mac 4 [56]. **in the mountains** (5 [27]) **and in the caves:** cf. Heb 11 [38].

7. wands wreathed with leaves: the word is thus used by Josephus, *Ant.*, III, x, 4; XIII, xiii, 5. **palms:** cf. Neh 8 [15]. These were carried at the Feast of Tabernacles, according to Lev 23 [40], as interpreted by the Rabbis.

9 marks the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth section of the book (see Introduction).

X. **10-XIII. 26. Events during the reign of Antiochus V, Eupator** (164-162).

X. **10-13.** Lysias succeeds Ptolemy as governor of Cœle-Syria and Phœnicia.

11. appointed one Lysias: but Eupator was a mere boy, and Lysias a well-known

member of the royal family (11 [1]), who had proclaimed him, ruled in his name: 1 Mac 6 [17] (so Polybius, Appian, etc.).

12. Ptolemy: 8 [8] *v.n.* **peaceful terms**: but cf. 6 [8].

13. abandoned Cyprus: Polybius, xxvii, 13. **failing to uphold the honour**: so by a slight emendation (Grimm).

14-38. Victories of Judas over the Idumæans and over Timotheus. This section is parallel to 1 Mac 5 [3-8]: for the rest of the narrative 1 Mac 5 [8-68] we have to wait till 12 [1-45].

14-23. Cf. 1 Mac 5 [3-5].

15. from Jerusalem: i.e. Hellenizers.

17. vigorously: 12 [27, 35]; Wisd 8 [1]. **kept off**: *beat off*.

19. Simon and Joseph: 8 [22] *v.n.* **Joseph and Zacchæus**: perhaps some confusion with *Joseph the son of Zacharias* (1 Mac 5 [56]).

20. Simon and they that were with him: more probably *they that were about Simon*, i.e. his officers, *leaders of the people* ([21]). **seventy thousand drachmas**: at the ordinary rate of a mina per head, ransom for 700 (Rawlinson).

23. twenty thousand: 8 [30] *v.n.* A most improbable number on the writer's own showing ([18, 20]).

24-28. Cf. 1 Mac 5 [6-8].

25. earth: cf. 14 [15]; 1 Mac 11 [71].

26. the altar: Judas therefore was in Jerusalem (cf. [27]). According to 1 Mac 5 [6] the fighting took place in Ammonite country.

29. on horses with bridles of gold: cf. 3 [25], 11 [8]; probably as RVm (with MS. V) *and leading on the Jews; who also, taking*.

31. and five hundred: an unusual affectation of exactness (Rawlinson).

32. Gazara: presumably the Jazer of 1 Mac 5 [8]. **Chæreas**: [37].

37. Timotheus: but he seems to reappear (12 [2, 18-24]: cf. 1 Mac 5 [11-40]). It may be that this story ([32-38]) and the notice 1 Mac 5 [9] are both put too early, and that the capture of Jazer is really to be connected with the death of Timotheus (as in 2 Maccabees), and took place later. **a cistern**: cf. 2 S 17 [18]; *B.J.*, III, viii, 1. **Apollophanes**: the name occurs as that of a prominent member of a Zidonian colony in the famous painted tombs of Marisa (3rd century B.C.).

38. blessed the Lord: 8 [27], 11 [9], etc.

XI. **1-15. Judas's first victory over Lysias: peace arranged.** This chapter must be compared with 1 Mac 4 [28-35]. The account here seems to be misplaced and embellished with rhetoric. Meyer (ii, 459) regards 11 [1-15] as a doublet to 13; but the former corresponds with 1 Mac 4 [28-35] (*v.n.*), and the latter with 1 Mac 6 [28-62].

2. fourscore thousand: according to 1 Mac 4 [28] 60,000.

3. the high priesthood to sale: cf. 4 [7, 8, 24-27].

4. elephants: none mentioned 1 Mac 4 [28]. **fourscore**: even Antiochus the Great at the battle of Magnesia had only 54 (Livy, xxxvii, 39).

5. Bethsuron: 1 Mac 4 [29] *v.n.* **leagues**: *schoeni* (30 stades). MS. V reads *stades* (the usual word in 2 Maccabees), which would give a distance altogether too small. **pressed it hard**: there appears to be some confusion here between Lysias's first and second campaign. The siege of Bethsura took place on his second campaign (1 Mac 6 [31]), not on his first (1 Mac 4 [29]).

6. a good angel: 15 [23]; Tob 5 [21]: cf. Ex 23 [20].

8. white apparel: cf. Mt 28 [3], etc. **gold**: cf. 3 [25], 10 [29].

13. Almighty: *mighty*.

14. A word added by some scribe in the margin seems to have crept into the Greek text here, but the general sense is certainly that given by the RV.

15. No such agreement is mentioned in 1 Mac 4 [35], but it is not impossible that Lysias may have made some concessions to the insurgents in order to cover up his failure and to represent to the king that a settlement had been reached (Abel, *R.B.* [1923], 511).

16-38. These letters, apart, perhaps, from certain minor interpolations, may well be genuine (Meyer, ii, 211). A comparison with contemporary documents shows, at all events, that their style and form are those of the period. Note also the appropriate variations of the title under which the Jews are addressed: (i) from Lysias—**the multitude of the Jews** (*plēthos*) [16], the correct formula for a people not properly organized into a state; (ii) from Antiochus—**the senate of the Jews** (*gerousia*) [27], i.e. the Council—naturally addressed by the king; (iii) from the Roman ambassadors—**the people of the Jews** (*dēmos*) [34], i.e. the people diplomatically recognized as a political assembly by the Romans (see Meyer, ii, 213, 214). The dates are a difficulty. Conceivably the first was written not long after the return of Lysias to Antioch (1 Mac 4 [35]), in 165-164, as the letter itself states. The second, undated, is apparently written after the death of Epiphanes ([23]), and the decision recorded in this and the third letter is to be connected with 163-162 (1 Mac 6 [58-60]) rather than with 165-164. Meyer, who attributes them all to 165-164,

is driven to regarding the mention of the death of Epiphanes (23) as an interpolation. Kolbe, who denies their authenticity, suggests that they were introduced by the same hand which prefixed 1-2 18 to the genuine epitome of Jason's work.

16. people of the Jews: 1 Mac 8 20, etc.

17. Absalom: possibly the Absalom mentioned 1 Mac 13 11 (cf. 11 70). **written below:** cf. 9 18, 25; the document is supposed to have been attached to Lysias's original letter, but the epitomist does not give a copy of it (cf. 9 25).

19. to contribute to your good: a formula often found in the Inscriptions (*B.S.*, 253).

21. 165-164 B.C. This dates the letter before the death of Epiphanes (164-163 B.C.) described in 9 5-28. **Dioscorinthus:** apparently some month in the (Macedonian) year not long before the month of Xanthicus (30), i.e. April: perhaps therefore a corruption of Dustros (March, cf. Tob 2 12; Sinaiticus); possibly an invention of Epiphanes himself (Meyer, ii, 211).

22. Antiochus: i.e. Eupator, 10 10. **brother:** 1 Mac 10 18, but cf. 1; 1 Mac 6 17.

25. This decision is to be connected with 163-162 B.C. (1 Mac 6 58-60) rather than with 165-164 B.C.

27. senate: 1 10 *v.n.*

28. A Latin-sounding salutation: cf. *S.V.B.E.E.V.* (*si vales bene est: ego valeo*).

29. Menelaus: perhaps the High Priest of 4 23 ff., 5 5 ff. is intended.

30. Xanthicus: April.

31. meats: cf. *Bel and the Dragon* 8. **ignorantly done:** cf. 1 Mac 13 39.

34-38. Such a communication from Rome is not impossible at this date, but according to 1 Maccabees it was not till after the death of Nicanor that Judas entered into direct political relations with Rome (1 Mac 8 17-32).

34. Quintus Memmius: unknown. **Titus Manius:** MS. V adds Ernius, possibly a vague reminiscence of Manius Sergius, who was one of the envoys to Antiochus Epiphanes (Polybius, xxxi, 9), or of T. Manlius Torquatus, a commissioner in Egypt in 164 (Livy, xliii, 11). That these Romans are referred to by two names rather than three is in keeping with the alleged date of the letter (2nd century B.C.). **ambassadors:** for this sense of the word *presbutes* see 1 Mac 14 22, 15 17; cf. Phm 9.

38. the fifteenth day of Xanthicus: but cf. 33; we should have expected to find the date of this letter intermediate between that of Lysias's (21) and Antiochus's (33).

XII. Further fighting in Palestine: Judas's successes. This section is closely connected with 10 14-38. It gives an account of more fighting with Timotheus (represented as slain 10 37), the expedition into Gilead, and a second campaign against Idumæa: cf. 1 Mac 5 8-68, where the order of events is clearer.

2. Note how **Apollonius, as son of Gennæus,** is distinguished from Apollonius, 3 5, cf. 5 24 *v.n.* **Nicanor the governor of Cyprus:** lit. *the Cypriarch* (cf. Asiarch, Ac 19 31), apparently to be distinguished from Nicanor the son of Patroclus (8 9, 14 12, etc.).

3-9. Night raids on Joppa and Jamnia.

8. Jamnia: 1 Mac 4 15 *v.n.*

9. two hundred and fifty furlongs: 240 *stades*; 340 is approximately the correct distance (*R.B.* [1925], 359).

10-45. A rhetorical version of encounters of which 1 Mac 5 37-68 is a more sober record.

10. Arabians: cf. 1 Mac 5 39.

13. Gephyrun: perhaps by a slight emendation read (with MS. 55) *with earthworks: a certain city strongly fortified with earthworks and walls.* But the word is somewhat doubtful in this sense. The name of the city seems to be Caspin, presumably Casphor (Muzeyrib): 1 Mac 5 26 *v.n.* Perhaps *Gephyrun* crept into the text from the margin, and was originally written by some scribe in the margin opposite *Ephron* (27 below). Ephron (1 Mac 5 46) may with some probability be identified with the Gephrus of Polybius, v, 70. MS. V omits.

15. wildly: lit. *like wild beasts* (10 35).

17. furlongs: *stades* (=606¾ English feet), over eighty-six miles. The distance is probably exaggerated. **Charax:** possibly el-Hurāk, about 120 stades north-east of Muzeyrib (*E.B.*, i, 723). **Tubieni:** i.e. men of Tob (1 Mac 5 13 *v.n.*).

19. Dositheus and Sosipater: note the Greek names of these captains (cf. 1 Mac 8 17). The name Sosipater has been found on a weight of this period as the name of an inspector of markets at Gezer (*R.B.* [1925], 208).

20. these two: better with the Syriac (by a slight emendation of the Greek) *captains*. **a hundred and twenty thousand footmen:** the strength of the largest army sent by the Seleucid king to Palestine is estimated, even by our author, at no more than 110,000 (13 2; according to 1 Mac 6 30 100,000), and Timotheus was a mere district governor.

21. Carnion: Carnaim (1 Mac 5 26 *v.n.*); but if this is Sheikh Sa'd the description of *the narrowness of the approaches* is due to some confusion (perhaps with Gephyrun [13]: cf. 1 Mac 5 46).

22. **this way and that**: Wisd 18 [18], **manifestation**: cf. 3 [25, 33], 10 [29], 11 [8], 15 [27].

26. **Atergatis**: rather Atargatis, a Syrian nature goddess. See *Rel. Sem.*[3], 172 f.

27. **Ephron**: 1 Mac 5 [46] *v.n.*

29. **Scythopolis**: Jdth 3 [10] (Polybius, v, 70), otherwise Bethshan, as in the parallel passage 1 Mac 5 [52] *v.n.* **six hundred stades**: approximately correct.

31. **the feast of weeks**: Dt 16 [10, 16], Pentecost, see below ([32]).

32-45. **Gorgias put to flight: a sacrifice for the slain.** This section seems to correspond to 1 Mac 5 [58-67], the defeat being here hushed up as much as possible.

32. **Pentecost**: so named because the festival was kept on the fiftieth day after the Passover Sabbath (Lev 23 [15, 16]; so named Tob 2 [1]; *B.J.*, VI, v, 3; and in NT). **Gorgias**: 10 [14]. **of Idumæa**: in *Ant.*, XII, viii, 6 Gorgias is called the governor of Jamnia (cf. [40] and 1 Mac 5 [58]).

35. **a certain Dositheus**: evidently distinguished from the Dositheus of [19]; **one of Bacenor's company**: some cursive MSS. read *one of the Tubieni* ([17]). This seems preferable. **cloak**: *chlamys*, a short military cloak. **Thracian**: Thracian mercenaries are often mentioned by Polybius (v, 65, 79, etc.) in the armies of the Hellenistic period. **Marisa**: 1 Mac 5 [66] *v.n.*

36. **Esdris**: the name Esdrei occurs 1 Ch 27 [26] LXX. Note the abruptness with which it is introduced here.

38. **Adullam**: not far from Mareshah (2 Ch 11 [7, 8]), perhaps *Sheikh Madkur* (*R.B.* [1924], 208).

40. **garments**: the close-fitting inner garments. **consecrated tokens**: probably little images worn as amulets (*Rel. Sem.*[3], 209 note). **the law forbids**: Dt 7 [25] f., etc.

43. **two thousand drachmas of silver**: nearly £110 (for the method of reckoning see 3 [11]). **a sacrifice for sin**: very likely Judas's own purpose was to avert further disaster upon the nation. On the accepted principle of the solidarity of the nation as a whole, the whole nation was regarded as tainted by the guilt of these secret law-breakers. It may be that that is the sense of the passage in the work of Jason, on which 2 Maccabees is based. But the epitomist interprets the sacrifice as a sacrifice on behalf of the guilty dead (cf. Meyer, ii, 180). Such an idea, however, is unparalleled in Jewish literature. The Burial Kaddish in the Jewish service books (hardly earlier than the 3rd, or later than the 7th, century A.D.: see I. Abrahams, *Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, ccxxx) contains remembrance of the departed, but remembrance only, and makes no specific petition for them. Perhaps he writes under Egyptian influence (see *Expos.* [1915], 361 ff.). On the law about the sin offering see Lev 4 [2-35], etc.

45. **looking unto an honourable memorial of gratitude laid up for them that die in godliness**: these men had after all given their lives fighting on behalf of religion. They could not therefore be regarded as real apostates, though their infringement of the Law must be atoned for.

XIII. **The great expedition of Eupator and Lysias ends in a treaty with the Jews**: 1 Mac 6 [19-63].

1. **the hundred forty and ninth year**: 164-163 B.C., but according to 1 Mac 6 [20] the expedition took place in 163-162 B.C.

2. **each**: probably to be omitted. There seems to be some slight corruption in the text. **five thousand and three hundred horsemen, and two and twenty elephants**: these are more probable numbers than those given in 1 Mac 6 [30] *v.n.* **chariots armed with scythes**: these did so much damage to their users at Magnesia in 190 B.C. that it is surprising to hear of them being employed again. At all events the number (300) seems to be excessive (cf. Arrian, *Alex.*, iii, 11).

3. **Menelaus**: heard of last in 4 [50] (cf. 11 [29]): cf. Alcimus in the expedition of Bacchides (1 Mac 7 [9, 12]). **with great dissimulation**: *with great pretence of patriotism* (Rawlinson). Menelaus no doubt professed to believe that the effective re-establishment of the Seleucid authority in Palestine was the only hope for the country.

4. **the King of kings**: En 9 [4]; 3 Mac 5 [35]; and in NT: 1 Tim 6 [15]; Rev 17 [14], 19 [16]. **Berœa**: modern Aleppo (cf. *Ant.*, XII, ix, 7).

6. **they all**: rather emend (with Niese) into *they bring and.* The punishment meant is evidently the Persian punishment of suffocation in a pit full of ashes (Ctesias, *Persic. Excerpt.*, 48, 52; Val. Max., IX, ii, 7; Ovid, *Ibis*, 317-318). **right justly**: the punishment being appropriate to his ill-doing (see Introduction and on 5 [10]).

9. **infuriated**: lit. *weighed down* like Pharaoh, Ex 7 [14], where the idea seems to be *difficult to move, stubborn* (cf. 9 [9]).

13. **the elders**: 1 Mac 7 [33] *v.n.*

14. **Lord**: MS. V reads *Creator* (cf. 7 [23]). **Modin**: 1 Mac 2 [1] *v.n.*

15. **watchword**: cf. 8 [23]. **brought down**: rather by a slight emendation of the text (Grimm) *stabbed* (the word used in 12 [23]).

16, 17. Better with MS. V . . . *departed with good success just as the day began to dawn. And this had been accomplished because of the Lord's protection.* . . .

19. **Bethsura**: cf. 1 Mac 6 [31]. Note how this and the following verses read like a rapid summary.

21. **shut up in prison**: cf. 10 [22].

22. As a matter of fact Bethsura was starved into surrender (1 Mac 6 [49]), and Judas was defeated (1 Mac 6 [47]; *Ant.*, XII, ix, 5).

23. **Philip**: see 1 Mac 6 [14, 15, 55, 63], but note the different tradition in 9 [29]. **was confounded**: but it was Lysias and not Eupator who was disturbed (1 Mac 6 [55]). **the place**: i.e. the sacred enclosure (2 [18]).

24. **unto the Gerrenians**: better, by a slight emendation, Gerarenes, i.e. unto Gerar, south-east of Gaza (Gen 10 [19], 26 [1]).

25. **Ptolemais**: 1 Mac 5 [15] *v.n.* It had suffered through a raid of Simon's (1 Mac 5 [23]).

XIV. **The intrigue of Alcimus and the expedition of Nicanor**: cf. 1 Mac 7 [1-26], where the details are different and on the whole more probable.

1. **Demetrius**: 1 Mac 7 [1] *v.n.*

2. **a mighty host**: twelve men and three boys (Polybius, xxxi, 22)! 1 Mac 7 [1] *v.n.*

3. **Alcimus**: 1 Mac 7 [5] *v.n.* **in the times when there was no mingling**: cf. [38]; i.e. in the early days of the persecution when religious Jews separated themselves from the Gentiles and fled into 'secret places' (1 Mac 1 [53], 2 [31]).

4. **the hundred and one and fiftieth year**: 163-162 B.C. **beside these**: *in addition to these customary offerings*; or with MS. V *beside these some of the festal olive boughs which were according to custom used in the temple.*

6. **Hasidæans**: 1 Mac 2 [42] *v.n.* **Maccabæus**: 5 [27].

7. **having laid aside**: rather *having been deprived of.* **ancestral**: he was *of the seed of Aaron* (1 Mac 7 [14]). **hither**: the reading *a second time* (MS. A, etc.) is evidently a scribal corruption of this.

12. **Nicanor**: according to 1 Mac 7 [8] Bacchides, Nicanor not appearing till a later stage (1 Mac 7 [26]).

13. **the great temple**: [31], 2 [19].

14. As RVm **And they that had fled before Judas all over Judæa thronged.**

15. **established his own people**: Dt 28 [9]. **his own portion**: 1 [26]; Dt 32 [9].

16, 17. Cf. 1 Mac 7 [31, 32].

16. **joineth battle with them**: possibly the writer means *marshals them* (his own men, not the enemy), but there seems to be something wrong with the text in this and the following verse. **Lessau**: according to another reading (V) *Dessau*: cf. perhaps Adasa (1 Mac 7 [40]).

17. **yet not till late, having received a check**: rather (with MS. V) *and had received a temporary check.*

18-25. Cf. the account of negotiations between Nicanor and Judas (1 Mac 7 [26-30]), where Nicanor's intentions are represented as treacherous (cf. [22] here).

21-25. Note the rhetorical effect of short sentences without connecting particles.

23. **the flocks of people**: i.e. of those who had been scattered by Judas and now thronged to Nicanor ([14]).

24. **always**: *continually.*

26. **successor**: rather *deputy*; cf. 4 [29] *v.n.*

30. **concealed himself**: cf. 1 Mac 7 [30].

31-36. Cf. 1 Mac 7 [33-38].

31. *he had been pluckily outwitted by Judas.*

35. Better as RVm **O Lord, who in thyself hast no need of the universe** (cf. 3 Mac 2 [9] and *Ant.*, VIII, iii, 3).

37-46. **the story of Razis.**

37. **Razis**: with the name cf. Resaias (1 Esd 5 [8]). **an elder**: cf. 1 Mac 7 [33].

38. **no mingling**: cf. [3]. **accused of cleaving to Judaism**: cf. 6 [6]. **with all earnestness for the religion of the Jews**: *most resolutely for Judaism.*

39. **to make evident**: in order, probably, to refute the charge of Alcimus ([26]).

42. The writer apparently approves of this suicide.

44. Better *in the midst of the open place* (cf. RVm).

46. **these again**: note the belief in the literal resuscitation and rehabilitation of all the materials of the earthly body. This is Palestinian rather than Alexandrian. See Introduction.

XV. **Defeat and death of Nicanor.**

1. **the region of Samaria**: vague and incorrect (cf. 1 Mac 7 [39-50]).

6. *a public monument of victory over Judas and his men.*

10. **their breach of their oaths**: 14 [27, 28].

11. **a dream worthy to be believed**: *a kind of vision* (reading with the Sixtine edition) *he rejoiced them all.*

12. **Onias**: 3 [1] *v.n.*

14. **prayeth much**: cf. also the intercession of angels (Job 33 [23]; Zech 1 [12]; Enoch 47 [2]). **the holy city**: 1 [12]. **Jeremiah**: cf. 2 [1-8]; 2 Esd 2 [18]; Mt 16 [14].

17. **not to carry on a campaign . . . the enemy**: the Greek text seems to need some correction, but the general sense is clear.

20. **elephants**: Dan (Th) 5 [2]; cf. 11 [4], 13 [2]; 1 Mac 1 [17] *v.n.* **horsemen drawn upon**

the flank: cf. the deploying at the battle of Magnesia (Livy, xxxvii, 40).

21. **the various arms**: characteristic of Seleucid armies: cf. Livy, xxxvii, 40. **not by arms . . .**: cf. 1 Mac 3 [19].

22. **Hezekiah**: 2 K 19 [35]; cf. 8 [19] *v.n.*

23. **a good angel**: 11 [6] *v.n.*

24. **holy people**: rather (with MS. V) *sanctuary* (cf. 14 [33]).

25. **trumpets**: 1 Mac 5 [31] *v.n.*

27. The largest number of slain recorded in 2 Maccabees.

30. **the foremost champion**: i.e. Judas 11 [7] (cf. 1 Mac 5 [62]).

31. **he sent for them that were in the citadel**: i.e. the Seleucid garrison.

32. **stretched out**: 14 [33]; 1 Mac 7 [47].

34. **heaven**: cf. 1 Mac 4 [24].

35. **from the citadel**: cf. 1 S 31 [10].

36. **common decree**: 10 [8]. **the thirteenth day**: 1 Mac 7 [49]. **Mordecai**: Est 9 [21].

37-39. The epilogue of the epitomist.

37. **the city**: the citadel had not yet been captured (1 Mac 13 [51]), and the whole city fell into the hands of Antiochus Sidetes, 134-133. But from the death of Antiochus Sidetes (129) the Jewish state was practically independent till the coming of Pompey (63). Cf. Introduction.

39. The author, like a true rhetorician, has aimed at giving attention in due proportion to the matter and to the manner of his discourse.

PART III
THE NEW TESTAMENT

CONTENTS

Subject.	*Author.*	*Page.*
The Political Background	P. V. M. Benecke ...	1
The Religious Background of the New Testament in Jewish Thought	W. O. E. Oesterley ...	9
The Gentile Background of Early Christianity ...	W. K. Lowther Clarke ...	22
The Synoptic Problem	F. D. V. Narborough ...	33
The Gospel according to St. Mark	C. H. Turner	42
The Gospel according to St. Matthew	P. P. Levertoff and H. L. Goudge	124
The Gospel according to St. Luke	C. Gore	207
The Gospel according to St. John	W. Lock	240
Additional Note	C. Harris	272
The Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, with an Outline of His Life	C. Gore	276
The Knowledge of Christ Incarnate	L. Hodgson	299
The Evidence of the Resurrection	E. G. Selwyn	301
Appended Note	C. Gore	313
The Virgin Birth of our Lord	C. Gore	315
The Acts of the Apostles	E. J. Bicknell	320
The New Testament and the Catholic Creeds ...	C. Harris	378
The Constitution of the Church in the New Testament	W. J. Sparrow Simpson ...	385
Sacraments in the New Testament	F. Gavin	395
The Theology of St. Paul	H. L. Goudge	403
Additional Note on Predestination	—	440
The Epistle to the Romans	N. P. Williams	442
I. Corinthians	J. K. Mozley	484
II. Corinthians	J. K. Mozley	515
Galatians	W. L. Knox	530
Ephesians	E. Graham	538
Philippians	J. C. Du Buisson ...	550
Colossians and Philemon	T. W. Crafer	557
I. and II. Thessalonians	Maurice Jones	566
The Pastoral Epistles ...		
I. Timothy ...	A. E. Burn and H. L. Goudge	573
II. Timothy		581
Titus ...		588
		592
Hebrews	S. C. Gayford	596
James	C. T. Dimont	627
I. Peter	A. J. Mason	639
II. Peter	T. W. Little	653
The Johannine Epistles	Sir Edwyn C. Hoskyns ...	658
Jude	T. W. Little	674
The Revelation of St. John the Divine	T. W. Crafer	678
Additional Note	H. L. Goudge	705
New Testament Prophecy and Apocalyptic	G. C. Joyce	706
The Sacred Sites of the Gospels	P. Usher	710
The Textual Criticism of the New Testament ...	C. H. Turner	718
The Chronology of the New Testament	W. K. Lowther Clarke ...	729

THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

By P. V. M. Benecke

I. The Roman Empire.—In New Testament times the greater part of the civilized world belonged to the sphere of influence of the Roman Empire. Of those named in Ac 2 [9-11], 'Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia,' perhaps also the 'Arabians,' were outside: these belonged to the Parthian sphere of influence, and it was only under very exceptional circumstances, and only for short periods, that the Romans thought seriously of conquering the Parthians and adding their territory to the lands administered by Rome: but all the rest fall within the Roman Empire.

The term 'Roman Empire' is convenient, and probably it is as little open to misunderstanding as any alternative that can be suggested. But, if we use it, we must remember that the 'Roman Empire' underwent a number of changes which make it difficult to say generally what principles guided its action, even during so comparatively short a period as that covered by the New Testament. The Romans showed no special desire for uniformity of system in government: they were content to deal with problems as they arose, and they were not anxious to undertake the execution of difficult tasks if they could find others to do it for them.

The Romans managed the territories under their control in different ways: we may put them under three heads, though no doubt each head would admit of subdivisions.

(1) Many of the districts which had belonged to the Romans since the time of the Roman Republic were administered on the system which the Republic had adopted. An official known as a *proconsul* was responsible for the administration, which was called his *provincia* or department of duty. This official had no superior within his province: technically he was the colleague of the consuls and of the Emperor in Rome, and any interference with his discretion was only rarely and reluctantly undertaken. He represented the State as supreme officer within his area in administrative, financial, and judicial matters. But a *proconsul* never commanded an army under the Empire (except in Africa for a short time at the beginning of the Empire): so this form of administration was not adopted except in provinces that were regarded as peacefully settled, and the presence of a *proconsul* as the administrator means that the province is regarded as in a quiet and settled condition.

The most important district of this class which concerns readers of the New Testament is what the Romans called the province of *Asia*. By this they meant the west coast of Asia Minor, with the adjacent islands, and a considerable part of the land behind the coast. The province was bordered by Bithynia on the north, by Lycia on the south, and by Galatia on the east. Within it fall the seven Churches of the Apocalypse (2, 3). Of one of these, Ephesus, which was frequently the residence of the *proconsul* (cf. Ac 19 [38]), we hear a good deal in the Acts. Another, Pergamum, had a temple erected in honour of Augustus as early as 29 B.C. Asia was one of the provinces where emperor-worship had always been most acceptable. Annual meetings of deputies from different parts of the province, which served as a convenient means for informing the Romans of the feelings and wishes of the province, connected themselves naturally with games and festivals in the Emperor's honour. The high priest of the Temple of Augustus gave his name to the year, and the office was an object of the highest ambition. Some identify this high priest with the Asiarch: but, though this is doubtful and there is a considerable controversy as to the exact functions of the Asiarchs, there is no doubt that past or present holders of the office of Asiarch were persons of importance, and that the friendliness of some of these 'chief officers of Asia' (Ac 19 [31]) testifies to the high standing of St. Paul in Ephesus.

Other provinces administered by *proconsuls* included Bithynia, Cyprus (Ac 13 [7]), Crete, and Cyrene. Macedonia and Achaia were not always under *proconsuls*, but we know from an inscription that Gallio, the brother of Seneca, was *proconsul* of Achaia in A.D. 51-52 (cf. Ac 18 [12]).

(2) Most of the districts acquired by the Romans from the times of Julius Cæsar onwards were not put under separate *proconsuls*, but the Emperor was regarded as himself the governor. Such provinces are accordingly called imperial, as opposed to the public provinces which have been placed under the first head. As the Emperor could not be personally present in these provinces, he had to be represented by officials acting under his authority. The most powerful of these representatives were called the Emperor's *legates*. They were, like the *proconsuls*, members of the Senate who had held high office in Rome, the prætorship at least, and, in the case of the highest posts, the consulship. Unlike *proconsuls* the legates could command armies: thus the very important legate of Syria commanded the legions which had to guard the frontier against Parthia. A legate might be occupying a position of far greater importance than a *proconsul*, and the post of legate in a leading province was a greater object of ambition than any proconsulate except perhaps those of Asia and Africa; but the legate never acted in his own name, always in the name of the superior whom he represented.

The Emperor was also frequently represented by officials of lower rank, who were not Senators. Thus in Egypt his representative (the acting governor) was called *præfectus*, and we find the title *præfectus* or *procurator* in many other places. The term *procurator* originally means a business agent. Any individual might have a *procurator*, but the *procurator* of the Emperor was so much more important than the agent of any other person that the word is often used by itself, where there is no ambiguity in the context, as the title of a *procurator* of Cæsar. *Procurators* in the sense of the Emperor's business or financial agents are found in most of the provinces. But it was sometimes found convenient to administer a district by means of a *procurator*. It is in this sense that we read of a *procurator* of Judæa at certain dates. A *procurator* was generally of equestrian rank, which means that he belonged to a class which stood next after the Senators both in respect of wealth and of prestige. It has been thought that, when a *procurator* was placed in an independent position, he stood in a position of general subordination to the nearest *legate* of the Emperor—e.g., the *procurator* of Judæa to the *legate* of Syria. But the evidence is not conclusive in this case, and there were *procurators* in authority over other parts of the Empire where it is not clear how this principle could have been applied. In any case, however, the *procurator* of Judæa was not confined to financial duties; he had also the judicial duties of the governor, and he had authority over such troops as were within his area. His residence was generally at Cæsarea (Ac 23 [33]), but he paid occasional visits to Jerusalem (Mk 15 [1]; Ac 25 [9]). Except in times of unusual stress, the Romans tried to keep only a small number of troops in or near Jerusalem, and there is a good deal of evidence to show that they were prepared to go very far in the hope of avoiding any religious difficulties which might arise through the presence of soldiers in the neighbourhood. But it would have been impracticable to have no troops at hand. The story in Ac 23 shows us that the chief captain had 470 men available for conducting St. Paul on his way from Jerusalem to Cæsarea, 400 of whom returned from Antipatris instead of completing the journey.

The districts which were administered by one Roman officer were generally arranged so as to correspond with older political or ethnographical divisions. But the motive of this arrangement was only convenience, and many of the Roman provinces included several districts which had formerly been regarded as separate. Some of these may have continued to be regarded locally or in popular language as separate; sometimes the new and the old divisions did not correspond; and, where the name of a Roman province is also the name of a district which is only part of the province, some ambiguity occurs in references to the name. The elect who are addressed in 1 Peter are 'sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.' The last four of these are the names of Roman provinces, but there was no separate Roman province called Pontus. The term Pontus generally means the district immediately to the south of the Black Sea. The western part of that district was attached for administrative purposes to the province of Bithynia, the eastern part to that of Galatia or of Cappadocia: in this case, the mention of Pontus just before Galatia may suggest that the writer has the eastern part mainly in mind. The province of Galatia takes its name from the three Gallic tribes in the centre of Asia Minor, but it included also other districts to the north and the south.

(3) The Romans frequently made use of client-kings to govern in their interest

portions of the territory which fell within their sphere of influence. A local prince, if he were acceptable to his subjects, might raise less opposition than would occur under direct external rule; if he were closely connected with the native race, he might find it easier to understand local controversies than would a governor from outside (cf. Lk 23 [7]; Ac 25 [14]); and in the worst case the odium of repressing disturbances would fall upon him. The earlier Roman Emperors clearly thought that, if one were found willing to accept this invidious position, it was not in the interest of Rome to prevent him from doing so. The system was used in various parts of the Empire: in Judæa we find it alternating with direct government. A king allied to Rome was of course not allowed to have an independent foreign policy; but he was left considerable freedom in internal administration; and the position was accompanied by enough marks of dignity to make it an object of ambition. The title of *rex* was only granted as a special favour: thus, Herod the Great enjoyed it, but it was not granted to any of his sons. Archelaus was only an *ethnarch* or ruler of the nation; Philip and Antipas were *tetrarchs*, a title which originally means the ruler of a fourth part and subsequently comes to be used of any ruler of a district whose rank is below that of king. It was a serious offence to assume the title of king without proper authority, and no doubt the distinction was insisted upon on all formal occasions. It is possible, however, that that title might occasionally be given to a ruler locally by courtesy or in popular language: thus, while the titles in Mt 14 [1], Lk 3 [1], 9 [7], are technically correct, the epithets given to Archelaus in Mt 2 [22], and to Antipas in Mk 6 [14], may correspond to local usage.

The Romans were never anxious to supersede local arrangements for government. The 'Roman Empire' was in theory composed of a large number of self-governing communities, each of which managed its own affairs. Some institutions were, no doubt, favoured by the Romans in preference to others, and there were some things which the Romans would not allow; but they never wished to interfere where they could avoid doing so, and the Roman administrator, by whatever name he might be called and to whatever status he might belong, was conceived as being occupied in seeing to it that the self-governing communities performed their functions in an orderly way, and maintained proper relations to each other. The administrator had important functions of his own to perform, as being the representative of Rome on the spot, but he ought not to be regarded as taking the place of the local governments. These local governments undertook most of the detailed work, and it is with them rather than with individuals that the Romans preferred to deal. If a Roman governor usurped their functions or interfered unnecessarily, he would be regarded from the Roman point of view as guilty of an offence, or at least as doing something unusual that required explanation. This system owes its origin partly to the accidental way in which the Romans had acquired their territory under the Republic: no doubt much was done under the early Empire to make the whole system more regular; but the fundamental idea remains unaltered, and it is only gradually, and later than New Testament times, that a different spirit, the desire for centralization, begins to prevail. In the correspondence at the beginning of the 2nd century between Trajan and Pliny, who was sent out on a special mission to Bithynia to enquire into and correct mistakes made by the local authorities, we find Trajan insisting on the need of maintaining local customs and privileges, of making use of any help that can be gained on the spot, and of avoiding the temptation to settle difficult problems by general rules. It is not surprising, therefore, that the New Testament shows a considerable variety of local officials: the prætors of the Roman colony Philippi, the rulers (politarchs) of the free city Thessalonica, the 'town clerk' of Ephesus, the advisory jurisdiction of the Areopagus in Athens, the 'chief man of the island' of Melita (Ac 16 [20], 17 [6], 19 [35], 17 [19], 28 [7]). In accordance with the same policy, the Romans seem to have encouraged local rivalry between towns, in the hope of stimulating ambition to govern in a vigorous and liberal way: such titles as 'the first of the district,' by which Philippi is described (Ac 16 [12]), are characteristic of cities in Roman times.

II. **Roman Judæa and its Neighbourhood.**—Judæa has been given as an instance of a province under a minor governor and also of a district under the control of a client-king. It may therefore be convenient to give in chronological order the successive changes in the status of Judæa and of those neighbouring territories which affect the New Testament most closely.

1 Mac 8 shows the reputation which the Romans enjoyed in Jewish circles during the 2nd century B.C.; but the first Roman

force to enter Jerusalem was that of Pompey in 63 B.C. A period of confusion followed, during which there were constant struggles, often violently conducted, between rival parties. There was occasional Roman interference (e.g. by Gabinius, Crassus, and Cassius), and one party alternately benefited by and suffered for taking the side of Julius Cæsar in the Roman civil wars. In 37 B.C. Herod, an Idumæan, who had had to flee from Jerusalem, made himself master of it once more with Roman help; he then reigned as king till his death in 4 B.C., and is commonly known as Herod the Great. He did much during his reign to establish order against brigands, he showed himself liberal in times of famine and pestilence, he was munificent as a constructor of aqueducts and baths, and he won a reputation as a patron of culture. The reconstruction of Samaria under the name Sebaste (the Greek equivalent for Augusta) and of Strato's Tower as Cæsarea, are indications of his zealous support of Rome; his fortress in Jerusalem bearing the name Antonia testifies to his skill in being a friend of Antony as well as of his successful rival Octavian. He promoted in many ways the material improvement of the country which he controlled. But his hellenizing activities, including the building of a theatre in Jerusalem and of an amphitheatre just outside it, did much to stimulate by reaction a revival of extremist feeling among the Jews; and the cruelty of his character, with which the account of the massacre of the innocents is in complete accord, must have done much to alienate even moderate opinion from his government.

Outbreaks occurred on Herod's death, and, during the time when Augustus was considering how to deal with his territory, Rome does not seem to have been well represented on the spot. After some delay Augustus decided to adopt in the main the suggestions made in Herod's last will, and the chief part of his kingdom was accordingly divided among three of his sons.

(*a*) Archelaus became ruler (*ethnarch*) of Idumæa, Judæa, and Samaria. But he proved so unsatisfactory that he was banished by Augustus to Vienne in A.D. 6, and his district was assigned to a Roman governor till A.D. 41. One of these governors, Pontius Pilate, administered Judæa from A.D. 26 to 36. Tacitus refers to him as *procurator*; some scholars think that the governors of this period bore the title *præfectus*; but the evidence is not conclusive, and the difference of title probably does not in any case mean a difference in the amount of the governor's authority.

(*b*) Philip, the ablest of the three, received various portions of his father's dominions, including Trachonitis and Ituræa, but not the neighbouring Abilene (Lk 3 [1]). He died childless in A.D. 34: his territory was then attached to the province of Syria, but in A.D. 37 the Emperor Gaius gave it to Agrippa, a grandson of Herod the Great who had been the Emperor's friend in the lifetime of his predecessor Tiberius.

(*c*) Antipas, who is generally called Herod in the New Testament, received Galilee and Peræa, bearing, like Philip, the title of *tetrarch*. He and his second wife Herodias were banished to Lyons in A.D. 39 by the Emperor Gaius, and his territory was given to Agrippa. The character of Antipas is not favourably described in our records: in his differences with Pilate, to one of which a reference is made in Lk 23 [12], it may be hard to say whether he was right or wrong, but his general conduct confirms the epithet 'fox' given him in Lk 13 [32].

Agrippa, who had been given Philip's portion in 37 and that of Antipas in 39, was recognized as king by Gaius and again by his successor Claudius in 41, and the district which had formerly been under Archelaus (Idumæa, Judæa, and Samaria) was added. So Agrippa reunited most of the dominions of Herod the Great. He does not seem to have shown the same skill as Herod the Great in conciliating the Romans: in spite of the friendly feeling of the Emperor for him, the legate of Syria warned him to keep within his proper limits, and after his sudden death in 44 (Ac 12 [23]), the Romans made no attempt to continue the client kingship as regards Judæa.

A *procurator* of Judæa was appointed in 44; but one of Agrippa's surviving brothers, who ruled the small principality of Chalcis, was given the right to name the High Priest in Jerusalem and the general oversight of the Temple. The Romans hoped that they would avoid difficulties by omitting to undertake through their own representative this highly contentious matter, and on the death of this Herod in 48, Agrippa II, the son of Agrippa I and the new ruler of Chalcis, succeeded to his uncle's duties in Jerusalem. Agrippa II was recognized by the Romans as king in 50; in 53 he was allowed to exchange Chalcis for the district which Philip had administered as *tetrarch*, and parts of Galilee and Peræa were added to his dominions later.

He seems to have remained on good terms with the Romans (cf. Ac 25 [13]), to whom he gave assistance during the Jewish War; and long after his duties in Jerusalem had ceased he continued as king until his death.

The *procurators*, though they had thus been relieved of the most invidious part of their duties, were not successful as administrators of Judæa. Their task was no doubt difficult, and, when Tacitus tells us that the 'patience' of the Jews lasted till the time of Gessius Florus, who was *procurator* in 65 and 66, he probably means only that there was no insurrection on a large scale till that time. One at least of these *procurators*, Tiberius Alexander, afterwards præfect of Egypt, must have been a man of considerable ability, and Porcius Festus (from 61 to 62: Ac 24 [27]) has a good reputation. His predecessor Felix, of whom the account in Acts does not give a very favourable impression, is attacked by Tacitus in violent language; but the historian disliked him as the brother of the Emperor's freedman Pallas, and it is not easy to understand why, if he had been utterly incapable, he should have been left for a considerable time, as he apparently was, in a difficult post.

If the Romans hoped to continue the administration of Judæa without resort to arms on a large scale, those hopes were disappointed. A systematic campaign had to be commenced by Vespasian in 67 and continued by his son Titus up to the capture of Jerusalem in 70. Henceforward, as the High Priesthood was abolished and Jerusalem was left in ruins, the administration of the province under the new name of Syria Palæstina has little direct bearing on the study of the New Testament.

III. **The Romans and the Jews.**—The treatment of the Jews by the Romans under the Empire owed a good deal to the attitude of Julius Cæsar. Flaccus, a governor of Asia whom Cicero defended on a charge of misgovernment, had refused to allow money to be sent from his province for the contributions to the Temple at Jerusalem. Cicero justifies this action, taking occasion to remark that, while each nation has its own religion, the Jewish religion was alien from the spirit of Rome, and the recent subjugation of the Jews by Pompey had shown that it was abhorrent to the gods as well. But Julius Cæsar seems expressly to have granted to the Jews this privilege of sending contributions to Jerusalem, to have exempted them from duties incompatible with their religion, and to have freed them from any penalties which might otherwise have fallen upon them through his stricter rules about meetings. Pressure was often brought to bear on the Romans by the non-Jewish population, who resented what appeared to them to be preferential treatment of an unpopular class, but the policy of Julius Cæsar was continued as the standing policy of the early Empire. Where there had been important settlements of Jews for some time, as in Alexandria or Antioch, their old privileges continued. The Jews in Alexandria, of whom there are said to have been about a million, were under an ethnarch of their own who dealt with contracts and other matters as though he were ruling an independent community. At Antioch we hear of a Jewish ruler who evidently exercised considerable powers over a body to the number and importance of which there is abundant testimony. The Jews were supported against anti-Semitic prejudice, but the Roman authorities were careful also to discourage outrage originating from the Jewish side. No restriction was put on Jewish assemblies for worship, and we find synagogues in various places in Asia and Greece.

Not quite so much latitude could be given to the Jews in Rome as elsewhere. In normal times they met with no interference, their main privileges were secured to them, and persons in important positions were often believed to have entered into close relations with Jewish faith and practice. It is possible that 'the synagogue of the Libertines' (Ac 6 [9]) refers to a community of Jewish freedmen in Rome. But the success of Jewish propaganda, especially when it affected Roman citizens, led to a certain alarm, which grew to a head from time to time. There were rumours of scandals: a large section of the mob found it easy to believe evil of the Jews, and the authorities, who disliked disorder in Rome and probably found it difficult to decide who was to blame, tended to follow the line of least resistance. We hear of an expulsion of Jews from Rome in the time of Tiberius and of another under Claudius (Ac 18 [2]): the former of these is said to have been due to pecuniary abuses, and there may have been some similar special cause for the latter. In neither case is it likely that the government continued to exercise resentment for long. If Claudius prohibited Jewish worship in Italy, there is no evidence that later Emperors repeated this restriction. Even after the destruction of Jerusalem, the policy of the Roman

government towards Jewish religion and practice remained liberal, the Jews retaining such privileges as exempted them from duties which were forbidden by their religion.

In spite of all this non-interference, there does not seem to have been any considerable party among the Jews on whom the Romans could count for support. It was not to be expected that the Sadducees, an aristocracy who considered themselves to have a claim to rule the country, should be any more favourable to Roman rule than they had been to the rule of the upstart Herod the Great. Many of them may have had little objection to Hellenism or to other foreign influences; but, though they had shown themselves prepared in times past to pay this price for their ascendancy, they were neither anxious to repudiate their Judaism nor ready to be mollified by purely religious concessions such as the Romans were ready to give. To some of the Pharisees religious privileges meant more, and they had been more ready on that account to tolerate the Herods, who were careful as a rule to avoid offending religious scruples (cf. the association of Pharisees and Herodians in Mk 12[13]; Mt 22[16]). These may have felt less active objection to the Romans, and the care of the Romans in religious matters may have been meant to conciliate them. But the Zealots had arisen out of an extreme section of the Pharisees; parties often find it hard to control their left wing; and a position which attached the highest importance to religion was easier to reconcile with an heroic endeavour to oust the hated foreigner than with an attempt to stand well with him.

Financial questions also caused trouble. The arrangements of Julius Cæsar may have promised freedom from tribute, but the assumption of responsibilities by the Romans under the Empire must have involved tribute of some sort. Roman taxation outside Italy seems to have admitted of as much variety as other parts of the Roman system, but it generally included a land tax and often also a personal tax. There is no reason for supposing that the Romans increased the amount of taxation above that which had been usual: it would be quite in accord with their practice if they reduced it. But the census, which was undertaken by Quirinius as legate of Syria to form a basis of taxation, was deeply resented, and it led to the insurrection of Judas (Ac 5[37]). In addition to direct taxes, there were customs dues and other miscellaneous charges. Most of these were farmed out, according to the usual Roman practice, to individuals or companies who undertook to pay to the state a fixed yearly sum and recouped themselves out of what they could collect. This system gave the state a regular amount coming in at stated times; but it lent itself to illegal exactions of all kinds, and the Roman governor, whose duty it was to repress extortions, had an exceedingly difficult and invidious task. The word *publicanus* is used of anyone who has entered into such financial relations with the state, and it may therefore include persons of considerable dignity and importance; but it is frequently employed of the minor agents of those persons, whose temptations are clearly indicated in the advice given them by John the Baptist, and whose reputation is responsible for the frequent association of publicans with sinners.

The Jews complained of having to pay tribute (cf. Mt 22[17]), partly because the administration was not in their own hands, partly perhaps because their regular contribution of a half-shekel for the Temple (cf. Mt 17[25]) made it hard for them to provide what was required. It is never easy to tell whether a people has good grounds for complaining of being over-taxed as compared with others; most peoples assert that they are over-taxed, and some complain more loudly and more successfully than the rest. Appian of Alexandria tells us that the personal taxes levied on the Jews are heavier than those levied on others; but he attributes this fact to their frequent rebellions, among which he includes the great rebellion under Hadrian, and it is not clear that we are justified in inferring that the taxes had also been heavier in earlier times. But certainly the Jews had one financial grievance which was imposed on them as a punishment after the capture of Jerusalem. All Jews were required to continue the payment of the half-shekel; but, whereas it had previously been a contribution to the maintenance of the worship at Jerusalem, it was now transferred to the service of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome. This payment was rigorously exacted under the Flavian Emperors, particularly Domitian; and we hear of a *procurator* whose title shows that he was concerned with these personal Jewish payments. Even had enforcement not been so strict, the Jews would no doubt have resented bitterly this insult to their religion. The Emperor Nerva, who succeeded Domitian, took

credit to himself, as we know from some of his coins, for removing the odium attached to this collection. Perhaps he caused it to be paid into the general revenues without special allocation to an object which would be hateful to the Jews; he does not seem to have abolished it, since Origen refers to it as existing in the 3rd century. This half-shekel was in one sense not an addition to the burden on the Jews, as they had paid it voluntarily for their own purposes from early times; but after the destruction of Jerusalem they might fairly argue that they were taxed more heavily than others, since they paid this extra contribution to the revenue and received no additional benefit in consequence of it. The attitude of the Romans in this matter can only be defended as a punishment imposed on the Jews. It is possible that the sense of its injustice may have something to do with the opinion held by many that the financial treatment of the Jews was severer at all times than that of other peoples, an opinion for which it is hard to find adequate evidence before the destruction of Jerusalem.

The general attitude of the Romans to the Jews shows contempt rather than hatred. Horace and even Juvenal are at times quite good-humoured in their references; Tacitus shows signs of a more definite dislike, but it has to be remembered that he is fond of sombre pictures. In the course of the campaigns in Judæa and in the suppression of the Jewish revolts, it is only too probable that there was much rigour and cruelty: this is in accordance with common Roman practice, and there is no ground for attributing it to anti-Semitic prejudice. The brutal action of Pilate to which there is a reference in Lk 13[1] is not different in principle from what Dolabella did in Rome soon after the death of Julius Cæsar, when his action received strong commendation from Cicero. From the Roman point of view many of those who were so violently punished represented only a section within the Jewish community; there were nearly always other Jews who were prepared, whether through their reception of Hellenic ideas or for other reasons, to accommodate themselves to Roman rule and to deprecate the violence of their co-religionists. Jewish religion was incompatible with some acts which might be required in ordinary life, but the Romans were not disposed to raise difficulties unnecessarily. The freedom of the Jews from military service removed one set of occasions when such difficulties were most likely to occur, and, though we have some evidence which suggests that individual Jews might seek martyrdom on conscientious grounds, such individuals could always be regarded by the Romans as eccentric persons who did not represent the only or the best tradition of their race. Provided such conflicts were avoided, the Romans might well think that the Jews, in maintaining their national customs wherever these were not forbidden, were doing something praiseworthy. These customs might contain much that seemed unreasonable, and some things that seemed disgusting, to a Roman; but a Roman, if he thought at all, must have been aware that his own traditions contained elements to which one who had not inherited them might apply similar epithets, and it would not be natural to a Roman to deprecate the maintenance of national traditions.

IV. **The Romans and the Christians.**—The relation of the early Christians to the Roman Empire was different from that of the Jews. If a Christian was also a Jew, he appeared to the Roman authority to be a member of a dissentient minority who were causing trouble: he might be entitled to protection against unfair treatment on a particular occasion, but he was at least subject to the suspicion that it was his own conduct which had brought about the difficulty. If he was not a Jew, he was not a member of a specially privileged people, and, as a Christian, he was not in fact a member of a recognized community at all. It gradually became clear to the Romans that a Christian nearly always regarded himself as bound to abstain from certain acts which ordinary custom required as tests of loyalty, and that conflicts of conscience such as occurred occasionally with fanatical Jews at rare intervals, were bound to occur more frequently with Christians, especially as Christians had no exemption from military service. The Romans were slow and reluctant to draw the inference that the State was bound to try to suppress Christianity; the correspondence of Pliny shows how little the matter had been thought out in A.D. 112. Pliny had been in Syria for a short time as a young man and had spent most of his life in legal practice in Rome; yet he writes from Bithynia for guidance, on the ground that he has never been present at the trials of Christians, and that he is not sure whether it is a crime to be a Christian or whether, when Christians are punished, it is on account of the offences which are commonly supposed to be associated with

Christianity. In the latter case, specific evidence of the commission of such offences by the accused would no doubt be required. Pliny says that he is prepared to take the most lenient view, if the accused will submit to the usual test of loyalty by offering incense at the Emperor's statue; but he has been obliged to punish some who would not do this. In his reply Trajan says that those who will not take this test must no doubt be punished; but he adds that there is no need to search for Christians. This attitude, as Tertullian subsequently pointed out, was really equivalent to admitting that a Christian as such is not a criminal. If he were, it must be the duty of officials to search for him and bring him to punishment, and there could be no justification for forgiving him for his past offences on a mere promise not to repeat them. But it is rather to be regarded as the attitude of one who had no wish to provoke conflicts with persons who were in most respects harmless individuals, and who professed to be loyal citizens.

Our Lord's command to 'render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's (Mk 12 [17] and parallels) has been variously interpreted, but it is quite compatible with recognition of the services which the Roman state was performing towards the maintenance of order and the good of society. The question to which this is part of the answer was intended to bring our Lord into conflict with the Roman authorities (Mk 12 [13], etc.), and His Jewish accusers made the most with Pilate of the claim to be the King of the Jews (Mk 15 [2, 9, 12]; cf. Jn 19 [12, 15]); but it is clear that Pilate understood the real cause of this proceeding (Mk 15 [10]), and the shorter account of the 3rd Gospel (Lk 23 [3, 4, 14, 15]) shows, even without the fuller explanation of the 4th (Jn 18 [33-37], 19 [4, 6]), that Pilate did not interpret the claim in any revolutionary sense. Whatever be the right interpretation of Jn 19 [11], the sentence can hardly be held to question Pilate's authority within its own sphere.

St. Paul was proud, not only of his citizenship of Tarsus (Ac 21. [39]), but also of his inherited Roman citizenship (Ac 16 [37-39], 22 [25-29]): it was often of value to him, and he must have been conscious of the help which the Roman system of administration had given to his numerous travels. When Jewish mobs or crowds of Greeks who, as at Ephesus, thought themselves faced with economic ruin, raised disturbances, the Roman state is to be looked on as the protector of the Christians from them (Ac 18 [12-17], 21 [31-39], 23 [12-35]). It is, therefore, not surprising to find St. Paul using strong language about the duty of obedience to properly constituted authority, including the payment of tribute or dues (Rom 13 [1-8]; cf. 1 Tim 2 [1-2]); and many have felt that, in the mysterious language of 2 Thessalonians (2 [6-12]), 'that which restraineth' should be understood of the Roman power. In 1 Peter, where the possibility has to be admitted that a man may be called upon to 'suffer as a Christian' (4 [16]), the brethren are exhorted to 'be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake,' to submit not only to the supreme ruler, but also to governors sent by him, and to 'honour the king' as well as to 'fear God' (2 [13, 14, 17]). The advice given by St. Paul to his Corinthian converts (1 Cor 6), to settle their disputes for themselves rather than to go to the courts, conveys no more stricture (in spite of his use of the word 'unjust') on the competence of the courts than does the horror of St. James (2 [6]) at a rich man dragging his brother before the judgement seat in order to exact his full claim. There is as little desire in the early Christian teacher to be revolutionary as there is on the other side to make martyrs unnecessarily.

On one occasion the authorities in Rome availed themselves of the unpopularity of the Christians with the mob to divert on to them the suspicion of having caused the great fire, which seemed likely otherwise to be dangerous to the Emperor Nero. The memory of this proceeding and of the horrors connected with it would be enough to account for the place occupied by Nero in Christian tradition as the first Roman persecutor, even if Christians did not at this date suffer punishment outside Rome. But the conflict was not due to the recognition of an irreconcilable difference of principle: it was brought about by the assumption that the Christians were responsible for the fire, an assumption which many of those who were not favourable to Christianity knew to be untrue. A further stage was reached when increased importance began, in the latter part of the 1st century, to be attached to the worship of the Emperor. This form of worship had its roots in much older traditions, particularly in the east. Augustus made very skilful use of it to cement his dominions together, and we know that it spread during his lifetime even in certain districts where the Emperor discouraged or forbade it. But the weaker points in the institution were clearly recognized by Augustus and

by Tiberius. The dangerous attempts of Gaius to force the worship of himself in places where it was unwelcome may have served as a warning to his successors; and, though we hear enough of Emperor-worship under Claudius and Nero to know that it was regarded as a valuable adjunct to government, and was at times a cause of discontent and offence, it was not till the days of the Flavian Emperors (A.D. 69–96) that the institution acquires greater prominence. The Apocalypse shows us the inevitable result of the presence of Christians in a province to which this development was particularly acceptable, and in cities proud of a display of loyalty to the Emperor which took this form. Antipas, who would not deny his faith, met with his death at Pergamum 'where Satan's throne is' (2 [13]), and similar sufferings are anticipated at Smyrna (2 [10]). The circumstances under which Antipas died are not further described, but other passages in the book make the reference clear. When we read of 'an image to the beast who hath the stroke of the sword,' and that 'it was given unto him to . . . . cause that as many as should not worship the image of the beast should be killed' (13 [14-15]; cf. 13 [8, 12], 14 [9], 16 [2], 19 [20]), the meaning can hardly be mistaken. In consequence Rome has become 'the woman drunken with the blood of the saints' (17 [6]), in whom 'was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that have been slain upon the earth' (18 [24]). If there are passages the political interpretation of which is difficult to give in detail (e.g. 13 [18], 17 [10]) they frequently appear in immediate juxtaposition to other allusions which make their general bearing obvious enough (cf. 13 [17], 17 [9]).

The language of the Apocalypse in regard to Rome may not have represented the feelings of Christians in all parts of the Empire at the time when it was written or revised; even in the later days of more systematic persecution, those persecutions were seldom carried out in all districts alike. As against turbulent mobs, the authorities would always protect the harmless victims of violence, and the Christians would often appear to them as innocent of provoking the outbreak. The government had no wish to punish unimportant persons whom they would regard as acting through ignorance, unless there were some definite reason for associating them with crime; the attitude of the Roman authorities in the Acts is the one which they would prefer to assume, and the concluding words of that book suggest that the author wished to lay stress upon it. But the Apocalypse reminds us that Christians were not prepared to perform acts which were to the ordinary man a customary test of loyalty, and that thereby they gave a handle to their enemies, by being guilty of a proceeding which the authorities, if their attention were called, were bound to punish. Christianity was obliged to adopt a position in conflict with one of the principles on which Augustus had relied for uniting his empire: the result was a contest which had to be fought out after New Testament times.

THE RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN JEWISH THOUGHT

By W. O. E. Oesterley

The importance of this subject lies in the fact that there is scarcely a chapter in the New Testament the full understanding of which does not demand some knowledge of Jewish religion, doctrinal or practical.

For the sources of Judaism we turn primarily to the *Old Testament*. But not less important, in certain respects, are the *Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha;* for the last two pre-Christian centuries saw some notable developments in Judaism. These were largely the results of the form which Judaism began to assume after the Exile, and embraced doctrine as well as outward religious practice.

A third source, which may not be neglected, is the *Rabbinical literature*. Here the Targums and the Mishnah are especially valuable. The latter, it is true, was not compiled until about A.D. 200; but it embodies material of earlier times, and the great mass of illustrative matter required for our present purpose can be proved to belong either to pre-Christian times or to the period during which the New Testament was written.

I. The Doctrinal Background—(i) *The Doctrine of God.*—The foundation of the Jewish doctrine of God is the belief in His *Unity* as expressed in the *Shema'* (see

III, iv): 'Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is One Lord' (Dt 6 [4]; cf. Mk 12 [29]). A notable feature in the Jewish presentation of this doctrine is the balance held between belief in the divine transcendence, on the one hand, and the insistence on God's solicitude for man and all his doings, on the other (cf. Jn 1 [18]: 'No man hath seen God at any time . . .,' and Mt 6 [32]: 'For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things'). The tendency in the Apocalyptic literature to emphasize transcendentalism is balanced by the Pharisaic teaching that man's concerns are very near to the heart of God. Thus any danger of pantheistic ideas, in spite of the influence of Greek thought, was eliminated. Again, while in the Targums there is a noticeable desire to soften down anthropomorphisms by the doctrine of the *Memra* (the 'Word' of God, in which we must see the Jewish contribution to the *Logos*-doctrine), Pharisaism would have nothing to do with any idea of the hypostatizing of intermediate beings between God and man; though in later times a considerable development in this direction took place. At the same time it must be recognized that the teaching on the transcendental nature of God greatly fostered the realization of His *Holiness*, and was a safeguard against a too literal interpretation of anthropomorphic expressions.

While, upon the whole, a sense of proportion is observable in what was taught regarding *the divine attributes of justice and love*, it is probably true to say that the former rather than the latter receives emphasis. Connected with this is the fact that the thought of divine Fatherhood is subordinate in the Jewish teaching of this period. In spite of the Individualism taught by some of the later prophets the doctrine of the love of God figures more frequently in connexion with the people of Israel as a whole than with the individual. Nowhere was the doctrine of divine justice believed to be more pointedly illustrated than in misfortune and suffering, whether national or individual. Every form of suffering was regarded as the penalty for sin demanded by divine justice (cf. Jn 9 [2, 3]). The idea that suffering was corrective occurs, it is true, and would have, in part, accounted for the sufferings of the righteous; but the normal explanation of suffering was to see in it a vindication of the justice of God.

(ii) *The Doctrine of Angels.*—The Jewish belief in angels is based on the teaching of the Old Testament; but Judaism did not refuse to accept some development of conception regarding them due to Persian influence. The Apocalyptic, as well as the Rabbinical, literature bears witness to this.

The angels, or 'holy ones,' form the heavenly hosts, and the number of them is countless; they are continually praising God and waiting upon Him. Moreover, as the words for angel in both Hebrew and Greek imply, they are the 'messengers' of God to men (cf. Lk 1 [11] ff., [26] ff.). When seen by mortals their appearance is as men (cf. Lk 24 [4]). They differ in rank since there are archangels as well as angels; there are also various classes among them; Ezekiel mentions, in addition to *Cherūbim* and *Seraphim*, *Ophānim* (lit. 'wheels'), *Chayyôth* ('living ones'), and *Arēlim*, of which the meaning is uncertain (cf. Ezek 1 [5] ff., and see also Zech 1-8). Names of angels occur first in the Book of Daniel, and also in *Enoch;* the two most prominent are Michael (cf. Rev 12 [7]) and Gabriel (cf. Lk 1 [26]).

(iii) *Demonology.*—The far greater prominence in the Gospels of the activity of demons than of that of angels coincides with what is found in Jewish teaching and Jewish literature. The reasons of this are that the sinfulness of man's heart made it a favourable soil for demons, and that the activities of demons were believed to be much more diverse than those of angels. As in the case of angelology, the belief in demons, owing to extraneous influences, underwent a great development in post-exilic times, during which the systematization found in the later Rabbinical literature was in process of formation.

In some respects the ideas concerning demons run parallel with those concerning angels; thus, they are countless in number, they can assume human shape, they are of various classes, they have names; e.g. Satan, a word meaning 'adversary' in quite a general way (cf. 1 S 29 [4]; 1 K 5 [4]; Ps 109 [6]), which came to be used as a proper name (cf. Zech 3 [1, 2]; Job 1 [6] ff., 2 [1] ff.), and Asmodæus (cf. Tob 3 [8]).

In other respects there are, of course, marked differences. The original idea of demons being harmful rather than evil is reflected in the general name for all demons, *Mazzîkin*, 'harmful ones,' as well as in the belief that there are storm-demons and demons of every kind of sickness, etc.

Another general term for them is *Shēdim*, a word derived from the Babylonian *shidu*, a 'genius,' good or evil. When not occupied in harming men the demons, so it was held, dwelt mostly in

desert places (cf. Lk 8 [29]), as well as in dirty places, such as refuse heaps, in unclean spots, such as tombs (cf. Mk 5 [2]), or in the vicinity of corpses which were regarded as unclean; also in waterless places (cf. Lk 11 [24]), water being the means of cleansing. They tend to congregate together (cf. Lk 11 [26]), and are especially dangerous at midday when the heat is intense (cf. Ps 91 [5, 6]), and during the hours of darkness (cf. Lk 22 [53]; Jn 13 [27, 30]), above all at cock-crow, the signal that the darkness is about to pass.

(iv) *Man and his Relationship to God.*—Man has been created body and soul, or spirit (cf. Mt 10 [28]); there is, according to Jewish doctrine, no difference between soul and spirit (in the Pauline epistles it is different, cf., e.g., 1 Th 5 [23]). His body is made up of earthly elements, his spirit comes from above; nevertheless, the body is never thought of as evil in itself; the evil element is the *Yetzer ha-ra'* (on the 'evil tendency' see next section). That man was made in the image of God (Gen 1 [27] [P]) means simply that his appearance was similar to that of his Creator; this comes out clearly in Gen 9 [6] (P).* In later times this belief was, at any rate in some circles, modified, and in the Targums man is thought of as having been created in the image of the angels.

Man's relationship to God centred in the command of Dt 6 [5]: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God. . . .' This love was shown forth by observing the precepts of the Law (see further, III, i, ii). As long as this was done a normal relationship existed between man and his God; but disobedience to the Law's commands resulted in the breaking of this relationship. The means to its re-establishment were repentance, confession, and amendment, together with the atoning sacrifice prescribed by the Law. But the inadequacy of sacrifices for atoning for sin was beginning to be recognized long before Christian times (cf. Ps 40 [6], 51 [16, 17]; Mic 6 [6-8]). The obtaining of forgiveness was thus a question of man's initiative (see further, III, ii).

(v) *The Doctrine of Sin and Righteousness.*—Judaism has no doctrine of original sin. Theories as to its origin vary considerably. As to Adam's sin, the teaching, put quite briefly, is that God granted the gift of immortality to Adam at the beginning; this Adam forfeited by his sin of disobedience, and thus became subject to death (cf. Rom 5 [12]). In consequence of this the whole human race became subject to death. The tragedy of Adam's sin lay in the fact that it involved the loss of immortality. *In itself* his sin is not regarded as very serious; what did make it serious was his want of repentance. Had he repented of his sin it would have been forgiven and the gift of immortality would not have been withdrawn. So that it was not sin, that one act of disobedience, which brought death, but the want of repentance for having committed it. There is thus no doctrine of inherited sin. Adam's sin entailed the *capacity* to sin on the part of all men; but it did not follow that all men were necessarily sinners, still less that they were born in sin. The only sense in which it can be said that man is born in sin is that he is born in a sinful environment.

While in various ways post-biblical Judaism exhibits developments in the doctrine of sin as taught in the Old Testament, in one respect, and that the most important, there is identity of teaching, namely, the truth expressed in the words: 'Your iniquities have separated between you and your God' (Is 59 [2]).

The universal prevalence of sin is strongly insisted upon, but this is not regarded as the result of Adam's sin, it is accounted for by the existence of the *Yetzer ha-ra'*, the 'evil tendency,' or 'bias towards evil.' That this doctrine was already in existence in the time of Ben-Sira (about 180 B.C.) is clear from Ecclus 37 [3] (in the Hebrew): 'O evil nature (*Yetzer ra'*), wherefore wast thou created to fill the face of the earth with deceit?' (cf. 27 [6] Heb.). The doctrine is based, ultimately, on Gen 8 [21]: 'The *imagination* of man's *heart* is evil from his youth.'

This evil tendency, it is taught, is part of man's nature; and it is balanced by the *Yetzer ha-tob*, 'the good tendency,' also part of his nature. Very interesting in this connexion is Rom 7 [15-25], from which it is evident that St. Paul accepted the doctrine of the two *Yetzers*.* But he differs from it in his conviction that deliverance from the tyranny of the evil tendency can only be effected through Christ ([24, 25]), i.e. through divine grace; whereas, according to Jewish teaching, a man can overcome it by the exercise of his unaided will (see further the next section).

* Considering the date of P, this seems to the editors an improbable suggestion: see on Gen 1 [26] n., and Driver on both passages.

* On the difference between St. Paul's view in Romans and that which he inherited from Pharisaism, see Williams, *Ideas of the Fall*, 151 f.—ED.

Further, when in this inner conflict the evil tendency has been subdued and the good tendency holds sway, the continued ascendency of the latter can be sustained by fulfilling the precepts of the Law. By this means a man attains to a state of *Zekûth* (lit. 'satisfaction,' equivalent to the Old Testament word for 'righteousness'), i.e. he is in that state of righteousness which is attained by having *satisfied* the divine demands of the Law made upon him, and consequently he stands justified in the sight of God. That this doctrine was likewise in existence in pre-Christian times can be seen, e.g. from Ecclus 3 [14, 15] (Heb.): 'Alms (given) to a father shall not be blotted out, and it shall stand firm as a substitute for sin; in the day of trouble it shall be remembered, obliterating thine iniquities as heat the hoar-frost,' i.e. almsgiving takes away sin, leaving a man in a state of righteousness. St. Paul was, of course, familiar with this doctrine, and rectified it by his profounder teaching about the grounds of righteousness (Rom 4 and 10 [2, 3]).

A doctrine of imputed righteousness, however, though of a very different nature, was also taught by Judaism. For not only could a state of *Zekûth* be attained by a man's own efforts; he had besides this, in case of need, the good deeds of his ancestors, and above all of the patriarchs, to fall back upon, their good deeds being imputed to their seed; this doctrine is known as *Zekûth Abôth*, 'the righteousness of the fathers.' There is possibly a reminiscence of this in Rom 11 [28]: '. . . but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sake.' But St. Paul's frequent insistence on the need of divine grace would have made it impossible for him to accept the Jewish doctrine. In opposition to the Jewish teaching of his time he showed that nothing that man could do on his own initiative was able to effect righteousness; the taking away of sin and the consequent possibility of attaining to a state of righteousness, and therefore of salvation, could only be brought about by an initial act of divine grace; 'by grace have ye been saved' (Eph 2 [8]). This leads us to—

(vi) *The Doctrine of Grace and Freewill.*—Here it must be recognized that, while Judaism taught the need of grace, it was accorded a subordinate position in comparison with that of Freewill upon which the main stress is laid. St. Paul's constant insistence on the need of grace (cf., e.g., Rom 5 [15, 17, 20] f.) was called forth by the tendency of Judaism to overrate the place of human freewill in the divine scheme of salvation. Judaism taught that grace itself could be acquired by man through repentance and confession; in opposition to this St. Paul insisted that these are the outcome of prevenient grace: '. . . not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance' (Rom 2 [4]).

It is very necessary to remember that while our Lord nowhere formulates any doctrine of grace and freewill, it is implicit in much of His teaching; the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mt 20 [1-16]) is a case in point. The definite Pauline formulation of the doctrine of prevenient grace is only the logical outcome of what is often implicit in the words of Christ. Where Judaism was wanting in this respect was in the undue weight which it laid on human freewill (see further, III, ii).

II. The Eschatological Background.—The details of the eschatological background are contained, in the main, in the Jewish apocalyptic literature of the last two centuries B.C. and the 1st century A.D. This literature was a popular one in the twofold sense of embodying popular traditions and of containing teaching which was eagerly sought and assimilated by the people at large. As early as the time of Amos eschatological ideas were current among the people (see Am 5 [18-20]; cf. also, for later times, Joel 2 [30, 31]). The familiarity with apocalyptic ideas and eschatological expectations which is taken for granted in the Gospels attests the knowledge of these among the common people. The means whereby these ideas were disseminated were not merely nor primarily through writings, the obtaining and reading of which would have been impossible for the bulk of the people, but through the spoken word; of this we have an illuminating example in the apocalyptic teaching of John the Baptist,* to whom the multitudes resorted (see Mt 3 [5]; Lk 3 [7] ff.).

But it is important to remember that the apocalyptic literature did not in all respects represent the teaching of orthodox Judaism. The religious leaders, both Sadducees and Pharisees, had little sympathy with the views and aims of the Apocalyptists; the former were too worldly, the latter too much taken up with the study and practice of the Law, to be interested in the other-worldly spirit of these seers (see further, IV, iv). At the

* It seems to us that the teaching of the Baptist is rightly described as prophetic rather than 'apocalyptic.' His anticipation of the Messiah has nothing in common with *Enoch*.—ED.

same time, however, it must not be forgotten that on some vital matters there was a measure of agreement between the Pharisees and the Apocalyptists.

The central thought in Jewish Eschatology was that of the *Kingdom of Heaven*; for this meant the sweeping away of the present world-order (the 'end of the world') together with the divine Judgement which would rectify all that hitherto had been wrong. The phrase 'the Kingdom of Heaven' occurs in early post-biblical Jewish literature; but the form 'the Kingdom of God' is not used because of the desire to avoid the mention of the name of God. In St. Matthew, the specifically Jewish Gospel, the form used is 'the Kingdom of Heaven' (Hebrew *Malkûth Shamayim*, Aramaic *Malkûtha di-Shemaya*); but St. Mark and St. Luke, who have non-Jewish readers in mind, use the form 'the Kingdom of God.' It is worth adding that the Targums frequently have 'the Kingdom of the Lord.'

According to orthodox Jewish teaching the Kingdom would be ruled over by the Messiah, the Son of David; and it would be a temporal, Jewish, Kingdom. But the Apocalyptists looked for a transcendental Messiah whose Kingdom would be world-wide. Orthodox Judaism here was particularistic, the Apocalyptists were, generally speaking, universalistic in their teaching on the Kingdom.

The title 'the Son of Man,' which, unlike 'the Son of God,' is a Messianic title, belongs originally to the Apocalyptists. It occurs first in Dan 7 [13-14], where it is used merely as a term of comparison, i.e. the mysterious figure is *like* a human being. This does not, however, mean a son of man in the sense of being of human birth. In the Book of Daniel, that is to say, the phrase is not a title; it is simply used to describe the appearance of him who 'came with the clouds of heaven,' who is compared with an ordinary man so far as his outward appearance is concerned. It is in the 'Book of Similitudes' (1 Enoch 37–71), written about half a century later, that 'the Son of Man' first occurs as a title. And in this book it is not merely his human-like appearance that is taught, it is above all his transcendental character (only implicit in Daniel) which is definitely insisted upon. So that the use of the title 'the Son of Man' in the Synoptic Gospels is based on its use in the Book of Enoch, not on that in Daniel.*

Further, since this title is applied to the Messiah, it is evident that according to apocalyptic teaching the Messiah is superhuman; orthodox Judaism, on the other hand, believed in a purely human Messiah.

While there is not always uniformity in the eschatological teaching of the Apocalyptists, the course of events is, speaking generally, somewhat of this kind: First, the signs of the end, known in Judaism technically as 'the pangs of the Messiah'; then comes the advent of the Messiah and the setting up of the Kingdom; this is followed by the Judgement; the wicked are consigned to Gehenna while the righteous enter Paradise; and finally there is the Resurrection. This order of events is not always the same. A few words regarding each of them is demanded.

The *signs of the end* consist of wars and tumults, and the consequent breaking up of home-life, always dear to the Jews; there are also terrible phenomena on earth, in the sea, and in the skies. These are often described in the apocalyptic literature, and on comparing them with such passages as Mk 13 [8, 24]; Lk 21 [25, 26]; Mt 10 [21], 24 [6] f., [29], and others, it becomes evident that they all belong to the same circle of ideas.

The *Central Figure* at the advent, One who will come as Judge, is, according to this literature, declared to be God Almighty by some of the writers; others say it will be the Messiah.

The *Judgement* is, again, differently conceived; sometimes the Israelites are represented as the instruments of God in extirpating the wicked; at others, and more normally, the judgement-seat is set, and God (according to some passages the Messiah) judges all, Israelites and Gentiles.

The *Sentence* pronounced is against the wicked who are condemned to everlasting torment in the fire of Gehenna; the righteous enter into Paradise to enjoy eternal bliss.

The *Ressurection* then follows, though sometimes an intermediate state is contemplated; in which case the wicked rise to final doom, the righteous to endless joy. But here again there is not uniformity of teaching, for according to some of the writers only the righteous rise; others make the Resurrection precede the Judgement.

So far as Eschatology is concerned it is the teaching of the Apocalyptists rather than that of orthodox Judaism which forms the background of what is written in the Gospels on the subject.* It is perhaps unnecessary to add that, of course, our Lord supplements the traditional apocalyptic ideas with teaching of a much

* For a different view see p. 291*a*.—Ed.

* For a different view see p. 296*b*-297*a*.—Ed.

more spiritual and wholly unique character.

III. Practical Religion—(i) *The Law.*—The Hebrew term for the Law, *Torah*, refers in the first instance to the Pentateuch; it is also used in a wider sense as including the whole of the Old Testament; and not infrequently it connotes the entire body of religious truth and practice as handed down by tradition. This threefold meaning of *Torah* includes, therefore, the written Law and the oral Law. According to Jewish belief and teaching the latter was implicit in the former when first delivered on Mount Sinai; it needed only properly qualified teachers to set forth the implications of the written Law; and these were never wanting. The *dicta* of these teachers were called forth by the changing circumstances of succeeding ages, new cases requiring new decisions; and it was in this way that a body of traditional laws, orally transmitted, gradually came into being, which was handed down side by side with the written Law.

Inasmuch as the oral laws were believed to be implicit in and logically developed from the written Law, both came to be looked upon as equally authoritative and binding. It was during and after the Exile that this process became expecially marked, and it is pre-eminently with the name of Ezra that it is associated (see Ezr 7 [6, 10, 11]; Neh 8 [1, 4] ff.; 12 [26, 36]).

It must be recognized that in principle there is something here which is thoroughly sane and sound. That there should be through the ages a living authoritative body to preserve and develop the Word of God, and to declare and teach this to the faithful, is essential; and the Jewish Church offers here a parallel to the Catholic Church of Christ. Nevertheless, while the principle is sound, there is in practice an obvious danger; for since it is the will and Word of God which is in question the divine motive-power must predominate; but if, from whatever motives, the human element takes the initiative, the result is inevitable: the law of man takes precedence of the law of God. To this danger the Jewish Church succumbed as is clear from our Lord's words: 'Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men . . .' (Mk 7 [8, 9, 13]; cf. Col 2 [8]). It is this tradition or oral law which Christ condemns in such passages as Mt 5 [21, 27, 33, 38, 44], 12 [4] ff., 15 [2] ff., in order that He may establish the Law of God.

(ii) *The Works of the Law.*—What has been said receives further illustration in considering the subject of fulfilling the precepts of the Law.

Mention must first be made of the *Observance of the Sabbath.* This was one of the foremost characteristics of Judaism. In pre-exilic days the Sabbath was purely a day of rest from toil (mainly agricultural), and it was kept as a religious festival during which social festivities were not considered inappropriate. During the Exile, owing in great measure to the forced suspension of the sacrificial system, Sabbath observance assumed a new importance and acquired a sacramental character. By degrees an increasing number of acts were forbidden on this day and penalties were imposed for breaches of its observance. With the rise of the Pharisaic party after the Maccabæan struggle legal rigidity in regard to the Sabbath tended to become exaggerated. But it is only right to point out that the attitude of the Pharisees in this matter has often been misrepresented. They recognized as permissible infringements of the Sabbath in all cases of emergency. It is well to realize, too, that many of the prohibitions contained, e.g., in the Mishnaic tractate *Shabbath*, are to a large extent theoretical; and they deal with special cases, so that the great bulk of the people would not have been affected by them. In the Rabbinical literature, which so often reflects the teaching and customs of Judaism in pre-Christian and early Christian times, it is again and again laid down that joy must be one of the characteristics of the Sabbath day.

The fundamental difference in principle between the Pharisaic teaching on Sabbath observance and that of our Lord lay in this: the Pharisees regarded it from the point of view of man's obedience to God; our Lord regarded it from the point of view of God's love to man. Did space permit this could be fully illustrated and substantiated from Rabbinical writings and from the Gospels.

Next to Sabbath observance, pre-eminent among the works of the Law (technically called *Mitzvôth*, lit. 'commandments') were *Almsgiving*, *Prayer*, and *Fasting*.

The first of these was the greatest, so much so that the Hebrew word for it is 'Righteousness' (*Zĕdākāh*, cf. Mt 6 [1], which is not an introductory verse to all that follows, but simply part of section [1-4]). Almsgiving, so it was taught, however, was only acceptable in the sight of God when prompted by love; this alone gave it merit; the mere bestowal of alms for

the sake of self-glorification was not the fulfilling of the commandment of the Law. So that it was against transgressors of the Jewish Law itself that our Lord spoke in the words, 'when therefore thou doest alms, sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men . . .' (Mt 6[2]). The same applies to what is said regarding *Prayer* in Mt 6[5] ff.; what our Lord says in this passage is sometimes thought to apply to methods of Jewish prayer in general. There could be no greater mistake. The reference is to the hypocrites and the Gentiles. Fixed forms of prayer were by no means used exclusively in Jewish worship; the regular use of extempore prayer in public worship is amply attested. It was not against the length of prayers as such, nor against their repetition, that our Lord spoke (see Lk 18[1-7]; Mk 14[39]), but only against the wrong spirit in offering prayer.

Fasting had been a rite in use among the Jews long before the time of Christianity, and for the following purposes: as a preparation for any initiation ceremony; as a form of penitence; as an accompaniment to supplication; as a means of expiation, in place of sacrifice; and as a sign of mourning. There is evidence to show, moreover, that it was practised for the purpose of controlling the passions; and, finally, it was regarded as a means of preparing the mind, through the subjugation of the flesh, to receive divine communications. The importance of fasting, therefore, according to Jewish ideas, will be realized. It is possible that the bi-weekly fast mentioned in Lk 18[12] refers to the custom of fasting on the days represented by our Monday and Thursday. Interesting, too, is the fact that almsgiving was regarded as a necessary accompaniment to fasting.

Further, among legal observances, mention must be made of the *Purity laws*. These are referred to in Mk 7[3] ff.; cf. Mt 15[1] ff.; they are included under 'the tradition of the elders,' so that the reference is to the oral, not the written, Law. The 'washing of hands' before meals consisted in having water poured upon them, not in dipping them in the water. The custom was originally due to the necessity of obliterating any impurity from the hands before food was touched, for the partaking of food was regarded as in the nature of a sacramental act. Numerous details regarding the custom are given in the Mishnah tractate *Yadaim*; and from the tractate *Berakhôth*, viii, 2-4 it is clear that there were controversies on the subject between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, whose main activity began about 30 B.C. The tractate *Kelim* contains many rules regarding 'the washings of cups, and pots, and brasen vessels.'

The fulfilling of *Mitzvôth*, or 'works of the Law' constituted the essence of practical religion; hence the stress laid on the efficacy of works. It was the undue emphasis laid on this which necessitated the frequent explicit, and perhaps even more frequent implicit, references in the New Testament to the need of divine grace. For if the works of man were meritorious he could, by accumulating them in sufficient quantity, claim the divine reward as of right. This belief found pointed expression in St. Peter's words to our Lord: 'Lo, we have left all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore?' (Mt 19[27]). The answer to this question takes the form of the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Mt 20[1-16]), in which it is taught, against the Jewish doctrine of the efficacy of works, that the fact of being able to do any work at all for God is due in the first instance to divine grace; cf. also our Lord's words in Lk 17[10]: 'Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do, but nothing more.'

(iii) *The Temple Worship.*—The *personnel* connected with the Temple and its services during New Testament times was, briefly, as follows: The *High-Priest*, who usually officiated only on Sabbaths and New Moons, at the great festivals, and on the Day of Atonement (see Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, V, v, 7). The large number of priests (Josephus, *c. Ap.*, ii, 8, says there were 20,000), upon whom devolved the conduct of the daily and other services; they were divided into twenty-four 'courses,' which were subdivided into 'families' (cf. Lk 1[5, 8]); the 'courses' took their turn week by week. Next came the *Levites*, assistants of the priests (see below), divided similarly into 'courses.' In addition to these there were the *representatives of the people*, likewise divided into twenty-four 'courses,' who took their turn week by week in attending the services. And, lastly, there were the *musicians* (the Levitical choir) belonging to the three families of Heman, Asaph, and Jeduthun (or Ethan); these, too, were divided into twenty-four 'courses.'

The public *daily services* were two in number:

(1) The *Morning service*, which took place at daybreak, consisted of the follow-

ing portions: (*a*) the *incense offering*, cf. Lk 1 [9]; (*b*) the *Tamid*, or 'perpetual' morning sacrifice of a lamb without blemish; during this sacrifice the Levitical choir sang to the accompaniment of stringed instruments, and the congregation offered prayers; (*c*) the *meal offering* of the High-Priest, i.e. the tenth part of an ephah mixed with oil, and baked. As a rule the High-Priest did not officiate himself here excepting on Sabbaths and Festivals; it was called by his name because he paid for it, and it was offered on his behalf; (*d*) the *service of prayer*, which took place in the 'Hall of hewn stone' (*Lishkath ha-gazith*); among others, the prayer called *Ahabah Rabbah* ('Great Love,' still used in the synagogue service) was said by the priests; this was followed by the recitation of the Ten Commandments and the *Shema'* ('Hear, O Israel'), after which came the blessing of the people; (*e*) the *service of praise*, beginning with the High-Priest's wine-oblation, during which the Levitical choir sang hymns with musical accompaniment, and concluding with the psalm for the day.

(2) The *Evening service*, which took place at twilight, was similar to that of the morning excepting that the sacrifice of the lamb preceded the incense offering.

The daily services are described at length, with many ritual details, in the Mishnah tractate *Tamid*.

(3) On Sabbaths and Festivals the services were as on ordinary days; but on the Sabbath the sacrifices were doubled, and the Shew-bread, which consisted of twelve fresh loaves every Sabbath, was offered. On the great Festivals (Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles) the sacrifices were greatly increased, and the whole twenty-four 'courses' of priests assisted at the services.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the sacrifices came under two categories: the public and the private ones; the latter were in part obligatory (see Lk 2 [24]; Mt 8 [4]), and in part voluntary, including burnt offerings, sin and peace offerings. The great majority of sacrifices were the private ones.

(iv) *The Synagogue and the Synagogal Liturgy.*—It is generally held that the *synagogue, as an institution*, came into being during the Exile. While this was probably the case, it must be recognized that there is no evidence available for the existence of synagogues in Palestine prior to the 2nd century B.C. In the Dispersion the earliest mention of them is in the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes, King of Egypt 247–221 B.C.

The word 'synagogue' is Greek, meaning 'assembly' (= the Hebrew *Beth ha-Kenēseth*, 'House of Assembly'); no Hebrew or Aramaic term for it occurs in the Old or New Testaments; the mention in Ps 74 [8] (EV) of 'synagogues,' or 'places of assembly,' refers, as the context shows, to assemblies for the festivals held in the Temple courts; hence the Septuagint rendering, 'feasts of the Lord.'

The primary purpose of the synagogue was, according to Philo (*c.* 10 B.C. to A.D. 40), for the study and teaching of the Law. This is amply borne out in the New Testament (see e.g. Mt 9 [35], 13 [54], and often elsewhere). Closely connected with teaching was preaching (cf. Mt 4 [23]; Mk 1 [39]; Lk 4 [44], etc.), both being based on the reading of Scripture (cf. Lk 4 [16] ff.; Ac 13 [14, 15], etc.). It is remarkable that only once in the Gospels (Mt 6 [5]) is prayer mentioned in connexion with the synagogue; but in the Acts it is different, as can be seen in 4 [31], 16 [13]; moreover, the hours of prayer, viz., the third hour, 9 a.m. (2 [15]), the sixth, midday (10 [9]), and the ninth hour, 3 p.m. (3 [1]), refer to the synagogue times of worship; for there was a synagogue in the Temple; and if men were not present at a synagogue service, they observed the hour of prayer at home or wherever they might be. Both Philo and Josephus speak several times of the synagogue as 'the house of prayer.' Other passages show that synagogues were also used for other purposes (Mt 4 [23], 9 [35], etc.); judicial enquiries were held there as well as the carrying out of sentences (Mk 13 [9]; Lk 12 [11], 21 [12]). The synagogue was thus used for other purposes besides teaching and worship; it was, in fact, the centre of Jewish life in general, including civil and municipal functions as well as religious activities. The New Testament reflects in many details what we know from other sources, especially the Mishnah, to have been Jewish custom and practice.

This is further borne out in considering the *organization of the synagogue*. In purely Jewish cities religious and civic leadership was vested in one and the same body, viz. the Sanhedrin, whose headquarters, with the exception of Jerusalem, was the synagogue. The Hebrew term for the Greek word Sanhedrin is *Beth Din*, 'the House of judgement'; it is called 'the Council' in Mt 5 [22], 10 [17]; Mk 13 [9] (note the plural, 'councils,' in the last two of these passages). In the larger cities this consisted of twenty-three members, in the smaller there were only seven. The members were called both

'elders' (e.g. Lk 7 [3]) and 'rulers' (e.g. Mt 9 [18, 23]), indicating their religious and civil character respectively. In cities which were partly Jewish and partly Gentile the functions of the synagogue authorities were restricted to religious matters; but there can be little doubt that in both civil and social affairs as well they exercised a powerful moral influence upon their own people. In either case, whether in cities wholly Jewish or only in part so, the synagogue was the property of the community (cf. Lk 7 [5]). The *Beth Din*, as the supreme synagogal authority, had the power of excommunicating (cf. Jn 9 [22], 12 [42], 16 [2]). The other officials of the synagogue were, first, the 'ruler of the synagogue' (cf. Lk 8 [49]), who was appointed by the *Beth Din*; the Hebrew form is 'head of the synagogue'; his duties were restricted to the ordering of the services as well as general supervision within the synagogue, and he was responsible for seeing that nothing which was considered unseemly happened there (see Lk 13 [14]). In the New Testament we have sometimes 'ruler' and at others 'rulers' (e.g. Mk 5 [22]; Ac 13 [15]) of the synagogue; in the latter it is the members of the *Beth Din* who are meant. Under the head of the synagogue were the 'collectors of alms'; they are not specifically mentioned in the New Testament, but, they are implicitly referred to in Mt 6 [2]. Then there was the official called the 'attendant' in Lk 4 [20], in Hebrew the *Chazzān ha-Kenēseth* ('superintendent of the synagogue'); his duties were to take care of the rolls of the Scriptures, and to bring them out of the 'ark' (see below) and present the one required to the person appointed to read the lesson (cf. Lk 4 [17]). He had also to notify, by the blowing of a trumpet, the beginning and ending of the Sabbath. To him, moreover, was assigned the distasteful task of scourging those who were condemned to this punishment. Of a quasi-official character was 'the messenger of the congregation,' called in Hebrew *Sheliach Zibbur*, who offered up prayer during the service as representative of the congregation; anyone present was eligible for this purpose, so that he could not be called an official in the strict sense of the word; his position was thus somewhat similar to that of him who read the lessons, a task which could fall to any member of the congregation.

The most important of the synagogal furniture was the 'ark,' called *Tēbah* in Hebrew; within this the rolls of the Scriptures were kept. The rolls themselves were covered with linen wrappers and laid in a small chest called the *Thik*, a Greek word (*Thēkē*) Hebraized. A raised platform stood in the centre of the synagogue, called the *Bima*, also a Hebraized Greek word (*Bêma*); on this the officiating minister stood and the reader of the Scripture portions usually read from it (cf. Lk 4 [16]). Seats were provided (cf. Lk 4 [20]); the 'chief seats' (cf. Mk 12 [39]) were those nearest the 'ark,' they faced the congregation and were reserved for the most honourable men present.

We have a good deal of definite information about the *Liturgy of the Synagogue* as this existed prior to and during the earliest ages of Christianity. A brief account of this will be of interest since it was the form of worship in which, as the Gospels clearly indicate, our Lord always took part.

The *Synagogal Liturgy* was constructed on the basis of that of the Temple. There was, as already pointed out, a synagogue within the Temple precincts; and it is recorded how the Levites came straight from the Temple service to take part in the worship of the synagogue. The music of the synagogue thus originated from the Temple music. Instrumental music in synagogues soon ceased; but this did not affect the singing, for the vocal part, always the more important, was sung independently of the accompanying instruments.

There were three daily services in the synagogue—morning, afternoon, and evening. While it is not possible to say what the exact order of the service was, for this has undergone modification from time to time, it can be stated with certainty what the constituent elements were.

The three main divisions were: Prayer, Scripture reading and exposition, Praise.

(1) The *Prayer* portion included the *Shema'*, 'Hear, O Israel . . . .' together with the three passages Dt 6 [4-9], 11 [13-21]; Nu 15 [37-41]. There is a clear reference to this in Mk 12 [29]. Belonging also to this portion was the *Tephillah* ('Prayer'), so called because it is the central prayer of the Liturgy, corresponding in this respect to the Lord's Prayer in the Church Liturgy. It is also called the *'Amidah* ('Standing') because during its recital the congregation stood (cf. Mt 6 [5]; Mk 11 [25]; Lk 18 [11]). In the Jewish Church prayer is not restricted to petition; it includes thanksgiving, and therefore each section of the *Tephillah* concludes with a benediction expressive of gratitude that the prayer offered has been granted (cf. Mt 21 [22], 'And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall

receive'). Prayer also includes thanksgiving, though a special division of the liturgy is concerned with this.

(2) *Scripture reading* originated with the practice of reading short passages from the Pentateuch on the great festivals and on certain Sabbaths. The next step was, in all probability, the regular weekly Sabbath lesson (cf. Ac 15 [21]), the Pentateuch being divided into, roughly, one hundred and fifty sections and read through once in three years. The lesson from the Prophets, like that from the Pentateuch, originated at the worship during the great festivals; there is reason to believe that, in the first instance, it was used merely as a fitting conclusion to the pentateuchal lesson. The readings from Scripture were at first always short, sometimes consisting of only a few sentences. A sermon or exposition usually followed the lesson on Sabbaths. The Targums, or Aramaic paraphrases of Scripture, originated from these; for, as by degrees Hebrew ceased to be the language of the Palestinian Jews and Aramaic became the vernacular, the Scripture reading had to be paraphrased for the people. These ultimately became stereotyped; but it did not necessarily follow that the paraphrase was always read; a sermon or exhortation would often take its place (cf. Ac 13 [15] ff., 15 [21]).

(3) The *Praise* portion of the service consisted of psalms and hymns, but we have no details of these for week-days and ordinary Sabbaths beyond the psalm for the day.

In addition to these main elements there were others, among them confession of sin, which, while important, did not occupy the same prominent position as those mentioned.

IV. Religious Parties—(i) *The Pharisees.*—The meaning of this name as applied to a Jewish party is a matter of some uncertainty; opinions on the subject differ. Most scholars interpret it as meaning the 'separated' ones, i.e. from the common people; others hold that it means 'expounders,' i.e. of Holy Scripture. Each theory has its difficulties.

The first time the Pharisees are heard of as a distinct party is at the close of the Maccabæan wars, in the last quarter of the 2nd century B.C.; but their activity must have been exercised long before, for a party like this with fixed views and ideals would not have come into existence suddenly, but must have been forming by degrees. Indeed, there is evidence to show that the Pharisees were the spiritual descendants of the 'Chasidim' or 'saints,' mentioned in some of the later Psalms and elsewhere, who were active in upholding the Jewish religion during the Maccabæan struggle.

The distinctive features of the Pharisees were:

(1) Their insistence upon the observance of the Oral Law as well as the Written Law, both being regarded as equally binding.

(2) They were strong in their resistance to all foreign influences. The insidious fascination of the Hellenistic spirit and its disastrous results on the religion and manner of life of many Jews (cf. 1 Mac 1 [11-15]) thoroughly justified the Pharisees in this attitude. It was they who, during the last pre-Christian century, preserved the Jewish religion and nation, as a whole, from pagan contamination.

(3) In another direction, however, the Pharisees were not without willingness to be influenced by extra-Judaic ideas. In some of their religious beliefs—the future life, angels, demonology—they adapted traditional conceptions to teaching which came ultimately from the Persians on the one hand, while in other directions they were indebted to Greek thought. In this respect, therefore, they can be described as progressive.

(4) It must also, in justice to the Pharisees, be pointed out that in spite of whatever faults may have characterized them as a body, the bulk of them were men of deep piety; their genuinely religious spirit is well brought out in the Pharisaic *Psalms of Solomon*, belonging to the middle of the 1st century B.C.

The religious zeal of the Pharisees and their ardent championship of the faith of their fathers, when contrasted with the picture drawn of them in the Gospels, presents what at first sight appears a difficulty. This may, however, be explained in a quite simple way. During the reign of Herod the Great the two famous religious teachers, Hillel and Shammai, lived and founded two schools of thought with opposing views on the methods of observing the Law. The activity of the representatives of these two schools of thought lasted long after the death of the founders. Both Hillel and Shammai were Pharisees; and practically the whole of the Pharisaic party was divided into Hillelites and Shammaites. The former were the advocates of mildness and tolerance in the interpretation and carrying out of legal precepts; the Shammaites, on the other hand, were hard, rigid, and exacting. We may well believe, therefore, that the denunciations found in the

Gospels were uttered against the Shammaite Pharisees; while the friendly intercourse between our Lord and the Pharisees referred to in such passages as Lk 7 [36], 11 [37], 14 [1]; Jn 3 [1] ff., 19 [39], would point to His attitude towards Hillelite Pharisees.*

(ii) *The Sadducees.*—This name is derived from that of Zadok who was priest in Jerusalem during the reigns of David and Solomon, and ultimately became appointed in place of Abiathar (see 1 K 1 [8, 32] ff., 2 [26, 27, 35]).

Unlike the Pharisees, whose whole activity was centred on religious matters, the Sadducees were mainly concerned with politics. The High-priestly office was mostly (but not always as is sometimes erroneously stated) held by one of this party, which occupied the position of the aristocracy of the land. Unlike the Pharisees, too, they were not beloved by the populace. According to Josephus, it was only among the wealthy classes that they had any influence; and he adds that they 'have not the populace on their side' (*Ant.* XIII, x, 6; XVIII, i, 4). As the ruling body their position in the Sanhedrin was predominant (cf. Ac 4 [1], 5 [17], 23 [1] ff.), though the far greater power of the Pharisees among the populace often necessitated the Sadducees giving way to Pharisaic wishes in their public acts.

The antagonism between the Sadducees and the Pharisees centred mainly in their opposing views on religious matters. So far as the Law was concerned the Sadducees were conservative; they regarded the written Law (the Pentateuch) as authoritative, but refused to be bound by the oral Law; this in spite of the fact that they had oral laws of their own. Their disbelief in the resurrection was a result of their conservatism, for their views regarding the future life coincided with the Sheol conception of the Old Testament. Josephus tells us that they 'did not believe in the immortal duration of the soul, and the rewards and punishments in Hades,' but that 'the souls die with the bodies' (*B.J.*, II, viii, 14); this is probably an exaggeration, for from Mt 22 [23] f.; Ac 23 [8]; cf. 4 [1], we know that the Sadducees denied only the resurrection of the body. In all likelihood they believed in the immortality of the soul, but not in any doctrine of the resurrection.†

In Ac 23 [8] it is said that the Sadducees did not believe in angels or spirits. There is a difficulty here; for since the Sadducees held firmly to the written Law as contained in the Pentateuch where the existence of angels is taught (see Gen 16 [1] ff., 28 [1] ff.; Nu 20 [16], 22 [22] ff., and elsewhere), it is most improbable that they disbelieved what was written there. It is, therefore, possible that what is said in Ac 23 [8] on the subject is due to a mistaken inference derived from the Sadducæan disbelief in the resurrection, namely, that the *departed* did not become angels or spirits; this does not necessarily deny the existence of angelic beings who have never been in the flesh.

A curious fact about the Sadducees was that, in spite of their generally conservative attitude, they were friendly inclined towards Greek culture. This is perhaps to be explained by their political position, which brought them more in contact with Gentile influence than any other among Palestinian Jews.

(iii) *The Scribes and Lawyers.*—The Scribes were the exponents of the Law and of the Scriptures generally; they were thus much occupied with the study of these. But since it also fell to them to make copies of the Scriptures, they were responsible both for seeing that the Hebrew text of these was correctly copied, and for guarding it from corruption. The Scribes had, in addition to this, to take their part in administering the Law, so that the Scribe was also a Lawyer. In the Gospels the two terms are synonymous, and therefore never occur together. As administrators of the Law the Scribes were represented on the Sanhedrin. They belonged, in the main, to the Pharisaic party (see, e.g. Lk 11 [42-47]), though not exclusively; in Mk 2 [16]; Lk 5 [30]; Ac 23 [9], it is implied that there were Scribes of the Sadducees.

(iv) *The Apocalyptists.**—The Apocalyptist Movement belongs, approximately, to the two last centuries B.C. and the 1st century A.D. The Apocalyptists were men who believed themselves to be the recipients of divine revelations concerning the end of the world. They were in a true sense prophets to the people of their times, following herein, in some important particulars, the prophets of old. If not in the same sense as these the expression of the national conscience, the Apocalyptists spoke to the hearts of the people, both denouncing and encouraging as the ancient prophets did. Their main con-

* But cf. notes on Mt. 23, p. 186*b*.—ED.

† This seems to us an improbable interpretation of the position of the Sadducees. See Josephus, *B.J.*, II, viii, 14, and Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 21 ff. and 168.—ED.

* For another estimate of the genius and influence of the Apocalypses see Jackson and Lake's *Beginnings of Christianity*, i, 127, and Box in *The People and the Book*, 453.—ED.

cern was with the future, with the world to come, when the inequalities and incongruities of the present world would be rectified. In their accounts of the process whereby the present evil world-order was to be destroyed the supernatural colouring played a great part. The terrible occurrences which were to come about were, so they taught, divine secrets, which God had revealed to them, and which they apprehended by means of the divinely accorded faculty possessed by them of peering into the hidden things of God. They believed themselves to be commissioned instruments of God to reveal these secrets to their fellow-men. It was because the Apocalyptists believed so firmly in the power they claimed to possess of looking into the deep things of God that they made the further claim of being able to measure the significance of all that had happened in the past and of all that was happening in the present; and on the basis of this knowledge they were able to foresee the future, and therefore the time of the end of the world and how that end would come about.

But with all their mysticism and otherworldliness, with all their eager looking forward to the passing of the present world-order, the Apocalyptists were not blind to the claims of the religious life in its *practical* aspect. They were loyal to the Law, though not in the Pharisaic sense, laying stress rather on the spirit of its observance than on carrying it out according to the letter. On the other hand, in conformity with Pharisaic teaching and practice, they were ascetic in their habits. A further important fact about the Apocalyptists was their, generally speaking, universalistic attitude. Sometimes narrower, particularistic sentiments find expression in their writings; but this is exceptional; while not always consistent, normally they embrace the Gentiles equally with those of their own nation within the divine scheme of salvation; and the wicked, who are excluded from the happiness of the life to come, are not restricted to the Gentiles; the Jews equally with them are to suffer punishment if they have been unfaithful.

The influence which the teaching of the Apocalyptists had upon the common people, or 'the people of the land' (*'am ha-aretz*) as they were called, was very great; for they proclaimed the coming of a superhuman Messiah in whose Kingdom the poor and the outcast would share equally with the great ones of the land the joys which were in store for God's elect.

The Apocalyptists thus played a very important part in the preparation for the coming of Christ (see further, V, iii).

(v) *The Zealots.*—These formed a Jewish party, of a somewhat fanatical character, which arose through hatred of the Romans and their domination over the Jewish people of Palestine. The party came into existence soon after 63 B.C., when Pompey destroyed Jerusalem, and continued as such until the city was again destroyed in A.D. 70. Even then the activity of individual Zealots did not cease, for they were the instigators of the revolts under the emperors Trajan and Hadrian. However questionable their methods there can be no doubt that the movement initiated by the Zealots was the outcome of deep religious fervour.

There was at the beginning of the Christian era a conviction among the people—it was an outcome of the teaching of the Apocalyptists—that the advent of the Messiah and the setting-up of his Kingdom was to be expected in the near future (cf. Mt 3^{2}, 11^{3}; Mk 15^{43}; Lk 2^{26}, 23^{51}); the Zealots naturally shared the general expectation, and were prepared to enrol themselves under the banner of the coming Ruler who would bring to an end the hated Roman tyranny.

V. Religious Literature.—The literature of the Jews in pre-Christian times which has come down to us comprises three collections: (i) The Old Testament; (ii) the Apocrypha; (iii) the Pseudepigrapha, consisting mainly of the apocalyptic literature. We do not include the Targums because it is uncertain when these were first committed to writing; they were handed down for centuries by word of mouth before they assumed a written form. These three bodies of literature do not by any means exhaust the number of books that existed (cf. Ec 12^{12}, though it is possible that the writer is referring to heathen books); various works to which reference is made in extant literature have perished; in some cases fragments have been preserved.

The Apocalyptic Literature.—From our present point of view there are, above all, two outstanding facts which make this body of literature such an important element in the Jewish religious background of the New Testament and especially of the Gospels. The first is that this literature was a popular one, and was thus familiar to the people in general. It was popular in two senses of the word. In the first place, the apocalyptic writers drew much of their material from popular tradition; many of the ideas embodied in the books of this literature were derived from the

common stock of floating tradition current among the people. The men who reduced these various elements to writing, or utilized them for enforcing religious or moral lessons, thus absorbed what was, or had for long been, in the popular consciousness. It followed from this, in the second place, that this literature was popular in the sense that the people loved what it taught; not only did it tell them of many things with which they were familiar, always welcome to the masses as expressing their mind, but, as we have seen (IV, iv), it gave them courage to endure the ills they had to bear by inspiring them with hope for the future. If it be asked how the contents of this literature was imparted to those the great mass of whom could not read—and if they had been able to they would not have had the money to buy copies—the answer is to be seen in what we read in the Gospels, which tell us of the way in which our Lord made His teaching known to the people.

The second fact of special, and indeed greater, importance is that the books comprised in this literature contain all the eschatological details with which the Synoptic Gospels have made us familiar. Not only do the thoughts and ideas, such as the wars and tumults, the signs in the skies, the torments in Gehenna, etc., find expression, but in many instances there is verbal identity between the two on these subjects.

On the other hand, it is supremely important to emphasize the fact that there are many things uttered by our Lord regarding the coming of the Kingdom and the nature of the Kingdom which find no parallel in the Apocalyptic Literature.

These two facts are sufficient to show in what a striking way the teaching of this literature must have prepared the minds of the people for the teaching of Christ.

The period covered by the Apocalyptic Literature is approximately 200 B.C. to A.D. 100.

Selected Bibliography

The large number of subjects to which a reference was demanded in this survey has necessarily involved a very inadequate treatment of them individually. Therefore a selected list of works is added in which fuller information concerning the whole field of enquiry can be gained.

Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu* (4th ed., 1901). This magnificent work is indispensable for the serious study of the period; the 4th ed. is much fuller than the earlier ones. There is an English edition, which is valuable, though somewhat out of date as it was translated from an early German edition.

Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (3rd ed., 1926). This is also a very important book, and indispensable for the understanding of the New Testament. The 3rd ed. has been undertaken by Gressmann. There is unfortunately no English translation.

Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (2nd ed., 1911). Deals with Jewish religious belief and practice.

M. Friedländer, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu* (1905). A full and learned account of the religious thought-movements of Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism immediately prior to and during the time of our Lord. There is no English translation.

Schechter, *Studies in Judaism* (1st and 2nd series, 1896 and 1908). Each volume contains a number of essays on Jewish subjects, some of which deal with our period, others with mediæval and modern times. They are all attractive and informing.

Walker, *The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age* (1923). Deals mainly with doctrine; a very useful and reliable work.

Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth, His Life, Times, and Teaching* (1925). Written from a purely Jewish point of view. It offers a great deal that is of real importance; but there is inevitably much that is distasteful to Christians.

The following works deal with special aspects of our general subject, indicated in their titles:

Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature* (1912); Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought* (1900); M. Friedländer, *Synagoge und Kirche in ihren Anfängen* (1908); Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (1925); Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (1st and 2nd series, 1917, 1924); Lightley, *Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Christ* (1925); Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha, their Origin, Teaching, and Contents* (3rd ed., 1924); Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba* (1903); Porter, *The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers* (1908); *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. by Charles and others (1913); G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (1927).

THE GENTILE BACKGROUND OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

By W. K. Lowther Clarke

This article attempts to sketch briefly the social, economic, intellectual, ethical, and religious background of the NT, so far as the Gentile world is concerned. The Gentile-political and Jewish backgrounds are treated elsewhere. The subject is of fundamental importance. Even stubbornly Jewish Palestine had been modified in many ways by Greek influence, and its social and economic life was largely Gentile; cf. Mt 4[15] 'Galilee of the Gentiles' and the mention of the Gentile Decapolis in 4[25] as the home of men who came to hear Jesus. The Jews of the Dispersion were naturally still more affected by Hellenism. The NT is written in Greek; language and thought being mutually dependent, to this extent all we know of the Gospel has been subjected to Gentile influences. But clearly the Acts and Epp. are the parts of the NT on which most light is shed by a study of the Gentile environment. For our purposes the cities of Asia Minor, and to a lesser extent Greece, in which St. Paul laboured are the most important. They were the centre of gravity of early Christianity. Strictly Roman civilization is less important, as is shown by the fact that the early Church of Rome was Greek-speaking.

Considerable stress must be laid on social and economic conditions. Harnack in his earlier books spoke of the 'acute secularization' of Christianity in the 2nd and following centuries. About 1900 this was a widely held opinion. The 1st century Church was thought to have been comparatively pure from alien elements. Later study finds no such divergence between the 1st and following centuries. The Gentile environment, and especially the social factors in it, are now thought to have influenced the Church from the outset. Each generation has its preoccupations, and we must beware of over-emphasizing the social and economic problems now so prominent; but they remain supremely important.

To believers a study of the Gentile background is inevitably a commentary on Paul's phrase, that God sent His Son in 'the fulness of the time' (Gal 4[4]). We see divine overruling in the peace which followed Augustus' victory at Actium in 31 B.C., the unifying of civilization, the wide extension of the Greek language, the revival of trade, the ease and safety of communications. In many ways it is a modern world revealed to our gaze, in which human motives and actions are more intelligible than those of the Middle Ages. But it is easy to exaggerate resemblances. The real England of the 18th century is to be found in the crowds that listened to John Wesley rather than in the literary world of Dr. Johnson. Similarly the characteristic background of the early Church is the mass of simple folk of whose lives precious glimpses appear in the Egyptian papyri rather than the modern-minded Society seen in Cicero's letters.

The Christian, delighting in the evidences of God's providence shown in the preparation of the world for Christ, may unwittingly ease the task of the secularist, who uses the same facts in support of his thesis that the evolutionary process, culminating in the 1st century mingling of Hebraism and Hellenism, is a sufficient explanation of the growth of Christianity. Further study removes the temptation to emphasize the environment unduly, and shows that the 1st century, for all its brilliance, contained the seeds of decay and death, and that the Gospel introduced a new principle of life through personality —God incarnate manifested in the lives of His members.

I. Social and Economic Conditions.—Alexander's conquests broke up the old fabric of the Eastern monarchies and spread Greek speech and institutions throughout their lands. After three and a half centuries the forces set in motion by Alexander still dominated the Eastern Mediterranean, though Hellenism appeared in its later 'Hellenistic' phase—less intense, but more flexible and with greater powers of assimilating and attracting other cultures and races. The Romanization of the East was never more than superficial, if by Roman we mean Italian rather than imperial. In the 1st century A.D. Greek and Syrian merchants began to supplant the Roman business men of the previous century. It was a time of peace, security and relative prosperity, and commerce within the Empire, and even with lands outside it, flourished.

The world to which St. Paul went was organized by cities. The original Greek *polis*, as its name implies to us, was a school of *politics*, of citizenship. The life of the free population was richly variegated, each member playing a part in the community's affairs. The city, with its surrounding territory, was a sovereign state. In the 1st century the city, though retaining many privileges, was merged in a larger territorial unit. But economically, if not politically, it was as strong as ever, and in central Asia Minor, for instance, the new Greek and Roman cities had supplanted the older centres belonging to a temple or under a kind of feudal lord. Further east, the town was devouring the country. So we find St. Paul hurrying from one city to another and adopting the Greek view of their importance; the territories of Galatia and Phrygia, with their primitive organization, being passed through quickly (Ac 16 [6]). The remains of these Hellenistic cities, after centuries of misrule, show us that dignified buildings were set in beautiful surroundings, and that life must have been inspiring to those of noble mind.

It is important to understand the social divisions of the urban population.

(1) The upper class was *an aristocracy of money and office* rather than of birth. In the case of a new city the privileged colonists introduced by the founder were the original ruling class. Their descendants and others who had risen later were the official class, whose representatives were responsible to the government of the province. In the older cities the same conditions were found to a large extent, in that the official class had superseded the general body of the citizens, whose powers were circumscribed. Paid administration to a large extent took the place of the old voluntary services rendered by the citizens in turn. The great fortunes of the period had been formed by deliberate exploitation of the opportunities afforded by world-rule on the part of influential Romans during the previous century.

(2) *The big merchants and bankers* had been mainly Romans in the 1st century B.C., but by this time Greeks and Syrians predominated in the East. This well-to-do class conducted export and import business and all the operations of a commerce wide-spread, if primitive according to modern standards.

(3) *The bourgeoisie, or small middle-class men*, formed the most significant section. They worked hard with their families, and perhaps a few slaves, at weaving, dyeing, pottery, or other trades, or they kept shops. They formed the backbone of the early Church; they worked the hardest, had the largest families (so it would seem), were continually recruited from the best of the slaves, and in the end emerged on top by sheer force of being the healthiest element in the community. Of this class were composed for the most part the free associations of workmen (*collegia*), an example of which is seen in Ac 19 [24]. 'St Paul's rules that, if a man will not work, he is not to eat (2 Th 3 [10]), and that each is to abide in his calling (1 Cor 7 [20]), presuppose this class, not the starving proletariat.

(4) *The free proletariat*, disdained by the upper classes as being merely *proles* —fit for nothing but *breeding*, were proud of their freedom but depressed economically by the competition of slaves. The right to maintenance (*panem et circenses*) appealed to them rather than the right to work. They were consumers rather than producers, the 'poor whites' of those times.

(5) The very numerous class of *slaves* are thought to have amounted to perhaps half the population. Their immense numbers were caused by the wars and proscriptions of the previous century. Slavery in Eastern Mediterranean lands was a comparatively mild institution; Mommsen's description of its cruelty applies in the main to the West. Instead of the big estates worked by gangs of slaves common in the West, domestic slavery was the rule. A large house was, as far as possible, self-contained. Its inmates produced for consumption, not for sale. Slaves, who were often as well educated as their masters, worked better, so it was found, if they were given a motive. So they were paid a small wage (*peculium*). Legally it belonged to the master, but in practice the slave was often enabled by its means to purchase his freedom. The freedman, trained by a long course of abstinence and hard work, frequently rose to high positions in the State, and in any case gravitated to the *bourgeoisie* rather than to the proletariat. These facts may help to explain why St. Paul did not denounce slavery. The worst features of Roman slavery did not appear in the East, and the outlook of the town slave was by no means hopeless. The Epistle to Philemon and 'the household of Chloe' mentioned in 1 Cor 1 [11] remind us of the slaves in the early Church.

Outside the city walls were the *pagani*,

or country-dwellers,* often cultivators of state or city lands which had formerly belonged to a royal domain. They had a fair amount of freedom, but the tendency was to attach them to the soil for the purposes of taxation; cf. Lk 2 [3].

Palestine fell into line with the surrounding lands socially and economically. The town was the centre, and the country folk (*'Am Ha-aretz*, 'people of the land') were subordinated to it. The priesthood was a town organization, and the Pharisees were largely bourgeois and engaged in trade. Palestine, as a meeting-place of East and West, was a great centre for the exchange of merchandise. The early Jewish Christians were homogeneous socially with the Gentile converts. Perhaps ostracism from their old associates caused them to seek openings out of Palestine and helped to diffuse the Gospel; cf. Ac 11 [19]. It is worth noting that when in A.D. 66 the Christians left Jerusalem for Pella, Jewish Christianity became a definitely country movement and therefore, in contemporary conditions, unimportant.

In studying the economic background of the NT it is important to lay aside modern preconceptions. 'The social problem' as we know it did not exist. It arises only when differences in rank and wealth are felt to be wrong, and all classes accepted them in that age as natural and divinely ordered. Before the Roman peace was imposed, revolutions were frequent in Greek cities, but their purpose was the more equitable distribution of land, etc., among the privileged class of citizens. The so-called materialistic interpretation of history is mistaken. Christianity was in no sense an economic movement of the oppressed classes, called forth by the miseries of the time, as Marxian writers represent it to be. Like every movement it had its economic side, but its motives were other-worldly. And the 1st century was a time of comparative prosperity, universal peace encouraging production and commerce, between the economic misfortunes of the 3rd centuries B.C. and A.D.

As we have already said, the brilliant culture of the early imperial period bore within it the seeds of decay. Ancient 'capitalism' did not, like its modern successor, increase wealth; it was merely a means of concentrating existing wealth into a few hands. The ancient Greek world, which had trembled on the verge of scientific discoveries which might have antedated modern industrial development, turned its energies into other channels. The falling off in science, the impoverishment of the soil, the growing burden of the cost of government, the falling birthrate, and 'the failure of nerve,' combined to produce deterioration. The Christians came to the front by their superior vigour as much as by conversions.

A feature of social life which deserves mention is the formation of *collegia*, or associations of workmen and others. These were not 'unions' in the modern sense, nor were they Friendly Societies. Rather they were primarily social organizations. Some were restricted to a particular profession; most were social clubs or religious bodies. These *collegia* had been suppressed, but in the imperial period were licensed again by the authorities under certain conditions. The provision of funeral rites was a usual object of these bodies. Within the society distinctions of rank, even of free men and slaves, disappeared. Such societies provided a substitute for the vigorous life of the small city which had once called for the best energies of the Greeks. A member 'would feel for an hour, as he took his place in the little circle, that he was a human being, in whom a few fellow-creatures had some interest.' No doubt the rapid growth of the Church owed much to this tendency to form societies in which the individual, now a nonentity in political life, could realize himself. But the *collegia* were local in their scope, the Church was Empire-wide.

The position of *women* had changed greatly since their days of seclusion in ancient Athens. Great ladies took a leading part in the affairs of Rome, but in the provinces too they were to a large extent emancipated. The women of the NT, e.g. Chloe and Priscilla (mentioned in Ac 18 [18] before her husband), reflect the altered position of their sex. The children of the family were the object of devoted parental love in many a household, as the papyri testify, but the Gentiles as a whole were 'without natural affection' (Rom 1 [31]), judged by Jewish standards. The father's message to his wife in a papyrus of the 1st century B.C. —'if you bear offspring, if it is a male, let it live; if it is a female, expose it'— contrasts vividly with our Lord's love of children (Mk 9 [36]). Children were few in

* But it would appear that it was the secondary meaning of *paganus*—as = a civilian, as opposed to a soldier—which gave rise to the later use of 'pagan' to mean a non-Christian. The 'pagan' was one who had never 'enlisted in the service,' i.e. of Christ.—C. G.

number in the upper classes, and suffered from being brought up by slaves.

There was much natural goodness and affection on which Christianity could build. Having said this, we must beware of reacting too far from the old indiscriminate condemnation of pagan life based on the exaggerations of satirists. The plays of Plautus are valuable testimony to the standards of family life prevailing in the Hellenistic age (to which the originals of his plays belonged) which seemed natural to Roman audiences. Comparing them with the picture of Jewish life drawn in Tobit, we understand how impossible it was for a 'Holy Family' to appear elsewhere than among the Chosen People.

Education was surprisingly efficient within defined limits. In ancient Athens the course was writing, reading, music and gymnastic. Higher education was called 'sophistic'; though severely criticized by Socrates, it prepared the way for the triumphs of Greek science in Aristotle. Under Roman rule scientific knowledge was popularized, but spread out very thinly. The practical needs of the conquering race determined the course of learning, and culture deteriorated during the wars. The Greek race in the 1st century B.C. produced no writers to compare with Cicero, Virgil and Horace. The characteristic study of the age was rhetoric—the art of words. In the West education was a private concern until the imperial period. Hellenistic municipalities, however, made it their care. Inscriptions reveal a busy educational life with a modern aspect—girls' schools, examinations, prizes, librarians, state control. Physical training was dear to the Greeks and provided St. Paul with some of his metaphors. The Romans preferred hot baths and massage. The general level of education in a lower middle-class Hellenistic congregation may be inferred from the Pauline Epistles. No doubt there were 'things hard to be understood,' but these letters were meant to be read publicly and presuppose a high level of general intelligence and a keen interest in things of the mind and spirit.

The fact that the readers of the NT all spoke Greek, and that many were bilingual, speaking Aramaic or Latin as well, explains much. Greek was a marvellous instrument of human thought and was never more adapted to universal use than at this period, when local peculiarities and classical subtleties had broken down. And the mental stimulus of translating thought from one language into another, especially from a Semitic to a European language in the case of Hellenistic Jews, must have been considerable. The inscription on the Cross in three languages (Jn 19 [20]) symbolizes the cosmopolitan culture of the age. In Ac 14 [11] we have a reference to a surviving vernacular language, but for the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles in the first age one language, Greek, sufficed.

II. **Philosophy.**—The English reader is introduced to the great philosophical systems of the ancient world by St. Paul's speech to the Stoics and Epicureans at Athens (Ac 17 [18]). He feels instinctively that this is a different kind of language from what he finds elsewhere in the NT. Some acquaintance with the main ideas of Greek philosophy is necessary if we are to understand the world into which Christ came, and indeed the world of our own day. Philosophy, which in Plato and Aristotle had been aristocratic, in their successors was popular and democratic. The most influential system was that of *The Stoics*. Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, who taught in the *stoa*, or 'porch,' at Athens, was of Eastern origin, like many of his followers. The Stoics believed in a controlling fate, or Reason, pervading all nature. The soul was divine, a part of God, imprisoned in the body. Man, thanks to his soul, could rise above adverse circumstances. The good or Wise Man lived in harmony with nature, that is with God. Virtue was its own reward. Some of the moral utterances of Stoic teachers, such as Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius and Seneca, have never been surpassed. But Stoicism remained a philosophy rather than a religion. 'God' tended to be a force not a person, as always when He is thought of as immanent in the world at the expense of His transcendence above the world. The Stoics said 'we are his offspring' (Ac 17 [28]), meaning that we are a part of the universal Mind, not that we are children of a loving Father. Relentless fate worked itself out in age-long cycles. The idea of a personal God revealing Himself to man was excluded. Stoicism is the noblest creed devised by man without the aid of special revelation. It appealed greatly to the best Romans. The masses were never attracted by it, preferring irrational faiths. Stoicism is still a power in the world, and many Westerners, in the absence of a living Christianity, revert to this old philosophy. Many of St. Paul's phrases recall Stoic teaching—as a skilled teacher he naturally used language familiar to his Gentile

hearers; thus in Phil 4 [11]: 'I have learned in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content' would have been recognized as Stoic language. But the springs of his action were far different.

The Epicureans have left their mark in the modern sense of the word *epicure*. Crudely stated, their doctrine was the pursuit of happiness. But this can be easily misunderstood so as to do them an injustice. The best Epicureans pursued the even tenor of their way, seeking happiness in a life undisturbed by excesses of any kind. Sensuality was inconsistent with true happiness. The gods, if they existed, lived a blissful life untroubled by human woes, and men should follow their example. 'Religion' (in the old pagan sense) was an evil, because it was a disturbing factor. Epicureanism was valuable as a protest against fatalism; man *could* control his life. It delivered many from base superstitions, and in its best forms, such as we see it in Lucretius, excites our reluctant admiration. But it was atheistic in tendency and peculiarly liable to be abused by mean-souled men.

Other philosophical systems were *Scepticism*, which, at least to begin with, said that knowledge and conviction were impossible; *Eclecticism*, which combined the features of various schools and acknowledged no man as its master; and *Neoplatonism*. This last reached its crown in Plotinus, whose very noble system is outside our period, though its beginnings were apparent in the 1st century. As its name implies, it was a development of Plato's philosophy, though it owed much to Oriental mysticism. God is the one true reality. He (though He is not personal in any real sense) is all. Salvation is absorption in the infinite. Man is nothing because God is everything.

It is difficult to know whether to treat the *Cynics* here or under the head of religion. Tracing their spiritual ancestry to Diogenes, the famous philosopher of Athens who lived in a tub and told Alexander to get out of his light, they made philosophy democratic. They went out into the streets and fields with a popular version of philosophy and ethics, urging that men should practise virtue, prepare for death, and die without fear. Man could save himself if he would. The Cynics taught simplicity of life by example as well as by precept and in some respects resembled the mendicant friars of later times. But pre-eminently they were *preachers*. They adopted a light, conversational tone known as the *diatribē*, which from its use in denunciations has acquired its modern meaning. When the conversation became a connected discourse the words 'dialogue,' 'homily,' which originally meant conversation, acquired an extended meaning. The literary form of the Pauline Epistles resembles in places that of the Cynic *diatribē*. These wandering preachers prepared the way for Christian missionaries. The moral yearnings of the populace were awakened, the habit of listening to exhortations was formed, and the conditions came into being in which the Gospel could find a hearing.

Another philosophical type appears in the *Hermetic Literature*. This has been famous for centuries as the revelations of 'Hermes Trismegistus,' at one time thought to be a secret tradition of immemorial antiquity, and still greatly valued by Theosophists. The standard English edition clears away the mists. The actual writings are not earlier than the 2nd century A.D., and their substance may go back to the 1st century B.C.—not earlier. The teaching is largely Platonic, with Stoic ingredients. The spirit which inspires it is Egyptian religious fervour. Hermes is the Greek equivalent of Thoth, the messenger of the gods in ancient Egypt. Trismegistos renders the Egyptian phrase 'great-great,' a superlative. The adherents of this system, which seems never to have been an organized religion or school, were evidently lofty souls, aiming at union with God by means of asceticism and purity of life. The Divine *nous* within a man saved him. But no true Incarnation upon earth was ever taught. Some Jewish phrases are found in these writings, but no borrowings from Christianity. It has been asked whether Christianity borrowed from them. Rather 'it took over the men themselves. . . . In the Hermetica we get a glimpse into one of the many workshops in which Christianity was fashioned.' Many of these pure-hearted seekers after God must have found in the Gospel their heart's desire.

Prior to these systems and underlying some of them was the greatest of all, *Platonism*, the leading principle of which is that true reality is found not in the objects of sense, but in the 'idea' which lies behind each class and is the heavenly reality of which they are but unsubstantial shadows. In the 2nd century A.D. Plutarch, Maximus of Tyre and Numenius are the outstanding Platonists. Hellenistic-Jewish thought at Alexandria was much influenced by Platonism, and

in Hebrews the philosophy has entered the NT. The writer held that Moses had beheld the heavenly realities on Mount Sinai and had modelled the tabernacle and its furniture on what he saw (8 [5]). In 9 [23] the unlearned Bible reader is brought into touch with the Platonic philosophy. This seems a natural, if not inevitable, explanation of the language of Hebrews. The early Fathers were to a large extent Platonists in their philosophy.

III. **Morality.**—It is very difficult to pass a just verdict on the morality of the Gentile world in which St. Paul worked. The bad side is obvious. The apostle sums it up truthfully in Rom 1 [21] ff. We may note especially these features:

(1) The Romans, whose example naturally dominated the world, were an exceedingly powerful and purposeful race. When immense wealth and world-dominion became their portion, their character degenerated, and gluttony, gross sexual indulgence and cruelty stained their record. Nero is the typical example of the depths of degradation into which human nature can fall, when given unlimited control of other men's lives.

(2) In the Greek half of the Empire women, though their position had improved, were still little esteemed. High-minded Greeks formed irregular unions as a matter of course.

(3) The stage was very corrupt, and the amphitheatre, in which men fought to amuse a callous mob, was a disgrace to the age which tolerated it.

(4) The vast extension of slavery brought with it the characteristic vices of hypocrisy and lying on the part of the slaves, and of cruelty and idleness on the part of the masters.

(5) A dark cloud rested over Greek, and to some extent Roman, civilization in the shape of unnatural vice.

On the other side we must remember that one-sided conclusions have been drawn from great authors, and especially satirists, who described the life of the capital, and in some cases blackened the imperial regime for political purposes. How about the ordinary citizen in a provincial town of the East? Here we have the evidence of the inscriptions and papyri. The former are official, but at least show that homage was paid to ideals of virtue. The latter reflect much natural family affection and many upright lives besides the hardness to which we have already referred.

We recall the indefatigable preaching of the moralists and philosophers, described above. Their popularity proves a yearning for better things on the part of the masses. Materialism had produced a reaction, and the face of the age was set towards a higher conception of life and duty. The strongest influence came from Stoicism, with its teaching of the unity of mankind. The hardships of slavery were being ameliorated, and less emphasis was being laid on distinctions of race and class. The lists of virtues required in Church officials by the Pastoral Epistles bear a curious resemblance to those found in pagan moralists. A virtuous pagan joining the Church would have been conscious of a new spirit, of life from the dead, but not of much change in the practical ethical demands made upon him.

On the whole, it seems best to lay stress upon the brighter side and to see in the Gospel the God-given response to cravings after righteousness which were more deeply implanted and more widely diffused than had been the case a century earlier.

In judging the men of this epoch we must make allowances for the shock they had received in the uprooting of old landmarks. The ancient *polis*, with its insistent demands on the energies and interests of its citizens, left little scope for the development of moral personality. The years following Alexander's campaigns introduced a regime of monarchy and cosmopolitanism, in which the individual could live his own life. Morality, which had been largely identical with the *custom* of the city (in Latin *mos* = 'custom,' *mores*, the plural of *mos*, = 'morals'), now became a matter of free choice. The change which took place can be illustrated from a comparison of Thucydides, with his objective description of events, and Plutarch, with his biographical method and analysis of character. The naïveté of antique man has passed. Periods of rapid transition such as this have generally been accompanied by a relaxation of morals; the old sanctions have largely disappeared and new ones have not yet taken the place of the old.

IV. **Religion.**—In discussing the Gentile background we must separate morals and religion in a manner surprising to the modern reader. It did not occur to antique man that a priest who performed the accustomed rites of the city tutelary god ought to lead a chaste and virtuous life in a sense inapplicable to a layman. Religion was an act of homage to unseen and feared powers, the outward and ceremonial expression of the community spirit: the movement towards moral im-

provement arose among the philosophers. But religion, if one-sided in its scope, was a strong force in the 1st century; the missionaries of the Gospel did not sow their seed on a rock.

We may classify the religious influences of the Empire in a fourfold manner, though the divisions were not clear-cut and there was much overlapping.

(1) *The old pagan cults* were the target for attacks—thus the Apologists in attacking polytheism took over many arguments from the Gentile philosophers and preachers—but they were to remain strongly entrenched for many centuries yet. In the East there was a revival of interest in the Olympian divinities, and in the West the immense trouble taken by Augustine in *The City of God* to refute popular Roman beliefs shows how tenaciously they were held. The graceful Hellenic mythology, which the Romans appropriated, was an integral part of literature and art; traditional pieties were entwined around the operations of agriculture; and the mysteries of birth, marriage and death were supported by the full force of inherited custom. Augustus in refounding the Roman State reaffirmed the old religion, and the burst of gratitude that hailed his achievement strengthened its hold. Well-known passages of Virgil and Horace show the religious feelings aroused alike in the noblest of Roman writers and in a worldling of genius. This revived religion was Hellenistic rather than Roman, and the process of identifying Roman with Greek gods was carried out to the full.

In the NT 1 Cor 8 and 10 vividly illustrate the strength of idolatry. In 1 Jn 5 [21] the command 'Little children, guard yourselves from idols' meant in practice 'renounce the world,' for polytheism pervaded every department of life. Even medicine was to a large extent a department of religion. A popular form of cure was 'incubation,' or sleeping in the temples of Asclepios, the god of healing. Probably the priests preserved medical secrets from the palmy days of Greek science, but they seem to have relied mainly on regime and suggestion; the votive inscriptions of grateful patients ascribe the cure with surprising unanimity to a visit of the god during a dream.

(2) *Emperor-Worship.*—The modern reader wavers between a feeling of repulsion at the deification of a man and a suspicion that after all the imperial cult was only a symbol of the sovereign State and need not have been taken so seriously by the Christians. The practice began in the East as a result of Alexander's conquests. Greek ideas had gone a good part of the way towards deification. A man's better self was known as his *daimon*, a spirit resident within him. Founders of cities were revered as 'heroes,' beings second only to the gods, who had been received at death into the divine Society. Aristotle erected an altar to Plato. Philip of Macedon was revered in his life-time by some Greeks as a divine being. We must remember that literal translations are often misleading. If *Theos* means 'God,' it could also be used in an adjectival sense of a being with god-like qualities. Perhaps its original application was to the powerful chief of the tribe, regarded as possessing *mana*. When the Greeks went East in the wake of Alexander they encountered another set of ideas. In Egypt especially, but also in Babylonia and Persia (and, it would seem, among the Hittites), the King was identified with the national god, himself a personification of the Community. Alexander as the political successor of the Pharaohs inherited their status. The continuance of the state-cults ensured the transference of the conception to future Greek rulers. The Greeks, as we have seen, had reached nearly the same position by a different avenue of approach. Alexander was reverenced as a god, not a hero, and in his lifetime. In the following centuries Greeks and Orientals united in paying divine honours to the Hellenistic monarchs. When they hailed their ruler as 'Saviour' it was not a mere servile gesture. The thought of the day tended to obliterate the distinction between human and divine. Divinity was believed to be immanent in man, and man by mystic intuition (*gnosis*, in its later sense) could pass the barriers which separated the divine from the human. And behind the divine honours paid to rulers was the natural gratitude felt towards the strong man who could give peace and security.

But to the Jews with their rigid monotheism such ideas were abhorrent. The fanaticism of the Maccabæan Jews, their obstinate struggle against civilization, saved the world from the universal acceptance of a false belief. The book of Daniel witnesses to the intensity of the struggle. In the Gospels an ironical reference to the honorific titles of Gentile monarchs (Lk 22 [25]) is the only direct allusion to the irreconcilable conflict, the renewal of which is, however, the background of the Apocalypse.

Emperor-worship at Rome was largely of political origin. Some symbol was needed to unify the scattered dominions of Rome. Octavian was known as *divi filius* as early as 40 B.C., and the assumption of the title Augustus in 27 (=Gk. *sebastos*, 'worshipful') marked a further stage of advance. Probably he and his legionaries became familiar with Oriental ideas when they were in Egypt. The peace which followed the battle of Actium called forth a great outburst of gratitude and enthusiasm. The cities of Asia Minor spontaneously erected temples to the Emperor. In Rome the new ideas were prepared for by the veneration paid to ancestors, the *manes*, and by the conception of *genius*. The *genius* of a family was its permanent living principle appearing in its various members. Augustus desired his *genius*, the divine incarnate in him, rather than himself, to be worshipped. Sturdy old Vespasian jested on his deathbed and said, 'I think I'm turning into a god.'

But to the Christians, who inherited the antipathies of the Jews, the matter was deadly serious. They could not swear by the *genius* of the Emperor, and died by thousands rather than be false to their convictions. Until we reach the Apocalypse little trace appears on the surface of the NT of this conflict between Church and State. Our Lord's words 'render unto Cæsar,' etc. are worked out in Rom 13 into a practical code of allegiance to the civil power. Closer study shows how vital the matter was from the first. A number of terms applied to Christ in the NT seem, from inscriptions and papyri, to have been the very words used of the Emperor; for example, 'coming' (*parousia*), 'appearing' (*epiphaneia*), 'King of kings.' It is not a mere coincidence that Domitian is called (in Suetonius) 'our lord and god,' and that Thomas' confession runs 'my Lord and my God.'

We may best understand emperor-worship by regarding it as the continuation on a vast scale of the old city-cults; that is, it reflected community feeling, not the religious sentiment of the individual. On quite different lines was the raising to divine honours of an individual teacher by his disciples. Apollonius of Tyana, a contemporary of Jesus, and Alexander of Abonoteichus are the best-known examples of this tendency. Rationalistic writers have compared them with Jesus, but there is a tremendous difference between the ascription of divinity to a man by pagans who had no clear idea of the distinction between God and man, and the position given to Jesus by Jews ever jealous of the monotheistic faith. Besides, the cults of Apollonius and Alexander seem to have been deliberately fostered as a counterblast to Christianity.

(3) *Astrology* had an extraordinary vogue in the Mediterranean world during our period. Its hold on the popular imagination may be gauged by the fact that even now it lingers on in obscure quarters. The idea of fate or necessity as an inexorable impersonal force was encouraged among the Greeks by the irresistible progress of Alexander. Among the educated the decay of belief in the old gods paved the way for determinism, to which Stoicism succumbed, though the Epicureans resisted. But the main cause of fatalism was the coming of astrology like a flood from Babylonia. In the clear Eastern sky men had observed the heavenly bodies intently and concluded that their majestic evolutions must somehow be connected with human destiny; the seven planets (sun, moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn) had been picked out as presiding over men's lives, When our language describes people as martial, jovial, or saturnine it bears witness to the tenacity of such beliefs.

The planets were thought to preside over periods of time, plants, metals, etc. For centuries human inquiry was diverted from science to pseudo-science. In the 3rd century B.C. Aristarchus of Samos maintained that the earth went round the sun and guessed with fair success the distance of the moon, which he said was as large as the Peloponnese. Such scientific insight disappeared as systematic Greek thought went back under the influence of the East. The connexion of earthly objects with the planets being arbitrary, not rational, the door was opened to magical practices of all kinds. In the early imperial period the planetary week was adopted 'because (says a recent writer) the plain man believed vaguely but profoundly in the power of the planets. He rose on Friday and Saturday with the belief that those days were somehow under the influence, the one of the beneficent, the other of the maleficent, star. . . . He was confirmed in his view by the belief that . . . the Jews appeared to attach immense importance to abstinence from activity on Saturn's day' (F. H. Colson).

The same writer points out that a *weekly* Commemoration of the Resurrection is a strange fact which requires

explanation. 'We owe our religious and civil Sunday to the combination of these two factors, the immemorial familiarity of the Jewish Christian with the sabbatical week and the recent familiarity of the Gentile Christian with the planetary week.'

The Christians could not remain unaffected by these popular beliefs, and there are hints in the NT of an astrological background. St. Paul's teaching about heavenly powers brought to nought by Christ would certainly have suggested astrological ideas to some readers, as would isolated phrases elsewhere in the NT. In Apoc 12 some commentators see a reference to the constellation Virgo. Otherwise to a surprising extent, considering that the Gentile Christians were drawn from the class most prone to popular superstitions, our documents are not interested in these paralyzing beliefs.

Magic is naturally associated with astrology. It is, viewed in relation to astrology, the means by which the maleficent effects of the stars may be averted; those who knew their supposed laws were tempted to practise magic. So the name of the Magi, the Chaldean school of stargazers, was used for magicians. Simon Magus was the typical sorcerer opposing the spread of the Gospel; and the Visit of the Wise Men, or Magi, from the East would have been taken by the first readers of St. Matthew to represent the overthrow of astrology by Christ; see also Ac 16[16], 19[19].

(4) *The Mystery Religions.* — Much study has been given of late to the Oriental cults which are called by this name. It is convenient to term them Oriental, but the tendencies which appeared in them in a fully developed form were present already in Greek, and to a small extent in Roman, religion. Thus the Eleusinian mysteries were celebrated in Attica during the classical period, the mystic Dionysos-cult was widespread, and Orphic and Pythagorean brotherhoods flourished. The word *mystes* means 'an initiate,' literally one whose eyes are closed; *mysteria* are simply 'secrets.' Probably these early Greek mysteries were themselves the result of Eastern influence at an earlier period. If we ask the origin of Eastern mysteries in the lands from which they came to the West, a plausible explanation is that in times of wars and invasions isolated fragments of peoples continued to cherish their ancestral religions. They were tolerated by the dominant races; sometimes their rites became the fashion, because they alone knew the ways of the local gods. The chief later mysteries were those of the Great Mother (from Asia Minor), the Syrian goddess, Isis and Serapis from Egypt, and Mithras.

In the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius we possess a famous account of the ceremonies of initiation. A certain Lucius, in the story, invokes Isis, who appears to him, bidding him enroll himself as one of her initiates. He goes to the Temple where he undergoes the following rites. First he proceeds to the baths and is 'baptized.' Then he puts himself unto instruction, fasting the while, for ten days, after which, clad in a new linen robe, he is led into the inner sanctuary. His experiences are described in veiled terms. 'I drew nigh,' he says, 'to the confines of death and, having trodden the threshold of Proserpine, I was borne through all the elements and returned to earth again. I saw the sun gleaming with bright splendour at dead of night, I approached the gods above and the gods below, and worshipped them face to face. Behold I have told these things, of which, though thou hast heard them, thou must know naught.' Some sort of dramatic representation evidently took place, and illusions were employed. The lower world was represented, and a symbolical journey took place through the realms presided over by the planets. After blindfolding, so it seems, the bandage was removed and a bright light was suddenly revealed in the dark interior of the shrine. Exactly what happened is doubtful. Perhaps something akin to a spiritualist seance took place. The visions may have been psychological, induced by realistic pictures marking the stages of the symbolic journey, and by the effect of fasting on a willing soul. Next morning Lucius was clad in a mystic's robe and set on a daïs beside the image of the goddess, revealed to the worshippers as divine, owing to his union with the goddess. A three days' celebration of the initiate's new birth followed and Lucius returned to Rome, uttering a solemn thanksgiving.

Such experiences were very startling and impressive to those who were accustomed to arid State rites performed by magistrates. Behind them lay a nature myth, such as appears in many countries. In Mediterranean lands spring comes quickly; the vegetation revives suddenly after the winter rains, only to wilt beneath the hot glare of summer. There are two actors in the divine drama: the great Mother earth weeps for her beautiful son,

the youthful god of vegetation who dies yearly. Her tears (the winter rain) and love restore him to life again; (in Orpheus and Eurydice by a variation the parts are reversed). This is re-enacted as a sacred drama: women weep for Tammuz (Ezek 8 [14]), Adonis, Osiris, etc., and by sympathetic magic nature is constrained to do her part.

As time goes on many other elements are attached to the originally simple idea. The religion of an Eastern god, coming to Greece or Rome, is confined to a secret brotherhood. Adepts teach the brethren the mysteries, as an Eastern priest hands on the secrets of the Temple to his successors in office. The philosophic ideas of the time attach themselves to the mysteries, and the adept receives knowledge (*gnosis*) of God, the intuitive process by which the barriers of the divine are broken down and he is absorbed into the world-soul. The various cults borrowed from one another but were rivals. All were agreed that salvation came from knowledge of the one god, but each insisted that its god was the true manifestation of the unknown. Devotees, to be on the safe side, were initiated into two or more mysteries. Through all these developments the idea of union with a god who died and rose again persisted.

We cannot tell how far the mysteries had a moral influence, what precisely 'purification' meant for the initiate. Humble souls were no doubt impressed by their experiences and underwent genuine conversion. But such nocturnal and secret proceedings cannot have been free from abuses. Cases were not unknown of women conceiving children as a result of their experiences. Conjuring tricks deceived the simple. The Christian Fathers' horror of these proceedings must have been, at least in part, based upon knowledge of their objectionable features. But at their worst the mysteries must have had a strong emotional content, and have produced genuine brotherhood among the initiates. Instead of the far-off Olympians of Greece or the abstract divinities of Rome, a living, suffering, dying and rising god was presented to the worshippers.

A separate paragraph must be given to Mithraism, in some ways the most interesting of these cults. Mithras was a god of the Indians and Persians at a very early date. In the Zoroastrian System he became a celestial warrior on the side of the Good Principle, Ahura Mazda. Passing to Babylon he was identified with the sun. Mithraism never appealed to the Greeks; it was a Western and Northern-frontier cult practised mainly by soldiers. Worship was conducted in caves or underground chambers, in which small independent congregations met. Adherents passed through seven stages of initiation. Severe ethical demands were made on them. The most striking ceremony was the *taurobolium*, or baptism in bull's blood, which flowed from the slaughtered animal upon the worshipper in a kind of pit beneath. There was also a sacramental meal. The Fathers took Mithraism very seriously as a devilish parody of the Faith. Modern scholars also take it seriously, because thanks to surviving monuments it can be studied more fully than the other religions, but it is a mistake to suppose that it ever competed in earnest with Christianity for the allegiance of the Empire.

The similarity of some of the ideas sketched above to Christian beliefs is obvious, and the conclusion has been drawn that the core of Christian doctrine —Christ the Saviour-God suffering, dying, wept over by women, and rising again in the springtime—was inspired by the mysteries, as also that the sacramental system, with its new birth in Baptism and its sacred meal, was derived from Gentile sources. Some scholars have replied that the developed mysteries were later, and that the sacramental features were in a measure modelled on Christian originals. This may be true, but it is a dangerous line of defence, for it is always inadvisable to build upon gaps in our knowledge. Probably the mysteries, being symbolic in character, were fairly stable for centuries, but were interpreted differently.

There are two distinct questions:

(*a*) *Was the Christian conception of a dying Saviour-God who rose again in any way influenced by the saviour-gods of the mystery religions, in whose case the same process was asserted?* (*b*) *Did the mystery religions so modify the presentation of Christianity among the Gentiles that an originally non-sacramental religion insensibly became a sacramental one, based on the imparting of the divine nature through a new birth in Baptism and its maintenance by means of a holy meal?*

(*a*) Any influence of this kind is incredible. There is an enormous difference between the dying and rising again of a symbolical figure in a mystery-cult, understood to represent the processes of nature, and the death and resurrection of a person with whom those who first proclaimed the message had lived in familiar intercourse. We should have to imagine that

Jews like the Apostles, whose ancestors had hated heathenism and died by thousands in Maccabæan times to resist it, and who shared their prejudices to the full, unconsciously absorbed what they most detested. This is so improbable that it can be disregarded. The second question is more important.

(*b*) It has been widely held that the process thus described took place in the 2nd and following centuries. The view is beset with difficulties; no one can say at what point the change began. Scholars therefore are practically agreed now that the development had already begun in the Epistles of St. Paul, in which mystic sacramental doctrines appear. It is very hard to believe that St. Paul was an innovator in this respect, for how could he have escaped censure from his Jewish adversaries who denounced him so bitterly for making concessions as regards observance of the law? There is no sign of controversy on this point. Some scholars acknowledge the justice of this and ascribe the change to the first years of the Gentile Church at Antioch. But how unscientific to take refuge in a stage of which we know nothing! Whatever hypotheses we may frame, no evidence exists for this alleged new departure at Antioch. The logical step, which some are not afraid to take, is to say that the new ideas arose in Palestine, as soon as the implications of the Gospel were thought and lived out by Hellenistic Jews. But by this time we have reached some of the original hearers of our Lord and we begin to see what our answer should be.

The world was dreaming of Saviours —incarnations or avatars of the divine Soul, born maybe of a Virgin, or nature gods dying and rising again, through whose mysteries initiates could be freed from the bonds of matter—and in Jesus the dream came true. He was a Jew, but transcended the limits of Judaism. There were elements in His Gospel which the Gentile was more fitted to appropriate than the Jew. Whatever elements of truth there were in the satisfactions offered to religious cravings by the Oriental cults, these were found in the original figure of Jesus.

All that we have been seeking vainly in the NT—an amalgam of the mystery religions and the religion of Jesus—is found in the Gnostic sects of the 2nd century. A study of them, followed by a renewed reading of the NT, is the best refutation of the recent theories about Christianity and the mysteries. How far apart the two systems were can be gauged by St. Paul's occasional use in a Christian sense of phrases which were technical terms in the mysteries. They must have been familiar to his hearers and we can be certain that he would never have used them if he had not so clearly thought out his position towards the mysteries, and made it so clear to his Churches that the Gospel and they were poles apart, that misunderstanding was impossible.

Before concluding this brief sketch of an unlimited subject we may remark that Christianity was planted in the Gentile soil of the Empire. The stock was Jewish and the plant remained true to type. As it grew it took up many Gentile elements from the soil, but they did not affect its nature. Had the Church really conformed to Gentile patterns there would have been no persecutions. Paganism had no objection to welcoming Jesus into the Pantheon. But just because Christianity continued true to its Jewish origin, it was fanatically intolerant of rival creeds. For this reason the early Church is an unattractive spectacle to many modern men, for whom there is no absolute truth, no final religion; but because of this the Church survived the break-up of civilization whereas its mighty rivals have passed away from the memory of all but professional scholars.

Some Books

General: S. Angus, *The Environment of Early Christianity*; Sir S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*; W. R. Halliday, *The Pagan Background of Early Christianity*; Sir W. M. Ramsay, various works. **Economics**: K. Kautsky, *The Foundations of Christianity* (gives the orthodox Marxian view); W. W. Tarn, *The Hellenistic Age*. **Pagan Religion**: E. R. Bevan, *Hellenism and Christianity*; F. H. Colson, *The Week*; G. Murray, *Five Stages of Greek Religion*. **Mystery Religions**: S. Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*; A. S. Geden, *Mithraism*; L. Patterson, *Mithraism and Christianity*. **Philosophy**: E. R. Bevan, *Stoics and Sceptics*; W. Scott, *Hermetica*. **Fiction**: E. A. Abbott, *Silanus the Christian*; C. Kingsley, *Hypatia*; W. Pater, *Marius the Epicurean*; R. B. Tollington, *Pyrrho*. E. Bevan, *Later Greek Religion*, gives the chief passages from the ancient documents in English translations.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

By F. D. V. Narborough

The first three Gospels are called the Synoptic Gospels. If you put these Gospels side by side in parallel columns and take a *synopsis* of them (*synopsis* is a Greek word for looking at and comparing two or more things together), an interesting fact will emerge from your survey; you will find that whole paragraphs occur nearly word for word the same, in some cases in all three of them, in other cases in two of them. This parallelism between these Gospels is too close to be explained by the simple hypothesis that the three evangelists happened, in independence of each other, to choose some of the same sayings of our Lord and some of the same events in His life for inclusion in their work. It is, as will be seen, so close as to compel us to suppose that there is some *literary* connexion between their Gospels. In other words, we must suppose either that one evangelist copied another, or that they made use of the same source of information, whether an oral tradition or a written document. The exact nature of this literary connexion between the Synoptic Gospels constitutes the Synoptic Problem.

Such being its nature, the Problem is obviously not a theme of abstruse and purely academic interest, but a matter of importance to every Christian who has any inclination and capacity for thought. Upon the solution of this problem depend the answers to many vital questions. For example, the evidence of one of the first three Gospels occasionally conflicts with that of another; and we cannot decide which author is likely to be nearer to the actual historical facts until we have solved the Synoptic Problem, until we have exactly determined the nature of the copying which seems to have taken place among the first three evangelists.

Even the most elementary student of the Synoptic Gospels should possess a 'synopsis' in which the text is arranged in parallel columns. (A good synopsis of the text in English is that arranged by J. M. Thompson.) A glance, in such a synopsis, at such a passage as Mt 8^{3} f. = Mk 1^{42-44} = Lk 5^{13} f.; or Mt 9^{5} f. = Mk 2^{9-11} = Lk 5^{23} f. will provide examples of parallel passages which appear nearly word for word the same *in all three Gospels*. It is difficult for those who do not read Greek to appreciate the full extent of the parallelism. In many cases even the most minute and insignificant Greek particles are the same in all three. If these close parallelisms appeared only in reports of our Lord's words, the phenomenon might imply no more than that three writers, working quite independently of each other, all reported with perfect accuracy exactly what Jesus had said. But the parallels cited above, for instance, are not merely in reports of words of our Lord, but *in descriptions of events in His life*. If at the present day you induce two or three different persons to describe independently of each other the same event, you will get two or three very different stories. Each story may be true to the facts which it relates, but in each account the points selected for emphasis, the words and phrases used, and the whole manner of telling will be different from the others; and it would be perfectly easy to recount (e.g.) the story of the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum (the second instance cited above) in many different ways. An examiner who set school children to tell the story in their own words might elicit many answers which differed greatly from each other in wording, but which were all worthy of full marks for accuracy in regard to the important points. Such similarity as appears in the passages common to the first three Gospels implies either that the Holy Spirit overruled the normal workings of the mind of the writers or that some common tradition, oral or written, of the life of Christ lies behind them. The former hypothesis represents a theory of the nature of Inspiration which is less than Christian. God as revealed in Christ co-operates with man, but does not dominate and completely overrule him. Nor would such an hypothesis explain the divergences in detail which the Synoptic Gospels exhibit.

It is to the hypothesis of a common tradition that we must turn as an explanation of the parallelism. Such an hypothesis alone will explain, in the second of the two instances cited above, the extremely cumbrous wording which appears alike in Mt 9^{6}; Mk 2^{10} f., and Lk 5^{24}—'But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (He saith to the sick of the palsy) I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed.' Long familiarity with the sentence has dulled our senses

to its awkwardness, but a little reflection will convince the reader that it is not a sentence which would arise spontaneously and independently in the minds of the three evangelists. Further, the presence of such a strange mode of expression in all three evangelists tells slightly against a common *oral* tradition as an adequate explanation of the parallelisms. In all probability the evangelists wrote in very different centres of Christianity, in contact with the traditions of churches which were geographically widely apart from each other, and it would be difficult to believe that in each of three distinct oral traditions stood the same unnatural phrase. A supporter of the hypothesis of a common oral tradition might at this point suggest that all three traditions had sprung ultimately from a common ancestor in which the unnatural phrases stood, and might remind us of the proverbial tenacity of the Oriental memory. The Oriental memory is no doubt efficiently tenacious of all that it desires to retain, but the Oriental imagination and the Oriental capacity for embellishing a story are no less efficient. The stories of the patriarchs in Genesis were matters of oral tradition for centuries before they were committed to writing, and as such reach back into very primitive times, but in the primitive period they can hardly have possessed that perfection of narration which characterizes them in their present form. As we have them, they are the finished product of the art of generations of story-tellers, an art which the narrators would have no hesitation in exercising in such a religious cause as the description of God's dealings with the ancestors of His people. The stories in the Gospels were probably matters of oral tradition for some time before anyone committed them to writing. Of the actual words of Jesus and of the bare outline of the facts of His life the 'Oriental memory' of the earliest Christians would be tenacious as a matter of religious duty, but in the manner of describing the events they might regard an effective style of narration as being almost equally a religious duty. Moreover, even among Orientals an unnatural phrase would become modified in the course of oral tradition, without the transmitters being conscious of the alteration.

We are not, however, restricted to such *a priori* arguments in seeking an explanation for the parallelisms between the three Synoptic Gospels. If Mark is divided into 100 sections (into which it quite naturally falls), 75 of those 100 sections appear again both in Matthew and Luke, and a further 21 of them appear again either in Matthew or Luke. Thus, only four considerable sections of Mark appear in it alone; though Mark has many words and sentences, some of them of great value, which do not reappear in either of the other two. [The four *sections* of Mark which will not be found elsewhere in the Gospels are: (i) The parable of the earth bearing fruit of itself (4^{26-29}); (ii) the cure of the deaf-mute (7^{32} ff.); (iii) the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (8^{22} ff.); (iv) the young man fleeing naked at the time of our Lord's arrest (14^{51} f.).] Further, the Markan material which reappears elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels tends to reappear in the same order as that in which it appears in Mark. In fact, wherever Matthew, in giving Markan material, gives it in a different order from the Markan, Luke gives it in the Markan order; and wherever Luke in giving Markan material gives it in an order different from the Markan, Matthew gives it in the Markan order. In other words, Matthew and Luke never agree against Mark in regard to the order of the material which is common to all three. St. Mark's Gospel, then, is almost entirely reproduced in the other two Gospels, and the order of Mark is practically the order of the material common to the three Sypnotic Gospels. It seems to follow that either St. Mark's Gospel as we have it, or a document closely resembling it, has largely shaped the other two Synoptic Gospels. A copying of Mark by the other two evangelists is the explanation of the double parallelisms now universally accepted.

This was not the solution offered when first the phenomenon of these parallelisms was noticed and considered, which was at a very early date. Mark is almost entirely neglected in patristic literature, and the chief reason for the neglect was a realization of the fact that it has very little which is not reproduced elsewhere in the Gospels. St. Augustine actually wrote a treatise 'On the Agreement of the Evangelists.' Thus there is no ground whatever for regarding the Synoptic Problem as an unnecessary difficulty raised by the perversity of the Higher Critics. As St. Augustine realized, it is an issue vitally and inextricably bound up with the defence of the Christian Faith as based upon historical facts. Upon its solution depends the credentials of our evangelists as trustworthy historians.

St. Augustine's solution of the problem of the double parallelisms is, however, untenable. He proclaimed Mark to be a mere abridgement of the other two. But it is *a priori* improbable that a writer with only four sections, and in the total only thirty-one verses of new material, to add, would make an abridgement of Matthew and Luke, omitting from his story so much that was of central importance. Moreover, an actual comparison of the three Synoptic Gospels reveals peculiarities in Mark which stamp it as being undoubtedly earlier than the other two (see Commentary on Mark).

The priority of St. Mark's Gospel is suggested, in the first place, by the fearlessness with which its author depicts the humanity of our Lord. Three passages will be sufficient to illustrate this statement: (*a*) Mk 3 [5] = Mt 12 [12]; Lk 6 [10]. Mark alone attributes to our Lord the emotions of anger and grief. (*b*) Mk 6 [5] = Mt 13 [58]. Whereas Mark states that Jesus *could not* do mighty works because of lack of faith among the Galileans, Matthew cautiously restricts himself to the mere fact that 'He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief.' (*c*) Mk 6 [6] = Mt 13 [58]. Mark alone states that Jesus *marvelled* because of their unbelief. We may understand the difference, in this respect, between Mark on the one hand, and Matthew and Luke on the other, if we realize that, as the Church in the course of the 1st century rose to a fuller appreciation of the Divinity of Christ (cf. the Christology of Ac 2 [22] with that of Jn 1), it became increasingly difficult for those who were not eye-witnesses to imagine the limitations which characterized Him 'in the days of His flesh.' Behind Mark lies the experience of the eye-witness, in relation to which the narratives of the other Synoptic Gospels are secondary.

Mark is bold, also, in his treatment of the Twelve, who, in his pages, expose themselves to rebukes from our Lord by constant failure to understand His purposes. The following three examples will illustrate a difference in this respect between Mark and the other Synoptists. (*a*) Mk 8 [17] f. = Mt 16 [8] f.; Lk 12 [1]. In Mark our Lord's rebuke to the Apostles is severe. In Matthew the words 'Have ye your heart hardened? having eyes, see ye not, and, having ears, hear ye not?' (strongly reminiscent of the description of unbelieving Jews in Mk 4 [12]) are entirely omitted. The only section of the Markan story which Luke includes is our Lord's warning against the leaven of the Pharisees. (*b*) Mk 10 [35-37] = Mt 20 [20] ff. Mark represents James and John as requesting for themselves the chief places in the Kingdom, whereas in Matthew the request is put into the mouth of their mother. Luke has no parallel to this story. (*c*) Mk 14 [37-41] = Mt 26 [40-45]; Lk 22 [45] f. Mark (followed in this case by Matthew) relates that the three disciples chosen to watch with our Lord in Gethsemane fell asleep three times, and were rebuked by Christ for their behaviour. In Luke only one such offence is mentioned, a curious excuse for it is given—that they fell asleep 'on account of grief,' and instead of rebuking them Christ merely advises them to watch, that they may not enter into temptation. In Matthew and Luke, when compared with Mark, appears what has been called 'a tendency to spare the Twelve.' Mark is bold in this matter, probably because behind his narrative was the authority of one of the Twelve (see Commentary); whereas the other Synoptists reflect the fact that as the years passed by, and death was gradually bereaving the Church of those whose eyes had seen and whose hands had handled, the veneration in which they were held would rapidly increase.

The hypothesis that the first and third evangelist used Mark may be put still further to the test by examination of differences between Mark and the others in respect of common material. Vivid, realistic touches in Mark suggesting the reminiscences of an eye-witness do not reappear in the other two. We may instance Christ looking round on His disciples in Mk 10 [23], or Christ sitting down and calling the Twelve to Him in Mk 9 [35]. Similarly, St. Mark's narrative appears in its most attractively lifelike aspect in the story of Christ's treatment of the children (Mk 10 [16]). The Lord takes them in His arms and blesses them, laying His hands upon them; whereas in Mt 19 [15] He simply lays His hands on them, and in Lk 18 [16] merely calls them to Him. We, with our developed historical sense, appreciate St. Mark's realism: but the first and third evangelists, each writing a Gospel for the spiritual edification of the Christian circles in which he worked, and each with much new material to add to the Markan material within the limited length of a papyrus roll, would naturally tend to omit details irrelevant to faith or morals. Again, some of the differences between Mark and the others are obviously due to attempts to clear up ambiguities in the Markan narrative. What is the meaning, for example, of the concluding words

of Mk 1 [38]? Is the meaning 'For this purpose I came out of Capernaum'? or is it 'For this purpose I came forth from God'? In Lk 4 [43] the ambiguity disappears, in the words 'for this purpose I was sent.' The ending of Mk 11 [3], again, is ambiguous. Does it mean that the owner will immediately let the disciples have the ass, or that Jesus will return the ass as soon as He has finished with it? The ambiguous sentence is absent in Lk 19 [31]. In Mt 21 [3] the ambiguity is cleared up—'and he will immediately send it.'

Our solution of the problem presented by the double parallelisms implies, as we have seen, a very free treatment of the text of Mark in Matthew and Luke (a freedom which reaches a climax in the treatment of Mk 10 [17] f. in Mt 19 [16] f.). Nor need such freedom surprise us. Mark, at the time when the others used it, had not attained anything like the status of Scripture, and an evangelist using it would feel free, or might indeed feel bound, to bring its contents into line with the traditions of the particular Church in which he lived and worked.

The one difficulty in the way of our solution is the fact that Matthew and Luke, in places where, according to our hypothesis, they are closely following Mark, sometimes suddenly agree together against it. It was to meet this difficulty that certain German critics, led by Holtzmann, postulated the existence of an *Ur-Marcus*. In other words they assumed that the version of Mark used in Matthew and Luke was a version earlier than that which has come down to us. This theory of an *Ur-Marcus* is untenable. In many of these cases, in which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark, what they substitute is an improvement upon the Markan style. For example, 'in about fifteen instances they correct in Mark the abrupt construction caused by the absence of a connecting word.' [For a full list of such improvements see *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 21 f.] It is clear, therefore, that, if they used a version of Mark different from our second Gospel, it was more probably a later, improved edition than an earlier version. Their common improvements of the style of Mark are such as would so obviously suggest themselves to any reader of that Gospel that the agreement of Matthew and Luke, in such cases, may be merely a matter of accidental coincidence. But not all the agreements are of this simple nature. In Burkitt's *Gospel History and its Transmission*, 42-57, the student will find a collection of twenty important agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in matters not of mere style. In Mk 11 [27], for example, we are told that Jesus was *walking* in the Temple when the chief priests came to question Him about His authority. The first and third evangelists are following Mark at this point, and yet, both in Mt 21 [23] and in Lk 20 [1], we are told that Jesus was *teaching* in the Temple when the question was put to Him. A great number of such agreements are, no doubt, due to what is called 'assimilation' of the text of the one Gospel to that of the other; for this see Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 139-144. That is to say, a scribe making a copy of the first Gospel has unconsciously put into it, from his memory, words which occur in the 3rd Gospel, or *vice versa*. Nor is the suggestion that assimilation of this kind has taken place pure speculation; it is strongly supported in some cases by textual evidence. The agreement quoted above, that of Mt 21 [23] with Lk 20 [1] against Mk 11 [27], disappears in some manuscripts of Matthew (Old Latin and Old Syriac), where the detail that Christ was *teaching* is omitted. In such cases, the assimilated reading is to be rejected, even when it has the authority of the better MSS. Nevertheless, some important agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark have no variant readings suggestive of assimilation. Room, therefore, still remains for the hypothesis that the first and third used a slightly different (later) version of Mark from that which we possess. Some of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark may be due to the fact that they used in common, as we shall see, a second source, in addition to Mark. There are reasons for supposing that this second source and Mark to some extent overlapped: and some of their agreements against Mark may therefore be due to the fact that Matthew and Luke are borrowing from this second source as well as from Mark. A case in which agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark can certainly be explained by this overlapping is that of the parable of the mustard seed (Mt 13 [31] f. = Mk 4 [30-32] = Lk 13 [18] f.). It has been pointed out that in the two verses of this parable there are no less than 'twelve small verbal coincidences between Matthew and Luke against Mark.' Both Matthew and Luke (but not Mark) append the parable of the leaven to that of the mustard seed. This pair of parables illustrates one and the same point, and

such pairs of parables are characteristic of our Lord's teaching as reproduced in all the sources of the Gospels. We may assume that the second source used by Matthew and Luke contained the mustard seed as well as the leaven, an assumption which explains their agreements against Mark in the parable of the mustard seed. Pairs of parables in our Lord's teaching—Mk 2 [21] f.; Mt 13 [44-46]; Lk 14 [28-32].

Some reader who has followed this discussion closely may have been led to wonder why these agreements are not explained by the supposition that the third evangelist had seen the 1st Gospel. That is a hypothesis which would raise greater difficulties than it would settle. We should be obliged to ask ourselves why he did not adopt more of a Gospel which would have appealed to him as being a much more edifying composition than Mark.

We may conclude our discussion of the double parallelisms by noticing the following further characteristics of the first and third evangelists in their methods of using Mark. Matthew alters the Markan order to a greater extent than Luke. This is because the first evangelist has a passion for grouping the materials from all his sources according to similarity of subject-matter, whereas in Luke large batches of Markan and non-Markan materials appear alternately. Matthew reproduces, on the other hand, a greater number of stories from the Markan narrative than Luke does. He finds room for them by abbreviating them rather drastically, whereas Luke gives such Markan stories as he does reproduce at greater length than Matthew. Perhaps the most remarkable instance of abbreviation in Matthew is to be found in Mt 9 [18], where the daughter of Jairus is represented as being already dead when her father first comes to Christ. Thus Matthew avoids the incident of people coming from Jairus' house to announce her death, which lengthens the story in Mk 5 [35] f. The most remarkable instance of St. Luke's tendency to omit altogether considerable paragraphs of Mark is to be found in the fact that the 3rd Gospel includes nothing from Mk 6 [45]-8 [26]. This is called in the technical jargon of Synoptic criticism 'The Great Omission.' For the rest, St. Luke rewrites the Markan Greek more thoroughly than Matthew, a natural phenomenon in view of the fact that the third evangelist's Greek style is among the best in the New Testament, while that of the 2nd Gospel is among the worst.

We must now notice another set of parallelisms. Some passages, not found in Mark, occur nearly word for word the same in Matthew and Luke. Two examples may be quoted by way of illustration—Mt 3 [12] = Lk 3 [17], and Mt 11 [25-27] = Lk 10 [21] f. The agreement, it will be noticed, is remarkably close, so that scholars have supposed that it indicates the use of a second common source by Matthew and Luke. The source is in this case no longer extant, except in the pages of Matthew and Luke. This non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke is found, on examination, to consist very largely of sayings of our Lord. At first sight, therefore, it might seem possible that they were in this case following a common oral tradition and not necessarily a written document, for great care would be taken in handing on the words of Christ, which would be repeated in verbally identical forms in the oral tradition of all the churches. Not all of this material, however, consists of sayings of our Lord. It includes, for instance, the narrative of the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum (Mt 8 [5] ff. = Lk 7 [2] ff.); and in this story the parallelism is unusually exact in the words of the centurion. These words of the centurion contain some curious phrases which appear in both Gospels, the Greek words for 'worthy that' in Mt 8 [8] and Lk 7 [6], and for 'say the word' in Mt 8 [8] and Lk 7 [7], being so peculiar that they are not likely to have survived unaltered in the oral traditions of two separate churches. A written document and not an oral tradition is confirmed as the explanation of this common material by the fact that part of it appears in the same order both in Matthew and Luke. Mt 5-7 and Lk 6 [20-49] contain an ethical discourse beginning with beatitudes and concluding, in both cases, with the comparison of two different types of listeners to two different kinds of builders. The next point in his Gospel at which the first evangelist gives matter not in Mark, but found in Luke, is 8 [5] ff., the story of the centurion's servant; and the next point in his Gospel at which the third evangelist gives matter not in Mark, but found in Matthew, is Lk 7 [2] ff., the same story of the centurion's servant. They were using, then, something in which the healing of the centurion's servant followed an ethical discourse; and there seems to be no reason why these two sections of material should hold such fixed positions in an oral tradition. To the written document underlying the parallelism

between Matthew and Luke has been given the non-committal name of Q, standing for the German 'Quelle' = 'a source.' Many ingenious attempts have been made to reconstruct Q. The only Q passages in our Gospels of which we may be sure are obviously those which stand in Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark. But just as some of Mark is reproduced only in Matthew, and some of it only in Luke, so, probably, does some of the material found only in Matthew, and some found only in Luke come from Q. Into the complex speculations which have arisen round this fact we cannot enter; though one reasonable piece of such speculation may be offered as an example. In Lk 11 [27] f. the incident of the woman who cried 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee' follows immediately after the saying about the wandering unclean spirit, a Q saying (see Mt 12 [43-45]). Matthew does not record the incident of the woman, but immediately after the saying about the unclean spirit he gives, from Mk 3 [31] ff., a story with a very similar purport. 'Whosoever shall do the will of my Father . . . he is my . . . mother,' resembles closely 'Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it.' No reason can be imagined for the first evangelist's insertion of the Markan story after the saying about the unclean spirit, unless we suppose that Lk 11 [27] f. stood in Q and suggested to Matthew at this point the similar narrative in Mark, which he preferred to the other. It will be sufficient to add that in all probability some of Q is altogether lost to us, on the analogy of there being a few sections of Mark which are reproduced neither in Matthew nor Luke.

The contents of the non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke may be summarized under the following headings:

(1) *A considerable amount of information about John the Baptist.* Not only an account of his mission (e.g. Mt 3 [7-10] = Lk 3 [7-9]), but also his message from prison (Mt 11 [2-11, 16-19] = Lk 7 [18-28, 31-35]).

(2) *The full story of our Lord's Temptation* (Mt 4 [1-11] = Lk 4 [1-13]).

(3) *Two miracles of healing by our Lord:* the dumb demoniac (Mt 12 [22] f. = Lk 11 [14]), and the centurion's servant (Mt 8 [5] ff. = Lk 7 [1] ff.).

(4) *Three short parables*—the mustard seed, the leaven (Mt 13 [31-33] = Lk 13 [18-21]), and the lost sheep (Mt 18 [12] ff. = Lk 15 [4] ff.).

(5) *Some denunciations of the Pharisees* (Mt 23 [25-36] and Lk 11 [39-52]).

(6) *A considerable amount of ethical teaching and a little eschatology* (e.g. the saying about the Days of Noah, Mt 24 [37-39] = Lk 17 [26] f.).

There is almost universal agreement among scholars that Q is a very early document originating in one of the earliest periods of the Church's history. Its contents suggest that it was a kind of handbook of Apologetic for Christian teachers. The comparative lateness of the New Testament literature as a whole, the fact that at first nothing and for a long time very little was committed to writing, is due to easily intelligible causes. The ending of this world order was believed to be imminent. There would be no posterity requiring written records. The pressing duty of all Christians was considered to be the spreading of the Gospel of salvation to as wide a circle as possible before the cataclysm should overtake the world. Nevertheless a certain amount of written material must soon have been needed to supplement the oral teaching. Christian Apostles founded a Church in a city and went their way, leaving the management of the Church in the hands of others who did not know very much about the life and teaching of Christ and the credentials of whose teaching, inasmuch as they were not eye-witnesses, could easily be questioned. Questions would soon arise which it would be difficult for these presbyters to answer. It is not far-fetched to suggest (see Streeter in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Essay vii) that the contents of Q are such as to provide answers to some of the earliest questions which would arise in the local churches. As is obvious from 'The Acts' and the Pauline Epistles, the earliest difficulties of the Church were raised by the Jews. The sort of questions which Jewish opponents of the Church would ask and which must have caused some heart-searchings to Jewish converts can easily be imagined. Why do you preach as Messiah one whose career was so unlike all that we have been taught to expect in the Messiah? The story of our Lord's Temptation in Q provides an answer, in the statement that He had been tempted to adopt the popular interpretation of the traditional Messianic rôles and had rejected such courses. In His eschatological sayings is the claim that He will one day be revealed as the expected Son of Man.

How was it that a conflict to the death set in between Him and the leaders of the people of God? The answer is in His denunciations of the Pharisees and

in the account of the Beelzebub controversy to which the healing of the dumb demoniac leads up in Q. (Mark has its own account of this controversy, 3^{22} ff., but Matthew and Luke are, in the main, following Q.) He found these leaders hardened and spiritually blind.

Again, even though the end might be near, Christian converts would soon feel the need of some outline of the standard of spiritual life which was required of them in the meantime. Hence the ethical teaching of Christ was put into writing.

Lastly, if we may judge from St. Paul's experience at Ephesus (Ac 19^{1-7}), and from the case of Apollos (Ac 18^{25}), Christian evangelists came in the course of their travels into contact with persons who had been baptized by John the Baptist and been led by him to look for the Messiah, but had never heard of Jesus. Such would naturally desire to know about the mutual relations of the new Master and their old master. As we have seen, Q contains much information about the Baptist.

It does not appear that Q contained an account of our Lord's Passion or of the events immediately leading up to it, for the first evangelist in this section of his Gospel follows Mark unusually closely, only adding here and there some material peculiar to his Gospel; while St. Luke gives, in the main, an account peculiar to his Gospel, with the addition of a few Markan touches. It is inconceivable that St. Luke drew his account of the Passion from Q, for the first evangelist would not have entirely disregarded Q at such an important point in the narrative, if Q had included an account of the Passion. If Q was a very early document, giving only what was absolutely necessary to supplement the living voice of the Christian teachers, the absence of a Passion narrative is not surprising. There is no good reason for supposing that the sufferings and death of Christ were the central point of St. Paul's teaching only. If the death of Christ was being preached everywhere, its preaching would necessarily entail a fairly complete and widespread oral tradition of the main outlines of the story of His death: and, accordingly, this part of the Gospel narrative would *not* be among the first which it was necessary to commit to writing.

In the main, then, the contents of Q suggest that it is exactly the sort of document which would naturally be compiled when first the need of written statements of the historical facts was felt. Anything like a biography of our Lord would represent a later demand; and there is almost universal agreement among scholars that Q is an earlier document than St. Mark's Gospel. In fact, there seems to be reason for supposing that St. Mark had some knowledge (perhaps only a recollection of some of the contents) of Q. In some of the cases where Mark and Q overlap, the Markan looks like an abbreviated version of Q. Mark gives, for example, in 1^{7} f., an account of the Baptist's teaching slightly shorter than that which appears in Mt 3^{11} f. = Lk 3^{16} f. The first and third evangelists seem at this point to be deriving their account from Q, for they agree in altering the position of the words 'I indeed baptize with water,' and in adding at exactly the same point 'and with fire; whose fan is in his hand . . .' Mark's brief reference to the Temptation looks like a similar abbreviation. Indeed, when one considers the enormous preponderance of sayings over deeds in Q and the corresponding preponderance of deeds over sayings in Mark, one may reasonably speculate that St. Mark wrote not only with a recollection of Q, but actually to supplement it. Q, with its account of the Mission of the Baptist and our Lord's Temptation, suggested to St. Mark a reasonable way in which to begin a biography of our Lord; but he abbreviates that beginning, in order to hasten on to the new material, not included in Q, which he has to offer.

It is possible that Q is the document referred to by Papias (see Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, iii, 39), who was Bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor about A.D. 140. Papias states that 'Matthew in the Hebrew tongue wrote down the oracles (*logia*), and every man interpreted them as he was able.' 'The Hebrew tongue' may mean Aramaic, as in Ac 22^{2}, which was, of course, the language spoken by the Hebrews (that is the Palestinian Jews) of that day; and the Greek of Q is such that it may well have been a translation from the Aramaic. Further, 'the Oracles' would not be an inappropriate title to apply to a document so largely made up of the sayings of Christ as is Q. But the Matthæan authorship of Q is not more than a reasonable possibility. Papias may have been referring to a collection of Old Testament texts which proved the agreement of the Christian revelation with prophecy. Such a collection is, as a matter of fact, brought into the Gospel which bears St. Matthew's name, where numerous proof-texts are introduced by the formula 'All this is

come to pass that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by . . .' (e.g. 1 [22]). For such a collection 'the Oracles' would be the natural designation, inasmuch as it was a usual term for the Jewish Scriptures, which St. Paul, for example, uses in Rom 3 [2]. The supposition that Papias' 'Oracles' were simply a miscellaneous collection of proof-texts has the additional advantage of accounting for his statement that 'every man interpreted them as he was able'; a remark which, if we are going to identify 'the Oracles' with Q, we must probably understand as referring to the translation of the document from Aramaic into other languages, a less convincing sense to put upon the words. On the other hand, we may notice that, as Q was to some extent a string of sayings devoid of any historical context and unconnected in meaning with each other (see the succession of Q sayings in Lk 11 [32-36]), the interpretation of them would sometimes be difficult. We may contrast the meanings given to 'There is nothing covered which shall not be revealed . . .' in the contexts of Mt 10 [26] f. and Lk 12 [1-3].

For the original order of Q (a rather unimportant question in regard to what was largely a string of disconnected sayings) we may trust St. Luke rather than the first evangelist. Just as the latter tampered more with the Markan order than St. Luke did, so does he seem to rearrange Q in order to group his materials according to their subject-matter. For example, he fills out Q's ethical discourse with material which is found scattered about in different parts of Luke; for it is inconceivable that if the material had stood in Q arranged as it is in Matthew, St. Luke should have pulled it to pieces and scattered it, in some cases into inappropriate contexts. The Sermon on the Mount as it stands in Mt 5-7 is an excellent example of Matthæan grouping, in this case under the heading of the New Law and its relation to the Old. It seems, on the other hand, that St. Luke has abbreviated Q's ethical discourse. The 'but' in Lk 6 [27] requires the sentence which precedes it in Mt 5 [43] to give to it any significance. This sentence was probably omitted by St. Luke because such contrasts between the old and new Law had little interest for the Gentiles for whom he wrote. Similarly we notice that the second and third temptations appear in different order in Mt 4 [5-10] and Lk 4 [5-12]. The order in Matthew is the more impressive, representing the temptation to gain the world by worshipping the devil as the climax of Christ's temptations. We should assume that St. Luke's order is that of Q, for he would hardly have altered a more impressive to get a less impressive order.

At this point the fact must be faced that some of the material common to Matthew and Luke and not found in Mark, though substantially the same in Matthew and Luke, appears in these Gospels, in two rather different forms. The Beatitudes, which constitute the opening of Q's ethical discourse, afford the best illustration of this fact. Contrast 'Blessed are the poor in spirit,' in Mt 5 [3], with 'Blessed are ye poor,' in Lk 6 [20]; or again 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness' in Mt 5 [6], with 'Blessed are ye that hunger now' in Lk 6 [21]. Is it possible to account for the difference, and to decide which evangelist gives us the original Q form of the saying? The scientific way of answering such questions is to discover whether the form of the saying given by the first or third evangelist agrees with any tendency appearing in his Gospel as a whole. If it does, we shall reasonably suspect that he is turning aside from Q to report the saying in a form which was in accordance with the general traditions of the Christian circles by which he had been influenced. In St. Luke's Gospel and in his 'Acts of the Apostles' appears an interest in the problems of poverty and riches and a sympathy with the poor more marked than in any other part of the New Testament. He alone gives us the parables of Dives and Lazarus, and of the foolish rich man (Lk 12 [16-21]) and the story of the quarrel about an inheritance, with the moral about riches which our Lord drew from it (Lk 12 [13-15]); and we remember what emphasis he lays in the Acts upon the system of voluntary communism which at first prevailed in the Church in Jerusalem. His form of the Beatitudes fits in with this general tendency of his writing. We should consequently assume that, while following at this point the general outline of Q, he turns aside from it to give its sayings in an alternative form, either a form which he had once heard and which had appealed to him, or the form which they had assumed in his own special source, representing the traditions of some church other than that in which Q had been compiled. We may thus in the case of the Beatitudes more safely trust Matthew than Luke for the original Q form of the sayings. We must not, however, suppose that in every such

case the Q form of a saying is necessarily the original form. Q is, as we have seen, in all probability a very early document, but we are not in a position to say that the special sources used in Matthew and Luke respectively necessarily represent later and inferior traditions. When Q was discovered and its early date established a somewhat disproportionate regard for it set in among critics, who wrote as if a position in Q guaranteed absolutely the correctness of a saying, and who correspondingly depreciated all that could not be assigned to Q. One of the many services rendered by Streeter in *The Four Gospels* is to correct this irrational tendency. The solution of the Synoptic Problem used to be described as a Two-Document Hypothesis, a phrase which referred of course to the documents Q and Mark. Streeter substitutes the phrase a Four-Document Hypothesis, thereby calling attention to the existence of both Matthew's and Luke's special source, which by no means deserve exclusion from the picture. Especially does this seem to be true of the special source used by St. Luke, to which Streeter assigns an early date (earlier in all probability than Mark) along the following lines of argument.

A most noticeable difference appears between the first and third evangelist in regard to their methods of combining their non-Markan with their Markan material. The first evangelist takes Mark as the basis of his Gospel, and his practice is to 'make Mark the frame-work into which non-Markan matter is to be fitted on the principle of joining like to like.' Sometimes he inserts a single verse. For example, Mt 17 [20] is a Q verse (see Lk 17 [6]) which the first evangelist fits into the Markan story of the demoniac boy because he considers the question 'Why could we not cast out the devil?' a suitable context for the saying 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed . . .' Or again, just after his Sermon on the Mount he inserts Mk 1 [22], and thus gives great point to the bare Markan statement that 'they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority and not as the scribes.' Sometimes he inserts whole paragraphs. For instance, in Mt 21 [33] ff. he adds to the Markan parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, spoken against the Jews, two other parables of the same purport, viz. the Two Sons and the Marriage Feast.

We turn from this highly intelligent method of the first evangelist to find in Luke a surprising phenomenon, viz. that the Markan and non-Markan materials appear in alternate blocks, e.g. 6 [20]-8 [3] is non-Markan, 8 [4]-9 [50] is Markan, and 9 [51]-18 [14] non-Markan again. This rule holds good throughout the Gospel except at the end, from 22 [14] onwards, where St. Luke, though giving in the main non-Markan material, interweaves with it a certain amount from Mark. This exception to the general rule is perfectly intelligible. From 22 [14] onwards St. Luke has two different authorities for the same all-important events, the incidents from the beginning of the Last Supper onwards. Therefore, if he was going to borrow from both sources (and for such an important period he would be glad to make use of two authorities), he would have to interweave them. In the rest of his Gospel, as has been said, he gives alternately a Markan section and a non-Markan section, the latter containing a mixture of material from Q and from his own special source. So much of the non-Markan material is aptly fitted by the first evangelist into the Markan framework that the method of St. Luke appears by contrast as singularly unintelligent. It surprises us exceedingly to find this apparent lack of intelligence in St. Luke, who, judged by his Gospel alone, has great merits as a writer, and considerable ambition as a historian (see 1 [1-4]), and, if judged by the Acts, displays a positive genius for the selection and arrangement of his materials.

Streeter has suggested the following explanation of the phenomenon: that the non-Markan sections of Luke, both from Q and L (the special source of Luke), had been combined to form a Gospel (which was not necessarily 'published') before the Markan material was added; that the third evangelist did not, like the first, use Mark as the basis of his Gospel, but inserted Markan sections into material which he had already collected and arranged. Streeter's hypothesis not only accounts for the general phenomena which we have just noticed, but is reinforced by the following considerations: (*a*) The non-Markan sections of Luke constitute in themselves a fairly continuous and lengthy narrative, ranging from the beginning of the ministry to the Resurrection. (*b*) In the 3rd Gospel Mark is not much used where the writer had similar information from another source. This is true, for example, of the account of the mission of John the Baptist, and of the narrative from Lk 22 [14] onwards. Further, in Luke appear many non-Markan stories similar to stories in Mark, for which St. Luke does not trouble to reproduce the Markan equiva-

lents. One striking illustration of this statement may be mentioned. In 7 [36] ff. St. Luke gives a non-Markan story of the anointing of Christ by a woman and does not reproduce the similar story in Mk 14 [3] ff. In regard to such cases Canon Streeter remarks (210): 'If we look up these passages in Mark in a synopsis of the Gospels and notice the incidents which immediately precede and follow them, we shall see that Luke reproduces everything else in the neighbourhood from Mark in the original order, but that he simply omits Mark's account of these incidents.' (*c*) The whole of Mk 6 [45]-8 [26] is omitted in Luke. This, like (*b*), would be intelligible if the third evangelist had already in hand a large amount of non-Markan material, and was obliged by the limited length of a papyrus-roll to add from Mark only what was entirely unrepresented by anything in that material. (*d*) It is a peculiar characteristic of the non-Markan material in Luke that in it Christ is often described as 'The Lord,' instead of by the name Jesus. This usage is not found in the genuine text of either Matthew or Mark. In Luke it occurs fourteen times in the non-Markan material, evenly distributed between Q passages and passages which came from St. Luke's special source. It does not occur once in the Markan parts of Luke. This law again suggests that the combination of Q and St. Luke's special source was a process distinct from the process by which Markan material was incorporated into the 3rd Gospel.

Such, in outline, is Streeter's theory of a Proto-Luke (i.e. first-Luke), the theory that Luke reached its present form by two distinct stages, in the first of which Q material was combined with St. Luke's special source, and in the second of which Markan material was interpolated into the document already compiled (see Commentary on Luke). It follows that St. Luke's special material is probably earlier than St. Mark's Gospel, and may represent a written document as early as Q itself.

The writer of this article has thought it best to present in outline the most important features in the generally accepted solution of the Synoptic Problem, giving only one or two illustrations of every statement made, rather than to crowd a multitude of references into the short space of a single article of a one-volume commentary. Anyone who reads these pages carefully should achieve a grasp of the problem and its solution, and if he has the desire and the time to pursue the study in greater detail Streeter's *The Four Gospels* will lead him on from the point to which, it is hoped, this essay may have brought him. In these days when the Christian Faith is so widely challenged, every churchman is called upon to be, to some extent, a Christian apologist: and even such a cursory study of the Synoptic Problem as the present will reveal the fact that we can be led to a definite decision about the various degrees of reliability accruing to various parts of our Gospels, by perfectly scientific methods. It will also be seen that any one who follows up the lines of study here laid down will discover in the Synoptic Gospels different varieties of apprehension of the many-sided Truth which is in Jesus, representing the reactions of various types of people to that all-embracing Personality which showed itself through His Life and Teaching.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

By C. H. Turner

Introduction

I. Who was the Author of the Gospel, and Where and When was it Written?—To each of these questions we are fortunate in being able to give a definite and decisive answer. It is not matter of serious debate that the author was Mark, the disciple of Peter, and that he wrote his Gospel in Rome somewhere about the year A.D. 65.

(i) There is perhaps no one among the secondary characters of the apostolic age about whom we are, as it happens, better informed than about St. Mark. His real name was John (Ac 12 [12, 25], 15 [37]): but John was nearly as common a name in Jewish circles of that time—witness John Hyrcanus the predecessor of Herod, John the father of Simon Peter, John the Baptist, John the son of Zebedee, John the presbyter—as it is with us to-day, and just as the numberless Johns at school or college, where Christian names according to our modern habit are in normal use, have somehow to be distinguished from one another, so our John was known

as John Mark. If a Jew took a second name, the second name was Greek, such as Herod Philip or Herod Antipas, or, from the time of the Roman conquest, Latin. And this second name often quite superseded the Jewish name. Just as the Apostle is known to us only as Paul, so the evangelist is, save in the Acts, never called by any other name than the Latin Marcus.

His mother Mary was a prominent member of the Church at Jerusalem, and her house a centre of Christian intercourse; so much so that St. Peter on his deliverance from prison naturally turned his steps to it and found many gathered there for prayer (Ac 12 [12]). Mary was clearly at that time a widow; but the house had presumably belonged to her husband, and it is at least not unlikely that it was in the same house that the Apostles and the other original disciples had made their headquarters after the Ascension (Ac 1 [13]), and that the Lord and the Twelve had met for the Last Supper (Mk 14 [12-15]). If further we accept the probable identification of the lad who followed Jesus to Gethsemane (see on Mk 14 [51]) with the writer of the Gospel, it results that Mark had been from boyhood in the closest possible relation to the Church of Jerusalem.

However that may be, he was at any rate by origin a Christian Jew of Jerusalem, and also a member of the first Christian mission to the Gentiles, as 'minister' (the word was later on used technically of subdeacons) to Paul and Barnabas (Ac 12 [25], 13 [5]). St. Paul supplies the reason both for the original choice of Mark, and for the loyalty with which Barnabas held to him when Paul declined to take on the second missionary journey a companion who had left them in the lurch in the course of the first: Mark was related to Barnabas as first cousin or even nephew (Col 4 [10]; Ac 13 [13], 15 [37-39]). That second journey was probably undertaken in the autumn of the year 49; and St. Mark disappears from view till the mention of him by St. Paul in the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (Col 4 [10. 11]; Phm [24]), written some ten or twelve years later from Rome, mention which shows that a complete reconciliation had by that time been effected; for Mark is not only praised as one of the Apostle's few fellow-workers from the 'circumcision,' but is singled out as not unlikely to visit the Church of Colossæ in the immediate future and commended warmly to it. If Mark carried out this intention, he was apparently still in Asia Minor when Timothy was bidden to 'pick him up' on the way to Rome and bring him with him, 'for he is useful to me for ministry' (2 Tim 4 [11]). But in view of the doubt which hangs over the Pastoral Epistles we can hardly place this bit of evidence on quite the same level as the rest.

Mark then had been for some time, though for what length of time we have no means of saying, in close contact with the Apostle; and so we should be prepared to find in his Gospel traces here and there of the influence of Pauline ideas and Pauline phraseology. See notes on Mk 1 [14], 5 [23], 7 [5. 22. 23], 10 [26].

But it is as a disciple of St. Peter that Mark left his impression on tradition. Early writers are practically silent about any connexion of his with St. Paul: with one voice both Eastern and Western authorities, Papias and Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, dwell on his connexion with St. Peter. He is the 'interpreter' of Peter, the 'disciple and interpreter' of Peter, the 'long-time follower' of Peter: and when Peter, after the outbreak of the Neronian persecution, wrote his circular letter from Rome to the Christians of Asia Minor, the only name (apart from that of Silvanus or Silas, as the channel of his communication) which he adds to the salutation from 'the fellow-elect church that is in Babylon' or Rome, is the name of 'Mark my son' (1 P 5 [13]). The phrase implies at once a disparity of not less than fifteen or twenty years in age and a special bond of long and affectionate relationship. Where are we to find room for this intercourse, and what exactly is meant by the word 'interpreter'?

These are not quite easy questions to answer. 'Interpreter' would naturally mean 'interpreter from one language into another'; if so, as it seems impossible to suppose that St. Peter could have lived so long in touch with Jews of the Dispersion without acquiring (if he did not possess it already) a competent knowledge of Greek, we should be driven to suppose that Mark 'interpreted' into Latin what Peter said in Greek. And there is nothing in itself improbable in that. A Gentile Christian Church in Rome must have contained from the first a Latin-speaking element. No doubt the Roman Church was, and for some generations continued to be, predominantly Greek in speech; Greek was its official and especially its liturgical language till the 3rd century. But too exclusive stress has been laid in modern times on this aspect of things: and if Mark 'interpreted' in the literal sense, it must surely have been from

Greek into Latin. It is, however, not quite certain that the literal sense is necessary; in modern Greek (and cf. Lk 24 [27]) the verb means 'to explain,' and there is something to be said for a more general rendering such as our 'private secretary.'

To the second question, where in time we are to place St. Mark's discipleship to St. Peter, the evidence is not sufficient to enable us to give a precise chronological answer. But we may well lay stress on the opportunities of the first twenty years after Pentecost when St. Peter had his headquarters at Jerusalem, and Mark was a resident there and his mother's house a meeting-place for the disciples. It was no stranger, but one whom we may believe to have known him intimately in the past, that Peter had for 'interpreter' in Rome in the years before the outbreak of persecution late in A.D. 64. That Mark should pass from the service of St. Paul to the special and intimate service of St. Peter is but one more of the links which bound together the Apostle of the Circumcision and the Apostle of the Gentiles, and gave historical justification to the tradition of the early Roman Church in its combined appeal to the names of 'Peter and Paul.'

(ii) Our second question is by implication already answered: it was at Rome that Mark was Peter's interpreter, and at Rome that his Gospel was written. And the external evidence that this Gospel was written for the Roman community is borne out by certain definite features of its contents. The Church of Rome, as St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans amply demonstrates (see H. N. Bate, *Guide to the Epistles of St. Paul* [1926], 120-123), was by now predominantly, perhaps almost exclusively, Gentile: and it is clear that St. Mark has Gentile readers in view. He dwells less than the other evangelists on prophecy and on the Old Testament: and more particularly he explains Jewish terms or customs, e.g. 2 [26], 7 [2, 3, 4], 14 [12], 15 [42], while in 7 [21, 22] he seems to follow up the transgressions named in the second half of the Decalogue with a sort of paraphrase of a less technically Jewish character. If he always accompanies any citation of an Aramaic word with its Greek equivalent (cf. 5 [41], 7 [11, 34], 14 [36], 15 [22, 34]), that no doubt might be almost as necessary for Hellenistic Jews as for Gentiles. More significant, and remote from the usage of the other Synoptic Gospels, is his use of transliterated Latin words: not merely such as may have been in use in Palestine, *prætorium*, *legio*, *denarius*, *census* (if that is the correct reading in 12 [14]), but *centurio* (15 [39, 44, 45]), *speculator* (6 [27]), *quadrans* (12 [42]), *sextarius* (7 [4]: in the form *xestes*)—of these four words no one recurs in Luke, and only one in Matthew—not to speak of his translation in 15 [15] of the Latin idiom *satis facere* 'to satisfy' into the verbally equivalent Greek. And perhaps we ought to place in the same category of indications pointing to Rome the special value which appears to attach in this Gospel to the evidence of the Western authorities for the text, the Græco-Latin codex Bezæ (D), and the three or four oldest of the Old Latin MSS.

(iii) The third and last question concerned the date of the Gospel. Early testimony is divided on the issue whether it was in St. Peter's lifetime or after his death that the Gospel was written. But it is more natural to think that it was exactly the loss of Peter's oral teaching which prompted the Roman Christians to demand, and Mark to provide, the nearest possible substitute, a written record which should in some measure reproduce what the Apostle had taught by word of mouth.

The *terminus a quo* of the Gospel will therefore be the death of Peter, and that can be established within very narrow limits. That both St. Peter and St. Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome in the persecution which broke out in A.D. 64—when Nero, as Tacitus tells us (*Annals*, xv, 44), wanted to find scapegoats to divert from himself the suspicion of having caused the great fire which devastated a large part of the city in the July of that year, and found them in the Christians—is plain matter of historical fact, and would never have been doubted if it had not been for the controversial desire to throw discredit either on Christian origins in general or on those of the Roman Church in particular. Against the quite unconvincing attack of Professor E. T. Merrill of Chicago, *Essays in Early Christian History* (1924), 267-332, may be set the judgement of the greatest living authority in Germany on ancient history, Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, iii (1923), 498-500. Meyer does not write from a Christian point of view, and many things that he says we could not of course accept; but his book is of the highest importance, and his argument always commands respect. 'The mention of Mark in Paul,' he writes, 'contains an irrefragable testimony for the presence and the martyrdom of Peter at Rome. Quite apart from that point, the tradition itself is as certain as can be, and rejection of it

can only be explained as due to dogmatic prepossession. . . . In any case Peter, the Rock of the Church, lived and laboured with apostolic authority in Rome for some considerable time.'

The outbreak of the fire was on July 19. We do not know how long it was before Nero bethought him of making the Christians responsible for it, nor over what period of time were spread the holocausts of human victims in Nero's gardens on the Janiculum, of which Tacitus and Juvenal tell us. That Peter was one of these victims is probable from the fact that his body was buried on the Vatican hill, for that is near by to the Janiculum. If we place the date of his martyrdom in A.D. 64-65, we shall not be far wrong. And it will naturally have been rather soon after the martyrdom that the need made itself insistently felt for a written record of his teaching. Between A.D. 65 and 70, and I should think nearer the earlier limit than the later, the first Life of Jesus Christ was written down in the record of the experiences of His chief disciple St. Peter by Peter's 'interpreter' St. Mark.

II. **The Unique Historical Importance of the Gospel according to St. Mark.**—As the number of the original eye-witnesses of the Gospel story dwindled, as one after another of the Twelve and the other personal disciples of Jesus were removed by death—as further the expectation of an immediate end to the present age gradually lost strength, so that it no longer seemed superfluous to commit anything to writing for the benefit of contemporaries and even of posterity—a growing need began to be felt for 'Gospels,' that is for record in permanent written form of the Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ. We do not know how many attempts were made in this direction: we do know that before the middle of the 2nd century four documents were singled out by the instinct of Catholic Christians and became the four canonical Gospels. They owed their position to no formal or concerted or authoritative action, but just to a common and universal movement. In no way is the centripetal force, which made of 2nd-century Christians, without any federated organization, one closely knit community, more clearly illustrated than by this agreement as to which and how many were the Gospels of the Church.

Of the Canonical Four the special contribution of the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke is the expansion on different lines of the early collection of sayings known as Q, and the combination of the Teaching with an outline of the Life; the Gospel according to John is a disciple's subjective interpretation of the meaning of the Incarnate Life; what of the Gospel according to Mark?

It is the unique record, objectively stated, of the experience of an eye-witness, an intimate companion of Jesus throughout His Ministry. And is it, then, paradoxical to say that historically it is the most important book ever written?

In support of this paradox let us try to estimate the value of this Gospel, first from the point of view of its relation to the other Gospels, and next from an analysis of its character and contents taken by itself.

(i) Modern critical enquiry into the origin and mutual relation of the three Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke—that is to say, into the Synoptic Problem, as it is called—began a few years before the middle of the last century, but for long it seemed to be lost in a quagmire out of which there was no exit. Firm ground was, however, reached at last: the intensive work of many devoted scholars converged before the end of the century on one secure result, the priority of Mark in relation to both Matthew and Luke. Whether, however, what lay before Matthew and Luke was the Gospel of Mark as we have it now, or only something so like Mark that it is conveniently known by the German term *Ur-Marcus*, 'the original Mark,' was still matter of dispute. There seemed to many enquirers to be just too much agreement, in the passages common to the three Gospels, between Matthew and Luke against the Mark we know to allow us to suppose that, as it stands, it could be the one and only source. But there are three considerations which between them rob this objection of all its force. In the first place, there are a few passages common to Mark and Q, and in these passages Matthew and Luke had a second source which will account for their agreements against Mark. Next there are a good many passages where the true text of Matthew has been corrupted from Luke, or the true text of Luke from Matthew, so that what have seemed to be agreements are not really agreements at all: e.g. Mk 12^{8} = Mt 21^{39} = Lk 20^{15}, where the true text of Matthew agrees not, as had been supposed, with Luke 'cast him out and slew him,' but with Mark 'slew him and cast him out.' In the third place, such agreement as remains is not more than may easily be due to the independent recasting of a rough and unliterary document like Mark by two more practised writers like Luke and Matthew.

Mark, then, our Mark, was used as a main source of their Gospels by both Matthew and Luke: and they are the only other documents bearing on the life of Jesus which have come down to us from the first sixty years after the Crucifixion.

(ii) There are, however, two other documents of early Christianity, one complete, the other a mere fragment, which, though later than Matthew and Luke, still have the form of Gospels, the canonical Gospel according to St. John and the unorthodox *Gospel of Peter*: and both of these use Mark, and use him at least much more than they use either Matthew or Luke. Whether the 4th Gospel knew Luke is doubtful, whether it knew Matthew is more than doubtful: but its knowledge of Mark is beyond question (cf. for instance Jn 6^{7} = Mk 6^{37}; Jn 12^{5} = Mk 14^{5}, where in both cases the numbers are omitted by Matthew and Luke but are given in John). The *Gospel of Peter* in my judgement knew and used all four canonical Gospels: but its use of Mark is primary, its use of the other three secondary.

In other words, every known Gospel of early times, alike in the great Church and in heretical circles, used St. Mark as the leading authority for the history of the life of Jesus.

(iii) But for seventeen centuries and more, from the middle of the 2nd century till after the middle of the 19th, St. Mark's Gospel fell more and more into the background. No doubt it was always one of the four canonical Gospels, and a MS. of the Gospels was incomplete without it: indeed, if it had not been for this 'canonization' it may be wondered whether it would have survived at all, so slight came to be the use made of it. Some homilies of St. Jerome, the Greek *catena* of Victor of Antioch, a commentary by Bede, are almost the only writings specifically devoted to St. Mark in patristic times, and the balance was not redressed till our own days. We cannot be sufficiently thankful for the early formulation of the fourfold Canon which has preserved for us this primary authority, primary at least from a critical and historical point of view, for the life of Christ.

(iv) Matthew and Luke may indeed give us a fuller record of His words, John may give us more mature and deeper reflection on His Person: but in John we have to allow both for the individuality of the thought of the evangelist and for the long lapse of time which seems to some of us to have here and there played havoc with the facts; and even in Matthew and Luke we have to allow for a more conscious writing of history and for the subtle growth of a changed attitude to the human element in the Lord's life and work.

Let us examine in some brief detail the relation of Matthew and Luke to Mark in the parts of their Gospels which one or both of them derived from him. Let us for this purpose put aside all their mere alterations of his language, and all their considerable abbreviations of his story—though these too are not quite without importance—and concentrate attention on those modifications which, however slight in themselves, have real and substantive meaning. Five points may be taken in succession as illustrating, by their cumulative effect, the contrast intended to be indicated. (1) In Mark the disciples always address our Lord by the Aramaic word Rabbi or its Greek equivalent 'Teacher,' and this no doubt correctly reproduces their actual usage: in Matthew and Luke other forms of address are invariably substituted, because Rabbi or Teacher seemed to the second generation of Christians a quite inadequate expression of the relation between disciples and their Lord. See for instance 4^{38} (and note), 9^{5}, with their parallels. (2) In Mark there is full place given to our Lord's working of miracles: but for all that in Matthew and Luke there is to be seen a certain heightening of emphasis. So $1^{32, 34}$ 'they brought all that were sick or possessed . . . . and he healed many' (see note), where Matthew inverts 'many' and 'all,' and Luke says 'he laid hands on each one of them and healed them'; 5^{39} Jairus's daughter 'is not dead but sleeping' (see note), where Matthew 'my daughter has just died,' and Luke 'they knew that she was dead,' transform Mark's miracle of healing into a raising of the dead; 6^{5} 'he could do there no mighty work,' which Matthew softens down into 'he did not do there many mighty works.' (3) And as the supernatural aspect is thus brought out by Matthew and Luke, so the more human side tends to be put in the background. In Mark our Lord finds out what He wants to know by the normal process of asking questions, e.g. 9^{33} He asks the disciples 'What were you discussing on the road?' where Matthew drops the question and Luke says instead that 'Jesus knew' the subject of discussion; cf. $9^{16, 21}$. (4) Mark notes too from time to time the human emotions of our Lord, His anger or indignation (1^{43}, 3^{5}, 10^{14}), His demonstrations of affection (9^{36}, $10^{16, 21}$), His consternation (14^{33}), and speaks of His human 'spirit' (2^{8}, 8^{12}), while all such language

disappears from the other Synoptic Gospels. (5) So also of the Apostles: Mark alone records their naive remonstrances with our Lord in the earlier days of their association with Him (4 38, 5 31, 6 37), and, both in his own narrative and in language ascribed to our Lord, speaks of their heart as 'blinded' or 'dulled' (6 52, 8 17); to Matthew and Luke the Apostles were already sacrosanct and above criticism, and therefore any statement or implication derogatory to them is almost sure to be omitted.

It has been an easy task to show the superior originality of Mark in comparison with the other Synoptists. There yet remains the last and most difficult part of the enquiry, namely the examination of the Gospel of Mark in itself. If we can trace, as between Mark on the one side and Matthew and Luke on the other, some tendency to modify as time went on the proportions of the original record, is it not natural, it may be asked, to suppose that the same tendency has been at work in Mark also, and that allowance must be made even in his case for some distortion of the original lineaments?

That question cannot be answered with the same precision as we have been able so far to attain, for the simple reason that we have no earlier document than Mark to bring into comparison with him. We must depend entirely on analysis of the Gospel itself. But the results of that analysis are, on the whole, extraordinarily reassuring.

The stages of such an analysis are two; the first is concerned with Mark, the second with Peter. We have first to ask, as to Mark, how far he has derived his material from Peter, and how far we can regard him as having conveyed to us the Petrine tradition in unadulterated form. We have then to go on and ask, as to Peter, how far he was likely to be, and how far he was, a faithful witness to the life and teaching of Jesus Christ.

Mark and his Authorities.—For the whole of the Ministry and for the story of the Passion as far as the condemnation by the Sanhedrin (1 14-14 72) Peter was an eye-witness and so could have been Mark's sole authority. Two main questions therefore dictate themselves on the threshold of the enquiry: the one, Who were Mark's authorities for the remainder of his Gospel? (1 1-13 and 15 1-16 8); and the other, Is there any reason, on internal grounds of analysis of the hypothetically Petrine portion, to segregate any part of it as non-Petrine? Only in one place, as it seems, does Mark give what is his own personal experience, in 14 51, 52: see the notes on those verses and on 14 36 ff.

(i) For 1 1-13 it is probable that Peter, though not there an eye-witness, was the source of Mark's knowledge. His brother Andrew was, according to the 4th Gospel (Jn 1 40), a disciple of the Baptist: and he himself, the chief of the disciples and intimate friend of Jesus, was as likely as anyone to have heard from Him the story of the Baptism and Temptation. But for 15 1-16 8 Peter was not an eye-witness, and Mark's record of the events must have been drawn (perhaps mediately through Peter, but perhaps more probably direct) from other sources. The Trial before Pilate is more baldly told in Mark (see on 15 3) than in any other of the Gospels; for the Crucifixion it may reasonably be conjectured that the witness of Simon the Cyrenian and of the holy women, or one of them, was at his disposal (see on 15 29-32), for that is the obvious explanation of their being mentioned by name in 15 21, 40; for the Resurrection again he will have depended on one of the women, presumably the otherwise unknown Mary, mother of James and Joseph, though no doubt, if we had the Gospel complete, Peter would have come once more upon the scene (see the appended note, p. 124[b]). It seems not unlikely too that Bartimæus was the narrator of the miracle of his own cure, not only because that is the only healing related in the later chapters of the Gospel, but also because it is the only miracle that is told apparently from the point of view of the man healed: see on 10 46-52. All these characters in Mark's story may well have been known personally to him, Bartimæus and Mary in Jerusalem, Simon in Jerusalem or in Rome.

(ii) So far the Markan element in the Gospel contains nothing to surprise us: it is in the main dictated by the circumstances. But we have now to ask whether we find reason to suppose that what we may provisionally call the Petrine story of the Ministry (1 14-14 72) betrays at any point the presence of an alien element, intruded by Mark from other sources into the Petrine narrative. And it must at once be admitted that there is one—though in my judgement probably not more than one—passage to which this description applies. The second account of the feeding of the multitude (8 1-10: see note *ad loc.*) can hardly be anything else than a doublet of the first (6 34-44): and, as between the two, it is the earlier story which by its dramatic touches approves itself as homogeneous with the Gospel as a whole. Moreover, 7 24-37, the section immediately

before the second feeding, is unique in the whole record of the Ministry as containing no mention of any disciples in company with our Lord, while the introductory phrase in 8^{1} is unlike any similar note of transition in the body of the Gospel after 1^{9}. It would seem therefore that 7^{24}-8^{10} or ^{12} (with 8^{20}) were derived by Mark from some other informant (there is no real reason to suppose a written source), and that the differences in detail between the two accounts of the feeding led Mark to suppose (erroneously) that he was relating two separate miracles.

Such a conclusion must of course detract something from our confidence in Mark. But not necessarily very much: for if this passage does stand alone as the only considerable section which on examination suggests positively a non-Petrine origin, is it really more than an *a priori* consideration of the probabilities might lead us to expect? We may hold the connexion of the Gospel as a whole with St. Peter to be undeniable, and yet need not assert that the evangelist has absolutely suppressed his own individuality. When the attempt is made to stereotype oral tradition in written form, gaps are sure to be found here and there; minor inconsistencies will reveal themselves; personal reminiscence will have to be transferred into indirect narrative. The hand of the editor is necessary to put the whole on to a coherent basis, and so it is natural to allow for the possibility of the intrusion of some slight amount of alien matter, recollections whether of the evangelist himself or of other original disciples, into the main Petrine stock. Suppose that some such early disciple was resident in Rome, and knew that Mark was casting into written form the substance of Peter's reminiscences, what more likely than that he should have begged the evangelist to incorporate just his own little bit of independent knowledge, as he conceived it to be and as in part it was, of the Ministry of the Lord? It must never be forgotten that in history, human nature being what it is, general conclusions are not necessarily or ordinarily valid without some qualification. The general conclusion that Mark's Gospel reproduces Peter's teaching, if satisfactorily established on other grounds, does not in the least cease to be true as a general conclusion because exception to its truth has here and there to be allowed for. It is just a question of proportion: and the proportion of what can be fairly judged to be non-Petrine matter is small indeed.

What evidence then does the internal analysis of Mark as a whole provide in confirmation or otherwise of the consentient tradition of early times connecting him with St. Peter? Very briefly we may emphasize in answer two characteristics of this Gospel.

(1) In strong contrast to Matthew and Luke, Mark's Gospel may be called autobiographical. They write Lives of Christ, he records the experience of an eyewitness and companion. It is crucial in this respect to note the predominant use of the plural in the narrative of Mark. Time after time a sentence commences with the plural, for it is an experience which is being related, and passes into the singular, for the experience is that of discipleship to a Master. So 1^{21} 'they enter Capernaum; and at once he taught on the sabbath in the synagogue'; 5^{38} 'they come to Jairus's house; and he sees the tumult . . .'; 9^{33} 'and they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house, he asked them . . .'; 10^{32} 'and they were on the road going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going on ahead of them . . .'; 11^{12} 'and on the morrow, when they had left Bethany, he hungered'; 11^{27} 'and they came again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking in the temple . . .'; 14^{32} 'and they came to . . . Gethsemane: and he saith to his disciples . . .' In none of these cases do either Matthew or Luke retain the plural: if the references given on 1^{21} (see *ad loc.*) are examined, it will be found that occasionally both retain Mark's plural, that more often only one of the two (more often Matthew than Luke) retains it, and perhaps more often still neither: and these references are only some out of many. Of course it is not suggested that any one of the three Synoptists had a rigid rule in the matter: but there is a clear and definite tendency in Mark to use the plural, in the others, and especially in Luke, to omit it.

(2) If the reader will now take one step further and put back Mark's third person plural into the first person plural of the narrator, he will receive a vivid impression of the testimony that lies behind the Gospel: thus in 1^{29}, 'we came into our house with James and John: and my wife's mother was ill in bed with a fever, and at once we tell him about her.' But this is to anticipate a little. Let us take our stand on the acquired result that the story as a whole comes from one of the intimate companions of Jesus, one at least of the twelve disciples who travel with Him on the last journey to Jerusalem. We can at once narrow our choice. For

five disciples special record is given of their call (1 17-20, 2 14). Four of the five were the auditors of a very private and familiar talk, about the End and its signs, in His last days (13 3). Three of these again made a sort of inner circle, who were not only admitted, to the exclusion of the rest, to the house of Jairus (5 37), but alone were with Him at the two great crises of the Transfiguration (9 2-14) and the Agony (14 33-42). Matthew and Luke derive these *arcana*, primarily and for the most part exclusively, from Mark: whence did Mark derive them but from one of the four, and from one of the three? But of the three James and John are named as a pair (besides their call) only twice (3 17 and 10 35); and John alone once (9 38). Peter, on the other hand, is given separate and distinctive mention in 1 36, 3 16, 8 29. 32, 9 5, 10 28, 11 21, 14 29, 37, 54 ff., 16 7. And four of these passages call for special notice: 16 7, because it implies that Peter played an individual part in the Lost Ending (see below, p. 124*b*); 11 21, for none but Peter would have '*remembered and* said'; 8 32 and 14 54, since it is not easy to suppose that any other would have recorded the Apostle's two great failures, and impossible to suppose that any other could have recorded his triple denial with such minute detail. The internal evidence of the Gospel tells thus exactly the same tale as the external: Peter is the disciple whose reminiscences and experience lie before us in the main body of Mark's work.

Now as a whole Mark gives the impression of being, what all tradition tells us he was, a faithful 'interpreter' of another man's ideas. He is simple, straightforward, unversed in literary artifice, Greek in speech but native Jew in all that lies behind speech, telling his story in the Old Testament manner with co-ordinate clauses and abundant repetition. He is no conscious historian like Matthew and Luke, constructing a Gospel from heterogeneous sources, blending teaching and narrative so as to produce a finished composition, a complete picture of the Christ. He had, beyond any New Testament writer, the 'mind of a disciple.' His story is homogeneous, with the qualifications above noted, from first to last. What lies outside his master's experience is confined, almost entirely, to the limits of just what is necessary to string his story together.

Then, finally, what of Peter himself? If Mark is the amanuensis, and Peter the moving spirit, does Peter himself give us, through Mark, an objective and impersonal record? We have worked back to the eye-witness, and an eye-witness who was of all the disciples the one best placed to tell us about Jesus, for he was the first and closest friend among them all. No doubt something must be allowed, at every new stage of the transmission, for some element of loss in the process. We would rather have had Peter's story direct from his own pen: but we have it in a form which, so far as analysis can tell us, has suffered comparatively little blurring of the sharpness of the outlines. And of Peter in turn all that we know goes to reassure us that what we have is a vivid and straightforward story of a real experience. He extenuates nothing: his ventures of faith and his failures, his slow apprehension and his steady growth of response to the Master's patient training, are all set down side by side.

Peter was not creative like Paul and John. He was the Rock on which the Church was built, just because he was the prototype of tradition. If we compare his 'memoirs' with those of John, we find indeed that they share some characteristic traits, the sort of things that give the impression of being told at first-hand, as against the other two evangelists: but John wrote a generation later, his purview is more or less limited to Jerusalem, and above all he is not so much a chronicler as an interpreter of facts, not so much an historian as a theologian, not only receptive but creative. His insight into the meaning of the story is supreme; the years that have passed have but deepened it: but his memory is an old man's memory, now strangely precise, correcting all three Synoptic accounts as to the relation of the Last Supper to the Passover, now as strangely off the lines of literal fact. Peter's mind was narrower in its range, but it was extraordinarily tenacious. He tells his own experiences; he does not suppress his own individuality; but the individuality is one which transforms itself on the model of a human friend who is realized to be a more than human Master, and the experience by which this realization comes about is related with no prepossession save to present it exactly as in fact it happened. It may well be that here and there what he recorded of the Master's teaching was beyond his understanding at the time: his apprehension of the Gospel message was not complete till he had welcomed Paul with open arms and admitted Cornelius to Christian baptism. That all meats were cleansed, that the new wine must burst the old bottles of Judaism, these lessons and such as these

were seed that took long to germinate in his slowly moving mind; but the words were the Master's, and it is to St. Peter's record, as set down by St. Mark, that we owe the most direct and literal transcript for posterity of the Life that has changed for all subsequent ages the course of the world's history.

[For analysis of the Gospel see notes at I. 1, I. 14, III. 13, VII. 24, VIII. 31, X. 32, X. 46, XI. 12, XI. 20, XIV. 1, XIV. 12, XV. 1, XV. 47.]

In all difficult passages reference should be made to the parallel passages, if any, in St. Matthew and St. Luke.

I. 1-13. The Good News of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God; the Preparatory Mission of John the Baptist; the Preparation of Jesus for His Ministry.—John preaches a baptism of repentance as a preliminary to the coming of One greater than himself who would baptize with the Holy Ghost. With the baptism of Jesus John's function is fulfilled: the Prophet makes way for Him to whom the Father bears witness, 'Thou art my Only Son.'

1-4. The construction of these four verses is difficult at first sight, but the clue to the true interpretation lies in recognition of the fact that [2] and [3] are parenthetical—in an English text they should be placed within brackets—so that [1] and [4] should be taken together: 'the beginning of the Good News of Jesus . . . was John the Baptist's preaching of a baptism of repentance.' The Greek verb translated 'came' in RV can equally well be rendered 'was.' Grammar, sense, Mark's fondness for parentheses, and the authority of the Greek Fathers, combine to recommend this solution of the difficulty. Only thus do we get good grammar, for the noun then has its verb, and good sense, for John's baptism was a real 'beginning of the Gospel' message. And the authority of ancient exegetes, like Origen and Basil, is of special value in the matter of understanding unpunctuated Greek MSS.: see e.g. on 7 [19]. Finally, parentheses are common in Mark, and (since ancient MSS. were devoid of such typographical expedients as brackets or dashes) are liable, especially if the parentheses are long, to mislead scribes and interpreters: see, for instance, even the brief parenthesis in 2 [15, 16]. Here the Old Test. quotations, reinforcing the first statement of Mark's Gospel, serve to link on the New Dispensation with the Old.

1. The Fourth Evangelist, whose knowledge of Mark is certain and obvious, also opens with 'the beginning' and with the mission of the Baptist: but to him 'the beginning' is not the Baptist's mission, but the eternal pre-existence of the Word.

the Gospel, more literally *the good news*: and it is in this literal sense only that Mark, who is specially fond of the word, uses it. So, too, when one or other written Gospel was entitled 'the good news according to Mark' or 'according to Matthew,' the good news was still a single thing, the good news about Jesus Christ as told by Mark or Matthew. But very soon it became customary to talk, just we as do, of the 'Gospels,' that is, the different embodiments in writing of the good news, though in strictness the good news was one and only one. It is not likely that the plural use 'Gospels' goes back to the 1st century: but it is quite possible that when the later evangelists wrote there was already a tendency to think of the good news or Gospel as something written, and that may be the reason why Matthew and Luke always omit or modify Mark's phrase 'the Gospel.' See Mk 1 [14, 15], 3 [14], 8 [35], 10 [29], 13 [10], 14 [9].

of Jesus Christ the Son of God: that is, 'about Jesus (as) Messiah (Christ) and Son of God.' The words are an epitome of St. Mark's Gospel: St. Peter's confession, 'Thou art the Messiah,' is the culmination of the first half of it, and it is more than likely that the Lost Ending (see below, p. 124*b*) contained a parallel confession of the Divine Sonship, for the indications of the remainder of the Gospel point in the direction of some such climax. The Father proclaims the Sonship in 1 [11]; the evil spirits recognize the Son of God, 3 [11]; once and again, as the story draws to its close, our Lord in His teaching and conversation challenges the same recognition from men—the Son of Man shall come 'in the glory of his Father,' 8 [38]; He whom the husbandmen in the parable put to death is the Son and heir, 12 [6, 7]; the son of David is also Lord of David, 12 [35, 37]; Messiah is Son of the Blessed, 14 [61]. That Jesus is Son of God is therefore as integral a part of the 'good news' according to Mark as that He is Messiah; and so on *a priori* grounds there is the best reason for supposing the words 'Son of God' in [1] to be genuine. The evidence for omitting them, indicated in the margin of RV, shrinks, in fact, on examination to very small proportions. Most of the Fathers alleged for omission are simply comparing the openings of the different Gospels, and cite the fewest words that will serve to identify the Gospel meant. And the two important witnesses that

remain, Origen and the codex Sinaiticus, are perhaps not two witnesses but one: the codex is, not improbably, nothing else than a copy on vellum of the Greek papyrus rolls that Origen brought with him from Alexandria to Palestine. Our oldest and best witnesses, including B (Vaticanus) and D (codex Bezæ), retain the words: it was no doubt by accident that they dropped out from some Alexandrian MS. of the late 2nd or early 3rd century, and in the case of Sacred Names, which would be abbreviated to a couple of letters apiece, accidental omission was easy enough. Note how nearly this summary of our earliest Gospel corresponds to the symbol, found in many of the earliest Christian sepulchral inscriptions, of a fish; the fish being chosen as consisting in Greek (*ichthys*) of the initial letters of the five words 'Jesus Christ Son of God Saviour.'

2. in Isaiah the prophet RV rightly: 'in the Prophets' of AV is an ancient attempt to get rid of the difficulty that of the two quotations which follow only the second is from Isaiah (40 [3]), while the first is from Mal 3 [1]. Either, then, Mark added the first as an afterthought in the margin, or he drew both from an early collection of *testimonia* (i.e. Old Testament passages bearing on the successive features of the Gospel story) in which the reference to Isaiah had got misplaced; or he may even have made the slip himself. Mark perhaps did not know his Greek Bible as well as either Matthew or Luke: except here, he never cites it outside the record of our Lord's words.

3. Make ye ready the way of the Lord: Jehovah, that is to say, comes in the mission of Jesus Christ.

4. John . . . who baptized. Rather *John the Baptizer*: Mark, alone among New Testament writers, uses a phrase which goes back behind the familiar 'John the Baptist'—one among many indications of his primitive date and outlook. So also 6 [14, 25].

baptism of repentance or change of mind (see on 1 [15]): so of Christian baptism, Ac 2 [38], 'repent and be baptized.' The repentance is warranted by the preliminary confession of sins ([5]).

unto remission of sins RV: unfortunately obscuring the connexion with the language of the Creed, 'baptism for the remission of sins.' John's baptism, then, shared with Christian baptism the purpose of forgiveness of sins (so, too, Lk 3 [3]): the essential difference was that it supplied no grace for the new life after baptism: see on [8].

5. in the river Jordan: Mark, on the first mention of Jordan, explains for his Roman and Gentile readers that Jordan was a river.

6. a leathern girdle about his loins: from the description of Elijah in 2 K 1 [8]. The words are omitted by some important MSS., and may have been brought in by scribes from Mt 3 [4], since Matthew is much more given than Mark to adducing illustrations from the Old Testament.

8. I baptized you RV: wrongly, for in English this would mean that John had ceased to baptize. Here is one of the cases where the Greek aorist is not equivalent to the English past tense: another is [11], where to translate 'I was well pleased' would be ridiculous. AV better *I have baptized.*

with the Holy Ghost: or, as there is no article here in the Greek, *with Holy Spirit.* The *differentia*, then, of Christian baptism is that it adds the gift of the Spirit. The phrase recurs in Ac 1 [5], 11 [16]; in Ac 1 [5] it refers to the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (and that is presumably why the parallels in Matthew and Luke have here 'with holy Spirit and fire'); in Ac 11 [16] St. Peter is reminded of the Lord's words (in Ac 1 [5]) by the descent of the Holy Spirit on Cornelius. But why is the gift of the Holy Spirit called 'baptism'? Obviously (as I think) because it normally formed part of Christian baptism, being given after the baptismal immersion by the laying on of apostolic hands (Ac 19 [5, 6], 8 [15-17]). In other words, 'baptism with (the) Holy Spirit' is what we call Confirmation, which in apostolic and early times, if baptism was administered by or in the presence of an Apostle or Bishop, followed it immediately, and in any other case as soon as practicable. Baptism with water, and Confirmation, were in fact two essential parts of a single Sacrament.

9. Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee. St. Mark's Gospel was, so far as we know, the first attempt at a Life of Christ: it was an answer, that is, to the demand of converts who wanted to know who and what manner of man He was whose teaching they had accepted, whose disciples they now professed themselves to be, into whose society they had been admitted as members. And the answer naturally takes the form of an autobiography: Peter gives the record of his own experiences of discipleship from his call by the Master to the (lost) appearance to him after the Resurrection. Here and there, of course, the story has been filled out, whether by the Apostle or the

Evangelist, from the testimony of other witnesses, especially at the beginning and end of the Gospel. For the preaching of John, Peter's own knowledge (Jn 1 [41. 42]), let alone common report, would have been enough; the events of the Baptism and Temptation Peter had received no doubt from our Lord's own lips (see below, on [10] and [11]). So much summary was needed as an introduction to the account of our Lord's public ministry and of His disciple's experience. Anything more was alien to the purpose of the Gospel: and therefore nothing more is given. The Gospels of Mark and John are the records of individual testimony, and so Peter and John confine themselves to the subject-matter of which they had personal knowledge. But the two Gospels that followed Mark's were not written, as we have them, by actual witnesses, and depending on others they naturally extend their historical investigations further back, and in St. Luke's case, with the Acts, further forward as well. That St. Mark's Gospel contains then no record of our Lord's Birth, Childhood, and early life is a *necessary* consequence of its plan and purpose. No argument whatever can be drawn from its silence as to any events concerned with them. Our Lord came 'from Nazareth of Galilee' to commence His public work, and therewith to enter the sphere of Peter's experience: that is all that had to be said.

in the Jordan RV, with margin 'into.' 'In' is correct (so AV): one of the most obvious characteristics of Mark's vernacular, non-literary Greek is the use of the preposition 'into' where classical Greek demanded the preposition 'in' (cf. 1 [39]). Modern Greek has gone beyond Mark and has dropped the latter altogether.

10. straightway. The persistent use of this phrase (so, for instance, 1 [12, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 42, 43]) is the oddest mannerism in St. Mark's Gospel. One may conjecture that it goes back to St. Peter's vivid way, accompanied perhaps with some dramatic gesture, of telling the Gospel story to his converts: to some extent the other Evangelists replace it by the word 'behold,' which Mark never employs in narrative. Perhaps too something may be meant to be suggested of the strain and pressure of our Lord's work during the days of His Ministry.

he saw the heavens rent asunder and the Spirit . . . That is to say, in Mark the Baptism is related entirely as our Lord's own experience. There is nothing here to suggest that the descent of the Spirit was seen, or the Voice from heaven heard, by any but our Lord Himself. At the Transfiguration, on the other hand, the Voice was addressed to the three Apostles (9 [7]): 'This is . . . hear him,' not 'Thou art . . . in thee . . .'

11. my beloved Son. Rather *My Only Son.* Nearly all expositors, apart from the great Dutch scholar Daniel Heinsius in the first half of the 17th century, have gone wrong (as it seems to me) by not paying sufficient attention to the meaning of the word *agapetos* in classical and Septuagint usage. *Agape*, love, is practically a creation of the Christian Church, for though it is sporadically found in the LXX, it does not appear in classical Greek at all. The verb, and the verbal adjective *agapetos*, are both classical, but 'to love,' 'beloved,' is not their proper meaning. *Agapetos* is 'that with which one must be content,' and so technically 'that of which one has no more than one,' and in particular 'an only' son or daughter. So Aristotle in the *Ethics* speaks of the duty of a wealthy man to spend largely on the banquet at the coming of age of an *agapetos* or only son: and in the *Rhetoric*, summarizing the kind of arguments barristers would employ on behalf of their clients, he emphasizes the distinction, in the case of those who have lost an eye, between the man who has another eye left and the man who had lost one already —'other men have one eye left, and one-eyed men, though they have lost something, have not lost everything: my client is deprived of his *agapetos*,' i.e. his only remaining eye. So also in the LXX: 'thy son, thine only son' of Isaac in Gen 22 [2, 12, 16] is again *agapetos* in the Greek (and no passage of the LXX is more likely than this, in conjunction with Ps 2 [7], to lie behind the thought of those who rendered into Greek the Voice at the Baptism); or again in the Prophets, (Am 8 [10]; Jer 6 [26]; Zech 12 [10]), mourning 'for an only son.' The same meaning is natural, 'one only son,' in the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (see Mk 12 [6]). No doubt this use of *agapetos* quickly gave way, with the large use of *agape* in Christian circles, to the more obvious meaning of an apparent derivative of *agape*, 'beloved.' But there are traces here and there in the Old Latin version, both of the New Testament and of the Old Testament, of the survival of a knowledge of the original meaning of the phrase as 'only son'; and Athanasius appeals to 'those skilled in Greek idioms' and to Homer, when asserting against the Arians

that the meaning 'only Son' is here the true one. Once more Greek Fathers are right against more modern tradition.

13. **Satan.** Greek-speaking Christians took over from the original Christians of Palestine certain Aramaic words or phrases, especially those of liturgical use, like Amen, Abba = Father (Mk 14 [36]; Rom 8 [15]), Marana tha, 'Come, Lord Jesus' (1 Cor 16 [22]; cf. Rev 22 [20]), and personal names of angels and evil spirits, Michael, Gabriel, Satan. Most of these dropped out in time, and Greek equivalents soon took their place. It is one of the archaic features of St. Mark that he retains them to a larger extent than do the other Gospels. Thus he always uses 'Satan' (3 [23, 26], 4 [15], 8 [33]), never 'the devil' or 'the evil one.' See too on 14 [36].

ministered: i.e. to His bodily need, as of the holy women in 15 [41], and cf. 1 [31]. Matthew places the ministry of the angels at the end of the forty days, but the parallelism of the clauses here, 'was being tempted . . . was with the beasts . . . were ministering' indicates that Mark meant either during the whole forty days or possibly at the beginning of it—compare the story of Elijah's forty days' fast in 1 K 19 [5] ff.

14. **The Ministry, first half: The Good News of Jesus as Messiah (1 [14]-8 [30]). (I) The Ministry of Power: Jesus addresses His message to His countrymen at large, teaching with authority and demonstrating His power over sin and disease by casting out evil spirits and healing the sick (1 [14]-3 [12]).**

Now. So both AV and RV, rightly: for according to the true reading the paragraph does not begin with Mark's almost invariable 'and,' but with the alternative Greek particle, which in Matthew and Luke and in Greek writers generally is that ordinarily used for transition, though Mark only so uses it to note some large new departure in his narrative (7 [24], 10 [32], 14 [1]). Here it emphasizes the commencement of the public ministry.

was delivered up RV: a literal rendering of the Greek. But Mark meant, and his readers would have understood him to mean, 'delivered into prison.' An English reader would not necessarily understand the connotation of the word: *arrested* or *imprisoned* is therefore better (AV 'was put in prison'). Mark does not delay his narrative at this point with further details: in his inconsequential but effective way he gives them later on (6 [17-29]), because there they are wanted to explain the development of popular beliefs about the character and mission of Jesus

the Gospel of God RV, and if this is correct it means 'the good news from God,' 'sent by God,' and is a point of contact (there are not wanting other such points in Mark) with Pauline phraseology. AV follows another and easier reading, almost as well supported, 'the Gospel of the Kingdom of God.'

the Kingdom of God is at hand. The expectation of 'a good time coming' has been ineradicable in the hearts of men: Hope still lay at the bottom of Pandora's box, according to the Greek myth, when all other gifts and blessings had taken flight from human life: Virgil's Fourth Eclogue testifies to the same hope in the pagan world of the time. Among the Jews especially, since the age of the later Prophets and still more from the date of the Maccabees, there had grown up an eager looking for the 'consolation of Israel' and 'redemption of Jerusalem' (Lk 2 [25, 38]) in a heavenly kingdom established on earth, in which righteousness should be vindicated and the Holy God reign over His holy people. More and more had this hope in religious circles become spiritualized: portions, for instance, of the (composite) book of Enoch approximate closely to some elements of the New Testament idea of the Kingdom—in particular the Kingdom is there conceived as definitely Messianic, that is, as ruled over by God's anointed vicegerent.

Jesus then came to set up this Kingdom of God upon earth, and to be Himself its Head as God's representative. That His followers called Him their King seems to follow from the language of the accounts of the Triumphal Entry on Palm Sunday, and of the Trial and Crucifixion: compare too Ac 17 [7], 'another King, even Jesus,' as well as the early Acts of the Martyrs, which supplement the Imperial or Consular dating with 'regnante autem Christo Iesu domino nostro . . .' or the like.

But though the Kingdom had thus come, it was also to come, and Christians are still praying 'Thy Kingdom come,' for it cannot be established in its completeness till all nations are gathered into it and evil finally overthrown, so that God 'shall be all in all' (1 Cor 15 [24, 28]).

repent: literally 'change your mind,' and so always in classical Greek; in later and in Christian Greek with the added sense 'in the direction of repentance,' but perhaps we lose something in English by the obscuring of the original content of the word.

the gospel: that is, the good news of

the coming of the Messianic Kingdom with Jesus the Messiah.

16. passing along: AV more idiomatically 'as he . . .' Translate *as he was passing along.*

the sea of Galilee or in John 'the sea of Tiberias': always called 'sea' by the local patriotism of the three Palestinian evangelists, but by Luke 'the lake' (5 [1] 'lake of Gennesaret').

Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon: see on [29].

19. James and John. Always in Mark in this order (1 [29], 3 [17], 5 [37], 9 [2], 10 [35, 41], 13 [3], 14 [33]): and it is natural to conclude that James is named first as the elder. Luke, writing in the light of later history, gives on occasions the preference to the historically more important brother (Lk 8 [51], 9 [28]; Ac 1 [13]): in Mk 1 [19], 3 [17], 5 [37] John is 'brother of James,' but in Ac 12 [2] James is 'brother of John.'

the boat . . . the nets. So rendered, the implication in English would be that James and John were in Simon's boat and were mending the common stock of nets. One of the first rules that the beginner in the classical languages is taught, is that in them the possessive pronoun is habitually omitted, while with us it is necessarily expressed. We must therefore translate *in their boat* and with AV (here and in [18]) *their nets.* So 'the hands' are regularly used in the Greek for 'his hands,' 'their hands,' 'your hands,' e.g. 6 [5], 7 [3], 9 [43].

with the hired servants gives perhaps a slightly wrong impression: 'with his men' is what is meant. In adding this detail, St. Peter did not intend to emphasize, though no doubt he implies, Zebedee's social standing; if it is more than just a pictorial touch, it is meant to suggest that the sons did not abandon their father to deal with the work alone.

21. they go: cf. [29] 'when they were come out of the synagogue, they came . . .' Mark is specially fond of the plural in recording the movements of Jesus and His disciples, while Matthew and Luke tend to replace it by the singular. Why? Because St. Peter told the story autobiographically, 'we go,' 'when we were come out,' and so on, while Matthew and Luke write not as actors in the events, but as biographers, concentrating attention on the figure of the Master (see Mk 5 [1, 38], 6 [53, 54], 8 [22], 9 [14, 30, 33], 10 [32, 46], 11 [1, 12, 15, 20, 27], 14 [18, 22, 26, 32]). In all these passages Mark's third person plural may be reasonably understood as representing a first person plural of Peter's discourses. More often than not, the parallels in Matthew and Luke either omit the plural verbs altogether or replace them by a verb in the singular.

he entered into the synagogue and taught. Our Lord, and His Apostles after Him in the first age of the Church, regularly attended the worship of the local synagogue—went to church, as we should say—every Saturday. To show the sort of way in which He might be invited to address the congregation, see Lk 4 [16] ff.; Ac 13 [15].

22. as having authority and not as the scribes. 'Scribes' (i.e. 'legal experts,' 'interpreters') judged as to the meaning of doubtful points in the Law: they quoted the opinions of eminent Rabbis as to what might be lawfully done or what might not. But our Lord said, This is right or wrong; He did not reject the authority of the Law, but He spoke as having authority from God to enunciate and enforce the principles that underlay the Law, and to carry them on into a new expression and a more complete correspondence with the Will of God in the coming Kingdom. 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . But I say unto you . . .'

24. Jesus of Nazareth. Literally *the Nazarene.* Mark, writing for Gentile readers, always uses the Greek (and Roman) adjective for 'a man of Nazareth' (10 [47], 14 [67], 16 [6]). It is presumably from his Gospel that this form—rather than the alternative form, commoner in the New Testament, 'Nazoræan'—became established in Greek and Latin (and so in English) Christian usage.

art thou come to destroy us? In the absence of punctuation in the MSS., and in the absence, characteristic of Mark's Greek, of any particle defining the sense, it is impossible, except from the context, to say whether this clause is meant to be a question (so AV and RV), or (as I rather think) a statement of fact. See a similar case in 16 [6], and the note there. For other groups of three disjointed clauses, beginning with an interrogation, in Mark, cf. 1 [27], 2 [7], 14 [64].

the Holy One of God. So St. Peter in Jn 6 [69]. Both there and here it appears to be equivalent of the Christ or Anointed One. In 3 [11] the unclean spirits advance to the further acknowledgement of 'the Son of God.'

25. Hold thy peace. Literally 'be muzzled': an instance of Mark's effective use of the language of the common people (it recurs in 4 [39]), and much more striking in Greek than in English, since our habit-

ual use of metaphorical language is quite alien from the genius of Greek.

27. A new teaching! with authority he commandeth . . . Luke (4 [36]) apparently, like AV and RV, understood Mark as intending 'with authority' and 'he commandeth' to be taken together. But in face of 1 [22], 'he taught as having authority,' it seems more natural to take 'with authority' in connexion with the preceding words, 'a new teaching with authority.' The newness of the teaching consisted for its hearers primarily in the fact that it was authoritative in form: its authority was now guaranteed by the submission of the unclean spirits.

28. into all the region of Galilee round about. The true rendering seems to lie midway between this, which limits the Greek phrase too much, and AV 'the region round about Galilee,' which certainly extends it too much. Perhaps *the whole Galilean district* or *neighbourhood*. Cf. 1 [39], 3 [7, 8].

29. they came into the house of Simon and Andrew with James and John. An awkward phrase, which only becomes really intelligible when we put it back into the mouth of St. Peter: 'we came into our house with James and John.' So in [16] 'he saw me and Andrew my brother.'

31. took her by the hand. In some of His cures our Lord is recorded by Mark to have healed by word alone (2 [11], 3 [5], 10 [52]); in some by touch alone (here and 1 [41], 8 [23, 25]); in some by both (5 [41], 7 [33, 34]). Perhaps if the accounts were fuller, we should have found that normally He made use both of the word and the sacramental act. See note on 6 [5].

32. at even, when the sun did set. It is characteristic of Mark's redundant style to describe the same thing in two ways. Sometimes an additional shade of meaning may be given in the second clause: thus here it may be suggested that the Sabbath (1 [21]) was over, and the most scrupulous might bring out their sick; or in 14 [30], 'to-day, in this night,' some extra precision is attached to the date. More often the double phrase is nearly or entirely pleonastic: so in the next few verses: 1 [35] 'in the morning a great while before day,' 'went out and departed,' 1 [42] 'the leprosy departed and he was made clean,' 1 [45] 'to publish it much and to spread abroad the matter.' Naturally Matthew and Luke tend to abbreviate at such points, and to retain only one or other of the double phrases: to some extent the scribes of Mark fell under a similar temptation; see notes on 1 [40], 9 [38], 12 [23]: and cf. also 2 [19].

33. the whole city was gathered together at the door. That is to say, a definite occasion is in view: in other words, from [21] to [34] is the account of events on one and the same day, perhaps the first Sabbath after the call of the Apostles.

34. many that were sick . . . many devils. Mark does not mean to imply that not 'all that were sick' of [32] were healed: though neither does he affirm, as do Matthew and Luke, that all were in fact healed. There is a certain heightening between Mark on the one hand, and Matthew and Luke on the other, of the miraculous element: see below on the story of Jairus's daughter (5 [39]), and on the ministry at Nazareth (6 [5]). We can therefore be the more confident that in Mark's Gospel we have the plain unexaggerated record of an eye-witness who tried to relate the facts just as he had experienced them.

because they knew him (1 [24], 3 [11]). Even the witness of the evil spirits had its value, as arresting attention and challenging to reflection about Jesus. But it was only valid, as the evidence from the miracles was only valid, up to that point: our Lord wanted men to think for themselves, and to believe in Him because of the claim which His whole teaching and character and personality made on them.

RV's marginal addition 'to be Christ' is a good example of the extent to which even the best MSS. succumb to the temptation of supplementing the text of Mark from parallel passages in Matthew and Luke (here from Lk 4 [41]).

36. Simon and they that were with him. Possibly still only the three called with him, Andrew, James, and John: more probably a larger group intermediate between the first four and the 'many disciples' of 2 [15].

38. the next towns (AV and RV). Rather 'the neighbouring country towns': Mark uses a rare word, literally 'village-cities,' intermediate between ordinary villages and a big town like Capernaum.

came I forth: that is, from Capernaum, cf. [35]. Capernaum was our Lord's headquarters, and from it He made missionary excursions through Galilee, returning always to it, 2 [1], 3 [19], 5 [21] (6 [30]), and probably 7 [1]: not till 7 [24] does He definitely move away beyond the Galilean district. Mark does not mean (though Luke so interprets him, 4 [43]) 'came forth from God,' a Johannine phrase (Jn 8 [42], 13 [3]) quite alien alike from the straightforward literalness of Mark's style and from the stage reached by our Lord's

self-disclosure at this part of the Gospel.

39. he went into their synagogues . . . preaching, RV wrongly: AV rightly *he preached* [more literally *was preaching*] *in their synagogues.* The reading followed by RV is an attempt to regularize the use of the preposition 'into,' which Mark often uses for 'in.' See note on 1^{9} 'in the Jordan.'

40. and kneeling down to him: a characteristically Marcan redundancy (after 'beseeching him'), omitted, whether because it was redundant or because it expressed a rather violent emotion, by some good MSS. of Mark here, and by Matthew and Luke in copying Mk 10^{17}. We must remember that the Jews did not kneel but stood in prayer (11^{25}).

41. being moved with compassion. Read, with codex Bezæ and two Old Latin MSS., *being moved with anger*: for (1) it is inconceivable that any scribe should have substituted 'anger' for 'compassion,' while the converse is intelligible enough; (2) the word mistranslated 'strictly' [margin 'sternly'], 'charged him' in 43, and 'murmured against her' in 14^{5}, means literally 'to snort with anger' (see Souter's *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, s.v. 'to groan,' 'to express indignant displeasure'); (3) Matthew and Luke, who otherwise follow Mark in this episode rather closely, have nothing parallel either to the verb of 41 or to that of 43, and the motive for omission at both points is doubtless the same, namely the avoidance of anything which clashed with the portrait of Jesus as the second Christian generation tended to picture Him. Compare 3^{5}, where Mark's 'with anger' disappears from the other two accounts.

Why, then, was our Lord angry? The answer must probably be found in the leper's words in 40, 'If thou wilt, thou canst . . .' To doubts of His power our Lord was very tender ($9^{22, 23}$): the leper had no doubt of His power, but was uncertain of His will, to heal. Now to acknowledge His power but doubt His good-will, was in germ the same temper as that of the scribes from Jerusalem, who admitted His power but denied that it came from God. So if Jesus could, but would not, heal, His mission could not come from the all-merciful God; if then the leper regarded Him as a wonder-worker, exercising His power at caprice, our Lord may well have been indignant at such a fundamental misconception.

44. for a testimony unto them. The same phrase in 6^{11} and 13^{9}, in both of which places AV renders 'for a testimony against them.' The cure of the leper would be a sign to the priests that a new and beneficent power was present in their midst, and if they either neglected the sign, or wilfully referred a good work to an evil origin, would be a 'testimony against them.'

45. into a city RV: margin and AV *into the city.* The reference is certainly to Capernaum: the article is omitted in the Greek, just as we omit it in talking of going 'up to town,' meaning London, or as an Eton boy talks of going 'down town' to Windsor. By a similar idiom 'in [the] house' of 2^{1} means simply 'indoors.'

desert places: rather perhaps *the open country.* There was no desert, strictly speaking, on the west side of the lake.

II. 2. he spake the word. We cannot easily distinguish in our language the ordinary Greek word for 'to say' or 'speak,' and the less common word used, here and frequently elsewhere by Mark, which rather indicates informal and familiar converse. 'Talked' is sometimes the best equivalent for it.

the word: that is, 'the message' of the good news. 'To preach the Word,' 'the ministry of the Word' are phrases so ingrained in Christian language that it is difficult to realize that at first it was a special and technical password, so to say, as much so as 'the Way' or 'the Brethren' (cf. $4^{14, 33}$).

4. uncovered the roof: that is, mounted by the external stair to the flat house-top (cf. 13^{15}) and from there made a hole through.

the bed, literally 'pallet' or 'shake-down': Mark, whose Greek is that of the common people, uses a non-literary word, which passed also into vernacular Latin as *grabatus.* It was something that could be easily carried about (6^{55}; Jn 5^{8}; Ac 5^{15}).

5. See on 10.

7. one, even God RV: AV *God only* rightly, and so the phrase should be rendered (against both our versions) in 10^{18}.

8. perceiving in his spirit: equivalent to 'perceiving in himself' (5^{30}), 'spirit' meaning His human spirit, as in 8^{12} (and cf. 14^{38}): but neither Matthew nor Luke repeats this use.

9. Whether is easier . . . Nothing is more characteristic of our Lord's method of teaching as recorded by Mark than His habit of propounding questions,

or answering question by question: e.g. 2 [19], 3 [33], 10 [18], 11 [29, 30], 12 [35]. Not all these questions admitted of immediate answer: their point was to provoke searchings of heart.

10. the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins. 'The Son of man' is in Mark the normal phrase used by our Lord in reference to Himself from the confession at Cæsarea Philippi onwards: before that central moment only here and 2 [28]. It cannot be *simply* equivalent to Messiah, or our Lord could not have asked His disciples 'Whom do ye say that I the Son of man am' in 8 [27, 29]. But still less can it be simply equivalent to 'a son of man,' or the claim to forgive sins as a son of man would have been rightly held to be preposterous. Clearly in this passage it connotes one who though Man has definite authority and mission from God. And if that authority includes the forgiveness of sins in the earthly sphere, then the commission entrusted to Jesus was different in kind, and not merely in degree, from the commission of any prophet. Our Lord, that is to say, is already, in this first stage of His Ministry, challenging the attention of men with the assertion of some quite unique claim. In substance, that means the claim to be God's special representative for the establishment of His Kingdom on earth: that is, to be Messiah. In terms, it takes the form of an insistent demand that those to whom He speaks should face the problem who and what He must be who can claim to forgive sins, and can so far establish His claim that He can cure a paralytic for his faith with a command to rise and walk. If He could do this, then they had in the end two alternatives to choose between, either that His power to heal came from God or that it came from Beelzebub. If it came from God, as He asserted, then the presumption followed that His further claim in the moral sphere was also valid; for God would not have given the power to do mighty works to one who made a claim which if not true was blasphemous. His hearers were not prepared to choose definitely either alternative. But they accepted the fact of the cure, and 'glorified God' ([12]) for it as for something beyond the range of their experience. They had taken the first step: and perhaps our Lord did not expect more from them on the spur of the moment. It remained to be seen whether they would advance further on the road on which He was leading them.

13. the sea side: that is, of course, as throughout Mark, the 'sea of Galilee.'

14. Levi the son of Alphæus. Not mentioned again in Mark, and therefore apparently not identified by Mark (or by Lk 5 [27]), as he is in the parallel story in Mt 9 [9], with the Matthew who occurs in the list of the Twelve (3 [18]). On the other hand, as this Levi is the only disciple whose call is mentioned by name besides the four chief Apostles, it is reasonable to conjecture that he too became one of the Twelve, and he was presumably brother of 'James the son of Alphæus.' See further on the list of the Twelve (3 [16-19]).

at the place of toll RV, 'at the receipt of custom' AV. Better perhaps *in the custom-house*. Capernaum was on the Great Road from Mesopotamia to Egypt, so that much merchandise would pass through it.

15. as he sat at meat. Our Lord did not disdain social intercourse, even when, as on this occasion, the company was large and mixed: cf. Mk 14 [3] = Jn 12 [2]; Lk 7 [36], 11 [37, 38], 14 [1, 7, 12].

publicans and sinners. 'Publicans' (our rendering is derived from the Latin *publicani*) were civil servants in the employ of the government: but what is meant by 'sinners'? We must exclude the technical sense of 'Gentiles'—which is certainly the meaning in 14 [41] (cf. 10 [33]), as in Gal 2 [15]—if only because, had our Lord eaten with Gentiles from the beginning of His Ministry, St. Peter could not have held the language of Ac 10 [28]. We must exclude also the other technical sense of Lk 7 [37], which there is nothing at all in the phrase or the context to suggest here. Probably it covers any who did not come up to the Pharisaic standard of observance of the Law. Its modern counterpart might be 'non-churchgoers.'

for there were many, and they followed him. 'Many publicans' or 'many disciples'? Undoubtedly the latter: it is the first time that Mark has used the word 'disciples,' and he means to call attention to the fact that 'Simon and his companions' of 1 [36] have now grown into a body of 'disciples'—'learners' at the feet of a 'master' or Rabbi—and that they were beginning to go about with Jesus. The words are an explanatory parenthesis quite after Mark's manner.

16. He eateth RV: margin with AV 'How is it that he eateth?' In fact, we have here one of Mark's vulgarisms, the use of the indirect for the direct interrogative, and we ought to translate simply *Why eateth He?* The same use recurs in 9 [11] and 9 [28]; in both cases RV text

makes the clause a statement, AV with RVm rightly a question. It has to be recognized that Mark did not write classical or literary Greek, and it is useless to try and translate him as though he did. This particular usage recurs in other Greek Christian writers of a non-literary type, such as Barnabas and Hermas.

17. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners: rather *not to call righteous men but sinful men:* My ministry is directed to just such people as you think outsiders, rather than to those who are confident that, because they have scrupulously observed all the external details of the Law, they have attained righteousness. 'As touching the righteousness which is in the Law, blameless' (Phil 3 [6]).

18. were fasting RV rightly: it was a fast-day, that is to say, perhaps only one of the weekly fasts (Lk 18 [12]), but we cannot tell. **they came:** not John's disciples, nor those of the Pharisees, but 'people came.' Mark is fond of this impersonal plural: see on 3 [21].

19. the sons of the bride-chamber: as we should say, 'the groomsmen.'

20. in that day RV rightly. It is more than likely that the *Pascha*, that is, the annual commemoration of the Resurrection with a fast immediately preceding it, was when Mark wrote already in regular use in the Christian communities. Tertullian definitely connects the Paschal fast with the Gospel saying: 'those days they hold to be marked out for fasts "in which the bridegroom was taken away."' Probably the earliest custom of this fast confined it to a single day preceding the Easter festival; and this would account for the singular in Mark. If this verse was spoken by our Lord in this connexion and on this occasion, it is the earliest anticipation of the Passion. We cannot dogmatize on such a matter: but there is no other indication that at this stage of the Ministry the End was definitely before His mind. It is possible therefore that the qualification of [19] by [20] is due to St. Peter, perhaps on the basis of other later words of Christ.

21, 22. The connexion of thought with [19] appears to be that the Kingdom, of which our Lord's mission was to announce the coming, must have its own principles and its own rules, so entirely was it to supersede the existing Jewish polity. In one sense Christianity was a development, in another it was a revolution. Our Lord's teaching contained both elements: the kingdom of heaven is like the householder who brings out of his treasure things new and old. In Matthew's Gospel we have emphasis on the fulfilment of the old in the new: in Mark's record of Peter's preaching to Gentile Christians at Rome we have the stress on the incompatibility of Judaism and Christianity, on the bursting of the ancient bottles by the seething of the new wine.

21. that which should fill it up: literally 'the fulness,' a word only used by Mark here and of the fragments that filled the baskets in 6 [43] and 8 [20]. In all three cases 'complement' expresses the exact sense.

22. they put: if the preceding clause is bracketed as a parenthesis, no insertion such as 'they put' is necessary.

23. to pluck the ears of corn: it was therefore towards harvest-time, April to June. As there is no reason to doubt that the order of events in Mark is in substance chronological, we have here a first spring, in 6 [39] 'upon the green grass' (cf. Jn 6 [4] 'the passover was at hand') a second spring, and at the final passover a third spring: it follows that according to Mark the Ministry extended over some two years. With this result the three passovers in Jn (2 [13], 6 [4], 12 [1]) tally exactly. The Gospel of Luke, taken by itself, might suggest, and in ancient times perhaps did suggest, a Ministry of only one year (Lk 9 [51], 4 [19]): but the more precise evidence of Mark and John seems decisive.

24. why do they on the sabbath day that which is not lawful? The Mosaic Law, more liberal than some modern enactments *in pari materia*, allowed the passer-by to take toll as he walked of ripe grapes or ears of standing corn (Dt 23 [24, 25]). But the rule of Sabbath rest overrode even the necessities of harvest-time, and reaping on the Sabbath was forbidden (Ex 34 [21]). Now, argued the Pharisaic interpreters—on the system of 'setting a hedge to the Law'—plucking ears of corn is a sort of reaping, and is therefore unlawful on the Sabbath.

25. Our Lord in answer cites a case where a rule of the Law as to the shewbread, confining the use of it to the priests (Lev 24 [9]), was broken for sufficient cause by David (1 S 21 [5, 6]): and He goes on to get behind the rule to the principle underlying it. Even so fundamental a rule as that of the Sabbath was not an end in itself, but was intended to secure a proper proportion of rest from labour, and leisure for things other than and beyond labour. It was for man's good: and if the good of man was really furthered by violating it, then a lesser law was broken in order to keep a higher. Both in the case of His disciples and in the

case of David, the higher law was that of man's necessary bodily needs. See further illustrations of this in 3^{2}, $7^{10\text{-}12}$.

26. when Abiathar was high priest. According to our Old Testament text (1 S 21^{1}) not Abiathar but Ahimelech his father was high priest at the time. It may be a case of a variant in the Old Testament tradition: it may be a pure slip of memory on the part of the evangelist (cf. Mk 1^{2}). That Matthew and Luke agree in omitting the note of time is not in the least likely to be due to their detection of the supposed mistake: it is habitual with both of them to leave out everything, including details of time and place, that seemed superfluous.

which it is not lawful to eat save for the priests. Probably not part of our Lord's words, but a parenthesis inserted after Mark's manner to supply to his Roman readers the information necessary to enable them to see the point of the analogy.

28. so that the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath. 'So that' RV: AV better 'Therefore': better still perhaps *Thus*. If the institution of the Sabbath was given for man's good, then the Man whom God had sent to be the instrument of setting up His visible kingdom upon earth and establishing His reign of righteousness, man's highest good, must needs have authority over the means and methods by which that good is to be attained. Note that in all our Lord's references to the Decalogue (7^{22}, 10^{19}, $12^{29\text{-}31}$, and parallels in Matthew and Luke) the Fourth Commandment is never even by implication cited or alluded to. It is, in fact, set aside for Christians.

even of the sabbath. If this is the right rendering, the idea is that the Sabbath is the most fundamental element of all the Old Testament legislation. But if we translate 'of the Sabbath also,' we may rather refer back to the previous mention of the 'Son of Man' and of His 'authority to remit sins' (2^{10}).

III. **2. And they watched him.** Taking this with ^{6}, it looks as though the whole episode was arranged by the Pharisees, whose prejudices had already on two occasions been aroused against our Lord ($2^{16, 24}$), as a test case, in order that if He publicly violated their rules of what might lawfully be done on the Sabbath, they might proceed to consider the taking of definite measures against Him. The distinction drawn by the Rabbis appears to have been that on the Sabbath relief might only be given to a sufferer in case of danger to life: where no prejudicial consequences would follow on delay, the cure must be postponed. As in 2^{25} our Lord takes the matter back to the fundamental purposes of the Sabbath. Was the doing of a good act inconsistent with those purposes or no?

4. to do good or to do harm? To save a life or to kill? It is over-subtle to see in the double form of these questions a reference to the evil intent which the Pharisees had in their minds against our Lord: the antithesis is rather between commission and omission—not to do a good act when you can is in effect to do ill; not to save life when the opportunity offers is really to kill.

5. at the hardening of their heart RV: AV 'hardness,' with the marginal alternative *blindness*. The corresponding verb occurs also in 6^{52}, 8^{17}, in both cases of the inability of the Apostles to grasp the significance of miraculous deeds of our Lord, and both our versions render on each occasion 'hardened.' But 'hardness of heart' is quite out of place in regard to the attitude of the disciples. They were 'slow of heart': they showed no quickness of spiritual apprehension: they learnt only line by line, and little by little: they were not responsive, they were unintelligent and stupid—Mark's Gospel especially emphasizes this defect of the Apostles—but that is a different thing from moral 'hardness,' the result of wilful shutting out of the truth. Jerome, the greatest of all translators of the Bible, rightly gives *cæcitatem*, 'blindness.' See J. A. Robinson's conclusive note in his *Commentary on Ephesians*, 4^{18}. Here, then, what grieves our Lord is the stupidity of any interpretation of the Divine Law which results in the discouragement of good actions, as though the Author of all good could possibly have meant to forbid the doing of good.

6. It must of course be remembered that even St. Peter was not a first-hand authority for the proceedings of our Lord's opponents in the same sense as he was for our Lord's own sayings and doings. He could only judge from hearsay and by results: and he may perhaps in this instance, with the close of the Gospel story in view, have over-emphasized the hostile intention of the opposition to our Lord. It is clear, however, that we have come to the point when the religious leaders of the people in Galilee definitely reject the appeal and the claim of Jesus. It is the first overt sign of the failure of His mission. The Pharisees, good men in the main, who as a school of thought

had done great service to the cause of religion among the Jews by maintaining the sacred traditions of Israel against the infiltration of a paganizing culture, and by spiritualizing at the same time the Jew's hopes and expectations of the future, had experienced the common fate of so many religious movements when the original glow has died away into a monotonous repetition of shibboleths which have no longer any spiritual reality. It is fair to balance the impression of them which the Gospels leave on us by the qualifying testimony of the Acts and St. Paul. They were throughout much nearer to the Christian point of view than were the Sadducees. But they had in our Lord's time quite lost the sense of proportion: and the sense of proportion is for theologians of all times and all countries the most valuable thing, and the thing most easily lost. The 'mint and anise and cummin' of the observance of the smallest details of the Law, and of their own interpretations of the Law, had come to mean more to them than the things for which the whole Old Testament stood, 'judgement and mercy and faith.' So in spite of the large measure of agreement between their religious ideas and those which were embodied in the teaching of our Lord, they reject His message. To them the Sabbath—the observance of which had of course been one of the tests of a faithful Jew in the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes—was not only itself an *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*, but had come to be fenced about with a multitude of explanatory rules, all of which acquired similar sanctity with the original institution: and because our Lord seemed to them to profane the Sabbath, they ally themselves with the other Jewish party in Galilee (there were practically no Sadducees outside Jerusalem), and held a common meeting with them (the same noun as in 15 [1]) to compass measures for putting an end to His work (see 186*b*).

straightway with the Herodians took counsel RV. Quite impossible as English: no doubt it is the order of the Greek, but no two languages, not even Greek and Latin, have the same rules for the order of words: render therefore with AV *took counsel with the Herodians*.

Herodians: only mentioned in the New Testament here and 12 [13] (=Mt 22 [16]), both times in conjunction with the Pharisees. *Herodiani*, a formation like *christiani*, 'partisans of Herod,' that is, of the dynasty of Herod the Great; of whose sons Herod Antipas still ruled Galilee and Herod Philip Ituræa and Trachonitis (Lk 3 [1])—that is, except Judæa, which was under direct Roman rule after A.D. 6, the whole of Jewish Palestine. The Pharisees, a party independent of the government, joined forces with the government party in order that the secular power might be called in to deal with Jesus. Herod might be more willing than a Roman governor to imprison or put to death a recalcitrant Jew whose activities the religious leaders wished to suppress.

7. he withdrew, from the opposition which was being organized against Him in Capernaum, to the lake-side somewhere away from the town (cf. Mt 10 [23]).

a great multitude from Galilee followed: and from Judæa, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa, and beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon RV. 'Followed' (with the stop after it) should be omitted: the true text of Mark enumerates in a single group the constituent parts of the 'great multitude.' Obviously a not inconsiderable period has elapsed since the commencement of the Ministry, to allow time for the spread of our Lord's fame to these districts outside, some of them a long way from, Galilee. Except Idumæa, all the districts named were actually visited later on by our Lord: Tyre (7 [24]), Tyre and Sidon (7 [31]), Judæa and beyond Jordan (10 [1]), Jerusalem (10 [32], 11 [1]).

11. whensoever they beheld him RV: AV better *when they saw him*, for the Greek particle here used, though it properly means 'whenever,' in Marcan usage ordinarily means 'when.' In fourteen cases out of twenty repeated action is quite excluded (good examples are 9 [9], 13 [14], 14 [25]), and RV itself translates 'when': for 11 [19], which really falls into the same category, see *ad loc.*: in most of the remaining five cases, 'when' suits as well as or better than 'whenever.' So here: though more than one occurrence is implied, there is no sort of suggestion of the idea 'as often as.'

11. Thou art the Son of God. As the introductory section of the Gospel contained at its close the Witness of the Father to the Sonship of Jesus, so this first section of the Ministry ends with the witness of the powers of evil. It remained only that man should come to the realization of the same truth: Mark's Gospel is the description of the slow processes by which the Apostles arrived at it. But it was not our Lord's purpose that men should be, so to say, dragooned into it by the example of unclean spirits. That witness was to remain unpublished.

fell down before him. Here and in 5 [6] the attitude of prostration on the part of the spirits, the acknowledgement of the presence of a superior power, corresponds to the confession 'Son of God.'

III. 13-VIII. 30. The Ministry of Jesus, second section (see on 1 [14]): the separation of a small company of disciples to be the special companions of Jesus and His assistants in His missionary work: the result of their training is the confession of His Messiahship.

Our Lord's appeal to His people as a whole had failed, at least in so far that their religious leaders had seen its implications and had rejected it, though the multitude lent Him still a willing ear. But the multitude, while they acknowledged Him as a prophet, still showed no signs of rising to a completer recognition. And therefore our Lord finds Himself compelled, while still continuing His popular mission, and indeed extending it through His new associates, to choose from among His disciples a small number of those whom He judged most fit to receive a more intensive training, and most capable of responding to it and of rising to a true apprehension of His message and Himself.

13. the mountain RV, and it is true that the definite article is present in Greek. But for all that AV *a mountain* is a better rendering, for it gives the right sense. Mark in fact does not mean a particular mountain: 'the mountain' here is not the same as 'the mountain' of 5 [11] or 6 [46] on the other side of the lake: he just means 'the hill-country,' 'the hills,' as opposed to the lake-side of 3 [7].

calleth unto him whom he himself would: and they went unto him. And he appointed twelve. Mark does not mean that Jesus made a preliminary choice of a number of disciples, and then reduced them further to twelve: with his usual fondness for redundancy of expression, he says the same thing in two ways, adding on the second occasion the exact number.

he himself RV: AV *He.* As in 3 [11], we have to do with a Greek word which RV renders according to its classical use, AV according to English idiom. The truth is that in Mark's degenerate Greek many words have lost something of their full meaning, and this among them: generally 'he' is the only possible rendering (1 [8], 5 [40], 6 [47], 8 [29], 14 [44]), and in the remaining cases, here and 4 [38], 6 [45], it is the better rendering. The closest equivalent would be our use of the capital letter to denote 'the Master,' 'He.' In this verse its place at the end of the Greek sentence shows that it cannot be as emphatic as 'he himself.'

16-19. The list of the Twelve is given in four books of the New Testament: Mk 3 [16]; Mt 10 [2]; Lk 6 [14]; Ac 1 [13]. Naturally the lists given in Luke and Acts are (apart from the substitution of Matthias for Judas) identical. And for eleven out of the twelve names all our lists tally: what is unexpected and disconcerting is the large measure of variation about the twelfth. Where the two Lucan lists read 'Judas (son or brother) of James,' Mark has Thaddæus with a variant Lebbæus, and in Matthew the authorities are divided between Lebbæus, Thaddæus, and 'Lebbæus who was surnamed Thaddæus.' The third Matthæan reading is obviously a later combination of the two earlier readings 'Lebbæus' and 'Thaddæus': we are left therefore in both Matthew and Mark with these two variants. Three further points are to be noted which may help us to a decision. (1) Mk 14 [10] 'Judas Iscariot the one of the twelve' may perhaps mean (see note *ad loc.*) to distinguish the traitor from the Judas who was not of the Twelve. (2) Mk 2 [14] suggests (see *ad loc.*) that 'Levi the son of Alphæus' would be one of the Twelve, yet not identical with Matthew. (3) Early Christian tradition spoke of Thaddæus (in connection with the story of Abgar of Edessa, cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, i, 13) not as one of the Twelve, but as one of the Seventy. Now, if we could identify Levi with Lebbæus (Origen, *contra Celsum*, i, 62, speaks of 'Lebes' the publican, and seems to make the identification in question), we might solve most of the difficulties by reading in Mark 'James the son of Alphæus and Lebbæus,' Levi the son of Alphæus being thus named among the Twelve immediately after his (presumably elder) brother James. The alternative seems to be the accidental omission in Mark (or in an early copy of Mark from which all our extant MSS. derive) of one name: and in fact the lately discovered 5th century MS. of the Gospels known as W does omit both the variants Lebbæus and Thaddæus. In that case the original may have run, 'James [and Levi] the son of Alphæus.'

16. and Simon he surnamed Peter. Jn 1 [42] connects the name Cephas (the original Aramaic form of Petros, 'the stone') with the call of Simon, Mt 16 [18] apparently with the confession 'Thou art the Christ' (in 10 [2] he only says 'Simon, he who is called Peter'): but Mark definitely associates the new name with the

appointment of St. Peter as first among the Twelve, for he always uses 'Simon' up to this point, and always uses 'Peter' afterwards. The one exception, 14 [37] 'he saith to Peter, Simon, sleepest thou?' is no real exception, for our Lord is never recorded as addressing the Apostle by any but his original name (Mt 16 [17], 17 [25]; Lk 22 [31]; Jn 21 [15, 16, 17]), save in Lk 22 [34].

18. Simon the Cananæan (RV rightly, both in Mark and Matthew): that is 'the zealot,' as Lk 6 [15] translates it. He had belonged to the party of the 'zealots,' or nationalists at all costs, like the Fascisti of Italy.

21. his friends, but AVm 'his kinsmen': the one too vague, the other too definite; the Greek is equivalent to the schoolboy phrase 'his people.'

for they said, He is beside himself. Who 'said'? Not his family: it is another of Mark's impersonal plurals (see 2 [18]), and here the distinction is all-important: the common talk of Capernaum reaches the ears of the family at Nazareth, and they hurry down to look into matters on the spot. Good examples of this use are 2 [18], 3 [32], 5 [35], 6 [14] (see note there), 10 [2] (see note), 14 [1] (see note), 14 [12]. It is especially common in the form 'they were saying,' and the best way of rendering the phrase is often to turn it into an English passive, as indeed Luke not infrequently does in the Greek.

22. the scribes which came down from Jerusalem. Probably the first step of the local scribes and Pharisees when they determined to take measures against our Lord (3 [6]) was to send for support to headquarters at Jerusalem (cf. 7 [1]). The emissaries from Jerusalem at once proceed to bring things, theologically speaking, to a head. The facts, they found, were undeniable: incurable diseases had been cured, evil spirits had been cast out: a new power was at work, and either its source was good—and, God being the only source of good, Jesus was therefore a prophet sent from God—or its source was evil. They did not shrink from the alternative.

Beelzebub . . . the prince of the devils. All Greek and all early Latin authorities give Beelzebul: our versions derive their 'Beelzebub' from the Vulgate, and Jerome altered the original form to 'Beelzebub' because he referred the name, no doubt rightly, to 2 K 1 [2, 6], where the Hebrew has Baal-zebub, 'God of flies.' Whether the change to -zebul meant a change in meaning is at best doubtful.

23. in parables. not in the strict sense of 'comparison' or 'illustrative story,' as 4 [2], etc., but as we should say 'in figurative language,' as 7 [17].

27. Jesus had invaded the dominion of the 'strong man' and despoiled him of the men whom he had enslaved. In doing this, He had shown Himself stronger than the strong, and master of Satan.

28. blasphemies. The Greek word means properly 'slanders' and is so used in 7 [22]: but in the next verse and in 2 [7], 14 [64], it is used in the technical Jewish sense that it bears with us, of speaking evil not against men, but against God. Here it is not so easy to say: Lk 12 [10] contrasts 'blasphemy against the Holy Ghost' with 'speaking a word against the Son of Man,' and if 'against the Son of Man' is the original form of the saying rather than Mark's 'to the sons of men,' then 'blasphemies' against Him would naturally mean 'slanders,' and the word must be used with a different connotation in the two verses.

29. blaspheme against the Holy Spirit is to attribute what you know in your heart and conscience to be good deeds to any other source than the prompting of the Spirit of the Holy God. To say that good is evil and evil good, when you know that it is not, is the one unforgivable sin. To deny Christ, to call Him a fanatic or a self-deceiver or a lunatic, all these things will be forgiven to those who are expressing their honest convictions; to deny the presence of moral goodness when you have been trained, as the Law trained the Jew—and *a fortiori* as the Christian dispensation has trained the Christian—to know what it is, is a far worse thing. Persecutors do not necessarily incur this censure: but too many of them, Christian as well as Jewish and Pagan, may have done so.

hath never forgiveness: more literally 'hath not forgiveness for ever.' Important authorities, Greek and Latin, omit the words 'for ever,' and they may have been originally a marginal gloss on the difficult phrase that follows.

guilty of an eternal sin RV: AV 'in danger of eternal damnation.' The first word, thus variously rendered in our versions, meant in classical Greek 'liable to,' though sometimes, as time went on, it came to be equivalent to 'guilty': Mark only uses it elsewhere in 14 [64] 'liable to death,' i.e guilty of the charge laid against him, a charge to which the death-penalty was attached. The RV phrase has too much finality about it: but it is not easy to suggest a better; perhaps 'under the burden of': Matthew and Luke found the same difficulty as we

do, and both omit. 'Eternal sin': the underlying thought may be 'a sin of the world to come,' i.e. a sin beyond the range of the Son of Man's 'authority on earth to forgive sins' (2 10).

31. And there came his mother and his brethren. It is over-subtle to suppose that the interval between 21 and 31 is meant to cover the interval between leaving Nazareth and arriving at Capernaum. Rather, the allusion to the popular idea that He was 'beside Himself' leads Mark at once to the graver assertion about Him that He 'had an unclean spirit': and after speaking of that, he reverts to the visit of His family.

33. Who is my mother and my brethren? There is no reason at all to represent the Mother of Jesus as inimical on Mark's showing to His mission. She heard the common report about Him, and with a mother's anxiety she thought that over-work was the cause, and came, escorted by His 'brethren' (see on 6 3), to take Him, by the pressure of a parent's authority, home to rest. But His work had to be done at all costs, and not even a mother may interfere with the call that comes to a man for his work in life. And in the new society of the disciples, they who have left all for Christ's sake and the Gospel's will find not only other human relationships but 'mothers' as well (10 30).

IV. **1. sat in the sea:** it is not surprising that neither Matthew nor Luke retain this naive description of Mark's, and it would perhaps be permissible to render 'embarked in a boat and sat there on the sea.'

2. in parables. The parables in our Lord's teaching as recorded by Mark are lessons to be learnt from some familiar event in the life of men in the world around. The parables are normally intended to emphasize one point, and one only: the accessories are necessary to the story if it is to be life-like, but at best are subordinate in the application. Thus in the parable of the Sower the essential idea is that the seed is all good, but that for its development everything depends on the ground on which it falls: possibly our Lord points to some sower within view, to birds at work, or to stones and weeds in different corners of the field that is being sown, but these are just illustrative details. The lesson is that the Gospel is offered equally to all within whose reach it comes, but that all depends on the temper in which it is received. God cannot save men against their will.

3. the sower RV: AV with English idiom *a sower*. Greek, having no indefinite article, is bound to use the definite article for a representative of a class.

4-8. some . . . other . . . other . . . others RV rightly, if ungracefully. As told both in Matthew, who has four plurals, and Luke, who has four singulars, the parable gives a little bit the impression that the fruitful seed bore only a small proportion to the rest. Any such impression is absent from the text of Mark, who has three singulars of the categories of unfruitful seed, and a plural, subdivided into three classes, of the fruitful seed, and there is therefore in his story no suggestion of disproportion between fruitful and unfruitful seed.

8 (and 20). thirtyfold, sixtyfold, and a hundredfold RV, probably rightly, taking the Greek word used with the respective numerals as the preposition 'in' = 'at the rate of.' AV, with the Vulgate, taking it as the neuter of 'one,' renders 'some thirty and some sixty . . .'

10. they that were about him with the twelve. The Twelve are already a separate group, but only gradually become the dominating or even exclusive company round Jesus: here we have a transitional state of things.

11. is given the mystery: Matthew (true text) 'is it given to know the mystery,' Luke 'is it given to know the mysteries.' 'The mystery' (here only in the Gospels) is the secret reserved for the initiated, and the 'mystery of the Kingdom' is the secret purpose of God from the beginning to found in Jesus a new Kingdom which should transform and supersede the Old Covenant; and that secret is now shared with those who are initiated into fellowship with Jesus, but hidden still from 'them that are without.' The word was regularly used in the Greek of our Lord's day: the 'mystery-religions' are those of which the votaries were admitted by a rite of initiation to a new knowledge, associated as a rule with a doctrine of redemption and salvation. In Christian Greek it came to be appropriated, in the plural, to the sacraments, whether because the outward rites had an inward and hidden meaning, or because the rites themselves were hidden from all but the faithful: but this use of the word is later than the New Testament.

unto them that are without (cf. note on 2 21, 22: both Matthew and Luke soften the phrase) 'all things are done in parables.' To those not initiated into the central secret, the full message is not delivered. They are given teaching 'in parables,' that is, teaching which it is not beyond

their power, if they are willing to take the trouble, to interpret and assimilate: but if they do not respond to that, the further stages must remain sealed to them.

12. that seeing they may see, and not perceive . . . lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them. A difficult saying, and to some a rock of stumbling, so that it is suggested that it is a comment, and an unintelligent and mistaken comment, of the evangelist's. For such a suggestion there is no ground save the *a priori* ground of reluctance to admit that the saying is our Lord's: and though in the last resort 'the spiritual man' must 'judge all things,' our first duty is to take the record as it stands—the Gospels are after all the only source of our knowledge of our Lord's teaching—and see whether we cannot proceed some way at least towards understanding it. (1) The words are a quotation from Is 6 [9]: and (apart from the introductory verses of the Gospel) all Old Testament citations in Mark are made by our Lord Himself (7 [6], 10 [6, 19], 12 [10, 26, 29, 36], 14 [27]). (2) 'That' (='in order that'), introducing the citation, may fairly be taken to mean 'in order that the prophecy may be fulfilled.' (3) The parallelism of [9] 'Who hath ears to hear, let him hear' with [12] 'hearing they may hear, and not understand,' is so close that the two phrases must obviously be understood in relation to one another—the prophecy is adduced as a commentary on the saying. Our Lord's message, in order to fructify, requires a fruitful ground: it will fall barren unless there are willing ears to receive it, and the parable itself implies that in numerous cases the word will find unresponsive hearts.

Our Lord of course cannot mean, and there is no reason why a careful exegesis should make Him out to mean, that God intended or desired that the Jewish people should reject the appeal of Jesus. But they had, in fact, proved in the main unresponsive. Their leaders in Galilee had plotted His undoing, and those from Jerusalem had involved themselves in the one irremissible sin. The multitude were willing to take His benefits, His present wonderful cures, and any prospect of His future leadership of a political upheaval, but they had not shown themselves, apart from a small minority of followers, willing to give anything in return. They must have the chance of hearing God's message: so only could the great dividing-line be drawn between faith and unbelief: but by this time our Lord has the sense of failure already beginning to cast its shadow over Him, and He feels that though they may see outwardly they will not in fact perceive, and though they may hear outwardly they will not make the effort to understand. After all, had not the Prophets foretold it all? Therefore somehow or another even this 'great refusal' on the part of Israel must have its place in God's eternal purpose. Chapters 10 and 11 of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans are the best comment on this verse and its problem, and in them assuredly the Apostle had 'the mind of Christ.'

14. the word, and again in [17, 20]. See above on 2 [2].

20. thirtyfold and sixtyfold and a hundredfold. The Fathers explain the different numbers as different classes, in order of excellence, in the Christian body. In early times the most usual interpretation was to take 'thirty' of the mass of Christians, 'sixty' of those who for the Gospel's sake renounced marriage, and 'a hundred' of the martyrs. That is to crystallize the distinctions too much: there are three numbers signifying different degrees of responsiveness to the Gospel as there are three types of failure, but they are not to be too closely pressed.

21. the bushel, that is, the pan or measure containing a bushel—or rather, since the *modius* (the Latin word is transliterated in the Greek) is much smaller than a bushel, a 'peck' or couple of gallons.

22. nothing hid save that it should be manifested. The ultimate end of the 'mystery of the Kingdom of God,' which our Lord had so far imparted to His disciples only, was that it should be made known to all. It was not meant only for a chosen few: all were to be invited to initiation into this 'mystery,' and in so far as they refused, or did not show enough interest to respond actively to the invitation, the Gospel of the Kingdom was a failure. Our Lord does not seem ever in terms to have indicated the supersession of the Jewish Church by a Gentile Church, but He used language which undoubtedly points in that direction: and in view of His growing consciousness of His rejection by the chosen people, there seems no reason at all to think that the evangelists have ascribed to Him language which He did not in substance actually employ, acquiring definiteness as the story of the Ministry develops (cf. 2 [21], 7 [19], 12 [9]).

24. With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you: a proverbial saying used by our Lord with a more direct

and limited application in Mt 7 [2], but extended to a new meaning here by the addition 'and more shall be given unto you.' It is those who listen to what they hear and apprehend it who will be introduced to higher knowledge: the measure of their reception is the measure of further and further gifts. But those who do not employ the gifts they have will lose the capacity to do so, just as an organ of the body becomes atrophied by disuse. The Jew in whom God's education by the Law and Prophets and the history of Israel had provoked no thirst for a higher knowledge lost all the advantage so far given him.

26-29. A parable peculiar to Mark: Luke omits it entirely, Matthew replaces it by the parable of the Good Seed and the Tares (13 [24-30]).

The point of the two short parables which now follow in Mark, the Seed growing secretly and the grain of Mustard, is to describe two complementary characteristics of the fruitful seed, the multiplication of which was the climax of the parable of the Sower—the first its secret growth in its early stages, followed by a steady and relentless advance to its perfection; the other the contrast of its tiny beginnings with the splendour of its maturity when every rival is dwarfed by the side of it. Whatever dressing minor details of a parable may have received in the recollections of St. Peter or in the setting down on paper by the evangelist, these ideas are the very point of the two similitudes, and therefore it does not seem easy to deny that our Lord looked forward to the triumphant spread of His Church upon earth.

27. night and day. So Lk 2 [37], and so always St. Paul. The natural order is 'day and night': but as the Jews (and possibly the early Greeks) reckoned the beginning of the twenty-four hours' day from sunset, the order 'night and day' was less unnatural to them than it would be to us.

29. is ripe. The marginal rendering in RV 'alloweth' is the only meaning of which the Greek word is properly capable.

30-32. Luke has this parable in another setting (13 [18, 19]) and derived it from another source: Matthew combines the other source with Mark's version. The only important variation is that while Mark says the mustard plant becomes greater than all 'herbs,' the other source, less correctly, said that 'it became a tree.'

33. as they were able to hear it. Again Mark emphasizes the scope and purpose of parabolic teaching: it is elementary, in that one point can be taken at a time and its meaning digested; but its interpretation makes some demand on the intelligence and goodwill of the hearer, and therefore it is a test of capacity for further instruction.

34. he expounded all things. That is, 'he interpreted': 'giving preference over the multitudes to those who were eagerly desirous of his wisdom' (Origen, quoted by Swete).

35. unto the other side: the east side of the lake, outside Galilee, where the country was wilder and, especially at the northern end opposite Capernaum, less thickly inhabited—more suitable therefore for rest and quiet (cf. 6 [31, 32]).

36. they take him with them. Again the story in Mark is told from the point of view of Jesus' companions. See on 1 [21].

38. Master. The Greek word, 'Teacher,' is the literal translation of the Aramaic 'Rabbi,' which was doubtless the title by which the 'disciples' habitually addressed their 'Master.' So in Mark 'Rabbi' (9 [5], 11 [21], 14 [45]), its Greek equivalent here and 10 [35], 13 [1], and (by our Lord of Himself) 14 [14]. But neither Matthew nor Luke ever uses either the Aramaic or Greek word in direct address from disciples to our Lord—the only exception is significant (Mt 26 [49]), by Judas Iscariot—for to the second Christian generation so common a form of address seemed inadequate from disciples to their Lord. The 4th Gospel habitually uses Rabbi, whether with or without the Greek interpretation: another sign, not indeed of an earlier date, but of the preservation in it of some more primitive traits than in Matthew and Luke.

carest thou not that we perish? St. Peter faithfully recollects, and Mark repeats, the naive remonstrances of the disciples where our Lord's action or words seemed to them unreasonable (cf. 5 [31], 6 [37]). By later writers like Matthew and Luke, to whom the Apostles had come to be, as Apostles, above criticism, all such language is dropped or modified.

40, 41. have ye not yet faith? . . . Who then is this? Our Lord's mighty works were, at least in part, challenges to faith (cf. 8 [17, 21]): who must he be, who could so command the elements or feed the multitudes? And the Apostles on this occasion propound the problem to themselves. That was the first stage: but they were still far from a definite grasp of even so much of the answer as is reached in St. Peter's confession (8 [29]).

V. 1. **into the country of the Gera-**

senes, RV rightly. AV has 'Gadarenes' in Mark and Luke, 'Gergesenes' in Matthew (Lk 8 [26]; Mt 8 [28]): RV 'Gadarenes' in Matthew, 'Gerasenes' in Mark and Luke, with marginal variants in Luke 'Gergesenes' and 'Gadarenes.' Both Gerasa and Gadara are well-known towns of the 'Decapolis' (for which see on [20]), but Gadara is six miles south-east from the south end of the lake, Gerasa thirty miles in the same direction. Gerasa at least is therefore out of the question as the scene of the event, yet it is almost certainly the true reading in Mark and Luke (it is given in both cases by the MSS. B D and the Old Latins): Matthew, probably from acquaintance with Palestinian geography, substitutes the much nearer town Gadara. Origen (and following him Jerome), with knowledge of all three readings, decides definitely for 'Gergesenes,' stating that Gergesa was 'an ancient city by the lake now called Tiberias, by which is a cliff overhanging the lake, from which they show that the swine were cast down by the devils.' The reading Gergesa then originated from a suggestion of local patriotism, in the days when the sacred sites of the Gospels first began to be matter of discussion, perhaps about A.D. 200, and, being supported by the great authority of Origen, made its way into texts influenced by him, such as codex Sinaiticus. It may not improbably be a true correction of an original error. Gerasa and Gergesa are so similar that either Peter or Mark may easily have made the confusion, especially as Gerasa was a town so large and important (its ruins are at this moment about to be explored) that its name would be familiar.

2-20. All possible difficulties seem concentrated in this story of the demoniac. In every respect it stands by itself. Its setting is weird and solitary. It is unique in its phraseology (see notes on [7] 'Son of the Most High God,' [19] 'the Lord'), unique in the command to the man healed to proclaim his cure to all and sundry, unique in the number 'a legion' attributed to the evil spirits, unique above all in the strange episode of the herd of swine. No critic can presume to solve all the difficulties: certain considerations can be suggested, certain solutions can be put aside.

In the first place, then, the story in its main outlines must be accepted: it is not historical criticism, but subjective and arbitrary method, to take what we like in the Gospel record and reject what upsets our prepossessions. There was a demoniac 'possessed' in an unusual degree: there was a remarkable cure at our Lord's mere word: there was an access of sudden terror in a large herd of swine resulting in a wild rush down into the lake. So much at least seems sober fact.

In the second place, the question whether the background of the story is Jewish or heathen has a real bearing on the problem. The 'Decapolis,' as its very name suggests, was a group of some ten Greek city-foundations, and the demoniac belonged to the Decapolis ([20]). Swine were of course an abomination to the Jews, as now to Mohammedans, and the presence of so large a herd of them would be inconceivable in any fully Jewish district, and unlikely anywhere where Jews were predominant. The phrases 'the Most High God' and 'the Lord' are both normal in Jewish language, but the fact remains that neither is used elsewhere in Mark. The command to proclaim the cure, in contrast to the habitual insistence in other cases on silence, is more easily explained if the man's associations were wholly alien to the sphere of our Lord's Ministry. The balance of evidence, then, points strongly to Gentile surroundings.

No one who has heard a missionary from Africa, equipped with all the presuppositions of European culture, testify to the reality of the presence and strength of the powers of evil when African heathenism is brought into contact with the message of Christ, can deal quite lightly with the possibility of a concentration of the 'legion' of 'unclean spirits,' if this was really the occasion when our Lord first came in contact with the vast empire of heathenism that ringed the country of the chosen people.

There remains of course the difficulty of the destruction of the swine: and it is a difficulty. That the herd was seized with a common instinct of terror and perished in consequence seems certain. It is another illustration of our changed attitude to the infallibility of the Bible record that we should like to think that Mark is in error in connecting their destruction with anything said or willed by our Lord. Perhaps that is the true solution. We have not much direct evidence of our Lord's attitude to the animal creation. Yet his references to beasts and birds and flowers are full of sympathy: not a sparrow falls to the ground without the Father, and we cannot imagine Him asking with St. Paul, 'Doth God care for oxen?' He may indeed have shared with His fellow-countrymen an instinctive dislike of the pig as a symbol of uncleanness—though

even that is difficult to think for us who realize that Christians may not call any meats common (Ac 10 [13-15]), and our Lord Himself 'cleansed all meats' (Mk 7 [19])—and He did not shrink from the cursing of the fig-tree. But at least we may note that He only 'suffered' the entry of the 'unclean spirits' into the unclean animals: and it may be, in view of 5 [30], that the effort of putting out His power into the supreme struggle with evil forces for the possession of the demoniac had exhausted His human spirit for the moment, so that He could not but 'suffer' them. We are perhaps on surer ground in believing that the loss of the herd weighed as nothing in comparison with the rescue of one single human being.

6. worshipped him: of the outward act, just as with the Roman soldiers in 15 [19]; the Greek word is used only in these two places in Mark.

7. Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God: as in 3 [11], but with the addition of the name Jesus, and of the adjective 'Most High' to God. 'Most High' as a title for God is common in the Old Testament, but is found only rarely in the New Testament—outside Luke and Acts, only in Heb 7 [1]. In Ac 16 [17] it is used, as here, by one possessed with a spirit: 'these men are servants of the Most High God,' and the phrase occurs on pagan inscriptions. Mark never puts it in the mouth of a Jew: contrast, e.g. 14 [61] 'Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' Thus it seems here to be an indication of heathen language.

torment me not: cf. 1 [24] 'Thou art come to destroy us.'

9. Legion: from the Latin *legio*, which was not only current in transliterated form in Greek, as here, but even in Aramaic as well. We have only to remind ourselves how many of our own military terms are of French origin: Imperial Rome and France set the model of organized standing armies for the ancient and the modern world. A legion consisted at full strength of 6,000 men, and so corresponded in numbers rather to a brigade than to a regiment.

10. he besought him much that he would not send them out of the country. This and the preceding verse are a welter of confusion between singular and plural, but the parallel in Lk 8 [31] shows that the plural 'them' was what he read in Mark, and it is clearly the spirits who did not want to be expelled from their district. They had to give up the man to our Lord's power, but they were eager to retain some territorial influence, were it only over the animal creation. That at least is the implication of the story as Mark recorded it for us.

13. about two thousand. Mark is fond of numbers: St. Peter as he spoke to his converts visualized his experiences, and the numbers, here and elsewhere, are in keeping with the other details which are characteristic of Mark's Gospel. Matthew and Luke (save where the numbers enhance the wonder of our Lord's miracles, as in the Feeding of the multitude) habitually omit numbers, especially where they are large (cf. Mk 6 [37], 14 [5]: note that in these two instances John retains them). Matthew and Luke write as historians, and the rhetorical training of the time was adverse to such precision in historical writing. In this case, too, they may have thought the figure exaggerated: and in fact St. Peter's estimate of the multitude in 6 [44] is larger by a thousand than the estimate in the parallel account of what seems to be the same miracle (see note on 8 [1]) in 8 [9].

17. they began to beseech him to depart from their borders, RV (AV 'coasts,' and so too 7 [24], 10 [1]: 'coasts' is no doubt now misleading, but 'borders' is hardly less so: in the plural, the only New Testament use, it means 'district' or 'territory,' like the Latin 'fines': see on 7 [31]). We can hardly wonder: to them the cure of a mere maniac was of less importance than the security of their property. And our Lord at once consented: if they were heathen, His mission was not primarily to them. Even the demoniac, perhaps just because he was not a Jew, is not allowed to accompany Him, but is bidden to spread the news of his cure, to be in fact a sort of missionary, in his own heathen district—another indication that our Lord's ultimate vision reached now beyond His immediate work among His own people.

19. the Lord: not found in Mark (apart from Old Testament quotations) either of God, save 13 [20], where the Greek is, however, without the article, or of Christ, save 11 [3], where see note. Here it certainly means God: but the unusual phrase cannot be disconnected from the other unusual features of this first occasion of contact on our Lord's part with the heathen world.

20. in the Decapolis: that is, in the Greek settlements, city-foundations of the times of the Greek Seleucid kings of Syria, for the most part east of Jordan, which fell under Jewish rule in the era of the Jewish conquests, and at the break-up of the dominions of Herod the Great

fell to the share of his son Herod Philip: Philip ruled from his father's death in 4 B.C. till A.D. 34. See on 3 [6].

22. one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name. In Lk 13 [14] we read of 'the ruler of the synagogue,' in Ac 13 [15] of 'the rulers of the synagogue': the number doubtless depended on the size and importance of the place and the congregation, just as our churches and parishes differ in their staff from one another. The ruler's name is given, we may suppose, because he belonged to that synagogue which was attended by our Lord and His Apostles when in Capernaum.

23. My little daughter. The diminutive is peculiar to Mark (again in 7 [25]), and was no doubt regarded by Matthew and Luke as non-literary, and below the dignity of history. Mark is fond of such formations: 'little girl' in 5 [41, 42], 6 [22, 28], 'little sandals' in 6 [9], 'little dogs' and 'little morsels' in 7 [27, 28], 'little fishes' in 8 [7], 'little ear' in 14 [47]. Most of these words are late Greek and colloquial: Luke retains no one of them, Matthew sometimes retains, sometimes changes. Note that we owe to Mark all the four miracles of physical healing which our Lord is recorded to have worked on women: Peter's wife's mother, Jairus's daughter, the woman with hæmorrhage, and the Syrophœnician woman's daughter.

made whole RV, with margin 'saved.' AV 'be healed.' The Greek verb and nouns which very early came to be technical in Christian Greek for 'save,' 'saviour,' and 'salvation' meant originally 'save from death,' 'preserver,' and 'deliverance,' and in the medical writers 'recover,' 'recovery' of illness. In John (save only on the lips of the disciples, 11 [12] of Lazarus, 'if he has fallen asleep, he will recover'), in the Pauline Epistles, and largely in the Lucan books, we have the metaphorical sense—though no doubt that is derived from the other sense, i.e. 'preserved in the day of the Lord's judgement': in the Synoptic Gospels, and sporadically in Acts (4 [12], 14 [9], 27 [20, 31]), the literal sense, but of all New Testament books most definitely in Mark. Once only, 10 [26] 'Who then can be saved?' is the Pauline sense demanded, and as it is hardly probable that the disciples would at so early a date have been employing the language of 'salvation,' it is possible that that is a case of the influence on Mark of Pauline terms. But normally in Mark the verb (he does not use either of the nouns) means 'to deliver,' or in the miracles of healing 'to cure': so certainly here and in 5 [28, 34], 6 [56], 10 [52], 13 [20].

29. plague RV, with marginal note '*Gr.* scourge.' Mark alone in the New Testament uses the word absolutely of disease (3 [10], 5 [29, 34]): Luke once, but in combination with the ordinary word for sickness (7 [21]). Possibly it is one of Mark's Latinisms, as a literal rendering of *flagellum*.

30. that the power proceeding from him had gone forth RV: a pedantic rendering, from which common sense or instinct saved AV, *that virtue had gone out of him*. What Mark meant by his rather awkward phrase was presumably 'the issue of force from him'; but the Greek past participle enabled him to imply that the thing had happened and was not happening still.

31. See note on 4 [38]. Here Matthew omits, and Luke modifies, the remonstrance of the disciples.

36. not heeding the word spoken RV, with margin *overhearing*. The latter is of course right, for our Lord did 'heed the word spoken' and answered it: and clearly Lk 8 [50] so understood Mark. It may be that the Greek verb means in the LXX 'to take no heed of,' but Mark was not in the least a student of the LXX, quotes it on his own account only once (1 [2, 3]), and then makes a blunder in his reference. It is much more to the point that the two first meanings given to the verb in Liddell and Scott are 'to hear accidentally,' 'to overhear,' with accusative of the thing, and genitive of the person, overheard. Aristophanes, Plato, and Lucian are good enough authorities, and the sense is just what is wanted. The servants do not bawl out their news, but give it semi-privately to their master, and our Lord 'overhears the message' as it is being delivered.

37, 38. he suffered no man to follow with him, save . . . And they come to the house: note that in Mark's account the multitude is dismissed, not when they come to the house (as Lk 8 [51]), but before a start is made for the house.

37. Peter and James and John. Here first these three alone: perhaps they were acquainted with Jairus. Even among the Twelve a few are chosen out for closer intimacy (9 [2], 13 [3], 14 [33]).

39. the child is not dead, but sleepeth. The Greek word here used for sleep is not that used in Jn 11 [11-14]: the latter can be used, and is used both in classical and Christian Greek, of the sleep of death, and from it is derived *cæmeterium*, 'cemetery'; the former means natural sleep, and that only (cf. Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary* s.v.). There is

nothing in Mark's story to show that the girl was dead (though apparently both Luke and Matthew did so interpret it), and if he had meant that she was actually dead he would surely have made his meaning clear. If we could read Mark's narrative uninfluenced by prepossessions drawn from our knowledge of Matthew and Luke, we should naturally conclude that what was taken by those who sent the message to be death our Lord knew to be not death but coma.

VI. 1. Our Lord leaves the shore of the lake to teach among the villages, and first in His own home Nazareth (1 [9]), in the hill country some twenty-five miles distant from Capernaum. Only here and in 2 [15] are the disciples said to be 'following' our Lord, and we ought probably to take the word quite literally: later on the Twelve form one company with our Lord, but here a larger number, perhaps a much larger number, is straggling after Him at intervals.

2. As at Capernaum (1 [22]), in the Decapolis (7 [37]), and at Jerusalem (11 [18]), the result of Jesus' teaching and miracles was a general feeling of 'amazement' ('astonished' of AV and RV is not in our modern use of it a strong enough word): everywhere else than at Nazareth this amazement implied at least respect, if not more, but on the stage of His own earlier life it only issued in disparaging comments on His upbringing and His surroundings. He had lived as an artisan by manual labour: His brothers could be counted by name, and doubtless still made their livelihood in the same or a similar way. The words of wisdom, the deeds of power, with which common report credited Him, seemed impressive enough: but instead of feeling any pride that a fellow-townsman had made so great a mark in the larger centres of population round them, they felt that they knew too much about His origins to regard Him as anything more than what they had known Him all along to be.

3. **the carpenter**: so the pagan philosopher Celsus in the 2nd century mocked at Jesus as a carpenter, and the pagan orator Libanius in the 4th asked 'What is the carpenter's son doing just now?' But God 'chose the weak things of the world.' It is true that manual labour was not regarded among the Jews as a thing derogatory in itself (cf. St. Paul's case, Ac 18 [3]); but a teacher of religion should 'have little business, and be busied in the Law,' and Jesus had worked regularly at His trade.

the son of Mary: obviously Joseph was dead.

brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon. 'Brother' in what sense? (1) In the same sense that He was 'son of Mary,' i.e. that James and the rest were sons of Joseph and Mary, and younger brothers of our Lord? (2) In the same sense that He is called son of Joseph in Matthew and Luke, i.e. that they were sons of Joseph and a former wife, and elder 'putative' brothers of our Lord? (3) In the sense that brother is loosely used for cousin, i.e. that they were really blood-relations of our Lord, being sons of another Mary, sister to the Blessed Virgin and wife of Alphæus (identified with Clopas), and therefore His first cousins? This third view was an invention of St. Jerome's, and a very ingenious one: but it was never heard of before him. (4) In the sense that the 'brethren' were putative cousins of our Lord on Joseph's side, being sons of 'Mary the mother of James and Joses' (Mk 15 [40]), and her husband Clopas (Jn 19 [25])? The 2nd-century writer Hegesippus (as cited by Eus., *Hist. Eccl.*, iii, 11; 32, §§ 3, 4) tells us that Clopas was brother of Joseph and that the Symeon who was chosen as a relation of our Lord's to be bishop of Jerusalem after the death of James was his son. This theory, propounded by Dom John Chapman, is even more ingenious than St. Jerome's, for it combines in a very simple way a good many historical data. But neither the James and Joses of Mk 15 [40], nor Symeon the bishop, are called 'brothers' of the Lord, nor are we any nearer to a sufficient ground for cousins being known as brothers. On the whole problem see the note appended to the commentary on the Epistle of James. The two first views can both claim support in early tradition, but neither of them in tradition so early as to be decisive on that ground alone. This passage in St. Mark contributes nothing either way, save the impression suggested by [4]: see note there.

James is 'brother of the Lord' in Gal 1 [19]: Judas is 'brother of James' in Jude 1; compare the story of his grandsons being brought before Domitian as members of the royal house of David, which Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii, 20) derived from Hegesippus—even Domitian could not regard the horny-handed countrymen haled before him as potential rivals. Of Joses (Joseph) and Simon we know nothing.

4. **among his own kin.** According to Jn 7 [3-5] 'neither did his brethren believe

on him,' though James at least was a believer at the time of the Resurrection (1 Cor 15 [7]), and apparently the others also (Ac 1 [14]). If our Lord was younger than His brothers (see on [3]), we can more easily understand their early attitude (cf. 1 S 16 [6-12], 17 [28]).

5. he could do there no mighty work AV and RV rightly. When Mark relates the inability of the disciples to cast out the dumb spirit (9 [17, 18]), he uses a different and stronger word, rightly rendered 'were not able' in RV. Here the word is the ordinary Greek for 'to be able,' which in Mark has got weakened down to an auxiliary like our 'can' and 'could.' It was not a physical inability to work cures, but a moral inability to cure without faith on the part of the recipient. So 9 [39] 'could easily speak ill of me.'

5. laid his hands: cf. 5 [23], 7 [32], where our Lord is begged to 'lay his hand' or 'hands' for healing on Jairus's daughter and on the man who was deaf and dumb. It was the regular outward sign of benediction in the Old Testament, and the regular outward sign of every sacramental rite in the early Church (see Gore, *Church and Ministry*, note G, edition of 1919, 341 ff.), of course with the accompaniment of prayer.

6*b*-13. he went round about the villages teaching: alone for the last time in Galilee, for the Twelve are now sent in pairs to begin the work for which He had appointed them (3 [14, 15]). They had been with Him, they return to Him (6 [30]), and they were, it seems, continuously with Him from 8 [1] onwards to the close of the Ministry: but here He sends them out 'on their own,' so to say, to develop the work of His mission to their Galilæan fellow-countrymen, and to gain an experience which would be a training for wider journeys in the future.

8, 9. They were to take poverty as their bride in as literal a sense as that in which St. Francis, after the example of the Master, sent out the first Franciscans as missionaries: without food or receptacle for food, without even copper coins for money, without more than one *chiton* (contrast the use of the plural in the case of Caiaphas; see note on 14 [63]), with nothing but wooden sandals for foot-gear —Roman readers would easily have understood *sandalia* as excluding boots or shoes—and carrying nothing but a walking-stick.

10. house, and **11 place.** Mark's report of our Lord's charge to the Twelve is strictly germane to the mission to the villages of Galilee. Both the other Synoptists give a more general scope to their report, and introduce 'cities.'

10. unto them: that is, 'against them,' as in 13 [9]: see on 1 [44].

12. repent: as our Lord had preached repentance (1 [15]).

13. anointed with oil: the only place in the Gospels (save in Luke's parable of the Good Samaritan, 10 [34]) where the use of oil for the sick is mentioned, but compare, of course, Jas 5 [14, 15], which gives doubtless a close parallel to the method of the Twelve in their acts of healing.

14. king Herod: see note on 'Herodians,' 3 [6]. This Herod, the only one of his name mentioned in Mark, was Herod Antipas, who on the partition of the dominions of his father Herod the Great after the latter's death in 4 B.C. had been allotted the lordship of Galilee with the title of 'tetrarch' (cf. Lk 3 [1]), that is, literally, ruler of a fourth part' of the Herodian kingdom. Mark only uses of him the title 'king,' Luke only 'tetrarch,' Matthew both the one and the other: and perhaps local usage, reflected in Peter's story, and doubtless Herod himself (cf. 6 [23]), preferred the more honorific title. But the Roman government would certainly not have recognized it: it was by special grant from the Emperor Caligula in A.D. 37 that Herod Agrippa I (the Herod of Ac 12) enjoyed the title; and when Herod Antipas thereupon asked that he too might be made 'king,' he not only failed in his object, but was deposed and banished.

Herod's seat of government was at Tiberias on the lake of Gennesaret, some way south of Capernaum. Our Lord's work and growing reputation at the latter place may probably enough have reached his ears: but Mark's introduction of his name at this particular point may be presumed to mean that it was the beginnings of an organized movement in the mission of the Twelve which aroused the attention and perhaps the alarm of Herod. The evangelist's curiously 'objective' record gives us the facts in proper succession, but leaves us to find out the connexion between them. It can hardly be accidental that after this mention of Herod's knowledge about our Lord, the scene of the Ministry begins to shift more and more outside the domain of Galilee. Neither the eastern shore of the lake (6 [32]), nor Bethsaida (6 [45], 8 [22]), nor Tyre (7 [24]), nor Decapolis (7 [31]), nor Cæsarea Philippi (8 [27]), was within the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas.

he said: the true reading is that given

in RVm *they said*, with a few, but those the best, Greek and Latin authorities; and this is clearly what Luke (9 [7]) found before him in Mark's text. Mark first notes three alternative popular explanations: John the Baptizer *redivivus*, or Elijah *redivivus*, or a new prophet of the type of the older prophets: and then Herod's choice between them.

16-29. Herod's identification of Jesus with John, whom he had against his conscience, as later on Pilate in the case of our Lord, condemned to death, leads to the belated narrative of his relations with John. Nothing was told us in 1 [14] save the bare fact of John's arrest, lest attention should be diverted from the central theme of the Gospel. Here, as it were by an afterthought, the story is given in full, in order to account for Herod's ideas about Christ. And it is of course possible that the actual execution of John had not preceded by any long interval the point at which Mark's story has now arrived.

17. Herodias his brother Philip's wife. Herod Philip the tetrarch (Lk 3 [1]) married later on the *daughter* of Herodias: but the brother whose wife Herodias was is nowhere called Philip save in this passage: Lk 3 [19] certainly, and Mt 14 [3] probably, omit the name. It is simplest to suppose that Mark or his informant confused Herodias's husband and son-in-law.

20. observed AV: rather *preserved*, as in effect RV.

much perplexed RV rightly: Mark is very fond of using the neuter plural 'many things' adverbially, and the verb 'perplexed,' hitherto known only in three MSS., all of one group, is now reinforced by the two newly discovered Greek uncial MSS. W and Θ, representing quite a different type of text.

heard him gladly: the phrase in our modern English use is too emphatic; rather *liked to listen to him* (cf. on 12 [37]).

21. birthday, or perhaps more probably *accession-day*: *dies natalis* was so used of the anniversary of the accession of an emperor or of the consecration of a bishop or pope. The guests fall into the three classes, high civil officials, high military officials, and unofficial persons of importance.

22. the daughter of Herodias. Our authorities are hopelessly mixed as to the words used to describe the relationship of this girl: and no doubt Mark or Peter may have blundered, for they would have felt very little interest in the relationships and intermarriages of the Herodian family. From other sources we know that Herodias had by her real husband a daughter named Salome.

25. on a charger: on a dish, as though it were one of the courses at the banquet.

27. a soldier of his guard. RV: 'an executioner' AV. Mark transliterates a Latin word *speculator*, which, starting from the more general meaning, came to be technically used in the restricted sense of AV: compare e.g. the Acts of St. Cyprian, *cœpit spiculatorem sustinere*.

30-34. The Return of the Apostles, and the retreat across the lake.

30. the apostles: here only in Mark, and presumably in the literal sense 'those who had been sent forth as missionaries,' the corresponding verb 'to send forth' having been used in 6 [7] and 3 [14]. Elsewhere Mark only uses, from 3 [14] onwards, 'the Twelve': on 'the Twelve' and 'the disciples' see note on 9 [35].

31. ye yourselves: that is, just yourselves and nobody else.

rest awhile: our Lord's consecration for us all, recorded by Mark alone, of holiday after work.

coming and going: see note on 14 [21].

they had no leisure so much as to eat, exactly as 3 [20]. Mark, recording the experiences of a disciple, includes this very human touch, which the other Synoptists no doubt regarded as below the dignity of history.

32. in the boat (the boat or ship which they kept in regular use), and therefore to the other side of the lake: see on 4 [35].

33. Capernaum was close to the north end of the lake; and from the direction the boat was taking, it seemed that it would be possible to hurry round even on foot and anticipate the boat on its arrival. It may be assumed that the conditions were not favourable for the boat to make a quick passage.

34. came forth: rather *came out* (AV) of the boat, as [2].

as sheep not having a shepherd: cf. Ezek 34 [2] ff.

35-44. The miraculous Feeding of the Five Thousand.

35. when the day was now far spent . . . the day is now far spent: literally, 'the hour is a big one,' Vulgate *hora multa* —i.e. reckoning from sunrise to sunset it was the ninth or tenth hour.

37. The naive question 'are we to go and spend £7 or £8 in buying up loaves?' is characteristically omitted (compare the treatment of the questions in 4 [38], 5 [31]) by the other Synoptists: Jn 6 [5-13] follows Mark much more closely in some of the

details. For the value of a 'pennyworth' see on 12 [15].

39, 40. **by companies, in ranks**: Mark repeats each word 'companies companies,' 'ranks ranks' to produce the effect he wants; it is not in the least necessary to look to a Semitic origin for this idiom, since we find a similar phrase to describe a precisely similar situation in another Greek document from Christian Rome, Hermas, *Sim.*, viii, 2, § 8 *tagmata tagmata*. No English rendering can reproduce the picturesqueness of Peter's visualization of the scene. Five thousand—even if the number was exaggerated: see on 8 [9]—might well seem a number impossible to control: but our Lord was no visionary enthusiast who left such things to take care of themselves. Not confusion but order was always according to His mind: and He directed the disciples to sort out and seat the crowd 'by companies' or *symposia*, that is, literally, the 'parties' of friends who met to have a common feast or *symposium*. So orderly was the arrangement that when the crowd were seated, by hundreds and by fifties, they presented the appearance of the 'beds' in a neatly laid out garden, for that is the proper meaning of the word translated 'ranks.' St. Paul's directions in 1 Cor 14 [26-32] are an admirable commentary, in the ecclesiastical sphere, upon this passage.

39. **the green grass**: see note on 2 [23].

41, 42. **And he took the . . . loaves . . . and looking up to heaven he blessed and brake . . . and gave to the disciples . . . and they did all eat.** The language is Eucharistic, as comparison with 14 [22] shows clearly enough: but the resemblance or anticipation is still closer if we adopt there the reading which assimilates [22] to [23] (see *ad loc.*) 'he took a loaf, and when he had blessed it he brake and gave to them: and they did all eat of it,' for in that case there is so far no word at all used at the Last Supper which is not already used here. The groundwork of the action was all familiar: the *differentia* which at the Last Supper marked off the rite to its new meaning lay just in the words 'This is my Body.' The miracle looks on to the Eucharist: the Eucharist was a weekly repetition in the spiritual sphere of the miracle.

41. **the disciples** RV: *his disciples* AV, probably rightly. It is one of the archaic traits which distinguish St. Mark's Gospel that it speaks normally of 'his disciples,' only very rarely of 'the disciples.' At the time of the Ministry there were disciples of the Baptist, disciples of the Pharisees, and so on: the disciples of Jesus were not yet '*the* disciples.'

43. **basketfuls**: literally 'the complement of twelve baskets': see on 2 [21].

45-VIII. 26. For the whole of these two chapters there is no real parallel in Luke. If, as seems probable, Luke only came across Mark's Gospel after he had sketched the first draft of his own, the simplest explanation is that he had not room for the whole of Mark's matter.

VI. 45-56. The Return again to the west side: the Walking on the Water.

45. **unto the other side to Bethsaida.** Strictly speaking, Bethsaida being on the east bank of Jordan, where it enters the lake, was on the same side as the scene of the Feeding; and the Old Syriac version, the translator being probably acquainted with the topography, omits the phrase 'to the other side.' But the Greek does not necessarily mean more than 'across' by water from the north-eastern to the northern shore.

46. **the mountain**: see on 3 [13].

48. **distressed** in rowing, RV: better than AV 'toiling,' but not as strong as Mark's word 'tortured'—another instance of metaphorical use which classical Greek would hardly have admitted. We might perhaps in English say 'strained.'

'the fourth watch of the night,' i.e. at 3 a.m.: see note on 13 [35].

51. Matthew (14 [28-31]) intercalates here the episode of Peter's joining our Lord on the water, and, whatever may be thought of it on other grounds, no sort of argument can be founded on its absence from Mark's narrative, for that would be quite of a piece with Peter's general self-suppression in this Gospel; cf. for instance the references to Peter in Mt 17 [24-27]; Lk 22 [31, 32]; Jn 13 [24], none of which have any parallel in Mark.

51, 52. Compare the earlier story of the stilling of the storm in 4 [39-41]. Then when 'the wind ceased' (4 [39]) they 'feared with great fear,' now they had no longer fear, but were still 'beyond measure amazed,' though they ought to have grasped the implications of the miraculous feeding of the multitude: they ought to have understood that their Master had from God a power over natural things that no other had, but their spiritual sight was 'dulled' or 'blinded,' Vu gate *obcæcatum*. Not 'hardened': see on 3 [5].

53. **Gennesaret.** Here only in Mark, and not of the lake, which he calls 'the sea of Galilee' (1 [16], 7 [31]), but of the plain, south of Capernaum, which gave the lake its alternative name. The 'wind being contrary' ([48]), they had to make for a

quite other landing-place than they had intended: the stilling of the storm, while it ensured their safety, did not obviate the natural consequences of their being driven out of their course right into the middle of the lake.

55. on their beds: see note on 2^{4}.

56. in the market-places RV: if this reading is right, Mark must just mean 'open places,' for strictly speaking the Latin *forum* or Greek *agora* (the word here used) definitely implies a 'city'; the alternative reading, followed by AV, 'in the streets' would be very attractive, if it were not so easy as to look like a correction—perhaps borrowed from Ac 5^{15}.

touched the border of his garment: cf. $5^{27.30}$.

were made whole: literally 'were saved,' the word being regularly used by Mark of bodily health: see on 5^{23}, 13^{20}.

VII. **1-23.** The Tradition of the Elders: Tradition and Scripture: Inward and Outward Defilement. The section consists of three episodes or discussions, loosely bound together and not necessarily, indeed not probably, belonging all to one occasion. Between them they represent the final stage of our Lord's Galilæan teaching, and the final breach between His conceptions and those of the Pharisees and scribes. While the earlier causes of friction had arisen out of His miracles and, so far as Scripture and tradition went, mainly out of the one subject of the Sabbath, we are now taken to face wider problems of ethics. As in 3^{22}, it is scribes from headquarters at Jerusalem who raise the more fundamental issues.

1-6. The tradition of the elders—or, as we might better represent it to ourselves, the tradition of 'the Fathers,' which is what in this connexion the word *presbyter* means in Jewish and early Christian language—hedged round the precepts of the Law on ceremonial cleanness, as contained in the book of Leviticus, by rules which were meant no doubt primarily to ensure purity after contact with the heathen such as was inevitable in the everyday life of a district like Galilee. These meticulous washings were not wrong in themselves, any more than the customs of polite society are nowadays. Christ did not mean to encourage us to sit down to table with dirty hands: He would not necessarily have denied that 'cleanliness is next to godliness': but He did imply that the cultured classes in Palestine at that day, or in the Roman Empire of the early Christian centuries, or among ourselves in the 20th century, might and did pay disproportionate attention to such external matters and rate them higher than the weightier matters of the Law, judgement and mercy and faith.

2. defiled, literally, with the margin of AV, RV, 'common': a technical Jewish term, as in the story of St. Peter's vision (Ac $10^{14.15}$), but as such unintelligible to Roman readers, and so explained here parenthetically to mean in this connexion 'unwashed.'

3. all the Jews except they wash . . . eat not. Mark's account does not square with what comes to us from Rabbinic sources: compare on ^{11}. But Mark wrote more than a century before the Rabbinic material was put on paper: he was a Jew himself and, though of course an unfavourable witness, he shows at the most critical part of the story, the account of the Passion, no tendency to press his case unfairly: see for instance note on 14^{55-65}. Except on the hypothesis that evangelists are less trustworthy than other people, there seems no ground for rejecting his witness here.

diligently RV: a rendering perhaps chosen to cover either of the two Greek readings: AV 'oft' follows the inferior reading, but not even the Pharisees can have required anyone to wash their hands several times before dinner. The true reading appears to mean literally 'with the fist,' which is not at first sight intelligible: but a passage in the *Lausiac History*—a compilation of stories about the great ascetics of the 4th century, put together by Palladius, the friend and biographer of St. Chrysostom—supplies us with the key. A certain bishop after a journey under a broiling sun began to wash his hands and feet—then comes the word used by St. Mark—in ice-cold water, and was rebuked by a fellow-traveller, Melania, the Roman patrician lady and one-time friend of St. Jerome, who told him that as a true ascetic she never washed more than 'the extremities of her hands'; that is, since strictly speaking the word 'hand' in Greek includes the forearm, in our phraseology 'her hands,' not 'her fingers.' The contrast must therefore be with washing up to the elbows.

4. except they wash themselves . . . 'washings of cups,' with margin 'baptize,' 'baptizings.' Nothing illustrates better the primitive atmosphere of Mark's Gospel than this use of the Greek word which became consecrated to the sacrament of initiation—and which was transliterated into Latin, and from Latin into English and the Romance languages—in a profane or non-technical sense (cf. too 10^{38}).

Small wonder that the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. substituted 'sprinkling' for 'baptizing'—though there their courage stopped, and they left 'baptisms of cups' alone; it is more wonderful that the mass of MSS. preserved the text faithfully. It assures us that, outside Alexandria at any rate, recension in the sense of conscious and systematic introduction of new readings played practically no part in the transmission of the Gospel text.

from the market-place, i.e. from the *agora* or forum (see on 6^{56}); 'the full *agora*' was in Greek a periphrasis for the morning hours, and the meaning here is therefore 'when they come home from business for the midday meal.'

5. Why walk not thy disciples . . .? Neither Matthew nor Luke ever uses the verb save in the literal sense: Mark here employs it in the metaphorical sense common in the Epistles, perhaps an indication of his indebtedness to St. Paul.

6-13. Conflict of duties: the sense of proportion. Our Lord challenges the elevation of the 'tradition of the elders'—or in modern language 'Catholic custom'—to the position of a supreme and binding authority. He does not say that it is wrong in itself, or that it has no validity in its own sphere: He does say that it may conflict with a higher law, and that to follow it then is to disobey God. He takes an extreme instance, where one of the Ten Commandments, the simplest primary code of ethics, was 'got round' in the interest of ecclesiastical finance.

7. teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men RV, by no means improving on AV: literally 'teaching as teachings commands of men.' The evangelist certainly wants to put in juxtaposition the two related Greek words, 'commands' of men and 'the commandment' of God.

9. Full well: rather perhaps *Finely, Admirably.*

11. 'Corban, that is to say, Given *to God*': on the principle that as God's service takes precedence of any service to man, gifts to His service are ear-marked as inalienable to any other service. The Rabbinic tradition, as reduced to writing about A.D. 200, is very much nearer to our Lord's teaching than what is here presented to us.* But Mark is the earlier witness (see on 3), and while it is possible that Rabbis of different localities may have differed in some features of their teaching, it is also possible that the Rabbis receded from a position that successive generations of Jewish Christians may well have chosen as a favourite ground of attack. Our Lord means more than merely to show what false exegesis can do with the plain letter of Scripture. He implies clearly that natural duties and responsibilities have the first claim: the man who stints himself to give his children a good education is doing his duty better than the man who stints his children's education in order to subscribe largely to church or chapel, even though the subscription is called 'Peter's pence' or by any equivalent name.

* But cf. Mt 15^{5} n., 164*b*-165*b*.—ED.

14-23. Outward and inward defilement. Our Lord puts in a nutshell, in one of the 'short sharp sayings' in which Justin Martyr describes His method as consisting, the ground of His belittling of the criticism passed by the scribes upon His disciples. His mission was not primarily concerned with the outward behaviour of men, but with a change of heart: if that came about, all else would follow in due course. A man cannot 'be defiled': in the full sense of the word, he can only defile himself. What He meant by that He explains to His disciples, for, as in 6^{52} and 8^{21}, they still could not 'understand.'

16. If any man have ears to hear, let him hear RVm, AV: in all probability the words are genuine, as in $4^{9, 23}$, and were omitted by one group of authorities in assimilation to the parallel in Mt 15^{11}. As in 4^{9}, the words come in between teaching to the multitude and its explanation to the disciples. Only those who listened and wanted to understand were capable of further and higher knowledge.

17. the parable (3^{23}): see on 4^{10}.

19. This he said, making all meats clean. For the construction of this verse, as for 1^{1-4}, we must have recourse to the Greek Fathers: the true interpretation was lost till it was recovered, not so long ago, from Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Chrysostom. Grammatically the words go with 'he saith' of ^{18}: it is just an extreme example of Mark's use of parenthesis. The interpretation, whether it is Peter's or Mark's, is a true one: the principle our Lord laid down did imply the ultimate abolition of the Mosaic distinctions between meats clean and unclean, though certainly the disciples did not at the time realize that, nor did Peter as late as the conversion of Cornelius. The marked emphasis in this Gospel on the want of intelligence shown by the disciples must certainly be taken to include blindness on their part to the scope of our Lord's teaching about the ultimate inconsistency of Christianity with the Law,

the new wine with the old bottles. It is possible of course that, when the pregnant meaning of the principles enunciated by Christ had been fully grasped, some elucidating emphasis was added by apostle or evangelist to the expression of them: just as the enumeration of the things that do defile in [22] (see note there) looks as if it may have been expanded under the influence of Pauline vocabulary. But that is all, at the most: the main substance is genuine and original. Our Lord's words were handed down with scrupulous fidelity; very rarely is there any reason to suppose they have been even interpreted, more rarely still that they have been modified. It is well worth while to note how much less change Matthew and Luke, in copying Mark, make in his record of Christ's words than they do in his narrative. That does not exclude improvements in the Greek form: since He spoke in Aramaic, the Greek rendering had no final authority.

21, 22. The list is full of difficulties: but so much at any rate is clear, that we have a group of plural concrete nouns, then a group roughly equal in number of singular abstract nouns, each half of the list apparently ending with a general and comprehensive term. And the plural group is a paraphrase of the second half of the Decalogue, introduced by the 'evil thoughts' which underlie the different evil acts then specified. Further, all our authorities for the text here agree in omitting (in this part of the list) the Ninth Commandment, and agree in duplicating 'fornications' and 'adulteries' for the Seventh Commandment: and the older authorities appear to give the Commandments in the order Seventh, Eighth, Sixth. Compare the similar but even more complicated variations found in the other summary of the Decalogue in 10 [19].

wickednesses: rather perhaps *evil deeds* generally.

deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness RV: and so AV with 'blasphemy' in place of 'railing.' These words as a whole suggest the language of the Epistles (St. Paul and 1 Peter) rather than of the Gospels: it may be that Peter (or Mark) is translating the Jewish Decalogue into terms more intelligible and more applicable to Gentile hearers or readers: cf. Gal 5 [20], Rom 1 [29, 30], etc.

deceit and **lasciviousness** are hardly strong enough renderings: it is more like *treachery* and *debauchery*.

an evil eye. Neither Mt 20 [15] 'is thine eye evil because I am good?' nor any of the Old Testament passages which show that 'an evil eye' meant a temper of jealousy, 'looking askance' on another, are adequate parallels. Mark refers, and his Roman readers would have had no difficulty about the reference, to the widespread superstition of the evil eye. St. Paul (Gal 3 [1]) uses the language metaphorically, no doubt: but Plutarch, when he speaks of 'those who are said to have the eye that can cast spells,' or a modern Italian when he talks of the *jettatura*, are to be taken quite literally. To cast 'the evil eye' over anyone meant something more malignant than mere jealousy.

railing should rather be *slander*, 'speaking evil of others,' that is 'blasphemy' in its original sense: see on 3 [28]. Matthew retains this word only out of the second half of the list; doubtless in the sense of 'blasphemies' as corresponding to the first half of the Decalogue.

foolishness RV, AV, sounds to us an anticlimax for the final term; better *senselessness*: it seems to sum up the list of vicious qualities as coming under the general heading 'want of moral perception,' 'an insensate state of mind.'

VII. 24-X. 52. The Ministry outside the borders of Galilee: Tyre, Decapolis, Bethsaida, Cæsarea Philippi, Peræa, Jericho (to Jerusalem).

VII. 24. And: rather *Now*: Mark uses here the particle of transition which he employs only to denote some important new departure in his narrative: see note on 1 [14]. He wants to call attention to the moment when Christ first abandoned Galilee and the lake of Galilee as the scene of His Ministry. Capernaum occurs only once again (9 [33]), and Mark has just before that mentioned (9 [30]) that this last visit to Galilee was being made, so to say, incognito. Perhaps the immediate cause of this journey northwards was to remove Himself quickly from Herod's jurisdiction: when He arrived at Tyre He hoped to escape notice (7 [24]), and it is worth remark that 7 [24-37] is the solitary occasion on which He makes a journey without (so far as Mark's story tells us) the company of disciples.

and Sidon: omit with RVm. The words have come in from Mt 15 [21], who there combines in one the two notices Mk 7 [24, 31].

26. a Greek: context and New Testament usage make it quite certain that the meaning is, with RVm, *a Gentile*. The woman was by race and of course by language a Syrophœnician, in religion a heathen. Our Lord had not gone to non-Jewish districts to preach or teach

(teaching is not again mentioned till 10 [1]): but His reputation had spread as far back as 3 [8] beyond Palestine, and where He found faith, even among the heathen, He would not refuse to meet it with works of healing (cf. 5 [2-8], 7 [31-37]).

27. the dogs. Always a term of reproach in the New Testament, and indeed in Eastern writers generally: and though the diminutive form used here and in the parallel in Matthew (not elsewhere in the New Testament) may do something to take the edge off the comparison, yet Mark uses diminutives too regularly (see on 5 [23]) for us to lay very much stress on this. Our Lord tried to deter the woman: her 'venture of faith' was that even such a comparison did not deter her.

28. Yea: should be omitted on good Greek, Latin, and Syriac authority; it is never found elsewhere in Mark, but is common in Matthew and has come in here from the parallel in Mt 15 [27].

Lord: rather *Sir*. The three later Gospels habitually put the word into the mouth of disciples addressing Jesus, and no doubt they mean by it 'Lord': Luke and John also use 'the Lord' habitually in narrative. But Mark, our earliest Gospel, never uses 'the Lord' in narrative, and never uses the vocative except here. It is not likely that Mark means to attribute to a Gentile anything more than the customary title of respect to a superior, and we should render 'Sir' as both AV and RV do in Jn 4 [49].

29. go thy way. The cure is wrought in answer to the mother's faith; at a distance, without either word or touch, possibly because the recipient was not one of the Chosen People.

30. laid upon the bed: that is, not yet strong enough to walk about (cf. 5 [43], 9 [26]), but resting peacefully.

31. through Sidon. Since Sidon was some way north of Tyre, our Lord was taking a circuitous route, the motive being probably to give a wide berth to the territory of Antipas. He crossed the Jordan north of the lake and came round to the lake of Galilee on its eastern or even south-eastern shore in the territory of Decapolis (see on 5 [20]).

through the midst of the borders RV: rather *of the district*: see on 5 [17].

32. had an impediment in his speech: literally 'barely able to speak.' The word is extraordinarily rare, though found twice in the LXX: but since in Is 35 [5, 6] it occurs with the 'blind,' the 'deaf,' and the 'lame,' and in a papyrus of century 2 A.D. (see Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary* s.v.) with the 'deaf' and the 'toothless,' since further it is represented in [37] by the 'speechless,' the conclusion seems clear that it is only a late Greek equivalent to 'dumb.'

33, 34. Note how in the later miracles described by St. Mark (cf. especially 8 [23-25]) there is what we may almost call reluctance and even difficulty on the part of our Lord. Certain it is that, as the Ministry draws to its close, miracles become less and less an outstanding feature of His work. Their significance belongs rather to the earliest stage of the Ministry: they challenge men's attention, they mark Him out as Lord and Healer of the body as well of the soul (in Matthew and Luke they are also the sign that the 'acceptable day' of prophecy has come to pass), but they are not His greatest or His ultimate work. Therefore these later miracles tend to be done as far as possible privately (cf. [36], 8 [23, 26]) and almost with effort. 'He sighed' in [34], and again in 8 [12], should rather be 'he groaned,' as in Rom 8 [23, 26]: compare the even stronger word of Jn 11 [33, 38].

Ephphatha: as in 5 [41] the actual Aramaic word with which our Lord accomplished the miracle impressed itself on the memory of the hearers: brief and decisive, as in 4 [39], Jn 11 [43].

37. the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak. But there is one category of healing in question, not two: the Greek has only one article for the two words 'deaf' and 'dumb,' and is really equivalent to 'the deaf and dumb to hear and speak.'

VIII. **1-10.** The second Feeding of the Multitude. The difficulties in accepting this narrative as independent of the Feeding already recorded in 6 [34-44] are serious. (1) While all four Gospels record the first Feeding, Matthew alone supports Mark in the second. If this consideration stood alone, it would not count for very much: for the 4th Gospel takes over no other miracle from Mark, and the 3rd has nothing corresponding to Mark from a much earlier point (6 [45]) to a rather later point (8 [26]): but it does not stand alone. (2) The real gravamen is that the accounts of the two miracles are suspiciously like one another, whether in the setting or in the details. If we had met them anywhere but in a Gospel, we should say at once that they were different descriptions of the same event. The variations in the numbers, whether of the loaves, or of the baskets, or of the multitude, are just what we should expect to find between the recollections of two different eye-witnesses. (3) When we

compare the two Feedings verse by verse, we find that the former narrative is full of the dramatic touches that characterize the body of the Gospel—the initiative of the disciples (6 35), their criticism of the course proposed by Christ (37), the vivid picture of the grouping of the multitude (39, 40)—while the one we are considering is relatively bare and jejune. (4) 'In those days,' the phrase in 8 1 which introduces the story, almost suggests the advent of intrusive material, so unlike is it to the ordinary run of Mark's narrative: it is used in 1 9, but there it brings Jesus Himself for the first time on the scene. We are forced to conclude that Mark has mistakenly taken two independent accounts of the same miracle for accounts of two independent miracles, the first being doubtless from Peter, the other from some unknown eye-witness. It does not follow that the second is valueless: the smaller estimate of the numbers present is likely to be nearer the truth, for most of us overestimate in such matters: see on 5 13.

But out of this conclusion a second problem arises: if this second Feeding is a doublet of the first, derived by Mark from a source other than Peter, does the intrusive or non-Petrine matter extend further backward or further forward in Mark's narrative? Note that each account of Feeding is followed by the recrossing of the lake to the western side, Gennesaret of 6 53 corresponding to Magedan or Magdal or Dalmanutha (whichever is the right reading) of 8 10: note also that the intention had originally been to cross not to the western side but to the northern end to Bethsaida (6 45); and may we not suppose that the arrival at Bethsaida in 8 22 was the accomplishment of the original intention? If so, we are back in the Petrine narrative by this point; and we can hardly dissociate the arrival at Bethsaida from the voyage to Bethsaida (8 13-21): indeed the introduction of the disciples in 14 without subject expressed is thoroughly Petrine. At the most, then, the non-Petrine source can claim only the two verses 8 11, 12 of matter that *follows* the second Feeding: of matter that *precedes* it we shall, if our hypothesis has any foundation, be glad to separate by the least possible interval the intention to go to Bethsaida, expressed in Peter's account at 6 45, from its fulfilment. From 6 53 to 7 23 our Lord is on the west side of the lake: at 8 11-13 He leaves the western shore for Bethsaida. The natural deduction is that the intrusive matter is what reaches from 7 24 to 8 10 (or possibly 12). It was pointed out on 7 24 that there is nothing, from 24 to 37, to show that Christ was accompanied to Tyre and Decapolis by the disciples: nothing, we may now put it, to connect those verses with St. Peter. Tentatively, therefore, it is suggested that from 7 24 to 8 10 (or 12) St. Mark has incorporated into the stock of the Petrine recital a group of reminiscences belonging to more or less the same period, derived from some non-Petrine source. Whether his new source or sources were oral or written we cannot say for certain. But the existence of written records in the first Christian generation is nowadays much too lightly assumed: we must bear in mind both the inborn preference of men for oral testimony, and the deep-seated expectation among Christians of the speedy End. If the material came to Mark in written form at all, it was probably put on paper just for the purpose of being used in his Gospel.

2. they continue with me now three days. More probably we should punctuate 'it is now three days: they are attending on me and have nothing to eat.'

5, 8. seven loaves, seven baskets. The number 'seven' is always a little bit suspect wherever there is any trace of variation in the tradition (cf. Mk 10 30 'a hundredfold' = Lk 18 30 'sevenfold'), and one is therefore led to give the preference to the 'five' of 6 38.

6, 7. having given thanks, having blessed. Both words are used (though in inverse order) in the Eucharistic narrative of Mt 26 26, 27 and the ordinary texts of Mk 14 22, 23: only the former in St. Paul (1 Cor 11 24), only the latter in Mk 6 41 and perhaps in the true text of Mk 14 22, 23.

9, 10. he sent them away . . . he entered into the boat with his disciples: rather, with the best authorities Greek and Latin, 'he entered himself into the boat with his disciples.' Comparing 6 45, it looks as though Mark wished to emphasize a point which helped to distinguish what were in his view two different miracles, namely that in the one case our Lord sent the disciples on while He Himself stayed behind to dismiss the crowd, while in the other He first dismissed the crowd and then embarked, He and His disciples together. As far as it goes, the discrepancy perhaps suggests that Mark's informant here was not one of the Twelve.

10. Dalmanutha. The authorities in Mark are divided between this form and Magedan and Magdala: in Matthew (15 39) the earlier authorities have Magedan, the later Magdala. Presumably, whichever name is right, the district

meant is equivalent to the Gennesaret of Mk 6 [53], and on the west of the lake.

11, 12. The demand for a Sign. Matthew records such a demand on two occasions (12 [38] ff. and 16 [1] ff.): Luke on one (11 [29] ff.). It is clear that the passage in Luke is parallel to the former passage in Matthew, and that on that occasion a sign was promised, the sign of Jonah; while the present passage of Mark corresponds to the second passage in Matthew, though Matthew to avoid inconsistency with his earlier passage has introduced the sign of Jonah in 16 [4] as well. But the demand for a sign was so natural and so constantly in the background that our Lord may quite probably have refused it on the occasion when it was formally demanded, and yet have referred again later on to the demand on His own initiative—exactly as Luke represents it—and told His hearers that they should indeed have the 'sign of Jonah.'

12. sighed deeply: see on 7 [34].

there shall no sign be given: literally 'if a sign shall be given,' a genuine Hebraism for a solemn form of negative.

14-21. The disciples are 'anxious for the morrow.' They had started, perhaps hurriedly and under pressure, and had not got with them more than a single loaf to be shared between the thirteen. They discussed among themselves this lack of bread: and our Lord remonstrates with them for worrying about it, so soon after they had experienced His power to provide food from God for a multitude so much larger than they were. Once and again (6 [52]) He makes His appeal, the appeal to be answered at last at Cæsarea Philippi, 'Do ye not yet understand who and what your Master is?'

There are two points of difficulty in these verses. (1) The development of the episode, otherwise quite straightforward, is interrupted by an intrusive reference to the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod in [15]. 'Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees' was a Saying of our Lord which is found independently in Lk 12 [1]: in this setting in Mark it seems best to treat it as purely parenthetical; the discussion about the loaves reminds the evangelist of the Saying about leaven. A modern writer would have put it in a note at the foot of the page. (2) If the account of the Feeding in 8 is only a doublet of the account in 6, then the reference in [20] must necessarily be an addition of the evangelist's: we have to admit that, acting on an erroneous belief that there were two miracles and not one, he has tampered with our Lord's words. None of us likes having to make such an admission: but we must be honest, and 'follow the argument where it leads,' or how can we expect to be listened to when we press the many reasons for our conviction in the general faithfulness of the record?

22. Bethsaida: see on 6 [45]. Not mentioned again in Mark: but Mt 11 [21] = Lk 10 [13] shows that it was one of the chief scenes of our Lord's 'mighty works.' It was in the tetrarchy of Philip, who had given it as its full name Bethsaida Julias, after Augustus's daughter Julia: but it was only just across the Jordan, and therefore close to Galilee and the tetrarchy of Antipas.

22-26. The Healing of the Blind Man: so curiously close are some of the details of the miracle to those of 7 [32-36] that it has been suggested that, like the two accounts of the Feeding, they are variant forms of the same story. Such an explanation is in this case not *necessary*; at any rate, the lifelike picture and marked individualism claim this story as part of the Petrine narrative. Nowhere else do we find a miracle described in two stages.

24. I see men, for I behold them as trees walking. If this reading is right, the word translated 'behold' must, on the analogy of 9 [4], 13 [26], 14 [62], 16 [7], mean something like 'have a vision of' them. But the reading represented by AV, which omits 'for I behold,' is simpler and seems more like Mark's style: if so, the fuller reading was an early attempt at explanation. Perhaps we should suppose that the man had had just enough vision left to enable him to avoid walking into trees: now he sees similar, if smaller, erect objects and sees them moving.

24, 25. After the ordinary verb 'to see,' three forms of the same verb compounded with different prepositions are used in the Greek, which we cannot represent in any corresponding way in English; 'to look up,' 'to look through,' that is 'to see clearly,' and 'to look at' everything, that is 'to command the whole range of vision.'

26. Do not even enter into the village. The earliest authorities are divided between this reading and 'do not tell it even in the village.' The difficulty arose from Mark's habitual use of the preposition 'into' for 'in' (see on 1 [10, 39]): he wrote doubtless 'do not tell it even into the village.'

27-30. The Great Confession of Jesus as Messiah by St. Peter, the consummation and close of the first half of the Ministry. At last our Lord is able to

reap the fruit of the earlier stage of His education of the Twelve: at last their leader and spokesman is able to make the first venture of faith in the recognition of their Master for part at least of what He was, namely the Messiah or Anointed One, whom God had sent in answer to the ever-increasing expectation of the devout among the Jews, to establish His Kingdom in righteousness. It was not all: the proem of Mk 1 [1] bids us regard the Gospel as the good news of Jesus not only as Christ but as Son of God: but it is the first stage and the necessary condition of the second.

27. Cæsarea Philippi: the ancient Paneas, rebuilt by the tetrarch Philip in honour of the emperor Cæsar Augustus and distinguished from other Cæsareas, especially from Herod the Great's foundation on the coast of Palestine, by the added name of the tetrarch. It lay twenty-five miles to the north of the lake of Galilee, up the Jordan valley, and close to the south-western slope of Mount Hermon. From 8 [22] to 9 [30] the scene is laid throughout in Philip's tetrarchy.

28. Repeated from 6 [14, 15].

30. he charged them that they should tell no man of him; exactly as He had charged the unclean spirits in 3 [11, 12] (see note there) after their confession of His divine Sonship. The verb is the same here: it is literally 'rebuked,' and implies at least a severe check on any eagerness they might be showing to spread the great news among the people that the Prophet of Nazareth was indeed no less than the longed-for Messiah. But the time for extensive mission was over, and was to be replaced by an always more intensive education of the Twelve. In the period that remained they were to keep close to Him and to learn what Messiahship meant and involved. Not Galilee but Jerusalem was now the goal.

VIII. 31—The end of the Gospel: second half of the Gospel: Jesus is not only Messiah but Son of God.

VIII. 31-X. 31. Third Section of the Ministry: the further and deeper training of the Twelve in the Christian ideal of sacrifice and service. The higher the call, the more complete must be the renunciation; the Master would set the example, His servants must follow it.

Three times in the space of two chapters, here and in 9 [31], 10 [33, 34], our Lord with increasing clearness imparts to His disciples what the future has in store for Him. He whom they have just confessed to be God's Anointed will have no easy victory over the forces that withstand the establishment of God's Kingdom. Not as Jewish fancy painted the incoming of Messiah's reign in power: that would come indeed, but only after He had suffered many things and been rejected by His people. He would be victorious: but His death was the condition precedent of His victory.

must suffer: wherever the word is used in this connexion, as in 9 [11] (13 [7, 10]), Lk 17 [25], 24 [7, 26]; Ac 17 [3], the meaning is that the Scriptures 'must' so be fulfilled. That is definitely expressed in Lk 22 [37], 24 [44]; Jn 20 [9]; Ac 1 [16], in all which cases the same word 'it must be' occurs with a distinct reference to 'the scripture' or 'the things written.'

be killed: so in all three passages and their parallels in Matthew and Luke, save that on the third occasion Matthew (20 [19]) substitutes 'crucify.' If this prophecy had not been spoken by our Lord but had been put into His mouth by His disciples *ex post facto*, we should inevitably have found the word 'crucified.'

after three days. That is the regular Marcan phrase, only varied by him in 14 [58] 'at an interval of three days' and 15 [29] 'in three days': and quite similarly he writes in 9 [2] 'after six days' and 14 [1] 'after two days.' Our other earliest authority, St. Paul, has (1 Cor 15 [4]) 'on the third day'; and that was the phrase which became normal in the Creed and is predominant in the New Testament, especially in the Lucan writings. But Matthew has 'after three days' in 27 [63]: and, in other connexions than the Resurrection, Luke writes similarly in Acts. What interval of time do these two phrases imply, and is it the same or a different interval? Now the unanimity of Christian tradition is really a quite sufficient answer: see in Mark's own Gospel the clear notes of time at 15 [42] (Friday afternoon), 16 [1] (Sabbath), 16 [2] (Sunday morning): but it may be worth while to refer to Field's conclusive argument (*Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, 11-13). The ancients, both Jews and Greeks, counted in both the first day and the last when reckoning up any interval, just as the French still do in using 'quinze jours' for our 'fortnight.' Therefore 'on the third day' is equivalent to our 'day after to-morrow.' Thus Porphyry writes that 'anyone who comes to stay with you at the close of a day, and starts early on the third day, is said to leave on the third day, though the intervening day was the only day he completed': and in the New Testament we have Lk 13 [32]; Ac 27 [18, 19]. If we go

on to ask whether 'after three days' means the same thing or no, we do not indeed find the same parallels from Gentile writers, but we have demonstrative proof in the LXX that it does: so Gen 42 [17, 18] 'he put them all together into ward three days, and said to them on the third day . . .,' 2 Ch 10 [5, 12] 'Come again unto me after three days. . . . Come to me again the third day.' Even the still stronger phraseology of Mt 12 [40] 'three days and three nights' means really no more; and there is again an appropriate parallel in the Old Testament, Est 4 [16], 5 [1], 'neither eat nor drink three days, night or day, I also and my maidens will fast in like manner . . . on the third day Esther put on her royal apparel.' The Gospels, then, convey by their divergence of phrase no divergence of meaning, but all imply the interval between a late hour on Friday and an early hour on Sunday.

In view of the triple repetition of the phrase (cf. 9 [31], 10 [34]), in view further of the charge brought against Jesus at His trial and crucifixion (14 [58], 15 [29]), it is difficult to refuse the conclusion that our Lord had actually used definite language about the exact interval between His death and His rising again.

32. and he spake the saying (that saying AV) **openly.** Probably the phrase is meant to lead up to and explain Peter's action in rebuking Christ. Naturally the saying, 'spoken openly,' without periphrasis and apparently without previous preparation, came as a shock to those who had at last made their first great venture of faith in the recognition of Jesus as Messiah. The whole journey to Jerusalem was directed to attune their minds gradually to the new conception of Messiahship. But at this first stage Peter broke out in indignant remonstrance against the novel idea that the Master, whom he had just confessed to be God's Anointed, could fall on such evil days. The episode is recorded precisely because of the public rebuke that followed: like all else in the Gospels that reflects on the Apostles in general or on Peter in particular, like the story of Peter's overzealousness and his subsequent denial, it is the Petrine Gospel that is our ultimate authority for it. Peter had learnt the lesson, inculcated so repeatedly in chapters 8 [31]-10 [45], of true Christian humility. The chief Apostle lays bare the record of his failures as well as of his faith in a way that no other Christian writer would have been likely to do in regard to him.

33. 'turned about,' as in 5 [30]: an emphatic compound, not found in the other Synoptists, like another compound verb 'looked all round,' which is found six times in Mk, once in Lk, never in Mt (see on 10 [23]). 'seeing his disciples': apparently it is meant that the rebuke was a public one, before the whole group, and, as the next words seem to imply, accompanied with an emphatic gesture of the hand, 'get away.' Elsewhere in the Gospel 'behind me' is always of 'coming after' Christ: here only of 'going away.' More and more clearly from this point onwards the Twelve are taken up into our Lord's company, as companions rather than followers: see on 9 [38], 10 [32]: but that could not be if they represented the spirit of Satan, tempting the Lord away from the path which lay before Him (cf. Mt 4 [10]).

34-38. A comment on Peter's remonstrance, instructing not the Twelve only but all who would be Christ's followers, that they too must walk in the same path and share in their measure the heavy load which lay on Him. They must 'deny themselves,' [34]—but not deny Christ, [38], as Peter was to do, 14 [30, 31]: they must even 'bear the cross'—as a condemned criminal did on the way to his crucifixion (cf. 15 [20, 21]; Jn 19 [17]). 'The cross' has become so familiar a phrase to us that it is not easy to picture to ourselves its effect when it first fell on the ears of the disciples. Even in the 'open' prediction of His passion our Lord had spared them that word: it is first in metaphor that He begins to foreshadow the completeness of His own 'denying of himself.'

35. his life: *psyche* always in Mark means physical 'life' (save where he is reporting Old Testament language used by our Lord, 12 [30], 14 [34]): see 3 [4], 10 [45]. The RVm '*or* soul,' and AV text in [36, 37], are therefore wrong: we must translate 'life' throughout the three verses.

38. of me and of my words: two of our oldest MSS., one Greek and one Latin, omit the noun, giving only 'ashamed of me and mine,' and that reading corresponds so closely to the emphasis in Mark's Gospel on the unity of our Lord and His followers (see e.g. 9 [38], 10 [39]) that it may well be right.

in this adulterous and sinful generation (the phrase is omitted by Luke in order to give the principle a more universal application): it is easy to understand why 'this generation' was called 'faithless' (Mk 9 [19]; Mt 17 [17] = Lk 9 [41]) or 'evil' (Mt 12 [39] = Lk 11 [29]; Mt 16 [4]) or 'perverse' (Mt 17 [17]) or 'crooked' (Ac 2 [40]), but why 'adulterous'? Presumably in the sense in which in the prophets Israel is

regarded as a virgin espoused to God, who yet forsakes her true and only husband—e.g. Hos 2 [2] ff., where as 'her fornication' is mentioned as well as 'her adultery,' we should perhaps understand 'sinful' in Mark in the technical sense which it bears in Lk 7 [37].

38, IX. 1. The first reference in Mark to the Return of Christ in glory and therewith the imminence of the Coming of the Kingdom. It followed from the Confession of Jesus as Messiah, that He would come as Judge, for that was an essential part of the conception of the Messianic office. But Jesus had just broken to His disciples the knowledge that what lay before Messiah was in the first place rejection and a violent death: and the resurrection that was to follow His death 'after three days' was indeed the assurance of His power over death, but only a presage of His final victory and the final establishment of the Kingdom of God. For that purpose He would come again 'in the glory of his Father' (see on 9 [2]). Naturally, then, it is only now that the Second Coming is first mentioned in the Gospel. But nothing is said in detail: such teaching was not part of our Lord's public Ministry, and is only imparted in the last days of our Lord's life and only to His specially intimate companions among the Twelve: see on 13 [3] ff. Here we are only told that within the lifetime of some of His hearers there would be a 'coming of the Kingdom in power': see on 13 [26].

IX. 2-8. Five days after the great Confession and consequent prediction of Messiah's coming death and resurrection, a vision is granted to the three Apostles who were taken into our Lord's closest intimacy (5 [37], 14 [33]) which carries them at once to a further stage of knowledge of His true nature. He whom Peter had recognized to be Messiah, who had just told them that Messiah would come 'in the glory of His Father,' He, they learn, was not only Son of Man but Son of God. The Father, who had borne that witness to Jesus Himself at the Baptism (1 [11]), now bears the same witness to the three Apostles (9 [7]). What the Baptism was to the Ministry as a whole, that the Transfiguration was to the second and concluding part of it.*

a high mountain: traditionally identified with Mount Tabor, but by modern scholars, it may almost be said unanimously, with the much loftier Mount Hermon, which rises to a height of 9,000 feet, to the north-east of Cæsarea Philippi in the direction of Damascus.

apart by themselves: perhaps rather *privately and alone*. More and more the work of the Lord is done on a smaller and smaller circle. If the foundations were to carry the great building of redeemed humanity, they must be dug deep and out of sight. Note not only how the public Ministry contracts itself, but further how the word 'privately' means first with 'his own disciples' (4 [34]), then with the Twelve (6 [31, 32]), and now with only three of the Twelve: cf. too 13 [3].

he was transfigured. The Greek word is strictly *transformed* (so rendered in Rom 12 [2] and by RV in 2 Cor 3 [18]), in the older sense of 'form' in which it denotes the underlying essence of a thing: cf. 'being in the form of God' (Phil 2 [6]). If here it does not quite mean that (and Luke changes the word), it does imply that the change was more than superficial, and that something of the divine glory was manifested in Christ. And when the Latin translators rendered it by 'transfiguratus est' (or 'commutata est figura eius'), they did not necessarily mean to express a change in outward 'figure' only, for the earliest Latin version rendered Phil 2 [6] 'in figura dei'; and so when Tertullian interpreted 'hoc est corpus meum' as 'figura corporis,' 'figure' in the sense of symbol only was exactly what he did not mean.

4. Elijah with Moses: an odd way of collocating the two names (both Matthew and Luke substitute 'Moses and Elijah'), due, perhaps, to the fact that Elijah was much in their thoughts at the time (8 [28], 9 [11]). The natural order is given in [5].

5. Rabbi (10 [51], 11 [21], 14 [45]): see note on 4 [38]. **It is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles** (RVm 'booths'). Perhaps it was the time of the autumn 'feast of tabernacles,' and perhaps Peter meant that a week of rest and of converse with the visitants would be 'good for them'—better than any journey into peril of death. But the comment that follows in [6], 'not knowing what to answer,' suggests that he simply said what was uppermost in his mind at the moment.

one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah. He puts indeed Messiah first, but he implies that He is only *primus inter pares*, one in kind with, if higher in degree than, the representatives of Law and Prophecy. But the Voice from heaven repeats the witness of the Baptism; Jesus is not only God's Anointed but God's only Son, and now that He has come, He sums up and supersedes all

* On the Transfiguration cf. Mt 17 [1-13], notes, p. 170*b*.—ED.

earlier stages; the Law and the Prophets have had their day, He alone is to be heard. For the rendering 'only Son' instead of 'beloved Son' see on 1 [11].

9-13. As it stands, this paragraph consists of two verses that are straightforward enough, followed by three that are unintelligible. Luke omits the whole: Matthew omits only so much as he could not understand, but the question about the meaning of 'rising from the dead' in [10], and the question about the scriptural authority for the suffering of the Son of Man in [12], both disappear. Now sense and coherence are at once restored to the passage, if we may assume that the second question has got transposed to a wrong place, and that it should be brought back to its natural place in immediate sequence to the other question. 'They kept that saying, discussing with one another what was this "rising from the dead," and where did Scripture say about the Son of Man that he must suffer many things and be rejected.' In other words, the fresh reference to the Resurrection reminds them of the first reference to it only five days before, when it had been connected with the suffering of the Son of Man and His rejection, and scriptural authority had been claimed for it all (8 [31]). So read, all is straightforward: and it is quite easy to suppose that words inserted between two short columns of a papyrus roll (the writing was always across, not down, the roll) intended to be inserted in the column to the left, at [10], were, when the roll was recopied, erroneously inserted by the scribe in the column to the right, at [12]. If this explanation is correct, it would seem to follow that the error already existed in the copy of Mark that lay before Matthew.

10. they kept the saying, questioning among themselves RV. But the Greek preposition does not mean 'among,' and the word rendered 'questioning' means always 'discussing' or 'disputing' with someone else (1 [27], 8 [11], 9 [14, 16], 12 [28]). Either then 'themselves' is used in the sense of 'one another' (so AV), as also in 11 [31]; or 'with themselves' must be taken not with the verb that follows but with the verb that precedes, 'kept the saying to themselves.'

11. The scribes say that Elijah must first come RV. Here, and in [28], RV has blundered badly by refusing to recognize that Mark uses the indirect for the direct interrogative—incorrectly no doubt, but Mark's Greek is not correct. AV rightly saw that the sense can only be *Why say the scribes . . . ?* 'Why could not we cast him out?' See above on 2 [16].

12. be set at nought RV, AV. Rather *be counted for nought*, equivalent to 'be rejected' of 8 [31]: the Greek lexicographer Suidas explains the verb to mean 'I count for nothing,' and that is certainly sometimes the sense required in the New Testament, e.g. Lk 18 [9]; 1 Cor 6 [4].

14-29. The healing of the lad possessed with a dumb spirit: the inability of the disciples to cure him.

15. all the multitude . . . were greatly amazed. Not an adequate rendering: the verb, whether used in the simple or, as here and 14 [33], 16 [5, 6], in the stronger compound form, is a favourite one in Mark and implies always an element of awe or consternation. It may well be that when the Lord descended from the mount of the Transfiguration, something of the glory of that moment rested still on His countenance, as on that of Moses when he descended from Sinai (Ex 34 [29, 30]; 2 Cor 3 [7]). But whereas under the Old Covenant the glory on the face of Moses had something terrifying about it, so that Aaron and the elders of Israel 'feared to come nigh him,' the radiance on the face of the Son of Man awed them indeed, but also drew them to Him, for 'they ran to him and greeted him,' or (according to the alternative reading of codex Bezæ and the Old Latin) 'they rejoiced and greeted him.'

16. And he asked them, What question ye with them? That is, apparently, asked the crowd what they and their local scribes ([14]) were discussing with the disciples: note how regularly our Lord is represented in Mark as finding out what had happened by the ordinary method of questioning (cf. [21, 33]). There is nothing in the story to suggest that these scribes were attacking the disciples: we are no longer in the neighbourhood of Capernaum, or in contact with scribes from Jerusalem: it is simply that the crowd and their natural leaders were discussing with the remaining disciples the case of the lad and the possibility of a cure. The father had brought him and had been accompanied by his friends and, as we should put it, by the clergy of the parish.

18. dasheth him down RV, with margin 'rendeth him': AV conversely 'teareth' with margin 'dasheth him.' The appropriate sense is undoubtedly that of RV text and AVm, 'throws him to the ground' (cf. 5 [22]), and it corresponds to the reading of codex Bezæ and the Old Latins; but the reading of the critical texts, though it differs only by one

letter, can only mean 'tears him,' or more literally still 'breaks him.' Precisely the same difficulty meets us in a passage in the *Shepherd* of Hermas, *Mand.*, xi, 3, and there, as here, the sense wanted is 'overthrow,' and there, as here, the Latin versions give the sense we want. Mark and Hermas both wrote in Rome, and both used Greek of the same vernacular type.

pineth away RV, AV. The Greek word is the same as that used in 1 K 13 [4] where Jeroboam 'stretched out his arm . . . and lo his arm became rigid . . . and he could not draw it in.' Render here *is rigid*, as in an epileptic fit. It was one of the symptoms of his seizures: and no patient 'pines away' in the course of a seizure.

19. O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? Against whom is this passionate outburst of our Lord's directed? Clearly He feels that something is in violent contrast with the tense majesty of the experience on the mount. And it seems difficult to find this in anything else than in the culminating point of the story just told, the failure of the nine disciples He had left behind to effect the cure. They had expected to effect it ([28]) and they ought to have been able to effect it: and if they could not, it was due to their want of faith and prayer, for our Lord sets no limits to the power of prayer with faith ([29]): cf. 11 [23, 24].

22, 23. if thou canst do anything: in contrast to the leper's exclamation in 1 [40], 'if thou wilt, thou canst,' see note there. Here our Lord in reply repeats the father's phrase, but in the Greek the article is prefixed, making the meaning clear 'That phrase of yours "if thou canst" ': exactly as we should make it clear in modern English by the use of inverted commas. But something is, perhaps inevitably, lost in any English rendering, for we cannot easily reproduce the similarity of the words 'canst' and 'possible,' in the Greek: 'if thou canst do! all things can be done by him that believeth.' Neither the power to act nor the will to act was wanting to our Lord: but something more was needed, and that was faith on the father's part in our Lord's will and power to heal (cf. 6 [5, 6]).

24. the child RV, AV; and it is quite true that Mark here uses a diminutive. But he is fond of diminutives, and in fact never uses this particular word 'lad' or 'boy' except in the diminutive: and since in this case the father had spoken in [17] of bringing his 'son,' and said in [21] that he had suffered 'from his childhood,' it is obvious that he was no longer a child, and we must render accordingly *lad*, just as both our versions do in Jn 6 [9] for a still more diminutive form of the same Greek word.

25. saw that a multitude came running together: rather *saw that a crowd was hurrying up.* By the analogy of the two miracles last recorded (7 [33], 8 [23]), we may presume that our Lord had retired with the father and the lad away from the crowd (cf. [15]), and that when He saw them following and gathering speed, He hastened to effect the cure before their arrival.

26. as one dead: so in 7 [30] the girl from whom the devil had gone out does not walk about at once, but was found 'lying down on her bed.' In both cases Matthew (15 [28], 17 [18]) substitutes 'was healed from that hour.' Mark alone of the Synoptists (cf., however, Jn 9 [6, 7]) records our Lord's curing by stages, and alone of the evangelists allows room for recovery by stages and for the slow regaining of strength by natural means (cf. 5 [43]).

28. we could not cast it out RV. On this mistranslation see above on [11]: render with AV *why could not we cast it out?*

29. this kind can come out: 'come out' is here really the passive of 'cast out'—the Greek language disliked passives, and the classical writers regularly used the active verb 'to fall out' as the passive of 'to cast out'—and 'kind' is the word which Latin and English transliterate as 'genus,' so that the meaning is 'this kind of creature can only be cast out by prayer' (cf. [43, 45]).

save by prayer RV rightly, with the best authorities (cf. 11 [24] and note on [19] above). The mass of MSS., both here and in 1 Cor 7 [5], insert 'and fasting,' because 'prayer and fasting' so naturally go together (Lk 2 [37]; Ac 14 [23]). Exactly in the same way 'prayer' itself has been inserted, against the run of the context, after 'watching' in 13 [33], see note there. In all such cases the shorter reading of the older authorities is to be preferred.

30-50. The last journey through Galilee and last visit to Capernaum: a journey undertaken privately and perhaps hurriedly, and unaccompanied by any public teaching. As before, what lies behind the record is the danger of interference by the government of Herod Antipas, if public ministry were resumed in his dominions. Jerusalem and the Passover were the place and time that our Lord now set before Himself: the intervening weeks or months were spent 'in the regions of Judæa

and Transjordania' (10 [1], 3 [8]), both of them outside the jurisdiction of Antipas. It is possible that visits to Jerusalem for the Feasts of Tabernacles (Jn 7 [14]) and Dedication (Jn 10 [22]) should be fitted into this period: Mark's brief summary, if it does not suggest them, does not exclude them. It was perhaps in explanation of His movements that He repeated the prophecy of the Passion ([31]), and this time with an added implication of its near approach by the use of the present tense 'is being delivered up': but once more the prophecy was unintelligible to them.

33. What were ye reasoning in the way? . . . they had disputed with one another in the way RV. This change of verb is a subtle refinement of which Mark was quite unconscious: the two Greek words are closely related, one being common in Acts, the other in the Synoptic Gospels. The probability is that Mark means precisely the same thing by the two verbs, using one for the imperfect, the other when he needs to express a pluperfect. 'Disputed' of AV hardly carried then the tinge of acrimony which it bears now, any more than the 'Disputa' of Raphael's fresco. Render *discussed*.

in the way RV: 'by the way' AV. Better *on the road*: the word is now systematically used in Mark to emphasize the itinerant character of this last section of the Ministry (8 [27], 9 [34], 10 [17, 32, 52]).

34. who *was* the greatest (*Gr.* 'greater')? No such question could have vexed their minds when they were first drawn to follow Jesus. But now they had confessed Him to be Messiah, God's Vicegerent in the coming Kingdom, and He had spoken to them of His glory and promised that some then living should see the Kingdom after it had come in power. It does not seem illegitimate to suppose (see on 10 [35] *sqq.*) that the competition in 'greatness' which they were discussing was a competition as to which of them could render the greatest services in the establishment of the Kingdom. Their very venture of faith became a snare to them: they 'sought great things for themselves' (Jer 45 [5])—not an ignoble ambition, but they had still to learn by what way the Christ would come into His Kingdom, and that Christian greatness was to consist in renunciation of all that the world values and in the service of those whom the world rates of least account.

35. called the twelve. It was the Twelve therefore who had been discussing who was the greater, and the disciples with whom our Lord was travelling ([31, 33]) must have been practically identical with the Twelve. Exactly the same deduction follows from 10 [23, 28, 32], 10 [35, 41], 11 [11, 14], 14 [12, 17]. At least during the last journey to Jerusalem, from 9 [30] onwards (if not earlier), our Lord is accompanied only by a tiny group of followers—few enough to gather in one house (7 [17], 9 [33], 10 [10])—whom the evangelist appears to call indifferently 'the disciples' or 'the Twelve.'

36, 37. a little child, little children RV: 'a child,' 'children' AV. See above on [24].

taking him in his arms: see on 10 [16].

37-42. It seems inevitable to connect [37] and [42] very closely together: **whosoever shall receive one of such children . . . whosoever shall cause to stumble one of these little ones that believe . . .** If so, the intervening verses ([38-41]) must be regarded as parenthetical; an illustrative episode is introduced by the evangelist, and the main thread of teaching is then resumed. Cf. for a somewhat similar case in narrative 3 [21-31].

38. John: the only occasion in Mark where John is named alone, and significant of his surname as 'a son of thunder' (3 [17]). Cf. Lk 9 [54].

we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he followed not us RV. But probably Mark wrote 'and he followeth not us, and we forbade him,' while Luke 9 [49] transferred 'he followeth not' to a more logical place as the reason for their forbidding him, and many of the best MSS. assimilated Mark to Luke. A more significant change is that while Luke writes 'followeth not with us,' Mark had written 'followeth not us.' To St. Peter the Lord and the Twelve are one group, journeying together (see on 8 [38]): never again are they said to 'follow' Him, save on one occasion, and that for a brief moment of crisis (10 [32]: see note there).

39. Forbid him not. Our Lord lays down the principle which His Church should follow in regard to those who act in His Name, even though they do not belong to the outward fellowship of His society. They are not against us, and therefore they are really on our side, and we must not try to hinder their work for Him.

be able quickly to speak evil of me RV: AV *can lightly speak evil of me*, which is better English and better sense, but 'lightly' should perhaps rather be 'easily.' For Mark's weakened use of the verb 'to be able' as an auxiliary see on 6 [5].

41. because ye are Christ's: because you belong to Him whom you have now recognized to be Messiah. Clearly a time is in contemplation when the Twelve will be preaching the faith of Christ. That our Lord from Cæsarea Philippi onwards is insistently predicting His own death, it is impossible not to recognize if we pin any faith to Mark's record; that He regarded that death as imminent and bound up with the journey on which they had already started, follows not only from the definite language of 10 [32, 33], but from the present tense used in 9 [31], 'the Son of Man is being delivered up'; that there would be an interval between His death and resurrection and His return in glory had been implied in 8 [38], 9 [1], and during that interval what was to be happening? In what was He educating the Twelve in those large portions of these chapters where they were His only audience (9 [31-50], 10 [23-45]) but in the spirit in which they were to exercise rule in the community of His followers, as ministers and servants of the least among those who should believe? This training of the Twelve to represent Him after His death implies the existence in some sense of a community, implies therefore the answer to the question whether our Lord contemplated a church; just as later on in the Ministry He filled out the indications of His earlier teaching (see on 2 [21]) when He clearly contemplated the replacement of the Old Israel by another and the commission of God's Vineyard to other husbandmen (12 [9]). But it is at the same time true that He gave a wholly new meaning to organization and leadership and rule, for the greatest in His New Israel were to be *servi servorum Dei*.

42-48. The teaching is still primarily addressed to the Twelve, but for the moment the plural is replaced by the singular. The connecting idea through these verses is 'causing to stumble'—'scandalize' is the transliterated equivalent (derived by us of course through the Latin) of the Greek word—first in relation to others, the 'scandalizing' of the little ones that believe ('on me' should be omitted with RVm), and then in relation to a man's own self, the renunciation of whatever causes him to come short of what he was called to be.

43, 45. to go (into hell) . . . to be cast (into hell): 'to go'—rather *to go off*—and 'to be cast' are equivalent terms: see note on [29].

hell: in the Greek 'gehenna' ('ge' in Hebrew is 'valley,' cf. on 14 [32]), the valley of Hinnom, a ravine which ran down southwards on the west of Jerusalem, meeting ultimately the valley of Kidron which came down from the east side. It was the place where refuse was thrown out, and, we may presume, burnt to consume and purify: for only so can we give intelligible meaning to the words that follow. The phrase attached to Gehenna in [48], the undying worm and the unquenchable fire, comes direct from the LXX of Is 66 [24]: but 'Gehenna' and 'unquenchable fire' are in [43] obviously intended as equivalents, and though no doubt every Jew knew what Gehenna meant literally, it had come to be used in Jewish language as a symbol of the place of future punishment, and our versions are no doubt right in rendering it 'hell.' Certainly our Lord uses it here as the opposite state to 'life' and 'the kingdom of God.' More He does not tell us directly. We can be sure that no soul which turns, whenever and wherever, to God will fail of welcome: we cannot be sure that the will may not become so obstinately hardened against God that it is no longer able to turn to Him, and no man can be saved against his will, any more than anyone could be cured by our Lord without concurrence of his own faith. Whether we may gather from [49] that 'the fire' is remedial as well as destructive, is a grave and difficult problem.

49. For every one shall be salted with fire, RV. That is apparently the true reading, though it not unnaturally puzzled both the scribes of Mark and the evangelist Matthew who omits the phrase. A very early reader or scribe of Mark must have jotted down in the margin the parallel from Lev 2 [13] 'every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.' The gloss was then either treated as the original reading, ousting the text, or (as in AV) combined with the text so as to make a double clause. The words 'with fire' appear necessary in order to justify the connexion, implied by 'for,' with the preceding verse. The fire then has a function to fulfil, related in some way to the function of salt. Now the function of salt is that it makes palatable and it preserves. Therefore (it would seem to follow) the function of fire is not only to destroy but to preserve. And the sense in which it helps to preserve is by consuming what is bad in a man, so that what is good alone remains. May we not think that Mal 3 [2, 3] was not far from our Lord's mind when He used these words? There fire, at the Coming of the Lord and Messenger of the Covenant, refines and purifies, and purifies primarily the sons of Levi.

50. In this verse two things seem to be clear: **salt** at the beginning takes up '**salted**' of [49], and **be at peace one with another** refers us back to the dispute with which the whole section opened in [34]. If we may further believe St. Matthew (5 [13]) to be pointing the way correctly to the interpretation of '**salt**,' we shall understand the verse to mean that the Twelve are to be as salt to the community of Christ's followers, and that unless they are this they are nothing. They have indeed a high prerogative: but their greatness is in the moral and spiritual sphere, and fundamentally different from anything the world calls by that name.

X. **1-32.** Ministry in Judæa and Peræa. A question on divorce: a blessing of little children: the appeal to a rich man: the problem of riches.

1. borders of Judæa and beyond Jordan. Not '**borders**' in the sense of edge or fringe: see on 5 [17], 7 [31]. '**beyond Jordan**': as in 3 [8] Mark means '**the parts beyond Jordan**' (i.e. Transjordania: he does not use the word Peræa), and apparently treats it as a sort of indeclinable noun, '**the regions of Judæa and of Peræa.**'

multitudes. Matthew frequently and Luke regularly use the plural, Mark never elsewhere, and there is quite sufficient authority for reading the singular here.

again . . . again. Mark is extraordinarily fond of this word, but rarely uses it in the full sense of '**a second time.**' Sometimes it means '**back,**' sometimes, as here, '**once more,**' sometimes it is hardly more, at the beginning of a paragraph, than a particle of transition, '**next.**'

he taught. Mark records far less of our Lord's teaching than Matthew or Luke: but he notes the fact of His teaching more frequently than either of them. Thus not only here, but in 2 [13], 4 [1, 2], 6 [34] (cf. 11 [17], 12 [35]), Mark writes '**he taught,**' where the other Synoptists omit the word.

2. there came unto him Pharisees, and RV and in effect AV: but the words are not genuine, and have been brought in from the parallel in Matthew. In Mark it is just an impersonal plural according to his favourite usage, '**they asked him,**' '**he was asked.**' No doubt both Matthew and the scribes of Mark who followed Matthew were influenced, in making the insertion, by the word '**tempting,**' which is so often used in connexion with Pharisees, e.g. 8 [11], 12 [15]. But the word does not necessarily mean more than '**testing him.**' To the multitude in these parts our Lord was a stranger, though doubtless they had heard much of Him; and they just wished to try His capacity as a Rabbi by submitting to Him a knotty problem, where there was divergence between the teaching of the Law (Dt 24 [1]) and the teaching of the Prophets (Mal 2 [16]). Divorce was terribly easy at the time: among the Jews one school of the Rabbis taught practically that the husband might divorce his wife if he got tired of her; among Gentiles, though the tradition of republican Rome had strictly upheld the sanctity of the marriage tie, under the Empire divorces became gradually so common that even the Christian emperors confined their efforts to limiting the number of grounds which entitled the innocent partner to claim a dissolution of the marriage tie. It may be, too, that our Lord was known by repute as a teacher whose ethical standard was as stern as His manner of life was simple.

Our Lord begins, as so often in Mark's Gospel, with a question of His own, in order to make clear what was at the back of their minds: Moses in fact had allowed divorce of the wife by the husband. But our Lord's own answer is plain and direct: the ordinance of Moses was a concession to a people whose '**hardness of heart**' rendered impossible the enforcement of the true ideal of marriage, but it was a declension from the primal law, for '**from the beginning of creation God made male and female**' (so the true text of Mark: Matthew as so often has assimilated the words to the text of the Old Testament [Gen 1 [27]], and scribes have again assimilated Mark to Matthew). From the first, then, God had joined man and woman, and what God had joined let not man separate.

10-12. To the question from the crowd our Lord is content to lay down in answer the governing principle. He does it in quite absolute terms: but He leaves it to them to make the application. To the question of His own disciples, however, His answer fills up anything that was wanting: they are to know that to Him marriage is indissoluble, and the sexes for this purpose on an equal level. Under Jewish law no woman could divorce her husband (though it was possible under Roman law), and so innate was the instinct against it that no passage in the New Testament except this defines the inability of the man and the woman to dissolve the marriage tie in precisely parallel terms.

In substance, however, St. Luke and St. Paul both reproduce the teaching of the indissolubility of marriage: Lk 16 [18] '**every one that putteth away his wife and marrieth another committeth adultery,**

and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery'; 1 Cor 7 [10, 11], with appeal to our Lord's teaching 'unto the married I give charge (rather not I, but the Lord) that the wife depart not from the husband—but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband—and let not the husband put away his wife.' Whatever explanation therefore we give of the exception allowed in St. Matthew's version (5 [32], 19 [9])—it looks as though the First Evangelist, like the Deuteronomist, was considering the standard that seemed possible for those for whom he wrote—it seems on critical and historical grounds a quite irrefragable conclusion that our Lord absolutely excluded divorce from the Christian code. It is of course a very different problem what the action of the State ought to be in countries where the Christian code is not accepted by the citizens at large. But the duty of the Church towards its own members appears to be clear; much clearer than, for instance, its duty in regard to marriages within particular degrees of affinity, where we have no such definite guidance.*

13-16. The Blessing of Children: cf. 9 [36], and it has been suggested that, like the two stories of feeding the multitude, these two stories about a child or children taken up in our Lord's arms are again variant accounts of a single episode. But the point in regard to the accounts of the feeding was precisely that the occasions were so similar, whereas here there is a quite definite difference. It is another question whether the two accounts of blessing children have not suffered some confusion with one another in the evangelist's mind: for if they are compared, the curious result follows that 9 [37] is more appropriate to the second occasion and 10 [15] to the first. When the Twelve had been coveting positions of greatness above one another, it seems more in point to speak of the duty of receiving the Kingdom of God in a childlike spirit, than to speak of receiving the children: and conversely, when the disciples had done their best to prevent access of the children to Christ, the duty of receiving such children in His Name looks to be the more natural comment.

16. took them in his arms (so also in 9 [36]), or possibly, if our Lord was seated, 'put his arms round them.' The other Synoptists both omit the detail, as well as His indignation against the disciples ([14]) and His blessing of the children: small wonder that our Church has selected the passage from St. Mark as the Gospel for the Baptismal office. Nothing perhaps in the Gospels reveals our Lord's uniqueness as a religious teacher more than this simple and vivid story. It is by a true instinct that this action of our Lord's is claimed as implying His sanction for infant baptism: it should not be forgotten that the 'laying his hands upon them' corresponds to what was from the first the complement of the rite of actual baptism: see on 1 [8]. There are still disciples who would rebuke the bringing of unconscious infants to Him: but these are no more to be debarred from membership of His flock than the children of Jews under the Old Covenant.

17-22. One morning, as our Lord was starting on the day's journey—*on the road* (see on 9 [33]) rather than **into the way** of AV, RV—**there ran one to him, and kneeled to him.** That he was a young man is Matthew's interpretation (19 [22]), and is perhaps only deduced from Mark's phrase ([20]) 'from my youth,' a phrase which in fact rather suggests that he was no longer quite young. But at any rate he had the enthusiasm of youth, for he kneeled down in public to our Lord, as Mark alone tells us, and addressed Him enthusiastically as **Good Master.** The adjective 'good' is not common in the LXX with a personal reference, but in the later Psalms, e.g. Ps 118 (117), it is used of God; and our Lord, as so often, answers question by question, cross-examining him, so to say, on his use of terms: what did he mean by addressing Jesus with an epithet that was used of God? It may not be fanciful to think that our Lord had His own disciples in mind, whom He was now trying to make realize that He had in truth a right to the term 'good,' because of His Sonship of the One who alone was in the full sense 'good.'

19. The list of the Commandments as here given in Mark raises even more difficulties than the earlier list in 7 [22]: for here the words are obviously given as a direct citation from the Old Testament. But the ground can be cleared a good deal when we have compared Mark's list with those of Matthew (19 [18, 19]) and Luke (18 [20]), for scribes of Mark have been assimilating as usual to the other texts. In the first place **do not defraud,** as not in terms corresponding to the Old Testament (Ex 20 [13-16]; Dt 5 [17-20]) is dropped by both Matthew and Luke and by a strong group of good MSS., including codex Vaticanus,

* For a fuller discussion of the problem cf. notes on Mt 19 [1-12], and *Sacraments in the New Testament*, p. 401*b*.—ED.

in Mark: but it is quite certainly genuine, as will appear further on. In the second place Matthew (just as in Mt 15 [19] = Mk 7 [21, 22]) has altered the order of Mark for the Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Commandments into agreement with the ordinary text (Greek and Hebrew) of the Old Testament, and again many of the best MSS. have transplanted this order into Mark; Luke, too, has apparently adapted his order to the LXX text of B in Deuteronomy, which transposes the Seventh and Sixth Commandments, and again another and larger group of MSS. reproduce this in Mark. The true text of Mark is more likely to be found in authorities which disagree with both Matthew and Luke, especially if the text they offer suggests the genesis of the other variants: and codex Bezæ (D), the Latin codex Bobiensis (*k*), and St. Irenæus give the three first commands as 'Do not commit adultery, do not commit fornication, do not steal.' Now in the list of 7 [21] the one point on which all MSS. agree is that both 'adulteries' and 'fornications' are named. It seems certain that the first item here was 'Do not commit adultery'; the second was either 'Do not commit fornication' or 'Do not kill' (the Greek words for these two being very similar), but more probably the former. If 'do not kill' had no place in the list, that was perhaps because murder was the sin least likely to be in question.

do not defraud. It is probable that as 'adulteries' under the Seventh Commandment are reinforced by 'fornications,' so 'theft' under the Eighth is reinforced by 'fraud.' Dr. Field, in his admirable comment on the word (*Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, 34), cites the Greek writers Plutarch and Stobæus as using it in connexion with stealing. In the absence of banks, a man forced to leave home for any length of time deposited his money or valuables with some friend: to deny that you had received the deposit, and so defraud your friend, was a negative form of stealing, and no doubt more common, certainly in the case of the well-to-do, than literal theft. Pliny the Younger, in the description he sent to the Emperor Trajan of Christian rites, says that they included a solemn oath 'not to commit theft, robbery, adultery, not to break faith, not to deny the receipt of a deposit when called upon to return it' *ne depositum appellati abnegarent* (cf. Cypr., *ep.* 52, § 1), and *abnegare* is the rendering, in the oldest Latin versions, of the Greek word here used by Mark. In the penitential discipline of the early Western Church idolatry, murder, unchastity, and fraud were, as we learn from Tertullian, the four sins regarded as irremissible, that is, beyond the right of the Church on earth to forgive by restoration to communion. And this is the only direct authority in the Gospels on which the reference to 'fraud' can ultimately be based. It seems therefore probable that our Lord, in regard to both the Seventh and the Eighth Commandments, 'set a hedge' to the Law by expanding the single word of the Old Testament into two: fornication and fraud were forms in which temptation was more likely to affect His questioner than adultery and theft.

21. Just as Mark, alone of the three Synoptists, tells us that the man 'ran and kneeled down to him' on the road, so he alone records that our Lord 'looked fixedly on him (cf. 8 [25]) and loved him.' Possibly with Dr. Field *ad loc.* we should translate 'kissed him,' for the Rabbis are said to have kissed their disciples when pleased with them, and the translator of Origen on Mt 19 [21] renders St. Mark's word 'dilexit eum uel osculatus est eum.' Our Lord saw in the man great possibilities, and loved him for them, and gave him the same call that He had given to Simon and Andrew, to James and John, and to Levi (1 [17, 18, 20], 2 [14]). They had 'left all and followed him' (10 [28]), and they would receive in return that 'life eternal' to which the man aspired (10 [30]): but he could not brace himself to answer the call, for his wealth was more to him even than his aspirations.

22. his countenance fell (which is nearer to the Greek word than AV 'he was sad'), **and he went away sorrowful** RV. A similar combination of the two elements in this description of the man's depression is found in the LXX of Dan 2 [12] (Swete).

he was one that had (AV better *he had*) **great possessions.** But the word 'possessions' has come in from Matthew (19 [22]), who perhaps wrote as a dweller in the country, to whom stock and chattels were the typical form of property. Mark wrote 'much wealth' or 'riches,' and the same word is taken up and repeated in our Lord's comment as given in the next verse.

23-31. The temptations of wealth, and the promise to those who in spite of its temptations renounce for Christ's sake and the Gospel's everything that they have.

23. looked round: a favourite word of Mark, whether in introducing special

sayings of our Lord (3 [5, 34], and here) or more generally 5 [32], 9 [8], 11 [11]; never in the other Gospels save Lk 6 [10] = Mk 3 [5]. Here we must no doubt supply 'on the disciples.' See also on 8 [33].

24. were amazed RV, 'were astonished' AV. Rather *were dumbfounded:* see on 9 [15].

Our Lord having stated the general truth in [23] repeats part of it in [24], part of it again in [25]. Our English versions indeed, by inserting the words 'for them that trust in riches,' make [24] in effect a repetition of [23]: but our best authorities, Greek and Latin, omit the words, and they were certainly an interpretative gloss. Just as in the teaching on Divorce (10 [9]), so here our Lord's statement is absolute: just as with the treatment in Matthew of His teaching on Divorce, so here scribes did their best to whittle down His teaching about riches and limit the wide range of its application. Alike in [23] and [25], as well as in Matthew and Luke, our Lord's saying concerns 'the rich' without qualification. But in Mark the prefatory address, 'Children,' does suggest that He was still saddened by the failure of His appeal in [21]. It was a tremendous call that He had made, and He knew that it was not easy to respond to it.

Doubtless it was this strong language of our Lord about property which moved the first Christians of Jerusalem to have 'all things common' (Ac 2 [44]). That experiment was soon dropped: and we have no reason to suppose that it was repeated even in the earliest days of the Roman Church for which Mark wrote. Nevertheless no attempt is made by the evangelist to whittle down His words. Here is decisive testimony to the scrupulous faithfulness of the written record of Christ's teaching.

25. a camel to go through a needle's eye: obviously a proverbial and paradoxical expression for something so difficult as to be practically impossible.

26. saying unto him RV text. But the other reading, *among themselves*, RVm and AV, is the only one that conforms to Mark's usage (cf. 1 [27], 4 [41], 8 [16], 9 [34], 11 [31]).

who can be saved? Here for the first time in a definitely spiritual sense, as identical with 'enter into the Kingdom of God.' See on 5 [23].

29. house: not in the material sense of the building, but in the sense of 'household' or 'home,' as 12 [40], 13 [34, 35].

or mother or father RV, 'or father or mother or wife' AV. But in [30], where the enumeration otherwise corresponds exactly with [29], there is (1) no mention of 'father,' and perhaps it should be omitted here with codex Bezæ and the best Old Latin MSS.; and (2) no mention of 'wife,' and 'wife' is not found in the true text of [29] in Mark any more than in the true text of the parallel of Matthew. Our Lord does not call on any man to leave his wife (cf. 10 [7]): but no doubt most of the Apostles and early Christian missionaries in general had made the sacrifice already by remaining unmarried.

30. a hundredfold: so Mark without variant, and so most MSS. of Matthew (19 [29]): but in Matthew a few good authorities read 'manifold,' while in Luke it is a question between 'manifold' and 'sevenfold.' Both Matthew and Luke dislike large numbers, and feared that Mark's number 'a hundredfold' would seem exaggerated. But the thought is that, just as all followers of Christ were 'brethren,' so all would find 'mothers' in every Christian matron, and 'children' in every Christian family, and 'homes' in every Christian household.

with persecutions: there will be wonderful compensations for those who have renounced all for Christ's sake, even in this life, in the common love and fellowship of Christians; but our Lord has no purely rose-coloured prospect to hold out to His followers, for besides the common love there will also be common sufferings, and for these the compensation is laid up 'in the age to come.'

31. One of our Lord's pithy Sayings, doubtless often repeated, as in Mt 20 [16]; Lk 13 [30]: not inappropriate here, and it may be that it was present to our Lord's thoughts that one of those who had left all to follow Him would yet betray Him.

X. 32-XIII. 37. The Ascent to Jerusalem; the Last Stage of the Ministry, and Preparation for the Passion.

32. And they were in the way: rather *Now they were on the road.* The connecting particle is that only used by Mark at the beginning of a paragraph where some new section of the Gospel is introduced: 1 [14], 7 [24], here, and 14 [1]. No break is marked at the actual entry into Jerusalem (11 [1]): the break is marked here ([32-34]), giving the keynote of the approach of the climax of the Gospel story, just as the last two chapters were introduced by 8 [31].

going before . . . followed. These two verbs are correlative to one another, as in 11 [9]: AV must certainly be right in seeing that the contrast in the verse can only be between two parties, Jesus who was going ahead, and the disciples

who were following at a distance: that those who so followed were the Twelve is proved, if proof were needed, by the words in the immediate sequel, **he took again the twelve**—that is, took them up again into company with Him. Why, then, on this one occasion was our Lord walking alone, but that the shadow of the approaching Passion, of which, as soon as His disciples rejoin Him, He speaks with more detailed emphasis than before, lay heavy on His soul? All difficulties in the verse and context are at once removed, if we may venture to change the verb that intervenes between 'going before' and 'followed' from the plural to the singular, and read not 'they were amazed' but 'he was amazed,' or rather, since 'amazed' in our modern English use of the word is quite inadequate to represent the Greek, 'he was overcome with consternation.' A stronger compound of the same verb is used of the Agony in Gethsemane (14 ^{33}): it is a foretaste of that moment.

33, 34. More clearly, and with increasing sharpness of definition, by comparison with 8 ^{31}, 9 ^{31}, the picture of the coming end unfolds itself to His mind: this present visit to Jerusalem will be the occasion; the Jewish authorities will proceed to the last extremity of a sentence of death against Him, and will hand Him over for its execution to the heathen government; no insult will be spared Him, mocking (15 $^{20, 31}$), spitting (14 ^{65}), scourging (15 ^{15}), before He is put to death. Even now the term 'crucifixion' is avoided: see note on 8 ^{31}.

35-45.* The request of James and John for chief places in the coming Kingdom. On the first occasion of the prediction of the Passion Peter made open and adverse comment (8 ^{32}); on the second the disciples still did not understand, but made no comment (9 ^{32}); but now some of them at least grasped the fact that the coming of Messiah in glory, to faith in which they had by Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi committed themselves, would involve suffering, apparent failure, death itself, before the final manifestation of the Kingdom of God with power. The two brothers, together with Peter our Lord's nearest disciples, were prepared to stick close to Him to the end, to share in His fate whatever that might be, because they had now risen to the certainty that it would only be a transient preliminary to His triumph. But in return for being the first to proclaim their confidence in the ultimate victory and their willingness to share in all that might precede it, they wanted their reward—the assignment of a privileged position in the day of His glory in return for their venture of faith in the days of His humiliation. The remaining Apostles were indignant with them, and we are tempted to sympathize with their indignation, and to look no further. But our Lord, though He refused the request and told the brothers at what sort of privilege His true followers must aim, did not simply blame them. He probed their faith in Him with a searching question; and when they answered that they could share the 'cup' and the 'baptism' which were His immediate lot, He said at once that they were right. So intimate was the union between Master and disciples that they could in some way take their part in the conditions of His work and 'fill up what was lacking in the tribulations of the Christ' (Col 1 ^{24}). But those who drank deeply enough of His spirit to do that would not look to hierarchical privileges, here or hereafter, as their reward, but to ministry and service as *servi servorum Dei*.

38. the cup . . . the baptism. Some interpreters have seen in these words a reflex influence of ideas derived by the evangelist from the two great sacraments; but any such thought is foreign to the context. The 'cup' is, quite obviously, as in Christ's prayer in Gethsemane (see on 14 ^{36}), the 'cup' of the Lord's wrath, a metaphor common in the Old Testament. The 'baptism' is not so simple, but it has an exact parallel in Lk 12 ^{50}. Mk 7 ^{4} (which see) shows that the evangelist could use 'baptisms,' 'baptize themselves,' in a literal sense, where later writers would certainly have avoided the words because of their association with the Christian sacrament. But in classical and post-classical Greek the verb, which is not uncommon, especially in the passive, appears regularly to have something of an unfavourable sense about it, whether (1) literal, 'drenched,' 'getting into deep water,' 'drowned,' or of ships 'sunk,' or (2) metaphorical, 'overwhelmed' in sleep, in anger, in grief, in debt: see the new edition of *L.S.* In these cases no doubt a noun gives precision to the sort of 'baptism' meant. But Josephus can write 'baptized' the city, when he just means 'flooded' the city with immigrants. There is no real difficulty, then, in understanding Mark to mean here 'I have an immersion to be immersed with,' i.e. 'I have deep waters to pass through.'

39. Ye shall indeed drink of the cup. It is not uncommon nowadays to inter-

* Cf. notes on Mt 20 $^{20-28}$, pp. 177*b*-178*b*.—Ed.

pret these words as meaning that not only James (Ac 12 [2]) but also John would be a martyr, and that therefore the son of Zebedee was distinct from John of Ephesus, author of the 4th Gospel. But that issue must be decided on other arguments: here the 'drinking of the cup' may be rather the continual dying to the world for Christ than actual death.

40. but it is for them for whom it hath been prepared: perhaps rather *save to those for whom it hath been prepared.* But the two Greek words 'but' and 'for whom' could be read, with other breathings and accents, as one word 'for others,' and so the oldest Latin MSS. with St. Augustine understood it, 'aliis paratum est': Jerome restored the true interpretation in the Vulgate.

45. and to give his life a ransom for many. There lay the difference between the Son of Man and other men. They could share His work of ministry and self-sacrifice, His endurance even to death. They could give their lives; He alone gave His life as a 'ransom for many.' There is no ground for questioning, with Dr. Rashdall (*The Idea of Atonement*, 29), the authenticity of this Saying. It recurs in substance in 14 [24] 'my blood of the covenant which is being shed for many,' though (1) the word 'ransom' is not used there, (2) the prepositions, in the phrase rendered 'for many' on both occasions in our versions, are not the same, that used in 14 [24] being strictly 'on behalf of,' that used here 'in place of.' (1) 'Ransom' means 'redemption,' which is indeed the rendering given to the cognate Greek word in Lk 2 [38] 'looking for the redemption of Israel.' But 'ransom' has with us acquired, in the history of the controversies about the Atonement, a connotation from which 'redemption,' though meaning the same thing, is free. (2) Perhaps even more difficulty than over 'ransom,' has been felt over the phrase 'in place of,' 'instead of,' but again the difficulty has been mainly caused by the unethical 'Substitution' theories that have been built up upon it since the 16th century. But the preposition is the strict corollary of the thought of 'redemption': and though we do well to guard against any interpretation which forgets that Christ's work is also in us and with us, yet that is not all: the religious instinct of Christians has never doubted that Christ is our Redeemer as well as our Example, that in a true sense we 'were bought at a price' (1 Cor 6 [20]), and that the price was the blood of Christ. And that was no invention of St. Paul or of Christians before St. Paul: the whole of the Passion story in St. Mark, if it has any historical value at all, shows how entirely our Lord's thought was based on the Old Testament Scriptures, and on His Death as the true expression and satisfaction of all the implications of the Law and the Prophets.

The sacrificial system of the Old Testament, especially the sin-offering of Lev 4, indicates the idea of a price paid to effect the restoration of the covenant relation: more definitely the thought of Is 53 suggests that the life of the innocent sufferer poured out unto death for the transgression of the people is something in virtue of which those for whom He suffers are ransomed and free. But it may be suggested that closer than anything else to our Lord's thoughts at this time was the significance of the coming Feast at which He was to suffer. Passover was the annual reminder to Israel that it had been saved from the house of bondage: and the symbol of that great redemption was the sacrifice of the lamb without blemish whose blood upon the door-posts had caused the Lord to pass over the Israelites 'when he smote the Egyptians and delivered our houses' (Ex 12 [27]). So Christ was 'the very Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world.'

X. 46-XI. 11. Sunday in Holy Week (Palm Sunday).

46-52. The healing of blind Bartimæus. From the express mention of the name we may guess that he was probably known afterwards to Mark in the church of Jerusalem: and as the episode a little interrupts the context, it is perhaps an insertion of Mark's own from details supplied by Bartimæus himself. The story seems throughout to be told, more so perhaps than any other miracle recorded in Mark, from the point of view of the man healed.

46. they come to Jericho: that is, as always, our Lord and His immediate disciples: see note on 1 [21]. The 'great multitude' which accompanies Him and them on His exit will have been mainly Galileans on their way to the feast (for it was usual, in order to avoid passing through Samaria, to take the route by the Jordan valley and Jericho), partly also inhabitants of Jericho or its neighbourhood, drawn by His fame as a teacher and prophet. It would seem that they escorted Him all the way to Jerusalem, fifteen miles, and were in fact identical with the crowd which accompanied Him on the triumphal entry (11 [8] ff.). Indeed

the mention of them here is perhaps intended to explain the numbers present on that occasion. There is no break in the story at 11 [1], so that the journey was apparently accomplished in a single day.

47. of Nazareth. Literally 'the Nazarene': see on 1 [24]. **Son of David:** see on 11 [10].

52. made thee whole: margin 'saved thee.' See on 5 [23].

in the way: that is, on the road to Jerusalem, among the crowd that followed Jesus there.

XI. **1. unto Jerusalem, unto Bethphage and Bethany.** Luke has all three place-names: Matthew omits Bethany. There is strong authority in Mark for the omission of Bethphage. But it is difficult, if not impossible, to account for the presence, without variant as it seems, of so obscure a village as Bethphage in both Matthew and Luke, unless they had both found it in Mark: and we can only suppose that in a very early Greek MS. of Mark a line 'Bethphage and' was accidentally passed over because the scribe's eye wandered on to the next line also beginning with 'Beth'-.

Bethany, 'a village at the second milestone from Aelia' [= Jerusalem], as Eusebius-Jerome tell us in the *Onomasticon*. The Mount of Olives was 'a Sabbath day's journey' (Ac 1 [12])—rather more than half a mile—from Jerusalem. Bethphage too, we happen to know, was also at the limit of the 'Sabbatic' zone. Therefore Bethphage was on the Mount of Olives, much nearer Jerusalem than Bethany was, and our Lord came to Bethany first. Not improbably He rested there, after the long walk from Jericho, for the midday meal: Bethany (11 [11, 12, 19], 14 [3]) was His home for the next few days, and the opportunity was presumably taken on this occasion to arrange for quarters for Himself and the Twelve. From Bethany He sent messengers to fetch from 'the village opposite,' no doubt Bethphage, an animal to serve Him for riding during the last part of the journey. The immediate reason may have been fatigue: but the unusual phrase 'The Lord hath need of it' (see on [3]) suggests also that He desired to make a formal and solemn entry into the Holy City. Matthew and John connect the circumstances with the prophecy of Zech 9 [9], John adding expressly that the connexion did not occur to the disciples at the time (12 [16]): but the acclamation of the multitude as they accompanied Him would be in harmony with the thought of the prophecy.

two of his disciples: Matthew and Luke, following the later usage, both write 'the' for 'his,' but in the days of the Ministry there were other 'disciples': see on 6 [41]. Note that the disciples are sent in pairs: cf. 6 [7], 14 [13].

2. whereon never man yet sat (rather, in English idiom, *had sat*): many authorities in Mark give 'has sat,' in which case the words are part of our Lord's injunction to the two disciples. For the thought compare the tomb 'where never man had yet lain' (Lk 23 [53]): and the Law required in certain cases the slaughter of a calf that 'had not borne a yoke' (Nu 19 [2]; Dt 21 [3]).

3-6. anyone . . . he . . . certain of them . . . they. These variations between singular and plural become a little less puzzling if (with Tischendorf and Swete, but against AV, RV, and Westcott-Hort) we put a comma only after 'hath need of him' and treat the rest of [3] as part of the message the disciples were to deliver: 'the Lord needs the colt, and will at once send it back again here,' i.e. to Bethphage. 'Back' (='again' RVm), which is certainly the genuine reading, suits this interpretation best. It is natural to suppose that, like the 'goodman of the house' in 14 [14], the owners of the colt were well enough acquainted with Jesus to comply unhesitatingly with any request from Him: but why does the message come not, as there, from 'the Master' but from 'the Lord'? 'The Lord' is found in the narrative of Luke, John, and the Last Twelve Verses of Mark; and in Jn 13 [13] the titles 'Master' and 'Lord' rank as equivalent. But nowhere else in Mark is the phrase used of Christ (in 5 [19] it is certainly equivalent to 'God'): why is it exceptionally so used here? We can only answer that the whole attitude of our Lord in the last days at Jerusalem does appear to be intended to accentuate His challenge to the Jewish authorities as one invested with authority higher than theirs. Therefore it was not unfitting that on the occasion of His public entry into the city He should speak a new language and formulate in new terms His unique dignity.

4. in the open street RV: 'in a place where two ways met' AV. Both meanings are possible. A Glossary gives the Latin equivalent as *compitum*, 'crossways': and that sense perhaps explains why the word was used in Greek papyri of Roman times for a rectangular block of buildings bounded by streets. But Pollux the lexicographer seems to understand it as a big street, like the Homeric

aguia, and codex Bezæ has the word in Ac 19 [28], where it can only mean 'ran out into the street.' Render therefore here *on the highway*.

7. cast on him their garments: because the colt, not having been broken in for use, had no saddle.

he sat upon him. Luke 'set Jesus thereon,' and perhaps in both Mark and Matthew the plural should be read, with the codex Sinaiticus, in the active sense 'caused him to sit' upon the colt, for that answers somewhat better to the context. Our Lord was being treated as one of royal dignity: compare with the next verse (the references are from Swete) 2 K 9 [13], where the external sign of the acceptance of Jehu's call to be king is that 'they hasted and took every man his garment and put it under him,' and 1 Mac 13 [51], where Judas Maccabæus makes a triumphal entry into the citadel of Jerusalem 'with praise and palm branches . . . and with hymns and with songs.'

9. they that went before and they that followed. There is nothing in the story to suggest that this implies two crowds, one that had come from Jericho with Jesus and another that came out from Jerusalem to meet Him. It is simply that the crowd naturally divided itself, as in any royal procession, into two, some in front and some behind, so that He should be in the centre.

Hosanna, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: or perhaps we should rather render it *Blessed in the name of the Lord is he that cometh*. The *Benedictus qui venit* is a direct citation of Ps 118 [26], given by Mark according to the Greek of the LXX: 'Hosanna' (only here and in the parallels in Matthew and John) is another instance of Mark's employment of native words, and comes from the preceding verse of the same Psalm, where the LXX renders 'O Lord save (us),' though 'Be propitious' appears to be the original meaning of the Hebrew: but see on [10]. Note that the verses almost immediately preceding, [22] and [23], are cited by our Lord in 12 [10, 11]. The Psalm was liturgically used at the two great Jewish feasts, and the latter part of it ([19-29]) was appropriate to every Jewish pilgrim who came up to the Holy City, and specially appropriate to our Lord, who had come to Jerusalem to claim the Kingship of His people.

10. Blessed is the kingdom that cometh of our father David. What seem to be undoubted echoes, in our Lord's own words, of the Lord's Prayer will be noted at 11 [25], 14 [36, 38]: it is tempting here to see in 'the coming Kingdom' an echo of 'Thy Kingdom come' on the part of the crowd, though if so the petition had been but half understood. Our Lord is greeted as coming to restore under Divine auspices, 'in the Name of the Lord,' the Kingdom of David: He is King, that is, as Son of David. That title does not make its appearance in Mark's record till the final week. Bartimæus is the first to use it (10 [47, 48]): our Lord recurs to it two days later (12 [35-37]). Perhaps the Davidic Sonship was not an idea so prominent in Galilee, where, moreover, some sort of native kingship did exist, as in Judæa, where religious thought was much more developed and where the visible presence of Roman dominion was calculated to keep nationalistic ideas, and the connexion of Messiah with the old Davidic kingship, very vigorously alive. It was part of the regular teaching of the Scribes that Messiah was Son of David (12 [35]): when Bartimæus was told that the commotion in the street at Jericho was due to the passing of 'Jesus the Nazarene,' he addressed Him without more ado as 'Son of David': and the prominence of this title in the Messianic conceptions of Jewish Christianity is witnessed to by the genealogy in Mt 1. That Mark (so too Lk 19 [38]; Jn 12 [13]) is right in emphasizing this element in the acclamations of the crowd follows from the charge brought by the Sanhedrin against our Lord before Pilate (15 [2]), for it must have been primarily on this episode that the charge was based. And it must be noted that our Lord made no attempt to restrain the demonstration: in contrast with so much that we meet with in the earlier part of the Gospel, He accepted and encouraged it. But if He had come to Jerusalem as Messiah and King, His teaching in 12 is directed to show that He was this because He was more than this, and that being more than this His kingship involved no rivalry with any earthly sovereignty.

Hosanna in the highest: obviously in this connexion an ascription of praise, and Luke gives the Christian interpretation when he renders it (19 [38]) 'glory in the highest.' It is not unreasonable to suppose that the LXX 'Save us' represents the current Jewish exegesis of the word, so that we may take 'Hosanna in the highest' as equivalent to 'Salvation from God!'

11. he entered into Jerusalem into the temple: probably with two or three good Western MSS. we should read *they entered*, in the plural, as in [12, 15] ([19]), [20, 27]: see on 1 [21], 10 [46].

it being now eventide. Our Lord's

first duty as a Jew was to go to the national sanctuary for prayer: it was necessarily afternoon, for He had come that day on foot from Jericho to Bethany, and had rested some time at Bethany. Therefore it was too late for any public action, and indeed it may have been what He saw in the Temple, as He 'looked round about' (see on 10 [23]) at all that was going on there, or at the traces of what had gone on in the daytime, that decided Him to take the drastic action that followed on the morrow.

he went out unto Bethany with the twelve. From Sunday to Wednesday inclusive He lodged at Bethany. It may well have been difficult to find quarters at such a crowded time in the city, and at Bethany He had friends and could secure quiet. But also by withdrawing each evening from Jerusalem, He made more difficult a premature *coup* on the part of the authorities. In the daytime the presence of the crowd protected Him: a secret arrest was more feasible at night if He was still within the city, and He was determined to wait until 'His hour was come' at the Passover itself.

12-19. Monday in Holy Week.

12-14 (20-24). The Cursing of the Fig-tree. Of course the story raises difficulties in our minds: Luke did not like it any more than we do, and omitted it entirely. But there it is: and, though Mark may have overlooked some element in the story that would have enabled us, if he had not overlooked it, to understand things better, there is not the slightest reason to question the accuracy of the record as a whole. The difficulties are of the same kind as those which arise out of the parallel case of the herd of swine in 5, and the fundamental answer is the same, that man is 'of more value than many sparrows,' and that the animal and vegetable creation exists for his use. If, as in this case, it does not serve the purpose for which it exists, it is useless, and like the salt without savour may be thrown away, and become like the salt a lesson for man, that if he too does not correspond to his calling he will undergo a similar fate.

Now this interpretation implies that our Lord expected, and had a right to expect, to find something edible on the fig-tree. That expectation could not have been founded on the mere fact that it was a fig-tree: for, as the evangelist is careful to explain, at that time of year—the month was in all probability March—'the time of figs was not yet.' There is some reason to suppose that something more or less edible might be anticipated on the tree when the foliage was so unusually forward: and that the point against the tree was that it promised more than it performed. But it is all difficult, and perhaps Mark did not understand what difficulties the story, thus baldly told, would raise for us. He does not explain how our Lord came to be hungry so soon after leaving Bethany. He does tell us on the next day that they started early in the morning, and indeed that day is crowded with events and teaching (11 [20]-13 [37]). But of the Monday nothing definite is related beyond the cleansing of the Temple, though perhaps [18] is meant to imply a time of popular teaching during the day. Matthew may have felt that some more explanation was wanted, for he inserts mention of an 'early' start, before breakfast it may be (21 [18], see notes).

15-18. The Cleansing of the Temple. Our Lord returned to the Temple with immediate and definite action in view. The court was crowded with all the machinery of an authorized traffic of buying and selling for religious purposes, the doves required for purification and the bankers' 'tables' or counters, where Gentile money could be exchanged for the Jewish coins that alone could be used in the Temple. More than that, one sort of traffic naturally encouraged another, and the courts of the Temple, like the nave of Old St. Paul's in London, had come to be used, by people carrying the apparatus of their daily business to and fro, as an ordinary thoroughfare. Our Lord makes a clean sweep of it all, and, as throughout His teaching during Holy Week, bases Himself on an appeal to the words of Scripture (Is 56 [7]). The House was meant to be a House of Prayer, and must be restored and confined to its proper function. It is implied that the traffic was a source of material gain to the Temple officials. The charges for the animals, the process of exchange, offered opportunities of exaction which, if not strictly dishonest—we are not bound to suppose that those concerned lined their own pockets—were a grossly improper way of raising revenue for the service of religion. There is reason to think that the Temple market was in fact a source of scandal to religious Jews, though vested interests are strong and a priestly caste is specially impervious to criticism. Our Lord's action was probably not unpopular. Even the Pharisees may have objected rather to His assumption of authority to act than to the action itself.

17. for all the nations: in more

idiomatic English 'for all nations,' unless we prefer to render 'for all the Gentiles.' Mark alone retains these words of the prophecy, and with full intent, just as he—no doubt faithfully representing St. Peter—preserves other indications in our Lord's teaching of the future world-wide scope of the Gospel, e.g. 2^{21}, 13^{10}. It is not easy to see why both Matthew and Luke omit them, but it is probably because they do not serve the immediate point of the quotation, which is the contrast, not between Jew and Gentile, but between merchandise on the one side and prayer and worship on the other.

18. the chief priests and the scribes: not technically the Sanhedrin, for which see ^{27}, but the representatives of the two great parties, Sadducees and Pharisees, united for the first time against our Lord by this assumption on His part of supreme authority over the existing Jewish religious organization.

the multitude: as $12^{12, 37}$, 14^{2}.

19. every evening RV: *when even was come* AV, rightly. A serious blunder of RV, due to the assumption that Mark wrote classical Greek, and never used 'whenever' for 'when.' See on 3^{11}.

XI. 20-XIII. 37. Tuesday in Holy Week. The close of the public Ministry of Jesus: His final challenge to the Jewish rulers and assertion of His authority over against theirs. His private prediction of the things that were coming on Jerusalem and on the world.

20-25. The power of undoubting prayer.

21. Peter, calling to remembrance. Nothing in the whole of Mark more clearly indicates Peter's close relation to the Gospel. Anyone else would have been content with 'Peter said': only Peter himself would add that he 'remembered and said.'

22-24. The lesson meant to be drawn from the cursing of the fig-tree and its result is the power of faith. Prayer is answered in proportion to the conviction in the mind of him who prays that it will be answered: without absolute 'trust in God' prayer does not arrive at its full proportions and effect. Because the words of Christ over the fig-tree had behind them that entire conviction of trust and union with God, they were not ineffective. If any of His followers could attain the same absolute union with the Divine Will, there would be no limit at all to what they could achieve. Our Lord's assurance to the Apostles is indeed cast in the form of a paradox: it is as if He said to them, Think of the most impossible thing you can in the natural sphere, the rooting up of the solid foundations of earth, the casting of a mountain like the Mount of Olives before you right away into the sea, and be convinced that spiritual force is stronger than material force and can deal as it wills with it.

25. ye stand praying. Standing was the normal attitude of prayer, whether in the Old Testament, $1\,K\,8^{22}$, 'Solomon stood . . . and spread forth his hands toward heaven,' etc.; or in the New, $Lk\,18^{11, 13}$, where both Pharisee and publican stand as they pray; or in the early Church, Justin, *Apology*, i, 67, 'then we all rise together and offer prayers,' *Acts of Peter with Simon*, 21, 'at the ninth hour they rose to pray,' *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, 'as she stood and stretched out her hands and was praying'; at the Eucharist, *Acts of Perpetua*, 12; Tertullian, *de Oratione*, 14. In Eastern churches there are to this day no seats (except some sort of stalls along the wall for the aged), and the congregation cannot sit and do not as a congregation kneel, though individuals may kneel from time to time. In prayer the hands were stretched out to heaven: see besides the above quotations $1\,Tim\,2^{8}$, and compare the figure of the *Orante* in early Christian painting and sculpture.

forgive, Father which is in heaven, forgive you your trespasses: the substance of clauses of the Lord's Prayer is in large part used by our Lord in these later chapters of Mark (cf. on $14^{36, 38}$). If the words were used in the context as given here, the meaning is that no one can be in that right relation with God which ensures that there are no limits to the power of prayer, unless he is first in right relations with his fellow-men (cf. $1\,Jn\,4^{20}$).

26. But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses AV: absent from RV, rightly as it seems, for though the verse might have been omitted accidentally, because it ends with the same words as ^{25}, it is on the whole more likely that it was inserted from $Mt\,6^{14, 15}$. The positive statement of ^{25} can be put into organic connexion with ^{24} more closely than the negative statement of ^{26}.

XI. 27-XII. 44. The questions put to Jesus, and His comments on them. The final breach.

XI. 27-33. (1) The deputation from the Sanhedrin, 'By what authority doest thou these things?'

27. 'in the temple': the Temple was the scene the day before of the great act of self-assertion by which Jesus had begun

to force matters to an issue: it is on this day the scene throughout of His public teaching (cf. 12 35, 13 1). He claims His rightful position in the centre of the worship of God's people.

the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. Here for the first time in Mark the three constituent parts of the supreme Jewish authority are formally enumerated (cf. 14 53, 15 1; in the latter passage the three are equated with 'the whole council' *synedrion* or Sanhedrin). They are here making, in fact, an official answer to His cleansing of the Temple; His act of challenge to them is met by their challenge to Him to justify the act by stating definitely and publicly on what authority He claimed to do what He had done. They may have hoped to extract some damaging admission on which they could base a legal accusation: but the question was, of course, after the event of the day before, a natural one.

29. Our Lord refuses to give them the handle for which they seek: He refuses to be drawn into a premature declaration which might have provoked His immediate arrest (see also on 14 13) before the time was come. And we may well believe that He wanted to give them still the chance of thinking out the whole situation. So He counters their question with another: 'I will put a question to you on one point, and if you will make your position clear on that, I can make my position clear to you on the matter of my authority for what I did.'

30. The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men? Not a mere conundrum to put them in a difficulty, but a question with a direct bearing on the situation; for if John's mission was from God, he had pointed to Jesus as the greater than himself for whom his work was but a preparation (1 7, 8), and *a fortiori* therefore the mission of Jesus and His authority was from God also, and the cleansing of the Temple an act within His rights. Note once more the primary importance of the Baptist's mission in the scheme of the Gospels, an importance which we are perhaps tempted to overlook: John's preaching was in truth the 'beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ' (1 1).

31. If we shall say. The true text (as it seems) prefixes the preliminary question 'What are we to say?' very much in St. Mark's manner.

32. But should we say (i.e. 'suppose we say'), **From men—they feared the people,** RV rightly. The alternative answer is broken off, we may picture, with a shrug of their shoulders: it would not do, and the evangelist supplies the unspoken reason, namely that the popular verdict on John was clear.

verily held (RV): rather, with the alternative reading in the Greek, *knew indeed*—'held' has come in from Mt 21 26, and 'verily held' is hardly sense.

XII. **1-12.** (1*b*) The Parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen. But though our Lord would give no direct answer to the official demand, He proceeds at once to push matters a long step nearer to the final issue. In the Parable of the Husbandmen He makes clearer than ever before what was the position He claimed for Himself, and what consequences the rejection of His claim by the Jewish authorities would have for them. God had planted for Himself a vineyard (cf. Is 5 1-7; the same metaphor is applied to the Church in Hermas, *Similitude*, vi), separate from the surrounding ground, and had entrusted the care of it to men who neglected their task, and treated with contumely or worse the prophets whom from time to time throughout the history of the Old Dispensation He had sent to them to remind them of their obligations. Now at last He sent His only Son (see above on 1 11); and Him they had made up their minds to put to death. That would be the end of things as they were: the present Dispensation would be brought to a violent close, and the true Israel would have other appointed leaders under the headship of Him whom their existing leaders were even now rejecting.

1. and built a tower (cf. Is 5 2): probably in order that a watchman might be set there (2 K 9 17) to scare thieves away: compare the description in the pseudo-Cyprianic *de montibus Sina et Sion*, 14, 15.

8. killed him and cast him forth out of the vineyard: killed him—that is to say, in the vineyard and threw the body outside. That would be the natural course of events: if Luke (20 15) inverts the order and says 'cast him forth out of the vineyard and killed him,' he was probably influenced by the desire to make the parable correspond with the actual details of the death of Christ, who 'suffered without the gate.' The true text of Matthew agrees with Mark.

10, 11. The quotation is from Ps 118: see note on 11 9 above.

13-17. (2) The question of the Pharisees and Herodians: **Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar?** The official deputation, and the parable that in effect answers the question put by it, form the first stage

of the day's proceedings: the second and third are represented by unofficial deputations, so to say, from the principal parties which divided Jewish political and religious thought. Each propounds a problem which it was hoped would put Jesus into difficulties. But the unofficial parties come under the *ægis* of the Sanhedrin as a whole: 'they send unto him certain . . .'

Of the Pharisees and of the Herodians. The two parties are also mentioned together in 3^{6}, and the 'leaven of the Pharisees' and the 'leaven of Herod' are put in juxtaposition by our Lord in 8^{15}. In those passages the explanation is simply that Pharisees and Herodians were the prominent parties in Galilee; here an additional reason is that the school which took its name from its 'separateness,' and the adherents of the native princes, were the natural people to raise the problem of the right attitude for a good Jew to adopt towards the foreign suzerain power, which since A.D. 6 had in Judæa ousted the native line, so that Jerusalem was under direct Roman administration. 'That they might catch him in talk' (RV) too much suggests a prolonged conversation; literally 'in word,' perhaps as contrasted with the 'deed' of the Cleansing of the Temple. It is almost 'in his answer' to the question which they are going to put to Him

14. true, that is 'straightforward.' He would not hide Himself in a mist of words, but would speak, as He always did, plainly, simply, and directly.

the person of men. The word *prosopon* is literally 'face,' as in 14^{65}: then metaphorically 'outward appearance'—it is technically used for the 'mask' of an actor, and so of a 'character' in a play—as here.

of a truth RV, 'in truth' AV. It means, I think, 'straightforwardly.'

tribute. Strictly and literally that is St. Luke's word: St. Matthew transliterates the Latin 'census,' and that, since it is also found transliterated in Aramaic, was possibly the word in official use. In Mark the evidence is divided between the transliterated 'census' and its Greek equivalent in this particular case 'poll-tax'—that is, a direct personal tax as opposed both to taxes on land and to customs duties. There were no special taxes at this period imposed on Jews as such: but every inhabitant of Judæa paid this direct tax, which went to the Emperor's privy purse, not to the State exchequer, and it was paid in silver *denarii*, which, unlike the copper money of Palestine, belonged to the imperial coinage proper and bore the name and effigy of the Emperor. In every way, therefore, this tax implied subjugation to an alien power in its acutest form.

15. Shall we give, or shall we not give? (RV, AV): more strictly *Are we to give, or are we not to give?* If our Lord answered No, He could be instantly delated to the Roman authorities on a charge of sedition; if Yes, He would (they thought) be acting inconsistently with His acceptance of the popular homage at the Triumphal Entry, which identified His coming with the coming of the 'Kingdom of our father David' ($11^{9, 10}$). It is clear from the convergent evidence of all four Gospels that 'He claims to be King' was the substance of the charge brought before Pilate against Jesus.

bring me a penny, that I may see it. The translation 'penny' was not unreasonable in the time of our first English versions, when money possessed far more purchasing power than it does to-day: but it is terribly inappropriate now, and in this passage has the further disadvantage of obscuring the fact that the *denarius*, the coin common to the whole Empire, was silver, while copper coinage was the normal coinage in Palestine (6^{8} the Apostles are to take 'no copper' with them: there was no question of silver), and, just because it was free from pagan symbols, the only coinage current in the Temple. Therefore a *denarius* had to be 'fetched.'

16. Cæsar's. The *cognomen* of C. Julius Cæsar, though he was never 'Emperor' at all, impressed itself on Roman usage as the generic name for the Emperors, and from Roman usage passed down the centuries to the German Kaisers and the Russian Tsars. The reigning Emperor, Tiberius, had no drop of the blood of the Julian house in him, being step-son of Augustus, Cæsar's great-nephew.

17. Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. Few texts have been more often quoted, and perhaps few more often pressed beyond the original meaning. The purpose of Christ was to draw a sharp distinction between the *civitas Dei* and the *civitas terrena*. The Kingdom which He came to establish was a spiritual Kingdom: to be enrolled as a citizen of that Kingdom and to undertake the obligations attaching to its citizenship was something of so infinitely great a value that questions of civil allegiance, of a Roman Empire or a Jewish national

State, were dwarfed beside it into insignificance. His mission concerned this supreme Kingdom, and had so far nothing to do with any other. But it may fairly be deduced further from the Saying that there was nothing in the Imperial Government, as such, which was necessarily inconsistent with the foundation and spread of the Divine Kingdom on earth.

There was in fact much to be said for the Roman Government of the day. Like the British Raj in India, but on an even larger scale, it had brought order, peace, good government, and on the whole even-handed justice, with all the material blessings that these things carry in their train, to a vast mass of subject peoples, who made up between them nearly the whole of the civilized world. Virgil's pæan in the fourth *Eclogue* was not devoid of truth. Even in matters of religion the Empire to no small extent anticipated the impartiality of British rule in India. No attempt had been made to impose the gods of Rome on conquered races: not only toleration but the protection of local rites and national worships was the normal policy of the Empire. The Jews in particular derived the fullest benefit in this regard: the stubborn resistance of the Maccabee movement had had its effect, and self-government in religious affairs was freely, if contemptuously, afforded them. The larger communities of the Dispersion, especially that at Alexandria, had their own separate quarter and their own organization: and historically the Romans had come into possession of Egypt and Syria as successors of the friendly Ptolemies in Egypt and enemies of the oppressive Seleucidæ in Syria (cf. 1 Mac 8, which, whatever its historical truth, reflects the conception in the mind of the writer). Under Cæsar and the earlier Emperors the Jews had been welcomed even in Rome: and the cult of the living Emperor as a divinity was as yet only in its beginnings. Even the worship of the genius of Rome and Augustus, intended as a sort of universal and unifying religious basis throughout the Empire for the existing state of things, left the Jews aside. Caligula's attempt, ten years later, to set up his statue in the Temple, however symptomatic of the later trend of Imperial policy, was in itself the isolated freak of a madman. And on the other side, the story of the next generation in Palestine was enough to show how far the anti-Roman movement of the Zealots was tainted with fanaticism and bloodshed. Small wonder, then, that religious Jews, whatever their political theories, felt that in practice acquiescence in the rule of the *de facto* government had much to recommend it.

Did our Lord mean to go beyond this, and to lay down for the citizens of His Kingdom a settled and permanent principle of non-intervention in worldly affairs? That was of course one of the charges most commonly brought against Christians from the end of the 1st century onwards: and no doubt it was, when the Church was a small minority pitted against the whole forces of society and the State, an inevitable consequence of the position. But our Lord's words must not be pressed to that meaning, now that Christians have their position and duties as citizens on equal terms with others—God has work for them to do in the world as well as in the Church—any more than they should be pressed to mean that Christians may under no circumstances take up arms against tyranny or oppression. Yet they are a permanent reminder that God's Kingdom in nature and His Kingdom in grace are distinct things, and all through the present age must remain distinct. The history of the 4th century, let alone of the centuries that have since elapsed, illustrates only too well the constant danger that this distinctness should be forgotten, and that in the process of accommodation Christian ideals, at one point or another, should suffer loss.

18-27. (3) **The question of the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection.** The third problem is propounded by the Sadducees. These were the sacerdotal aristocracy, the coterie of the families from among whom the High Priest was drawn, rich through the revenues accruing under the priestly code of the Old Testament, educated in Greek as well as in Hebrew literature, in fact the *élite* of culture, wealth, and official position at Jerusalem: they are never heard of throughout the Gospels in Galilee, and this is the first occasion on which our Lord is brought into contact with them. Theologically their special tenet was the denial of any resurrection. To the mass of Jews the belief in immortality had come to be, since the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, an integral element of their religion: against the gloom of the present they had learnt to set their hopes on a future age where the balance would be redressed, and God would vindicate His holiness and bring in by an act of universal judgement the reign of His elect. But the Sadducees, content with

what the present life had to give, saw no need to budge from a conservative adherence to the older Jewish view that God's judgements were accomplished in this world alone. And they thought to pose our Lord with a difficulty that was indeed obvious and real, so real that it may have had something to do with the discouragement of second marriages in the early Church. They put an extreme case—a woman who had had seven brothers as successive husbands. Jewish feeling laid great stress on the continuance of the family line: and the Deuteronomic law (Dt 25 [5]) directed that in the event of an elder brother dying childless, his unmarried brother (or if need were his brothers successively) should marry the widow, and 'raise up seed unto his brother.' In the case put, seven brothers married in succession the same wife, and all died childless: whose wife, if there was such a thing as a resurrection state, would she be in it? If the wife of one, of which and why? if of all, what of the law of monogamy?

Problems of this sort can be multiplied easily enough. Of two brothers, if one die young or an infant, and the other in old age, how is the experience wanting to the one to be made up to him? And our answer must be that we simply cannot tell. Nor does our Lord enlighten our ignorance: He tells the Sadducees that they are hopelessly wrong in transferring the conditions of the present life into that of the world to come, where all limitations of age and sex, as well as of education and position, are transcended on to a higher plane of life in God. That principle they could have found adumbrated in Scripture, when God said of Himself to Moses, **I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob**, for whatever is in present relation with Him must share His life (cf. pp. 184*a*-185*a*).

23. In the resurrection (RV): *in the resurrection when they shall rise* AV, rightly as it seems, in spite of the inferior MS. evidence, for such redundancy of expression is very characteristic of Mark (cf. e.g. 13 [19], 'from the beginning of the creation which God created'), and the phrase is taken up again in [25] 'when they shall rise from the dead.' In the parallels to both verses Matthew and Luke have only the noun 'the resurrection': it is their constant habit to prune away one or other of Mark's redundant synonyms, as e.g. at Mk 1 [32, 42], 14 [30].

25. marry, of the man: **given in marriage**, of the woman.

26. in the book of Moses, as Ac 7 [42] 'in the book of the Prophets,' i.e. the twelve minor Prophets.

in the place concerning the Bush RV, probably correctly, the reference being to a part of a book, as Rom 11 [2] (RVm) 'in Elijah,' i.e. in the portion concerning Elijah. There were no chapters or verses in ancient MSS. of the Bible: and therefore this sort of reference according to subject-matter was natural and inevitable.

28-34. (4) The question of an individual scribe: **What commandment rank first of all?** The last of the series of questions put to our Lord differs from the previous three in being put by an individual on his own initiative, and without any hostile intention. A scribe, of the Pharisee party no doubt, had listened with approval to our Lord's answer to the Sadducee deputation, and moved (it would seem) by an honest desire to inform himself as to what Jesus regarded as the core of His teaching, asked Him what was the fundamental commandment of the Law. Our Lord answers with texts taken *verbatim* from the Pentateuch (Dt 6 [4, 5]; Lev 19 [18]), so stated as (1) to put in the forefront the supreme contribution of Judaism to the history of religion in the world, faith in One Only God, (2) to interpret the whole duty of man, to the One God and to his fellow-men, in terms of the single verb 'to love.'

28. knowing RV, as in 12 [15] 'knowing their hypocrisy': *perceiving* AV, rendering the same Greek word as in 12 [34] 'saw that he answered discreetly.' The reading represented by AV is quite well supported, and makes better sense.

32. Of a truth, Master, thou hast well said that he is one, RV. It is rather difficult to get this order of the words out of the Greek; and it is tempting to render *Right, Master, with truth hast thou said that he is one.*

35. answered and said. No question had been asked: and it seems to be a habit of Mark to use the participle and verb 'answering said' as not really meaning more than 'went on to say' (cf. 10 [24, 51], 11 [14], 15 [12]).

35-37. The questions had been asked and dealt with: our Lord was left unmolested for the moment to continue His own teaching on His own lines. He proceeds therefore to develop the challenge raised by Him in the parable of the Husbandmen and the Only Son, as to His own person and office. He appeals now to a passage in the Psalms; and the point

is made, as so often in His teaching, in the form of a question, because if men have to answer they have first to think. It was common ground in current Pharisaic teaching (the Sadducees had less interest in Messianic speculation) that Messiah would come of David's line, and that was probably the implication of the triumphal appeal on Palm Sunday to 'the kingdom of our father David' (11 [10]). Now in a Psalm admitted to be Messianic (Ps 110) the Psalmist calls Messiah his Lord: how can you reconcile Lordship and sonship? Our Lord did not mean to deny the latter: but He wanted His hearers to see that there was here a problem to be thought over. The heading of Mark's Gospel is 'the good news of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God'; and while the first half of the Gospel culminates in the confession 'Thou art the Messiah' (8 [29]), the second half of it sets in view, more and more clearly as the story goes on, our Lord's effort to make men realize that He who was Messiah and Son of Man was more than man and was Lord of man.

A difficulty, and a serious one, stares us in the face with regard to the form in which the argument is cast. As stated, it assumes and turns on the Davidic authorship of Ps 110. Yet nobody would wish nowadays to be committed to belief in anything of the sort. Whether or no any portion of the Psalter goes back to David, it is at least in the highest degree unlikely that Ps 110 has anything to do with him. It cannot but be unpalatable to Christians to admit that our Lord used an argument which, as stated, is invalid. But there are three things to be borne in mind. (1) It would really be much more upsetting to all idea of the fitness of things if our Lord had explained that David was not the real author of the Psalm: we should all agree that He had not really entered into the 'measure' of human nature if He had displayed knowledge in earthly things that was outside the reach of His time and place in the history of the world. (2) He does very distinctly tell His most intimate disciples, 13 [32], that the Son was ignorant of the day and hour of the End. But if the Son of God had emptied Himself, in order to become Man as we are men, of knowledge of the time of His own Second Coming, it almost follows *a fortiori* that in matters of such comparative unimportance as the authorship of the Psalm, He would have been subject to the natural limitations of knowledge which belonged to the age in which He lived. (3) So far, so good: what still oppresses us is not the ignorance itself, but the consequent resting of an argument about Himself on a premiss which being invalid made the conclusion *pro tanto* invalid—though after all the particular premiss does not make the conclusion invalid for more than the particular reference to David. It remains true that a Psalmist spoke of Messiah as his Lord, and that therefore the Son of Man is more than man. But the fundamental answer is a deeper one. If once the main thesis of the Gospel be accepted that He whom the disciples first knew as Very Man was at the same time the Only Son of God, then we simply cannot pretend to fathom all the consequences of that tremendous mystery. We can only take whatever things we learn from our Lord's own words in the Gospels as our *data*, and build up our theology on them: above all things we must beware of reversing the process and wresting the *data* to suit the theology. Docetic tendencies —the tendency, that is, to suppress the truth of our Lord's real manhood and His real limitations under the conditions of His life in the flesh—have been, in the history of Christological speculation, the most serious danger to which Christian thought has all along been exposed. (Cf. pp. 185*b*-186*b*, 205 ff.)

37. the common people: RVm 'the great multitude,' which is literal but meaningless: it is just 'the masses.' Mark is extraordinarily fond of adding an adjective to denote the size of a crowd: here he wants to illustrate the large amount of popular interest that was felt in Jesus at Jerusalem.

heard him gladly is definitely a stronger phrase than the original, which is hardly more than 'liked to listen to him.' The same phrase is used of Herod Antipas and the Baptist in 6 [20] (Swete).

38-40. Why are 'the scribes' singled out by our Lord as those whom He confutes ([35-37]) and denounces? Not because their faults were greater than the faults for instance of the Sadducees, but, no doubt, because they were the religious leaders of those to whom our Lord was speaking. It was their teaching and their example which would influence the masses: and it is of a piece with His whole determination to force matters to an issue that He now turns on what we may call the clerical class. The scribes were not indeed technically 'priests'—clerical influence and domination are not confined to religious bodies of which the ministers are called 'priests'—but they were the men with religious authority, and they were a profession; and both their

foibles and their vices were those of clericalism. They liked attention and deference: at their worst they made material profit out of spiritual influence.

desire RV; AV, much better, *love*. RV would suggest that the desire was not necessarily effective. Doubtless the Greek word in its classical sense means 'wish': but in modern Greek it has sunk to be the auxiliary verb of the future tense, like the English 'will,' and Mark's Greek shows quite definite signs of the process of deterioration by which such verbs as 'can,' 'will,' 'have' end by being simply auxiliary. 'Which like to walk' represents here Mark's meaning.

long robes of RV is perhaps better than 'long clothing' of AV, but the point is not so much the length as the impressiveness. A cassock would hardly count as a *stole* or 'robe': 'dress-clothes' would be more like it, if we ever wore them in the daytime; cf. Lk 15 [22].

salutations . . . chief seats . . . chief places: that is to say, signs of public deference, such as with us raising the hat, or in church front pews, and at dinner the seat on the right of host or hostess.

40. In the construction of this verse I follow the margin of Westcott and Hort (which is indeed the only way to make grammar) and believe our Lord to be distinguishing the foibles which precede from the graver faults which follow. 'Those among them who devour widows' houses or make use of devotional habits from ulterior motives, they shall receive severer judgement' than those who only make use of their position to exact outward signs of respect.

devour widows' houses. Widows are mentioned because they would presumably be the only Jewish women who would have large households and large incomes: the widows, for instance, of Jews who died in the Dispersion often came back to settle in Jerusalem, and though many of them were poor (Ac 6 [1]), some would be wealthy. Women all the world over have been more subject to religious influences and charitable instincts (all honour to them!) than men; and as long as the husband was alive the scheming ecclesiastic would have a much poorer chance.

41-44. The widow's mite. St. Mark has given much emphasis to our Lord's warnings against riches: here he illustrates the converse side, His benediction of the poor. Money is so useful for religious and charitable purposes that there is always the temptation to think more of the large offerings of the rich than of smaller offerings which may yet represent a much greater effort and more real self-denial. Subscription lists are dangerous things at best.

the treasury, that is, the boxes for contributions which appear to have been ranged against the wall of the Court of the Women in the Herodian Temple; since no Gentile could penetrate there, the offerings were from Jews only, and if it is correct that only copper coins (RVm 'brass' is rather misleading) were allowed in the Temple, a large contribution would necessarily make a good deal of noise.

42. two mites which make a farthing. The 'mite' was the smallest coin in use, and Mark explains for his Roman readers that two of them were only equivalent to a *quadrans* (he transliterates the Latin word), the quarter of an *as*: since sixteen *asses* went to a *denarius*, the *as* was not much more than a halfpenny and the *quadrans* was much less than a farthing.

more than all: not merely more than any of them, but more than all of them put together.

XIII. **1, 2.** The prophecy of the destruction of the Temple must beyond all reasonable doubt have been actually uttered by our Lord. Not only does it find place in one form or another in all our Gospels, but it was the subject of a charge brought against Him before Caiaphas (14 [58]): it was repeated against Him at the Crucifixion (15 [29]: see also the note on 14 [65]): it appears to lie behind the story of St. Stephen, whether in the charge made against him (Ac 6 [14]) or in the whole contrast underlying his defence, as to the relative validity of the Law and the Temple: and if St. Luke's version of our Lord's words (21 [20]) and perhaps even St. Matthew's (24 [15]) may be suspect as being coloured by the event, St. Mark's Gospel was certainly published before the final catastrophe. For the additional words found here in the Western text see note on 14 [57-61].

behold what manner of stones and what manner of buildings RV. The exclamation of the unnamed disciple (probably Peter did not know, or had forgotten, who it was) is more naive in the original: 'Just look! what huge stones! what huge buildings!' Herod the Great, like the late Leopold II of Belgium, had a passion for building on a big scale: the impression made by his Temple on a Galilean visitor must have been as great as, perhaps even greater than, the impression of St. Peter's on a modern pilgrim in Rome.

3. on the mount of Olives over against

the temple. The Temple was on the east side of the city and therefore in full view from the hill facing Jerusalem from the east across the intervening valley of the Kidron.

3-37. The Signs of the End: the so-called Little Apocalypse. Just as the Eschatological school of Albert Schweitzer and his followers lays primary stress on this chapter as containing the quintessence of the message of Jesus—His supposed indifference to the world as it is, because of the imminent overthrow of all actual conditions with the return of Messiah in judgement and the visible establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth—so the Liberal Protestant school, alike in Germany and among ourselves, finds much that is here put in the mouth of Christ so unpalatable, indeed so irreconcilable with its conception of Him and His mission, that it tends to deny the authentic character of the tradition. But it is quite impossible to believe that the anticipation of the triumphant return of Christ could have had such firm hold on the first Christian generation, if it had not had deep roots in our Lord's own teaching.

asked him privately. The Greek verb, according to Mark's custom when a verb is followed by several names of which the first is the most important, is in the singular (1 [36], 3 [34], 8 [27]): Peter was at least the spokesman. It is very important to note that the apocalyptic matter of this chapter was not public teaching at all, not even part of the training of the Twelve, but a very private talk with Jesus' most intimate friends. There had been in more general discourse references to the Return—e.g. 8 [38], 9 [1]—and our Lord did not hesitate to proclaim it before Caiaphas (14 [62]); but details about the indications which would precede it were not part of the Gospel, and He only discussed them in confidence with some few of those who were to be His most trusted representatives, and at the very close of His Ministry.

5-37. The discourse divides itself into three parts. (1) The signs before the End ([5-23]); (2) the End ([24-27]); (3) the Moral ([28-37]).

5-23. (1) The section begins and ends with the two words **Be on the look out** (' take heed ') and **lead astray**: apocalyptic expectation is an upsetting thing, and calls for a temper of reserve and restraint. What He tells them in general is intended to calm and reassure them as to the immediate moment. They must not be looking at once for the End: not every upset in the world is the beginning of the final tribulation: not every appearance of a supposed Christ is a sign of the final manifestation of the powers of evil. These things are only the beginning of travail: the End is not yet, and the ' good news ' must first be preached everywhere ([7, 8, 10]). There will be increasing tension between the forces of good and the forces of evil, between the powers that be and the company of Christ's followers. Family ties will count for nothing: persecution will come upon them not only from their own people but from their own parents or children. Everywhere they will encounter odium for the sake of the Name. Then will come a supreme effort of the forces of evil, alike in the physical and in the spiritual sphere: at Jerusalem the ' abomination of desolation,' throughout Judæa tribulation so terrible that the whole population would be like to be exterminated if God for His Elect people's sake had not mercifully determined to hasten the consummation; on Christian faith a more deadly assault through pseudo-Christian teaching and pseudo-Christian miracles.

5, 6. These two verses are a preliminary summary, [6] being taken up again in [21, 22]: see note there.

6. ' in my name, saying, I am he ' RV; ' I am *Christ* ' AV: the point of the false pretence was that they would claim to be the actual Jesus of Nazareth, returning, as He had promised, to bring in His Kingdom in power. Otherwise ' in my name ' would seem to be meaningless.

7, 8. The ' hearing ' about wars, about ' nation ' against ' nation,' the news of earthquakes and famines, all point outside Palestine, to the happenings in the great world around. That is the first stage of catastrophe: but it will not directly affect the disciples in Palestine.

9-20. After the general prophecy of political commotions and convulsions of nature in the world around them, our Lord concentrates His vision on His immediate surroundings at home. Coincident with disturbances outside, there will be, He warns them, a time of persecution for His followers at the hands of their fellow-countrymen, and after that tribulation beyond anything so far known on all in Judæa, Christians and non-Christians alike.

9-12. The horizon is here limited to the relations of Christians with Judaism: the Roman Empire is nowhere indicated as initiating persecution. ' Councils ' (i.e. local Sanhedrins) and synagogues are obviously Jewish, and the punishment

inflicted by them is Jewish ('of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one,' 2 Cor 11 [24]): 'governors and kings' are Roman officials like Pilate (Mt 27 [2]; Lk 20 [20]), Felix and Festus (Ac 23 [24], 26 [30]), and Jewish kinglets like Herod Antipas (6 [14]), Herod Agrippa I (Ac 12 [1]) or Herod Agrippa II (Ac 26 [30]), secular authorities before whom the Jews would bring Christians for the sake of securing the death penalty which they had not themselves the power to inflict.

9. for a testimony unto them RV, literally; AV, giving the sense, 'for a testimony against them,' i.e. against the Jews: cf. 6 [11] (1 [44]).

10. must first be preached unto all the nations (see on 11 [17]): rather *must needs be*, since the meaning is 'must as the Scriptures teach' (see on 8 [31]). So certainly the Apostles in their earliest preaching (e.g. Ac 2 [39], 3 [25]) proclaimed the inclusion of the Gentiles in the Messianic Kingdom on the basis of the Scriptures: and it is reasonable to think that this earliest preaching was based on our Lord's own words.

14. when ye see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not (let him that readeth understand) . . . RV rightly. The language is based on the pollution of the Temple under Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan 11 [31], 12 [11]): but it is intentionally obscure, because there is meant to be an indication of the Roman power, and open reference to it might be construed as treasonable. The combination of neuter and masculine, 'the abomination . . . standing where he ought not,' has an exact parallel in 2 Thess 2 [6, 7], 'that which restraineth' (the Empire), 'he that restraineth' (the Emperor). The evangelist's parenthesis 'let him that readeth understand' simply asks the reader of the Gospel to look beneath the surface, for what is said is less than what is meant, exactly as in Rev 13 [18], where 'he that hath understanding' will see that the number of the Beast conceals an allusion to Nero. It may be useful to add that, though the Greek word for 'readeth' means properly to 'read aloud,' that does not prevent its applying here to the individual reader, since the ancients read aloud to themselves: Augustine notes that the usage of St. Ambrose was peculiar—he read, as we do, to himself, without using his voice.

in Judæa: that is, Judæa in the narrower sense (not including Samaria and Galilee), as always in St. Mark (3 [7], 10 [1]).

15. not go down RV after Mt 24 [17]: AV *not go down into the house*. Not only is the redundancy 'into the house . . . out of the house' quite in St. Mark's style, but the reading of RV makes nonsense, for a man on the roof must 'go down' to get away at all.

20. would have been saved, in the physical sense, as generally in St. Mark: see on 5 [23].

shortened: a picturesque colloquial word, properly used in the literal sense 'amputated,' and in the New Testament only found here and in the parallel passage in Matthew (24 [22]), who, however, avoids 'the Lord shortened the days' by turning it into the passive 'those days had been shortened.' Metaphorical use of words being more characteristic of English than of Greek, we could quite easily render 'curtailed.'

elect whom he chose (AV 'hath chosen'): in Greek the noun and verb are the same word, 'his elect whom he (hath) elected.'

22. false Christs: the best 'Western' authorities omit the word, and it has perhaps been introduced into St. Mark's text from St. Matthew, for it is rather the mark of a 'false prophet' to show lying wonders: see especially Rev 13 [13, 14], 19 [20]: the 'for' which connects [22] with [21] appears in fact to imply that the reference is not to the false Christ himself, but to the man who says, 'Lo, here is the Christ!' that is, to the false prophet.

24-27. (2) The End. When Christ should in fact return, there would be no doubt about it: His Coming would be in the strictest sense catastrophic, a complete and instant 'overthrow' of the present age, at the moment when evil seemed entirely triumphant and the elect had all but failed under the double pressure of physical and spiritual trial.

26. See note on 14 [62].

27. from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven (Greek 'of earth . . . of heaven'): the Old Testament parallels are all either 'from the uttermost part of heaven to its uttermost part' (so here Matthew), or 'from the uttermost part of earth to its uttermost part'; in Mark both are combined, simply in order to make the description as widely flung as possible. Above all, the phrase must not be taken to suggest 'the living elect on earth,' 'the departed elect in heaven'; the New Testament gives no colour to the idea that departed saints are 'in heaven' before the Consummation.

28-37. (3) The Moral. What is the lesson to be learnt by those to whom

this teaching about the Signs of the End and the End itself had been addressed? It is twofold: in the first place, that there will be preceding Signs, and that they will be no more meaningless than that spring—He points to a budding fig-tree—is meaningless as a sign of summer; in the second place that the actual moment of the End cannot be made known to them, for it is not known even to Him, and that their attitude must therefore be just that of 'wakefulness' (33, a different word to 'watch') and 'watching' (35), lest the Master who is leaving them should on His return take them unawares.

28, 29. even so ye also suggests a definite contrast with the subject of the preceding verse: instead of 'ye know' in 28, we must therefore adopt the alternative reading (it is only the interchange of two almost equivalent vowel sounds in the Greek) *it is known*, 'men know.'

these things, that is, the Signs of 6-23, preliminary to the End, as opposed to 'those days' of 24. The Greek words for 'these' and 'those' imply a sharper contrast than their English equivalents.

30, 31. This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished . . . of that day or that hour knoweth no one . . . , neither [not even] the Son, but the Father. Much was indeed accomplished in the generation of our Lord's own contemporaries; the final breach between the new Israel and the old, the martyrdom of the chief Apostles, the catastrophic close of the Jewish polity: but yet not all the things predicted, and after nineteen centuries the Master's return still mercifully tarries—like Tertullian we may still pray 'pro mora finis,' for the delay of the End. What explanation are we to give of the difficulty? Are we to suppose that in the course of thirty or forty years, as some at any rate of the preceding Signs seemed being fulfilled, the expectation had become more acute and the tradition of our Lord's words had unconsciously taken on a more definite form? It cannot be said that there is any evidence of this: the earlier utterance recorded in 8 38, 9 1, so far as it goes, is against it: and the very writing down of a Gospel perhaps implies as its background the idea that the use of the written word might not be wholly ephemeral. Or are we rather to remind ourselves of our Lord's own statement in 32 that He, the Father's Only Son, was, in His Incarnate life, as ignorant of the moment of the End as we are ourselves? Christians have from early times to our own, and particularly after the rise of Arianism, which deduced an essential difference of nature between an all-knowing Father and a not all-knowing Son, been reluctant to take these words in their natural meaning. But the apostolic tradition of our Lord's own sayings must be our primary guide as to the conditions of that Self-emptying of which St. Paul speaks (Phil 2 7; 2 Cor 8 9), and we must honestly consider whatever deductions appear to follow from them. In such a matter no Christian critic can speak more than tentatively and with reverent caution, and always with the recollection that the *ultima ratio* is the guidance of the Spirit in the Body of Christ. But it does not seem that we can exclude consideration of the possibility that the ignorance which our Lord attributed to Himself was not merely academic but a real ignorance with real results. See the note on 12 36 above. (Cf. also pp. 193*b*-194*b*.)

33. and pray: the addition is quite inappropriate in this context, and has doubtless been introduced from 14 38; the omitting authorities are very few but the very best, both Greek and Latin.

34. given authority to his servants: rather *given his servants their authority* or possibly *his authority*—the Greek article implies one or other. The use of the word is natural when we remember that those addressed were all Apostles, office-bearers in the Divine household.

commanded also the porter to watch RV: AV more simply *and commanded*. If RV is right, the clause becomes a sort of climax to the whole verse; even with AV the emphasis on 'the porter' individually after 'the servants' in general is not a little remarkable. I cannot help suspecting that a reference to St Peter is intended in the phrase. The singular verb 'watch' in 34 combined with the plural in 35 is of a type with other references in the Gospel tradition to Peter singly and the Apostles collectively, e.g. Mt 16 19, 18 18.

35. at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrowing, or in the morning: the four watches of three hours each, into which the Romans divided the night (cf. 6 48), put into popular language.

37. what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch. The duty just inculcated on the office-bearers of the household of God is equally incumbent on all its members. The ethics of the Christian clergy are not a separate code from the ethics of the laity: in their different measures they have the same code.

XIV. 1-XVI. 8. **Sixth main section of the Gospel: the Passion and Resurrection.**

1-11. **Wednesday in Holy Week.**—The previous day was Tuesday (11 20-13 37); and though it is not said that this was the next day, yet the following day (14 12) was certainly Thursday, the day before the Crucifixion, so that the intervening day can only have been Wednesday. And that is also the result to be obtained from the phrase here used, 'after two days' was the Passover: for if 'after three days' (see on 8 31) means the interval from Friday to Sunday, which we, not counting both ends, call two days, by parity of reasoning 'after two days' must mean what we should call one day, i.e. 'the next day.' The next day, then, was the Passover, because St. Mark, writing for Gentiles, uses the Roman (and modern) reckoning of the day from midnight to midnight: see note on 12.

On the Wednesday, then, St. Mark places the definite determination of the 'chief priests and scribes,' that is not the Sanhedrin officially (15 1 and apparently 11 27), but the leading members of the Sadducee and Pharisee parties, to effect a private arrest of Jesus. The emphatic word, put first in the Greek in accordance with constant Greek idiom, is 'with subtilty'; and the reason for avoiding an open arrest is that 'they said, Not during the feast, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people.' The connexion between premiss and conclusion is not at first sight obvious: but remembering that Mark regularly means, by the phrase 'they said,' '(unnamed) people said' (e.g. 2 18, 3 32, 5 35: see on 3 21), it would seem that the argument was being put forward by some that an arrest at Passover with all the crowd then present at Jerusalem, many of whom were sympathizers with Jesus (11 9, 18, 12 12, 37), might provoke a riot; and that the 'chief priests' so far deferred to the objection that they proposed to make the arrest privately on some occasion when they could find Jesus alone and comparatively unattended. That was why the assistance of Judas was all-important and so eagerly welcomed by them: that was perhaps why our Lord enveloped His future movements with so much secrecy, see 14 13-16.

3-9. The meal at Bethany, placed apparently by St. Mark on the Wednesday, is definitely put on the preceding Saturday in Jn 12 1-8. And it is just possible that St. Mark only records it here because the anointing 'beforehand for the Burial' belongs to the story of the Passion, somewhat in the same way that the execution of John the Baptist is recorded at the moment when Herod began to interest himself in our Lord's preaching.

3. **in the house of Simon the leper.** We hear nothing of this Simon elsewhere: the name was very common, like Judas and Levi and Joseph, as being that of one of the twelve patriarchs: whether he was of the family of Lazarus, Martha, and Mary (Jn 12 1-3), we cannot tell, but obviously he was connected with the circle who gave lodging to our Lord and the Apostles at Bethany, 11 11, 12 (13 3).

an alabaster cruse of ointment of spikenard very costly. St. Mark characteristically (or St. Peter before him) heaps up the details that illustrate the value of the gift: Matthew (26 7)—Luke also, if we are to bring Lk 7 37-48 into connexion with this episode—reduces the epithets to the smallest compass, while the 4th Gospel copies St. Mark's description much more closely. What St. Mark's *pisticæ* meant, the earliest Latin and Syriac translators knew no better than we do, for they simply transliterate the word: both AV and RV omit in the text and give various alternatives in the margin. Perhaps it is worth considering whether Mark did not really mean *pistacæ*, 'of the pistachio nut.'

4. **some:** Jn 12 4 says it was Judas. Either Judas was supported by others, or St. Peter simply had not noticed or did not remember. The objection was not unnatural: 'three hundred pence' (*denarii*), that is to say £10 or more—Matthew and Luke again drop the number, John again retains it: compare on Mk 6 37—was a large sum for anyone, and for our Lord and the Twelve a very large sum indeed. But He would not check the woman's devotion; and we may reasonably see in His approval of it a sanction for costly offerings for the worship of God in His Church, if we remember that these must be exceptional and that the poor who are 'always with us' are the regular channels for our offerings to Him (10 21).

8. **she hath anointed my body aforehand for the burying.** To the Jews the due performance of the rites of burial was placed very high in the scale of religious duties: see the Book of Tobit (1 17, 18, 2 3-7, 14 10-13), and note the contrast in Lk 16 22 between Lazarus who 'died' and the rich man who 'died and was buried'; for our Lord's burial see Mk 16 1; Jn 19 39, 40.

9. **the gospel** (that is, 'the good news') RV rightly, according to Mark's regular usage, and an indication of his early date (see on 1 1): Mt 26 13 (followed here by

AV) 'this Gospel,' and Matthew makes the same change in 24 [14] = Mk 13 [10].

10. he that was one of the twelve RV rightly, but the margin is still better *the one of the twelve.* An odd phrase, but not inappropriate, if we take St. Mark to mean 'the Judas who was one of the twelve,' in contrast with 'Judas of James,' whom St. Luke includes among the Twelve (Lk 6 [16]; Ac 1 [13]: cf. Jn 15 [22]), though Mk 3 [18], followed by Mt 10 [3, 4], does not.

11. conveniently, literally 'at a good season,' i.e. avoiding, according to the desire of the chief priests, any publicity.

XIV. 12-72. Thursday in Holy Week.

12. on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover. Strictly speaking the first day of unleavened bread, Nisan 15, began at sunset, and the paschal lambs were slain a few hours earlier, that is to say, by Jewish reckoning on the afternoon of Nisan 14. By Roman and modern reckoning the killing of the lamb in the afternoon and the eating in the evening would of course fall on the same day: see on [1].

that thou mayest eat the passover. Our Gospel is absolutely clear that the Last Supper was also the Passover: the 4th Gospel is equally clear that Passover fell on the day following, and many or most modern critics prefer its narrative. The constant use of leavened bread for the Eucharist in the Eastern Church implies the Johannine tradition: just similarly unleavened bread was probably introduced in the West because the scholars of the Carolingian revival accepted the Synoptic account, and so assumed that unleavened bread was used at the Institution.

But if the 4th Gospel is right, how is it that Peter, or even Mark, can have made what is at first sight so incredible a blunder? Let us cast our thoughts back to that first Good Friday evening. Can we suppose that Peter and his fellow-disciples, at the moment when their Master had just been put to a shameful death, proceeded to celebrate the Paschal meal? Must they not rather, instead of keeping the feast, have fasted and wept, and dwelt rather on the meal of the preceding evening when He had last eaten with them and had left them the Memorial of the New Covenant in His Blood? What it all meant they did not yet realize: but either all the faith and hope they had cherished had crumbled to dust, or something had happened which was radically to transform the Old Covenant and its rites. Pass on a year: as Nisan 14-15 came round again, were the disciples to think of the Jewish Passover, or of the death of Jesus and of its meaning for them and for Israel and for the world? Were they to feast or fast 'in that day when the Bridegroom' had been 'taken from them'? Is it overbold to suggest that they may have treated the preceding evening, that of the Last Supper, as the Jewish Pascha, and then on Nisan 14-15 have kept their Christian Pascha, the fast that ended in the Easter feast? If this were so, we can see how easily the phraseology would grow up which spoke of the Last Supper as a Passover. There is no direct evidence, to be sure: but there is a real problem to solve, and what else but some such explanation will solve it?

13-16. The reason for the roundabout directions given for the finding of the house where Jesus intended to eat the Passover with His disciples was presumably for secrecy and to avoid arrest, and therefore perhaps also to give no clue beforehand to Judas as to His movements.

14. The Master saith. Clearly our Lord was known to the owner of the house. It is not at all unlikely that the 'large upper room' was also that in which the disciples met after the Ascension (Ac 1 [13]). See note on [51].

17-25. The Last Supper.

17. with the twelve: obviously not a separate set of people from 'the disciples' who in [12] had enquired about the preparations to be made, but more or less identical with them. See also 6 [30, 35], 9 [31, 35], 11 [11, 14].

19, 20. The question and answer as given in Mark are barely intelligible without the fuller details of the 4th Gospel. The Twelve cannot all have asked our Lord privately and all received a private answer: yet a public answer would have defeated its object. The ambiguity has arisen from the fact that it was St. Peter to whom the answer was given, and that, as so often elsewhere in this Gospel, he has suppressed his own name.

21. the Son of man goeth. There is no ordinary word in Greek, oddly enough, for 'go' as opposed to 'come': Mark uses—frequently in the imperative, but otherwise only in 6 [31, 33], 'coming and going,' and here—a word which presumably was colloquial only, for Luke almost always, Matthew sometimes, omit or replace by another word; St. Paul never uses it, but it is common in the 4th Gospel and the Apocalypse (cf. Rev 13 [10], 17 [8]). Here, too, as in the Apocalypse, it seems

to mean 'goes on his way,' 'goes to his death.'

as it is written: see on 9^{12}. We should note how very close, as the end draws near, Biblical thoughts and language are to the mind and speech of our Lord (cf. $^{24, 27, 34, 36, 49, 62}$, 15^{34}).

22-25. The other accounts of the Institution of the Eucharist are in 1 Cor 11^{23-25}; Mt 26^{26-29}; Lk 22^{16-20}. The textual confusion in some of the accounts shows very clearly how far liturgical usage and the instinctive desire to unify the tradition of so universal and sacred a formula were early at work in obscuring the original words of the evangelists. All the more important is it to note that our earliest authorities, St. Paul and St. Mark, agree on the essential elements: 'He took bread [or rather "a loaf"], and when he had given thanks' ['had blessed it' Mark] 'he brake it . . . and said, This is my Body.' But the text of St. Paul has affected in many of the best MSS. the text of St. Luke; and it is at least possible that the text of St. Matthew—the Gospel which was so largely based on St. Mark, but which so largely in the 2nd century superseded St. Mark—has in all but one of our witnesses affected the text of St. Mark. For while in the account of the Institution of the Cup the structure of Mark's text differs sensibly from that of Matthew's, in the Institution of the Bread their texts are practically identical, save in one, and only one, witness. That witness is, however, the codex Bobiensis (*k*), the unique fragment of the earliest Latin version as used by St. Cyprian in the middle of the 3rd century: and its text of Mark runs thus: 'He took bread and blessed and brake and gave to them, and they all ate of it: and he said to them, This is my Body. And he took a cup and blessed and gave to them, and they all drank of it: and he said to them, This is my Blood . . .' If this is the true text of Mark, he recorded the Institution of the Bread and that of the Cup on precisely the same lines, and Matthew made the same alteration in both, replacing the statement that 'all ate,' 'all drank' by the command 'Take, eat,' 'Drink.'

22, 24. this is my body . . . This is my blood: Mark never puts into our Lord's mouth such figurative expressions as 'I am the Door' or the like, and there is no reason at all to suppose that he and his readers did not understand the language of our Lord at the Institution to mean just what it said: the words are so familiar that it is quite impossible for us to realize how the tremendous claim here made must have startled any outsider, however much in sympathy with the Christian ideal, into whose hands the Gospel may have come. Jn 6^{52} suggests the language that might have been used: and that may be why the 4th Gospel, and perhaps the 3rd as well, omit the actual Institution. It had become a Christian *arcanum*, a 'mystery' in the strict sense, hidden from all but the 'initiated.'

24. my blood of the covenant RV rightly: in most MSS. of Mark, and in nearly all of Matthew, the adjective 'new' has been added from 1 Cor 11^{25}. The words 'the Blood of the Covenant' are repeated directly from Ex 24^{8}: 'And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which the LORD hath made with you concerning all these words.' But this was a greater Covenant, and this Blood was no longer the blood of oxen, but the Blood of the Mediator of the New Covenant Himself.

which is shed [literally 'which is being poured out'] **for many.** Not 'many' as opposed to 'all' (Christ 'died for all,' 2 Cor $5^{14, 15}$), but 'many' in contrast with 'one': not even, primarily, the 'many' (Jew and Gentile) as opposed to the one Chosen People of the Old Dispensation, but, as in 10^{45}, the 'many' redeemed and the One Redeemer. Cf. Rom 5^{15}; Is $53^{11, 12}$: 'by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many . . . he hath poured out his soul unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many.'

25. the fruit of the vine, literally 'the produce of the vine.' The Greek word, when spelt with two n's, means 'that which is born' of men or animals; when spelt, as here, with one n, 'that which is made' or produced from anything inanimate: cf. Nu 6^{4} (of the Nazarites), 'nothing that is made of the vine tree.'

until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God. Matthew adds 'with you,' Luke, perhaps disliking the words eating and drinking in connexion with the Kingdom, substitutes 'till the kingdom of God come.' Jewish imagery tended to picture the future life under very material forms (so especially the Apocalypse, and that was one principal reason for the hesitation of Greek Christians, outside Egypt, in accepting the book as canonical), and our Lord used the language of His people, e.g. Mt 8^{11} = Lk 13^{29}, where 'sit down' ('recline') means 'sit at the feast.' The Western Church has not scrupled to reproduce such figurative language; as in 'Jerusalem the

golden,' the 'song of them that feast.' But it is easily overdone, and our Lord uses it with much restraint.

In this verse the emphasis is on 'new,' which perhaps corresponds to the use of the same word in St. Paul 'the new covenant in my Blood': in the New Israel 'all things are made new,' and the new Wine of the Eucharist supersedes the cups of the Passover: in that sense the 'Kingdom of God' came with the Passion and Resurrection and Gift of the Holy Spirit. It may well indeed be that the Saying is a further prophecy of the approaching Passion: this last time that He would touch wine before His death He consecrated it to a special relationship to the Blood He was about to shed.

26. And when they had sung a hymn: AVm 'psalm,' no doubt a correct interpretation, for the Psalter was the hymnal of the Jewish Church, and special Psalms were prescribed by Jewish custom as part of the paschal solemnity. 'A hymn' is so far misleading that the Greek has only a verb, and might just as well be rendered 'sung hymns.'

they went out: not only from the upper room, but from the city, as 11 [11].

to the mount of Olives: 11 [1] suggests that we cannot make distinction between 'Bethany' (11 [11]) and 'the Mount of Olives.' It was the familiar route they had taken each night; but they did not even reach the Mount: Gethsemane (see [32]) lay between it and Jerusalem.

26-42. The Agony in Gethsemane.

27, 28. On the way our Lord reveals to the Twelve His human sense of desolation in face of the approaching trial. He must tread the wine-press alone: every one of the friends and trusted followers in His company would be 'offended' or, more literally and idiomatically, 'scandalized.' They could not, even now, when the crisis actually came on them, fully grasp the knowledge our Lord had been, since the confession at Cæsarea Philippi (8 [29]), educating them to face, of His coming death. But once more He combines it with the confident assurance of His Resurrection. As He had 'gone before them,' in the days of His awe and consternation (10 [32]), from Galilee to Jerusalem, so in the days of His victory He would 'go before them' from Jerusalem to Galilee.

it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad (Zech 13 [7]). It is noticeable that here, as elsewhere in the Gospels, the text of the Greek Old Testament used by the evangelists seems to have resembled codex Alexandrinus (A)—not the Vaticanus (B), which gives 'the shepherds.' Our Lord Himself presumably cited the Hebrew: see on 15 [34].

30. to-day, even this night RV: more literally 'to-day, in this night.' See, for the similar tautologies in Mark, on 12 [23]. Matthew omits 'to-day,' Luke omits 'in this night.'

before the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice. Only Mark, of all the four evangelists, mentions a double cock-crowing: but after all Peter's witness in this matter is naturally conclusive. So drastic, however, was the influence of the text of Matthew on the text of Mark that no one of our best authorities retains on all four occasions ([30. 68. 72a. b]) the mention of it. The second cock-crowing is mentioned as a note of time in various classical writers: Aristophanes, Cicero, Juvenal, Ammianus Marcellinus, are cited. It was this second cock-crowing, somewhere about 3 to 4 a.m., which was technically known as *gallicinium* (see below on [66-72]).

32. a place [or 'piece of land'] **called Gethsemane,** i.e. 'vat for olives.' Codex Bezæ (D) and St. Jerome, two authorities rarely found in agreement, give the name as Gesemani, 'valley of olives,' perhaps rightly: the spot was in fact in the valley between Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives, just across the 'brook Kidron' (Jn 18 [1]).

33. Peter and James and John: the three who had witnessed the anticipation of glory at the Transfiguration were now to witness something of the Agony.

began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled. John, and perhaps Luke, omit all details of our Lord's Agony; it seemed to the second generation of Christians better to draw a veil of reverent reserve over such things: Matthew copies Mark's account with some lessening of the description: Mark (and nowhere do Christians owe more to his Gospel) gives, as elsewhere (cf. 10 [32]), the fullest emphasis on our Lord's human emotions—the first of the two verbs is never found in the other three Gospels, the other only in the parallel passage here in Mt 26 [37]. On the other hand, the tradition of our Lord's own language was, as always, much more faithfully reproduced (see on 7 [19]): Matthew copies into his account both [34] and [36] of St. Mark; Luke copies [36].

34. My soul is exceeding sorrowful, from Ps 43 [5]: as in 15 [34], our Lord falls naturally, in His hour of desolation, into the language of the Psalms.

36-39. If we ask ourselves how the words in which our Lord prayed were

known to the evangelist, the answer must be, either that He was only 'a short distance' (35) away from the three Apostles, so that Peter may well have been awake long enough to hear the first words, and catch the drift, of the prayer; or perhaps more probably, in view of the Apostles' drowsiness, that it was Mark himself (see on 51) who had followed close enough to have overheard.

36. Abba, Father (the Aramaic word and its Greek equivalent), and so St. Paul (Gal 4 6; Rom 8 15), while Matthew and Luke drop the Aramaic and retain only the Greek. Mark and Paul use the phraseology of the first Christian generation, where even in Greek-speaking circles some few Aramaic pass-words, so to say, survived for a time, especially in the language of worship: compare St. Paul's Marana tha (1 Cor 16 22).

this cup, as in 10 38: once more an echo of the Old Testament Scripture, since the 'cup' must apparently be the cup of the Lord's fury of Is 51 17, cf. Jer 25 15, 17; Ps 75 8 (so Rev 14 10, 16 19): but here the thought of it is preceded by the expression of assurance in a Father's love and followed by the acceptance of His will.

37, 40. sleeping . . . asleep. They had been bidden to watch; but our Lord's prayers were long and sustained, the hour was late, and they were doubtless accustomed to rise early and sleep early. They did not mean to be lacking in sympathy, the spirit was willing enough, and our Lord, even in His agony, does not forget the hardest thing for a sufferer to do, and makes allowance for their weakness. But just because the flesh was weak, watchfulness and prayer were the more incumbent on them.

37. Simon, sleepest thou? couldest thou not watch one hour? 38, 40, 41 are addressed to the three collectively, 37 to Peter only: our Lord, as always, calls him by his personal name Simon, not by his official name Peter (Lk 22 34 is the only exception in the Gospels), and asks reproachfully whether at least he, our Lord's most trusted friend and the leader among His followers, could not keep awake for an hour. 'Couldest': literally 'hadst thou not strength enough?' and though the full classical meaning of this verb, as of many other similar words, tends in later Greek, and especially in St. Mark, to be weakened, we should at least render 'wast thou not able?' The same verb is used in 9 18.

38. that ye enter not into temptation. A clear allusion to the substance of the last clause of the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6 13 = Lk 11 4), and enough to justify us in seeing an allusion to other clauses in 36, 'not what I will, but what thou (wilt)' (Mt 6 10; not in Luke), and perhaps also 'Abba, Father.' Comparing 11 25, it seems certain that the Prayer lies near the mind of Christ as expressed in the record of the earliest Gospel.

40. they wist not what to answer him, exactly as at the Transfiguration (9 6), but in this case from drowsiness.

41. Sleep on now, and take your rest. If we take these words closely with what follows, they must be meant ironically. That does not seem, in the context, satisfactory: it seems better to take them as a real concession to the Apostles' weakness, broken off suddenly as our Lord detects the approach of the party sent to arrest Him.

it is enough: and so Jerome in the Vulgate renders it, 'sufficit,' and the Greek lexicographer Hesychius says the same thing. That is strong authority: but in view of the regular classical use of the verb in the sense 'to be far from,' it seems possible that it may here express the sudden reversal by circumstances of His encouragement to sleep—'far from it! the hour has come: lo, the Son of Man is at this moment being handed over into the hands of sinners.'

of sinners: literally 'of the sinners,' and St. Mark's meaning is therefore certainly 'of the Gentiles'; cf. Gal 2 15 'Jews . . . and not sinners of the Gentiles,' and 10 33 'they shall hand him over to the Gentiles (nations).' See note on 2 16.

43-52. The arrest of Jesus.

43. a multitude with swords and staves from the chief priests and the scribes and elders. The party sent by the Sanhedrin were no disciplined force, such as Mark's Roman readers would be accustomed to, but what they would regard as a 'rabble' armed with such weapons, 'knives and sticks,' as had come to their hands.

a token: Mark uses a word which was common in the LXX and later Greek in this technical sense of a concerted signal.

take him: rather perhaps *arrest him*, as 6 17, 12 12, 14 1.

45. Rabbi: and kissed him. Rabbi was the regular Aramaic term by which our Lord as a Teacher was addressed whether by His disciples or by other Jews (cf. 9 5, 10 51, 11 21), though it is normally translated into the Greek 'Teacher' or, as our English versions render it, 'Master': see note on 4 38.

The kiss, we are told, was the proper

method of saluting a Rabbi: and Judas 'kissed' Him. RVm gives 'kissed him much': and it is true that in classical Greek the simple verb means 'kiss,' the compound verb here used 'to kiss tenderly.' But in the New Testament 'to kiss' is never, save in [44] of this passage and its parallels, expressed by the simple verb but always by the compound verb. In the colloquial Greek of the 1st century many compound verbs were losing the special force of the preposition: cases in Mark of verbs compounded with this particular preposition which have come to mean no more than the simple verb would be: 6 [41] 'brake,' 10 [16] 'blessed.'

47. a certain one of them: Peter, according to Jn 18 [10]: see note on [19, 20].

49. that the scriptures might be fulfilled. Mark, writing for Gentiles, does not, like Matthew, call constant attention in his narrative to the correspondence of this or that event with prophecy: but he shows with no less clearness than the other Gospels how entirely the Old Testament Scriptures filled the background in our Lord's own mind.

51, 52. The **certain young man** has of late been generally identified with Mark himself; in which case the introduction of the episode, otherwise meaningless, would be at once accounted for—Mark wanted to bring in his own solitary point of contact with the Gospel story. The details given suggest that the lad had got out of bed in his night-clothes to follow our Lord and the Twelve to Gethsemane: it looks as if he belonged to the house where the Last Supper had been held, was perhaps aroused by the chanting of the final psalm, and then with a lad's adventurous curiosity had determined to see things to the end. If he was a son of the house, his father was well acquainted with our Lord (see on [14]), and so he may have heard talk about the danger to which the Prophet of Galilee was exposed, and the animus of the Jewish authorities against Him, after His dramatic cleansing of the Temple: a lad's enthusiasm may have reinforced a lad's curiosity, and when the Apostles all fled he still 'followed with him' (see also on [36]). When we remember further that Mark's mother Mary had a house in Jerusalem large enough for many Christians to meet in, and central enough for Peter to turn his steps to after his deliverance from prison (Ac 12 [12]), it must be admitted that, though the elements of this reconstruction are conjectural, they connect astonishingly well together.

they lay hold on him: Mark's common use of the impersonal plural, where later texts, followed by AV, supply a nominative by inserting 'the young men.'

53. to the high priest: here for the first time (apart from the indirect reference in [47]) in the singular. The office was properly a life office, and the use of the plural of living persons, the 'chief priests,' would probably have been inconceivable in earlier Jewish history. But in the two preceding centuries the high priest had been so often deposed by the interference of the secular power of the Seleucid kings, and even more commonly under Herodian and Roman rule, that there might be as many ex-high priests as there are ex-Lord Chancellors: and the language of the Gospels no doubt reflects current Jewish usage, whether we interpret 'chief priests' as meaning 'high priest and ex-high priests' or 'members of the high-priestly families': cf. Ac 4 [6]. The name of the high priest, Caiaphas, is not given in St. Mark: he held the office for the unusually long period of eighteen years, from A.D. 18 till his deposition in A.D. 36.

there came together with him all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes, that is to say, a meeting was held of the whole Sanhedrin, as [55] 'the chief priests and the whole council' further shows. But the contrast with 15 [1] perhaps suggests that this meeting was technically an informal one, and that a more formal meeting was held in the morning.

54. Peter followed afar off: while the young man in [51] had more boldly 'followed with Jesus' and was consequently arrested.

even within, into the court of the high priest. Mark, as we should expect, gives us the fullest data of St. Peter's movements, Luke the fewest; John only mentions Peter's original introduction into the 'court,' Matthew follows Mark more or less closely, but with some blurring of details: neither Matthew nor Luke helps us to interpret Mark. Mark then gives three notes: (*a*) Peter followed 'right within into the court' (how he got into it the 4th Gospel tells us, 18 [15, 16]) and sat there with the attendants by the fire; (*b*) he was 'down below in the court' ([66]), the hall where the Sanhedrin sat being presumably up a flight of steps from the courtyard; (*c*) he went out into the 'outer court' (AV and RV 'porch' wrongly, following Matthew: RVm 'fore-court'), [68], where he would be colder but safer.

warming himself in the light of the fire RV: the revisers do not explain how the 'light of the fire' would warm anyone.

What Mark might conceivably have meant, what Lk 22 56 apparently took him to mean, is that Peter was warming himself at the fire and therefore sitting in the fire-light, where he would most easily be detected. But while Luke tells Peter's story as a whole at this point, in order to preserve the sequence of the Trial of Jesus before both Jewish and Roman tribunals without interruption, Peter, narrating events annalistically, first brings the characters on the scene (53, 54), then tells what concerned his Master (55-65), and last of all what concerned himself (66-72), so that the mention of the firelight is too far removed from the mention of the maid's detection to be intended as the reason for it. The plain fact is that Greeks said 'the light' where we should say 'the fire': Liddell and Scott quote from Xenophon the noun with the very preposition used by Mark and render it 'by the fire.' AV *warmed himself at the fire* is therefore not only good sense but good Greek.

55-65. The Trial before the Sanhedrin. The chief priests, in order to compass the death of Jesus, had to satisfy the conditions of both Jewish and Roman law: they had to satisfy Jewish opinion (and even in the Sanhedrin there were currents of opinion not definitely unfavourable to our Lord, Mk 15 43 = Lk 23 51) by finding a capital charge under Jewish law established by such evidence as that law required, and they had also to persuade or intimidate a reluctant Roman governor to ratify their sentence by dangling before him some capital charge under Roman law. It says something for the sense of justice of at any rate a part of the Sanhedrin that for some time no decision could be reached: there were charges, and witnesses to support them, in plenty, but the merciful provision (Dt 19 15) that a single witness was inadequate for the legal proof of any charge, 'at the mouth of two witnesses or at the mouth of three witnesses shall the matter be established,' was not satisfied, for in no case did the two witnesses give, as St. Mark phrases it, 'equal,' that is coincident, testimony.

57-61*a*. What had probably been selected as more or less the official charge was that of disloyalty to the national worship (cf. Ac 6 13, 14): 'I will destroy this Temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands' (cf. 15 29). Our Lord had clearly foretold the destruction of the Temple, see 13 2, and if the Western text in that passage is right, He had gone on to foretell that 'in three days another would rise without hands' (cf. Jn 2 19). If He had been overheard on that occasion, both the accusation and the discrepancies in the evidence for it, substantially true though it was, would be explained. It is likely enough that, after the events of the Monday, spies and eavesdroppers had shadowed our Lord's public movements.

61*b*-63. To the first charge our Lord answered nothing: to the second He made instant answer. The first would have meant explanation and interpretation: the second went to the root of the matter, and He was as ready as the high priest to force matters to a crisis. Just as He avoided arrest before the advent of the feast, so He would not be condemned on any less issue than His claim to be Messiah and Son of God.

the Christ, the Son of the Blessed. The disciples had not felt the identification to be necessary: it needed a second stage of their education before the 'good news of Jesus as Messiah' was completed by their realization of the 'good news of Jesus as Son of God' (Mk 1 1): though in fact one line of Jewish Messianic thought (for instance, one of the later *strata* of the Book of Enoch) had made the identification. Caiaphas, as a Sadducee, would not himself have been much interested in Messianic theology: but any Pharisee who looked for a Messiah would have regarded a spurious claim to Messiahship, carried to the point of a claim to be Son of God, as in the last degree blasphemous. Now our Lord's teaching about Himself in the preceding days—e.g. the parable of the Husbandmen and the Only Son—may well have been matter of discussion among the leading Sanhedrists, and if He could be induced to repeat His assertion of a unique relationship with God, there need be no question of the sifting of evidence, no hesitation on the part of Pharisees to accept the lead of the chief priests.

62. ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven: cf. 8 38, 13 26, 27. The common elements in all three passages are (1) the Son of Man, and (2) the Coming: in the first and second the mention (3) of 'glory,' and (4) of the angels: in the second and third the mention of (5) 'clouds' and (6) 'power.' Of these (1), (2) and (5) come direct from Dan 7 13: 'clouds' are a symbol of the glory that surrounds the presence of God and veils it ordinarily from the eyes of man, as 9 7; Ac 1 9. As 'authority' in Dan 7 14 is 'given' to the Son of Man, so in Mark in 8 38 it is 'the glory of his

Father,' while in 13 [26] it attaches to the Son of Man. Similarly 'power,' like 'glory,' belongs in 13 [26] to the Son of Man, while here He is 'at the right hand of power.'

sitting at the right hand of power is the one new phrase in this passage. The right hand was with the Jews, as with us, the place of honour: Mk 12 [36] = Ps 110 [1] (the Psalm is clearly in our Lord's mind) shows, with many other New Testament passages, that 'the right hand of the Power' (the Greek here has the article) means 'the right hand of God': we may compare the *Gospel of Peter*, in which 'My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me' takes the place of the canonical 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' But this combined reference to the Session and Second Coming under the one verb 'Ye shall see' seemed strange enough to both Matthew and Luke to call for some alteration, since the Session attached to the Exaltation of Christ after His Passion: Matthew does not do more than insert 'from henceforth,' thus emphasizing the immediate Session, but leaving unexplained the 'ye shall see': Luke similarly adds 'from now,' but drops all reference to the Second Coming, 'from now shall the Son of Man be seated at the right hand of the Power of God.'

63. rent his clothes. A primitive expression of genuine personal grief had become an official convention under highly specialized rules. While the Law forbade the high priest to show any such sign of mourning for private bereavement (Lev 21 [10]), custom required him when acting judicially to make under certain circumstances something like a formal protest from the Bench. It is not surprising to learn that the rent had come to be of specified length and to apply to specified clothes, those in fact which could most easily be mended: not the outer garment, but as Mark correctly says, the vests—waistcoats we should perhaps now call them: the Emperor Augustus, we are told, being very susceptible to cold, wore five at a time—which were torn at the neck.

What further need have we of witnesses? The meticulous sifting of evidence, he means, need go on no longer: the accused has admitted a charge of blasphemy by uttering it: it only remains to take the votes of the judges.

64. blasphemy: see on 3 [28]. It was of course under the Law (Lev 24 [16]) a capital offence: Jn 19 [7] 'we have a law, and according to that law he ought to die, because he made himself Son of God.'

they all condemned him to be worthy of death RV, inadequately: it means *they all gave their votes against Him as guilty on a capital charge.* It was no mere platonic expression of opinion, but a definite sentence; one indeed which they had no legal power to carry out on their own authority. (Jn 18 [31]), and therefore St. Mark does not say here 'they condemned him to death' (10 [33]).

65. Parts of this verse are simple enough: some persons of importance (for they are contrasted with the 'officers' or, as we might say, with 'the police') began to vent their feelings by offering personal indignities such as spitting and hitting at Him, and the guard, encouraged by this example, struck Him with blows: but other parts present real difficulty. Why did they 'cover his face'? and what did they mean by saying 'Prophesy'? Luke clears matters up by writing 'they covered up his face, and asked him saying, Prophesy: who is it that smote thee?' But that can hardly be Mark's meaning: for (1) he does not connect the covering of the face directly with the 'Prophesy,' and (2), more important, he does not add the explanation of the demand to prophesy as 'Who is it that smote thee?' Therefore by 'Prophesy' he must apparently mean 'Give us more prophecies,' alluding to the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple and building it in three days' (14 [58], 15 [29]). Of the other phrase 'to cover his face,' the only tolerable explanation is that it was the Roman custom to cover the face of a condemned criminal (cf. Est 7 [8]). But we have not to do at this point with Roman officials at all: and in fact it is probable that the word 'cover' ought not to stand in the text, for it is omitted by three good authorities of different groups. Tentatively, then, we may suppose that the 'covering' has come into the main tradition of Mark's text from Lk 22 [64]: and if so the verse ceases to offer any obstacle to straightforward interpretation.

the officers received him RV: it is difficult to be patient with a process of revision which produces meaningless literalisms of this sort. Clearly Mark is using the verb in a colloquial (or, as we should say, slang) sense 'got him.' AV *did strike him* is quite near enough.

with blows of their hands RV: this again is senseless, for all blows are blows with the hands, and AV correctly reproduces the technical meaning of the word in later Greek, 'blows with the open hand' as opposed to 'blows with the fist.'

66-72. Peter's three denials. Matthew and Luke reproduce Mark, adding, as is

natural, no new historical data: John alone tells the story with fresh material. Mark on the three occasions has 'one of the maids,' 'the [same] maid,' 'the bystanders'; Matthew 'one maid,' 'another [maid],' 'the bystanders'; Luke 'a maid,' 'another man,' 'some other fellow'; John 'the maid that kept the door' (when the other disciple introduced Peter to the high priest's court), 'the bystanders,' 'a man-servant who was kinsman to Malchus.' Mark tells a simpler story than the rest in identifying the first and second questioners.

On the first occasion the maid 'looked hard' at Peter and said, 'You too were with the Nazarene, with Jesus' (John indicates that 'You too' meant 'You as well as the friend who is introducing you'): on the second she tells the bystanders 'he is one of them': on the third the bystanders say 'She is certainly right, for you are a Galilean' ('as your dialect shows,' adds Matthew, correctly interpreting their innuendo). The story is very simply and straightforwardly told: any hostile intent there may have been in the remarks made is implied and not expressed.

Peter's first answer (68) was a hurried and embarrassed one, so awkwardly expressed that both Matthew and Luke in different directions clarify it, and RV gives alternative renderings: on the whole it may best be translated 'I neither know him [compare 71], nor have I any idea what you can mean' (by saying I was with a man I do not know). Then, in order to avoid further notice, he retreated 'into the outer court'—and a 'cock crew,' perhaps soon after midnight: quite a long time may have elapsed between the first and the third denial. AV and RV both have here and in 72 'the cock' (against the Greek), as though Jerusalem could only produce one cock. But it is creditable to the revisers that they retain this first cock-crowing in their text against their favourite authorities: it is necessary to Mark's story (see on 30), it is quite alien to the type of addition made by scribes, and its absence from some very good MSS. only shows once more how powerful was the influence of the text of Matthew on Mark for omission as well as for insertion.

His second answer was merely a repetition of his 'denial'—his denial, that is, that he knew Jesus: his third was accompanied by anathema and oath; 'anathema' on himself if he was not telling the truth, and a solemn asseveration that he did not know 'this man of whom you speak.' 'And' a 'second time' a 'cock crew.' On the first occasion he had paid no conscious attention at the time: now he is suddenly reminded of the Lord's prophecy, and the revulsion of feeling is immediate: but of the form it took we can only say for certain that 'he wept,' for the accompanying participle is of very doubtful interpretation. 'When he thought thereon he wept' AV, RV, but both with marginal alternatives: AV 'he wept abundantly,' 'he began to weep,' RV 'he began to weep.' None of these renderings appears to do justice to the situation: a more definite action seems implied. Matthew and Luke were as much in the dark as ourselves about the meaning of the participial verb used by Mark—unless indeed the action suggested was too violent for their liking—for neither has anything corresponding to it, so that we may guess Mark, as elsewhere, to have used a colloquial non-literary expression. Dr. Field (one of the greatest of all the scholars who have commented on the Greek of the New Testament) argues for the meaning 'threw his cloak over his head.' If one may venture a suggestion, it would be 'cast himself on the ground and wept.'

XV. 1-47. Good Friday.

1-15. The Trial before Pilate.

1. held a consultation AV, RV. In view of the facts that (1) this occasion seems to be related to 14 53. 55, as the more formal to the less formal meeting, (2) that the Greek noun is technically used of the 'council' with which a Roman governor conferred (cf. Ac 25 12), it seems better to translate *formed themselves into an assembly*. It is possible that they could not technically do this before daybreak.

delivered him up as 10 33, 14 41: the same word as is rendered 'betrayed' in reference to Judas.

to Pilate. The name was too well known to Christians to need any introduction: 'was crucified under Pontius Pilate' (cf. 1 Tim 6 13 'was martyred under Pontius Pilate') was, it may be, already part of the Baptismal Creed at Rome. We need not suppose that Pilate was thus singled out because early Christian opinion wanted to transfer to him from the Jews or chief priests the responsibility for our Lord's death, though after all he was technically responsible; but his governorship supplied the date for the greatest fact of history. All the Gospels emphasize Pilate's reluctance to condemn—St. Mark, whose account is briefest and most 'objective,' less perhaps than the others: later Gospels reflect the growth of tension between Jews and Christians, till in the 4th Gospel and

the *Gospel of Peter* 'the Jews' as such are the enemies.

2. Art thou the King of the Jews? Comparing [12] 'whom ye call the King of the Jews,' it seems clear that the charge on which our Lord was arraigned before Pilate was primarily the political one (cf. Lk 23 [2]; Jn 19 [12]).

Thou sayest RV: but this is hardly intelligible in English, and AV *Thou sayest it* is right; as we should now put it, 'You say so.' Our Lord neither admitted nor denied the charge: not simply that He threw on Pilate the responsibility for the decision, but that He trusted to the whole circumstances of the position to convince Pilate that He and His few followers, unarmed and unresisting (apart from the impetuous act of a single disciple in Gethsemane), were not meditating any action in the political sphere.

3. And the chief priests accused him of many things or perhaps adverbially (a favourite usage of Mark) *accused him at length.* If we compare Mark's narrative with those of the other Gospels, we get the impression that Mark had not at his disposal at this point (neither Peter nor the women would here have been available as witnesses) any detailed account of the proceedings: either he depended on general information, or his authority was too far off to follow accusations, questions, answers, at all fully. It is more than likely that the chief priests (note once more that they, not the scribes and elders, are the accusers), finding that the first charge made little impression on Pilate, went on to indicate that the accused was guilty of capital crimes under the Jewish Law. It looks at least as if they must have accused Him of claiming to be the Messiah, a charge that would easily be connected with the claim to Kingship.

5. He answered nothing: as He had been silent before the high priest to all accusations save the final one, so now He is silent to all accusations save the one which Pilate, representing the civil power, had a right to hear and judge.

6-11. The episode of Barabbas. The evidence of the Gospels makes it clear that, just as any happy event in the annals of the State—a victory in war, or the conclusion of peace, or the accession of a monarch, or his birthday, or the like—is customarily marked by amnesties or remission of penalties, so great occasions in the life of Judaism (and those were the annual festivals) were similarly marked by an act of grace on the part of the civil power. At the Passover the governor, it seems, was always in Jerusalem: and doubtless the act of grace was personally and publicly announced. Only in Mark is the initiative placed with the crowd: and as it is difficult to see why the multitude should have introduced Barabbas's name at all at this moment, it seems better once more to suppose that Mark's information was defective, and that Matthew and John are right in ascribing it to Pilate, who would see in the customary act of grace a way out of his difficulty. But all accounts agree that the prisoner to be released was selected by the Jews themselves.

6. whom they asked of him: the Greek word which RV is intending to represent must certainly be rendered 'wanted to beg off.'

7. one called Barabbas, i.e. 'son of the father' (actually found as a name of Rabbis), unless we understand it as Bar-Rabba, 'son of the Teacher.' If the former is correct, even more interest would attach to the evidence for reading in St. Matthew (27 [17]) 'Jesus Barabbas or Jesus called the Christ.' In Mark 'the Jesus called Barabbas' would make excellent sense, but there is no extant evidence at all for it: we must be content to translate 'the man known as Barabbas.' That he was a notorious personage in Jerusalem seems to follow from the double use of the definite article 'a prisoner together with the [='his'] party of rioters, who in the [='their'] riot had gone as far as murder': he was liable to execution, in fact, on either of two counts.

8. the multitude went up (so RV rightly); they were below (as Peter was below in the high priest's courtyard, 14 [66]), and proceeded upstairs to present their demand to the governor in person: Mark's previous mention of Barabbas seems to imply that he supposed they had him already in their mind as the prisoner whose release they would ask.

9. the King of the Jews: as in [26], Pilate plays with savage irony on the charge brought by the chief priests against the humble prisoner before him. He recognized easily enough that it was no loyalty to Roman rule which had moved them, but envy of the influence of Jesus over the people in matters of religion. It is possible that he knew more than the Jewish authorities gave him credit for about the character of the new religious movement.

11. stirred up the multitude. It would seem therefore that 'the multitude' had not as yet taken up a definitely hostile attitude to Jesus, though it is

probable enough that the chief priests had organized a *claque* of their followers to support them in putting pressure on Pilate. It is of course a real problem to account for the discrepancy between the popular favour accorded to our Lord during the earlier days of the week (12 [37]) and the popular outcry against Him in this final scene. To some extent no doubt the change was more apparent than real: many who favoured Jesus would have been of the quieter type that avoided demonstrations in the street: but no doubt many also would have been shaken in such allegiance as they had so far been inclined to render Him by the charges of disloyalty to the national worship and of blasphemy against God.

12-15. The condemnation of Jesus to death. **What then shall I do?** RV: the reading represented by AV 'what then do you want me to do?' is more likely to be right, for it is a much more natural question for Pilate to put.

13. **Crucify.** That is, 'condemn Him to death': it is assumed that the death will be by crucifixion.

15. **wishing to content the multitude:** the Greek phrase is a Latinism for *satis facere*, and might be better rendered 'to satisfy.' Two other words in the immediate context, 'scourged' in this verse and 'prætorium' in the next, are actual transliterations from *flagellare* and *prætorium*—used no doubt by Mark because the Greek vocabulary at Rome was naturally replete with Roman technical terms.

when he had scourged him: not a gratuitously additional punishment, but a normal part of the sentence of crucifixion.

16-20*a*. Jesus in the hands of the soldiery. Like the menials after the condemnation by the Sanhedrin (14 [65]), so now the platoon of soldiers, to whom Jesus is committed after the scourging for the execution of the capital sentence, take their own part in mockery and maltreatment. They knew that He had been condemned as a pretender to Kingship: with the brutal humour of their kind they will give him a taste of kingly honours before He dies. He had been stripped for the scourging: and instead of restoring His clothes, they find a bright-coloured garment—perhaps a scarlet *sagum* or soldier's cloak—that suggested royal 'purple' or red (at a not much later date the rare red Egyptian granite called 'porphyry' was, for instance, reserved for the Emperor's own use); for a diadem they hastily wove a circlet from the nearest thorn-bush: other accounts add, probably enough, that a reed was put in His hand for sceptre (Matthew) and that He was seated on some sort of raised chair to receive homage (*Gospel of Peter*): the homage was expressed in a parody of the *Ave Cæsar*. If we wonder how they could find opportunity for their horse-play with a prisoner awaiting execution, it may be conjectured that Pilate's judgement may have named a definite hour for carrying out the sentence (see [25]), and that that left a certain interval to be filled up.

16. **within the court, which is the prætorium.** The prætorium was originally the general's headquarters in a camp, but it came to be used of the provincial governor's official residence. The normal residence of the procurator of Judæa was at Cæsarea, and he occupied there the palace or prætorium of Herod (the Great), cf. Ac 23 [35]: by analogy therefore it would be likely that when in Jerusalem he would occupy Herod's palace; and a striking parallel from Josephus's *Jewish War*, as to proceedings before Gessius Florus at that palace, is quoted in Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, 53. Moreover, there was a main street leading direct from the Temple area and council-chamber of the Sanhedrin to this palace of Herod, and the traditional site of Calvary is not far outside the neighbouring gate. Therefore modern archæologists are pretty well unanimous in identifying the *prætorium* with Herod's palace and not with the fortress of Antonia.

the whole band: RVm '*or* cohort.' The Greek word is in itself indeterminate: it is no doubt used by St. Luke in the Acts to represent the Latin *cohors* or 'battalion' (Ac 10 [1], 21 [31]; 27 [1]) with *chiliarch* (*ibid.*, 21 [31]) to represent its commander, the Latin *tribunus*. But it is in the last degree unlikely that a whole battalion of several hundred men was 'called together': and in fact the officer in charge is called in [39, 44, 45], *centurio*, the Latin word being transliterated, and a centurion was originally, as the word implies, the commander of 100 men, our 'captain'; not to say that Jn 19 [23] implies that not more than four men were left in actual charge at the Cross. But further the word here translated (by AV and RV text) 'band' is in Polybius (see Liddell and Scott) the regular rendering of the Latin *manipulus*, two centuries or one 'company.' Clearly, then, on all grounds 'cohort' is wrong: 'band' does well enough, being as ambiguous in the English as in the Greek: but if we desire further precision, we must say either 'company' or 'platoon.'

19, 20. **spit, mocked, crucify:** with

the scourged of [15] the Lord's sufferings at the hands of 'the Gentiles,' as foretold in 10 [34].

19. bowing their knees worshipped him. It is characteristic of Mark's style that he intercalates this final reference to the mockery of Jesus as King into his description of the physical ill-treatment which followed on the mockery: Matthew sorts out the elements of Mark's story into a more logical order, and naturally connects 'bowing the knees' with the salutation 'Hail, King.'

worshipped him. We must not suppose any thought of our Lord's claim to be Son of God: the word came in later theological Greek to be limited to the 'worship' due to God only, but it was the regular word in classical Greek for 'the Oriental fashion of prostrating oneself before kings' (L.S), and is so used here. Cf. 5 [6]; Jn 9 [38]; and often in Matthew.

20*b*-24. The road to Calvary: the preliminaries of the Crucifixion.

they lead him out: not, probably, 'out of the city' (though it was also this in fact), but 'out to execution.'

21. they compel: RVm '*Gr.* impress.' A Persian word, used of couriers 'impressed' into the royal service. Doubtless our Lord had started, according to the brutal custom of Roman law (and not only Roman: there are enough modern parallels), bearing His own cross: so the 4th Gospel expressly (Jn 19 [17]). But Mark had not been an eye-witness himself: only he did happen to be acquainted with the sons of a man, who as it happened was coming into the city as the procession left it, and was 'impressed' to carry the cross which Jesus was too exhausted to carry any longer Himself—if He could not carry it, a fellow-countryman must be found to do it; no soldier would so demean himself. It is very worthy of note that the evangelists make no attempt to heighten the picture of our Lord's sufferings: the Stations of the Cross may emphasize His giving way under the burden, the Gospels maintain a reverent reserve.

one . . . Simon of Cyrene . . . the father of Alexander and Rufus. 'Of Cyrene,' to distinguish him from the many other Simons: Cyrene, between Alexandria and Carthage, capital of the Pentapolis, in the district now called Tripoli, had one of the largest settlements of Jews, witness the references in Ac 2 [10], 6 [9], cf. 13 [1]. 'Alexander and Rufus': obviously named because they were known to Mark either at Jerusalem or Rome, and perhaps more probably at Rome, for then they would be known to his readers also; if the Rufus of Rom 16 [13] is our Rufus, he was living with his mother, and his father was presumably dead, so that the episode *may* have come to Mark's knowledge only through the sons.

22. Golgotha . . . the place of a skull. One would naturally suppose that the gruesome name was somehow connected with the gruesome use of the site, rather than with the configuration of the ground, though it is probable enough that it was a low rounded rise.

23. they offered him RV: *gave him* AV. Literally 'they were giving,' 'were for giving' (imperfect tense); and if Mark were a writer skilful in the Greek use of tenses, RV would no doubt be right. But Mark quite habitually uses the imperfect where he ought to have used another tense, and indeed he has it in [36], where the act was a single one, and our Lord did not refuse the drink offered. Therefore the simpler rendering of AV is better.

wine mingled with myrrh: that is, drugged, in order to deaden the nerves; a humane expedient, not without its analogies to-day. Mark records the kindly touches here and in [36] with the same simple 'objectiveness' as he records the brutality of police or soldiery. No one would call him, by our ordinary standards, a great historian: but he has one of a good historian's supremest qualities, he never suppresses evidence. He is about the last writer in the world to suspect of 'tendency.'

but he received it not: perhaps because it was wine, and He had vowed at the Supper not to taste wine again, 'that maketh glad the heart of man,' this side the Coming of the Kingdom: perhaps because it was drugged, and He would not cloud His vision; see Keble's fine poem in *The Christian Year* for Tuesday in Holy Week.

25-39. The Crucifixion.

25. And it was the third hour: Mark with his fondness for precision in numbers gives, what Matthew and Luke in reproducing him both omit, the time of day, 9 a.m. The hour may have been fixed in Pilate's sentence (see on [16-20*a*]).

and they crucified him. But Mark has mentioned that already in [24], and the parallels in Matthew 'sitting down they watched him there,' and in Luke 'the people stood beholding' make it almost certain that they read here in Mark not 'they crucified him,' but, with the Western authorities, 'they kept guard on him.'

26. the superscription of his accusation: that is, the *titulus* or inscription containing the name of the prisoner and an indication (apparently by an adjective in agreement with the name) of the crime for which he suffered: Swete aptly compares the Letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne in A.D. 177 (Eusebius, *H.E.*, v, 1, § 44) where one of the martyrs is marched into the amphitheatre with a board preceding him containing the notice 'This is Attalus the Christian.' In Papal Rome even in the 19th century printed notices were posted up before any execution, announcing the time, the place, the name and city of origin of the criminal, and the character of his crime. The parallels suggest that the fullest form of the inscription given us, that in Jn 19 [19], is probably the most correct—in Latin HIC EST IESVS NAZARENVS REX IVDÆORVM: Mark's information confined itself to the one element that could vary, the nature of the charge. Pilate repeats the charge brought against Jesus in [2], probably intending to suggest, 'A proper King for such a people.'

27. robbers of RV is better than 'thieves' of AV, but is still inadequate. As 14 [48] shows, the word implies some sort of desperado who might show fight: 'brigands' is more like it.

one on his right hand and one on his left; two Jews, with Jesus their King enthroned between them. Cf. 10 [37] of James and John.

29-32. The railing of the passers-by and of the chief priests. Some chance passers-by, going to or from the city, overheard by Mark's informant (it might have been Simon of Cyrene, who would not improbably have stayed, after his task was over, to see the end; it might have been one of the women, [40]), knew our Lord only from the report of His prophecy of the destruction of the Temple (14 [58]): obviously that charge was well calculated to arouse local animosity and had succeeded in doing so. His admirers had spread knowledge, we may well believe, of His wonderful cures in Galilee: if He had the power, let Him use it now. But there were other visitors at the Cross: no passers-by, but His principal enemies, who condescended to witness a Roman execution, perhaps to make sure that no 'untoward event' should baulk them even then of success; and taking up the jeers of the country folk (executions were doubtless too common to attract more than passing attention from any but those directly interested) they repeated the taunt at the miracle-worker. Here is His chance: not on obscure folk in the provinces, but on Himself: not in any hole and corner, but in the sight of credible witnesses like themselves: if He is what He claims to be, King-Messiah, that is surely not much to ask.

32. And they that were crucified with him reproached him. If we try to reconstruct the scene from St. Mark, the impression quite definitely emerges that the story is told as from a distance. The centurion is standing 'over against him' ([39]), presumably in order to keep back the crowd from too near approach. The passers-by would be on the road: if the chief priests took up their jeers, they too must have been among the spectators, and indeed it would have been below their dignity to approach the crosses of criminals too nearly. What happened was visible enough: of what was said by our Lord nothing was audible, save when He raised His voice to a 'loud cry' ([34, 37]), and even so the words used only carried on one occasion, when He ejaculated a well-known verse from the Psalms. Luke and John had more detailed knowledge, gathered from some who were nearer: Mark only knew that the Lord's fellow-sufferers appeared to join in the revilings.

33-38. The End. From noon till 3 p.m. **there was darkness over the whole land.** The word rendered 'land' can mean either the earth in the sense of the world, as 9 [3] 'no fuller on earth,' or 'land' in the sense of a large district, as Mt 4 [15] (Is 9 [1]) 'land of Zabulon and land of Nephthalim.' Taken by itself the phrase might perhaps suggest 'the whole world': and if it were question of an eclipse, that would be not out of place. But at full moon, when the moon is visible all night and not at all in the daytime, it cannot get between earth and sun, and an eclipse at midday is then impossible. Ancient exegesis (the *Gospel of Peter* and Origen are quoted by Swete) adopted the alternative rendering 'the whole land of Judæa,' and it is reasonable to follow them and give Mark the benefit of the doubt.

34. Eloi, Eloi, lama sabacthani? This reading cannot be right, for the form 'Eloi' cannot possibly have suggested 'Elijah.' We must therefore follow the best Western authorities, codex Bezæ (D) and *heli* of the Latin codex Bobiensis (*k*), which, with some support from the codex Vaticanus, give the Hebrew form, 'Eli, Eli, lama zaphthani?' Our Lord would naturally make His dying ejaculation from the Psalms in the sacred language itself, just as in similar circumstances a

Roman Catholic would naturally use Scriptural words according to the Vulgate, not in the vernacular.

My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Once more the same authorities, with two other Old Latin MSS., give (instead of 'forsaken') 'reproached'; and as no one could have thought of inventing this reading, it must certainly be accepted as what Mark wrote. The combined influence of Matthew and the LXX account quite sufficiently for the substitution in all other authorities of 'forsaken.'

Behold, he calleth Elijah. No Jew could possibly have confused the Name of God with any other name: the 'some that stood by' were therefore those who stood on guard or on duty at the Cross—not necessarily Roman legionaries, but at any rate non-Jewish provincials to whom the Hebrew Name was unfamiliar. But then the difficulty meets us, what should non-Jews know of Elijah? Now the Old Latin MS. (*k*), quoted just above, gives in [35] not *helian* but *helion*, that is to say, not Elijah but *Helios*, the Sun. [A similar confusion between the two Greek words occurs in the apocryphal *Vision of Paul*, § 20, where the Latin version has *solem* for *Helian*.] This change of one letter may have been pure accident: but whether due to accident or to faithful transcription, it has high claims to be regarded as reproducing the word of which these bystanders actually made use. Remember that it was at the ninth hour that Jesus cried aloud 'Eli, Eli,' and that that was also the moment when the darkness passed off and the sun emerged: what more likely than that non-Jewish Orientals, to many of whom *El* or *Eli* (*Heli*) was the name of their sun-god, hearing the cry and connecting it with the reappearance of the sun, should suppose that Jesus had called on the sun and had been answered by it, and that they, or one of them, should have gone on to say, 'Let us see whether after all Helios is coming to take Him down'?

36. The sense of this verse is clear: but its interpretation in detail is not easy. It is certain that the act was intended in pity: it seems to presuppose the 'I thirst' of Jn 19 [28], and if that word was not more than whispered, it may well not have reached the ears of Mark's informant at some distance: but the merciful action was visible, and the soldiers' comments would be loud and audible enough. So far so good: but what is meant by 'Let alone'? It may be supposed that there was some word or movement on the part of the others to discourage their companion's act of mercy, and that he answered, whether in jest or in earnest we cannot tell, 'Let be, let us keep life going in him in case after all the sun-god is coming to deliver him.' And certainly 'let be' is most naturally interpreted 'let me alone,' not 'let him alone,' which would have needed the word 'him' expressed in the Greek: cf. 14 [7] 'let her alone.'

37. And Jesus uttered a loud voice, RV, with more regard to sense than to English. Our Lord spoke loud enough for Mark's informant to hear that He was speaking but not apparently to hear what He said. Lk 23 [46], Jn 19 [30], fill up the gap in different ways: Luke certainly intends to identify the 'loud utterance' of Mark with his own 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'

38. the veil of the temple was rent in twain: the veil, that is, which separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies (Ex 26 [33]). Mark, followed by Matthew, connects the rending of the veil with the moment of Jesus' death, but he gives us no clue for deciding whether he attached any other significance to it than that of a mysterious and presumably supernatural concomitant, like the great darkness, of the Passion. Mystically by the Sacrifice and Death of Christ we have gained free access to God, and all that barred the way is brushed aside: and it was natural for Christian exegesis to interpret in this sense the synchronism of Jesus' death with the rent veil of the Temple. The Epistle to the Hebrews at two points (6 [19, 20], 10 [19, 20]) emphasizes the opening up for us of a way 'within the veil' by the passing of Jesus on our behalf into the Holy of Holies, a High Priest offering the sacrifice of His own Blood: but in neither passage is there any definite reference to a rending of the veil. It is possible that the episode of the rent veil of the Temple, as an element of very early Christian tradition, suggested to the author of the Epistle his allusions to the veil: it is possible that the conditions were just the reverse, and that early Christian teaching on the sacramental meaning of Jesus' death in relation to the supersession of the Temple worship had spoken of it as a symbolical rending of the veil, and that the symbolism had then been crystallized into concrete fact. This would imply that some sort of doctrine of Atonement was brought into connexion with Jesus' death at a very early period in the history of the Christian community; for the rending is certainly treated as fact by St. Mark, and time must be allowed

for the transition to a concrete interpretation of the symbolical language.

39. the centurion, which stood over against him: see notes on 16, 32.

he so gave up the ghost RV; literally 'expired.' With this reading it is not quite easy to see how a reason is supplied for the profound impression made on the centurion: we should have to expand the word 'so' to cover the whole of Jesus' attitude and of the accompanying circumstances, and that may possibly be the true interpretation: but the reading of AV and RVm, 'he so cried out and gave up the ghost,' gives a more natural sense. It would imply that our Lord had uttered words just before His death: and whether or no the centurion could understand them, he could tell that they were uttered in a tone of confidence, as of one who was 'master of His fate' and triumphant over it. But may we not perhaps, with the help of Lk 23 46, go a step farther? Suppose the centurion had either understood the words or (more probably) asked some bystander to interpret them, and learnt that Jesus was commending His spirit into the hands of a 'Father,' we can better understand —what otherwise is not obvious—the point of his comment that this man was in truth a 'son' of God.

the Son of God AV, RV: RVm *a son of God*, rightly, for there is no definite article: contrast 3 11, 14 61.

40, 41. The holy women are mentioned here, perhaps as informants or part informants of the evangelist for the preceding narrative, in any case as introducing their part in the story of the Burial and Empty Tomb. They were all Galileans, who had been among the 'followers' of Jesus 'when he was in Galilee,' their special function there, as women, having been to 'minister' to His bodily needs. The emphasis on their work in Galilee suggests that they had not been in His company after He left Galilee: but they had come up to the feast, so as to be with Him again, and they were now 'beholding from afar,' on the further outskirts of the spectators.

Mary the Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less [RVm *Gr.*, 'the little'] **and of Joses, and Salome.** All of these women are here named for the first time in Mark: Lk 8 2 is the only place in the Gospels where any of the women followers are named earlier, and that enumeration includes of these three only 'Mary that was called Magdalene, from whom seven devils had gone out.' Obviously from that fact, as well as from the order of names, here and 47, in Mark, and from Jn 20 1-18, she was the leading spirit among them. 'Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses' is only named in St. Mark, in the dependent passages of Matthew and Luke, and also (if she was 'Mary [wife] of Clopas') in Jn 19 25: Mt 27 56 simply copies Mark, and in 27 61, 28 1 calls her 'the other Mary,' which suggests that she was only a name to him; Lk 24 11 calls her 'Mary of James.' We may assume that to the Christian community, in this case no doubt of Jerusalem, Mary was distinguished from other Maries as the mother of two well-known sons, James the little (whether little in stature or in age: so called to distinguish him from other homonyms) and Joses: but in 47 James is omitted and the mother is 'Mary of Joses,' probably because Joses, though the younger, was the better-known son. As she is thus the least known otherwise of the three holy women, it is more than likely that she is specially named because she was St. Mark's special informant. Salome is named in no other Gospel: but Matthew has instead 'the mother of Zebedee's children,' and John 'his mother's sister.' If we may combine these several data, Salome was sister to the Blessed Virgin, and mother of James and John, who were therefore first cousins to our Lord: a result not unlikely in itself, though their father appears to have been in a better social position (Mk 1 20) than the parents of Jesus.

42-46. The Burial. Jesus died, it would seem, soon after 3 o'clock in the afternoon: the day was Friday, or, as it was called by Greek-speaking Jews and is still called by Greek-speaking Christians, 'Preparation,' that is (as Mark goes on to explain for his Gentile readers) preparation for the Saturday or Sabbath. On the Sabbath no work could be done, and therefore any burial must take place before sunset of Friday, and time did not allow of any elaborate rites. Whatever was done had to be done hurriedly. Even so the introductory phrase 'as it was now late' must be construed very loosely: in 1 32 it is used of the time at and following sunset, and the implication of 14 16 is almost as clear: Luke therefore (23 54) transfers the note of time to the completion of the Burial.

But there was another reason for haste. The Jewish law (Dt 21 22, 23) made specific provision for the burial of crucified criminals before sunset on the day of their death: and though our Lord's death was no doubt unexpectedly speedy, the Jewish

authorities would soon learn of it, and would therefore be likely to claim the body of Jesus for immediate disposal. On every ground, therefore, those who wished to secure a reverent burial would have to act at once.

43. Joseph of Arimathæa, a counsellor of honourable estate. Joseph is described, in distinction again from other Josephs, as 'from Arimathæa,' variously identified with a village on the north of Jerusalem and a village near Lydda in the south-west of Judæa: he was 'a counsellor,' that is, a member of the Sanhedrin, and 'of honourable estate'—the word used properly means 'a gentleman,' like the Latin *honestus*, but in vulgar use (against which purists in Greek protested energetically) it came to mean 'rich,' and Matthew, no doubt rightly interpreting Mark, paraphrases it in that sense. It is employed to account for the prodigal outlay of Joseph.

who also himself was looking for the Kingdom of God, just as in Lk 2 [25, 38] Symeon was 'looking for the consolation of Israel,' and Anna was talking about the Child to all that were 'looking for the redemption of Jerusalem.' Joseph was not a regular follower or open disciple of Jesus, and was apparently not known by sight to the Galilean women: but he had been powerfully attracted by Jesus—like Cleopas and his friend in Lk 24 [21], he had doubtless 'hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel'—and though too timid it would seem to record his sentence in favour of Jesus in the Sanhedrin (14 [64]), he resolved at least to secure Him honourable burial and an undisturbed tomb.

he boldly went in unto Pilate, a rendering which underrates the merit of the deed: it means that he 'screwed up his courage,' as we should say, a timid man atoning for his timidity by taking a course from which anyone might have shrunk: to ask for the body of one who had died a criminal's death was doubtless as unusual then as it would be now. But he was met half-way: Pilate was more than willing to affront the Jewish authorities who had forced him in the morning to act against his sense of justice, and only waited to satisfy himself, by sending for the officer in charge, that the sentence had been really carried out and that it was no scheme on Joseph's part to remove a still living prisoner.

45. he granted the corpse. The verb implies that it was a special act of grace: the noun, only used of the Lord's body here and perhaps in [43], and only by Mark, reflects presumably the language in which the request was made and granted. Note once more the straightforward faithfulness of Mark's record in the use of a word which it might have been natural to avoid.

46. he bought a linen cloth. 'Bought,' both to save time, and to secure that the linen shroud should be clean and unused.

wound him in the linen cloth. For Mark's 'wound' or 'swathed,' which we must suppose was unusual or colloquial or both, the other two Synoptists substitute an equivalent verb 'wrapped.' The cases where we cannot at once account for agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark are extraordinarily few, so few that they may easily be reckoned accidental. With more knowledge we might be able to explain their common rejection of Mark's word and common substitution of another—perhaps the technically correct—word.

in a tomb which had been hewn out of the rock. Mark's knowledge at this point becomes more jejune than that of any of the other three Gospels. That the tomb was a rock-tomb would have been visible to the women: the earlier details in Mark's account may have come from some one of Joseph's servants in attendance on him.

47-XVI. 8. Easter Eve and Easter Day.

47, XVI. 1. And Mary Magdalene and Mary the 'mother' of Joses beheld where he was laid. And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the 'mother' of James, and Salome, bought spices that they might come and anoint him. This repetition of names in successive verses is odd in itself: and when we compare the dependent narratives we are puzzled by the absence of Salome from both of them. Mt 27 [61], 28 [1], have only 'Mary the Magdalene and the other Mary,' Lk 24 [10] adds Joanna on his own account to 'the Magdalene Mary . . . and Mary the *mother* of James': the two obviously depend (apart from Luke's Joanna) on Mark, so why should neither have included Salome, if Mark had at this point named her? Therefore when we find that the two Western witnesses, whose evidence we found so valuable in 15 [34], agree on omitting altogether the mention of names in Mk 16 [1], we shall be inclined to accept their evidence and to read: 'And Mary the Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid, and when the Sabbath was past bought spices to come and anoint him.'

Once more it is the text of Matthew which has played havoc with the tradition of the text of Mark: Matthew, having copied Mk 15 [47] in its proper place at 27 [61], interpolates in 27 [62-66] the story of the sealing of the tomb, returns at 28 [1] to follow Mark, and therefore *repeats the names of the women.*

The two Maries then watched from a distance the action of Joseph. They did not know him, and did not venture to approach and take part: they were near enough to mark the exact site of the tomb, but could not see anything that was done inside it, and had no assurance that there had been any proper fulfilment of the duties which it was the natural part of women to carry out, and they were not to be baulked of all that tender devotion inspired of care for the Body of their Lord. It was close on sunset, and the Sabbath precluded their doing more for another twenty-four hours. On Saturday evening, after the Sabbath ended, they made their purchases and preparations: early on Sunday morning they took their way to the tomb.

1. come and anoint him: rather *go and anoint him.* On the absence of any separate Greek word for 'go' in our sense, see note on 14 [21].

2. very early . . . when the sun was risen. For Mark's curiously loose use of language in describing hours near sunrise and sunset, see on 15 [42]: the other accounts all make it clear that 'very early' is the element in Mark's language here which is exact; it is tempting indeed to suppose that the Greek word 'not yet' has dropped out of the text before the word 'risen.'

3, 4. As they approach the tomb, it occurs to them, as perhaps it had not done before, that they might have difficulty in moving aside the stone at the entrance: perhaps they had not seen, at their distance and in the twilight of Friday evening, how large the stone was: AV rightly prints the greater part of [4] as a parenthesis.

4. and looking up they see that the stone is rolled back. The tense of 'rolled back' is perfect, and the idiomatic equivalent in English is 'had been rolled back.' AV has 'rolled away,' as in [3]: RV tries to represent the slight change in the Greek, between the verbs used in [3] and [4], by 'rolled back,' but that is the same thing as 'rolled away,' and we should probably be right in crediting St. Mark with meaning a real change in the sense. The *Gospel of Peter* too says that the stone had 'given way a little,' and possibly that is Mark's meaning.

5. a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe. A 'young man' as in 14 [51]: but Mark is here describing a supernatural visitant in terms of a human figure, just as Old Testament writers do: compare the 'three men' of Gen 18, and the 'two young men . . . splendid in their apparel' of 2 Mac 3 [26], while Mark's exact word is used of the angel Raphael in Tobit 5 [5-9] (according to the better text, that of the codex Sinaiticus).

on the right side: Mark perhaps means to note that the Lord's Body had in fact lain on the right side of the tomb, the place of honour (see on 14 [62]).

arrayed in a white robe: for the 'robe' see on 12 [38]. The full phrase in Rev 7 [9]: here obviously to emphasize the supernatural character of the visitant, as in 2 Mac 3 [26].

6. ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, which hath been crucified RV, a rendering which is not good English and does not give the effect of the Greek: we must render either *Jesus the Nazarene the Crucified* or with AV *Jesus of Nazareth which was crucified.* It is doubtful whether the clause is, as Matthew takes it (and so AV, RV), a statement, or, as Luke takes it, a question. Ancient MSS. are not punctuated, and Mark makes very sparing use of the particles by which Greek writers indicate their meaning apart from punctuation. We have therefore to consult Marcan usage: and Mark is fond of heaping up a succession of brief clauses as here (cf. 1 [24], 2 [7], 14 [64]), and his custom appears to be to combine both statements and interrogations. On analogy, then, as this is the only clause in a group of five which can possibly be interrogatory, it seems probable that Luke is right. For the word Nazarene see note on 1 [24].

7. tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you RV. This punctuation overlooks the fact that what our Lord had said was not that they should see Him in Galilee, but that He was going before them after His resurrection into Galilee (14 [28]). Punctuate therefore 'He goeth before you into Galilee (there shall ye see him), as he said unto you.'

8. Neither said they anything to any man, for they were afraid. Here ends the Gospel according to St. Mark as it has been preserved to us; not indeed as he wrote it, or at any rate intended to write it, for it seems incredible that anyone could have ended a book with the words 'for they were afraid,' or that any evangelist should have recorded the fact

of the Resurrection, as implied by the Empty Tomb, without going on to record any of the appearances that guaranteed the Resurrection. For further discussion of the Lost Ending and its probable contents, see the appended note.

APPENDED NOTE: THE ENDING OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

THE conclusion of the Gospel according to St. Mark is found in three different forms in ancient authorities: (1) As ending with the words 'they were afraid' at 16^{8}; (2) as continuing, after the words 'they were afraid,' with a summary account of some appearances of Christ, of the unbelief of the Apostles, and of Christ's appearance to them, His rebuke of their unbelief, and His charge to preach the Gospel everywhere—this ending is familiar to us as 16^{9-20} of AV, and is commonly entitled 'The Last Twelve Verses,' or the Longer Ending; (3) as continuing, after 'they were afraid,' with a few brief words rounding off the narrative: 'But all the things that had been enjoined on them they announced briefly to Peter and his companions. And afterwards Jesus himself too appeared and sent forth through them from the east right to the west the holy and uncorrupt preaching of eternal salvation. Amen'—this is known as the Shorter Ending.

(1) *The Gospel closes at* 'they were afraid' in the Greek codex Sinaiticus (ℵ), and in the Old Syriac as given in the lately discovered Sinai MS. So nine out of the ten oldest known Armenian Gospel MSS. So also apparently the original form of the oldest of the Old Latin MSS., the codex Vercellensis (*a*), though it might have had (3), the Shorter Ending. Further, it would seem that Eusebius's analysis of the Gospels into sections, which we know as the Eusebian Canons, ended Mark with a section corresponding to 16^{8}. And the codex Vaticanus (B) also closes at 16^{8}, though a whole column is then left blank as though the scribe supposed something to be missing.

(2) *The Longer Ending* is found without any sign of doubt as to its genuineness in all later authorities, Greek and Latin, and among earlier Greek MSS. in the codex Alexandrinus (A), in the Washington MS. (W, but with additional matter between 14 and 15, see below), and in codex Bezæ (D). Quotations of matter from the Longer Ending are found in Irenæus, and perhaps in one of the votes given in Cyprian's Carthaginian Council of A.D. 256.

(3) *The Shorter Ending* is found as the close of the Gospel in the codex Bobiensis (*k*); while in four Greek uncial MSS., mostly of the 8th century, including L (codex Paris, 62) and Ψ (of the Laura on Mt. Athos, 172), the Gospel ends at 16^{8}, but is immediately followed by the Shorter Ending, and that again by the Longer Ending, both Shorter and Longer Endings being preceded by a heading to the effect that 'this also is found in some MSS.'

Now the Shorter Ending (3) may be dismissed at once. Obviously it was tacked on to a text that ended 'for they were afraid,' in order to provide something more suitable for the closing words of a Gospel. It has no claim to be authentic, though its place in *k* is sufficient to guarantee its early date. It may well have been put together at Rome some time in the 2nd century A.D. But since no one would have added it to, or substituted it for, the Longer Ending, *all evidence for the Shorter Ending is evidence against the Longer Ending*: (1) and (3) must be taken together against (2). That (3) is of Western origin is suggested alike by its presence in *k* and by the reference to 'the West.'

What then are the claims of (2) to be considered the genuine ending of the Gospel? On the side of external evidence, it can claim very early attestation in Gaul: Irenæus, the codex Bezæ, and the Old Latin MS. *ff*. But in every other part of the Christian world the earliest attestation is against it: Italy (codex *a*), Africa (codex *k*), Egypt (codex B), Palestine (codex ℵ), Syria (the Old Syriac). No early father but Irenæus cites it, and the silence of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen can hardly be accidental. It was indeed adopted into the Antiochene recension of the New Testament by Lucian about A.D. 300, and so passed into the official text of Constantinople: but Lucian's younger contemporary, Eusebius of Cæsarea, tells us in his *Quæstiones ad Marinum* that the accurate copies ended 'for they were afraid,' while the additional matter was found only in comparatively few copies.

But the external evidence against (2) can be taken much further back, since it is practically certain that neither Matthew nor Luke found it in their copies of Mark. That *both* Matthew and Luke cannot have used it follows from the fact that, while their narratives run more or less parallel to one another as far as Mk 16^{8} = Mt 28^{8} = Lk 24^{6}, from that point onwards they diverge, never to come into contact again. For Matthew we note further: (i) that after 28^{8} his

account, which down to that point has many personal touches, such as the names of the holy women, becomes more vague and general; (ii) that the silence of the women is suppressed and exactly the opposite is stated; (iii) that there is no trace of anything that corresponds to the matter of Mk 16 [9-20]. For Luke we have again the suppression of the silence of the women, and, still more important, the absence of any mention of Galilee in his whole Resurrection narrative: Mk 16 [7] is watered down to the mere statement 'remember how he spake to you while yet in Galilee.' It is therefore difficult to avoid the conclusion that both Matthew and Luke found themselves for some compelling reason led to construct the remainder of their Resurrection narrative on lines of their own: and what reason so compelling as the failure of an authority on which they had so far leant?

And if we turn from external to internal evidence, the result is the same.

(1) The style of 16 [9-20] is totally different from the style of St. Mark. Nothing, for instance, could be less like Mark's detailed telling of a story than the summary accounts of the two appearances in 16 [9, 11].

(2) There is no connexion, indeed there is clear inconsistency, in the junction of 16 [9, 10] with 16 [8]. 16 [9] commences, as it were, the Resurrection narrative from the beginning with no regard to what has preceded: Mary Magdalene is mentioned alone, and nothing is said of any companion; and she 'went and told' the disciples, without anything being said of any previous silence or reluctance.

(3) In contrast with 16 [7], there is no mention at all in 16 [9-20] either of Galilee or of Peter, so that one may put it generally that the Last Twelve Verses are constructed as an independent summary with total neglect of the contents of 16 [1-8].

(4) Not only is 16 [9-20], to all appearance, an independent summary, but it has all the look of a *cento* made up from known documents, with a special 'tendency' of the writer in his emphasis on the unbelief of the Apostles. Matthew, Luke, John, Acts, possibly the Pauline Epistles (with 16 [15] cf. Col 1 [23]), possibly the Gospel of Peter (with 16 [10] 'as they mourned and wept' cf. *Gospel of Peter* 'we sat mourning and weeping': but here the indebtedness may perhaps be the other way), have each been laid under contribution.

It is as certain then as anything can be in the domain of criticism that the Longer Ending did not come from the pen of the evangelist Mark: the only problem about it that is at all doubtful is whether (like the Shorter Ending) it was written simply to fill up an obvious gap, or whether it is an excerpt from another document. In favour of the latter view there are—besides its want of connexion with the genuine Marcan matter of 16 [1-8]—two bits of evidence worth mentioning.

(*a*) In the text of the Longer Ending, as given in codex W, there is, between 16 [14] and 16 [15], a considerable insertion (part of which is also guaranteed in a citation by St. Jerome, *Dial. c. Pelagianos*, ii, 15): 'And they made defence, saying that this world of sin and unbelief is under Satan, who through the unclean spirits suffers not men to apprehend the true power of God: therefore reveal thy righteousness at once. They so said to Christ: and the Lord addressed them (saying) that Fulfilled is the limit of the years of the authority of Satan, but there approach other terrible things even on those for whose sins I was given up to death, that they may return to the truth and may sin no more, that they may inherit the glory of righteousness which is in heaven, spiritual and incorruptible.' This insertion appears to be genuine, for it certainly improves the connexion both with the preceding verse ([14]) and with the following verse ([15]). Either then it had at an early stage of the transmission fallen out from all other witnesses that give the Longer Ending, or else it was added to the text by recourse to the document of which the Longer Ending was an excerpt.

(*b*) As was noted above, all the older Armenian MSS. with one exception end the Gospel at 16 [8]. The exceptional case is a MS. in the patriarchal library at Etchmiadzin, written in 989, which adds the Longer Ending under the heading *Of the presbyter Ariston:* and it is suggested that this heading gives us the clue to the origin of the fragment, since the elder or presbyter Aristion is named in Eusebius's *Church History* (iii, 39), on the testimony of Papias, as a direct disciple of the Lord and one of his (Papias's) principal authorities for 'traditions' and 'narratives of the Lord's words.' But too much stress must not be laid on so hypothetical an identification.

We conclude that it is *certain* that the Longer Ending is no part of the Gospel; *probable* that it was borrowed from a separate, already existing, document at a very early date (before A.D. 150), to form some sort of ending to St. Mark on the lines of the other Gospels; and *possible* (more cannot be said) that this document goes back to the presbyter or elder Aristion.

The ground then is so far cleared. Neither the Longer nor the Shorter Ending need be taken any further into account. We are left with 16 [1-8] as the only Resurrection narrative that we have from the pen of St. Mark. Yet it is incredible that any Gospel should have come to an intentional close on the words 'for they were afraid.' Even if with E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, i (1921), p. 18, we were to suppose that the Resurrection itself was to St. Mark a mystery not to be set down in words, the close need not have been, and would not have been, so abrupt. Something therefore is wanting, though we cannot tell whether the defect is due to unforeseen circumstances which prevented the lost ending from being ever written at all, or (as seems much more likely) to the accidental destruction of the last bit of the papyrus roll which once contained it.

But whether the end was ever written down or not, the extant portion of the Gospel gives us some clues as to matter that would have been contained in it if we had it before us. There is indeed nothing to suggest that a really large proportion (Professor Burkitt suggests a third of the whole) of the Gospel has been lost. Mark nowhere indicates that he meant to include a history of the first beginnings of the Church: and if the hypothesis of accidental loss is right, then the smaller the loss, the more probable the accident. We are on surer ground if we examine the Gospel as it stands.

Mk 1 [1]: **The good news of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God.** The first half of the Gospel leads up to the confession of Jesus the Messiah in 8 [29]: we expect the second half of the Gospel to lead up to the confession of Jesus the Son of God, as the completed expression, after the Resurrection, of the Apostles' or Peter's faith in Him.

Mk 16 [7]: **tell his disciples and Peter . . . there shall ye see him.** We expect an appearance to the Apostles and something special about Peter.

Mk 16 [7]: **he goes before you into Galilee.** There must have been something about Galilee.

Mk 16 [8]: **neither said they anything to any man.** We must have heard how their silence was overcome, or at any rate how the knowledge that Christ had risen reached the Apostles.

Combining these data, we may offer the following as probable conjectures:

(i) The reluctance of the women to say anything was overcome by an appearance of our Lord to one or more of them. For Matthew, Luke, John all agree that the women (or one of them) did convey the news to the Apostles: and Matthew and John agree that the first appearance was to the women or to one of them. This agreement is more like tradition than invention: and the silence of St. Paul in 1 Cor 15 [5] is amply accounted for when we remember that the point of his list is to accumulate evidence specially trustworthy as to either quality (the leaders: Peter, James, Paul) or quantity (the eleven, all the Apostles, the five hundred).

(ii) An appearance to the Eleven (Mt 28 [16, 17]; Lk 24 [36]; Jn 20 [19]; 1 Cor 15 [5]), and a commission to them to preach the Gospel everywhere (Mt 28 [19]; Lk 24 [47]; Jn 20 [21]; [Mk 16 [15]]): an appearance perhaps more probably to be set in Jerusalem (Luke, John) than in Galilee (Matthew). But some appearance there must, it would seem, have been in Galilee; and if the appearance to the Eleven was in Jerusalem, then what Mark recorded as taking place in Galilee will presumably have been the appearance 'to above five hundred brethren at once' of 1 Cor 15 [6].

(iii) An appearance to Peter alone, it would seem, before that to the Apostles (1 Cor 15 [5]; Lk 24 [34]). With this appearance were perhaps connected a confession by Peter of the Divine Sonship (Mk 1 [1], see above; Mt 16 [16]; and cf. Jn 20 [28]), a restoration after his denial (cf. Jn 21 [15-17]), and a special commission to the chief Apostle (cf. Mt 16 [17]; Lk 22 [32]; Jn 21 [15-17]).

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW

By P. P. Levertoff and H. L. Goudge

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

By H. L. Goudge

Date.—The Gospel according to St. Matthew is probably the latest of the Synoptic Gospels. It must be later than Mark, for Mark is the chief authority employed; and the date of Mark is unlikely to be earlier than A.D. 65. It must be earlier than Ignatius, for Ignatius quotes Mt 3 [15] (*ad Smyrn.*, 1), and almost certainly than the Didache (cf. Streeter, *The*

Four Gospels, 507 ff.). But the date of the Didache is itself too uncertain for us to derive from it much help in fixing the date of Matthew. Thus we are left with little but the internal evidence of the Gospel itself; and even this, as we shall see, is indecisive.

Author.—But what do we mean by 'according to St. Matthew'? Not necessarily that St. Matthew was the author of the book; though, when the title was first added to the Gospel, he was probably believed to be this. Nowhere do we find the marks of the eyewitness as we find them in Mark and John. For the narrative the writer is generally dependent upon Mark, and seems nowhere to introduce reminiscences of his own; while the incidents which he adds do not suggest apostolic authorship. But we can hardly suppose that St. Matthew had nothing to do with the Gospel; had the title been a pure invention, we should have found the name of a more prominent Apostle. It is here that Papias (Eus., *H.E.*, iii, 39) comes to our aid. 'Matthew,' he tells us, 'composed the Logia in Hebrew, and every one interpreted them as he was able.' Now the word 'Logia,' often translated 'oracles,' suggests discourses rather than incidents; and much is explained if we suppose that it is to St. Matthew that we chiefly owe that lost Christian document, to which modern scholars refer as Q (cf. *The Synoptic Problem*, 38 ff.). If Papias is referring to the Gospel as we have it to-day, he is certainly in error. Matthew is based on the Greek Gospel of Mark, and a Greek Q is presupposed by the strange Greek forms reproduced alike by Matthew and Luke (cf. Mt 11 [11]=Lk 7 [28]; Mt 8 [8]=Lk 7 [6, 7]). What St. Matthew probably wrote was a Hebrew or Aramaic account of the Lord's teaching similar to that part of the Book of Isaiah which is concerned with Isaiah of Jerusalem. It consisted for the most part of discourses, and said nothing of the Passion or Resurrection. But it related our Lord's Call and Temptation; and it gave short narratives, like those of Is 7 and 8, when they were necessary for the understanding of His words (cf. e.g. Mt 11 [2-6]). Matthew was probably the oldest of the Apostles; for publicans were generally men with a past (Lk 15 [14, 15]), and the custom-house at Capernaum was a very important one. Probably also he was of all the Apostles the most accustomed to the use of the pen; and he may, like Euclides in the *Theætetus* of Plato (143), have written down many of his Master's words during that Master's lifetime. If, as is almost certain, it is the Gospel according to St. Matthew which gives us more fully than any other the contents of Q, it is Q which is the most important element in it, and there was but little error in attaching to it the Apostle's name. But the actual author is a compiler rather than an original authority; and he does not claim, as even St. Luke does, to be more than this.

Purpose.—What then do we know, not of St. Matthew, but of that simple member of the Palestinian Church, to whom we shall henceforth refer as 'Matthew'? Like St. Paul, he was a Jew to the core; and it was for his own people, the faithful remnant of Israel, that he wrote. The sky was dark over their heads. Jerusalem had probably already fallen; and, though in its fall the great Christ had come in judgement (10 [23], 26 [64]), and for those who had eyes to see the carnal Israel was no longer the sphere of the divine Kingdom (21 [43]), His final coming still tarried. It was a time of fiery temptation for them. Iniquity was abounding; the love of the many was waxing cold (24 [12]); and their unbelieving fellow-countrymen, stunned for the moment by the fall of Jerusalem, were re-establishing their national life and calling the Christians back to the Pharisaic fold. Matthew writes, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, to say 'Stand fast, that no one take thy crown.' His Gospel is, as Dr. Bartlet says, 'an appeal to wavering of all sorts to trust the King, whose reign is of heaven and depends on the action of God, not of men: and not to become involved in the current of the false national ideal.' The Lord's chariot-wheels may tarry; but the Lord Himself is all that Christians have believed Him to be. He is the Messiah of Israel's hope, as the fulfilment of the prophecies proves. He is the true seed of Abraham, the last Redeemer as Moses was the first, the true Son of David, the final Judge of His people and of the world. It is His Church, not the old carnal Israel, which is the true Israel of God and the heir to its blessings; His law, not the old law which He has superseded, which is the true guide of His people's life; His Name, which must be openly confessed by all who will have to meet His judgement. These trials which His people have to meet are but the trials that He foretold; these ceaseless controversies with the Pharisees are His own controversies living on though He is no longer seen, and the old conflict His people must still sustain. Nay, more; they must not stand fast only; they must evangelize. All authority is His in heaven and in earth;

and, as His representatives do His work, they will find Him with them to the end.

Value of the Gospel.—Now it is in this Jewish outlook that both the unity and the value of this Gospel largely lie. Matthew enables us to see, as Mark and Luke do not, the real background of the Lord's earthly life, and the continuity of the old Israel with the Catholic Church into which its faithful remnant grew. Mark and Luke wrote for us Gentile Christians; and, though they cannot tell us of the Lord's ministry without showing us something of the *milieu* in which it was exercised, they put aside what they do not think that we require, or fear that we might misunderstand (cf. Mt 15 [24-26] = Mk 7 [27]). What have we to do with offerings at the Temple (5 [23, 24]) or with the bad language of quarrelling Jews (5 [22])? Indeed, what have we to do with the Law at all, or the relation of our Lord's own teaching to it? The Law has passed away for ever. Again, we Gentile Christians know little of the OT, and have little interest in the Jewish national hope. Why trouble us with those detailed fulfilments of prophecy which Matthew possibly draws from a recognized collection of OT fulfilments; or emphasize a Messiahship which for us is almost forgotten in higher and more universal aspects of the Lord's Person? But then, if all this is passed by, we largely fail to see the Lord's life as it was actually lived, or to understand His teaching as it was actually given.

So it is with the continuity of the Church. Mark and Luke write as its members and for its members; a religion without a Church would have been unintelligible to them; but they do not write, as Matthew does, out of the heart of a controversy as to where the Church is to be found, nor do the ordered life and discipline, which belong to the Church after as well as before the Lord's coming, appear in their Gospels as they do in Matthew's. Thus it is a right instinct which has led the Church to put Matthew first among the Gospels. Historically Mark is the earliest, and its study the foundation of critical enquiry. But the ordinary Christian is not a historical critic; and, though Mark gives the most vivid and accurate picture of the Lord's activity, as far as he goes, his omissions are fatal to a balanced portrait.

Even more important perhaps is Matthew as a recorder of our Lord's teaching. Mark, but for one conspicuous exception in his 13th chapter, records very little of it; probably he supposes that Q is in his readers' hands. Luke tells us a great deal, making large use of Q, and desiring, like Matthew, to produce a complete Gospel; but none the less he omits much which is of priceless value both historically and ethically. No doubt Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness, and love is its fulfilment. But we cannot fully appreciate the end unless we know the beginning, or understand a fulfilment without clearly seeing what needed to be fulfilled. We may criticize Matthew in more ways than one; but of all the Gospels it is probably his which we could least easily spare.

Method of Compilation.—We should then approach this Gospel with a deep sense of our need of it. But, if we are rightly to use it, we must understand both the method of its compilation and the mind of the compiler himself. Both will become clearer as we proceed, but the main features should be before us from the first. It will be here presupposed that the article on the Synoptic Problem has already been read, and that Matthew's dependence upon both Mark and Q is fully recognized.

Matthew and Mark.—How then does Matthew deal with Mark? Probably he knows the close connexion between Mark and St. Peter, and accepts Mark as of full authority. He never intentionally contradicts him, and he reproduces in substance almost all that he says; he always follows Mark's order, except when he has a special reason for departing from it, and fits his other material into the Marcan narrative. Thus for the Sermon on the Mount he starts from Mk 1 [21, 22], and returns to it in Mt 7 [28]. But the language of Mark has no sacredness for him; and he edits and adapts and interpolates with the freedom of the scribes of former days in their dealing with the OT Scriptures. Even when he follows Mark closely he does not copy him word by word. Apparently he reads a sentence or two, and then reproduces what he has read in his own way. He thinks—and here we can agree with him—that Mark writes awkwardly, and uses more words than are necessary for the expression of his meaning. He thinks—and here we cannot agree with him—that Mark's picturesque details are not always worth the space which they occupy; naturally the value which they would possess as indications of the truth of the Gospel story does not occur to his mind. Thus he gives us a narrative much smoother, but not nearly so interesting. Again, he thinks, and perhaps with experience to support him, that Mark is an incautious writer, and sometimes tells his story in a way likely to cause stumbling

to 'the little ones' of the flock. Surely the Christ must have been possessed of a more unruffled calm than Mark suggests (cf. Mk 3 [5] = Mt 12 [13]; Mk 8 [12] = Mt 16 [1, 4]; Mk 10 [14] = Mt 19 [14]); surely those who came to Him must have been more mannerly than not to address Him as 'Lord' (cf. Mk 1 [40] = Mt 8 [2]; Mk 10 [47] = Mt 20 [31]; Mk 14 [19] = Mt 26 [22]); and surely, if there are two versions of a story current, and one of them may be misused to the troubling of the faithful, there can be no doubt as to which we ought to choose (cf. Mk 10 [17, 18] = Mt 19 [16, 17]). Yet again, if a paraphrase or a note of explanation will make the Lord's meaning clearer, it must be well to supply it (Mt 12 [40], 16 [28], 26 [28]). In all such cases Matthew does what he thinks necessary; and, as he has never heard of footnotes, and never tells us whether he is giving our Lord's *ipsissima verba*, or what he conceives to be their substance, it is just as well to keep Mark open before us. Thus we should always prefer Mark's version to Matthew's, except when Mark seems to have made omissions in view of his Gentile readers.

Matthew and Q.—How does Matthew deal with Q? This it is not so easy to say, since we have not Q before us. We do not e.g. know how much of the arrangement of our Lord's teaching in this Gospel is due to Matthew, and how much to the source which he is following. But for two reasons the probability is that it is chiefly due to Matthew. In the first place, though there is some amount of similarity between the order of the materials from Q reproduced in Matthew and in Luke, the arrangement of much which is common to them is very different in the two cases. In Luke the sayings of the Lord are generally found like wild flowers in their true surroundings, while Matthew collects them into great *parterres* of teaching regardless of the occasions on which they were spoken. It is unjust to suggest that Luke invented the settings which he gives, since he frequently records teaching of the Lord without notes of time or place; and it is very unlikely that he could have learned these settings, if they had not been contained in Q. In the second place, it is very improbable that so primitive a document as Q would have been arranged in Matthew's artificial way. When Papias complains that Mark does not write his narrative 'in order,' he is probably not thinking of chronological order, but of the kind of order which Matthew supplies. Not only is the Lord's teaching collected for the most part into five great discourses, which recall the five books of the Law and of the Psalms; but beatitudes and woes, miracles and parables, incidents and sayings, delight the simple heart of Papias by defiling before us in twos and threes and fives and sevens, so that we can remember them as easily as the prayers on a rosary. 'All the generations from Abraham unto David are fourteen generations; and from David unto the carrying away to Babylon fourteen generations; and from the carrying away to Babylon unto the Christ fourteen generations (1 [17]). That is what pleases Papias, and would please us too if we were enough in earnest to learn the Scriptures by heart. But, whatever the source of Matthew's artificial arrangement, we must, as we read him, keep its character continually in mind. Such a collection as the Sermon on the Mount is invaluable for self-examination; and the charge to the Apostles (10) forms a splendid pastoral handbook. But we shall be involved in historical difficulties and contradictions if we treat the sayings found in either as having been all spoken at the same time. It is e.g. inconceivable that at a stage in the Lord's ministry, when not even the Apostles had recognized His Messiahship, He should have claimed to be the Universal Judge (7 [21, 22]); or that, contrary to the teaching of the 4th Gospel, he should have told the Apostles of all the persecutions which they would one day have to endure, when first sending them out (10 [16-39]; contrast Jn 16 [1-4]). The truth is that for chronological purposes Matthew is practically useless except when he is following Mark, or when, according to the hypothesis which the Special Introduction will explain, the Sabbath lections reveal the time of the year when our Lord's teaching was given. For him the words that will never pass away have already shaken off the manacles of time; the Lord spoke them, and that is enough. If one saying reminds Matthew of another, he places them side by side.

Other Materials.—Thus far for Matthew's two great authorities. But he is not confined to these; as a member of the Palestinian Church he is in touch with its traditions, and often we find incidents as well as teachings which have no parallel elsewhere. He has e.g. a cycle of traditions connected with St. Peter, and apparently another connected with Pilate. Interesting these traditions always are, and sometimes beautiful, but how far we can trust them it is not easy to say. These 'Matthean additions,' as they are called, we must consider on their merits

when they appear. As a rule, they seem to be authentic when they relate our Lord's words; but, when they relate incidents, they are extremely questionable. It is not that the miraculous element which they sometimes contain troubles us. All the great miracles of this Gospel have Mark's authority; if we reject them, we must dismiss Mark as an historical writer. But, as we shall see, most of the Matthean additions involve difficulties which do not meet us in the Marcan story, and here and there we feel ourselves *en route* for the Apocryphal Gospels. This is perhaps the chief reason for placing Matthew late in the 1st century, though legends may of course arise early. We must remember that to embody truth in a tale was a frequent practice of Jewish teachers, which finds many illustrations in the OT itself; and Matthew may not always have recognized the true character of the stories which were passed from mouth to mouth. So far from the Matthean additions discrediting the Gospels as a whole, they should have the opposite effect. It is the absence from the other Gospels of the special difficulties which they present which helps to convince us of their reliability; and even in Matthew these stories are entirely exceptional.

Eschatology.—There is one other way in which we should be upon our guard in the study of Matthew. In times of suffering eschatology assumes a prominence which does not normally belong to it; and Matthew is no exception to this rule. As Streeter has shown, the proportion of eschatological sayings in Mark is higher than in Q, and in Matthew higher than in Mark. Quite clearly, as Matthew himself bears witness, our Lord did not always speak of the Kingdom which He proclaimed in quite the same way. Sometimes He seemed to identify it with the final consummation; but sometimes He regarded it as already present in Himself and His little company, or as to come in power very soon. Now the stress in Matthew is almost everywhere upon the final consummation; and he sometimes gives an eschatological turn to words which in Mark or Luke do not seem to possess it, and introduces eschatological sayings where they appear to be out of place. In the Gentile Church, though the eschatological outlook was never lost, the present Kingdom of God in the Church came more and more into the foreground, as St. Paul's epistles show; in the Jewish Christian Church, on the whole more sorely tried, it was naturally otherwise.

So, as we read Matthew, we shall have the Jewish Christians ever in our minds; and we shall try to see, with the help of the Hebrew part-author of this commentary, what the words would have meant to them. The view that he will propound to us of the construction of the Gospel may to most of us seem strange as well as new; but we must ask whether what seems strange to us would have seemed so to Matthew himself. Not all the analogies between OT words and the story of the Gospel, which Matthew points out, now appeal to us; and he may have seen many more, which have waited for a distinguished Rabbinical scholar of to-day for their due appreciation. It need not be said that to this scholar the Hebrew and Rabbinic learning of this Commentary is wholly due.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTION

By P. P. Levertoff

As to the purpose and scheme of the Logia we venture to put forward the following hypothesis (cf. *Theology*, February and April, 1927). The casuistic discussions of the Rabbis of the 1st and 2nd centuries, as well as their haggadic, i.e. allegoric, ethico-religious, exegesis of Scripture, were preserved in the Midrash, or early Rabbinic scriptural interpretation (cf. *Mechilta* and *Sifre* on the one hand, and *Pesikta* and *Pesikta Rabbati* on the other), primarily owing to their original connexion with the Synagogal Lessons from the Law and the Prophets. It is probable that the Gospel tradition was preserved in the memory, and fixed later in writing, under the guidance of a similar liturgical connexion.

The Synoptic Gospels contain direct quotations from Deuteronomy, and Matthew especially has allusions to this book and to 2-Is, to which only occasional references can be made here. Now it is certain that the Pentateuchal lessons were fixed in the Synagogue at least as early as the 3rd century B.C.; and, although we cannot be as certain about the prophetic lessons, we can gather from Rabbinic literature that the lessons from 2-Is must have been read in conjunction with Deuteronomy at an early date.

And now to the crux of the matter. The word 'Logia,' whether or not applied to a source identical with Q, is, we suggest, nothing else but the Greek for the Hebrew 'Debarim,' the traditional name for Deuteronomy. If this be so, the purpose of the 'Logia,' which Matthew incorporated in his Gospel, was to present a

kind of new 'Deuteronomy,' describing the life of our Lord as the 'Last Redeemer,' preparing the new Israel for the Kingdom of Heaven, in a manner similar to that of Moses, the 'first redeemer,' as pictured in the old Deuteronomy, preparing the people for the Promised Land. Moreover, if this liturgical hypothesis be accepted, it will be found that the sequence of events as described in Matthew corresponds chronologically with the Jewish liturgical seasons, and is not so arranged merely to satisfy the author's plan. In e.g. the Synoptic tradition concerning the Baptist, his call to repentance and the quotation from Is 40 [3] find a remarkably fitting frame if we assume the events to have taken place in the month of Elul (end of August and beginning of September) in preparation for New Year's Day, the ten days of Repentance between New Year's Day and the Day of Atonement, and the Day of Atonement itself. That the baptism of John was primarily eschatological in character is clear, but the significance of the baptism generally seems to have been misunderstood. It certainly had nothing to do with the baptism of proselytes, as I have tried to prove in my German translation of the Talmudic tractate 'Gerim' (cf. also *Angelos*, ii).

The weeks preceding the Day of Atonement were always a time of preparation for that great fast, and the Jewish *motif* of that season was 'teshubah' (repentance) and 'Malkut Shamayim' (the Kingdom of Heaven), while Israel's prerogative as sons of Abraham was much in the minds of the people, since their chief plea for forgiveness of the sins of the year was based upon 'the merits of the Fathers.' The baptism of John thus heralded the approach of the establishment of the New Covenant founded on forgiveness of sins (Jer 31 [31-34]), as the Old Covenant on Sinai was preceded by 'sanctification' (Ex 19 [10]), which in the earliest Midrash is actually called 'baptism' (cf. my edition of *Sifre*, 92). One of the prophetic lessons for this season was the latter portion of Mic 7; cf. [19], 'and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.' (This verse has given rise at a later date to a quaint Jewish custom retained until this day. On one of the days between New Year and the Day of Atonement the people go down to any neighbouring sheet of water and shake their garments into it, thereby symbolically disposing of their sins. This little drama is called *Tashlich*—'thou wilt cast.') As straws are capable of indicating the quarter from which the wind blows, so these small matters suggest the probability that John began his ministry about this season, at which season also the Synagogal Lessons from the Book of Deuteronomy began to be read and 2-Is formed the prophetic complement. This would explain the Baptist's allusion to Is 40 (cf. Mt 3 [3]). Judgement is also one of the dominating themes of New Year's Day—at least as early as the *Book of Jubilees* (cf. *Jub.*, vi, 23, and *Jewish Q.R.*, July, 1926). Again, we find a Deuteronomic *motif* 'righteousness' (cf. Dt 6 [25], 9 [4, 5, 6]; Is 42 [21], 45 [23, 25], 51 [1, 5, 7, 8]) in the narrative of our Lord's baptism in the verses peculiar to Matthew. Apart from the direct quotation from Is 42 [1], the opening of the heavens and the voice are in keeping with the ideas suggested by the season, when the 'books of heaven' are opened, and the record of each son of Abraham is scrutinized and divine judgement passed. The further bearing of this hypothesis on the Gospel story from the baptism of John to the Transfiguration of our Lord the following commentary will illustrate.

A word may be added about the problem contained in the phrase 'Jesus and the Rabbis.' Many Jewish and Christian scholars have collected a large number of isolated Rabbinic sayings as parallels to the teaching of our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount and in the parables. But, as Sanday (*Outlines of the Life of Christ*, 13) rightly remarks, 'it can hardly be questioned that the same source supplies proof enough that the denunciations of the Gospels were not without foundation.' Moreover, as has been said: 'In religion, as in art, the difference between the best and the second best is one that cannot be verbally formulated; it is a matter of a hair, a shade, an inward thrill—and yet, what a difference it is!'

The Contents of the Gospel

(1) **Prologue**: 1-4 [11].—(*a*) Genealogy, birth, and infancy of Jesus: 1, 2. (*b*) Preparation for the ministry: 3 [1]-4 [11].

(2) **The Prophetic Activity of Jesus in Galilee**: 4 [12]-11 [1].—(*a*) General introductory programme: 4 [12-25]. (*b*) The Sermon on the Mount as an example of His teaching: 5-7. (*c*) Examples of His healing activity: 8 [1-17]. (*d*) The constant wanderings of the Teacher and Healer: 8 [18]-9 [34]. (*e*) The co-operation of the disciples: 9 [35]-11 [1].

(3) **Difficulties and Encouragements**: 11 [2]-14 [12].—(*a*) Jesus and the Baptist:

11 2-19. (*b*) Jesus and the cities of Galilee: 11 20-24. (*c*) Jesus and the 'babes': 11 25-30. (*d*) The conflict with the scribes: 12 1-45. (*e*) The true relatives of Jesus: 12 46-50. (*f*) The teaching in parables: 13 1-53. (*g*) Rejection at Nazareth: 13 54-58. (*h*) Herod's attention drawn to Jesus: 14 1-12.

(4) **Gradual Withdrawal of Jesus from Public Activity, and His Concentration upon the Instruction of the Disciples: 14 13-20 28.**—(*a*) The feeding of the 5,000: 14 13-21. (*b*) The walking on the lake: 14 23-36. (*c*) The rebuff to the Pharisees and scribes in Jerusalem: 15 1-20. (*d*) The Canaanite woman: 15 21-28. (*e*) The feeding of the 4,000: 15 29-38. (*f*) The leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees: 15 39-16 12. (*g*) The confession of Peter and announcement of the Passion: 16 13-28. (*h*) The Transfiguration: 17 1-13. (*i*) The disciples without Jesus: 17 14-23. (*j*) The Temple tax: 17 24-27. (*k*) Stumbling-blocks in the Church: 18 1-35. (*l*) Marriage and children: 19 1-15. (*m*) The rich young man and the disciples' reward: 19 16-20 16. (*n*) Through suffering and service to rule: 20 17-28.

(5) **Towards the End: 20 29-23 39.**—(*a*) Healing of the blind in Jericho: 20 29-34. (*b*) The entry into Jerusalem and the Temple: 21 1-16. (*c*) The cursing of the fig-tree: 21 17-22. (*d*) Discussion with the High Priest and elders: 21 23-22 14. (*e*) Discussion with Pharisees and Sadducees: 22 15-46. (*f*) The woe over the teachers of the people and over Jerusalem: 23. (*g*) Eschatological speeches: 24, 25.

(6) **The Passion and Crucifixion: 26, 27.**—(*a*) The conspiracy; the Anointing at Bethany: 26 1-13. (*b*) The treachery of Judas; the Last Supper: 26 14-29. (*c*) Gethsemane: 26 30-56. (*d*) The trial before the Sanhedrin; the denial of Peter: 26 57-75. (*e*) The trial before Pilate and condemnation: 27 1-26. (*f*) The mocking, crucifixion, and death: 27 27-56. (*g*) The burial; the watchers: 27 57-66.

(7) **The Resurrection: 28.**—(*a*) The empty grave: 28 1-15. (*b*) The last appearance of the Risen One: 28 16-20.

I.-IV. 11. Prologue.

I. 1. Possibly the evangelist intended this verse as a title to the whole Gospel. The formula 'the book of the generation' recalls not only Gen 5 1, but also Gen 2 4, thus suggesting the cosmic significance of the advent of the Messiah. He is the Restorer of God's creation, which was 'subjected to vanity' through man's sin; the Bringer of the new heaven and the new earth, and the Founder of the new Israel. Similar suggestions are frequently found in Rabbinic literature (cf. Midrash on Gen 12). Abraham, in contemporary literature, is called 'Father of Israel,' 'Bearer of the blessing,' and 'Father of proselytes.' 'The Son of David' is a Messianic title. Apart from the *Book of Enoch*, xc, 9 f., and *Orac. Syb.*, bk. 5, where the Messiah was to be a reincarnation of Moses or Joshua, he was generally expected to be of Davidic descent. In Abraham God chose a people to be set apart; in Jesus He unites all the peoples of the earth (cf. 28 19). In Him God's activity reached its climax, all that went before Him in nature and in Israel's history having been merely preparation; 'for the burden of all prophecy was the coming of the Messiah' (*Sanh.*, 99*a*). The earliest Jewish writings where the expected Redeemer is called 'the Christ' are the *Book of Enoch* (xlviii, 10; lii, 4) and the *Psalter of Solomon* (xvii, 36; xviii, 6-8), and in this Gospel the article is generally employed. But in this verse 'Christ' is used as a proper name of the ascended Lord, as was customary at the time when the Gospels were written.

2-17. The genealogy of the Messiah (cf. Lk 3 23-38).

Probably the documents reproduced here and in Lk 3 23-28 were the 'public registers' from which Josephus (*Vit.*, i; cf. *c. Ap.*, i, 7) asserts that his own genealogy was taken. In Rabbinic writings there are frequent references to genealogical rolls. 'God lets his Shekhina dwell only in families that can prove their pedigrees' (Midr. *Sifre* on Numbers). The names in 2-12 are taken from 1 Ch 1-3 (cf. Ru 4 18-22). To a Jewish Christian the Davidic descent of Jesus would be all-important. In 11 'Jechoniah' may be a corruption of 'Jehoiakim' (cf. 1 Ch 3 15). As the text stands Jechoniah appears twice over in the genealogy.

The genealogical tree as given in this Gospel is artificially divided into three groups of fourteen generations each. This arrangement is the more striking in that it makes fourteen generations from the Captivity to Joseph, where Luke makes twenty or twenty-one, and the first group of fourteen is formed by the omission of three names. It is clear therefore that this grouping is essential to the purpose of the evangelist, which is to give a rapid survey of the march of Israel's history from Abraham to David, from David to the Captivity, and from the Captivity to Jesus. There is an interesting parallel to this in Midr. to Gen 39 13 (cf. *Tanch.* on Genesis). Fourteen generations are enumerated as leading from Abraham to the height of Davidic sovereignty, fourteen

to its downfall, and yet another fourteen to the final restoration of the royal dignity in the Person of the Messiah. Scriptural genealogies often give a regular number of generations by omitting some intermediate steps. It is probable that the Rabbinic scheme frequently repeated (cf. Midr. to Ex 12 [2]) was already known in the apostolic age. The rise and fall of the glory of Israel was compared to the waxing and waning of the moon. Abraham was the rising moon, waxing to Solomon; Solomon brought the period of full moon; from him to Zedekiah was the waning which culminated at Babylon, the setting. The evangelist, however, goes further, and shows that the period of the full moon has again arrived in the rising of Jesus the Messiah. The fourteen generations naturally correspond to the fourteen days of lunar waxing and waning.

God is the God of history; and history, in great events as well as in small, is made to serve Him and His Kingdom. This history, being human history, is one of sin and weakness as well as of good (note the inclusion of Tamar, Rahab, and Bathsheba). It may be that the evangelist mentions these and Ruth as a reminder to the pride of Israel that they also are in the royal Davidic line; for the four mothers, Sarah, Rebekah, Rachel, and Leah alone were those usually remembered. In Rabbinic literature they are called 'hills,' and the Patriarchs are called 'mountains' (cf. *Sifre Dt.*, 146*b*). In Rahab and Ruth we have examples of heathen accepted into the commonwealth of Israel, proofs of the universalistic purpose of the Kingdom of God. Many of the names in the genealogy are Messianic types. Thus we have (i) Judah, in connexion with Gen 49 [8] (cf. Midr. *Tanch.*, 54); (ii) Perez, who often stands for the Messiah (cf. Gen R 12; Ex R 30); (iii) Nahshon (cf. Nu R 13); 'six things were taken away from Adam (after the Fall), and they will be restored through the son of Nahshon, that is the Messiah.' Rahab is often mentioned, and not only as an example (cf. *Sifre* to Numbers, 52 f.). Ruth is mentioned, not only as an example (cf. *Sifre* to Numbers, *ibid.*), but as an ancestress of the Messiah. 'God found her in Sodom and appointed her as the mother of the Messiah, who is to come.'

16. The reading to be adopted in this verse is uncertain, but that accepted by the RV has the authority of the two oldest MSS. For the difficulties suggested by the two genealogies found in the Gospels cf. p. 318.

18-25. The Messiah belongs to humanity, but He is a Saviour because He transcends the category of man. The evangelist does not find it necessary to explain the name of Jesus, evidently expecting his readers to understand it. Jesus is the Greek name for Joshua, and means 'Jehovah is salvation.' The Messiah, as the organ of God's salvation, is found in pre-Christian Apocalyptic (cf. Ps Sol 18 [18]; *Test. Levi*, 3; *Test. Juda*, 24; and especially in En 46 [4], 48 [5, 10], 62 [9]). His life began with the breath of God ([18]); the Spirit presided over the beginning of a new creation. As in the beginning of cosmic life, as in the first quickening of the higher life in man, so at the outset of the new order inaugurated by the Incarnation it belonged to the Divine Spirit to set in motion the new development. In contemporary Judaism the thought of the Holy Spirit as the creative power of God is not to be found; the early Rabbis rather understood the Spirit to be the spirit of prophecy.

In form the narrative of the Virgin Birth is partly dependent upon earlier models (cf. the births of Isaac, Moses, and Samson); but this does not brand it as legendary; we have every reason to regard the central fact as historical (see the article on the Virgin Birth). The evangelist did not invent the narratives of the Infancy to show how prophecy was fulfilled, but used the OT to illustrate a belief already held. 'That it might be fulfilled,' the phrase which occurs so frequently in this Gospel, has no purpose beyond that of pointing to some similar OT occurrence, or drawing the attention of the reader to some OT fact suggested to the evangelist by the subject in hand. Cf. e.g. 2 [15, 18, 23]; in 2 [18] there is no thought of any prophecy. This use of the word 'fulfil' occurs continually in Rabbinic literature. The following is an interesting example. In *Sifre* on Dt 33 [24], § 355, it is related that a certain Rabbi came into the house from the fields with his friends and called to his handmaid saying: 'Come, wash our feet.' She poured out oil into a basin and washed their feet, that it might be fulfilled which is written in Dt 33 [24]: 'let him dip his foot in oil.' In the light of this it is unnecessary to assume with some scholars the existence of an anthology of prophecies before the books of our NT began to be written.

This section was intended to weld inseparably the two beliefs of the early Church that our Lord was miraculously conceived, and that He was the heir of

David. This could be done only on the basis of Joseph's genealogy, for whatever the lineage of Mary (and according to Jewish tradition she was also of Davidic descent, cf. *Sanh.*, 106*a*), it was Joseph that mattered from the legal point of view.

18 ff. The story, if authentic, must have come from Joseph himself, and presents little difficulty to those acquainted with modern psychology. The solution of difficulties which have troubled the waking mind not infrequently takes place in dreams, and the divine teaching may be given there as elsewhere. Betrothal was to the Jews far more important and binding than it is with ourselves (cf. Dt 22 [23] f.), and required divorce if it was to be annulled: cf. 'thy wife' ([20]). Joseph may have heard from Mary of the Annunciation, but have doubted her story.

21. The position of our Lord is plain from the first. The 'people,' or Church of God, is His own people (cf. 16 [18]); He can deliver them from their sins; and in His coming there is a manifestation of 'God with us.' Cf. the significant alteration of the words of prophecy at the beginning of Mark (1 [2]).

23. the virgin. So the LXX of Is 7 [14], though the Hebrew word does not necessarily mean more than 'a young woman.' But many scholars connect this passage with the Babylonian expectation of a Saviour who will be born of a virgin: cf. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, and Levertoff, Notes on the third German edition of Jeremias's *The O.T. in the Light of the Ancient East*. The fact that the Jewish expositors never regarded Is 7 [14] as speaking of a Virgin Birth makes it most improbable that this passage was the source of the belief that our Lord was virgin-born.

25. Some very early authorities read 'and she brought forth a son.' Either version may have been altered into the other for dogmatic reasons—the shorter into the longer to safeguard the Virgin Birth, and the longer into the shorter to safeguard the perpetual virginity of Mary. But the longer version is simply intended to make it clear that our Lord was not Joseph's son (cf. [18]), and not to give any further information.

II. 1-13. The Magi (cf. Is 49 [7]; 60 [3-6, 10]; Ps 68 [29], 72 [10] f.).

The homage of the Magi to the Infant Messiah is less a fulfilment of prophecy than itself a prophecy. The Messiah, born to save His people from their sins, is sought, found and worshipped by Gentiles; while the highest representatives of His own people are so indifferent to the quest that they leave it to the tyrant to discover the true King, and then only with a view to destroying Him. The setting of the narrative is genuinely Jewish (cf. *Mech.* on Ex 15 [20], and *Sota*, 12*b*). As the 'star stood over where the young child was,' a cloud hung over that part of the mountain where Isaac was to be sacrificed, and Abraham seeing it said: 'This seemeth to be the place' (Midr. Gen 56 [2]: cf. also Midr. Ex 35, end). Even more striking is the passage often quoted, found in Midr. *Rabbah* to Ex 1, where Pharaoh's astrologers perceive that the mother of the future redeemer of Israel is with child, and the king orders all children henceforth born to be drowned. Indeed, it is possible that the story of the Magi is, at any rate in part, a Christian Midrash rather than authentic history, though the compiler of the Gospel may not have recognized its true character. For (i) the summoning of the Sanhedrin is most improbable, since any scribe could have answered Herod's question (cf. Jn 7 [42]); (ii) not only was no guidance to Bethlehem thereafter necessary, but [9] seems to involve ignorance of the nature of stars; (iii) the story is difficult to reconcile with Luke, who in 2 [39] seems to imply that the Holy Family returned to Nazareth immediately after the Purification. But even regarded as a Christian Midrash it is full of beauty and of spiritual teaching. The call to seek Jesus is from God alone; the seekers have to learn the truth from the teachers of the Church, unworthy of their calling though they are; then once more God guides those whom He has called, and fulfils their longings.

The manner in which the evangelist puts into the mouth of the scribes an interpretation rather than a version of the prophecy (note the addition from 2 S 5 [2]) is quite Rabbinic. Cf. *Targ.* on Mic 5 [1]: 'And thou Bethlehem Ephratah . . . from thee shall come forth the Messiah, who shall take up the sovereignty over Israel, whose name was called from of old, from eternity.' The comparison between the last redemption and the first is found in *Mech.* on Ex 12 [42], and is based on OT prophecy (Is 11 [11]; Mic 7 [15]). Not only does the Messiah repeat in His own life-story the history of His people in spending His infancy in Egypt (cf. Hos 11 [1], quoted in [15]); but as the 'first redeemer' fled from Egypt, the 'last Redeemer' fled into Egypt. There is an independent Jewish tradition of our Lord's sojourn in Egypt (*Sanh.*, 107*b*: cf. Orig., *c. Cels.*, i, 66). For [20*b*] cf. Ex 4 [19-23]. So once more with [23]. There is no such

passage in the OT; but 'nezer,' = branch (Is 11 1) and 'Zemach' = offspring (Jer 23 5; Zech 3 8, 6 12) are eschatological conceptions. Cf. *Targ.* on Is 11 1: 'A king shall rule from the loins of Jesse, and the Messiah will be great.' Such loose quotations from the OT are to be found not only in early Rabbinic writings, but in the OT itself (cf. Ezr 9 10 ff.). In 2 the Sin. Syriac has: 'We have seen his star from the east,' i.e. the star was in the west when the Magi saw it.

But it cannot be said that the story was constructed only to give a pictorial setting to the fact that Gentiles welcomed the Messiah, while the Jewish people rejected Him, for there is abundant evidence of the widespread expectation in the East of a universal king and deliverer. The Babylonian astrologers actually expected Him to come in the west, bringing in His train universal righteousness, peace, and joy. Cf. Friedrich Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies*, 133; Gressmann, *Ursprung der israel.-jüd. Eschatologie*; Sellin, *Der israelit. Prophetismus*; and my notes in A. Jeremias's *Das A.T. im Lichte d. alten Orients*, 3rd edition. To the first readers of this Gospel the story of the Magi would not have sounded legendary. Since the Exile the Jews had continued to make proselytes in Mesopotamia; and, about forty or fifty years after the event recorded by the evangelist, Prince Izates of Adiabene, together with his mother Helena and all her family, accepted Judaism. The tale of their pilgrimages to Jerusalem and of their rich gifts to the Temple is fully related by Josephus (*Ant.*, XX, ii, 1-5, and IV, i, 3). The character of Herod, his cruelty and cunning, are borne out by accounts of him in the Talmud, and by Josephus (*Bell. Jud.*, i, 33, vi, 8; *Ant.*, XVII, vi, 5, viii, 2). Moreover, his questioning of the scribes concerning the Scripture teaching on the birthplace of the Messiah is in the picture (*Baba bath.*, 33*b*), for his superstitious fears of a supplanter darkened all his life, and increased his desire to put off the evil day that he felt was surely to come. Josephus, however, makes no mention of the slaughter of the innocents.

Nazareth is nowhere mentioned in the OT, but neither are many other places in Palestine; and there is evidence that Nazareth was in an ancient Rabbinic list of places of priestly residence in Galilee.

Preparation for the Ministry (3 1-4 11: cf. Ex 3 1-14).

III. 1-12. The Ministry of John the Baptist (Mk 1 2-8; Lk 3 2-17: cf. Jn 1 6, 19-24).

1-12. Between the infancy of Moses and the commencement of his redemptive work there is an interval of forty years spent in the obscurity of the Midian desert; and between the infancy of Jesus and His entry into Israel's history as the last Redeemer is an interval of thirty years spent in the obscurity of a Galilean village. While Jesus dwelt unknown in Nazareth, there appeared suddenly like a new Elijah John the Baptist (cf. for the Jewish expectation of Elijah as the herald of the Messiah Ecclus 48 10 Hebrew). Under this name he is introduced without further preamble as one well known (cf. Jos., *Ant.*, xviii, 2: 'John who is called the Baptist'). The scene of his activities is described as the 'wilderness of Judæa' (cf. Jg 1 16; Ps 63 1), a term which properly applies to the rough mountainous country which forms the western boundary of the plain of the Jordan towards the influx of the river into the Dead Sea; but could also include a portion of the Jordan Valley (see Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*, 82). Since in Lk 7 29 the Galilean multitudes also are said to have sought him, Judæa probably means the whole country, as in Lk 4 44. The evangelist summarizes the whole preaching of the Baptist in a single sentence, apart from the repetition in 4 17 found nowhere else in the NT. The Baptist justifies his call by the assertion that the great upheaval is very near which will bring the Kingdom in its train. There is no difference in meaning between 'kingdom of heaven' and 'kingdom of God.' The former expression is due to a reverent desire to avoid the divine Name: cf. Lk 15 18 and 1 Mac (*passim*).

John probably commenced his call to repentance in the month of Elul (August) in preparation for the New Year, the ten days of repentance ending with the Day of Atonement (see Introduction).

The confession of 5 was probably a public confession of the definite sins committed. John emphasized the ethical requirements as a condition of entrance into the Kingdom; but the essential meaning of the baptism was a dedication for the New Covenant. The people had to prepare themselves to accept 'by baptism' the covenant delivered on Sinai (cf. *Sifre Nu.*, 92); the New Covenant also is to be received after sanctification through baptism.

3. The Apostolic Church saw in John the herald of this new Messianic Covenant. Isaiah proclaims to the exiled people that God, who has hidden Himself from them, will again reveal Himself in all His glory, and lead them back to their own land.

As in the time of the Exodus the wilderness separated them from the Promised Land, so after the Exile the way from Babylon lay through a wilderness, and the pathless desert became a symbol for all that separated Israel from God (cf. Is 59[1] f.). Israel's condition must be changed, and the need embodies itself in a call: a voice of one that calleth 'in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord; make straight in the desert a road for our God.' According to Jn 1[23] the Baptist himself saw in this poetic representation a suitable description of his own activity; and it has thus won a firm place in the Christian estimation of the Baptist's personality (cf. Mk 1[3]; Lk 3[4]). All the Synoptists read with the LXX 'a voice of one crying in the wilderness,' since this reading was so apt in regard to John. But not one of them emphasizes the scene of his preaching in a manner that would suggest that in that they saw the chief fulfilment of the prophecy; it was rather in the contents of his preaching. In their interpretation, 'the voice of one crying in the wilderness' refers to John the Baptist, and 'the Lord' (Jehovah) is Jesus Christ, the second part of the verse having been shortened accordingly. Here is an example of the agreement of all the Synoptists against the MT and LXX. In the 'repent ye' and 'the Kingdom of God is at hand' of John's preaching they saw the same demand—'make a path for the Lord who comes to judge and redeem.' That judgement and redemption would be mediated by the Messiah is stated neither by the Baptist nor by the prophet; but the evangelists, who knew from the Baptist's message (3[11] ff.) and their own experience that the prophetic proclamation was truly fulfilled in the advent and work of Jesus, were justified in applying Is 40[3] to Him (cf. Ps 130[8]).

4. According to Zech 13[4] (cf. Is 20[2]) this garb was the dress of the ancient prophets.

5, 6. Cf. Mk 1[5].

7-12. The sermon contained in [7-12] has been in part called forth by the sight of many members of the Pharisaic and Sadducean parties, who, moved by the general excitement, have come to see and hear him; it is not throughout meant to be an example of his preaching. To the Pharisees and high-priestly aristocracy this sermon conveyed a special warning ([9-10]) of the futility of their boast in the days that were coming. The difference between 'to the baptism' ([7]) and 'to be baptized' ([13]) seems to show that, although they did not come out with their minds made up against the reception of baptism, neither did they come urged by desire for it.

7. The appellation 'generation of vipers' (cf. 12[34], 23[33]) was perhaps suggested by the flight of snakes before a desert fire (G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, 317, and Is 59[4-6]). Fear of the people (21[26]) whom they despised and enslaved (23[4]) drove them to come and hear the prophet; but he was not deceived.

8. Thus he held out hope even for them —'bring forth fruit worthy of repentance'; by your actions prove the genuineness of your repentance. Do not let pride deceive you, for God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. This trust in 'the merits of the fathers' was characteristic of the Jews, especially at the New Year season. They often pleaded these merits in their prayers, as the 'merits of the saints' have been pleaded in the Catholic Church. St. Paul, though recognizing the truth underlying this practice (Rom 11[28, 29]), like the Baptist guards against its misapplication (Rom 2[17] ff.). The Baptist suggests that in the place of unworthy sons of Abraham, who have broken the Divine Covenant, non-Jews will be incorporated into the New Covenant and will show themselves to be true sons of Abraham. The judgement is immediate; 'even now is the axe laid unto the root of the trees'; and it will be drastic (cf. Is 10[34]; Jer 46[22]; Mal 3[5]).

11. he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire (see note on Mk 1[8]). Water only touches the surface, and, though purifying, has no permanent result. In contrast to this is the Spirit which, wherever it works, reaches the heart and there produces life (1[18, 20], 4[1], 10[20], 12[28], 22[43]; Jn 3[6-8], 6[63]); and fire (only in Matthew) which, taking hold of its object, either melts or entirely destroys it. The position of this verse between [10] and [12] makes it clear that here too fire is intended as a manifestation of the divine wrath, and not, as at Pentecost, as a sign accompanying the working of the Spirit. All breathes judgement, and a division of the worthy from the unworthy by a baptism of the Spirit to the former, and a consumption by fire of the latter. In [12] the picture is made still more vivid as John describes the thoroughness of the coming judgement. The fan is the shovel, by which corn and chaff were thrown into the air to be separated by the wind. The message concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit was not new (Jl 2[28]; Is 44[3-5], 57[16]; Ezek 36[25-28]; Jer 31[31-34]), especially in view of the approaching Feast of

Tabernacles (cf. Jn 7 [37, 39]); but the Baptist proclaims it as immediate and about to come to pass through a mysterious human personality, whose shoes he is not worthy to bear. From **gather his wheat into the garner** we see that the Baptist had some vague presentiment of the New Israel that the coming of the Messiah would establish. 'Gather his wheat' is another liturgical motif reminiscent of the approaching Feast of Tabernacles.

13-17. The Baptism of Jesus (Mk 1 [9-11]; Lk 3 [21, 22]; cf. Jn 1 [32-34]).

13. See note on Mk 1 [9].

14. The fact that our Lord's baptism presents difficulties to the Christian mind which may be reflected in [14, 15] is at least an argument that it actually took place. Although before our Lord's baptism the Baptist 'knew him not' (Jn 1 [31]) as the One who should 'baptize with the Spirit and with fire,' he had already apprehended the 'otherness' of Jesus.

15. Our Lord's desire for baptism was dictated by His holy Love: 'to fulfil all righteousness.' If, as has been suggested above, John's baptism was a dedication for the New Covenant, our Lord's acceptance of it presents no difficulty. In any case (cf. Lk 3 [21]) He takes His place among the people of God. He recognizes and takes upon Himself the sins of the people through His membership in Israel, and in baptism thrusts them from Himself with holy hatred and abhorrence, dedicating Himself at the same time to His Messianic vocation. The words 'suffer it now' imply that the truth about His Person will be revealed in due time. He identifies Himself with His people, taking up that burden of sin which He carried till the end (cf. 8 [17] and Lk 7 [29, 30]). This is for Him the fulfilment of 'his righteousness' (cf. Dt 6 [25], 9 [4, 5, 6]; Is 42 [21], 45 [23, 25]). The Baptist, though himself needing the baptism of the Spirit ([14]), is the representative of the passing dispensation and the herald of the new; and Jesus links him with Himself by the words 'It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' The Jews expected Elijah to act as High Priest by anointing the Messiah with oil

16, 17. Cf. notes on Mk 1 [10, 11]. Luke adds 'and praying.' Jesus seeing the people gathered for baptism and confessing their sins, prayed that the wilderness of sin might be removed, that the 'heavens might be rent' and God come down (Is 64 [1]), and that the outpouring of the Spirit (Jl 2 [28]) might be bestowed. The signs, whether seen by our Lord alone (cf. Mark) or by John also, were the answer to this prayer. The heavens were opened and the Spirit poured out upon Him. He is the Son; in Him begins the new Israel of God, 'born not of human elements but of God' (Jn 1 [13]). As the first redeemer was consecrated by the theophany in the burning bush, and from thence heard a voice which called him to his work, so it was also with the last Redeemer (cf. Jn 1 [32]). Since the evangelists drew from Aramaic notes based on oral tradition, the variations found in the Synoptists are easily explained. The Sin. Syr. omits 'straightway' in [16].

IV. **1-11. The Temptation of the Messiah** (Mk 1 [12] f.; Lk 4 [1-13] and notes; *The Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ*, p. 28*1a*). —The narrative must have come from our Lord Himself; and should probably be accepted as it stands, as there seems no reason why He should have described normal human experiences in such language as this (cf. Ezek 8 [3] ff.; 2 Cor 12 [2-4]). There is much evidence that there are times when, especially perhaps after prolonged fasting, while the body appears wrapped in slumber, its possessor is conscious of being present in some other place. Israel's struggle with Satan is in the Jewish lections a New Year and Day of Atonement *motif*, and the destined Head of the new Israel must reproduce Israel's experience (cf. carefully Dt 8 [1-3]). The impossibility of sin to the Lord was moral and not physical, and He had to attain the perfection of human sympathy (Heb 2 [17, 18], 4 [15], 5 [2]) by plumbing the depths of suffering which faith and obedience may involve (Heb 5 [8]; cf. 12 [29]).

The first temptation is to doubt the reality of the divine Sonship, and to put it to the proof by using the powers bestowed upon Him for the supply of His physical need (cf. 27 [39-44]). His reply (Dt 8 [3]) recalls how Israel was similarly tempted. True life depends upon obedience to the divine word, which has just called Him to His work (Jn 4 [34]); if obedience is given, the Father will care for the needs of the body (6 [33]). The second temptation is similar in character. It is possible that the Lord was tempted to win the people to His side by a stupendous miracle (cf. 12 [38], etc.). But Dt 6 [16] looks back to Ex 17 [7], and suggests that He was tempted to test the reality of the divine support by a presumptuous experiment. Better swift death from the dizzying height of the pinnacle than to go forward and fail. Satan, it has been observed, omits from his quotation 'to keep thee in all thy ways.' It is only in the ways of God that His support is sure. In the third temptation, the Lord's

Messianic calling is accepted as a fact, and the pageant of the glory of the world is made to pass before His eyes. To those with vast ambitions Satanism is a real temptation; and the true character of an appeal to the world's methods of force and fraud would not have been hidden from the Lord's eyes. If the Messianic sovereignty is asked of God (Ps 2 [8]), it must be won by the way of the Cross (cf. Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, v.).

12-XI. 1. The Ministry in Galilee (Mk 1 [14]-3 [6]).

12-25. General survey.

12-16. Cf. Mk 1 [14, 15], and notes there. Jesus, on hearing of the imprisonment of the Baptist, retires to Galilee, which owing to its mixed population ([15]), its distance from the centre of the Jewish cultus and scribal learning, and its impure pronunciation of Aramaic (26 [73]; Mk 14 [70]), was not held in high esteem (Jn 7 [1-4, 41, 52]). He chooses not Nazareth, as might have been expected from 2 [23], as His headquarters, but Capernaum. In this the evangelist rightly sees the fulfilment of Is 9 [1, 2]. After thundering out the judgement that should come upon Jerusalem and Judah by the hand of the Assyrians (Is 8 [5-22]), the prophet proclaims the dawn of a new hope. This joy-bringing hope which lightens the darkness will be the birth of a descendant of David, who will establish the kingdom of peace (Is 9 [5-6]). Yet not in Jerusalem and Judah will this light first dawn, but in the northernmost part of the land of Israel, that part that was the first to suffer from the devastating Assyrian hosts (2 K 15 [29]; 1 Ch 5 [26]). This prophecy found its spiritual fulfilment when the Messiah began in this region first to spread His light—a region which lay in 'darkness and death' (9 [36]), and which even the Baptist had not been able to reach with his call to repentance. The evangelist aptly makes allegorical use of the geographical terms in the prophecy to illustrate its fulfilment.

Capernaum = Kephar-nahum: cf. Jos., *Bell. Jud.*, III, x, 8. There can be no doubt that it is identical with Tell-Hum: cf. Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*, 126.

17-25. Cf. Mk 1 [16-21] and notes. Here the evangelist gives in bold outline a picture of that activity of Jesus in Galilee which explains why at His entrance into Jerusalem He was greeted as 'Jesus the Prophet of Nazareth of Galilee' (21 [11]). It is a brief anticipatory summing up of the teaching, the acts of healing, the wanderings and the training of disciples, all of which is given later in detailed presentations. 5-7 present a specimen of our Lord's teaching; 8 [1-17] a selection of His acts of healing; 8 [18]-9 [34] pictures of His wanderings; while 9 [35], which is almost identical with 4 [23], forms both the end of one section and the beginning of another (9 [36]-11 [1]), dealing with the co-operation of those disciples, whom He called to be 'fishers of men.'

V.-VII. The Sermon on the Mount as a specimen of the teaching of the Messiah.

Jesus began by taking up not only the announcement of the Baptist that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand, but also his call to repentance (4 [17]). The starting-point of both was the same. But Jesus soon left this starting-point far behind; for the heads of the Baptist's teaching are soon told, while the teaching of Jesus expands in a thousand directions. 'It is like passing from the narrow cleft of the Jordan to a Pisgah-view over the whole Land of Promise' (Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, 65). This sentence aptly describes what was in the mind of the evangelist, or more probably of the compiler of the Logia. For, as Moses, the 'first redeemer,' having seen the Land of Promise from Mount Pisgah, sought also to show it to the children of Israel (Dt 1 [8]), so the Messiah, the last Redeemer, having seen the Kingdom, seeks to show to His disciples the new Land of Promise from 'the mountain' (5 [1]). As Moses, expounding the Law and raising it to a new spiritual height, taught, according to Deuteronomy, that the condition of entrance to this land was the keeping of the Law, so Jesus expounds the Law, raising it to an even greater spiritual height for 'the sons of the Kingdom.'

It is impossible to deal here with all the intricate problems connected with the Sermon on the Mount; yet, viewed in connexion with the liturgical factor, many of these problems seem to solve themselves. It is certain that the framework of the sermon was fixed before either Matthew or Luke wrote (cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 249 ff.). It began with Beatitudes, corresponding to the 'blessings' of Dt 28 [3-13], and ended with the parable of the builders on rock and sand, corresponding to Ezek 13 [1-14] (the denunciation of the false prophets), which concludes in [10-14] with a similar parable. These verses in Ezekiel formed the Haphtara (prophetic lesson) completing the Parasha (pentateuchal lesson), which was taken from Dt 13 [2-6]. The 'blessings' and 'curses' form a kind of frame for the Law as expounded by Moses, and the Beatitudes form a parallel to the

'blessings.' But the evangelist, in genuinely Jewish fashion, leaves out the 'curses,' as not forming a propitious ending. The sermon abounds with Deuteronomic keynotes, and strikes chords which are echoes of the corresponding Haphtara passages from Deutero-Isaiah and the Psalms for the season. A great part of the Sermon was probably delivered as a connected discourse, but Matthew enlarged it by incorporating some other Logia. Luke, on the other hand, cut out a good deal which he considered no longer of value. The essential purpose of our evangelist is to give a specimen of the general tenor of our Lord's preaching. It had as its kernel enforcement in the boldest and most paradoxical terms of the supremacy of the law of love. It aimed at producing a Messianic Israel worthy to be the 'remnant' to carry out God's purpose (cf. Zeph 3 [12, 13]; Is 65 [8-11]), and reveals the Messianic consciousness of our Lord. He considers the OT revelation *sub specie æternitatis*. He, the second Moses, is also the true Joshua who will bring His people into the Land of Promise (cf. the first Beatitude with Dt 3 [1-28]). Their moral and spiritual life must be directed, not by the legal righteousness of the scribes (cf. [20] with the continual emphasis in Deuteronomy upon righteousness), but by the eternal divine intention behind the letter. Our Lord is conscious that in Himself the earlier revelation of God's will has been transcended, and a new and higher revelation made (5 [21-48]). Moses, moreover, was not only a legislator, but a judge (cf. Ex 18 [16]); and so in the sermon our Lord is represented as the final Judge of men (7 [21-23]), who pronounces upon the value of every life.

V. 1, 2. The sermon is not addressed primarily to the multitudes with the view of winning them for the Kingdom (4 [17, 23]), but is an instruction given to 'his disciples' who have already accepted the call. Yet it is given in the hearing of the people, for those who have 'ears to hear.' They too may perchance be awakened to repentance and faith.

3-12. The Beatitudes (Lk 6 [20-23]).

In the Beatitudes our Lord draws the outlines of the character of the 'sons of the Kingdom.' They describe not different types of men, but different aspects of the one type that the Lord desires. In them our Lord gathered all the coloured rays of the spectrum of OT piety and Messianic hope into the white light of their fulfilment in the new Israel. As the disillusionment of the present had gradually strengthened the Messianic hope, so blessedness (Hebrew 'O the happiness of') had come to be the special good that the elect hoped to enjoy in the promised Kingdom.

The promise of the 'Kingdom of heaven' is especially attached to the first and eighth Beatitudes. This is the consummation of blessedness, the recurring note of the beatific octave. It is something which is beyond, behind, and within; real, yet waiting to be realized.

3. First Beatitude. The 'poor' and the 'pious' are identical in Deutero-Isaiah and the Psalter (Hebrew *'ani*); the words describe not just the poor in earthly goods, but the group of religious people who will constitute the 'remnant.' This Beatitude is based upon Is 66 [2]; cf. 5 [15]; Ps 34 [18]. Luke (4 [18]) preserves the LXX translation of *anawim* in his description of the first sermon of our Lord at Nazareth (cf. Mt 11 [5]). Since *'ani* and *'anaw* are often interchangeable in the OT, it was probably *'anaw* that was used both here and in [5]. Matthew here adds 'in spirit' in order to prevent misunderstanding. An interesting parallel is found in *Sifre* on Numbers, § 101, 81.

4. The second Beatitude is based upon Is 57 [18] and 61 [2]. The Messiah is the Comforter of the 'mourners of Zion,' mourning here being the expression describing their ardent longing for the establishment of the Kingdom (cf. Levertoff, *Die religiöse Denkweise der Chassidim*, 154-160).

5. The third Beatitude is a direct quotation from Ps 37 [11], often interpreted eschatologically in Rabbinic literature (cf. *Sifre*, § 42; see also En 5 [7]). Meekness is confident dependence upon God, who will in His own good time vindicate His people by making them the inheritors of the world (cf. Ps 37 and Rom 8 [17]). It has nothing to do with the easy-going amiability which often masquerades under the name.

6. The fourth Beatitude is probably based upon Ps 63 [1]; Is 41 [17], 44 [3], 55 [1]. The words 'and thirst after righteousness,' not found in Luke, were probably inserted by Matthew to preserve the spiritual and eschatological significance of the saying. For the promise cf. Dt 8 [10], 11 [15]; Is 65 [13]. In the Deuteronomic passages the reference is to worldly prosperity, while in Isaiah there is an eschatological reference. In none of these passages is there any thought of the longing after holiness for its own sake. The righteousness for which Israel thirsted was that redeeming righteousness of God of which Deutero-Isaiah speaks, and which is

practically identical with His merciful fulfilment of His promises.

7. Those that are merciful shall find mercy in the Day of Judgement. For the eschatological significance of the term 'obtain mercy' cf. Dt 13 [17], 30 [3]; Is 54 [7, 8]; and *Tos. B. Kama*, ix, 30, where Dt 13 [18] is interpreted as follows: 'As long as thou art merciful, the Merciful One will have mercy upon thee.'

8. To be 'pure in heart' is to be single in purpose, or whole-hearted. The reference is probably to Dt 6 [5]: cf. Ps 24 [3-5], 51 [10]. For the expression 'see God' cf. Ps 17 [15], and for the connexion between the beatific vision of God and the Messianic Hope Is 40 [5], 52 [7, 8]. See also Levertoff, *Love and the Messianic Age*, ch. I.

9. The seventh Beatitude is probably suggested by Dt 20 [10]; Is 48 [22], 57 [2], and especially 57 [19]. For 'sons of God' cf. Dt 14 [1]; Is 43 [6]. In Slav. En 52 [11] 'blessedness' is also attached to peace-making: 'blessed is he who planteth peace and love.' The peacemakers shall be recognized by God as His children, because they share in His purpose. For the eschatological significance of peace cf. *Sifre* on Numbers, 35-39.

10. The eighth Beatitude was probably suggested by Is 51 [1]: 'Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness.' The verb in the passive form is often used in the Talmud for being persecuted. The chapter is Messianic, and those who follow after righteousness are promised the restoration of Zion. This explains the connexion of being persecuted for righteousness' sake with the possession of the Kingdom. This connexion is also to be observed in [11] and in Is 51 [7].

11. The address here becomes more personal (cf. Luke). The Beatitude is emphatically expressed in the second person, and the personality of our Lord is definitely introduced. Luke has 'for the Son of Man's sake' instead of 'for my sake.' The old Syriac version of Matthew read here 'for my Name's sake,' which is probably not a variant but an idiomatic rendering.

12. That Christ's followers will be reviled and persecuted for His sake is taken for granted. They should rejoice not in spite of the persecution but because of it, for their reward 'is great in heaven.' The underlying thought is that everything that is done or suffered for God's sake enters into the consciousness of God (cf. 6 [20], 19 [21]; Ac 10 [4]); it ascends to heaven and is there accumulated as a treasure (cf. for 12*b* Is 66 [5]). The prophets of old were the predecessors of Christ's followers, and they also suffered for the sake of their vocation. For modern applications of the Beatitudes cf. Gore, *The Sermon on the Mount*.

13-16. The reward of the disciples is at present in heaven; but their vocation is here on earth. The latter is now set forth in metaphor (cf. Mk 9 [50]; Lk 8 [16], 14 [34]).

13. The disciples are the 'salt of the earth'; and as, according to Dt 4 [6-9], 7 [6], 26 [18-19]; Is 43 [21], 60 [3], the vocation of Israel was to leave its stamp upon the world at large, so one of the functions of the disciples is to preserve the world from moral decay and to make it more palatable to God. Unless this distinctive moral and spiritual savour is preserved, they will become as contemptible as apostate Israel (Dt 28 [37]), the blind servant (Is 42 [19]), and God's purpose for the world will be frustrated.

14. Another of their functions is to live 'above' the world and aloof from it, as a beacon in the surrounding darkness. There is probably a reference to Is 2 [2-4]. In the new Israel God's missionary purpose will be fulfilled.

15, 16. To lock up the spiritual light that is in them is as foolish as to put the corn measure over the candle, instead of putting it upon the upturned measure to throw the light abroad in the house. The indwelling light of the disciples should so shine out before men that all men will be moved to glorify God as the Father of the disciples. Their conduct should be such as to characterize them as sons of God in a specific sense, not merely as belonging to Israel (cf. Dt 14 [1] and 1 P 2 [12]).

17-20. This parenthesis has often been misunderstood (cf. Allen; McNeile; Streeter, *The Four Gospels*; Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*; B. W. Bacon, *The Sermon on the Mount*; F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*).

Before proceeding with the interpretation of the Law, the fulfilment of which would enable men to bring forth 'good works' and qualify them for membership in the Kingdom, our Lord explains to the disciples, in words probably suggested by Dt 4 [2], that, notwithstanding His new programme for them as a distinctive community and His seeming opposition to traditional piety, He does not come as a new Legislator, but, like Moses, the 'first redeemer' (Dt 1 [5], where the Hebrew word translated 'declare' means 'to make clear'), as an Interpreter of the old revelation. He has not come to 'annul' (the word used in the original Aramaic or Hebrew belongs to the terminology of 'vows':

cf. Nu 30 [8-16]) the divine Will expressed in the Law and the Prophets, but to bring out the full divine purpose contained in them. The scribes and Pharisees, in spite of their eagerness to keep the letter of Dt 12 [32], casuistically either 'loosened,' i.e. evaded, certain commandments, or added innumerable laws of their own.

Moreover, our Lord must have had in mind Jer 31 [31-34]. He was the Founder of the New Covenant, under which the divine instruction was to be written on the hearts of the new Israel. Israel 'loosened' the covenant, but He has come to fulfil it, to act it out in the fulness of its demands. The Law contains divine thoughts which, as long as the present heaven and earth, the period before the commencement of the Messianic era, lasts, must receive due regard (cf. 11 [13] and Lk 16 [16]). Our Lord's words refer to the period before the accomplishment of the divine promises by the setting up of the Kingdom; and, so far from contradicting St. Paul's teaching that the Law has passed away for Christians, themselves anticipate that teaching. Under the New Covenant, the law of love, which the Spirit will both reveal and bestow the power to keep, will be sufficient. Meanwhile, those who prematurely endeavour to lighten the burden by antinomian teaching, or by casuistic evasions, show a lack of understanding of the divine purpose. When the Kingdom shall have been established, these will be regarded with contempt by those enjoying the full enlightenment of the Messianic age. On the other hand, those who in the pre-Messianic age strive to live and teach the full keeping of the Law, will be counted great by the children of the Kingdom, because of their loyalty and devotion to the light which they possess. If this explanation of these difficult verses seems to give an unnatural meaning to the passing of heaven and earth (cf. 24 [35]), we must remember (i) the eschatological associations of our Lord's language (Is 65 [17] and 66 [22]); and (ii) that our Lord did not in His teaching clearly distinguish the different stages in the development of the Kingdom of God, and perhaps did not yet know what they would be (cf. 24 [36]). The word 'jot' = Greek *iota*, the smallest letter in the Greek alphabet, is substituted here for the Hebrew *yodh*, the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet. 'Tittle' means either the stroke used to mark an abbreviation, or, as Burkitt suggests, the letter *waw*. *Yodh* and *waw* are vowel letters often omitted in Hebrew and Aramaic texts.

20 is obviously meant to be taken ironically. The 'righteousness' of the scribes and Pharisees was pre-eminently external and without moral dynamic. It could be practised without much spiritual or moral effort.

For the connexion between 'righteousness' and entering 'the Kingdom of heaven' cf. Dt 9 [4, 5, 6] and Is 60 [21].

21-VII. 27. The 'Good Works,' or the Moral and Spiritual Heroism of the 'Sons of the Kingdom.'

V. **21-48.** Heroism in relation to men.

21-26. Our Lord now proceeds to expound the new and higher law. The sixth commandment was treated in the discussion of the schools merely from the juridical point of view, and 'ye have heard that it was said by them of old time' is a traditional scribal phrase, with the sense of 'you have understood this to mean.' But our Lord emphasizes the divine mind behind this prohibition to murder, and teaches that both the harbouring of anger and the use of abusive language are included within its scope. He also makes use here of the current scribal style of expounding, differentiating the several degrees of anger.

22. Without a cause is probably a later addition. Anger is, from the divine point of view, liable to the same judgement as that given by the local tribunal upon a murderer. The local tribunal consisted of twenty-three members, and was specially appointed to deal with flagrant offences, whose punishment was fixed and certain, and did not require the expert decision of the great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem (cf. *Sanh.*, i, 3, 4).

Raca means 'empty head' or 'scamp.' This offence, not being as serious as that of harbouring anger, is only adjudged equal to a crime requiring to be judged by the Central Sanhedrin in the Temple. This council gave judgement upon 'light' or delicate cases, not simple enough for the local council. The word translated 'fool' is either the equivalent of the Hebrew *shote*, used by the Jews until this day, or perhaps a play upon Dt 21 [18], *sorer u-more*, stubborn and rebellious. This offence would not be considered punishable even by the Sanhedrin; but in the divine mind that can judge of the malevolent intentions of the heart the offender is liable to punishment by the 'Gehenna of fire.' Gehenna was the name of a ravine just outside Jerusalem where rubbish was burnt. It had come to be used of the place of future punishment.

According to the usual interpretation we have an ascending scale of offences and

penalties. The scale is in fact a descending one, as in [39-42].

23-26 (cf. Lk 12 [58, 59]). Here we find the teaching applied to a particular case, and the method of procedure set forth. The gift of one who has offended God by uncharitable anger, contempt, or abusive language against his brother, is not acceptable to Him. The offerings of 'the peacemaker' are His delight: 'first be reconciled to thy brother.' He who brings an offering to the Temple appears before the face of God (Ps 42 [2-4]); and, if anyone has a grievance against him, he should lose no time in becoming reconciled, lest death, overtaking either of them, leave the debt unpaid, and the offender to appear presently before the Great Judge. Since sinning against a fellow-man is regarded as the incurring of a debt (cf. 6 [12, 14], 18 [21-35]), the punishment is presented in legal terms: we have judge, police officer, and imprisonment. A sincere attempt to enter into peaceful relations with the brother against whom we have sinned is a more important duty, and more acceptable to God, than a gift upon the altar. He who does not fulfil this duty will be under a divine ban until he does. In Lk 12 [58, 59] we find [25, 26] in a different connexion. Luke's context is probably the right one.

27, 28. Here the seventh commandment is expounded in the new light. This commandment was interpreted by the scribes as only applying to definite acts of sin, and that only with a married woman (cf. *Sifre* on Numbers, §§ 7-21). Yet thought is the seed of which action is but the matured growth. Adultery has been committed by any man who allows himself, in the glance of an eye, deliberately to regard a human being as an instrument of lust. The Greek seems to show that our Lord speaks neither of the involuntary occurrence of evil thoughts, nor of the involuntary awakening of the sexual impulse, but of looks whose deliberate purpose is to awaken the latter.

29, 30 (cf. 18 [8, 9]). See notes on Mk 9 [43-47]. No one should excuse himself on the ground of the weakness of his sensual nature. If his instincts are unruly, he must take heroic measures to subdue them. The eye and the hand are the special instruments of lust.

31, 32. These verses form a sub-section. Cf. 19 [3-12]; Mk 10 [11, 12]; Lk 16 [18], and the notes on all. Those who strive after the higher righteousness must not be influenced by the conventional interpretation and application of the law of divorce (Dt 24 [1]). This, it is true, contains a concession of the 'hardness' of the human heart. But the will of God is that marriage should be a lifelong union between a man and a woman, which can be dissolved neither by the lust or caprice of the husband nor by any legal enactment, and which remains unbroken, even after a separation has taken place. as long as both are alive. Divorce is not so much undesirable as impossible. The 'saving' clause, which is absent from Mark and Luke (cf. 1 Cor 7 [10] f.), has often been interpreted as recognizing one case in which divorce is allowable and as reflecting the current practice of the Palestinian Church when the Gospel was written. Possibly, however, it is added by a copyist, and only intended to qualify the clause 'causeth her to commit adultery.' An adulteress could not by her husband's act be made an adulteress, since she would be one already; and it would be in accordance with Rabbinic dialectics to raise this objection. (For the current scribal interpretation of Dt 24 [1-3] cf. *Sifre* on Numbers, ix, 12.)

33-37. Cf. Ex 20 [7]; Lev 19 [12]; Nu 30 [2]; Dt 23 [21-23]. Another distinctive 'good work' of the disciples should be their avoidance of unnecessary strong utterances of affirmation or denial, and of the indiscriminate use of oaths. It requires heroic self-control, especially in the East. to avoid this; but he whose words are always truthful needs not to confirm them with an oath, nor does he give to another any justification for demanding one. 'Whatsoever is more' is the result of the prevalent untruthfulness and the mutual distrust resulting from it. In totally denying the lawfulness of oaths the Quakers have the support of some of the greatest of the Fathers. But human law has to take account of the prevalence of evil, and it is not clear that our Lord would forbid us to take an oath when the representatives of the State command us to do so (cf. 26 [63, 64]; 2 Cor 1 [18, 23]; Rev 10 [6]). The Rabbis drew casuistic distinctions between different formulæ in swearing. The disciples not only avoid oaths by any of the divine names, but oaths by anything associated with God. There is indeed nothing that is without its own relation to Him (cf. Is 66 [1]; Ps 47 [2]). The original form of 5 [37] was probably 'let your yea be yea and your nay be nay' (cf. Jas 5 [12]; Midr. Ruth 3 [16]).

38-42. The rule of revenge (cf. Lk 6 [29] f.). As the *lex talionis* in Dt 19 [21] is connected with false witnessing (Dt 19 [16-20]), so here the new law concerning retaliation follows on that concerning swearing. Though the original purpose

of the *lex talionis* was perhaps to restrict rather than to inculcate revenge, the Shammaiite school of interpretation insisted upon its literal enforcement. Christian heroism in this case consists in the elimination of all vindictiveness and in detachment from worldly self-interest (cf. Lk 6 [30]). 'Evil' (39) may mean 'the evil one,' i.e. the violent person, or 'that which is evil.' It is exemplified by four concrete instances arranged in a descending scale: acts of violence, legal proceedings, official demands (forced military or civil service), and simple requests. In all this our Lord legislates for His own new society and its individual members, especially in their relations with the hostile and persecuting world (44): cf. 26 [52-54] and note there. The duty of the State is another matter (cf. Rom 13 [4]), and the Christian should support the State in fulfilling its duty of dealing with evil-doers within and without its borders by police action and defensive war (cf. 22 [21] and note there).

43-48. The rule concerning the treatment of enemies (cf. Lk 6 [27-36]).

43. In Deuteronomy there are frequent references to Israel's attitude to their enemies when entering the Land of Promise (cf. 7 [16], 20 [17], 23 [3-6]), and much which seems to justify the maxim 'Thou shalt hate thine enemy.' But our Lord rejects this teaching. It cannot be in accordance with the mind of God to narrow the great principle of love by distinguishing between Israel and the Gentiles, between friends and enemies (cf. note on 22 [39]). The disciples must show forth their 'good works' as children of their Father, who bestows His blessings on all alike; the categorical imperative for them if they are to 'possess the good land' is found in imitation of God, in loving as He loves (cf. Lev 19 [2]). So Philo says that 'Holiness consists in imitating the deeds of God' (*De alleg. legum*, i, 14; Mangey, i, 52). For Rabbinic and mystical ideas of *Imitatio Dei*, cf. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinical Theology*, xiii; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, xx; and Levertoff, *Love and the Messianic Age*, 20-23.

In [45-48] God is represented as the Father, not of all men, but of our Lord's disciples; and the word 'brethren' presupposes the special bond of common membership in the people of God. Though God is in a true sense the Father of all, and we may rightly speak of the brotherhood of man, the NT speaks neither of the universal Fatherhood nor of the universal brotherhood. Mt 25 [40, 45] affords no exception.

VI. **1-18.** Heroism in relation to God.

Almsgiving ([1-4]), prayer ([5-8]), fasting ([16-18])—these are the three characteristic marks of Jewish piety (cf. Dan 4 [27]; Tob 12 [8-10]); and, rightly understood, as helping the poor, fellowship with God and contrition, are also to be the marks of piety in the 'sons of the Kingdom.' For this reason our Lord makes clear to them here the distinction between real piety and Pharisaic ostentation, the former having God alone for its motive. 'The secret of religion is religion in secret.' Although they are to be seen doing good works (5 [16]), they are to beware of doing good works in order to be seen. This paradox is the pivot of the whole sermon. In Jewish writings these marks of piety are usually put in the order—repentance, prayer, and almsgiving. The warning of [1] (the variant reading 'alms' is due to the LXX trans. of *zedakah*: cf. Dt 6 [25]; 24 [13]; Dan 4 [27]) is intended as an introduction to the section; and 'righteousness' comprises almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. The expression 'doest thine alms' is a Rabbinic phrase (cf. *Sifre* on Numbers, 38). Standing is the usual attitude of prayer among the Jews. The name given to the ancient prayer, 'the eighteen blessings,' is *Amida* (standing). The 'messenger of the congregation' (cf. 'angel of the church' in Rev 2 and 3), the congregational leader-in-prayer, stood in front of the ark containing the rolls of the Law. 'Inner chamber' is reminiscent of Is 26 [20].

2. sound not a trumpet. There may be a reference to some Jewish practice here; but the words are probably metaphorical.

7-15. These verses contain appended *logia* on prayer, together with the Lord's Prayer. The logion in [14, 15] is found in its original context in Mt 18 [21-35]. The Lord's Prayer in a shorter form is found in Lk 11 [2-4], [13b] is a liturgical formula, and does not belong to the original prayer. For [14, 15] cf. Mk 11 [25, 26]; and for similar connexions between man's forgiveness and God's cf. Ecclus 27 [3-5]; Philo (Mang.) ii, 670; *Yoma*, 23*a*.

7. use not vain repetitions. The origin of the Greek word employed is uncertain. It is probably a hybrid word such as often arises in the common speech of bilingual countries. Its first part is the Aramaic *batel* (empty), often used in the Talmud for idle, empty words, in contrast to the words of the Torah (cf. 12 [36]). This sense is preserved in the Sin. Syr. translation. Thus the word will not refer to 'vain repetitions' of the same prayer, but to that use of meaningless words as a charm, which was specially characteristic of

heathenism, as our Lord must have observed. This, and the condemnation of the materialism of their aim in life in [32], are the only reproaches that our Lord directed against the Gentiles.

9-13. Much has been written on the Lord's Prayer and its OT, and later Jewish, background as regards both phrasing and thought (cf. Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*). The Kingdom that the Lord is proclaiming is in view throughout; and the recompense of which the Lord speaks ([4, 6, 18]) will be bestowed when it comes.

9. The address 'Our Father' is, according to Jewish usage, proper even in a man's private prayer, 'for even when alone he must unite himself with the community' (*Ber.*, 30*a*). Many Jewish prayers begin with 'Our Father, Our King'; and the phrase 'which art in heaven,' absent in Luke, is also often used. It is important to notice that 'the hallowing of the Name' is, in Jewish thought, always connected with martyrdom.

10. Thy kingdom come—may God's rule fully enter into the hearts of men. **Thy will be done** is not a prayer of resignation, but one for the full accomplishment of the divine purpose, as in 26[42]. The words **as in heaven, so on earth** belong to the three preceding clauses (cf. Burney, *The Poetry of our Lord*). The Kaddish prayer ends with 'May He who maketh peace in His heights make peace for us and for all Israel.'

11. The difficult Greek word translated 'daily' is so uncertain that it can be taken to mean either 'give us the bread we need for to-day,' or 'give us to-day the bread we need for to-morrow.' Cf. Mechilta: 'The man who has enough to eat to-day and asks "What shall I eat to-morrow?" belongs to those of little faith.' These are the words of Rabbi Eleazar of Modin, who deduces this from Ex 16[4]; but Rabbi Joshua derives from the same verse the opposite meaning, viz. that a man should think of to-morrow.

12. And forgive us our debts. The Aramaic word for 'debt' is used in Targum and in the Talmud for 'sin'; Luke has 'sins.' The meaning is that only in so far as we cancel the debts of others towards us will God cancel our debts towards Him. There is no direct Rabbinic parallel to this, but cf. Ecclus 28[1-5].

13. That **bring us not into temptation and deliver us from evil** are closely connected is very probable; for 'temptation' may refer to the 'woes of the Messiah,' the moral and spiritual tribulations attendant upon the consummation of the Messianic age. Then the disciples will be called upon to suffer for the Lord's sake, when they must stand firm and not deny Him. According to the current Jewish idea, the evil disposition, *yetzer ha-ra'*, is identical with Satan and with the Angel of Death; in other words, sin and death are personified in the evil one. Thus the meaning is 'deliver us from evil lest we be led into spiritual death.' The prayer is a prayer of humility and self-distrust, not of cowardice and selfishness. We are not to presume upon our own strength. The doxology is missing in Luke, and also in the best authorities here. Similar doxologies are found in the OT (cf. 1 Ch 29[11], etc.); but whether it was actually used by our Lord or added later on the OT model is uncertain.

16-18. Our Lord does not primarily refer to the appointed fasts; for otherwise it would not be necessary to 'appear unto men to fast,' i.e. to go about unwashed and unkempt (cf. *Taanith*, i, 4-7; *Yoma*, viii, 1).

To [17] there is an interesting parallel in *Test. of Joseph*, iii, 4. The principle of our Lord's teaching applies to all suffering, voluntary or involuntary. We are to be cheerful and make light of it, not seek the admiration of others for our fortitude.

19-34. Heroism in relation to oneself (cf. Lk 11[34-36], 12[22-34], 16[13]). The deceitfulness of riches and the care of this world.

The connexion of this section with the preceding one is at first sight not clear. It consists of two parts closely united, the warning against the accumulation of worldly possessions and that against anxiety. The Lord's great desire is that we should be unworldly and single-hearted ([21-23]); the presence of the divine light within depends upon our being so. But why is the single heart so difficult? Because, desiring to lay up earthly treasure, we try to serve two masters ([24]). And why do we desire to lay up earthly treasure? Because we are anxious about the future. Thus the Lord sees that it is upon the banishment of anxiety that the possession of the single heart ultimately depends, and so chiefly sets Himself to banish that. Whether this section originally belonged to the sermon, or Matthew collected and inserted *logia* which originally had other connexions, cannot be stated with certainty; but the purpose of the evangelist in inserting it here is clear. It is a part of the heroism expected of the 'sons of the

Kingdom' that they should not set their hearts upon the accumulation of earthly possessions or be anxious about the necessaries of life; for 'the care of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word' (13 22).

19. for yourselves. It is selfish hoarding that is forbidden (contrast 2 Cor 12 14). The word translated 'rust' means rather 'devouring by vermin.' Wealth in the East consists chiefly in jewels, garments, and produce.

21. The heart follows the treasure. The heart cannot be in heaven if the treasure is here. In the psychology of the Bible the heart includes the intellect as well as the emotions. Both our thoughts and our love follow our treasure.

22. single. The word thus translated may mean 'liberal' (cf. Rom 12 8), but the wider meaning is better here.

24. Throughout the verse what is said of God comes before what is said of mammon. There are two possibilities: (i) We may love money, and then we necessarily hate God. His demands upon us continually interfere with our ways of making and of hoarding money. (ii) We may resolutely hold to God, and then we necessarily despise money. We do not hate it, but we regard it as a 'very little thing' (cf. Lk 16 10 ff.).

25. Therefore: because the love of money arises chiefly from anxiety. Two points should be carefully noticed: (i) There is no contrast between soul and body. The 'life' in question is merely that of the body. This life is more precious than the food which sustains it, as the body is more precious than its clothing. (ii) Anxiety is forbidden, not because the body and its life do not matter, but because anxiety is both useless (27) and for the disciples unnecessary.

26. Our Lord's argument is *a fortiori*. The birds and flowers differ from us in three ways: (i) They make far less provision for the future. (ii) Their intrinsic value is far less. (iii) The duration of their existence is much shorter. If then God cares for them as He does, how much more will He care for His believing children? Our Lord displays an appreciation of natural beauty without parallel elsewhere in the Bible, but there is not the slightest suggestion that we ought to imitate the birds and flowers.

29. one of these. Each flower has its own individual beauty and value. How much more has each individual Christian in God's eyes!

32. after all these things. The heathen life is one of ceaseless distraction, for so many things are necessary; and the heathen, who care nothing for God's will, have no claim upon His providence. They have every reason for anxiety.

33. his righteousness. Not in Luke. The reference is either to the coming vindication (cf. note on 5 6) or to the true righteousness in the moral sense, as contrasted with the Pharisaic. The two are in the closest connexion.

added unto you: cf. 1 K 3 11-14; Mt 4 4; Rom 8 28; 1 Cor 3 21-23.

34. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. This, absent in Luke, means that it is foolish as well as wrong to be like the heathen in being anxious about the morrow. It is enough to cope with the difficulties of to-day; we can leave to to-morrow its own. For a Talmudic parallel (*Sanh.*, 100*b*) cf. Allen *ad loc.* There is deep pity for human life in these words of the Lord, reflecting as they do His own experience.

On the whole passage see notes on Lk 12 22, 35, and Levertoff, *Reflections of a Danish Philosopher on the Sermon on the Mount* (Quest, vol. xvi, No. 1, 1924).

VII. This chapter appears to consist of *logia* which resemble pearls without a thread. Its apparent want of connexion with the preceding one has caused it to be assumed that the sermon, as it stood in Q, is now resumed by Matthew at the point where he left it at the end of 5. The chapter is full of paradoxes; e.g. 'Judge not' is followed by an injunction to distinguish between men, lest 'that which is holy' be 'cast to the dogs.' Probably, as is customary in the East, the sermon was interrupted by questions from the audience, and these verses contain the answers of our Lord to some of these interruptions.

1, 2. Measure for measure, the old Jewish saying often found in Midrash and Talmud (cf. *Sifre* to Numbers, 23; Mishna *Sotah*, i, 7), is here used to illustrate the truth that a man will be judged by the standard which he sets up for the judgement of others. He who knows this will, in view of his own sins and shortcomings, show mildness and mercy in his judgements, if not withhold them altogether (cf. Rom 2 1 ff.).

3-5. Cf. Lk 6 41, 42 and note there. The illustration of the mote and the beam is occasionally found in Rabbinic literature (cf. Midr. *Tehillim* on Ps 53).

6. In this verse by 'that which is holy,' meat offered in sacrifice is probably meant. The meat of certain sacrifices was consumed by the priests (Ex 29 33, etc.), and to give it to dogs would be extreme dese-

cration. Cf. the Christian liturgical formula, 'Holy things for holy persons,' and *Didache*, 9. The swine would be unable to appreciate pearls; and, not finding them eatable, they would trample them in their greedy search for food. The first parable presents only the danger of desecration (Holtzmann suggests 'ear-rings' instead of 'holy.' The word for 'ear-rings,' *kadasha*, is similar in sound to *kadosh* = holy: cf. Pr 11 [22]), while in the second both the possession and the possessor are endangered. What is holy is the precious possession of the sons of the Kingdom, to whom these words are addressed. They will come into contact both with those who will accept the Gospel without being able to appreciate its character, and with those who will despise both the gift and the profferer. They should avoid the danger of holy things being profaned, as well as the personal danger to themselves. In the teaching of the Lord faithfulness is one thing, and foolhardiness is another (cf. 10 [16-18, 23]).

7-11. In these words our Lord probably answered those whom He saw to be in despair of ever being able either to attain the high standards set forth in the sermon, or to enter the Kingdom. The Kingdom is a prize to be won by prayer and effort of ever-increasing urgency (cf. Lk 13 [24-27]; Jn 6 [37-29]).

In Lk 11 [9-13] this section follows the parable of the friend at midnight and the Lord's Prayer. It is not improbable that Matthew found these sayings in the order in which he has given them.

10. According to the better reading, **ask also for a fish.** The child asks for one thing after another. The earthly father is too often irritated by this, but the heavenly Father is not. He goes on giving the true blessings asked, not disappointing substitutes which resemble them.

16. being evil: better *unkind*. The kind heart of the Lord had noticed that, unlike God, we do not find generosity easy (cf. 2 Cor 9 [7-9]; Phil 4 [19]; Jas 1 [5]).

12-29. Cf. Lk 6 [31]; 13 [23, 24], 6 [43, 44, 46], 13 [25-27], 6 [47-49]. Here we find a short summing up of the whole sermon in a kind of Pilgrim's Progress. 'Therefore' opens this résumé. 'Do as you would be done by' is the sum for the Law and the prophets. Then walk not along the broad way, but along the narrow way of the few, who follow this apparently impossible standard. False prophets will try to lead you astray. Judge them by their fruit. Even to the very gates of the Kingdom will some come who will not be given a place in it. Therefore be warned. He who hears these sayings and practises them is as a man who builds on rock; while he who hears and disregards builds on sand.

12. Cf. Tob 4 [15], the nearest OT parallel. It is characteristic of the Lord to give to the precept a positive, and not a merely negative, form. But, as He says, in substance it is not new.

13, 14. Cf. Dt 30 [19]; Jer 21 [8]; *Test. Abrah.*, 10 f.; and the early part of the *Didache*. But our Lord probably speaks from His present experience. The narrow gate is that of acceptance of His message and attachment to His person; only by entering it can the approaching judgement be escaped. Already it is clear that the nation as a whole is rejecting Him. For the doctrine of the two ways cf. Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*.

15. The false prophet is not the fantastic dreamer, but the prophet the falsity of whose teaching arises from the evil which prevents him from hearing the voice of God. It is ever his characteristic that he preaches smooth things, and denies the truth expressed in [13, 14] (cf. Jer 14 [14], 23 [16, 17]; Mic 2 [11]). For 'sheep's clothing' cf. Zech 13 [4], and for 'ravening wolves' Ezek 22 [27]; Jn 10 [12]; Ac 20 [29] (perhaps a reference to our Lord's caustic antithesis here). The false prophet seeks ever his own advantage, and 'devours' the flock. Cf. Ezek 34 (a chapter which frequently lies behind the Lord's language); Lk 20 [47]; 2 Cor 11 [20]. Even here our Lord may have the Pharisaic teachers in mind.

16. The false prophet is arrogant, unsympathetic, unapproachable (cf. again 2 Cor 11 [20]; Gal 4 [17]). It is precisely because the Lord has 'words of grace' (Lk 4 [22]), and is neither a thistle nor a thornbush, that He calls men away from the Pharisees to Himself (11 [28-30]). Often the man who claims to speak in God's name brings a message whose truth we cannot immediately test; we must judge by his character and conduct. For other tests cf. Dt 13 [1-3], 18 [21, 22]; 1 Jn 4 [1-3]; but the Lord's is the simplest and best.

19. Repeated from 3 [10], perhaps mistakenly.

21. There should be no fresh paragraph here. Our Lord warns His hearers that there will be false prophets and miracle-workers among Christians themselves. As in [16-18], the teaching here specially applied to prophets has in Luke a much wider reference (cf. Lk 6 [43-45]). The Jewish Christians for whom Matthew writes, by reason of their religious knowledge were far more disposed to become

teachers of others than the Gentile converts (cf. Rom 2 [19, 20]; Jas 3 [1]). The Corinthians were in this exceptional (1 Cor 14 [26]). Thus Matthew's version of our Lord's teaching is probably here more accurate than Luke's. This is borne out by the title of 'Lord' here given to Jesus. It is quite natural to put it into the mouth of those who see the Lord on His judgement throne; but not so natural as it appears in Lk 6 [46], since it does not seem to have been commonly employed by the disciples during our Lord's earthly life. The entrance into the Kingdom to which our Lord here refers is, as the context shows, entrance into the final Kingdom which will follow the judgement. The Kingdom of heaven is for those who obey the Father of heaven.

22. in that day: *Dies iræ dies illa* (cf. Mal 3 [17]; En 45 [3]). It is always easy for those who seem to themselves to possess spiritual power to rest upon it as a sign of their acceptance with God; but it is hard to say what powers are truly supernatural. Holiness is a far better test of union with God.

23. The knowledge here spoken of is probably the knowledge involved in the divine approval (cf. Ex 33 [17]; Jer 1 [5]; Nah 1 [7]; 1 Cor 8 [3]). The last words of the verse suggest that our Lord saw His own experience foreshadowed in Ps 6. After His Passion and glorification He will be the minister of the divine judgement.

24. Prudence is with the Lord one of the cardinal virtues.

27. The ruin of a soul is a great tragedy.

28. the multitudes were astonished. Not only did Jesus proclaim Himself the Judge at the great assize, but His claim to authority found an echo in their own consciousness. It was 'numinous,' a revelation of God. The word used for 'authority' is probably a translation of the Hebrew *Geburah*, which in Rabbinic literature is a substitute for the divine name. Cf. the phrase 'the Decalogue was given by the mouth of Geburah,' i.e. directly by God (cf. 5 [22, 28]). This is more probable than Reitzenstein's far-fetched derivation of the word from the terminology of the hermetic mystery-religions (cf. Poimandres, i, 13, 14).

The prophetic lesson which was read in connexion with Dt 11 [26] f. (blessing and curses) and Dt 13 [1-5] (false prophets) was Ezek 13 [1-15], which deals ([1-9]) with false prophets and is followed by a similar parable.

VIII. **1-17. Examples of our Lord's healing activity.**

In the short summary (4 [23]) the evangelist refers to the healing as well as to the teaching of Jesus. Having given a specimen of the teaching, he now selects some of the healing-miracles, omitting that of the demoniac (Mk 1 [23-28]; Lk 4 [33-37]), since other opportunities will arise for describing such cases (cf. 8 [28-34], 12 [22], 15 [22-28], 17 [18]). The three examples in this group are (i) of leprosy in a Jew who was unclean from his condition; (ii) of the palsy ([5-13]) in a Gentile who was by the Jews considered impure; and (iii) of fever in a relative of a disciple. That Matthew, whose purpose was, we suggest, to relate the narratives in connexion with the Deuteronomic and corresponding lessons, found the incidents in this order in the Logia is probable. Dt 28 [15-18] follows the exposition of the commandments with curses upon those who fail to keep them: the exposition of the New Torah is followed by blessed acts of mercy. The first redeemer threatens dreadful diseases of the skin and fever; the last Redeemer heals these sicknesses. The Haphtara for the Deuteronomic passage is Is 57, containing ([19]) the words 'Peace, peace, to him that is far off and to him that is near . . . and I will heal him.' This probably accounts for the order of the incidents—first, 'him that is far off,' the centurion's servant, and secondly, 'him that is near,' Peter's wife's mother.

1-4. The healing of the leper (Mk 1 [40-45] *v.n.*; cf. Lk 5 [12-16]).

Luke, following the Marcan order, places this miracle much earlier.

2. worshipped him. The act of prostration is frequently used in the East (cf. 18 [26]), and does not involve 'worship' in the strict sense of the term. But it is noticeable that our Lord, unlike His servants, does not refuse it (cf. Ac 10 [25, 26]; Rev 19 [10], etc.).

3. touched him: contrast 2 K 5 [10, 11]. Our Lord does not shrink from ceremonial uncleanness. His volitional activity is very clear in this miracle.

4. shew thyself to the priest: cf. Lev 14. The leper was as such separated from the people of God, and needed to be formally restored. The Levitical ceremonies were for atonement, cleansing, consecration, and restoration to the community. Without the priestly action the blessing would have been incomplete.

5-13. The healing of the centurion's servant (Lk 7 [1-10] and note: cf. Lk 13 [28] f., and Jn 4 [46-53]).

Notice both the different setting and the fuller characterization of the centurion there given ([29]). Matthew characteristically omits details which he thinks

unnecessary. In the sources the centurion section was probably found in connexion with the sermon. The centurion was a non-commissioned officer in the service of Herod Antipas. Probably he was a native of Palestine who spoke Aramaic and knew the Jewish prejudice against 'entering in' with a Gentile. In Luke he is too modest to appear in person.

7. Our Lord's words are probably to be taken interrogatively.

8-9. He had such a comprehension of the supernatural power, healing sympathy, and love of Jesus as to believe that He could bring His power into action as easily as he himself could govern the movements of his subordinates. Moreover, he seems also to recognize that just as his own authority over others rests upon his loyalty to his superiors, so the power of Jesus depends upon His perfect obedience to the Father.

10. In Israel, the people of faith and hope, Jesus found no such recognition of the power of God working through Him as that which He found in this Gentile. He exhibited the faith characteristic of the true spiritual Israel. In 15 [21-28] it is again a Gentile who believes that the Lord can heal without personal contact with the sufferer.

11, 12. The eschatological passage here introduced by Matthew is probably a genuine logion of our Lord, the style being reminiscent of Is 65 [13-14]. That chapter begins with the contrast between Israel and the Gentiles. In the traditional Jewish interpretation, [1] refers to the Gentiles, and [2] to Israel (cf. LXX and Rom 10 [20, 21], 9 [25]). Our Lord casts a prophetic glance into the future when it would often happen that Jews would be put to shame by Gentiles. This one Gentile, living in the 'land of Israel,' brings into His mind a vision of the numberless pagans who, like this centurion, will come to believe His power and, entering the Kingdom, participate in the Messianic feast with His people. To His people belong the saints of all times. At their head are the patriarchs of Israel, who to God are not dead (22 [32]). The 'sons,' the natural heirs, of the Messianic Kingdom shall, through their unbelief, be cast into 'the outer darkness,' the punishment awaiting sinners (Ps. Sol. 14 [6], 15 [11]; 2 Esd 7 [93]). 'The outer darkness' is an eschatological expression found only in Matthew (cf. 22 [13], 25 [30]). The brightness of the feast is contrasted with the darkness without.

14, 15. The healing of Peter's wife's mother (Mk 1 [29-31]; Lk 4 [38, 39]).

Since Matthew intends merely to give examples of Jesus' healing activities, he omits details, and gives a shorter account than either Mark or Luke. Jesus reverses the curse of Dt 28 [22] (fever); and the incident is aptly put after the healing of the centurion's servant to correspond with Is 57 [15-21], the probable Haphtara to the chapter of 'curses' in Deuteronomy.

16-17. The healing of the sick at even (Mk 1 [32-39]; Lk 4 [40, 41]).

The news of the healing gets abroad so that even in the house of the disciple Jesus has no rest. Since it was Sabbath, it was when 'even was come,' i.e. when Sabbath was ended, that the people came thronging. They brought 'many' and He healed 'all' (cf. Luke). Mark has they brought 'all' and He healed 'many.' But no difference of view as to what took place is likely to be implied in such variations. The Lord's power was always present to heal, but not always the faith necessary to obtain the healing. The demoniacs are specially mentioned because of the excitement of the morning over the cure of one (Mk 1 [23-27]).

17. This verse refers to the whole section. Cf. Is 53 [4] (quoted from the original, and not from the free LXX trans.), which our evangelist regards as fulfilled in the healing activity of Jesus. He Himself 'bore' (both by sympathetic feeling with the sufferers and by healing them) their sicknesses, and carried their diseases. For a similar application of this verse in later Rabbinic cf. Dalman, *Der leidende Messias nach der Lehre der Synagoge* (1877), 11-15; Levertoff, *Die rel. Denkw. der Hassidim*, 158 f. The application of the essential features of the servant of Jehovah in Deutero-Isaiah to our Lord was common to the Apostolic Church (cf. Mt 12 [15-21]; Lk 22 [37]; Jn 12 [38]; Ac 8 [30-35]; 1 P 2 [22-25]: cf. also 2 Cor 6 [2] f.), and was based upon our Lord's own teaching (Lk 4 [17-21]).

18-IX. 34. The wanderings of the Teacher and Healer.

In these sections Matthew gives briefly a few examples of the busy life of our Lord. In Mark the crossing of the lake follows the second stay at Capernaum, not the first, as here (cf. Mk 4 [35]).

VIII. 18-22. Two aspirants to discipleship (Lk 9 [57-60]). Luke seems plainly to be right in placing this section at the time of our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem; for (i) our Lord was not homeless in the early stage of His ministry, but had a house at Capernaum; (ii) the apparent harshness of [22] corresponds to the urgency of the later situation.

The scribe, addressing the Lord as Rabbi, offers to accompany Him on His journeys as a disciple. Jesus does not repel him, but invites him to count the cost (cf. Dt 20 [2-9]). The claim to a settled home is always inconsistent with discipleship. The Spirit of God, like the pillar of cloud in the wilderness, must always be our guide as to when to stay where we are and when to move elsewhere. The other aspirant evidently belonged to that larger circle of disciples who with more or less constancy accompanied our Lord in His wanderings. We do not find here a case (cf. 10 [35-38]) of a choice between love to Jesus and love to relatives who are the enemies of Jesus, or a collision between duty towards the Master and duty towards a dead parent. Other relatives, not disciples of Jesus, could perform the funeral rites. In the figurative sense such persons are dead, while the disciple under the vivifying influence of the Master has become alive. Had he properly valued the blessing of fellowship with Jesus, he would have preferred to leave such duties to others rather than to leave Jesus even for a short time. The proverbial saying is probably based on Dt 33 [9]. It is, however, possible that the father was not yet dead, and that the disciple asked to remain with him till his life was ended.

For the title 'Son of Man,' used here for the first time, see notes on Mk 2 [10]. Since in Aramaic 'Son of Man' means simply 'man,' both the description of Moses in the OT as 'the man Moses' and 'the man of God,' and the contemporary Jewish estimate of him (cf. also Dt 34 [10]), may throw some light upon this enigmatic title. Is 53 was applied to Moses by some Jewish circles. In Midr. to Dt 33 it is said of Moses that 'from the middle down he was human, while from the middle up he was divine,' because he was called the 'man of God,' i.e. Man-God. It is not therefore improbable that our Lord, being cognizant of these ideas, expressed in this title both His humanity and His unique relationship to God, His suffering as well as His exaltation. By some groups among the Jews the Messiah was expected to be a reincarnation of Moses (cf. En 90 [9] f.; *Orac. Syb.*, v). For the NT apposition of Moses and Jesus cf. Jn 5 [46].

Allen says that it is not easy to see why Matthew should have placed this section here in his series of miracles. But Is 65, whether a Haphtara or not, was probably the motif of Mt 8 [11-12], and it contains words referring to 'death' (Is 65 [12, 20]); thus in Midrashic fashion the section concerning the two aspirants is put here, for our Lord says 'Let the dead bury their dead.' In Halakic as well as Haggadic terminology this method of artificially grouping together incidents suggested by sentences or words found in the Scripture lesson is called *semukim* (in earlier terminology *hekesh*: cf. Hillel in *Tos. Pesahim*, iv, 162, Luck ed.). It would also explain Matthew's arrangement of the narratives in 8 [23]-9 [26]. It was probably customary to relate these incidents in connexion with the prophetic lessons from Deutero-Isaiah. Is 51 [10] and 63 [12, 13] possibly suggested the 'stilling of the storm,' 65 [4] the cure of the demoniacs, 55 [7] the healing of the paralytic (forgiveness of sin: cf. also 51 [7]), and 54 [6] the healing of the woman with an issue. Is 58 [5] supplied the keynote for the narrative concerning fasting and our Lord's presentation of Himself as the Messianic Bridegroom.

23-IX. 34. A series of narratives found together in the three Synoptics (cf. Mk 4 [35]-5 [43]; Lk 8 [22-55]).

VIII. 23-27. The Tempest on the Lake (cf. Mk 4 [37] f. and the notes there; Lk 6 [23] f.). Some of the peculiarities of Matthew's presentation are due to an abbreviation of Mark's narrative. He has 'upheaval' (the word elsewhere in the NT means 'earthquake') instead of 'a great storm.' (On sudden squalls on the Sea of Galilee see Dalman, *Orte und Wege Jesu*, 182); he omits words which are unfavourable to the disciples (cf. Mk 4 [39, 40]); he attributes the exclamation and the fear (changed soon to 'marvel') to 'the men,' perhaps the boat's crew, of whom no mention has been made before.

24. Christian thought has seen in the ship the symbol of the Church. The sleep of the Lord is not only the sleep of exhaustion but the sleep of trust in God.

26. Our Lord seems to grant the miracle unwillingly; the disciples should not have needed it. Miracles are for the world; the Lord and those closely associated with Him may rely upon the Father's care (cf. 4 [3, 4], 6 [33], and Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, v). The rebuke of the winds and the sea does not suggest a personification of them, as though they were evil spirits, but is probably an allusion to Is 51 [15] (cf. Ps 106 [9]; Nah 1 [4]).

27. It is the Lord's action rather than His words which raises the question of His Person. He does what God does (Ps 89 [9]; 107 [23-30]).

28-34. The Gadarene demoniacs (Mk 5 [1-20]; Lk 8 [26-39]).

For the three different place-names, the moral implications of the destruction of

the swine, and other difficulties, see notes on Mark. Peculiar to Matthew are the words 'before the time,' i.e. 'before the last judgement,' and the mention of two demoniacs (cf. Mt 20 [30]).

29. Cf. Jg 11 [12]; Mk 1 [24]; Jn 2 [4]. The phrase protests against a connexion or a claim which another is seeking to establish. For the coming judgement of the demons cf. Eth. En 15 [16]. The demons, being bodiless, cling to the means of activity open to them, and desire the position of 'controls.'

32. Go. Our Lord is the Saviour of men. He is not at present concerned with cosmic redemption, though one day He will be (cf. Rom 8 [19] ff.). The redemption of the universe must wait for that of men.

34. It is not only the owners of the swine who desire the Lord's departure (cf. Lk 5 [8]). The divine suddenly revealed is *mysterium tremendum*, even more than *mysterium fascinans*.

IX. 1-8. The healing of the paralytic at Capernaum (Mk 2 [1-12]; Lk 5 [17-26]).

Here also Matthew abbreviates the Marcan account, omitting the picturesque details. The unique designation 'his own city' (cf. 8 [5], 17 [24]) for Capernaum is used in contrast to 8 [28, 34]. Capernaum to our Lord, like Antioch to St. Paul, was the centre from which He departed, and to which He returned. Immediately on His arrival they brought to Him a paralytic 'lying on a bed.' Since Matthew omits the details, the reader has to guess at what led Jesus to see faith in the bearers. The thoughts of the scribes were mirrored in their looks and gestures; and the 'evil' is the blasphemy which they impute to Him.

6. Two points must be observed for the understanding of our Lord's words: (1) Sin and suffering are regarded as closely connected; (2) the coming of the Kingdom, which the Lord proclaims, is to banish both. The Lord's healing miracles are the signs of the Kingdom, the first drops of the coming torrent of blessing. If He brings the blessings of the Kingdom for the body, He can bring them for the soul also.

8. glorified God, which had given such power unto men. The title 'Son of Man' did not suggest to them the Messianic claims of Jesus; but they felt exalted as men by the experience that God's acts of forgiving and healing had become possible for man. Their manhood was uplifted in the Son of Man, who removed in the name of God the guilt of sin as well as physical disease.

9-13. The call of Matthew. Jesus eats with publicans (Mk 2 [14-17] and notes there; Lk 5 [27-32]).

Mark has 'Levi and son of Alphæus,' and Luke 'a publican named Levi'; Matthew and Levi are clearly to be identified. It was not uncommon, especially in Galilee (*Tos. Gittin*, vi), to have several names; and the name in this case may possibly have been Matthew Levi, or Matthew the Levite. Clem. Alex., however (*Strom.*, IV, ix, 73) and other writers distinguish between Levi and Matthew.

9. Our Lord's method is noticeable. In order to touch a difficult class, He completely gains an important member of it, and so gets into touch with the rest. At the north end of the lake was the border custom-house for the dominions of Antipas and Philip.

10. in the house. It is not clear in Matthew whether the house is our Lord's or Matthew's. Perhaps our Lord welcomed the publicans to His own. By 'sinners' is not necessarily meant open evil-livers, but those who did not rightly observe the Law. The publicans e.g. could not observe the Sabbath. Our Lord seems to have recognized that men became tax-collectors because they were broken men who could find no other means of support (Lk 15 [14, 15]).

11. The critics complain to the disciples of the Lord, as they complain to the Lord of the disciples ([14]), instead of making their complaints directly.

13. The quotation from Hos 6 [6] is found only here and in 12 [7]. The formula 'come go ye and learn' is Rabbinic. It is the practical love of God and man which brings sanctity, not aloofness from the ungodly. The Pharisees, whom our Lord ironically characterizes as 'whole,' are in truth not so; for they lack the essentials of true piety. The Lucan addition 'to repentance' found here also in some MSS. narrows the Lord's meaning. His call was primarily to the Kingdom; repentance was but a necessary preliminary.

14-17. The question of fasting (see Mk 2 [18-20] and notes there; Lk 5 [33-39]). Who were the questioners? Though Mark and Luke are ambiguous, they are here definitely said to be disciples of the Baptist; and our Lord's answer probably suggests a rebuke to the disciples of the 'friend of the bridegroom' (cf. Jn 3 [29]).

15. Fasting is an expression of sorrow; it has no reality unless the sorrow is present and craves expression. Our Lord's words here are His first reference in the Synoptic Gospels to the Passion, but it is a veiled reference, as are all that

precede the confession of His Messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi. In the Lord and His disciples the Kingdom is in a true sense already beginning; the disciples are the groomsmen of the Messianic bridegroom, ready to go with Him to claim Israel His bride. But suddenly the bridegroom will be mysteriously removed, and the anticipated feast turn to mourning (cf. Lk 17 [22]). The fasting of the Pharisees was the fasting of law; it was performed in fulfilment of a positive command. The fasting of the Baptist's disciples was the fasting of repentance; it was an expression of sorrow for sin. Christian fasting at its highest is an expression of sorrow for the Passion of the Lord and for our present separation from Him. In Scripture the purpose of fasting is to give power to the prayer which accompanies it. The thought of it as a help to the discipline of the body hardly appears in Scripture (cf. Col 2 [23]).

16, 17. The main thought of these verses is clear, but the exact points of the comparisons a little obscure. Is the Lord defending the disciples of John who adhere to the old ways, or defending His own disciples for breaking with them? Probably the original occasion of the sayings is lost. The metaphor of the garment is according to OT usage applied to the righteousness of the people of God. Threadbare as the Pharisaic righteousness may be, it is useless to put Christian patches upon it. The metaphor of the bottle is found in Job 32 [19], and is applied to a man full of a message which he has to deliver. Neither the Pharisees nor the disciples of John were suited to be heralds of the Kingdom that the Lord proclaimed. On all this the history of the Apostolic age is the best commentary. The attempt of the Jewish Christians to patch the Pharisaic righteousness was completely unsuccessful; the Law passed away, and the Spirit took its place as the creator of the Christian character (Gal 5 [22]). The Pharisaic Christians, so far from becoming the evangelists of the world, were the great hinderers of St. Paul's activity.

18-26. The raising of the ruler's daughter, and the healing of the woman with an issue (Mk 5 [21-43]; Lk 8 [40-55]). For the stylistic differences between the Synoptic renderings of this narrative and for the story itself see notes on Mark.

27-34. The healing of two blind men and of a dumb demoniac. These two sections are peculiar to Matthew: the first looks like a doublet of 20 [29-34].

27. **Have mercy on us, thou Son of David.** This address may have been the cause of Jesus' unresponsive attitude. Only on His arrival at His house does He enter into their trouble. Their loud acclamation of Him as Messiah was not such an expression of personal faith as had been given by the ruler and by the woman with an issue. Not until He receives an emphatic affirmative to His testing question does He touch their eyes and pronounce to them the fulfilment of their desire.

30. For the charge not to make public his action, since He does not desire fame as a mere miracle-worker, cf. 8 [4] and 12 [16-19].

32-34. At the moment when these left the house, a dumb demoniac was brought to Him. Thus even in the house and far on into the evening those in need of help gave Him no rest (cf. 8 [16]).

33. Since the act of healing took place in 'the house,' the words 'and the multitudes marvelled' cannot refer to this particular cure, but are rather a statement of the general impression made by all that Jesus had done in and near Capernaum up to this time. The section could not have been closed more fitly.

34. This verse seems out of place, and is omitted in 'Western' and other texts; it was probably added by a copyist from 12 [24].

35-XI. 1. The co-operation of the disciples.

35-X. 1. Introduction to the mission of the Twelve.

Here we have not only a résumé, which almost in the words of 4 [23] summarizes the wanderings, teaching and healings of Jesus, but also an introduction to a new section, the co-operation of the disciples. Already we have heard of the call of two pairs of brothers (4 [18-22]) and of Matthew (9 [9]). Moreover, the distinct position of the Lord's disciples, and their mission to the world, have been made clear in the Sermon on the Mount (cf. especially 5 [11-16]). But not until now is their training described, or the part which they took in the work. The evangelist describes the emotion of our Lord in words founded on those spoken on another occasion (cf. Mk 6 [34]). In Rabbinic literature Moses is called 'the faithful shepherd' (cf. Is 63 [11]). It is in this task of gathering the scattered sheep (15 [24], 18 [12]) that the Lord proves Himself to be the promised Shepherd of Mic 5 [4]; Ezek 34 [23], 37 [24], the true King of Israel. But He could not, while on earth, reach all; and so like Moses in Nu 11 [16, 17] needed fellow-workers to aid Him.

IX. 35. Teaching and preaching are distinct. The Gospels record much of the

Lord's teaching, but little of His evangelistic preaching, though cf. Lk 4 [16-22]. The latter, as included in the Gospel preached by the Apostles, was already well known to all Christians. It was in these evangelistic tours from Capernaum that the Lord obtained first-hand knowledge of the deplorable condition of the people.

36. distressed and scattered: better *harassed and prostrate*—in the modern phrase 'down and out'—from lack of true guidance. In the OT the shepherd is not a symbol of the priest or prophet, but of the ruler (Nu 27 [17]; 1 K 22 [17]; and above all Ezek 34). Our Lord thinks of him as the sheep-master, to be contrasted with the hireling (Jn 10 [12]). The miserable condition of the people was due chiefly to the fact that neither Pilate, nor the Herodian princes, nor the Sadducean high priests, were worthy of the name of shepherds; and that even such moral and religious guidance as the scribes provided was not upon true lines. But human rule is at best a poor thing; its forms are ever changing, because all are found unsatisfying. Our Lord comes to establish the rule of God.

37, 38. The Lord shows no pessimism about the future of Israel. The Law and the prophets have not been in vain, and it is a harvest ready to be gathered if the needed labour can be provided (cf. Jn 4 [35]). It is for God, to whom the harvest belongs, to provide it. In the OT and other Jewish literature, as in 13 [30, 39], the thought of the harvest is specially connected with the judgement (cf. 3 [12]); but our Lord uses traditional language in new ways of His own.

X. 1. It is here taken for granted that Jesus had already selected the Twelve and bestowed upon them the title of Apostles (10 [2]); for they are introduced without preamble as a defined and recognized body. See on the other hand Mk 3 [13] f.; Lk 6 [13]. The Apostles are twelve, to correspond to the tribes of Israel (19 [28]), always in the NT regarded as still existing in Palestine and in the Jews of the Dispersion (Mt 4 [14-16]; Lk 2 [36]; Ac 26 [7]). The NT knows nothing of 'lost tribes' preserving their identity in some place unknown.

2-4. The names of the Twelve (Mk 3 [16-19]; Lk 6 [14-16]: cf. Ac 1 [13]). Matthew somewhat changes the order from that given in Mark. His order agrees most closely with Luke's. In the first group of four he puts the brothers in pairs, instead of placing Andrew after the three chief Apostles. He might have done both; but that would have involved putting Peter third, which Matthew would not do ('first' in [2] means 'first and foremost'). In the second group Matthew is placed after instead of before Thomas. The lists, especially those of Mark and Matthew, have many variants. The history of the text of the Gospels is, as it were, seen in miniature in these passages. See Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 144, and cf. notes on Mk 3 [16-19].

5-42. The Discourse to the Twelve.

In this second long discourse Matthew again agglomerates sayings of the Lord belonging to different periods, probably desiring to provide the evangelists of the Palestinian Church with a kind of pastoral handbook, as he has already provided the whole body in the Sermon on the Mount with a summary of Christian duty, the new law of the Kingdom. Thus he takes first Mk 6 [7-11]; then adds to it other matter, drawn partly if not entirely from Q, which belongs to a later stage in the Ministry (cf. Lk 10 [1-16]). In [17-22] he draws from the great apocalyptic discourse of Mk 13 ([9-13]), and finally collects various sayings of the Lord which possess a special meaning for Christian evangelists, though they have also a wider application.

As with the Sermon on the Mount, nothing is said concerning the time when the charge to the Twelve took place. But we gather from 9 [36-38] that a considerable time must have passed before our Lord saw the necessity for appointing helpers. How little the evangelist intended to give here a chronological account can be seen from the fact that in contrast to Mk 6 [12, 13, 30] he is silent both about the result of the charge and about the return of the Apostles.

5, 6. These verses, peculiar to Matthew, concentrate for the time upon work among Israel. 'The way of the Gentiles' does not refer to missionary journeys into distant countries (cf. 23 [15]), but to attempts to preach to Samaritans and to Gentiles in the Decapolis, where Jesus Himself occasionally went (8 [28]). These verses, like 5 [17], warn the disciples not to break prematurely the barriers between Israel and the Gentiles. Their consciousness of the universal significance of the Kingdom and of their own mission (5 [13] f., 8 [10, 11]) as well as their experiences in Samaria (Jn 4 [3-42]) might have induced them to work among the Gentiles and the Samaritans; but our Lord knew that they were not yet ripe for such work. The disciples were to keep in mind the words of 10 [24] with regard to the future developments suggested, and not to attempt that

which the Master had not yet seen fit to attempt.

7, 8. First comes the preaching, which is in essence that of the Baptist and of our Lord Himself (3 [2], 4 [17]: cf. Mk 6 [12]; Lk 9 [2, 6]); then the healing, which includes the raising of the dead (omitted in many MSS.: cf. Lk 10 [9]). The words 'freely ye have received, freely give' refer to healing; they were not to trade with their miracle-working power. Cf. Is 55 [1], and the Talmudic saying: 'God says, As I (have given you the Torah) for nothing, you (must spread it) for nothing' (*j. Ned.*, 38*c*; *b. Ned.*, 37*a*; *Bechoroth*, 29*a*).

9-10. Cf. note on Mk 6 [8, 9], where a staff is permitted. The outward equipment is to be even less than that of the poorest traveller. The 'students of the Law' were accustomed to travel from place to place to imbibe the wisdom of famous Rabbis, and were given hospitality by the people. They usually carried with them staves on which to hang their bundle of clothing, and in their wallets a little money, roasted nuts and parched corn. In the cold weather it was usual for them to wear two coats as a protection (cf. 1 Cor 9 [14]).

11-15. Cf. Mk 6 [10, 11]; Lk 10 [5-7]. They should not accept indiscriminately any hospitality offered to them; but, having found a worthy host, remain in his house until their departure from the place. The customary salutation *shalom*, 'peace be with you,' would be no idle greeting, but would leave a real blessing in its wake. Matthew does not need to explain *shalom*, as Luke does. 'Salute' and 'peace' are practically the same both in Hebrew and Aramaic. For the style cf. Dt 20 [10-12]. If they proved to be mistaken in the worthiness of their hosts, the misplaced blessing would 'return' to them in compensation for any unpleasantness they might have experienced (cf. Zech 5 [3, 4]). Both blessings and curses were regarded as having an objective existence of their own. The blessing which they had the power to impart they were not to force upon those who had no desire to possess it (cf. 7 [6]); and any house or city showing lack of receptivity and sympathy with them and their message they were to leave, and to shake off even any dust of that house or city which might cling to their feet. A solemn assurance is given to them that the inhospitable city, and not they, shall suffer. Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19 [4-11]; Dt 29 [23]; Am 4 [11]; Is 1 [9]) are often mentioned in the Talmud as examples of inhospitality. According to Mishna *Sanhed.*, x, 3, the Sodomites will have 'no part in the world to come,' but their resurrection for punishment is assured. The authority claimed by our Lord is remarkable. It is seen (i) in the claim to quarter His messengers upon those to whom He sends them. They are not to go as begging friars, but to enquire for a host worthy to receive them (cf. Lk 19 [5]). (ii) His followers are the carriers of a blessing so powerful that it must come to rest somewhere. (iii) The message is not to be 'taken or left,' as men think well. To refuse is to incur an awful responsibility and a terrible punishment. The message of the Gospel is never rightly delivered unless the responsibility of the hearers is brought home to their minds (cf. Ac 13 [40, 41, 51], 20 [26]). The modern Church here fails deplorably, and fails not from excess of charity, but from lack of courage and of the sense of mission.

16-23. Predictions of persecution. Lk 10 [3] places the saying of [16] at the beginning of the charge to the Seventy. The Lord's teaching here is quite inappropriate to the earliest mission of the Apostles (cf. Jn 16 [1-4]), and evidently looks forward to their work after the Ascension. That the majority will treat the Apostles with aversion, when they come as ambassadors of the Messiah, is taken for granted (cf. 5 [11] f.). Their fellow-Jews will deliver them over to the Jewish councils, and they will scourge them in their synagogues. This was permissible even under the rule of the Herods and of Rome (cf. 23 [34]; Ac 22 [19], 26 [11]; 2 Cor 11 [24]; Mishna *Makkoth*, iii, 12). Moreover, they will be brought before governors, i.e. Roman proconsuls and procurators, such as Pilate and Felix, who kept to themselves the prerogative of the *jus gladii* (cf. Jn 18 [31], 19 [10]), and before kings for His sake. See notes on Lk 12 [11, 12], 21 [5-9].

16. I send you forth. There is a great sense of authority in these words. In this, the Lord's later teaching, His sense of the world's hostility seems to be deeper than in 9 [37]. Cf. Midr. *Rabba* on Cant 2 [14]: 'God saith of the Israelites: Towards me they are sincere as doves, but towards the Gentiles they are prudent as serpents.' The RV. translation 'harmless' is deplorable; 'pure' or 'sincere' is probably right. The great weapons in dealing with the world are our Lord's own—wisdom and purity of character. Eastern adroitness, though disliked by ourselves, is a fine quality which our Lord in the Gospel story exhibits at every turn. It is the rapier that He wields, and not the bludgeon. In the conflict with the world His followers are to use every

legitimate weapon; there is nothing admirable in stupidity, or in 'muddling through.'

17. beware of men. The dexterity of the serpent is mainly shown in this: he is difficult to catch (cf. [23]). So far from our Lord demanding of His followers the foolhardy disregard of their lives in doing His work, He forbids it. His own skill in escaping from His enemies during His ministry was remarkable, as was also St. Paul's. In the early centuries this part of our Lord's teaching was often forgotten.

19, 20. Both Matthew and Mark record, apart from these verses, hardly any direct teaching about the future gift of the Spirit; though, as will be seen in Mt 25, the parables presuppose it. But it is obvious that, unless our Lord had given more teaching upon the subject than any of the Synoptists record before the Resurrection, these verses would have been unintelligible.

21. Cf. [34-37], and for the language Mic 7 [6].

23. D, supported by Sin. Syr., Origen, and Ephraem, has the following reading: 'But if they persecute you in this city, flee into another; and if they persecute you in the other, flee into another: for verily,' etc. The saying of the last half of the verse is probably a genuine word of the Lord (cf. Jn 16 [16]), but it is found only here, and we do not know its original context. But had the Lord meant, as has been strangely suggested, that the final consummation would come before the end of the Apostles' tour, we should find the verse after [15], and not here. Matthew evidently understood it to mean that the Lord would in some sense 'come' before the evangelization to follow the Ascension was complete (cf. notes on [23, 34-36]). On our Lord's anticipations of 'the end' cf. notes on 24.

24-33. A further group of sayings on persecution.

These verses contain injunctions to fearlessness; the dreadful prospect of humiliation, loss, and persecution should not fill them with alarm (cf. Lk 6 [40]; Jn 13 [16], 15 [20]), since as disciples of the 'Master' and servants of 'the Lord' (cf. 7 [21]) they can hardly expect better treatment than He Himself has received (see Mk 3 [22]). The true nature of His work and that of His enemies will be revealed, and persecution end with the coming of the Kingdom (cf. 5 [10, 11]). The disciples must not be always merely passive; when the proper time comes they must proclaim our Lord's teaching upon the house-tops. [28-33] enforce these thoughts. In *Sifre* on Nu 5 (cf. Eng. edition, 75) we find a parallel to the injunction to fearlessness. God said to Moses: 'Persuade them (the elders) with words first. Say unto them words of praise: "blessed are ye that ye have been chosen," and then say unto them words of blame (concerning Israel): "know that they (the Israelites) are troublesome and tiresome; ye have been chosen upon that condition that ye should take it upon yourselves to be cursed and stoned by them." The condition I made with thee (Moses) I make with them also' (cf. Mt 10 [24]).

24, 25. These or similar words occur also in Lk 6 [40], Jn 13 [16], and 15 [20], but in varying senses. Our Lord Himself may have applied them differently at different times. The same is true of [26] (cf. Mk 4 [22]; Lk 12 [2] ff.). For the charge brought against the Lord in connexion with Beelzebul cf. notes on 12 [22] ff.

27. In the East the house-top is the favourite place for gossip and discussion.

28. him which is able. The reference is undoubtedly to God. At the approaching judgement the whole man may perish. As in similar NT passages, it is the living who are in view; there is no thought either of death or of resurrection.

29-31. Our Lord here speaks of the divine knowledge which embraces all existence; and the illustrations chosen suggest that this knowledge is accompanied by a living and loving interest in what is known. But His words do not exclude from the world a real element of contingency; it is not true that all that takes place is equally the act of God.

32, 33. As in [28] the time contemplated is the approaching consummation of all things (cf. Rev 3 [5]). Our confession of Christ is our confession of Him as Christ and Lord (Rom 10 [9]); His confession of us is His recognition of us as members of His household (contrast 7 [23]).

34-39. The conflict of claims.

It is the purpose of Jesus to produce conflict; He has not come to 'cast peace' (cf. for the expression *Sifre* on Nu., 33) upon the earth. The message which He brings to men is a Gospel of that Kingdom which fulfils the highest Messianic hope; the acts which accompany its preaching are acts of peace and goodwill; every house and city the Apostles should salute with 'peace' ([12] f.); to make peace should always be their chief aim (5 [9]). But the Gospel must inevitably divide society into camps (cf. Lk 12 [52, 53], 14 [26, 27]), for the Lord 'came to set a man at variance' (found only here and in Aquila, Dt 14 [6])

with his nearest relations (cf. Dt 33 [9]; Is 66 [5]). It will not be enough to respect truth and righteousness more than the wishes of our nearest relatives; we must yield to the claims of Jesus even when this means facing the bitterest hatred of the nearest and dearest. In the conflict of claims His own is supreme; and he who would let any other claim soever outweigh His is not worthy of Him. A disciple to be worthy must voluntarily take up the cross on which he is condemned to die, and follow the Master who marches in the van to the common end. He who under the pressure of persecution desires to preserve his life will lose the true life of the soul; while he who joyfully dies will live. In the Lord's martyr-spirit is to be found the pattern for the disciple (Lk 9 [23] f.). There are five forms in which the Synoptists preserve this paradox (cf. McNeile on Matthew, and Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 191). In *Ber.* R. 65 a Rabbi compares Isaac carrying the wood for the sacrifice (Gen 22 [6]) to a condemned man carrying his cross.

34. Cf. 5 [17]. Both the mistakes against which the Lord warns us continually recur. Our Lord is never the Prince of Peace except to those who accept His authority. His claims, unless fully accepted, tend, as history has shown, to the dissolution both of the family and of the State, though their acceptance gives to both a unity and strength unknown before (cf. 19 [29]). In such sayings as this we must remember that the Hebrew mind does not distinguish between definite purpose and necessary consequence. The purpose of our Lord's coming was, we should say, to establish the reign of peace; the sword of division was but the necessary consequence of the condition of the world (cf. note on 13 [15]).

35, 36. An adaptation of Mic 7 [6]. The very situation which seemed to Micah so deplorable is the situation which our Lord will produce. Human society is like a broken limb badly set; it must be broken again before it can be set rightly. The division created in the Jewish people by the Apostolic preaching was the first example of the truth of the Lord's words. In the East the relation of the daughter-in-law to the mother-in-law is much closer than among ourselves; even with us religious and moral differences often poison it.

38, 39. It is the taking up of the Cross in response to some God-given call to which parents so frequently object. They do not urge their own claims, if their daughter wishes to go to India as the wife of a soldier; but, if she wishes to go as a missionary, they urge them at once. The Crucifixion was a spectacle only too familiar in Palestine, and these words may have been spoken at any time during our Lord's ministry (cf. 16 [24, 25] and Jn 12 [25], where the Lord may apply the same principle to Himself).

40-42. The dignity of the Lord's servants, and the reward of those who welcome them (cf. [11-15], 25 [31-46]). Cf. also for the thought of representation Lk 10 [16]; Jn 13 [20], etc.; [42] is drawn from Mk 9 [41].

40, 41. In the eyes of God the value of the Apostles is great. They are representatives of the Lord, as He is of the Father; they are prophets ([20]) and righteous men, showing forth (5 [16]) the true righteousness of the Kingdom. Thus the attitude of men towards them will reveal their attitude to Christ and to God, to the word of God and the character of God. 'In the name of' means 'in the capacity of.' For the reward to be gained the welcome must not be due either to the natural kindliness of the welcomer, or to the natural attractiveness of the servant of Christ. The Lord's teaching rests in part upon the ordinary rights of a representative; an ambassador must be honoured as the king whom he represents. But far deeper thoughts enter in. The Lord represents the Father because in Him the Father Himself comes (Jn 14 [9-11]). Similarly the Apostles represent Christ, because they bring Christ (Jn 15 [4]; 2 Cor 13 [3, 4]). Matthew, as we have seen, has the needs of the Apostles and evangelists of the Church everywhere in view; but the principles which our Lord's teaching involves apply to all Christians in their measure.

42. Cf. Is 60 [22] and the great parable of 25 [31-46], especially [40].

XI. 1-XIV, 12. Difficulties and encouragements.

XI. The failure of the Galilean ministry.

1. This verse is a mere formula of transition to another section (cf. 7 [28]).

2-19. Jesus and the Baptist (cf. Lk 7 [18-23]).

2. in the prison: cf. 4 [12], 14 [3-12]. The imprisonment seems to have resembled that described in Ac 24 [23]. Antipas found himself in a difficulty (Mk 6 [20]—the better reading). The public denunciation of his relation to Herodias could not be tolerated, but he had no desire to harm John, in whose personality he took an interest (cf. Lk 23 [8]).

3. The Baptist's question presents no difficulty. He had apparently identified Jesus (3 [14]) with the One who would baptize with the Holy Ghost and with

fire, and expected a Messiah of judgement. The career of Jesus thus far had in no way suggested the fulfilment of John's expectations. Not only had Jesus as yet made no public claim to Messiahship, but He seemed to be acting in a way inconsistent with it. Is 61, one of the Haphtaras for New Year's Day, probably prompted the sending of the disciples. If John's activity began at the New Year, a whole year must have passed since he in full faith proclaimed Jesus to be 'the One'; but now despair began to fasten upon his spirit.

4-6. From the answer of our Lord it would almost appear that the messengers of John had actually quoted some of the Haphtara passages for the New Year: 'to preach good tidings unto the poor, . . . to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of revenge of our God.' One of the Deuteronomic lessons for that season was Dt 29, where Moses is portrayed as exhorting the children of Israel to obedience by the memory of works they have seen. The fact that Hos 14 was also one of the lessons for the season throws light on [6] and [19], for that Haphtara ends with the words: 'Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? . . . for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them, but the transgresssors shall stumble therein.'

4. It was not the Lord's way to give 'a plain answer to a plain question.' The questions put to Him generally involved misconceptions. So it was here. Our Lord turns the mind of the Baptist to prophecies very different from those upon which he had chiefly dwelt (cf. e.g. Is 35 [5, 6], 61 [1-4]), and so to a different conception of Messiahship. Were not these prophecies being fulfilled in the Lord's miracles and proclamation of the Kingdom? Was He not proving the truth of the message of the Kingdom by these foretastes of its blessings?

6. A gentle warning to the Baptist not to be alienated by the lack of fulfilment of his expectations. It is not uncommon to find urged as difficulties for faith the very events and experiences which the Lord has taught us to expect.

7-19. Jesus' estimate of John (Lk 7 [24-34]).

7-11. While the messengers are departing, but are still in sight, our Lord breaks forth into a panegyric. Lest the multitude may look upon John's wavering with surprise, Jesus bids them glance back to his ministry by the Jordan, and so grasp his historical significance. What had urged their pilgrimage to Jordan? It was surely something more than to view the river sights. Was it not that after the long silence a true prophet had arisen, who could show them the will of God? And when they had come to him, had they been disappointed? Here was no courtier in rich clothing, but a prophet, himself the fulfilment of prophecy (Mal 3 [1]). Among men there has arisen none greater than he (cf. Dt 34 [10]). Yet paradoxically there is a greatness superior to John's—that which belongs to even the least of those disciples whom our Lord calls 'little ones.' For them Jesus and the Kingdom are interpenetrating realities; whereas John stands looking towards Jesus, but with a gaze both critical and perplexed.

10. It is doubtful whether this verse was spoken by the Lord; it may have been an interpolation in the authority here used by both Luke and Matthew. The words of Mal 3 [1] are: 'Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me,' and the LXX correctly translates the words. The Synoptists, however, all give a different meaning to the prophecy by their alterations, and identify the coming of the Lord with the expected coming of Jehovah to judgement. We have in fact a Christian Targum.

12. Cf. Lk 16 [16]; Mt 21 [31], recalling Lk 7 [29, 30]. On the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles the final passage of Deuteronomy was read, thus bringing to an end the cycle of lessons. This may have suggested to our Lord that with the coming of John the Baptist the old dispensation had come to an end, a situation had arisen which called for instant and decisive action, and the Kingdom of Heaven was now being violently stormed by aggressive men as Joshua stormed Jericho after the death of Moses. Probably the original Hebrew or Aramaic underlying the difficult Greek word translated 'violent' was *parezin*. It should not be interpreted as by Professor Marshall (*Crit. Review*, January, 1896) 'the law-breakers,' but in the traditional sense of followers of the son of Perez (the Messiah), who in the Rabbinic literature are actually called *Perezim*. These followers of the Messiah (according to the traditional interpretation of Mic 2 [13] he is called *Porez*) 'break through and make a way for themselves' (cf. Midr. on Gen 85, end). *Paraz* has the double meaning of breaking and spreading; hence Luke's variant 'the Gospel of the Kingdom is preached,' i.e. spread. The *Perezim* are so eager to enter the Kingdom

that they jostle one another in their efforts to reach it: '. . . and the violent take it by force.'

13, 14. All the prophets, and indeed the Law before them, pointed towards this inauguration of the new era (cf. the Talmudic saying 'all the prophets prophesied for the days of the Messiah,' *Sanh.*, 99*a*). This era began with John, who, if they can only believe it, is the long-expected Elijah (Mal 4 [5]).

16-19. The parable of the children's game (cf. Lk 7 [31-35]). In this parable our Lord pronounces His verdict on His contemporaries. The people have changed their minds concerning the Baptist; now that his preaching has ceased to frighten them, they complacently affirm 'he is possessed by a demon of moroseness.' When the Son of Man came with His cheerfulness entering into the common life of men, they said: 'He associates with men of lax life.' Thus they can no more be taken seriously than the children, when they sit in the market-place, two rows facing one another, and chanting rhymed responses with refrains of sadness or of joy. They can grasp neither the solemn warnings of John nor the joyous tidings of Jesus. In those, however, who estimate the lives exhibited by John and Jesus at their true worth, the Divine Wisdom will find her apology. Through her children Divine Wisdom will be seen to have been right. (For the personification of Wisdom cf. Pr 8.) The reading 'children' instead of 'works' seems to be the right one, as it is found both in Luke, and according to Sin. Syr. and the Old Latin in Matthew also.

The Lord's comparison has abiding value. Only two types of God's witnesses make a strong appeal to the world, the ascetic and the profoundly human. The world will always 'go out to see' the one who calls them to play at funerals, and welcome the one who calls them to play at weddings. But the force of the message can always be broken by saying of the ascetic that he is mad, and of the profoundly human teacher that he is just like everybody else. Both types are necessary. First there must be the message of judgement; and, if it is to be effective, it should be delivered by an ascetic. But when the fallow ground has been broken up, sympathy with human life is needed, and the touch which sympathy bestows.

20-24. The dirge against the cities. Cf. Lk 10 [12-16], where it is appended to the charge of the Seventy. Probably its place, however, in the Logia was that which Matthew has given to it. Everything from New Year to the Feast of Tabernacles emphasized the threefold conception of God as King, Judge, and Redeemer, His rule in the present, and the consummation of the Kingdom in the Messianic age. Dt 32 was one of the lessons for the season; and in the Song of Moses we have the idea of judgement ([36]), and ([32]) a mention of Sodom and Gomorrah which probably suggested the language of Mt 11 [23]. The traditional Haphtara corresponding to this Parasha was Is 1, in which are found the woes against Israel and (in [9] and [10]) mention of Sodom and Gomorrah. The words 'wherein most of his mighty works were done' imply that the Galilean ministry of our Lord has been almost completed, a year having passed. This accounts for our Lord's pronouncement of judgement over the cities of Galilee, and for His thanksgiving in [25-27]. This section, like 11 [2-6], shows that, even according to the Synoptists, the awakening and upholding of faith formed one of the purposes of our Lord's mighty works. The contrast frequently drawn between the Johannine and Synoptic teaching on this point has no real existence.

20. Our Lord was not primarily, like the Baptist, a preacher of repentance. But repentance was involved in that attachment to Him which belief in His message demanded. It was worldliness that had to be abandoned rather than gross sins (cf. 22 [5]). Chorazin was close to Capernaum.

23. shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? (cf. Is 14 [13-15]). Capernaum seems to have thought that a great future was before it. Civic pride may be as disastrous as personal.

24. Sodom had been judged already. But the Lord thinks of the final day of God as bringing with it a judgement from which none can be excluded. It is only at the final consummation that all the issues of past action can be known. The 'particular judgement' deals with the present condition of the individual soul (cf. St. Thom. Aqu., *S.T.*, III, lix, 5).

25-27. Jesus' great thanksgiving (cf. Lk 10 [21, 22]). As Is 61 [1-3] is connected with the question of the Baptist, so Is 61 [10, 11] seems to be connected with this thanksgiving. It expresses a joyful acquiescence in the Father's will, and our Lord's consciousness that He is the Servant of Jehovah, the hitherto unknown voice that spoke in Is 61. If, as we have suggested, the cycle of Scripture lessons was drawing to a close, another echo is found in [27]; for in Dt 34 [10] we find the

words 'there arose not a prophet . . . like unto Moses, whom God knew face to face.' This passage is not found in the same connexion in Luke, but in the Logia it probably stood as here, following the woes. When our Lord reflected on His work and its issues, disenchanting as in some respects they were, He praised God His Father, who had so wisely ordered that the revelation should be hidden from the 'wise' Rabbis and 'understanding' students of the Law, and made known to the simple and untutored. Had it not been so, only the few would have understood and benefited. But a revelation to 'babes' is accessible to all; the wise may apprehend it if they will lay aside their pretensions and become as little children (cf. 18 [3]). The language seems to have been coloured by Is 29 [14] (cf. also Dt 29 [29]). In Jewish mysticism *nistar* and *nigla* have become technical terms for esoteric and exoteric doctrine (cf. Levertoff, *Die rel. Denkweise der Chassidim*). There only the wise, who are entrusted with the mysteries of the Divine Being and Redemption, can deal with mysteries.

25. An example of the falsity of the statement that the Lord thinks of God only under the symbol of fatherhood. The omnipotence and sovereignty of God are fully recognized; and the parables set God forth, not only as Father, but as King, Master, and Judge.

26. A frequent Jewish liturgical formula, to be here paraphrased: 'yea, I thank thee, Father, that (not "for") it was so decided by thee.'

27. The contents of this verse are closely connected with the allusion to scribal piety in [25]. The 'tradition of the elders' (15 [2] f.), the technical terms of which are *Masora* (delivery, i.e. from one Rabbi to another) and *Cabbala* (reception), instead of leading them to a direct knowledge of God, blinds their spiritual perception. With this our Lord contrasts the direct 'tradition' of truth by the Father to the Son. Jesus is the true and perfect Mediator of the revelation of God to men (cf. Jn 17). The 'tradition' which He represents comes from God. In Him is the true *Masora*. What is said of Moses (Dt 34 [10-12]) is true in a much higher degree of Him. The Father, in the work of making Himself known to men, has no organ but the Son, and they possess a perfect and exclusive knowledge, the One of the Other. Moreover, as the will of God, so the will of Jesus reveals the truth only to the receptive ('whomsoever the Son will'). But the Son Himself is not only the Mediator of revelation who communicates to the receptive the knowledge of God, but is Himself a mystery open to God alone. 'There is nothing in the New Testament which carries us further than this, and nothing more is wanted to justify completely the attitude of Christian faith to Jesus' (Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, 272). To Claude Montefiore (*The Synoptic Gospels*) [27] is a great stumbling-block: 'The exclusiveness of the saying that "no one knows the Father except the Son" is painful; one can only hope that Jesus never uttered it.' If we knew nothing about Jesus apart from this utterance, it might well seem staggering. But in His Messianic consciousness He speaks as the personified Divine Wisdom (cf. Pr 8); and the absolute significance of the manifestation of God's saving power in Him pervades all His teaching. This passage strongly reminds us of the 4th Gospel. But our Lord uses of Himself the title 'Son' in just as exclusive a sense in our earliest authority (Mk 13 [32], etc.); and this passage almost certainly was found in Q.

28-30. This tender invitation is reminiscent of Is 45 [22], 'Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth,' and perhaps even more of Ecclus 51 [23-27]. Once more the Lord is seen as the Divine 'Wisdom.' 'In [25] ff. and [28] ff. are preserved two utterances of Jesus of central importance for the doctrine of His Person; Matthew has done well to place them side by side. But it is doubtful if they were originally connected. The "babes" receive the revelation of the Father and of the Son; the "toiling and heavy laden" are invited to accept the "light yoke"; we have here different spheres of thought' (McNeile *ad loc.*). It is however probable that Matthew found them together in the Logia; and on New Year's Day 'the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven,' which in Jewish tradition is practically identical with the 'yoke of the Torah,' was one of the central thoughts. The last chapters of Deuteronomy dwell continually upon the keeping of the Law. The Lord's invitation to accept His yoke not merely suggests a contrast to the 'yoke of the Law,' but contains the conscious claim that in Him the Kingdom has come. It is 'my yoke.'

28. labour and are heavy laden. The primary meaning may be that suggested by 23 [4]; our Lord thinks of the burden of the Pharisaic tradition and of the harshness by which it was enforced. But both in [25] and here the thought is probably wider. There are other forms of 'wisdom'

and 'understanding' which may be made as great obstacles to faith as those of the Pharisees (cf. 1 Cor 1 [18-29], where St. Paul may have our Lord's words in mind), and other forms of weariness from which our Lord alone can set us free. There is nothing in [29. 30] inconsistent with 5 [20]. The Lord's yoke is lighter than that of the Pharisees, in spite of the fact that His standard is higher. For (i) His gracious personality and example make all the difference. (ii) He banishes unreasonable legalism, as the next chapter will show. (iii) The peace that He brings is one with that gift of the Spirit, which brings a new power to obey.

XII. 1-45. The conflict with the scribes. Like the other evangelists, Matthew is mainly interested in the Passion, and is concerned to show how it came about.

1-21. The two disputes about the Sabbath (cf. Mk 2 [23]-3 [6]; Lk 6 [1-4]). Cf. notes on Mk 2 [23-28]. Matthew adds [5-7], and omits Mk 1 [27].

3. Our Lord and His followers are like David, cast out and hungry. The Pharisees care about the legal point, the Lord about the human need.

5. The scribes taught that Sabbath laws did not apply to the work of the priests in the sanctuary (cf. *Sifre* on Nu., § 142; *Jub.*, i, 10 f.; *M. Pes.*, vi f.), basing their teaching upon such passages as Nu 28 [2. 8] ff., but they refused to admit this as a precedent for ordinary life (*Shab.*, 74*a*: cf. Abrahams, *Studies*, i, 134). Our Lord's extension of the principle is based upon His own position in the purpose of God. The right text has not 'one greater' but 'something greater,' a phrase suggesting some hidden secret (cf. 26 [61], 27 [40]; Jn 2 [19-22], and perhaps Mal 3 [1]).

7. The keeping of the Sabbath was in the divine intention an act of mercy, but the Pharisees had made of it an act of sacrifice. The reason why Matthew omits Mk 2 [27] may be that it was covered by our Lord's application of Hos 6 [6].

8. The meaning is not quite certain. 'Son of man' in Aramaic simply means 'man'; and, in view of [7], it may have that meaning here. But the reference is probably to the Lord Himself. In the Logia there was probably a concluding argument *a fortiori* (*Kal-we-chomer*): if, even according to the scribes, 'the Sabbath was for man, and not man for the Sabbath' (cf. the Rabbinic phrase 'unto you is the Sabbath delivered, but not you to the Sabbath,' *Mech.* on Ex 31 [13]; cf. Mk 2 [27]), how much more is the Son of Man Lord of the Sabbath! Mark preserved one part of the saying and Matthew the other.

9-14. Cf. notes on Mk 3 [1-6]. The man with the withered hand. Matthew regards this incident as having taken place on the same Sabbath. Luke makes it another Sabbath. In Mark and Luke the Pharisees watched our Lord, and He asked them whether it was lawful to do good or to do harm on the Sabbath. Rabbinic law only allowed healing on the Sabbath when life was in danger; while it did allow the succouring of animals suffering from an accident. Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in omitting our Lord's anger at the hardening of their hearts; also in omitting 'the Herodians.' See notes on Mark and Luke.

Matthew adds to Mark the detail 'a sheep in a pit.' If we compare with this the addition 'ox in a pit' in the similar story in Lk 14 [1-6], we shall be inclined to attribute it to conflation with another version rather than to editorial expansion (cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 260).

15-21. Jesus' avoidance of publicity (cf. Mk 3 [7-12]). When Jesus perceived the intention of the Pharisees ([14]), He withdrew in order not to stir up further contention. For the injunction to silence, addressed in Mark to unclean spirits, cf. 8 [4], 9 [30]. He did not desire to gain a victory over His enemies through increasing His popularity by miracles of healing. The evangelist illustrates this aspect of our Lord's character by a citation from one of the great Servant-hymns in Deutero-Isaiah (42 [1-4]). The quotation is taken from an Aramaic Targum, the existing Targum also interpreting it Messianically. It is independent alike of the LXX and of the MT. Jesus is the Servant whom Jehovah has chosen, the Beloved in whom He is well pleased (cf. 3 [17]). In Jesus is, and will be, fulfilled what is said of the Servant. God has at the baptism put His Spirit upon Him (3 [16]), and there is harmony between the conduct of Jesus and the picture of the Servant. Jesus avoided open strife with His enemies the Pharisees; He avoided publicity, and treated with wonderful patience and love those who were like bruised reeds and wicks dimly burning. To this Servant the most splendid victory is promised.

The Hebrew (Is 42 [4]) is 'The isles shall wait, or hope, for his teaching,' but the citation in [21] is from the LXX, 'for his Name.' It is His Name (i.e. His Person) which is the hope of the Gentiles (cf. 7 [22], 10 [22], 18 [20]). It is Jesus to whom the Gentiles will turn as the fulfilment of their longing (cf. 18 [20]; Rom 10 [12]; 1 Cor 1 [2]; Ac 9 [14]).

22-45. The Beelzebul controversy and the request for a sign.

The liturgical factor, and the Deuteronomic and Deutero-Isaiah background, are here almost obvious. If 12 [1-13] took place on the 'Sabbath of Repentance,' between New Year's Day and the Day of Atonement, the Beelzebul controversy and the request for a sign find all their *motifs* in the Day of Atonement. One of the characteristic aspects of this season is Israel's struggle against Satan. The case of Israel is tried before the Supreme Court of Heaven, and Satan appears before God with all his accusations against the people. On New Year's Day the books containing the records of the deeds of men are opened, and from this day to the Day of Atonement (the 'fearful days,' *yomim noraim*) the people endeavour by earnest repentance to tip the balance in their favour. The confession of sin is naturally another element in the ritual of the season, and is the first condition of forgiveness. Among the sins enumerated are blasphemy, evil tongue, unfounded hatred (cf. Mt 12 [31, 32, 34, 36]). It is unnecessary to point out the connexion of forgiveness with the Day of Atonement. [41] and [42] gain in force when contrasted with the Rabbinic teaching that the Day of Atonement brought forgiveness to Israel only (cf. *Pes. Rab.*, xlv, 185*b*), especially when the fact that the Book of Jonah was one of the lessons for the Day of Atonement is kept in mind. Is 63 was probably another of the lessons (cf. Is 63 [10, 14] with Mt 12 [31, 32]). All Greek and early Latin authorities give Beelzebul as their correct reading. The meaning of Beelzebul, 'the Baal, or Lord, of the dwelling,' is probably the *motif* for the comparison made by our Lord ([25, 26]); and in the parable of the unclean spirit ([43, 45]) the demon takes possession of the person and makes him his 'dwelling-place.' This parable ([43-45]) aptly rounds off the passage. Once the Day of Atonement was over the Jews thought themselves clean, purified from all evil (cf. *Yoma*, 85*b*), and forgiven for all the sins of the past year; but by their attitude to Jesus, by their blasphemy of the Spirit, by their idle or 'scandalous' words, spoken without serious meaning ([24]), they show that, notwithstanding all the purification, they are a tempting habitation for the evil one (cf. Is 63 [15]).

22, 23. The healing of a blind and dumb demoniac (cf. Lk 11 [14]; Mt 9 [32, 33] is probably a doublet of this).

24-30. Cf. Mk 3 [22-27] and note on [22]; Lk 11 [17-23]. Hearing of the impression ([23]) that this cure made upon the multitudes, the Pharisees (Mk 3 [22] has 'the scribes which came down from Jerusalem') ascribe this extraordinary power of Jesus to demoniacal agency.

Our Lord first shows the absurdity of their accusation. Satan, the head of the organized kingdom of evil spirits, wishes to bring men and the world under his dominion; if he casts out Satan, he destroys his own dominion. Then our Lord turns against His enemies their own argument. From Tob 8 [1-5], from Josephus (*Ant.*, viii, 2-5; *B.J.*, VII, vi, 3: cf. Ac 19 [13] f.), and from the Talmud we gather that there were Jewish exorcists who professed to cure the demoniacs by smoke and water, the mixture of different roots, and all sorts of incantations. These exorcists were not only unmolested but actually countenanced by the scribes and Pharisees. In the healing of the possessed, it is God who is at work and showing that He has now begun to rule as King of Israel ([28]). The demoniacs are helpless instruments of Satan and his demons. It is impossible to enter Satan's house and take away his goods without having previously bound Satan. The strong one has met with a Stronger who has breached his house; and those who will not enter with Him into this breach are working against Him.

28. by the Spirit of God: Luke 'by the finger of God' (cf. Ex 8 [19]). There is no difference in meaning. In the OT the Spirit of God is God Himself in action (cf. Mt 1 [18]). The points to notice are (i) that in the activity of the Spirit God's rule is already a reality; (ii) to speak against this activity is to blaspheme God Himself.

29. The Lord may look back to His victory in the wilderness (4 [1-11]). There Satan had claimed to be the ruler of the world. But of course this reference could not have been recognized by the Pharisees. The binding of Satan (cf. Rev 20 [2]) takes place wherever the Kingdom of God is effectively present: cf. Is 49 [24] f. (LXX).

30. For 'gathering' as the characteristic work of Jesus cf. Ezek 34 [5, 11, 13, 16]; Mt 9 [36], 10 [6], 15 [24], 18 [12], 23 [37]; Jn 11 [52]. The patience and reasonableness of the Lord's dealing with the Pharisees is remarkable. The opposition of the Pharisees to Jesus had thus far consisted in criticisms in the form of questions (9 [3, 11], 12 [2, 10]); and the council which they had held had taken place in secret. Even the Beelzebul insult was more a way of escaping from embarrassment than an expression of hatred; for intercourse with evil spirits had been attributed to Abraham and to Solomon.

31-37. Cf. Mk 3 [28, 29] and notes; Lk 12 [10].

31, 32. In [32] 'Son of man' may simply mean 'man' (cf. [8] and note). In any case the contrast is between evil-speaking against men and evil-speaking against God. As long as the divine was not recognized in Jesus, there might be honest opposition to His action and His claims. But the opposition could no longer be honest after the presence of God in the Lord's activity had been demonstrated. The goodness of God is the very power which leads to repentance (Rom 2 [4]); if that is hated and blasphemed, what further appeal can be made? 'Eternal sin' (Mark), eternal impenitence, must mean eternal condemnation. Cf. the Rabbinic differentiation between all other sins and the sin of the 'profanation of the Name' of God, for which neither repentance, nor the Day of Atonement, nor bodily suffering has the power to effect pardon (*Yoma*, 86*a*; *Sifre* on Numbers, 100).

34. out of the abundance, or 'overflow.' What comes from the heart by the mouth reveals the character of the heart. How little hope our Lord had of the Pharisees can here be seen. To many scholars this saying seems to be too harsh to have been uttered by Him (cf. Montefiore and McNeile *ad loc.*). But, if we take into consideration the probable liturgical background (cf. Dt 32 [33]; Is 63 [10]), this seeming harshness is mitigated, for with prophetic insight our Lord sees that an evil disposition has become their second nature, and out of this evil nature their malicious judgements arise.

36, 37. On the Day of Judgement an account will be required of every 'idle word' (cf. *Pes. Rab.*, 172; Jas 3). The style of [37] indicates that it is an echo of Ps 51 [6], probably one of the psalms of the season, since it deals with sin, repentance, and forgiveness.

38-42. The request for a sign (16 [1-4]: cf. Mk 8 [11-13]; Lk 11 [16, 29-32]). The Book of Jonah was one of the prophetic lessons for the Day of Atonement, and Dt 18 [10-22] also is undoubtedly connected with our Lord's reply. The latter passage deals both with sorcery and with the prophet like unto Moses. It appears from Ac 3 [22] and 7 [37] that in some circles this prophet was identified with the Messiah, and the words of Deuteronomy were probably in the minds of the scribes and Pharisees when they made their demand. If only Jesus, in accordance with Dt 18 [22], would make a prediction which could be tested, or force their belief by some palpable wonder such as Isaiah had promised! (Is 7 [11]). The kind of sign that would have been appreciated by the scribes and Pharisees can be seen from *Sanh.*, 98*a*. When Rabbi Jose ben Kisma was asked by his disciples, 'When cometh the Messiah?' he said, 'I fear you ask for a sign.' When they denied this, and yet his answer seemed to them vague, they did say: 'Give unto us a sign.' Then said he: 'If my word be true, then the water of the Cave of Paneas will be changed into blood.'

39. Our Lord gives no direct answer, but speaks of their demand as characteristic of the unfaithfulness of the whole people to God. Instead of believing the testimony of Jesus in word and deed, they desire a sign which will make moral and spiritual conviction superfluous. The only sign accorded them will be 'the sign of Jonah'; as Jonah preached repentance to the Gentiles with success, so a time will come when the Gentiles will hear and accept the Gospel, while Israel will reject it.

40. This verse, peculiar to Matthew, probably gives the interpretation of our Lord's words current in the Palestinian Church and accepted by the evangelist himself. Indeed it may be true to the mind of the Lord (cf. Lk 12 [50]; Jn 12 [31, 32]; and Mt 16 [21] note). The Lord's Resurrection, by which He passes to His wider activity, is the great sign to which the Apostles ever point as the proof of the Lord's Messiahship. For the strange description of the interval of time cf. note on Mk 8 [31].

41, 42. Cf. Lk 11 [31, 32]. Here again, as in [6], 'a greater than' is neuter, and suggests the mystery attaching to our Lord's Person. The verses are a remarkable example of that 'self-assertion' of the Lord, which offends so inevitably those who reject the Church's teaching about Him. The words 'rise up in the judgement with this generation and condemn it' can only be properly understood by a retranslation into Aramaic (cf. Wellhausen *ad loc.*). 'Rise up in the judgement with' is then seen to mean 'accuse,' and 'condemn' to mean 'cause to be condemned.'

43-45. The return of the unclean spirit (Lk 11 [24-26]). Cf. note on [22-45]. Our Lord, in the form of a parable, foretells the degeneration of the people, who imagine that they have nothing to learn from Him, although He has more wisdom to impart than Solomon gave to the queen of Sheba. It must frequently have happened that one seemingly cured from demoniac possession suffered a relapse, and that his state became worse than

before. Desert, waterless places were considered to be the abode of demons (cf. Is 13 [21], 34 [14]; Tob 8 [5]; and Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 21 f.).

The moral of the parable lay perhaps in this, that notwithstanding the Day of Atonement, with its repentance and forgiveness of sin, the people were in danger of a relapse into even greater evil if they did not open their souls to the influence of the Holy Spirit acting and speaking through Jesus. The last days of Jerusalem brought a terrible fulfilment of the Lord's works. Burkitt, in *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 170-174, seeks to distinguish between Rabbinic Judaism and its teachers before and after the destruction of the Temple. But that the Rabbis, even after Hadrian and Bar-Cochba, notwithstanding their many splendid sayings, did not cease to identify the source of Christ's miracles with the power of evil, there is ample proof. Cf. *Sanh.*, 43*a*: 'Forty days before the Eve of Passover the Crier called through the streets: "Jesus of Nazareth is about to be stoned because He performed witchcraft and misled Israel. Anyone who has some good to say of Him, let him come forward and say it!" and there was none that came forward; and they hanged Him on the Eve of Passover' (cf. also Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 69).

46-50. The Mother and brethren of Jesus (cf. Mk 3 [31-35] and note on Mk 3 [33]; Lk 8 [19-21]).

Neither Mark nor Luke gives any indication of the time when this took place; but Matthew expressly connects it with the previous utterance, 'while he yet talked to the people.' It has already been pointed out that the 'Song of Moses' (Dt 32) was the lesson for the Sabbath before the Day of Atonement; and, presenting as it does a picture of the future history of Israel, was probably the background of our Lord's prophetic utterance concerning 'this generation' (cf. Dt 32 [5]). The 'blessing of Moses' (Dt 33) follows immediately after, where it is said of Levi: 'He who said to his father and to his mother, "I have not seen them," and his brothers he does not recognize, and his sons he does not know,' i.e., God's sons considered the will of God as of greater importance than their attachment to their nearest relations. In the Gospel story Mary ever stands for the claims of home and family (Lk 2 [48]; Jn 2 [3]); her very presence at the Cross was a silent call to come down from it. It is always for the mother to do this; but always also for the son or daughter to set aside her appeal, when it conflicts with the higher claims of God; and this is what the Lord, though without harshness or blame, invariably does. It is His own action which justifies His words in Mt 10 [37] (cf. Lk 2 [35]). On the brethren of the Lord see the Commentary on James, Introd.

XIII. 1-52. The teaching in parables.

'The parable chapter is obviously an agglomeration compiled by the editor of the Gospel' (Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 264). The parable of the Sower ([1-8]) with the narrative introduction and explanation ([10-23]) is from Mk 4 [1-20]; the Mustard-Seed and Leaven parables ([31-34]) stood together as a pair in Q (cf. Lk 13 [18-21]); the other four, the Tares ([24-30, 36-43]), the Treasure and the Pearl ([44-46]), the Drag-net and its explanation ([47-50]), are from some other source.

1-23. The parable of the Sower (cf. Mk 4 [1-20] and notes; Lk 8 [4-15, 18]).

The actual citation ([14-15]) from Is 6 [9] f. (LXX) is peculiar to Matthew, although it is suggested by Mk 4 [12]. The parable reflects our Lord's experience in that appeal to Israel which is now drawing to a close. He, like other Jewish teachers, made great use of parables of different types (for different uses of the term see Lk 4 [23], 6 [39], Mt 24 [32]). But this is the first example of the parable which requires interpretation, as contrasted with the simple illustration (cf. Lk 18 [9-14]) which explains itself. That profound analogy between the processes of nature and of grace which lies behind the parable of the Sower would not have been familiar to any of our Lord's hearers; and our Lord's action in speaking this parable to the multitude as much demanded explanation as the parable itself. This explanation is given in [10-15] in a form which suggests that Matthew, like ourselves, found the language of Mk 4 [11, 12] open to serious misunderstanding. The two accounts should be compared. For an admirable account of the purposes served by parables see Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, x.

11. Our Lord, as in 11 [25, 26], recognizes the divine will—a will that is not arbitrary, but determined by the divine wisdom and love. The secret of the Kingdom (cf. note on Mk 4 [11]) is not for all (cf. Col 1 [26, 27]).

12. A law of the divine action, to which frequent reference is made (cf. 25 [29]; Lk 19 [26]). In divine truth, as in physical science, the knowledge acquired leads on to further knowledge; but, if the effort to advance ceases, the old knowledge is gradually lost. In the case of divine truth even more than in the other case a moral element enters in. Divine revela-

tion has always a practical purpose, and demands of us action which corresponds to it. If we are not disposed to obey, we find it unwelcome and refuse our attention; we even forget what we have learned because subconsciously we wish to forget. That the loss takes place according to psychological laws does not make it any the less a divinely imposed punishment.

13. Our Lord adopts the parabolic method in conscious recognition of this divine law. The multitude has heard His message of the Kingdom and seen the mighty works which demonstrate its reality; but to no purpose, since they are unwilling to make the sacrifices which the acceptance of the message demands. Thus for the plain method of the past our Lord substitutes a new method, which for the faithful few will be more advantageous.

14. Isaiah's experience foreshadows the Lord's (cf. Heb 2 [13], referring to Is 8 [16-18]). Isaiah's mission, like the Lord's, was to the whole nation; but it was only the few who believed his message. Thus he could only bind up the testimony and seal the instruction among his disciples, the 'remnant' for whom the divine promise could be fulfilled. Matthew's version of the prophecy brings out the fact that the dullness of the people was self-imposed. No doubt the text of Is 6 [10], like Mark, gives a different impression. But that is due to two things: (i) As has been noticed above, Hebrew thought does not distinguish between definite purpose and necessary consequence. (ii) Isaiah, looking back on the result of his mission, regards it with a sad irony as a mission of condemnation rather than of salvation.

16, 17. These verses of Q are placed as appropriately here by Matthew as they are by Luke in the different context that he gives to them (10 [23, 24]). The saints of old longed for the message of the nearness of the Kingdom and for the redeeming activity which the Lord is exercising.

24-30, 36-43. The parable of the Tares. This parable, found only in Matthew, deals with the presence of evil in the kingdom, its source and duration, the danger of its forcible expulsion, and its final extermination. Like the parable of the Sower, it speaks of a man who sows seed which matures and is reaped at harvest time. There are real difficulties in accepting this parable as our Lord's. For (i) the elaborate allegory which it involves ([37-39]) has no complete parallel elsewhere in our Lord's teaching. (ii) It deals with a situation which did not yet exist, though it arose before this Gospel was written. (iii) The Kingdom and the world appear to be confused. It is not clear whether it is the existence of evil in the world which is the trouble, or its existence in the Church. We must, however, remember (i) that our Lord directly foretold the evil which would enter the Church (24 [10-13], etc.), and may well have told His followers how they should deal with it. (ii) It is very characteristic of the Lord to take an OT symbol like that of the harvest (Jl 3 [13], etc.), which has become somewhat hackneyed, and make it the basis for a new and striking parable. The illustration of the tares seems too striking not to be authentic, though it is possible that the parable as we have it contains later elements.

The main points of the parable are these. Although the consummation of the Kingdom will take place in the future ([41]), it exists already in the present (cf. 11 [12]; 12 [28]). There are those to be found there who do not really belong to it, and who will be excluded from it 'in the time of the harvest' ([41]). The Kingdom is thus not an invisible union of pious souls, but a visible commonwealth, to which it is possible formally to belong without being of it inwardly (cf. 7 [15-23]; Jn 15 [1-6]). These alien elements are 'a seed of evil-doers' (cf. Is 1 [4] LXX), and by mixing with 'the sons of the kingdom' are an occasion for stumbling ([41]) to the latter. The genuine members would remove 'the sons of the evil one' by force. The question why God allows the mixture of good and evil is not here considered; it is sufficient for our Lord to point to the end. Since God has reserved the right of judgement at the Last Day to the Son of Man, men should not anticipate the final decision, but wait patiently for the day when the doers of iniquity will be removed. As the Kingdom will then have been preached in all the world, the Son of Man will send forth the angels to gather together all the evil and deliver them to judgement ([41] f.). Then the righteous will shine forth in the Kingdom as does the sun when the clouds and mists have blown away, or like dawn after a dark night (cf. Dan 12 [3]); it is the present mingling of the evil with the good which now veils their glory (cf. Col 3 [4]). The Kingdom is called the 'Father's' Kingdom ([43]), suggesting that God will then fully manifest both Himself as the Father of the righteous, and the righteous as His sons (cf. 5 [9]; 1 Jn 3 [2]).

The teaching of this parable is of abiding importance. The Church is the earthly embodiment of the Kingdom; ideally it is holy, as ideally it is one. But the notes

of the Church can never be perfectly realized here. Open sinners should of course be separated from her communion. As Bengel says: 'Zizania majorem speciem habent quam cardui et spini; ergo a tolerantia illorum ad horum non valet consequentia' (cf. 18 [15-20]); but beyond this we cannot go. Probably one of the motifs for the parable was the Feast of Tabernacles as the Feast of 'Ingathering.' The drama of world-history ends with a great separation.

31-33. The Mustard Seed and the Leaven (cf. Mk 4 [30-32]; Lk 13 [18-21] and the notes there).

While the spread of the Kingdom in the world is mentioned in the parable of the Tares only as a detail in the picture, in the parable of the Mustard Seed it forms the central thought: it will be out of all proportion to the germinal development now at work. What the mustard seed is in comparison with other vegetable seeds, that the divine Kingdom is to all other kingdoms.

In the parable of the Leaven it is not a contrast between the smallness of the beginning and the growth to unexpected greatness that is expressed. It is not the present smallness, but the present invisibility and inwardness of the Kingdom, which might disturb the peace of mind of the disciples. The Baptist had proclaimed the Kingdom as a great universal upheaval, and Jesus had not contradicted him. Yet the world went on as before, as though nothing had happened. The teaching of the parable is that though the Kingdom is now a mystery hidden from the world, it is none the less an active force (cf. Lk 17 [20] f.) transforming all that receives it.

Beside the traditional interpretation of these two parables, there is another for which strong arguments can be urged. It is that they set forth the future transformation of the Church into a great kingdom of the world, and its consequent leavening by the power of evil. We note (i) that in Scripture 'leaven' is elsewhere invariably a symbol for what is evil (cf. 16 [6]; 1 Cor 5 [6]; Gal 5 [9]), and that in Rabbinic theology the evil impulse in man is compared to leaven. Our Lord habitually adopts the established symbolism of the OT, and it is difficult to believe that He here sets it aside. (ii) The language of [32] is modelled on that of Dan 4 [12], where the reference is to a kingdom of the world (cf. Ezek 31 [6]). (iii) On this interpretation these parables follow naturally upon that of Tares, which also may speak of the corruption of the Church. Cf. also [19], where the birds are explained as 'the evil one.' (iv) No valid argument against this interpretation can be drawn from the opening words of these parables. The words 'the kingdom of heaven is like unto' are used very loosely in [24] and [45]. It is neither the sower nor the merchant who corresponds to the Kingdom of Heaven, but the field sown and the pearl. Even if the ordinary interpretation be preferred, we must not identify the three measures of meal with the world. It is entirely contrary to the whole teaching of our Lord and the NT to suppose that the Church will ever transform the world. To the end it is to be a body persecuted and hated by the world. The kingdom of the world becomes the Kingdom of God and Christ not by conversion but by judgement (Rev 7 [15]). When the Church endeavours to embrace the world, it becomes deeply corrupted. The leaven transforms the meal that honestly receives it, but nothing else.

34, 35. Editorial conclusion (cf. Mk 4 [33-34]).

The quotation from Ps 78 [2], introduced by Matthew's characteristic formula, is peculiar to Matthew. This Psalm, one of those appointed for the Feast of Tabernacles, gives a poetic picture of Israel's past history from the time of the Exodus to David's enthronement and the concentration of worship on Zion, in contrast to Dt 32 and 33, which describes a future development. The Psalmist uses (cf. Dt. 6 [16], 8 [1-18]) as parables the experiences of the Exodus and the desert, and interprets the 'riddles,' i.e. the short enigmatic sayings, which require explanation. The historic facts described by the Psalmist are well known, but they become 'parables' and 'riddles' when applied to contemporary events. The evangelist finds in our Lord's method of teaching an analogy to the Psalmist's. The phrase 'things hidden from the foundation of the world' suggests 'the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven.'

44-52. The Treasure in the Field ([44]); the Pearl of Great Price ([45]); the Net ([46-50]); the Treasure of the Householder ([52]).

These parables are only found in Matthew. The four preceding parables were spoken to the people, in the hearing of the disciples, the first two being interpreted to them when alone in the house with Jesus. Three of the concluding four were given without interpretation to the disciples, who have now learnt to understand the Lord's parabolic teaching ([51]). Jesus henceforth used this method of instruction for the disciples chiefly in

view of their future vocation (52). They will be not only preachers of the Gospel, but later on 'scribes,' the students and teachers of the people of God. While He was with them, they would be able to collect from His parabolic teaching such a store of precious knowledge that in time to come they would, as teachers, be able to draw upon their treasure for 'new things' (52), never before taught in Israel, and also be able to present the old familiar things in a new light, according to the capacity of their hearers.

The first two of this latter group are concerned with the appropriation of the Kingdom by individuals, the great motive being joy, not fear. Yet they differ sharply from one another, since in the first the man finds the treasure without having sought for it, while in the second a merchant on the look out for pearls comes across one that is of greater value than all the others which he possesses. The Kingdom is the 'one thing needful.' There is an endless variety of experience in the glorious adventure of entering the Kingdom. To one its wonder and its worth are suddenly and (as it may seem) accidentally revealed; while by another it is only found after long years of searching. What the finder of the treasure and the merchant of pearls did after having made their discovery, he who hears of the Kingdom must do if he would possess this precious thing; in the knowledge of its immeasurable worth he must joyfully abandon all else. That call of the Lord, which the disciples answered so bravely (4 18-22, 19 27), was not for them alone; its 'categorical imperative' is for all time. (For an interesting Jewish parallel to the parable of the Pearl, cf. Levertoff, *Love and the Messianic Age*, 13 f.)

As the parable of 'the tares' is linked up closely with that of 'the sower,' so the parable of 'the net' is closely connected with those of 'the treasure' and 'the pearl.' In thought and form this parable reminds us of the second half of the parable of the Tares. The fishermen who cast the net into the sea drew it to the shore before sorting the fish. It is only on the shore that the value of the catch is discovered (cf. 1 Cor 2 12-15). So the disciples, as 'fishers of men' (4 19), should not be discouraged by the fear of bringing into their nets some worthless fish, which have been drawn by their preaching into a temporary connexion with the Kingdom. The sorting out of the wicked from among the righteous is not their task, but that of God and His angels (49-50).

For Matthew's formula in 53 cf. 7 28.

54-58. The rejection in Nazareth (cf. Mk 6 1-6 and notes there; Lk 4 16-30).

After describing the attitude of the people to Jesus in its contrast to that of the disciples, Matthew now turns back to Mark in order to describe the impression which Jesus made, first upon the inhabitants of Nazareth, and then upon the tetrarch (14 1-2). Luke places this section at the beginning of the Lord's ministry.

The changes in the narrative which Matthew makes are probably intentional. Cf. (i) 'the carpenter's son' with Mark 'is not this the carpenter?' (ii) 'Is not his mother called Mary?' with Mark 'the son of Mary'; and (iii) 'did not many mighty works' with Mark 'and he could there do no mighty works.' Matthew altogether omits 'and he marvelled, because of their unbelief,' perhaps out of reverence.

XIV. 1-2. Herod's attention drawn to Jesus (cf. Mk 6 14-16 and notes there; Lk 9 7-9).

3-12. The Baptist's death (cf. Mk 6 17-29 and notes there; Lk 3 19-20).

This is the last of a series of narratives which began in 11 2. It ends, as it began, with John's disciples coming to Jesus; formerly it was with a despairing question, and now it is with the news of their master's death. Mark connects it with the return of the Twelve, and omits the fact that the disciples of John the Baptist came to tell Jesus of the tragedy. One of the reasons why Matthew changes the sequence of events is probably that it suits his scheme to end the series, which began with the doubting of the Messiahship of Jesus by John and his disciples, with the coming of the disciples of John to Him now in their bereavement. They had learned that He was the only One who could give them consolation and help. Matthew, as well as Mark, tells the story of the Baptist's death parenthetically.

XIV. 13-20 28. The withdrawal of Jesus from public activity. The time has come for our Lord to give Himself chiefly to the instruction of the disciples, especially of the Twelve, though probably He still occasionally teaches the people (cf. Mk 6 34; Lk 9 11). But Matthew says little about this, for 15 10 is but a short parable which our Lord had to explain even to the disciples. Acts of compassion (14 14-21; 31, 36, 15 21-28, 30, 32-38, 17 14-18, 19 13-15, 20 30 f.) and answers to opponents (15 1 f., 16 1 f., 19 3 f., 16 f., 21 23 f., 22 15 f.) are of course still frequent. Although the evangelist (13) gives as a reason for the retirement of Jesus the danger from Herod (cf. 4 12)

the chief reason may have been the refusal of faith by the Galileans.

14-21. The feeding of the five thousand (cf. Mk 6 34-44 and notes there; Lk 9 10-17; Jn 6 1-14 and the OT parallel in 2 K 4 42).

14. Mark speaks of teaching only; Luke of both teaching and healing.

18 is peculiar to Matthew (cf. 17 17), as also is the mention of women and children.

19 is an abbreviation of Mark's vivid description. The fact that the grass was 'green' (Mark) suggests the spring season, and John (6 4) directly states that it was near Passover. Perhaps different companies were preparing for the pilgrimage towards Jerusalem. The 'blessing,' 'breaking,' and distributing of the bread have a eucharistic colouring. **he took the five loaves**: the bread must be 'taken' in the hand by him who, as a host, says the blessing. Cf. *Ber.*, 12*a*: 'He gave him the bread that he might break it, and said to him, "Take, say the blessing."' The traditional blessing is: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, the King of the world, who bringest forth bread out of the earth' (*Ber.*, vi, 1). The host recites it in the name of all present, and they respond with 'Amen' (*ibid.*, viii, 8). The distribution symbolizes the union of all before God. They are one fellowship. Indeed, the parallel with the Eucharist goes further than this. We note (i) that the miracle is a miracle of compassion for a crowd, whose individual needs it seems impossible to meet; (ii) it is worked through earthly food, needed by the Apostles themselves, which has to be surrendered to the Lord for the purpose; (iii) the nature of the miracle altogether baffles the imagination. In no other miracle of the Lord is it so impossible to picture what took place. (iv) The disciples who have made the sacrifice distribute the food; and it is found to be sufficient for all. (v) What remains is sacred food, and is carefully collected. Even apart from the Eucharist the spiritual teaching of the miracle is all-important. The Lord, according to His own teaching (6 33), accepts responsibility for the supply of the needs of those who follow Him, a responsibility which the Apostles do not recognize. But He supplies the need only by the sacrifice of the property of those closest to Him. For the historicity of the narrative cf. Headlam, *Miracles*, 323 ff.

22-36. The walking on the lake (cf. Mk 6 45-52; Jn 6 15-21).

The 4th Gospel tells us that the crowd desired to make Jesus a King. As at all crises, He retired to pray, though the Apostles were evidently unwilling to be separated from Him. With 32, 33 cf. 8 23-27. Matthew's account here differs from Mark's. If we accept it, the confession of 33 should not be regarded as an anticipation of 16 16, but as an impulsive expression of an overpowering experience.

28-31 form one of the 'Matthean additions.' Like the story of the Magi, this addition is full of beauty and of spiritual truth. What the Lord can do the disciple can do likewise if, and as long as, he believes (cf. 17 20, 21 22). For Peter's impulsive offer cf. Lk 22 33; for his failure Lk 22 54-62, and for his recovery Jn 21 15-17. Peter will only succeed when he learns to let the Lord by the Spirit 'gird' him and 'carry' him; as yet he is too disposed to 'put God to the test' by 'casting himself down' (4 5-7), and asks for a sign. But the story is difficult to credit for two reasons: (i) It is unlikely that, if the story were true, Mark, Peter's interpreter, would not have known of it; or that, knowing of it, he would have suppressed it. It is one thing for Mark not to relate facts about Peter which lie outside the course of his narrative, and quite another to suppress part of a story which he relates. Matthew often does this for the sake of brevity, but not Mark. (ii) It is not probable that Peter, at this stage in the development of his faith, would have offered to walk upon the sea. The time for such teaching as that of Jn 14 12 had hardly come. Probably we have again a Christian Midrash.

34-36. The landing in Gennesareth (cf. Mk 6 53-56).

XV. 1-20. The rebuff to the Pharisees and Scribes (Mk 7 1-23).

For a detailed exposition see notes on Mark. Here it may suffice to illustrate from Rabbinic literature some points usually misunderstood.

2. The 'washing of hands' was required before and after every meal, especially of bread (cf. *Tos. Ber.*, v, 5). It was founded on the desire to consider every meal as a sacrifice, and therefore to consume even 'ordinary food' in 'purity.' The scribes as the 'Disciples of the Wise' especially took it upon themselves to keep this 'tradition of the elders' very strictly (cf. *Tos. Dem.*, ii, 2).

5. The custom which our Lord was reproving was not, as Allen (*I.C.C.*) and others explain, 'that the scribes allowed a man by a formula to dedicate all his property to the Temple, and so escape the duty of supporting his parents.' It had nothing to do with the Temple. First, it must be kept in mind that the

language of [5] is used in anger by the son, who, exasperated by his father, utters this 'vow' to cut off his parent from every kind of benefit he might gain from him. It is a curse against his father which he utters. The son does not dedicate his goods or his services to the Temple; he merely vows all away from his father. The Rabbis said: 'Whoever shall say: "Korban is everything whereby thou mightest be profited," he shall be bound.' This latter part of the formula our Lord does not quote; but it is nevertheless the thing which He condemns; for, by making the vow binding to the son, the Rabbis absolved him from all duty to his parents. In enforcing the 'traditions of the elders,' they broke the commandments. Anyone who had said 'Korban' was forced to keep the vow even to a ridiculous and cruel extent, and many examples are given in the Talmud. The following are a few. A case is reported in the Mishna of a son who repented of his rash vow, and longed to make restitution to his parents. With this end in view he bestowed a portion of his goods upon a neighbour, so that the latter might in turn bestow them upon his parents; but the Rabbis decided that such a procedure was impossible. 'Korban' once uttered, the property is irredeemable, just as an animal, once dedicated to the altar by the word 'Korban,' must be sacrificed. Anyone who has said, 'My goods are Korban to all people,' cannot bestow anything upon, nor do any service for, any person living. In *Nedarim*, v, 6 we have an example of how this vow can be in some degree circumvented. 'If a person has been prohibited by a vow from benefiting another, and the latter has nothing to eat, then the former may make a gift of food to a third person who may give it to the hungry one'; but such a gift must be made unconditionally, for by intimating that the gift was to be used for that purpose the whole plan would fail. In the same Mishna we hear of a man who had made this vow, and later desired that his father should share in the wedding festivities of the grandson, and so become reconciled. To this end the man presented the court where the marriage-feast was to be held, together with the whole of the meal, to a neighbour, making the condition that it was to be his only for the time of the marriage-feast. But the Rabbis decided that 'such a gift is no gift,' and the old father could not participate in the festivities. In *Nedarim*, iv, 8 it is said that, if two are travelling together between whom is the vow of 'Korban,' and the sufferer from the vow be without food, the other may put some food upon a stone or a wall and say, 'This food may be consumed by anybody; it is no longer mine.' Since it is now no longer the possession of the one who had said 'Korban,' the sufferer may come forward and eat it. Under the vow the father may not receive from the son even the smallest coin; not even a shirt, or a piece of bread, or a drink of water. The son cannot visit his father when sick, except for a very short time, lest the father should, by being attended by the son, save some money he would have had to pay to a nurse (*Nedarim*, vi, 4). When, however, the father is dead, the son may provide the coffin and the shroud, and pay the musicians and mourners, 'for the dead receive no profit' (*ibid.*, ii, 7).

12-14 are peculiar to Matthew ([14b] = Lk 6 [39]). The Pharisees were 'scandalized'; and it is probable that to the disciples themselves our Lord's answer seemed harsh. In His answer to the disciples He refers to the scribes and Pharisees themselves rather than to their teaching. As in the Messianic fellowship (13 [24] f.), so also in the community of Israel, there are some who have lost the right to be considered members of the Covenant people (cf. 3 [9]). They are ripe for judgement, and will be rooted out. The disciples should leave them alone and free themselves from their authority.

20. to eat with unwashen hands is peculiar to Matthew. Whether it was actually said by our Lord or added by Matthew, it does not refer mainly to the 'washing of hands,' but has an ironical trend; for in [11] and [17] all the dietary laws are included, as in Mark, and declared to be ethically and religiously of no moment.

21-28. The Canaanite woman (cf. Mk 7 [24-30]). Luke does not report this incident, and even Mark seems to have kept back part of the story (cf. [23, 24]) as liable to be misunderstood by Gentile readers. Our Lord was not merely testing the woman's faith; He regarded His earthly ministry as definitely limited to Israel. Even before Jesus had crossed the border from the Jewish land, the domain of Antipas, and entered the Phœnician region, which belonged to the province of Syria, the woman came over the border to meet Him (cf. 4 [24]). In Mark our Lord is actually in Phœnician territory. The woman must have known that some Jews considered Jesus to be the promised 'Son of David,' and she addresses Him as such. The story is told in Matthew with dramatic vividness. The woman kept on crying, and from a distance. The burden of the

cry comes in snatches. 'Have mercy upon me!' 'Lord!' 'Son of David!' 'My daughter is grievously sick of a devil.' As Jesus, without vouchsafing a reply, continues His way, the disciples beg Him to grant her request in order to be rid of her. In their request He hears the echo of His own desire. He did not yet allow His compassion to override the limits of His personal and temporal mission, and on this occasion our Lord pointed to them more emphatically than when He healed the centurion's servant (8 5-13). The centurion was a Gentile already influenced by Judaism, while in this case to heal would mean to be drawn into a ministry to the heathen world. As the woman approaches Him more calmly He explains to her the reason for His refusal in words seemingly harsher than those used in 24. For further details cf. notes on Mark.

29-31. Cf. Mk 7 31-37. For the difficulties of Mark's geographical notice cf. notes on Mark. Matthew omits the 'Ephphatha' miracle, and gives instead a summary of all the cures effected. The words 'And they glorified the God of Israel' suggest the Gentile character of the crowd.

32-39. The feeding of the four thousand (cf. Mk 8 1-10). The disciples do not come, as on the former occasion, to remind Jesus of the hunger of the multitude; for it was probably mainly Gentile, and the disciples had not yet overcome their prejudices. Because of the marked similarities between this narrative and that of the feeding of the 5,000, the second is held by many scholars to be a duplicate account of the first (see notes on Mark and McNeile, 237 f.). If this miracle took place among the Gentiles, our Lord's recurrent reference to Jonah would be most apt, for had He not just been finding the Gentiles most receptive, while Israel was still asking for a sign?

39. For 'Magadan' Mark has 'Dalmanutha,' which Procksch (*Palestina-Jahrbuch*, 1918) interprets as 'dal-mānuthā,' i.e. 'of Manutha.' If 'Magadan' stands for Magdala, now Al Majdal, it was a place mentioned in the Talmud as 'Magdal of the fishers' (*Pes.*, 46*a*; *p. Maaser*, 50*c*; *Sanh.*, 19*a*). From the Greek name Tarichæ Dalman (*Orte und Wege Jesu*) concludes that it was a centre of the fish trade and of salting fish. Being a great centre of commerce, it was originally the most important city on the western shore of the lake (cf. Midr. *Lam.*, ii, 3). Our Lord does not seem to have entered it, but only its borders.

XVI. 1-4. The request for a sign (Mk 8 11-13; cf. Mt 12 38).

Probably a year has passed, and the New Year's Day, or the Day of Atonement, has come round again. That this time the Sadducees also demand a sign (Mark has only Pharisees) marks the advanced development. In earlier days it was local Pharisees and scribes who opposed Him (9 3, 11; 12 1-14, 24, 38); later it was Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem (15 1); and now the Sadducees came forward. Mark mentions Herodians (8 15). In Mishna *Jadaim*, iv, 8 we read of Galilean Sadducees; so it is not necessary to assume that the Sadducees here mentioned came from Jerusalem.

Our Lord's reply is given in 4 (cf. 12 38 f.).

2-3 are a very ancient interpolation. It is not a harmonistic insertion from Lk 12 54-56; 'for there is very little verbal agreement, and it must have been derived from an extraneous source' (cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 241). Yet it is probable that this apocryphon reflects a real utterance of our Lord. They may be good weather prophets, but they do not discern the approaching judgement or the passing away of the old order. On the lower scale they are prophets; on the higher they cannot discern the signs of the times. For the general confidence cf. 11 23; it seems to have been shared by all.

5-12. The leaven of the scribes and Pharisees (cf. Mk 8 14-21 and notes there; Lk 12 1).

5. Matthew omits the 'one loaf.' Probably it had remained in the boat the whole time; that which was taken up in the seven baskets they had not taken with them, since it had been handled by Gentiles and 'defiled.' This action being perfectly natural to them, they could not account for Jesus saying 'beware of the leaven of the Pharisees,' except by regarding it as a reprimand for being without bread. He had just given them in the feeding of the 4,000 Gentiles a proof that the teaching of the Pharisees on their defilement was ignored by Him; and therefore He was annoyed with them for shrinking from the use of bread touched by Gentiles. Jesus had understood their repugnance to bringing the bread, and now saw how they had interpreted His saying. At their dulness of understanding He is seriously annoyed; He was not concerned with this at all; had they not yet realized that He was able to feed them? It was the wrong spirit of the whole teaching of the Pharisees against which He wished to warn them, a teaching which killed loving-kindness and bred sus-

picion and hatred. Luke has the whole incident in a different connexion.

13-20. Peter's confession (cf. Mk 8 [27-30] and notes there; Lk 9 [18-21]). We have suggested that the asking for a sign took place near the Day of Atonement, about the beginning of October. It is thus natural to find that the Cæsarea Philippi section has clearly a connexion with the lessons and ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles, about ten days later. One of the lessons was Ex 33 and 34 (cf. specially 33 [11, 12, 13, 18, 21-23], 34 [1-10, 27-35] relating the transfiguration of Moses). One of the Psalms was Ps 76 (cf. specially [1]). For the liturgical connexion of this Psalm with the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles cf. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 67 f. That the symbolism of the holy or 'cosmic' rock, which provides the world with water, is closely connected with the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles, and that Jn 7 [37-40] has this symbolism as a background, has been shown by J. Jeremias (*Golgotha und der heilige Felsen, Angelos*, ii).

13. The Lord's questions are even more significant than the answers; and the first prepares for the second. Jesus is not only conscious that He is a problem to men, but assumes that He ought to be. It is improbable that our Lord asked His first question merely to gain information; it was rather in order to lead His disciples to crystallize their thoughts about Him. Matthew alone has here the title 'Son of Man.' To have used the title in its Messianic sense would have been to anticipate Peter's confession (cf. Montefiore *ad loc.*). If the original form of the question is rightly given, Jesus must have meant, 'What do people understand by this enigmatic title, which they hear Me use of Myself?' The mention of Jeremiah is also peculiar to Matthew (cf. the legends in 2 Mac 2 [1-12], 15 [14-16]). Popular eschatological expectation was much concerned with those who were believed not to have seen death (cf. 2 Esd 6 [26]). Among these were included not only Enoch and Elijah (cf. Wisd. 4 [10] f.), but Moses and Isaiah, whose ascension was related in apocryphal books (cf. Ju [9]), Ezra (2 Esd 14 [9]), and apparently Jeremiah (2 Esd 2 [18]). Since death and corruption are the penalty of sin, bodily assumption seemed to the Jews the natural reward of supereminent sanctity. Cf. the Christian legend of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. It is a notable fact, as showing the impression that the Lord had made, that He was popularly regarded as having come down from above. Such language as that of Jn 3 [13] may well have been interpreted on the lines of the popular belief by those whose acquaintance with the Lord was but slight.

16. Though on a former occasion the Apostles may have declared Jesus to be 'the Son of God,' the expression of faith had been but an impulsive utterance drawn out by an overpowering experience of supernatural power. Here, however, Peter expresses his own and the other disciples' conviction of the Messiahship of Jesus, a conviction founded on their experience of His unique relationship to God. By this confession Peter accepted in its fulness the self-testimony of Jesus (11 [27]). The words 'the Son of the living God,' like 'the Son of Man' ([13]), are found only in Matthew.

17-19. These verses form far the most important of the 'Matthean additions.' The first question that arises is that of their authenticity. It may be urged (i) that, like the last Matthean addition (14 [28-31]), which also relates to Peter, they are inserted in a Marcan narrative. If Mark, the interpreter of Peter, knew that our Lord had thus spoken at this time, why did he omit the words? However interpreted, they are of importance, and not fully covered by anything said by the Lord elsewhere. Luke reproduces Mark's narrative without this addition. (ii) The Kingdom of Heaven seems more completely identified here with the visible Church than in any other teaching ascribed to the Lord, and the promise of the latter part of [19] is given to all the Apostles or to our Lord's followers as a body in 18 [18]. (iii) The pre-eminence here given to Peter seems to render unintelligible the later questioning among the Apostles as to who is the greatest. These considerations seem, however, to be outweighed by others. For (i) not only are the words characteristic of the Lord, but the occasion requires them. An enthusiastic welcome of Peter's faith is but what we expect. (ii) The language employed is so characteristically Jewish as almost certainly to belong to early Jewish tradition. It may be the Jewish character of the language, and not ignorance of the Lord's words, which is the true explanation of their omission by Mark and Luke. There was no need to emphasize among Gentiles, for whom they wrote, the primacy of Peter among the Twelve, since, as Acts and the epistles show, the Gentile churches were not under the authority of the Twelve, but under that of St. Paul and those whom he had appointed (cf. Gal 2, especially [6-10]), the

Council of Jerusalem being the last occasion known to us on which any authority over the Church as a whole was exercised by the elder Apostles. Just as little was there need in the Gentile churches for the other teaching here given by the Lord; both the substance of the teaching and its fulfilment in the life of the Church were entirely understood, and the words themselves would have been unintelligible to them. For the Palestinian churches for which Matthew wrote the words were necessary, and by them they could be easily understood. There is much evidence that the Jewish Christians were disposed to place James the Lord's brother higher than the Apostles on the ground of his blood-relationship to the Messianic King, and to recognize a sort of Caliphate in the Lord's family. The position of James at the Council of Jerusalem is symptomatic, and the teaching of the pseudo-Clementine literature clear.

17. The language seems unmistakably to be our Lord's. He always, except in Lk 22 [34], addresses Peter as Simon; Bar-Jonah, or Bar-John, is found in Jn 1 [42] and 21 [15] ff.; and for 'blessed' cf. 5 [3] and 13 [16]. 'Flesh and blood' is a common Jewish expression for the human as contrasted with the divine. It was God Himself who had led St. Peter to faith through his experience of the Lord; and his blessedness did not rest only upon the faith itself, but upon the divine purpose manifested in bringing him to it (cf. 11 [25, 26]). He has a place in the purpose of the living God, who is at work for the world by His 'Son.'

18. I also: probably not 'I bear witness to you, as you to me,' but 'the Father has bestowed the faith, and I bestow the position which corresponds to it.' The Greek here is 'Thou art Petros (stone), and on this Petra (rock) I will build my church.' But in Aramaic no such distinction would be possible, and the difference only appears in Greek because Petra is a feminine word which could not be employed as the name of a man. But what is the Lord's meaning? The symbol of a rock is often used, not only in the OT (cf. Dt 32 [4]; 2 S 22 [32], 23 [3]; Ps 18 [2]; Is 30 [29], 44 [8], and specially 28 [16]), but also by our Lord Himself (7 [24, 25]), and in Rabbinic literature. Thus in connexion with Is 51 [1-2], where Abraham is designated as a rock, the Midrash says: 'God is like unto a king who wished to build himself a house. He digged and digged, but in each place water sprang up and destroyed the foundation he had dug. At last he chanced to dig where deep down he came upon a rock (petra); then said he: "Here will I build." In like manner God, wishing to create the world, looked out upon the generations of Enoch that would be, and that of the flood, and said: "How can I make a world out of such sinners, who will people it with those who will annoy me?" But when he saw Abraham he said: "Ah, here is a rock upon whom I can found a world"' (*Yalkut Shimoni*, i, 766 on Nu 23 [9]). Abraham, the Father of faith, is shown here as a rock prevailing against the flood, and also as bearing the burden of the whole of creation, in harmony with the symbolism found elsewhere, according to which the rock shuts off the under world and is a stepping-stone into the upper one. In another Rabbinic source a similar parable is used in connexion with the patriarchs (cf. *Ex. Rab.*, xv, 8). Peter similarly is the 'rock' upon which our Lord will build His *Zibbura* or community, already existing in embryo in the disciples and His other followers, and perhaps also the rock against which the powers of the 'underworld' shall not prevail. It is, however, simpler to regard the last words of the verse as a promise of the perpetuity of the Church. For the 'gates of Hades' cf. Is 38 [10]; Ps 9 [13]; Wisd 16 [13], etc. The Church will never be a prisoner within them.

The Jewish parallels cited above seem to make it clear that the rock, on which the Church is to rise, is Peter himself, and not our Lord. Probably our Lord is never in the NT spoken of as the foundation of the Church, the foundation in 1 Cor 3 [10, 11] being the truth that Jesus is the Christ. But they also make it clear that the rock is Peter as the man of faith. Through the *débris* of a ruined Israel, which is no longer Israel, our Lord has dug down till His spade has struck the rock; now He can begin to build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen (cf. Ac 15 [16]). Peter and the Apostles who share his faith are not the first stones of a new building (Eph 2 [20]) so much as the faithful remnant of the old, through which alone the divine purpose can be fulfilled. There is only one Ecclesia of God and of His Messiah—'my Church' is in no way contrasted with God's (Jn 17 [10])—and that is the 'Israel of God' in its continuous life both before and after the Lord's coming (cf. *The Constitution of the Church in the New Testament*, p. 387). To ourselves the word 'build' suggests a new structure; but in the OT 'to build' is simply the opposite of 'to break down' (cf. Jer 1 [10], etc.). The work of the Lord will not be to found the Church, for it has

been founded long ago, but to build it up or 'edify' it, to make it all that God wills it to be. But now we must consider Peter as the man of faith. It is generally supposed that to interpret the rock as Peter himself, and to interpret it as the truth of Christ's Messiahship which he has just expressed, are two different explanations. But that is not so; the two interpretations are one. Peter is Peter only by the faith which makes him what he is, and truth is only truth as incorporated in the mind and heart of the man who believes it; the man and the truth are one. This is our Lord's teaching elsewhere. The seed is the word of the Kingdom (13 19), but He speaks none the less of him 'that was sown upon the good ground' (13 23); and St. Paul's usage seems to be the same (cf. 1 Cor 3 10-17). From this there follows a conclusion of the first importance. The promise to St. Peter is a personal promise. Our Lord is not creating an office, which can be held either by Peter or by Alexander VI; the NT knows of no office in the Church higher than that of an Apostle (1 Cor 12 28; Eph 4 11). He is foretelling the place which Peter by his faith will occupy in the extension of the Church after Pentecost, and the way in which as the man of faith others will rest upon him (cf. Lk 22 32). What this place was Acts sufficiently shows. As the foundation of the Church neither Peter nor his fellow-Apostles who share his position (Eph 2 20; Rev 21 14) have successors, any more than had Abraham and the patriarchs before them. A successor was indeed appointed to Judas, because he had ceased to be an Apostle; but not to James the son of Zebedee, or to any other of the Twelve.

19. Peter is to become not just a doorkeeper, but an administrator or steward of the Kingdom. Eliakim ben Hilkiah is set up instead of Shebna as the minister of the house and bears the key of the house of David (Is 22 15-22: cf. Rev 1 18); and our Lord speaks of the faithful and wise steward, who is to give his household their portion of food in due season (Lk 12 42). So again He speaks of the scribes as taking away the key of knowledge (Lk 11 52), and so shutting the Kingdom of Heaven against men (Mt 23 13: cf. *Sifre* on Dt 32 25). Thus the main thought seems to be that of teaching (cf. 13 52), and of the disciplinary power by which it is to be enforced. The words that follow confirm this. 'To bind' and 'to loose' are technical Rabbinic terms for the power of the doctor of the law to 'pronounce forbidden', or 'pronounce permitted' some action about which a question has arisen, while the terms are also occasionally applied to disciplinary measures such as excommunication (cf. *Moed Katton*, 16*a* and note on 18 18). The Jewish teachers held that these decisions were acknowledged in heaven, not in the sense that earthly decisions affected the heavenly world, but in the sense that 'God,' or the 'heavenly court' (cf. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 174; Wellhausen *ad loc.*), recognized and endorsed the decisions given below. So the meaning of 19 is that Peter, as an administrator of the Kingdom of Heaven, will have a divinely recognized authority to teach and discipline the future community (cf. Ac 5 1-11, 15 9-21). The context shows clearly that the 'Kingdom of Heaven' and the 'Church' are here synonymous (cf. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 176; Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, i, 112, note 1).

Two further points may be added: (i) In the text there is no 'and' at the beginning of 19; and 19 may have been spoken at some other time. Our Lord, when the time came for the fulfilment of His promise, made all the Apostles stewards of the mysteries of God, scribes of the Kingdom, with power to interpret His will in the power of the Holy Spirit (cf. 18 17. 18 and notes there; Jn 20 22. 23). But the promise seems first to have been given to St. Peter alone, though we do not in the NT find Peter exercising any authority over his fellow-Apostles, nor is there any suggestion that their powers have come to them through him (cf. Gal 1 1). (ii) The power of the Church to bind and to loose is a power to interpret the law of Christ, and not a power to add to it, just as the powers recognized in the scribes was a power to interpret the law of Moses and not to add to it (cf. 23 8-10). The one is very apt to slip into the other.

[*Note.*—Harnack's attempt ('Der Spruch über Petrus als den Felsen der Kirche,' in *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften* [1918], 637-654) to prove from Tatian's Diatessaron that the sentence about the building of the Church is a later addition, and that the last word of 18 was not 'it' but 'thee,' with the meaning that Peter will not die until the Parousia, has failed (cf. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry* [fifth edition], p. 5 note, and Euringer, 'Der locus classicus des Primates,' in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des chr. Altertums*, Bonn, 1922, 141-179).]

20. Our Lord for the present prohibits the public proclamation of the Messianic confession. It might easily have become a

mere slogan, resulting in mob enthusiasm (cf. Jn 6 [15]) and a revolutionary outbreak.

21-28. The first prediction of the Passion and the teaching on discipleship (cf. Mk 8 [31-39] and notes there; Lk 9 [22-27], 14 [27], 17 [33]).

21. The 'must' is that which follows from the divine purpose revealed in Scripture, especially in Ps 22 and Is 53. Both passages speak of victory only won through agony, and the latter of a work of atonement. A Christ who could not deal with sin would not be a Christ who could really save. As far as we know the identification of the Christ with the Suffering Servant of Jehovah was first definitely made by our Lord Himself, though it seems to be implied by the divine voice at His baptism, and perhaps in Jn 1 [29]. We must not read into the words 'rise again' more than they contain; they might refer to other forms of recovery besides bodily resurrection, and apparently the Apostles derived no expectation of our Lord's bodily resurrection from them. Gunkel (*Zum religionsgeschichtlichem Verständnis des N.T.*, 79 ff.) attempts to connect the three days between the death and resurrection of our Lord with the myth of the sun-god; 'after three days' would thus be a *motif* in a 'Messianological' system proving 'that already before Jesus there was in Jewish syncretistic circles a belief in the death and resurrection of a Messiah.' The baselessness of this assumption has been shown by G. Kittel in *Rabbinica*, 36 f. The Rabbinic sayings which seem to lend colour to this view are of much later date. Thus we find: 'God does not allow the righteous man to remain in distress for more than three days' (Gen R 91 on Gen 13 [17]), and 'the Israelites do not suffer tribulation for more than three days,' the idea being derived from the history of Abraham (Gen 22 [4]), Joseph (Gen 42 [17]), Jonah (Jon 1 [17]), and Mordecai (Est 4 [16]), and from Hos 6 [2]. Our Lord may have had these OT examples in mind in speaking of three days. Their experience would be reproduced in His own.

23. Peter, who is to speak for the Lord, may speak for Satan. Satan may be found in him as well as Christ. Our Lord recognizes the old temptation of 4 [9], the temptation to seek to attain His Messianic destiny without the Cross. His words show the instantaneous recoil with which He met suggestions of evil.

24. To deny oneself is much more than to deny particular pleasures to oneself. It is to treat oneself as Peter treated Christ, to renounce all allegiance to oneself. Self-denial is self-renunciation, not a seeking for the Cross—which our Lord never practised—but an acceptance of it in whatever form it may be given.

26. in exchange for his life: better to *buy his life back* when he has lost it (cf. note on 20 [28]).

27, 28. Mark's language is significantly altered (cf. General Introduction, p. 128*a*).

XVII. **1-13.** The Transfiguration (Mk 9 [2-13] and notes; Lk 9 [28-36]: cf. also 2 P 1 [16-18]). The probable connexion of the Transfiguration with the lessons for the Feast of Tabernacles has already been noticed. The story recalls the story of Ex 24. In the latter, after the people have accepted the divine law ([7]), Moses accompanied by Aaron, Nadab, Abihu and seventy of the elders of Israel goes up Mount Sinai, and receives a vision of God ([12-15] seem to give a different version of the same story). Here thoughts from both versions are combined. The three chief Apostles take the place of Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, while the nine wait below (cf. Ex 24 [14]). Under the New Covenant the faith of the Apostles in the Lord's Messiahship takes the place of the acceptance of the Law; and the cloud, as in Exodus, is the Shekinah-cloud, the glorious manifestation of God, out of which He speaks (cf. Ex 40 [34, 35] LXX, where the same word is used as in [5] here; and 1 K 8 [10, 11]; Ac 1 [9]). The divine voice declares that all divine revelation is now included in the Lord Himself (cf. 11 [13]): Moses and Elijah, representing the Law and the prophets, pass away, leaving 'Jesus only.' Matthew alone has the words 'in whom I am well pleased.' They may be added from 3 [17], but are very appropriate. As the divine voice at the Lord's baptism set the seal of the divine approval upon the Lord's hidden life at Nazareth, so the divine voice here sets it upon the public ministry and the Lord's acceptance of the Cross, and the Resurrection will set it upon all that the Lord has done and said and claimed to be.

14-21. The disciples without Jesus. The cure of the epileptic (cf. Mk 9 [14-29]; Lk 9 [37-43*a*]). Both Matthew and Luke abbreviate the Marcan narrative. Matthew alone states that the father knelt before Jesus (cf. Mt 20 [20]).

20 is probably a combination of Mk 11 [23] with a saying found in Lk 17 [6].

21 is omitted in the best MSS., and was probably added with some alterations from Mk 9 [29].

22-23. Second prediction of the Passion (cf. Mk 9 [30-32]; Lk 9 [43*b*-45]). This prediction is different from the others (16 [21];

20 17 f.) not only in its brevity and the omission of the reference to Jerusalem and the High Priests and scribes, but also intrinsically: 'The Son of Man will be delivered up and they will kill him.' He who had shone with heavenly glory, who had been proclaimed Son of God by a divine voice, and who had revealed His power over Nature, is yet the Man, connected so closely with humanity as by the will of Him who directs history to be 'delivered up.' This time the disciples neither contradicted nor agreed; they were only exceeding sorry.

22. Note the alternative reading in the margin of RV 'were gathering themselves together.' The little company is privately assembling for the last journey to Jerusalem.

24-27. The Temple tax. With the exception of the first words introducing the scene of the incident (Mk 9 33), the passage is another 'Matthean addition'; and it belongs to a group of traditions connected with Peter (cf. 14 28-31, 16 17-19). Since it is concerned with the Temple tribute, which ceased on the fall of the city in A.D. 70, it must belong to early Palestinian tradition. One of the collectors of the Temple tax accosted Peter in the street and asked him whether Jesus paid it. This tax every Jew above the age of nineteen years had to pay towards the maintenance of the Temple. As Jesus was known to do things that were considered to be contrary to the Law, the collector would obviously not have been surprised to learn that He refused to conform to this rule. The question was not as to whether the tax had been paid this time, but whether it was the habit of Jesus to pay it. Peter's ready answer shows that it was; here as always our Lord was faithful to the principle of obedience which He had laid down (cf. 3 15, 5 17, 8 4). Jesus meets Peter on the threshold with a counter-question, which showed His knowledge of what had taken place. The 'kings of the earth,' e.g. the Tetrarch of Galilee—do they exact toll from their family or from the rest of the people whom they govern? Members of the ruling families and certain privileged citizens who possessed the *jus Italicum* were exempt from taxation: and in the Talmud we find a question as to whether the priests were liable to pay Temple duty (cf. Mishna *Shek.*, i, 4). Now Jesus and the disciples are the sons of 'the great King' (5 35), for whose Temple in Jerusalem the tax is raised. They are 'sons,' not merely by being sons of Abraham, but by the direct influence of the living God upon them: and that notwithstanding the contrast between the Lord, by His origin the only Son (2 15, 3 17, 11 27, 14 33, 16 16, 17 5), and those who have become sons of God through Him. Since this relation of Jesus and His disciples to God is independent of the nation and its cultus, their relationship to God does not compel them to contribute to the latter (cf. 12 6; Jn 4 20-24). Yet in 27 we see why our Lord conformed to the rule and desired His disciples to do so. He did not wish to offend those who as yet were not positively against Him. As long as the Temple stood, He desired that the disciples should fulfil their legal duties towards it; for in this they would show their love to Israel, and so avoid making the Gospel difficult of acceptance by the Jews. The law of love is laid upon the 'King's sons,' who are free from the law of force (cf. Jas 1 25, 2 8, 12).

The more closely the Gospels are studied, the more we find how faithful a reproducer of our Lord's own teaching St. Paul is. The Jews are servants, while Christians ought to be sons (cf. Jn 15 15); the very fact that the maintenance of the Temple demands that a compulsory tax should be levied upon the Jews shows that they have still the spirit of servants; sons cannot possibly be under such a law as this. But Christians are not to claim their freedom when to do so would be to give the impression that they are lawless—that they are less than servants, and not more. The son is one who gives a higher and fuller, though not a legalistic, obedience. In exactly the same way, while St. Paul teaches that the Law no longer exists for Christians, he is quite ready to limit the application of the principle for others' sake (cf. 1 Cor 8, especially 13, 9 19-22).

Our Lord's words concerning the money in the mouth of a fish may be but a playful allusion to Peter's trade, and perhaps also an ironical allusion to the Jews' thirst for startling miracles. The fact that the miracle is not reported to have taken place seems to confirm the idea that our Lord's words were not meant seriously. There are similar stories in Rabbinic writings (cf. e.g. *Shabb.*, 119*a*). If it is the evangelist's meaning that the miracle actually took place, we can hardly accept his story. It seems contrary to our Lord's self-imposed limitations for Him to use miracles for the supply of His own personal needs; for these He relies upon the Father's providence (cf. 4 3, 4). Frequently it is impossible to accept our Lord's teaching and reject the miracles associated with it; the two are bound up together. Here it

is not so. Our Lord's beautiful words about sonship do not involve the acceptance of the miracle.

XVIII. Stumbling-blocks in the Messianic community.

The last section of 17 dealt with the relation of the disciples to the Jewish nation and cultus. The instructions found in 18 1-20 28 are mostly concerned with inter-communal relationships.

1-5. Cf. Mk 9 33-37; Lk 9 46-48. This and the following conversations took place in the house in Capernaum (17 24, 25: cf. Mk 9 33). From Mark alone do we gather that they arose out of certain discussions of the disciples on the way. Possibly it is to shield the disciples that Matthew introduces our Lord's teaching in a different way. The priority given to the closest disciples (17 1), the exceptional part played lately by Peter (14 28, 15 15, 16 16, 17 24), and the growing absorption of the minds of all in the approaching Kingdom (16 28) made their question a natural one. Every 'righteous' Jew expected a special paradise for himself (Lev R 27). There are at least seven gradations of honour (*Sifre* on Numbers, 67*a*); and the place at the right hand of God will, according to Lev R 81*a*, be awarded to the faithful teachers of children. Jesus answered His disciples by calling forward a child (perhaps one of the children of our Lord's brothers), and setting him 'in the midst of them,' the teacher's place. They will not even enter the Kingdom unless they again become like children.

3 is found in Mk 10 15 (= Lk 18 17) in another context. That the soul of a child represents the purest type is an idea foreign to ancient thought (cf. Heinrici, *Die Hermes-Mystik*, 65). The humble receptivity of a little child can only be attained by an adult through conversion, which brings about the right condition both for the understanding of divine revelation (11 25) and for personal salvation. For 5 see 10 40-42 and Mk 9 37.

6-9. Cf. Mk 9 42-48 and notes there; Lk 17 1-2. Because of their relation to Jesus even the humblest among His disciples should be treated with respect and consideration. To give such an one occasion for stumbling is a crime so great that our Lord is moved with emotion at the very thought of it (7: cf. Lk 17 1 f.). That evil condition of the world, which renders occasions of stumbling unavoidable, must not be made an excuse for treating them lightly.

8, 9 are a doublet of 5 29, 30; but the foot, inappropriate there, is retained here.

10-14. This section is found only in Matthew. Not only must the disciples guard against causing the weak to stumble, but the 'little ones' must be protected by the stronger ones, and helped in times of spiritual danger. The omission of such care is a serious breach of duty, for the 'little ones' are precious in the sight of God and the angels. The expression 'their angels' does not necessarily convey the Jewish idea that each pious person has his own special guardian angels (cf. for this Box in *Cent. B. ad loc.*). The angels, through whom God works in the world, and whose aim is the establishment of His Kingdom, are also the angels of those, however humble, whose aim coincides with theirs. The angels have free entrance into the presence of God, and they both bring before God the needs of their *protégés* and convey to them God's help. How great then would be the sin of him who in fancied superiority despised them, and in spiritual danger left them to their fate!

12-14. These verses illustrate what has gone before. Here the parable teaches a different lesson from that found in Lk 15 4; the one who allows the erring brother to be lost without attempting to save him sets at nought the will of God.

15-20. Peculiar to Matthew, except 15, which has a parallel in Lk 17 3. If 16, 17 are the words of our Lord, they should be interpreted like 5 23, 24, in relation to the ordinary life of the Jewish ecclesia in our Lord's day, though they will of course apply to the Christian Church also (cf. Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 9 f.). Their form does not suggest that He is looking forward to the future, nor does the reference to the Gentile and the publican. In this case 18-20 could not have been originally attached to 15-17. It is Matthew's custom to group sayings together which were spoken at different times.

15. **against thee.** These words, though omitted by the best MSS., probably represent our Lord's meaning. He thinks of the moral danger both to the offender and to the offended, if an injury is done and no redress given. In dealing with 'the world' Christians should receive injuries silently (5 38 ff.); but, where a special religious bond exists, the evil must be put right if fellowship is to continue. There is nothing inconsistent with our Lord's mind in the words about the Gentile and the publican. A good Jew would treat both with courtesy and kindness; but he would not acknowledge the existence of any special religious bond in their case.

18. Probably a detached saying, spoken

originally to the Apostles (cf. 16[19] and note there), but true of the interpretative and disciplinary authority of the Church in all ages. The context in which Matthew places the saying shows that he considered the authority to bind and loose to be accompanied by authority to enforce by discipline the decisions given. In the case here contemplated the authorities of the local ecclesia would (i) declare the conduct of the erring brother to be such as the Law forbade, and (ii) excommunicate him, if he refused to repent and make satisfaction for his fault. It is, however, not unlikely that the words are later than our Lord, though founded upon His teaching.

19, 20. This detached saying about prayer is linked with the preceding by the fact that it is the presence of Christ in the Church through the Spirit which bestows upon the Church both the power of legislating and exercising discipline, and the power of effectual prayer (cf. Jn 20[22, 23]). The true interpreter of the mind of Christ is the same mind living on in His Body the Church by the Spirit (1 Cor 2[16]). The true prayer which is always answered is the prayer which the mind of Christ inspires, and which can therefore be offered in His name (Jn 16[23, 24]). The Gospel of Matthew (cf. note on 10[19, 20]) records little of the Lord's teaching about the Holy Spirit; but much that is found in Jn 14-16 is in substance contained in these verses. Moreover, it is the dependence of the Church's authority over men and with God upon the presence of the Spirit which prevents equally in both cases this authority from being misused. If the Spirit of God is grieved and banished, neither are the Church's decisions ratified in heaven, nor her prayers heard. Cf. the saying, often repeated in Talmudic literature, 'Where two or three are together to study the Torah, the Shekina is in their midst.' If it was current in the time of our Lord, it is possible that He refers to it here, and thus consciously identifies Himself with the Shekina. In any case the greatness of the claim which these words involve is manifest; they anticipate in some degree the final words of the Gospel.

21, 22. Cf. Lk 17[4]. Peter's question is here directly connected with [15], and evidently provoked by it, though Luke has our Lord's words in another context. For the language employed cf. Gen 4[24]. There it is used in connexion with 'vengeance,' here with forgiveness.

23-25. The parable of the Unmerciful Debtor.

This parable needs little explanation. The lesson to be drawn is that the disciple who does not forgive not only causes grief to the community ([31]), but incurs the wrath of God. There is not one who does not stand in the same relation to God as the unmerciful servant to the king of the parable. We should note: (i) The Lord's deep sense of the greatness of human sin. Ten thousand talents are the equivalent of two million pounds, and one hundred pence of about four pounds. It is sometimes maintained that our Lord, unlike St. Paul, makes little of sin; but it is not so. (ii) The forgiveness, in accordance with Hebrew thought, is seen in the divine action. It consists in the fact that the servant is allowed to retain his family and possessions. Our obligation to forgive others is a practical rather than an emotional obligation; and, if we do not perform it, we must expect to find those blessings forfeited, in which God's present forgiveness is seen. The divine forgiveness is probationary, and may be recalled at any moment. Peter's question ([21]) presupposes the reality of his rights and the limitation of his duty. It is only when our true relation to God is grasped that we cease to think in this way. Here, as elsewhere, true moral ideas depend upon true religion.

XIX. **1-15.** Marriage and children (cf. Mk 10[1-16]).

1-2. Cf. Mk 10[1]. No part of Judæa was beyond Jordan. The reference is to the parts of Peræa adjacent to Judæa.

3-9. Divorce (cf. 5[31] f. and note; Mk 10[2-12] and all the notes there; Lk 16[18]).

3. for every cause: these words are peculiar to Matthew. There is probably a reference to the contrasted views of Hillel and Shammai. Under the Jewish law no woman could divorce her husband, the toleration of polygamy destroying all possibility of equality in the rights of man and woman. But Hillel practically permitted divorce by the man for almost any reason; it was enough if his wife was displeasing to him; while Shammai only permitted him to divorce her for uncleanness (cf. Dt 24[1] ff.). Matthew's account, though as a whole less accurate than Mark's, probably states correctly the exact question put to the Lord. Mark generalized it, since the Rabbinical discussion possessed no importance for Gentile readers.

6. What therefore, i.e. the 'one flesh,' the new and indivisible reality which God intends.

9. There are several variations in the text here, but not one which substantially

affects its meaning. Our Lord condemns divorce, or rather denies its possibility, in all cases but one. Normally 'remarriage' in the lifetime of the former partner is simply adultery; but a man may put away an adulterous wife, the death penalty being no longer imposed, and presumably marry another woman. But did our Lord really say this? The case against it is overwhelming, and almost all scholars are now agreed that the exceptive clauses here and in 5^{32} were never spoken by Him. (i) No such exception is recognized in our other accounts of the Lord's teaching (Mk $10^{11, 12}$; Lk 16^{18}; 1 Cor $7^{10, 11}$), and all are prior to Matthew. Where Matthew alters the meaning of his chief authority, Mark, his alteration hardly ever justifies itself, and here his exceptive clauses affect the very substance of the Lord's teaching. (ii) These exceptive clauses do not even harmonize with his own narrative. Throughout 5^{17-48} our Lord is substituting the perfect standard of God for the standard recognized by the Jews of His day; but, if the exceptive clause is retained, our Lord's teaching is no higher than Shammai's. Here the exceptive clause seems to be inconsistent both with $^{4-8}$ and with ^{10}. Why should the disciples be startled by the Shammaite teaching, probably the dominant view among contemporary Jews? (iii) The Christian teaching of the first three centuries recognizes no exception to the strictness of the law of Christ. In view of the current standards of both Jews and Gentiles, such a revolution is inconceivable, unless our Lord's teaching had been known to demand it. (iv) Common sense leads us to the same conclusion. It is precisely the indissolubility of Christian marriage which leads both husband and wife to do their utmost to make their marriage a success. All weakening of the Christian law weakens the high call which marriage brings, and destroys its romance, since the maxim 'safety first' is the death of romance. The view that adultery dissolves the marriage bond not only degrades the conception of marriage by making its physical side the dominant consideration; it involves two absurdities. First, a man may cease to be married and yet be unaware of the fact. Secondly, it makes adultery, or the pretence of having committed it, the one way to get rid of a marriage which has become distasteful, and so puts a premium on adultery. If marriage is to be dissoluble at all, it should be also dissoluble upon other grounds than this, as sensible opponents of the Christian law recognize. The suffering which an unhappy marriage involves is not in the least confined to that caused by unfaithfulness; and nothing will get rid of it but the rule of Hillel combined with sex equality. Our conclusion is plain: these exceptive clauses have no Dominical authority. Our Lord no more than St. Paul in 1 Cor 7^{11} forbids separation; indeed, it may sometimes be a duty; but for His new community He totally disallows divorce.

But how, it may be asked, did the exceptive clauses come into the text? There is no evidence of a relaxation of the Christian standard among the Palestinian Christians, or any other example in Matthew of an alteration of Mark which lowers the Christian standard. A better explanation is this. Either Matthew himself, or a later copyist, thought that our Lord's words might be understood as forbidding separation in all cases. Though a man may and should forgive an adulterous wife on her repentance, he must not live with her if he cannot trust her. That would mean *confusio prolis*, the bringing into the world of children whose parentage would be uncertain. The exceptive clauses were therefore inserted in both cases to guard against this misunderstanding, the writer failing to observe that his well-meant interpolations might bring about a far worse misunderstanding. This explanation is borne out by the fact that no Christian writer of the first three centuries seems to find anything in Matthew inconsistent with the strict rule.

Those who wish to know what can be said in favour of recognizing the exception may consult Charles, *The Teaching of the N.T. on Divorce*. In favour of the strict rule cf. Box and Gore, *Divorce in the N.T.* (answering Charles), and Gore, *The Question of Divorce*. On the evidence of the early centuries cf. O. Watkins, *Holy Matrimony*, 198-215, and on the history of the interpretation of the Matthean passages *ibid.*, 167-171. For a different view cf. *Sacraments in the N.T.*, p. 401*b*, and references there given.

Perhaps a few words may be added, though they go beyond the expositor's task. The real difficulty does not lie in the ascertaining of our Lord's meaning, but in the practical application of His rule. The Lord lays upon His people the duty of rising to the divine standard (5^{48}), because by the gift of His Spirit He enables them to rise to it. But it is a standard impracticable for the world's 'hardness of heart,' and the world, whether outside the Church or nominally within it, has never taken the Christian law of marriage seriously. The Church in its turn, having

once admitted into its fellowship multitudes of nominal Christians, has widely relaxed the Christian law. The Eastern Church has long practically abandoned it. The Roman, though nominally adhering to it, has often permitted divorce in practice by declaring marriages from the first invalid, and that on preposterous grounds. The English Church sometimes tends to draw a distinction between the 'innocent party' and the guilty in a divorce, and allow remarriage to the former. But no such distinction will stand. The original marriage either stands or it does not. If it does, no other can be lawfully contracted; if it does not, the guilty party is as free as the innocent. The truth is that the loss of the Church's discipline has brought about conditions not contemplated in our Lord's words. Multitudes of marriages among nominal Christians are in fact heathen marriages which God has never blessed. They are lightly formed and lightly discarded, the Christian view of marriage never having been even understood. Then new 'marriages' are formed, perhaps more satisfactory than the old ones. What is to be done when a conversion takes place among people thus situated? Is it to be a condition of communion that an existing home with children should be broken up, when there is no practical possibility of return to the original partner? Christians need to understand better both the reasons for the law of Christ, and the reasons why those who do not look beyond this present world reject it. Three modern plays may be here recommended: G. B. Shaw, *Getting Married* (in spite of its flippancy full of wisdom as well as wit); St. John Ervine, *Jane Clegg*; and Milne, *Mr. Pim Passes By*. These will put some of the real problems before us.

10-12. This section is peculiar to Matthew, and is constantly misunderstood. The disciples considered the indissolubility of the marriage tie to be so heavy a burden that it must be better not to marry. The answer of our Lord refers to the teaching just given (4-9), and means that not to all men is it given to accept it. Here, as in the Lord's teaching generally (13 11, 12), the power to recognize new truth is the reward of moral faithfulness. In 12 the first two classes are those of actual eunuchs. The third contains (i) those who, having found just cause for divorce according to the Law, still refrain from claiming it, but become 'eunuchs' rather than break the sacred marriage vow; (ii) those who, like John the Baptist, refrain from marriage for the Kingdom of God's sake; and (iii) those who, like Peter, have left wife and family to follow Jesus. Here again is truth which not all will be able to recognize either theoretically or practically. Let the man who is able do so. St. Paul reproduces what the Lord here says (1 Cor 7 *passim*). Celibacy is a loftier condition than marriage in the Lord's eyes, not because there is anything evil in marriage, but because celibacy gives fuller opportunities for prayer and service to the Kingdom. It is no doubt true that celibacy means a limitation of true human experience, which is in itself disadvantageous; but, if rightly employed, it means a more than compensating widening of it in other directions. There is no justification for throwing doubt upon the authenticity of our Lord's teaching here. Cf. note on 21.

13-15. Jesus and the children (cf. Mk 10 13-16 and notes there; Lk 18 15-17). The account in Mark is fuller and more vivid.

16-20. The rich young man and the disciples' reward (cf. Mk 10 17-31 and notes there; Lk 18 18-30).

16, 17. The true text in Matthew differs considerably from that of Mark and Luke. Mark and Luke have 'good Master,' while Matthew transfers the word 'good' to the actual question, and has 'what good thing?' In the Lord's reply Mark and Luke have 'Why callest thou me good?' while Matthew makes a second change corresponding to his first. Matthew's version is less natural, and is probably the result of mingled reverence and timidity. The story had been altered in the Palestinian tradition, since it seemed to suggest that Jesus disclaimed moral perfection, and perhaps divinity also. But both versions of the story, rightly understood, are invaluable. God alone is perfectly good, and the one true good of His creatures; all else is only good by its relation to Him. Thus (i) there can be no action good in itself, apart from its relation to the will and purpose of God. The keeping of the commandments is a condition of entry into that eternal life which is God's life, because we thus co-operate with His purpose, and find fellowship with Him and with His people (1 Jn 1 7). As St. Paul says, no obedience to an external code can in itself bestow life (Gal 3 21), and the 'moral' man may find just as great a void in his soul as the immoral. (ii) There can be no master good in himself, not even Christ. A master is only good in so far as God is found in him, and known as teaching and acting through Him (cf. Jn 14 6-10). We

are too much disposed to accept 'good masters' as our ultimate authorities, and to substitute the ideas about God with which they provide us for God Himself. Our Lord's words here about the Father are in spirit similar to those of St. Paul about our Lord (1 Cor 1 [12-15]).

18, 19. Matthew's version of these verses makes short work of the difficulties of Mark's text, but adds mistakenly 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' The addition was probably prompted by fear that our Lord might seem to sanction too low a standard for a candidate for eternal life.

20. young man: another 'Matthean addition'; but again mistaken, as Mk 10 [20] shows.

21. If thou wouldest be perfect: these words correspond to 'One thing thou lackest' or 'lackest yet' in Mark and Luke. 'Perfect' therefore is here the opposite of 'lacking.' The demand which follows was not altogether exceptional; it was on the last journey one absolutely necessary to be made of all whom the Lord called to be His immediate followers. Correspondence with God's purpose, and so eternal life, for all whom the Lord called now depended upon the taking up of the Cross. Comments which lay stress only upon the need of complete sacrifice of property in this case, because love of money was the thing which kept the man from complete devotion, miss the mark. The primary question is always not 'What will best develop my character?' but 'What does the work of God require?' If we take care to do God's will, our characters will take care of themselves. A religion of self-culture means a Pharisaical religion.

Does this narrative, rightly interpreted, support the well-known distinction between the 'precepts' and the 'counsels' of Christ? Undoubtedly, just as [12] does. But the divine vocation is too mysterious and delicate a thing for our human language, and though the word 'precept' is a satisfactory word, the word 'counsel' may be misleading. (i) Though the religion of Christ is not a legal religion, His law of liberty and love has applications which are universal, and these are rightly termed 'precepts.' If we do not pay regard to them, there can be for us no eternal life ([17-19]). (ii) There are ways of living, e.g. voluntary celibacy and poverty, which our Lord by word and example commends to us as higher and better in the abstract than their opposites, and which He urges those who are able to bear them to embrace. But (iii) the word 'able' is here ambiguous. Inability to embrace them may arise in many ways. Our God-given temperament, or the position in which His providence has placed us, may make it clear that our Lord does not even 'counsel' us to adopt them. In such cases neither marriage nor property will prove a hindrance to our attainment of perfection in our own 'kind.' But inability may also arise from a want of moral and spiritual development which is our own fault. This may completely blind us to the ascetic side of our Lord's teaching, or make of us people who cannot bring themselves even to consider such a life as He suggests. In this case we may pass through life and death in a 'state of grace,' but sacrifice our highest possibilities and perhaps for ever. It is one thing to reach heaven as a pauper, to come to port 'only not a wreck.' It is another to find oneself there the owner of a 'treasure,' and cross the river while 'the trumpets sound upon the other side.'

23-26. Mark's version is again the better, but not as read in AV text. The words 'for them that trust in riches' almost certainly should go out, as in RVm; their tendency is to explain away our Lord's warning against riches. But a little explanation is necessary. (i) The circumstances of Israel in the previous two centuries had tended in a special way to identify the poor with the godly, and the rich with the ungodly. The rich were largely those who had kept on good terms with the foreign rulers by unfaithfulness to the divine law. (ii) Still more important is it to observe that riches consist in the money and other resources which are really, and not merely theoretically, at our own disposal. In England, e.g., professional incomes are largely mortgaged in advance by the expenses unavoidable, if the positions to which they are attached are held. A stockbroker can live as he will and where he will; an officer in the Army cannot; and a working-man may have far more money which he can spend upon his own pleasures than a priest or a physician. Now it is this position of freedom from financial anxiety, with its overwhelming temptation to self-indulgence, which our Lord declares in almost all cases to bring with it the refusal of His yoke, and so the loss of the Kingdom which He proclaims. The rich in the true sense of the word can only attain the Kingdom if they either abandon their wealth, or use it simply as the stewards of God (cf. Lk 16 [1-15])—and that means to cease to be rich. 'Rich' people are often delightful people, since they have little

to try their tempers; but they are not therefore followers of Christ.

27-30. Matthew introduces into the Marcan text a saying also found in Lk 22 [30]. The regeneration is the new birth of the world to be expected at the coming of the Kingdom (cf. Is 65 [17], 66 [22]; Ac 3 [21]; Rom 8 [20, 21]). The insertion of [28] is probably made to avoid the suggestion of Mk 10 [31] (here [30]) that the Apostles will not after all rank highest in the Kingdom. Luke has the saying at a later time, when their probation was even more fully advanced (cf. Lk 22 [28]). Matthew's version, as frequently, has the more apocalyptic colouring. The original meaning of the saying probably was that in the new Kingdom the Twelve would be under the Lord the rulers and judges of Israel. To judge is not to condemn, but to do justice to (cf. Ps 72 [2, 4]).

29, 30. See notes on Mk 10 [29-31]. The new relationships gained in the great Christian family compensate for those lost by the dividing sword of 10 [34-37]. There are two elements in the 'future reward,' one the eternal life common to all—the penny of the following parable, the other the heavenly treasure proportionate to the sacrifices made.

XX. 1-16. The Labourers in the Vineyard (peculiar to Matthew). For a Rabbinic parallel with a different application cf. Midr. on Dt., vi. The parable looks back to the end of the last chapter, and further elucidates our Lord's answer to Peter: it has no direct connexion with the conversion of the Gentiles. Our Lord detects in the Apostle's question a spirit of self-seeking. Hope is (in its right place) a necessary motive, just as fear is; and our Lord promises reward frequently and generously, without destroying the power of His words for simple minds by explaining that this reward will be 'purely spiritual.' Thus the danger arises of an otherworldliness little higher, except that it rests upon faith, than ordinary self-seeking. Our Lord's profound though humorous parable corrects this by supplementing the great promises of 19 [28, 29] by the thoughts of the privilege of service and of the sovereignty of God in His gift of eternal life. In connexion with such a gift there can be no thought of wages. St. Paul reproduces our Lord's teaching (Rom 6 [23]). Even the details of the parable are significant. The coming of the Kingdom is prepared for by the co-operation of many labourers, and God 'rises up early and sends' them. But the character of His promise is different at different stages. At first there is a definite bargain. It is for the ordinary blessings, which the Baals of the nations round Israel were also supposed to offer (cf. Dt 28 [3-8]). At the second stage reward is still promised, but the old definiteness has disappeared ([4]); the labourer must trust the master's character. At the third stage ([7]), according to the true text, there is no promise of reward; the labourers rely upon the master's character alone. But they are not disappointed. Though the master has taken them for their own sake rather than for that of his work, he meets their trust with unbounded generosity. The last called are paid first; their fellowship with the master is the closest; and the bargainers protest against the equality of reward. But the master insists upon his right, as long as he is faithful to his promise, to go beyond it as he will. He claims to 'do as he will with his own,' not in the miserable sense which we have learned to give to these beautiful words, but in the sense that he refuses to have his generosity limited. Human justice has continually to compare the 'merits' of men with scrupulous exactness, because what it has to distribute is so little. With God it is otherwise; He fulfils every need 'according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus' (Phil 4 [19]). The symbols of the master and the servant are of value in thinking of our relation to God, but only a small part of the truth can be expressed by them. If the conclusion of the parable shocks our ideas of justice, that only shows how great is our need to correct and expand them.

17-28. Through suffering and service to rule.

17-19. The third prediction of the Passion (cf. Mk 10 [32-34]; Lk 18 [32-34]).

Mark's version vividly depicts the inner struggle of the disciples and the determination of our Lord: 'He set his face towards Jerusalem.' In [19] **and to crucify** is peculiar to Matthew; but in Mark too the details of the Passion are now coming before the Lord's mind.

20-28. The request of the mother of the sons of Zebedee (cf. Mk 10 [35-45] and notes there; see also Lk 22 [24-30]).

20. In Mark the request is made directly by James and John, but the Matthean version is to be preferred. It is in harmony with the ambitions of a Jewish mother for her sons, and fully recognizes that James and John came with her and joined in her petition. She was probably Salome (cf. note on Mk 15 [40]); but she is described just as the mother of the sons of Zebedee, her life being bound up in that of her children. The last words should

be explained by the Marcan parallel. Salome wishes our Lord to pledge Himself to grant her request before He has heard it, as Antipas did with the daughter of Herodias.

21. The request is the expression not of ambition only, but of an ardent faith that beyond that mysterious Passion, of which the Lord has spoken to them, there awaits Him the crown of the Messiah (cf. Lk 23 [42]). But the Lord's relation to the Father is not understood. The sons of Zebedee suppose that the Father's authority is delegated to Him, that He may use it as He will; it is not the Father's Kingdom which is coming, but His. That is not so. Certainly He can 'command,' and what He commands will be done, but only because He is Himself 'under authority' (cf. 8 [8, 9]). His mission is to put down all other rule than His own, that in and through Him the Father Himself may rule (cf. 1 Cor 15 [24-28]); and not even in matters of detail has He any arbitrary authority.

22, 23. Ye know not what ye ask. They know not the inconsistency of their prayer with the nature of the Lord's authority, or the suffering which the highest place in the Kingdom must involve, or the lowly service which is the characteristic of true greatness. The Lord must teach them all three. Even in the life of the world envy of high place generally rests upon ignorance both of what it has cost and of the strain which it involves. Shakespeare gives noble expression to this truth (cf. 1 *Henry IV*, Act iv, Sc. 5; and *Henry V*, Act iv, Sc. 1). The Lord's answer in these verses brings out two great truths: (i) Fellowship with Christ in glory involves fellowship with Him in suffering; and the higher the position to be attained, the greater the suffering that leads to it. The *locus classicus* for this truth is 2 Corinthians (cf. especially 4 [7-18]). This double fellowship is within the reach of all. But (ii) we must not pray for a fellowship in Christ's sufferings which lies outside God's purpose for us. In the 'great house' of the Kingdom 'there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth' (2 Tim 2 [20]). If our vocation falls short of the highest, our suffering will fall short of the deepest. Our part is to do God's will, and be satisfied with the Cross that is given. Matthew omits 'the baptism' mentioned in Mark, perhaps supposing it to have the same meaning as the cup.

24. Cf. Gen 37 [8].

25-27. The Lord's teaching has many applications (cf. Lk 22 [24-30]). To the ten He says: 'High place means service. The great is a minister, and the greatest of all a slave. Are you angry because you are to have ministers and slaves?' To the two He says: 'Count the cost, not of the present suffering only, but of the glory beyond. The highest place means the lowest ministry; and you must welcome that law of love, and live by it even unto death as I do.' To judge the twelve tribes (19 [28]) will mean labour and pain (2 Cor 11 [28]). The kings of the Gentiles do not understand this, and that is why the sheep have no true shepherds (9 [36]). Though like Ptolemy Euergetes they may be called benefactors (Lk 22 [25]), they bestow no benefits. It will not be so in the Kingdom of God.

28. Cf. the note on Mk 10 [45] and (as against Dr. Rashdall) add two further arguments: (i) Whatever was the exact meaning attached by the Lord to the title 'Son of Man,' it is specially used by Him in connexion with the thought of His glory as reached by the Cross. (ii) At this stage in His ministry, when His teaching centred round the approaching Passion, it would have been entirely unnatural not to refer to it as His own highest act of service. He 'came' that He might die for His people (cf. Heb 2 [14, 15], words closely connected with the thought of the 'Son of Man' in 2 [5] ff.). The Lord's language probably looks back to Ps 49 [7-9], and to His own words (16 [26]) about buying back our life. What others cannot do for us, and what we cannot do for ourselves, He is about to do for us, since He alone can (cf. also Is 53).

Two points may be added: (i) This section gives our Lord's own teaching as to the meaning of the Cross. It is (*a*) a cup which the Father puts into His hand, and which He drinks because it is the Father's will (Mk 14 [36]; Jn 18 [11]). It is (*b*) a baptism, in which the deep waters will pass over His soul, but which will be (like our own baptism) the path to a fuller life, in which the present limitations of His activity will have passed away (cf. Lk 12 [50] with its thought of present straitening). It is (*c*) a ransom. In and through that fuller life to which He goes He will be able to give us our own true life back. Our life is bought back by the payment of His own. (ii) This section finds a wealth of parallels in Jn 12 [23-32]. For the cup cf. [27, 28]; for the baptism [26, 32]; for the ransom [24]; and for the application to the Apostles and all the servants of Christ [26]. A large part of the reason for the immense exaggeration of the difference between the teaching of the Synoptists and that of

the 4th Gospel lies in our failure to grasp the depth of the Synoptists' teaching.

XX. 29-XXIII 39. The end approaching.

XX. 29-34. The two blind men. (Mk 10 46-52 and notes there; Lk 18 35-43; cf. Mt 9 27-33).

The other Synoptists mention only one blind man (cf. the doubling in 8 28, 9 27), and Mark mentions him by name. The description in Mark is more vivid. Note the Lord's insistence upon definiteness in prayer (32).

XXI. 1-11. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem (cf. Mk 11 1-11 and notes there; Lk 19 29-38; Jn 12 12-19).

The days of reserve (16 20) are now over; and the Lord publicly makes His Messianic claim, forcing upon Jerusalem and the authorities the choice between faith and definite rejection, though He knows well what the result will be. This is clear (i) from His deliberate fulfilment of Zech 9 9 (cf. the verses following); (ii) from the 'lowly pomp' which He adopts, and the acclamations which He welcomes (cf. 2 K 9 13 and 1 Mac 13 51), and perhaps from His use of the title 'the Lord' (3). It is noticeable that of all the promises of the Messiah's coming He chooses the gentlest for fulfilment; with the popular conception of the triumphant Son of David He had no sympathy. The hymn *Vexilla regis* suits Palm Sunday admirably.

1. The day seems to be fixed as Sunday by Jn 12 1, 12.

2. Mark and Luke mention the ass only. The addition of the colt is probably due to the words of Zechariah quoted below. But the last words of that verse do not really speak of a second animal; they are merely an example of the parallelism characteristic of Hebrew poetry. Matthew's misunderstanding leads him into absurdity in 7, though the RV deftly conceals it. He speaks, unless the right reading be that of D and Sin. Syr., of the Lord as riding on both animals.

3. The Lord speaks as a King; His need is sufficient.

4, 5. **that it might be fulfilled.** We can hardly doubt that our Lord's fulfilment was deliberate, though the war-horse would have been inappropriate to Him. If this kind of fulfilment seems to us childish in comparison with the higher and broader fulfilment of the ideals of prophecy, we must remember the needs of the simpler minds. Christ's Gospel is for all, and to all must be commended in the way appropriate to each (cf. Rom 1 14). The older form of the argument from prophecy does not deserve the contempt lavished upon it. 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion' comes from Is 62 11. It is composite quotations such as this (cf. Mk 1 2, 3) which suggest to some scholars the use by Matthew of a collection of prophecies fulfilled by the Lord.

8. The multitude probably consisted mainly of the Galilean pilgrims coming up for the Passover (cf. Mk 10 46). The multitude that cried 'Crucify' (27 22, 23) was the multitude of Jerusalem. There is little justification for the charge that the same men who had cried 'Hosanna' uttered the second cry.

9. **Hosanna** is an invocation of blessing, and means 'save now'; but transliterated into Greek it was misunderstood, and regarded as a shout of praise. The original form of the acclamation is probably preserved in Mk 11 9 (cf. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 180 f.). **Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord** is from Ps 118 26 (the previous verse has 'save now') and was used as a greeting to pilgrims to the Temple. Two other verses are cited by the Lord in 42, and the whole Psalm is one of Passion and Resurrection.

10, 11. Peculiar to Matthew, but most lifelike. The local patriotism of the Galileans cries out: 'It is our prophet who is King-Messiah.' The stirring of the whole city is not noticed in either Mark or Luke, but no doubt took place.

12-17. Jesus and the Temple (cf. Mk 11 15-19 and notes there; Lk 19 45-47; Jn 2 14-17). Matthew, unlike Mark (11 11, 15), links the cleansing of the Temple closely with the triumphant entry. By this the story of Holy Week is shortened by one day and the narrative weakened. It is most unlikely that the cleansing took place at the beginning of our Lord's ministry (as John would lead us to suppose), or that He cleansed it twice. The detailed notes of time in Mk 11 11, 15 are convincing as to the truth of the Synoptic account; and the act was one full of Messianic authority, and thus very improbable while the Lord was still keeping His claims in the background. Moreover, His words in Jn 2 19 seem to have been used against Him at His trial (Mt 26 61) and at Calvary (27 40), and were thus presumably recent. The best explanation of the difficulty is to suppose that the disciple of the fourth evangelist, who put together his Gospel after his death, has confused two Passovers and so misplaced the story. There are other apparent dislocations in the 4th Gospel.

13. Cf. Is 56 7 (LXX) and Jer 7 11. The

combination is an admirable example of the Lord's familiarity with the OT and insight into its meaning. But Matthew, in abbreviating Mark, omits the words 'for all the nations,' and spoils the quotation. It was in the court of the Gentiles, where the traffic took place, that the divine welcome was offered to the strangers who loved the name of Jehovah (cf. Is 56 [6]). There is not the slightest justification for the suggestion that the action of the Lord was due to dislike of the sacrificial system; the very verse that He quotes from Isaiah recognizes its value. His action was due to reverence for the Temple as 'the house of God' (cf. carefully 23 [16-22] with the note there, and Mk 11 [16]). The Jewish Temple, like the temples of the Gentiles, was primarily a dwelling-place for the God there worshipped. God had chosen to 'set his name' there. In Jn 4 [21] our Lord speaks of what will be, not of what at present is (contrast Jn 4 [23]). Soon the veil of the Temple will be rent, for there will no longer be a divine presence to veil (cf. 24 [2]), but the house is not yet 'left' (23 [38]) to a rejected people, and it must be respected. The 'churches' of Christians are, as their name suggests, not primarily houses of God, but places of assembly for His people; and in the NT 'the house of God' is the Catholic Church itself (Eph 2 [21, 22]; 1 Tim 3 [15]). Reverence for the material buildings may now easily be exaggerated. Our Lord will teach in the Temple in these last days (26 [55]; Lk 19 [47]), and heal there the blind and the lame (21 [14]); unlike the chief priests and scribes He is not shocked at the acclamations of the boys of Jerusalem. But He is shocked when He finds traffic there, as the priests and scribes are not.

16. Another exquisite quotation. The word used in Ps 8 [2] may mean either 'praise' or 'strength.' Cf. the context in the Psalm. The children silence the 'adversaries' of the 'Son of Man.' The Church found the 'Son of Man' of the Psalm in the Lord Himself (1 Cor 15 [27]; Heb 2 [6-9]); and, in view of the connexion of this title with glory won through humiliation, it has been suggested that it was from this Psalm that the Lord derived the title. Cf. Lk 19 [39, 40], a similar incident with another adaptation of Scripture language.

18-22. The cursing of the fig tree (cf. Mk 11 [12-14, 20-25] and notes there; Lk 13 [6-9]).

Matthew again compresses the Marcan narrative, which shows that the withering was only discovered on the following day, and omits Mark's statement that it was not the season of figs. Mark's careful notes of time and reference to the 'remembrance' of Peter (11 [21]) assure us that the story is true, and not just a dramatized form of Lk 13 [6-9]. There is no reason, as we shall see, even for wishing that it were untrue.

18. in the morning, and therefore before the first meal of the day. The previous day had been most exhausting.

19. The 'way' of the Lord He describes in Jn 16 [28]. Israel is the 'one' tree by the wayside from which fruit for support upon His mission might have been expected, and which 'outwardly' appeared beautiful (23 [27]). Though it is not yet 'the season of' the fruit of the Spirit, the early April fruit of the Law and the prophets might have been expected both in conduct (Lk 16 [31]) and in faith (Jn 5 [46, 47]). Thus the curse falls. To be fruitless for the Christ of God is to be for ever fruitless for all. 'The Legacy of Israel' to the world is the legacy of its life and witness before it made 'the great refusal,' and the legacy of the faithful remnant which passed over into the Catholic Church. What has it given to the world since but the ever-present warning of its punishment? So it must always be. The son or daughter who loves father or mother more than Christ, and so refuses His call, may have been fruitful at home before the call has been heard, but will not be so afterwards, though the withering may not be quite so immediate as Matthew's version of the story might suggest.

21. The Lord speaks to those who will carry on His work. All must serve them, as in their undoubting faith in the divine purpose (Rom 4 [20, 21]) they face the difficulties in their way. The nation or kingdom that will not serve them must perish (Is 60 [12]; 1 Cor 3 [21-23]). Mountains as a rule serve the divine purpose best where they are, and we must not expect our path always be to made easy. But when faith discerns the miracles which the divine purpose demands, faith is to ask for them. The natural order is the servant of the order of redemptive grace, and will yield to its demands. 'This mountain' is of course Olivet, and the Lord may be thinking of Zech 14 [4].

Where then lies the difficulty of this miracle? It arises for those who, like Charles Dickens, think of Christianity merely as humanitarianism, seeking to make things comfortable in this present world, and who cannot bear that anything should be destroyed even for the creation of values immeasurably higher. But on what ground would it have been legitimate for Jesus to cut down a tree for use in His

carpenter's shop? The love of God for all that He has made finds noble expression in Wisd 11 [24]-12 [1]. But when God 'calls' His handiwork ([25]), He calls it for use in the carrying out of His purpose. It may have at each moment its timeless value as 'a thing of beauty'; but this must be sacrificed for its higher value for the service of man. But man too finds his highest value as the instrument of God's purpose which the Messiah comes to realize, and all sacrifice is justified if it forwards that. Indeed, all must forward it whether they will or not—if not as willing instruments, then as monuments of His just severity (cf. Rom 9 [17]). That is the truth which the Lord embodies in the tale of Lk 13 [6-9], that it may 'enter in at lowly doors,' and far more powerfully in the acted parable of the barren fig tree and in the agelong history of the Jews.

23-37. The authority of Jesus challenged (cf. Mk 11 [27-33] and notes there; Lk 20 [1-8]).

23. The conflict now deepens, and the Sadducean high priests, stung into activity by the cleansing of the Temple, assume the front place which they will keep to the end. Our Lord's authority is something new to their experience. What kind of authority is it, and who gave it to Him? It is not the Lord's teaching which they challenge; they have shown little interest in that. The challenge which the world feels lies not so much in what the servants of God say as in what they do.

24. The Lord's reply is characteristic. When we enquire about His credentials, He in His turn enquires how we have dealt with the appeals which have been previously made to us. John called them to repent ([32]); he promised the coming of the Kingdom and of One who would baptize with the Spirit. What view did they take—in practice—of his mission? Did they repent and believe John's message? Did they undergo his baptism?

27. The words are very stern; the Lord acts upon the principles of 13 [12] and Jn 3 [12]. The chief priests speak as His judges; He replies as theirs, as He will also do later at the crisis of the conflict (26 [64]). It is a duel to the death.

28-32. The parable of the Two Sons (peculiar to Matthew). Our Lord contrasts the chief priests and elders, themselves God's sons by membership in Israel, with the multitudes of sinners who came to John the Baptist and were baptized. The former, who had every opportunity of knowing the will of God, and loudly professed by following it to be forwarding the coming of the Kingdom, have rejected God's prophet instead of co-operating with him. But the publicans and sinners, who were open rebels against the laws of God, came and heard John, repented and entered upon work in God's vineyard. Even when the chief priests and elders had seen this wonderful effect of John's teaching they still refused to repent and believe. It is a great sign of obduracy to be unmoved by the conversion of notorious sinners.

31. The first: D and Sin. Syr. read 'The last,' an impertinent answer quite possible to a man like Caiaphas, and which our Lord might treat as beneath notice. It is much more probable that scribes would alter 'The last' into 'The first,' regarding the reading which they found as obviously a blunder, than that they would alter 'The first' into 'The last.' Had the revisers known that D had the support of so important an authority as Sin. Syr., they might have given their reading a place in the margin.

33-46. The parable of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen (cf. Mk 12 [1-12] and notes there; Lk 20 [9-18]).

The parable of the Vineyard (cf. Is 5 [1-7]), appears in all the Synoptists with little variation. According to [39], the heir was taken out of the vineyard and then slain (cf. Heb 13 [12]), while in Mk 12 the corpse is cast out unburied. In [41] Matthew ascribes the prediction of the fate of the husbandmen to the people.

33. a hedge, i.e. 'a fence.' A map of Palestine is the best commentary. Israel has most 'scientific' frontiers in the mountains, the desert, and the sea (cf. Nu 23 [9]).

37. my son. The contrast here drawn by our Lord between Himself and the prophets who came before Him is very striking (cf. 11 [27], 24 [36]). Both this passage and 24 [36] come from Mark, our earliest authority, and are incontestably authentic. Our Lord claimed to be the Son of God in a sense peculiar to Himself. Just as on Palm Sunday He for the first time openly proclaimed His Messiahship, so now He proclaims to the world His divine Sonship also. Thus the charge brought in Jn 19 [7] is fully intelligible even by the witness of the Synoptists.

38-41. It may be objected that the story is unnatural, since no people in their senses would suppose that the murder of the heir would mean their own undisturbed possession of his heritage. But our Lord is depicting the mind and action of His enemies, and madness in the real actors can only be depicted by madness

in those who stand for them. Our Lord, as King-Messiah, is 'the heir of the world,' and not only of the vineyard of Jehovah, Israel itself. The priests after Palm Sunday recognize the claim that He is making, and know that, if Israel is His, it can no longer be theirs.

42. Cf. note on 21 [9]. In Ps 118 the stone rejected by the builders is probably the despised people of God upraised by a God-given victory. The Lord, the true seed of Abraham, applies the words to Himself. He is the corner-stone in the divine building, who holds it all together. The thought passes from the Kingdom as a growth to the Kingdom as a building, as it passes in 1 Cor 3 [6-9], perhaps with remembrance of the Lord's words here. The one metaphor emphasizes life nd fruitfulness, the other stability and the divine indwelling.

43 is peculiar to Matthew and is spoken prophetically. There is no need to doubt the authenticity of the saying.

44 is omitted from many important MSS., and is probably a gloss from Lk 20 [18]. For the meaning see the note there.

45, 46. Cf. Mk 12 [12]; Lk 20 [19].

The Kingdom or rule of God should have been realized in the Jewish people, and so have manifested God to the world by the blessedness of those under His rule. The Lord their God was their King (1 S 12 [12]; Is 33 [22]). Now He will no longer be so, and the blessedness of His rule will be no longer within their reach. It is the Catholic Church which inherits His rule now; but the Lord does not explain to the priests and scribes who the successor will be. As a rule, Matthew means by the Kingdom of God the Kingdom in its final perfection. In this and the following parable the teaching of the Lord has two aspects. First, it has an immediate application, which even His opponents can understand. Secondly, it enshrines great truths about His Person and work which were beyond the grasp as yet of the Apostles themselves, but which were grasped later on, and appear in the teaching of St. Paul. Cf. for the foregoing parable Col 1 [15-18] and Rom 8 [16, 17]. In the parables of 25 we shall find a further stage reached; they will deal wholly with the future. The wisdom of the Lord's method is plain on reflection. Had He directly revealed the profounder truths, He would have disturbed His followers; and, since what is not understood is not remembered, His teaching would have been forgotten. Had He left these truths wholly to the later teaching of the Spirit it could have been plausibly maintained that they did not possess His authority. But such parables as His would be accurately remembered, even though not yet understood; and the gift of the Spirit would in due time light up their meaning. His method is explained in Jn 14 [26], 16 [4, 12-15, 25]; and in Jn 16 [25] the RVm 'parables' is right, and not 'proverbs' as in the text. It is our Lord's parables, and not His proverbs, which enshrine the mysteries which He is keeping back.

XXII. **1-14.** The parables of the Wedding Feast and the Wedding Garment.

1-10. The Wedding Feast (cf. Lk 14 [16-24]). There seems to be little doubt that this is the same parable as that found in Luke, notwithstanding the many differences. The lesson is that the Gospel rejected by the Jews will be offered to a wider circle (cf. 21 [43]). In Luke the great feast is the Messianic banquet, while here it is a marriage feast for the king's son, the celebration of the union of the Messiah with His people. The servants, the prophets to John the Baptist, were sent to call Israel, which was already bidden. [7] is probably a later addition referring to the destruction of Jerusalem. The pith of the parable is found in [8-10].

2. The king's primary purpose is not the pleasure of his guests, but a great affair of State, the marriage of his heir. Hence the Pauline teaching, which looks back to an eternal purpose to be fulfilled in the union of the Son with humanity. It is the Son who has the central place in the divine purpose, though His members are joint-heirs in and with Him. Cf. Rev 19 [7-9], which draws out the deeper teaching.

3, 4. The first messengers are the prophets of the OT, the second the Baptist and the Lord. All proclaimed the Kingdom, but only the latter that it was at hand.

5, 6. The vast majority of Israel offered no violence to the Baptist or to the Lord; they listened with respect and interest. But, having heard the message, they returned to their own pursuits and refused the call given. It was comparatively few who were directly responsible for the Passion. Our Lord recognizes this, and it is a mistake to regard [6] as well as [7] as an insertion.

8. The true answer to the objection that the Baptist and the Lord declared the Kingdom to be at hand, and yet it did not come. All was ready for it on the side of God; but the Kingdom of God can have no actual realization except in those who

welcome the call to it. It did come in the Church, so far as the response was given; that it could not come fully was the fault of man. There can be no marriage of the Lamb till the bride has made herself ready; and 'the righteous acts of the saints,' though proceeding from the grace of God, proceed from that grace as accepted and used (cf. Rev 19 [8]).

9, 10. the partings of the highways, i.e. the points, found in most cities, from which the great roads diverge, and where the crowd is greatest, especially of the country people from outside. Matthew's form of the parable does not suggest the call of the heathen as clearly as Luke's. It rather suggests our Lord's appeal to the despised 'people of the land' and the outcasts, as contrasted with the observers of the Law. For 'bad and good' cf. 13 [47.48].

11-14. The Wedding Garment (peculiar to Matthew).

Possibly this is a different parable, Matthew omitting the beginning and uniting the rest with that of the Wedding Feast. But note against this view (i) that the wider invitation greatly increases the number of the guests, bringing in many unworthy ([10]); (ii) that our Lord in such parables always insists upon the coming division (13 [41. 49. 50]); (iii) that our Lord does not make it a universal rule to keep to one main point in each parable, as we see in Lk 15 [11-32].

11. The king only enters after the feast has begun. The wedding feast of the Kingdom begins long before the final consummation, the judgement of the guests being put off until the King Himself comes to pass it. The wedding garment the King Himself provides, the washing of the workday clothes being insufficient.

12. Censure is passed not only on the man, but on the doorkeeper who admitted him. The application of the parable to the Eucharist is close, though not probably in the Lord's mind.

13. The language may be 'eschatological,' but exactly suits the story. Such a king as Antipas would be likely to treat an intruder in this way, and an Oriental thus expelled to howl and gnash his teeth with fury.

14. There is no suggestion of Calvinism here. The 'elect' in Jewish theological language are the pious remnant of the nation chosen for survival—'called and chosen and faithful' (Rev 17 [14]). It was the few who had accepted the call of the Lord, though almost all had heard it.

15-22. The question concerning tribute money (cf. Mk 12 [13-17] and notes there; Lk 20 [20-26]). Though the Lord is addressed simply as a teacher, this question would obviously have a close connexion in the eyes of the Jew's with His claim to be the Messiah. The Pharisees, unlike the Zealots, were generally prepared to accept any *de facto* government which did not interfere with their observance of the Law, and would have, on the assumption that the Messiah had not yet appeared, no quarrel with our Lord's teaching in [21]. If, however, the Lord claimed to be the Messiah, the whole situation was changed.

16. their disciples. Mark speaks of the Pharisees themselves as coming; but Matthew seems to mean by a Pharisee a Pharisee who is a teacher. The Herodians were partisans of the native dynasty, and would have their own reasons for dislike of the tax.

18. hypocrites: because the real purpose is to base upon the Lord's answer a charge before Pilate. It is characteristic of the Lord to awaken the conscience by enquiring the reason for an action (cf. Jn 18 [21. 23]). We are thus led to condemn ourselves.

19. Again most characteristic of the Lord's wisdom. The 'image' was that of Tiberius, and the inscription probably in Greek—'Kaisaros Sebastou' (cf. Wroth, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Galatia, Cappadocia, Syria*, 166 f.). Both were familiar enough. But the fetching of the money, and the definite attention paid to the coin, fixed the whole incident and our Lord's answer upon the mind as a mere reference to both would not have done. All this suggests that the Lord meant His answer to be a serious answer remembered and understood by His followers, and not just a means of confounding His adversaries.

21. The important word is **Render,** i.e. not give, but give back. Our dues to God and man are alike for value received. To God we owe all and must pay all; though there are many things which are not Cæsar's, there are none which are not God's. But the blessings of God are ministered to us by many different means; and when these means are personal beings who act freely, such as our parents or the ministers of the State, we have (within the great debt to God) a debt to pay to them also (cf. Rom 13 [1-7]; 1 P 2 [13-17]). Difficulty only arises in two cases: (i) When the government is a tyranny which is 'a terror to the good work' and not 'to the evil.' In this case there is no debt to pay; and support of the Government, if we have the power to refuse it, is a partaking in its evil deeds. (ii) When the

government, though in intention beneficent, makes demands upon Christians with which the law of Christ does not allow them to comply (cf. Ac 5 [29]). The 'conscientious objector' in time of war thinks himself to be in this position, but almost certainly erroneously. (i) He has throughout his life received the protection from foreign foes, as well as from evildoers at home, which the Government supplies, and must 'render' what he owes in personal service (if it is needed) as well as in money. (ii) It is, according to St. Peter and St. Paul, the duty of the State to resist the evildoer by force, and the ruler cannot do this without the support of the ruled. Between just war and police action there is no difference in principle, as the wisest pacifists recognize (cf. note on 5 [38-42]). That man who has the image of God must be rendered to God is a true thought, but not likely to have been intentionally suggested by the Lord here.

23-33. The question concerning the Resurrection (cf. Mk 12 [18-27] and notes there; Lk 20 [27-40]).

Our Lord's 'high argument' to prove the resurrection of the body, though understood by the author of Hebrews, seems scarcely ever to be understood today, though it is one of great importance.

24. Cf. the context of the quotation Dt 25 [5-10]. The law belongs to a time when there was a profound belief in the future of Israel, but as yet no belief in personal immortality. Thus it is a horror that a man's name be 'blotted out of Israel'; but his future existence lies only in his posterity. His resurrection lies, so to say, in the 'raising up' of his seed. This conception is natural when the sense of family solidarity is strong (cf. Heb 7 [9, 10]) and that of personal individuality weak. In the Lord's time the belief in individual resurrection was already widely held, and these 'Levirate' marriages probably rare.

28. All crude conceptions of the resurrection of the body lend themselves to such puzzles. Cf. St. Aug. *de Civ. Dei*, xxii, 12 ff.

29. Ignorance of Scripture and of the power of God are still even to Christians the great difficulties in the way of accepting the resurrection of the body. St. Paul in 1 Cor 15 [35-57] appeals both to Scripture and to God's power.

30. Luke explains fully the Marcan text (Lk 20 [34-36]). There are no marital relations in the life of heaven because there is no death, and therefore no need for fresh births. In the present life we depend for our birth upon one another; for our new birth into the life of heaven we depend upon God alone, and the divine sonship takes the place of the human (cf. 1 Cor 15 [38]).

31, 32. It is plain that our Lord sets Himself to prove from Scripture not just personal survival, but individual resurrection. His argument turns upon the depth of meaning contained in the statement that God is the God of the patriarchs. Far more is meant by it than that He was the object of their worship. It was not Abraham who chose God, but God who chose Abraham to be the instrument of His purpose of universal blessing, and entered into a covenant of promise with him (cf. Gen 12 [1-3], 13 [14-17], 15 [1, 13-16], 17 [7, 8]). So it was with Isaac (Gen 26 [3-5]) and with Jacob also (Gen 28 [13-15]). Two points are here to be observed: (i) The promise is of a thoroughly realistic kind. It has nothing to do with a far-off heaven, but is concerned with an abiding inheritance here. (ii) The promise is twofold, to the patriarchs personally and to their seed, the two aspects of the promise being repeatedly distinguished the one from the other. Now in Gen 17 [7] we find these words: 'I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee'; and it is to this that the words of Ex 6 [2-8] seem to refer, the twofold aspect of the promise appearing here as in Genesis. Thus when the Lord says that 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living,' He means that the patriarchs, though 'gone to their fathers in peace' (Gen 15 [15]), are men who for God live as those who have received a promise which still awaits its fulfilment (cf. Jn 8 [56]). So the author of Hebrews fully understands (11 [8-10, 13-19]; note specially [10, 16, 19]). God is not ashamed of the patriarchs 'to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.' No doubt the writer speaks of the better country as 'heavenly' ([16]); but he is a Christian, not a Platonist. He thinks of 'the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem' (12 [22]), as a city with a heavenly origin, but which 'comes down out of heaven from God' (Rev 21 [2]), and to which the members of the Church 'are come' already (Heb 12 [22]), though only as it exists in embryo in the Catholic Church. 'The spirits of just men made perfect' belong to it in a true sense already (Heb 12 [23]), as we ourselves in our spirits do, though not yet in our bodies (Rom 8 [10]). But neither for us nor for them can there be full inheritance yet; the body

must be transformed by the indwelling spirit, or God must give afresh to each perfected spirit 'a body of its own' (1 Cor 15 [38]), for there can be no full personal life without it; and, when at last 'the creation itself is delivered from the bondage of corruption' (Rom 8 [21]) and becomes itself 'the better country,' the blessed dead will with us be made perfect in body as well as in spirit.

Now that is our Lord's argument; and it was on these lines that Israel came to believe in the resurrection, and that the best modern defenders of immortality, even when they 'know not the Scriptures,' proceed to-day. Immortality is not, as far as we know, any necessary consequence of the nature of the soul, though we may listen to Plato with respectful attention. It results from the relation of God's servants to Him, and the impossibility of supposing that those who have lived and died for the city of God will not themselves inherit it. The God of the eternal promise is their God, and that is enough. How far the final redactors of the old stories of the patriarchs grasped what was implicit in the words they wrote we cannot say. It was long before the individual was finally disentangled from the people to whom he belonged, as the Levirate law proves. But we are not any the less individual men and women, with claims of our own upon the God of the promise to whom we live, because we do not fully grasp all that we are; and God will deal with all according to the truth of things, and not according to our own imperfect apprehension of it.

33. This verse is peculiar to Matthew.

34-40. The question concerning the greatest commandment (cf. Mk 12 [28-30] and notes there; Lk 10 [25-28]).

In Mark the question is asked in a friendly manner, and our Lord commends the questioner. Luke may perhaps be recording a different incident; he adds the parable of the Good Samaritan.

36. Rather perhaps, *What kind of commandment is great in the Law?* The answer is 'A commandment of love.' In this the second is 'like unto the first.'

37. There are slight differences in the three evangelists in their report of the Lord's words; and we need not exactly distinguish between heart, soul, and mind. The great point is that love is not primarily a matter of emotion but of self-devotion. All our powers of will and mind and affection are to be given to God. Dt 6 [5] was part of the Shema, and was recited by the Jews twice a day.

38. A commandment might be the first without being the greatest, but love to God is both: 'præceptum,' as Bengel says, 'non modo maximum, necessitate, amplitudine, diuturnitate rei; sed etiam primum, natura, ordine, tempore, evidentia.'

39. From Lev 19 [18]. Both the great commandments in their original meaning rest upon the special relation of God to Israel. This appears both in the phrase 'the Lord thy God' (He is not yet the God of other peoples), and in the context of Lev 19 [18]; 'neighbours' are 'the children of thy people.' God to-day is still especially the God of the members of the Church, who are sharers in the Lord's redemption, and claims a greater devotion from them than from others; while we owe a special love to our fellow-members in Christ's Body (Gal 6 [10]). They are more our neighbours than others, because our relation to them is closer; and our Lord recognizes this (Jn 13 [34. 35]). But just in so far as we are brought into contact with others, they become our neighbours too, as the parable of the Good Samaritan teaches (cf. 2 P 1 [7]). While Israel was a people dwelling alone, and not reckoned among the nations (Nu 23 [9]), their 'neighbourhood' was limited; but when they took their place among the nations, and recognized that their God was 'the God of the whole earth,' their sympathies should have expanded. Cf. 1 Tim 2 [3-6] and notes there.

40. A great saying only found in Matthew (cf. 7 [12]). The lawyer asked about the Law alone: our Lord reminds him of the prophets also. In the Christian life two things must be remembered: (i) Christian conduct has two *foci*. Though the love of God and the love of man are intimately connected, we should think of them separately as well as together. Devotion to God, however real, in no way relieves us of the duty of serving men; and service to men, however devoted, in no way relieves us of the duty of loving God. (ii) The love of God comes first, since our debt to Him is far the greater of the two. Moreover love to God, if we understand anything of His character, always brings the love of men in its train; while love to men has not the same power to bring about love to God, and in those ignorant of God's ways sometimes occasions a special embitterment against Him. English Christians here especially need our Lord's teaching.

41-46. whose son is he? (cf. Mk 12 [35-37] and notes there; Lk 20 [41-44]).

There is little difference in the three accounts, but Matthew characteristically

represents our Lord as directing His question to the Pharisees.

42. The general view was that the Messiah was to come of David's line, but some held that He would be a Priest-King of the tribe of Levi. It is probable that Ps 110 is a Maccabæan Psalm and originally referred to the priest-king Simon Maccabæus, one of the greatest rulers whom the Jews ever possessed (cf. 1 Mac 14 [41]). Our Lord never threw doubt upon His own Davidic descent; but the anticipations which among the Jews centred round the 'Son of David' were just those with which He had least sympathy, and the triumphal entry had brought them to the fore. The people were probably expecting Him to call them to arms, in spite of His identification of Himself with Zechariah's king of gentleness. Thus the Lord turns their attention to a very different and much loftier conception of His Person. He is, as He has taught them (21 [37]), not just the son and heir of David, but the Son and Heir of God. The final victory will come not from any Messianic rising, but from the power of God, at whose right hand He will sit (26 [64]). Jn 18 [36] expresses the same trust before Pilate, and Jn 18 [19-21] may look back to His teaching here. His 'teaching' was in no way an incitement to His 'disciples' to rebel. The importance of our Lord's teaching in relation to the immediate situation does not seem to be widely observed.

43-45. Cf. notes on Mk 12 [35-37]. David in the NT stands for the Psalter (Ac 2 [25]; Rom 4 [6]; and specially Heb 4 [7]). Our Lord's argument, though possessing additional point if the words are regarded as those of 'David himself' (Mark and Luke), does not depend upon that assumption. It depends upon the title given in the Psalm to the Messiah, and the depth of meaning given to the title by 'Jehovah's oracle unto my Lord.' To be David's heir would confer no such position. What our Lord does assume here as elsewhere (e.g. 22 [31, 32]) is that the words of prophets and psalmists have a deeper meaning than they themselves could have recognized. The Psalmist, e.g., may have only meant that Jehovah as reigning in Zion in Ps 110[2] would use Simon as His viceroy, but 'the Spirit' meant something far greater, as he did also in Ps 110[4]. The Church's belief in the mystical sense of Scripture has behind it not only the authority of Origen and of St. Paul, but that of the Lord Himself. Cf. Additional Note at the end of the Gospel.

XXIII. Denunciation of scribes and Pharisees (Mk 12 [38-40]; Lk 11 [37-52]).

This is, next to the Sermon on the Mount, the longest connected discourse of which the Matthean and Lucan versions 'cannot be referred to a single written source without raising great difficulties' (cf. Streeter, 253). It is certainly composite in character, originally distinct sections which dealt respectively with scribes and Pharisees having been fused together, since Matthew hardly distinguished between the two classes. The language is of awful severity, and can but give pain to Jews who, though not yet Christians, are by their reverence for our Lord not far from the Kingdom of God. Three things must, however, be observed: (i) Matthew's method of arrangement gives a false impression. Our Lord did not say all these things about the Pharisees in a set invective before the multitudes. He said many of them between them and Him alone, as Luke shows, and others 'to his disciples,' because they too would need them. Moreover, Matthew writes his Gospel as a Jewish Christian for Jewish Christians who have suffered greatly from their fellow-countrymen, and are still in danger from them both materially and spiritually. It was essential for him, as it was not for Mark and Luke, to show what the Lord's teaching had been. (ii) So far from being hostile to the Pharisees from the beginning, our Lord appealed first to the religious Jews in their synagogues, and not to the 'publicans and harlots.' The Gospel story shows this as plainly as such a parable as that of 22 [1-9]. As against the Sadducees He was on their side in matters of faith, and He could speak with sympathy as well as humour of religious conservatism (Lk 5 [37-39]). Not even the first part of the parable of the Prodigal Son is more beautiful than the second, where He has the Pharisees in view. If He spoke differently at the end, was there not a cause? (iii) Christians to-day have learnt to recognize both the nobility of the aims of the early Pharisees and the nobility of much of the later Rabbinical teaching. But *corruptio optimi pessima*, and our Lord had to deal with the Pharisees as He found them. The later Rabbinism is no better evidence for that of our Lord's day than the Catholicism of the counter-Reformation for the later mediæval teaching. For the Pharisaism of our Lord's day His teaching is the best contemporary evidence that we possess, and St. Paul's the next best.

2, 3. These verses are found nowhere else, and are amazing as ascribed to the Lord. It is indeed impossible that He

could have used them, except in a context which explained their meaning. For (i) They confuse the scribes with the Pharisees. The scribes might conceivably be regarded as the spiritual successors of Moses; but the Pharisees were a religious party without any official authority. There was an actual 'seat of Moses' in some of the synagogues (cf. *p. Yeb.*, 13*a*; see also Dalman, *Jesus-Jeschua*, 42). (ii) Taken as they stand, the words must mean that not only the Law, but the whole traditional teaching built upon it or attached to it, are binding upon both the multitude and the Lord's disciples; and this is totally contrary to all that our Lord elsewhere says (cf. e.g. 15 [1-14], 23 [16-22]). It cannot be urged that, though the Lord with His higher authority corrected their teaching, He would not have allowed others to do so; for He attacks them on grounds of reason and conscience obvious to all. Our Lord may well have taught that the word of God enshrined in the OT was none the less His word because the scribes who translated it into the vernacular Aramaic did not observe it themselves; but He could not have said more than this. For the 'do not' cf. 7 [26]. In Rabbinic literature great stress is laid upon 'doing,' and in the Talmud mention is made of certain Pharisees who neglected to practise what they preached (cf. Gal 6 [13]). But none of them had lived according to our Lord's spiritual interpretation of the Law.

4. Cf. Lk 11 [46]. The charge is threefold: (i) They interpret the Law of Moses in such a way that it becomes practically impossible for ordinary folk to observe it. (ii) They claim that their outrageous deductions from the letter of the Law should be respected and observed. (iii) They will not stir a finger to get rid of these regulations. A good example is found in 12 [1] ff. (contrast 11 [28-30]). The reason why the Galileans (Jn 7 [49]) were such 'bad Jews' lay in part in the fact that under the circumstances of their lives the Law, as St. Peter said (Ac 15 [10]), could not be observed. A sound moral theology is of the utmost importance, and religious people in easy circumstances often make the worst moral theologians. Before we interpret the law of Christ for the poor and ignorant, we must understand their circumstances and limitations. There is much that is unsatisfactory in the moral theology of Rome, but much also which proceeds from a real effort to follow our Lord's teaching here.

5-7*a*. The reason for the detail of 6 [1-18] becomes even plainer. Our Lord is not here blaming the formalism of the Pharisees, but their vanity and self-seeking. Phylacteries are leather cases containing strips of parchment inscribed with passages from the Law, and worn on the left arm and forehead (Ex 13 [1-10, 11-16]; Dt 6 [4-9], 11 [16-20]; all four passages speaking of binding them for a sign upon the hand and for frontlets between the eyes). The 'borders' were the corners of the garments to which the tassels of Nu 15 [38] and Dt 22 [12] were attached. Our Lord certainly wore the latter (9 [20]) and probably the former. Crosses, scapulars, texts framed upon the walls, are things of the same kind, excellent if we use them as helps to devotion, but worse than useless if we employ them that we may seem to be devout, and worse still if the appearance of piety is desired as a means of social advancement. What our Lord blames is not the arrangements by which particular seats in Church and elsewhere are assigned by custom to particular people, for that tends to prevent too great importance being attached to them: what He blames is the 'love' of these things. Things which can be settled satisfactorily by hard-and-fast rules are always unimportant.

7*b*-10. Peculiar to Matthew. It is a noble ambition to become a competent religious teacher, but ignoble to desire to be honoured as one. There seems to be some confusion here, [10] looking like a variant of [8]. Our Lord turns to the disciples; He has been blaming the Pharisees lest His own disciples should resemble them. What He desires is that the divine Fatherhood and His own teaching should be so completely satisfying to us that we want no other, and that all differences between us of position and knowledge should seem to us of no account in view of our common brotherhood in the family of God. Joseph, we doubt not, did a father's part to the Lord in His boyhood, but the Lord would not call him 'father' (Lk 2 [48, 49]); and His dislike of being called 'Good Master' has the same source. If He claims to be 'teacher' and 'master' to us, it is because God Himself is found in Him (cf. note on 19 [17]). He will have no divided allegiance, no dependence upon a number of separate experts, to whom we are expected to defer. There may be fathers in God (1 Cor 4 [15]), but not fathers separate from God; masters in Christ, but not masters separate from Christ. 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.' We may call the great teachers of the early centuries 'the Fathers,' as the Jews called the great

Rabbis of the past. But we should not call men to-day our fathers or masters except in so far as we find God in them, or accept such titles except in so far as they find God in us (contrast Rom 2 [19] ff.).

11, 12. Cf. 20 [26-28]. The claiming by the teacher of too dominating a relation to the taught is his characteristic form of self-exaltation.

13-31. The seven woes. That the RV is right in omitting [14] is clear not only from the MS. evidence, but also from the fact that its insertion would spoil Matthew's numerical arrangement. In the seven woes the scribes and Pharisees are addressed directly, as in Lk 11 [37] f., while the Beatitudes (5 [3-10]) are in the third person.

13-15 are found only in Matthew. The scribes prohibited the Jews from becoming disciples of Jesus, yet they themselves would go on journeys by land and sea in order to make one proselyte. The two verses are closely connected. The Pharisees were at any rate missionaries. But here too their spirit of self-seeking spoilt all (cf. Gal 6 [13]). We must never seek to make men converts to a religious party except with the desire of helping their spiritual life. Converts to a party tend to exaggerate its worst characteristics. The disturbance of the religious convictions of others is in itself harmful, and only justifiable when necessary.

16-22. Peculiar to Matthew. It is a denunciation of scribal hair-splitting and casuistry. The purpose of true casuistry is rightly to interpret the Law in relation to particular circumstances (cf. [4]), and so to secure its fulfilment: to employ its methods to narrow the application of the Law is grossly to abuse it. The fact that the later Rabbinical teaching does not substantiate the particular charges here made throws no doubt upon their truth; it only suggests that our Lord's denunciation was effective. At all ages the reformer is denounced, and his charges denied; but that does not prevent the things which he denounces from being quietly dropped. Incidentally we learn our Lord's mind on two further points: (i) Consecration is a divine act, not a human one. God consecrates temple and altar by the closeness of His relation to them, and the temple and altar impart their own sacredness to the gold which we offer for the decoration of the one and the gift which we place upon the other. We only consecrate by offering to God for His consecration; unless He accepts our gifts there is no consecration at all. (ii) Though God's throne is 'in heaven,' His dwelling in the temple below is a reality. His presence and activity depend upon His will, and operate where and when He wills. To say that God transcends space and time is not to say that He is equally present in all places and at all times (cf. note on 21 [13]). It is possible so to misunderstand and abuse the doctrine of God's omnipresence as in effect to put Him further away from us.

23, 24. Our Lord's charge is that the Pharisees are scrupulously obedient in matters which cost them little, while they leave undone the duties which make real demands upon them. The 'weightier' are not only the more important, but the more burdensome. Our Lord is not scoffing at the tithing of mint; the Law commanded it (Dt 14 [28]), and He Himself approved it (cf. the last words of [23]; also 5 [19] and note there). In maintaining that any wilful disobedience to God's Law is a repudiation of our allegiance to Him, the scribes would have been right (cf. Jas 2 [10]). Quite apart from Lev 11 [20-23], if we see a gnat in our drink we remove it. But tithing mint is not difficult, while our Lord in His sympathy knows that doing justly and practising mercy and showing humble faith in God are very difficult indeed, and so we excuse ourselves from them. One reason why the abolition of the Mosaic Law was so necessary was that it had come to be legalistically interpreted, and legalism always means the loss of the distinction between the gnat-like sin and the 'cameelious.' 'He who kills a flea on Sabbath is as guilty as he who kills a camel' (*p. Shab.*, 107*a*). Our powers of moral effort are at best limited, and we want them all for the things that matter. The blind guide is still the preacher or confessor who forgets this.

25, 26. The Lucan context is illuminating (Lk 11 [37-41]). Again, the objection is not to what the Pharisees do, but to their omissions. The Mosaic laws of cleanliness might be abused to the fostering of spiritual pride, but they were of high value; and Muhammad most wisely adopted them. It is a good thing that laws of hygiene should have a religious sanction (cf. Guillaume in *The Legacy of Israel*, 158 ff.). But man himself is a vessel which must be meet for the Master's use (2 Tim 2 [21]), and 'extortion and excess' are worse than dirt, which is but 'matter misplaced.' A 'decent' meal means a meal honestly earned and temperately enjoyed; and neither cleanliness nor saying grace will serve as a substitute for honesty or temperance.

27, 28. whited sepulchres, or 'beautifully veneered boxes,' containing fossilized ordinances. Sepulchres were whitewashed shortly before the Passover, that passers-by might see them and not contract ritual pollution by touching them. When the Lord spoke the work had probably just been done. Here, as in [24], our Lord's caustic wit has given an edge to His words which has made them ever remembered. The Christian teacher, like the Lord, should employ humour with the well-disposed, and keep wit for the demolition of moral evil. Both are to be used, each in its right place; 'dulness is not dignity,' and point is necessary for penetration. Note that our Lord definitely charges the Pharisees of His day, as St. Paul does, with wickedness in the ordinary sense of the word. Conscientious people, even though censorious and lacking in sympathy, do not come under the lash of the Lord as 'Pharisees.' The 'respectable' are much nearer to Him than self-satisfied evil-livers.

29-31. Cf. Lk 11 [47-48], in substance the same, but in setting different. The embellishment of the prophets' tombs was no proof that the Jews had repented of the action of their fathers. A true honouring of the memory of the prophets would have been shown in an acceptance of their teaching; and this, rightly understood, would have led them to an understanding of Jesus and His teaching. The prophets and the just, the witnesses by word and the witnesses by deed, are put side by side, as in 10 [41]. The force of the **Wherefore** in [31] is not clear. Either (i) in saying 'our fathers' you own to being their sons: 'fill ye up,' etc., or (ii) even more caustically, as Lk 11 [47, 48]: 'First the murder, then the building of the tomb: it is all in the contract, and all executed by the same gang.'

32-36. The approaching doom. The first 'ye' is emphatic—ye in your turn. Every generation contributes its quota till at last judgement falls. For the thought cf. Gen 15 [16]. In [33] there is an echo of the Baptist's words (3 [7]). But the Baptist says, 'Who warned you to flee?' and the Lord, 'How shall ye escape?' It is now too late. Our Lord warns of hell; but not till the conscience has been brought to recognize both the reality of the sin and the inevitability of the punishment. 'Tidings of damnation' out of their proper context are harmful.

34-36. Our Lord, according to Matthew, does not quote some other authority as Lk 11 [49] may suggest, but speaks in His own name of the sending out of His disciples. Cf. 10 [16-23], which also refers to the mission of the Apostles to Israel after the Lord's glorification. The present passage suggests that the coming of the Son of Man in 10 [23] is His coming to judgement upon Jerusalem. Matthew's 'prophets, and wise men, and scribes' no doubt reproduces our Lord's actual words, and not Luke's 'prophets and apostles.' Under the OT dispensation God had sent to His people prophets; and they had been followed by the wise men of the Wisdom literature (cf. Pr 1 [6], 24 [23]; Ec 12 [11]) and the scribes of the Law. The Lord, the divine Wisdom Incarnate (Lk 11 [49]), will send all three for the final appeal to Israel. The three types of God's messengers are permanent types. The prophet, possessed by, rather than possessing, his God-given message, ranks highest; the wise man, with his systematic grasp of moral and religious truth, comes after him. But the humble scribe, who can but reproduce the best that he has heard from others, is also God's messenger (cf. 13 [52]), and may also win the martyr's crown. Much harm is done by language which suggests that every member of the Christian ministry should be possessed of the prophet's gifts and power of influence (cf. 1 Cor 12 [19]).

35. Luke rightly omits **son of Barachiah.** The reference cannot be to Zachariah the son of Baruch, who was murdered in the Temple during the siege, as Wellhausen (*ad loc.*) suggests. It must be to Zachariah the son of Jehoiada (2 Ch 24 [20] ff.). Abel is the first recorded martyr of the Hebrew Bible, and Zachariah the last. 'Son of Barachiah' may be a gloss added after A.D. 69.

37-39. The lament over Jerusalem (Lk 13 [34] f.).

Luke places this in a different context, but one far less appropriate. These wonderful words form precisely the ending which the chapter requires. The awful severity has had a breaking heart behind it, and yet one which knows that, in spite of Israel's present ruin, the divine purpose will be at last fulfilled.

37. The deep emotion of the Lord is seen in the repetition of the name (cf. Lk 10 [41], 22 [31]; Ac 9 [4]) and in the doubly broken construction of the sentence, so unlike the usual literary perfection of His speech. Here alone in Matthew we find the old sacred form Hierousalem, not the customary Hierosoluma. But what does the Lord mean by 'how often'? He may refer to previous visits to Jerusalem. But, in view of the vast sweep of the outlook in [35], and the parallel passage Lk

11 [49], He may speak as the Incarnate Wisdom of God (Pr 8 [22] ff.: cf. 1 Cor 1 [24]), and look back over His ceaseless efforts for the gathering of Israel under His wings in the ages of the past (cf. Dt 32 [11]; Ru 2 [12]). Ever, and not only now, He 'would,' but Israel 'would not,' and Israel's children have had their will. Thus interpreted, this passage is the complement to 11 [27. 28] (cf. notes there), the relation of the Son to human history corresponding to His relation to the Father Himself. That confident identification of the Lord with the divine Wisdom or Word which we find in the epistles will thus find its basis in the Lord's own teaching.

38. desolate should be omitted as in RVm. **your house** is probably the Temple as in Is 64 [11]. Jesus left it and never entered it again. It was left to the people who had refused the divine guardianship ([37]). When they had to guard it themselves, its desolation would come soon enough (cf. 24 [2]). Of what use to complain that the Lord (26 [61]) and St. Stephen (Ac 6 [13]) speak words against the holy place, when its guardians 'always resist the Holy Ghost'?

39. His ministry is ended. They will see Him again when He comes back in glory. Is it in part from this saying that St. Paul derives his confidence in the final conversion of Israel?

XXIV. The eschatological discourse (Mk 13; Lk 21 [5-36]). Matthew (as usual) takes Mark's account as his basis, alters it here and there, and expands it by matter drawn from other sources. [26-28] and [37-41] find parallels in Lk 17 [24-37]; and [43-51] in Lk 12 [42-46]. There are difficulties in this discourse, but they are often greatly exaggerated. Throughout we must bear in mind the characteristics of Biblical prophecy: (i) Its main purpose is to warn and to encourage, not to 'write history beforehand.' (ii) Its language is often symbolical, and not intended to be interpreted too literally. (iii) Though it exhibits a profound insight into the purpose of God, it does not reveal 'times or seasons' (Ac 1 [7]). The immediate future is made clear, but not what lies beyond; and to the prophet's eye the 'Delectable Mountains' on the far horizon seem nearer than they are. Whether all these principles apply to the prophecies of the Lord we shall presently consider; our first task is to discover, if we can, what He really said. So far from historical criticism being inconsistent with reverence for our Lord, it is our reverence for Him which makes it so necessary. We shall find that in this chapter it does not create difficulties but removes them.

1. Mark's account is much more lifelike. Our Lord's words (23 [38]: cf. Jn 2 [19]) had been a menace to the Temple. Does He mean what He says? How terrible its loss would be!

3. privately. The discourse was only heard by four of the Apostles (Mk 13 [3]), and they may for a time have kept it to themselves. St. Peter never threatens the Temple in his early preaching; that is left for St. Stephen. If this was so, the discourse would probably not be incorporated in Q. This explains why Mark, who reports but little of our Lord's teaching, gives a place to this long discourse in his Gospel. He thought it important, and his readers did not already know it. Indeed he seems to have derived it not from St. Peter's oral teaching, but from a written document (cf. Mk 13 [14]). Matthew in this verse alters the disciples' second question. In Mk 13 [4] they seem to ask about the Temple alone; no other subject has come up; and the Lord in Mk 13 [5-23] answers them accordingly. He does not indeed mention the Temple; but in answering a question it is not necessary to repeat it. When, however, Matthew writes, the Temple has almost certainly already fallen; his interest is in the final consummation; and so he reads into the second question in Mark more than is there, and paraphrases it as he understands it. That the disciples at this time would so have spoken is very improbable. To take but one point: the word 'parousia,' here translated 'coming,' is never found in the Gospels except in this chapter of Matthew; it is specially characteristic of St. Paul. Outside the Bible it is used once of the appearing of God to redeem His people (*Test. Jud.*, xxii, 2), and frequently of royal visits. Thus it is a very appropriate word for the final coming of the ascended Lord, but not likely to have been used by the disciples at this stage of the development of their faith.

4-13. From speculative questions our Lord ever turns our attention to those immediately practical (cf. Lk 13 [23] ff.), though not refusing information when it can profitably be given. He looks behind the question to the state of mind which it reveals in the questioner. Now it is the mind that is most curious about the future which is the easiest prey of the dreamer and the charlatan. If we must have 'definite' answers, we care for no teaching which does not provide them. But what we really need to learn about the future is how to deal with it. Our Lord says:

(i) Wars, actual or expected, national or dynastic, local famines and earthquakes, are all in the divine counsels, and must come to pass. They are like the first pangs of childbirth; the new order is struggling to be born (cf. Is 66 [9]). We should neither be alarmed by them nor suppose that the end is necessarily near. (ii) We must expect the world's hatred to fall upon the Church, and specially in times of strain. The Church is often blamed for the very evils which it foretold. (iii) There will be a great falling away of Christians themselves. Why, they will say, does God permit the evil of the world to go on increasing? (iv) False Christs and false prophets will arise. Times of unrest favour the rise and popularity of fanatical religious teaching. These are the dangers, and Christians must endure to the end (cf. Lk 21 [19]).

9-14. Matthew here abbreviates Mark, since he has already used his words in 10 [17-22]. But he adds in [9] 'of all nations'; and in [14] reproduces Mk 13 [10], which seems to have been wanting in Luke's copy, and may be out of its true context. It is a little awkward here, since before the fall of Jerusalem the evangelization of the world had hardly gone as far as these words suggest. Cf., however, Col 1 [6].

15. the abomination of desolation. Matthew adds to Mark the reference to Daniel, alters the gender of Mark's word for **standing** from masc. to neut., and changes Mark's 'where he ought not' into **in the** (or a) **holy place.** In the second case, as we shall see, Mark has a justification for his grammatical blunder. But what is meant by this verse? Three interpretations are possible: (i) We may be guided by Daniel, to whom Matthew refers us (cf. Dan 9 [27], 11 [31], 12 [11] with Driver's notes in *C.B.*; 1 Mac 1 [54], etc.). In 168 B.C. Antiochus Epiphanes set up in the Temple an altar, and probably a statue, of Zeus Olympios; and 'abomination of desolation,' or 'abomination which causes horror,' is the phrase by which they were described. 'Abomination' is often used in the OT to describe a heathen god or idol (1 K 11 [5, 7]; Is 44 [19]; Jer 7 [30]), and the whole phrase may have been originally an insulting parody of Baal Shamayim, or Baal of heaven, the equivalent of Zeus Olympios (cf. Driver on Dan 11 [31]). The meaning of the words in Mark and Matthew will then be that a similar desecration will befall the Temple and be a sign of the approaching destruction of the city; the disciples are then to flee into the mountains as Mattathias and his sons did before them (1 Mac 2 [28]). On this view the 'holy place' means the Temple, as in Ac 6 [13] and 21 [28]. That this is the natural meaning of the words is indisputable. The Maccabæan struggle was the most glorious in Jewish history and very familiar to the Jews; every Feast of the Dedication (Jn 10 [22]) reminded them of it. But in this case we seem to be faced with an overwhelming difficulty. Not only does this prophecy seem to be unlike our Lord's way of speaking of the future, but it was never fulfilled. We have in Josephus a full account of the last days of Jerusalem, and no such desecration took place. (ii) We may be guided by the similar language found in 2 Th 2 (note specially [2-4]), where St. Paul is speaking of antichrist: see notes *ad loc.* and *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 439. But this interpretation is far less natural, and similar difficulties arise. Not only is there no evidence that our Lord accepted the Jewish belief in antichrist, but antichrist never appeared in the Temple. (iii) We may be guided by St. Luke, who in 21 [20] seems to interpret the Marcan phrase as meaning 'Jerusalem compassed with armies,' and to understand 'where he ought not' as referring to the Holy Land. We thus have just the prophecy which we might have expected our Lord to give. The approach of the legions would be the signal for the flight of the Jewish Christians. It is, however, in view of Daniel almost inconceivable that 'the abomination of desolation' means nothing more definite than this. All three interpretations find support in the Fathers (cf. Maldonatus *ad loc.*). The best solution appears to be the following. What lies behind this strange phrase is the attempt of Caligula about A.D. 38 to set up his statue in the Temple. The whole story should be read in Jos., *Ant.*, xviii, 3; and the wonderful drama *Paulus unter den Juden*, by the Jewish poet Franz Werfel (which vividly portrays this incident) compared with it. See Levertoff, 'St. Paul among the Jews,' *Theology*, December, 1927, and January, 1928. This attempt moved all pious Jews to their depths, and we may be sure that Christian Jews were not a whit behind the rest in their horror at the intended sacrilege. Once again 'the abomination of desolation' was to be set up in the holy place. Nor would their fear have passed away when through the courage of Herod Agrippa I the attempt was abandoned. The blasphemous claims of the emperors to worship were still pressed and admitted all over the empire, and what one emperor had sought to do some other would accomplish. Antichrist would come in

the person of a Roman emperor, and the final consummation would follow. But Christian Jews would go further than this. Like simple Christians of later ages, they would try to find in Daniel references to the events of their own day, and form their anticipations of the future from it; and what they found themselves they would expect their Master to have found before them. His sayings, as the Synoptic Gospels prove, were often extant in more forms than one, and it was easy to read into them thoughts which they did not originally contain. That, we would suggest, is what has here taken place. The verse before us is a Christian Targum; it substitutes for what the Lord said what His followers understood Him to have meant: Probably Lk 21 [20] gives us the substance of what our Lord really said; and the evangelist may have had good grounds for his implied assertion that the Marcan account is incorrect. The theory of Colani that a 'little Apocalypse' of Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin has been incorporated in our Lord's discourse has many supporters among modern scholars, but it is not necessary.

17, 18. All must flee at once if they wish to escape. Remember Lot's wife (Lk 17 [32]).

20. on a sabbath. Jewish Christians would shrink from more than a Sabbath day's journey.

21. Cf. Dan 12 [1]. But the final words, 'no, nor ever shall be,' are added by the Lord, and are important. Human history will not end after the fall of Jerusalem, as Luke's version makes even clearer (Lk 21 [24]).

22. The Jewish race, it has been said, seemed in A.D. 70 to have appointed 'a rendezvous for extermination.'

24. Had our Lord really accepted the Jewish belief in antichrist, it would surely have appeared here. For the deceptive signs see Dt 13 [1] ff. The AV 'if it were possible' is probably an instance of the influence of Calvinistic bias. The seriousness of our Lord's warnings rests upon the fact that the deception of the faithful remnant is only too possible.

25. Our Lord solemnly calls attention to His warnings. We are much too disposed to cherish a baseless optimism which we call 'faith,' and then to be 'offended' when our airy castles tumble to the ground.

26-28. An addition from Q (cf. Lk 17 [23, 24, 37]) which tends to obscure the true development of the discourse. The fall of Jerusalem was a true coming of the Son of Man in judgement (cf. Mk 14 [62]), and one of far-reaching importance; but the words here more naturally suggest His final coming.

26. The false Christ who is a soldier raises his banner in the wilderness (cf. Ac 21 [38]); the false Christ who is a charlatan performs his tricks in inner chambers (cf. Ac 8 [9, 10]).

27. The world-wide self-revelation of the Son of Man is contrasted with merely local disturbances ([7]).

28. the eagles: rather '*the vultures.*' A great principle which the fall of Jerusalem illustrated. Israel in seeking to save its life (Jn 11 [48]) would lose it, and the Roman vultures would deal with the carcase.

29. The Lord's teaching in Mark as well as Matthew probably now passes beyond the national disaster to the final consummation, the difference in time between the two being clearly marked later on. The words 'this' and 'that,' 'these' and 'those,' must in Mark be carefully observed if confusion is to be avoided.

Again Matthew alters his source. Mark's 'in those days' is quite indefinite, and seems to refer to the time, long or short, which will follow the fall of Jerusalem. But Matthew's 'immediately' suggests to us that he expects the final consummation to come at once. But this is surely impossible. Such an expectation would conflict not only with his own experience (for he probably writes some years after the fall of the city), but with [21] and [36]. Matthew has probably (unlike Mark) already passed in thought ([26, 27]) to the later period of the Church's life—'those days'—and he thinks of them as possessing a tribulation of their own. Indeed he knew only too well that they possessed it. The language of these verses is that of OT prophecy: cf. Is 24 [21], 34 [4]; Jl 2 [30, 31] (quoted in Ac 2 [19, 20]). The 'powers of the heavens' are angelic powers, the 'high ones' of Is 24 [21], the 'world-rulers' of Eph 6 [12]. The 'world to come' will not be subject to them as the present world is (Heb 2 [5]); the 'yoke of inauspicious stars' will be shaken from us for ever.

30. the sign of the Son of man, i.e. 'the ensign of the nations' (Is 11 [12]; cf. the context), Jehovah-Nissi, the Lord our banner (cf. Jn 12 [31, 32]). The judgement of the world, the casting out of Satan, and the 'drawing' of the Lord to Himself, the great point of rallying, have already begun. But the consummation is to come, a joy to the faithful, but a terror to the peoples who have rejected the Messiah.

31. Cf. Is 27 [13]; 1 Cor 15 [52]; 1 Th 4 [16], etc.

32. **Now**: better *but* as in [29]. We pass back in thought to 'these things' ([33. 34]), to the immediate future.

33. **he is nigh**: better '*it is nigh*,' i.e. the spiritual summer of the Kingdom, as Luke explains. The fall of Jerusalem was a great event in the development of the Kingdom.

34. **this generation**: men now living. Our Lord does not answer the disciples' question as to the time of the destruction of the Temple more exactly than this. The interval from Pentecost to the fall of the city was forty years (cf. Heb 3 [9. 17]; Jon 3 [4]), in accordance with the Biblical symbolism of numbers.

35. **shall pass away**, i.e. at the final consummation, which will bring a new heaven and earth.

36. Again the change of the demonstrative pronoun, and now from 'this' to 'that' (cf. Ac 1 [7]). Our Lord knew the purpose of God, but not (under the conditions of His earthly life) the time of its fulfilment. But His words suggest that His knowledge, though not equal to the Father's, is greater than that of the angels. He is the Son, while they are but servants (see below).

37-42. Cf. Lk 17 [26] ff. Mark's exquisite conclusion is different, and forms an even better introduction to the parables of the next chapter. The final coming, unlike the fall of Jerusalem, is apparently to come without warning. The Lord lays stress, as usual, not upon the world's wickedness, but upon its carelessness—its neglect of the warnings given to it, its absorption in the material side of life without any consecration of it to a supernatural end (cf. 22 [5]).

40, 41 are to be explained by [31]. It is the wheat which is 'taken' and gathered into the garner; the chaff is 'left' to the unquenchable fire of the judgement.

43-51. Cf. Lk 12 [39-46]. This passage has a special application to the Apostles, the future stewards of the Kingdom (cf. 16 [19], 19 [28] and notes there). It is not enough that their fellow-servants should not be beaten (20 [25]); they must be regularly fed.

43. The illustration chosen is at first sight as strange as that of the unjust judge, but it is a master-touch upon the right string. The peasant with his little hoard in the 'hidy-hole' is the perfection of watchfulness.

Before leaving this chapter it may be well to add a few words about our Lord's eschatological teaching and the extent of His knowledge of the future.

(i) Our Lord's eschatological teaching often repels modern critical students rather than attracts or impresses them. Thus they tend either, like Schweitzer and his school, to regard Him as a dreamer, or to think that this teaching could not have come from Him, and seek to get rid of it by critical expedients. This repulsion has two roots, one involving a misunderstanding, and the other not. The first root is found in the attention which modern scholars have given to the apocalyptic literature of the Jews, and to the abuse in this literature of the symbolic language of the prophets. OT prophecy probably contains from the first an apocalyptic element. But the language which it employs is symbolic language, and differs not only from the language of fact, but from that of metaphor also. A metaphor involves a comparison between two things, each of which is familiar, and we can see at a glance how far their similarity extends. But a symbol compares two things, only one of which is distinctly known, and the extent of their similarity thus escapes us. To the prophet the unseen is dimly revealed in his spiritual experience through the facts of nature and of human history. Just as 'sunset and evening star' may speak to the soul of the rest which remains for the people of God, so the eclipse and the meteor-shower may speak to it of the instability and transitoriness of all earthly things, and the storm-cloud sweeping up the sky of the imminence of judgement. The prophet uses these things not as descriptions of unseen realities, but to kindle in others through their emotions and imagination thoughts and feelings resembling his own. It is truth which is thus conveyed, and that the deepest, but not truth which can be formulated in statements of fact; and, if we try thus to formulate it, it either escapes us or ceases to be truth at all. Now the Jewish apocalyptists spoil this symbolic language for their readers. They turn poetry into prose; and the old language becomes stale, flat, and unprofitable. By the time that the modern critical student has worked through Enoch and similar books he has had enough apocalypse for his lifetime. Thus, when the old symbolic language is heard again on the lips of the Baptist and the Lord, he is repelled; the backwater of apocalyptic has spoilt for him the living stream of prophecy.

But this is not the only difficulty. Our Lord teaches that passing events are in themselves of little importance, and that

the world as we know it may at any moment pass away. This appears to many religious men to be inconsistent with any rational view of life. The final goal, they think, must not only justify, but find a place for 'the world' and 'the things that are in the world' (1 Jn 2 15). The world itself must gradually become the Kingdom; and the more remote such a consummation appears, the farther off must that divine event be to which the whole creation moves. But this optimistic monism is no part of the outlook of the prophets or of the Lord. They do not indeed teach us to despise the present world. It is the scene in which eternal values are being realized:

> 'Machinery just meant,
> To give thy soul its bent,
> Try thee, and turn thee forth sufficiently impressed.'

Unseen the city of God is rising. But when it is built, and the number of God's elect accomplished, the present scaffolding will be taken down. 'The things which are seen are temporal'; it is 'the things which are not seen' that alone are 'eternal' (2 Cor 4 18). It is not the Catholic Christian who lives in a world of dreams, but those who place their hopes upon gradual social amelioration and a supposed law of progress. 'The kingdom of the world' becomes 'the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ,' not by conversion, but by judgement (Rev 11 15).

(ii) We see then that we are without excuse if we are 'ashamed' of our Lord's words. But what did He know of the future? There is mystery here. That His knowledge was limited He Himself has told us; but what the limits were He has not told us, nor is there any *a priori* road by which we may discover them. It is the facts which must guide us; and we may go as far astray, if we infer from His humanity that He knew little of the future, as if we infer from His divinity that all lay open before Him. The Gospels seem to show that from His baptism He recognized His Messianic calling, and the path of suffering by which according to the Scriptures His work was to be accomplished and His glory won. That He would rise again from the dead was plain from Scripture; how otherwise could He see His seed, prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord prosper in His hand? Even 'the third day' may, as the Church believed, have been found in the OT (cf. note on 16 21). But is it clear that our Lord could have fully satisfied the Apostles, when they questioned among themselves what the rising from the dead should mean? (Mk 9 10). The scene in Gethsemane is more intelligible, if even to Him the future lay largely in the shadow; and we never find Him in one and the same discourse speaking of His resurrection, His ascension, His coming by the Spirit, and His various comings in judgement, or carefully distinguishing them all one from another. So with the future of the Church and of the world. The facts show that He knew much of the future of both—more, as His words suggest, than the angels knew (cf. Eph 3 10; 1 P 1 12). He knew, e.g., as the parables of the next chapter will show, what the Spirit would do for the Church; and knew also the path of bold witness and patient suffering by which it would have to follow Him. There is, as we have seen, no basis for the suspicion that the Lord confused the judgement upon Jerusalem with the judgement of the world, or taught that the end would come before His own generation had passed away. But here too our Lord's language does not suggest that the stages by which the Kingdom of God would come were clearly before His mind, and certainly He did not reveal them. Thus it is probably a mistake to ask what exactly the Lord meant by such a saying as that of Mk 9 1. The Kingdom of God came with power at Pentecost, and with power also when Jerusalem fell. But we cannot say that the Lord meant the one and not the other; He may have meant no more than He said.

XXV. Three parables of judgement, the first two dealing with the Church, and the third with the world. Judgement begins at the house of God (1 P 4 17). The first two are closely connected with the discourse of the last chapter, while the third, as we shall see, expands in magnificent symbolism the thought of 10 40-42. The Lord looks forward to the gift of the Spirit as the source both of the Church's life and of the Church's activity; He is Himself the Bridegroom and the Master of the Church, and the final Judge and Lord of all.

While in the parable of 24 45-51 faithfulness and wisdom are the attributes of the good servant, in the parable of the Virgins it is the watchfulness which must be exercised which is set forth; and in the parable of the Talents the faithfulness which is demanded of everyone to whom any office has been entrusted in the Church. Thus the parable of the Virgins impresses upon us the duty of all members of the Kingdom; and that of the Talents the duty of those who have been entrusted with special

tasks. Both parables throw the Parousia on the screen, and thence glance back over the past to point out the necessary preparation.

1-13. The parable of the Ten Virgins. Peculiar to Matthew, but cf. Mk 13 [35-37] and Lk 12 [35] f.

The parable of the Virgins gives a vivid picture of an Oriental wedding. At night the bridegroom is expected at the house of the bride, that he may take her to his own home (1 Th 4 [17]). She and her bridesmaids await the moment. These latter will go forth to meet him when the cry is heard that he is near. The bride has ten maids of honour, and their lamps are ready, trimmed, and burning while they wait.

1. The Kingdom will be 'made like unto' a wedding then, though it bears a different aspect now. All the faithful are virgins (Rev 14 [4]), ready to follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. The eschatology of the Apocalypse, as Milligan has pointed out, is in close connexion with that of this Gospel. They bear lamps filled with the oil of the Spirit (cf. Zech 4 [1-6]) that their light may shine before men, and that they may increase the joy of the festival as well as share it (cf. 5 [15, 16]). There is an interesting reading 'the bridegroom and the bride.'

2. Prudence is a virtue upon which the Lord frequently insists (cf. 7 [24]). The numbers of the wise and the foolish are here described as equal; the question of Lk 13 [23] our Lord does not answer.

5. We expect a bridegroom of all people to be punctual. This verse (cf. [19]) is one of our Lord's many hints that the Church's expectation of His speedy return may be disappointed, and the sense of the imminence of His appearing pass away from the Church as a whole. This will not greatly matter if the oil remains abundant. It is possible, but not probable, that our Lord thinks of the sleep of death.

6. a cry: the trumpet call of 24 [31].

7. There is time to trim the wicks, but not to buy the oil. It is the error of Pelagianism to confuse the two. The trimming is most necessary; many a well-filled lamp burns with a smoky light for lack of it; but no amount of trimming will serve as a substitute for the oil.

8. are going out. Their sleep has concealed the fact from them.

12. They are strangers (7 [23]), or have become such.

13. Cf. 24 [36, 50]. The connexion with the previous chapter is very close.

14-30. The parable of the Talents (cf. Lk 19 [11-27] and notes). Luke marks even more clearly than Matthew (though cf. [19]) our Lord's reference to the possible delay of His Second Coming (Lk 19 [11]). The chief difference of the two versions is that, while in Luke the same sum is entrusted to each of the servants, in Matthew the sums differ. In both it is faithfulness which matters.

14. his own servants. This parable, like the last, is concerned with the Church only; and the Lord's 'goods' are not 'talents' in the modern sense, but the endowments of the Spirit, bestowed without measure upon Him (Jn 3 [34]), and through Him upon His servants, 'to each according to his several ability.' It is upon the teaching of this parable, explained by the experience of the Church, that the apostolic teaching about spiritual gifts is probably based (cf. Rom 12 [6] ff.; 1 Cor 12 [4] ff., noting especially [5] and [7]; Eph 4 [7]; 1 P 4 [10]). In the distribution of the Lord's goods our natural endowments are taken into consideration; the spiritual gifts consecrate the natural, and enable them to accomplish what would be otherwise beyond their power. The word 'talent' has been adopted into many modern languages under a misapprehension of its meaning, just as the phrase 'besetting sin' has been.

16. Straightway. There must be no waiting after the Spirit has been given.

20. I have gained: contrast Lk 19 [16] 'thy pound hath made.' Each statement represents one aspect of the truth. Grace and freedom work together in perfect harmony, the freedom being exercised in the faithful use of grace bestowed (cf. 1 Cor 15 [10]). But Luke characteristically emphasizes the grace, and Matthew the necessity of correspondence.

21. good and faithful. The servant is well-disposed towards his master and so finds faithfulness easy. His labour is a labour of love. The word 'lo' is full of glee—'Look, master.' He knows well the praise he will get, and loves his lord's appearing (cf. 2 Tim 4 [7, 8]). Contrast [24] and [26]. The expression 'the joy of thy lord' is one in which the spiritual meaning of the parable shines through (cf. Jn 12 [26]). The reward is fellowship with Christ in the beatitude of the Kingdom as well as wider opportunities of rule and service.

24-27. A marvellous example of the Lord's power of illustration. The story is absolutely vivid and natural, and yet fully charged with spiritual meaning. It is best to put a note of interrogation, as in Nestle's text, at the end of [26]. The master does not accept the character given to him, but takes up the servant's words. 'Oh!

you knew that, did you?' Behind all slackness in the Lord's service lie two things which are in the closest connexion, and of which each aggravates the other. The first is a misconception of God's character, the feeling that He is hard upon us and demands more than is reasonable (24). The second is the evil spirit which grudges the labour and sacrifice which He asks (26). When these two things exist, there is always fear (25) and the burying of the talent. The servant has no love for the work entrusted to him; he cares little whether it succeeds or not; all that he cares about is that he may be able to say 'Don't blame me.' It is such workers as this who are the curse of the Church at all ages. In 27 the point may well be that a master such as this servant supposed his master to be would have no objection to increasing his gains by usury.

28. It is the best and most competent servant who has to do the work that another has neglected, but he receives the additional spiritual gift wherewith to perform it.

29, 30. Probably no part of the parable. Matthew in 29 introduces, as so often, another saying of the Lord which illustrates the one he has just given; and in 30 the eschatological language from which he seems unable to keep away. It is appropriate in 8 12 and 22 13, but surely not either in 24 51 or here.

31-46. The Sheep and the Goats. Peculiar to Matthew. From 24 42 to 25 30 the Parousia has been considered in relation to the Church. It is to be a Day of Judgement in which a decision will be made concerning each individual member, upon which his ultimate entry into the Kingdom will depend. Now follows as a sublime finale a dramatic picture of 'the judgement of all nations.' Here it is no longer those who already have enlisted as members of the Church that are described, but all the rest of humanity that have not done so. Their final judgement will be based upon their attitude towards even the least important disciples of Jesus: 'Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.' Our Lord has a mission of redemption, a great purpose of God to be carried out, and His servants share His mission and continue His work. What fundamentally matters is our attitude to Him and to those who represent Him (cf. 10 16-42, especially the final verses). The exegetical reasons for the interpretation here adopted are the following: (i) It suits the context. In 24 we have seen that the Gospel is to be preached to the world, and that the Lord's final coming will follow upon this, and bring the present order to an end. The parables of 25 1-30 have already dealt adequately with the judgement of the Church in regard both to character and to activity; what remains is the judgement of those outside its borders. (ii) The language demands it. 'The nations' outside the covenant are continually contrasted with 'the people' of God within it, and the word 'brethren' regularly presupposes a special religious bond, except when it refers to blood-relationship. In the sayings of our Lord no exception to this rule is to be found; and, when He speaks of brotherhood to Himself, He always refers to His disciples (cf. 12 48-50, 28 10; Jn 20 17). Indeed there is probably no exception in the whole Bible, Heb 2 17 being necessarily to be interpreted by Heb 2 11, 12. The Bible recognizes the physical unity of the human race (Ac 17 26), but never speaks of it as involving 'brotherhood.' (iii) The parallel passages demand it: cf. 10 11-15, 40-42 (noting the close parallel of 42 with 25 40), 18 5; Jn 13 20; Ac 9 4. The passage is perhaps the most awe-inspiring in the literature of the world, as well as the most full of unearthly beauty. But what the Lord seems chiefly to have intended to teach His followers was that, though He seemed to send them out so ruthlessly as sheep in the midst of wolves, and did not shrink from telling them all that lay before them (24 9), their sorrows would be His own, and He would know and feel them every one.

31. The phrase **Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory** is found in En 62 5, and our Lord may have read Enoch. But this and the other parallels which may be adduced go nowhere near to proving this, since (apart from our Lord's own title 'Son of Man') the language is ordinary OT language which Enoch reproduces (cf. Dt 17 18; 1 S 2 8; Is 22 23; Jer 14 21).

34. The final blessedness proceeds from the Father and fulfils His eternal purpose. With the curse it is otherwise (41); that was never intended for man.

46. This verse is probably added by Matthew and recalls Dan 12 2. The words seem flat after what has gone before them, and add nothing to its finality. But neither do they in any way detract from it. There seems to be no foundation for the view that the Greek word here used for 'punishment' implied at this period a reformatory purpose, or that the Hebrew mind distinguished between 'eternal' and 'everlasting.'

XXVI. and XXVII. **The Passion and Crucifixion.**

These two chapters follow closely Mark 14 and 15 (cf. also Lk 22 and 23; Jn 18 and 19). Additions to the other narratives may particularly be noted in 26 [52, 53], 27 [3-10, 24, 52-55, 62-66]. The notes to Mark should be read throughout.

XXVI. **6-13.** Cf. Mk. 14 [3-9] and notes; Jn. 12 [1-11].

12, 13. The thoughts of the Lord's approaching death and of the extension of His work are associated in His mind (cf. Lk 12 [50]; Jn 12 [31-33]).

15. Matthew alone mentions the reward given to Judas and the weighing of the money. Zech 11 [12] is already in his mind (cf. 27 [9, 10] and note there). The rôle of Judas in the story of the Passion was less important than is generally supposed. The authorities had decided upon the Lord's death, and could have arrested Him at any time. Judas only enabled them to make the arrest at night, when there was no fear of popular tumult (cf. [5] and Lk 22 [6]).

17-30. The Last Supper (cf. Mk 14 [12-26] and notes; Lk 22 [7-23]).

17. Was the Last Supper eaten on the evening which began Nisan 15, when the Jews were keeping their Passover feast, or on the evening before? *Primâ facie*, all the Synoptists presuppose the former view (Mt 26 [17-20]; Mk 14 [12-17]; Lk 22 [7-14]), and the 4th Gospel very definitely the latter (Jn 13 [1, 29], 18 [28], 19 [14]). The statements of Matthew and Luke are not of the first importance, since they may be merely reproducing what they understand Mark to say. We seem, however, to be faced with contradictory statements from Mark and John, and the two authors of this commentary are not agreed as to the solution of the difficulty. We note: (i) In spite of the ingenious arguments of Edersheim (*Life of Christ*, ii, 479-482, 566-568, 7th edition), it is not possible to explain the statements of John in other than their *primâ facie* meaning. (ii) The Synoptic narrative contains nothing inconsistent with the identification of the Last Supper with the Passover. Ex 12 [22] was interpreted by Jewish tradition (Jos., *Pes.*, viii, 14, 17) as referring only to the Exodus Passover; arms might be carried (Mk 14 [47]) on a Sabbath or festival in self-defence (*Sab.*, vi, 4); a rebellious teacher of the Law could be executed on a festival day (*San.*, xi, 4: cf. *Sifre* on Deuteronomy, 105*a*); and there is no question that one hanged on a festival would be buried on the same day, especially when it was to be followed by a Sabbath. Indeed, if the grave was ready, burial could take place on the Sabbath itself. Thus Levertoff would accept the *primâ facie* meaning of the Synoptists and regard the Johannine account as probably due to the desire to make the death of the Lord synchronize with that of the Passover lambs. To the NT Editor—in view of the care with which notes of time are given in the 4th Gospel and the naturalness of their introduction in this particular case—another solution appears more attractive. Mark, he would suggest, meant what John means; but his characteristic awkwardness of expression has either caused him to be misunderstood, or has occasioned an early corruption of his text. He identifies (14 [12]), as even Josephus is found to do, the first day of unleavened bread with the day on the afternoon of which the Passover lambs were sacrificed; and this day according to Jewish ideas, began at sunset on the previous evening. Thus Westcott (*The Study of the Gospels*, note at the end of vi) may be right in his view that it was on this previous evening that the question of Mk 14 [12] was asked. What occurred was that the simple preparations made were used on the same evening, since the Lord knew that His desire to eat the Jewish Passover that year with His disciples could not be realized (cf. Lk 22 [15]). Of course, in this case there could have been no Paschal lamb. That, however, is just what all our accounts suggest. Not only is nothing said about it; but, had the Paschal lamb been there, it would have been very strange for our Lord to make bread, and not the lamb, the symbol of His sacrificed Body. The Last Supper was the Lord's own Passover, but not that of the Jews. Thus, as we should have anticipated, our Lord was on the Cross at the time of the sacrifice of the Paschal lambs, and the Resurrection took place on the day of the offering of the first-fruits of the harvest (cf. Lev 23 [5-11]; 1 Cor 5 [7], 15 [20]). Early Christian tradition supports this view, and the use of leavened bread at the Eucharist follows from it. Cf. also for the Jewish tradition the note on 12 [43-45] (quotation from *San.*, 43*a*).

25. A Matthean addition, and one very difficult to credit. It is not likely that Judas was near enough to the Lord for whispering; and, had the Lord's answer been heard by the eleven, they would hardly have permitted Judas to leave.

26-29. Matthew follows Mark closely; but in his characteristic way he explains the meaning of Mark's 'Take' by adding 'eat,' makes it clear that the drinking of

the cup was in response to a definite command to do so, which rested upon the character of what it contained (note 'for' in [28]), and adds 'unto remission of sins' ([28]) and 'with you' ([29]). All these alterations are valuable; and all but the last may have been found in the consecration prayer to which Matthew was accustomed.

26. Sin. Syr. reads **and blessed over it.** Grace had no doubt been said by the Lord at the beginning of the meal; thus a new form of blessing is implied. So in [27], when a different word is used. The words used by the Lord to the disciples are plainly words of administration, not of consecration; we do not know how the Lord had 'blessed over' the bread and wine; but His words of blessing may have done much to render intelligible His words of administration.

28. The mention of the covenant implies a reference to Ex 24 [1-16]. A new covenant is to be made between God and His people (cf. Jer 31 [31-34]; Heb 9 [11-28], 10 [16, 17]); and the Blood of the Lord which **is being poured out** will, like the blood of the old covenant-sacrifice, be sprinkled upon men and presented before God. Matthew's **unto remission of sins** is justified by Ex 24 [5], the primitive burnt offerings being often expiatory (cf. Heb 9 [15]), while the peace offerings formed the material of the communion feast. For 'many' cf. Is 53 [12]; Mt 20 [28]. Our Lord's language is throughout anticipatory, as His Body has not yet been broken, nor His Blood poured out. He 'gave himself with His own hand' by anticipation and deliberate will, but not yet as He would give after His glorification (cf. Jn 6 [62, 63]). As yet His Flesh and Blood were not glorified, nor had the faith of the Apostles reached the stage at which they could assimilate such food. The Lord's words speak of His Body and Blood both as a sacrifice to God and as the means of a sacrificial feast. It is by partaking of the latter that we claim in faith the pardon and new life won by the former. Further than this the Gospel accounts of the Institution do not carry us, though much may be learnt from St. Paul as to the mind of the Apostolic Church. Cf. the notes on 1 Cor 10 [15-22], 11 [17-34].

29. The immediate point is that it is the Lord's last meal on earth. The wine that makes glad the heart of man will share the coming transformation of heaven and earth (cf. Lk 22 [16]). All earthly joy will find its fulfilment then.

31, 32. The quotation from Zech 13 [7] comes from Mark, and is not one of Matthew's inserted fulfilments of prophecy. It is the Shepherd who has been the bond of union to the flock, and who will be so again. Our Lord, the Good Shepherd and the 'fellow' of the Lord of hosts, would see His approaching experience foreshadowed in Zech 13 [7], and the saving of His faithful remnant out of the approaching national destruction in Zech 13 [8] and [9]. Thus there is no sound reason for rejecting [32]. It is not the Lord's way to speak of the Passion without also speaking of the victory beyond; and the Church's corporate witness to the Resurrection demanded an appearance in Galilee to the whole body of followers whom the Lord had there gathered round Him (1 Cor 15 [6]). The Good Shepherd who had gone before the Apostles to lead them to Jerusalem would lead them back again (cf. 28 [7], also from Mark).

36-46. Gethsemane (cf. Mk 14 [32-42] and notes; Lk 22 [39-46]). The Agony was to the Passion what the Temptation was to the Ministry. In both cases our Lord looked forward into the future and overcame temptation in advance (cf. Lk 4 [13] with Jn 14 [30]). But the Lord is now the centre of the faithful remnant of Israel (Lk 22 [28] ff.), and Gethsemane is their time of testing as well as His ([36]). Thus He goes to and fro from the Father to them, prayer and pastoral activity alternating as throughout the Ministry. He calls them first to fellowship with Himself ([38]); and, only when this appeal fails, speaks of their own danger ([41]). He does not, however, ask the same of all. The eight are bidden to rest, the three to watch; and our Lord seems to have specially felt the failure of Peter (Mk 14 [37]).

37, 38. The language of Ps 42 [5, 6] and probably the whole Psalm, with its record of present anguish and confident hope, is in the Lord's mind (cf. [55] with Ps 42 [4]) as the language of Ps 22 will presently be; but it is only the anguish which as yet finds expression. Matthew characteristically softens Mark's statement that the Lord was 'astounded,' but his addition 'with me' is a valuable explanation of the Lord's meaning.

39. Mark's record is here much the better, as it brings out our Lord's sense both of the divine transcendence and of the Father's personal activity in all that takes place. (i) All things are to God possible, because the created world, and the divine purpose being worked out in it, are but one freely chosen and partial expression of the divine Being. God is their Master, not their slave. (ii) The cup does not pass by the mechanical operation of

secondary causes. If it passes, it is because God removes it.

41. Watch, i.e. 'keep awake.' The comma should certainly be put after 'pray,' not after 'watch.' Temptation derives its power not so much from its inherent force as from the condition in which it finds us; the same temptation which overwhelms the drowsy and prayerless who 'enter into' it is at once repelled by the watchful and prayerful who do not. The last words of the verse look back to [33] and [35].

42. Matthew notes the stages of the Lord's victory more carefully than Mark. The Lord now recognizes that, though all things are possible to the Father, not all are possible if the Father's purpose is to be fulfilled; and the form of His prayer changes, resolution being maintained and strengthened by repetition of the prayer ([44]).

45. Sleep on now, and take your rest. There is not certainly any touch of irony; the three, having failed, can now go no further than the eight. As the penalty of sin is more sin, so the penalty of sleep is more sleep. For all the Apostles the Passion must now be a time of prostrate inactivity.

Profoundly moving as is the story of Gethsemane, it presents two difficulties: (i) Why does our Lord apparently shrink from suffering and death, as many of His servants have not shrunk? (ii) How was it, in view of His previous teaching, that He could think the removal of the cup possible?

(i) The answer to the first difficulty is easy: (*a*) We must distinguish physical and emotional from moral shrinking. Our Lord exhibits no moral shrinking. Not only is His surrender to God's will expressed in words throughout the Agony; it is expressed also in action. He remains where Judas will find Him, instead of eluding His enemies as He has always successfully eluded them before. The prayer 'Thy will be done' is a prayer for the accomplishment of the divine purpose, and it must almost always have a practical embodiment if it is to be sincere. Physical and emotional shrinking, on the other hand, are only partially within the control of the will; their absence is generally a sign of insensibility or lack of imagination; and it is the noblest nature which has the greatest capacity for suffering. (*b*) The physical suffering of the Cross was probably but a small element in the Lord's cup. Our Lord was the Messiah, and the Servant of Jehovah of whom Deutero-Isaiah spoke, and as such stood in a mysterious relation to the whole people of God. In the Cross Israel's cup of iniquity would be filled up; and our Lord thought of the Passion of Israel, of which His death would be the cause, more than of His own (cf. Lk 23 [27-31]). We have also to remember the mystery of sin-bearing, though the subject cannot be dealt with here (cf. 2 Cor 5 [21]; Gal 3 [13]; 1 P 2 [24], and the illuminating words of Heb 5 [7, 8], 11 [17-19]). The mystery lay in the death of Him upon whom as upon Isaac the fulfilment of God's promise depended. Our Lord had in faith to yield not only Himself, but the divine purpose bound up in Him, to death, that both might be saved out of death. It was faith that was accounted to the Lord for righteousness, as it is to His followers.

(ii) The answer to the second difficulty is less easy. But (*a*) the truths by which our lives are guided are truths which rest upon complex evidence, which are held fast in spite of the difficulties involved in them, and which are not (like the truths of mathematics) equally clear at one time and at another. The condition of the body affects the mind through the brain; and, when there is a physical breakdown, the mind is affected by it, and the facts are no longer grasped in their true mutual relations. Even the Lord's 'flesh' was 'weak' (2 Cor 13 [4]), though His 'spirit' was ever 'willing'; and, with Him as with His followers, the human powers had to fail and break if the divine were to be fully manifested (cf. 2 Cor *passim*). (*b*) The narrative of Gen 22, to which Jn 1 [36] possibly refers (cf. Gen 22 [8]), may well have been in our Lord's mind. In that great story, the cup did pass when the self-surrender was perfected. Was there indeed for the Lord 'no way but this'?

47-56. The betrayal (cf. Mk 14 [43-45] and notes; Lk 22 [47-53]). Our Lord suffered three betrayals: by Judas to the priests, by the priests to the Romans, by Pilate to the Jews again. The same word apparently is used of all three (Mk 10 [33]; Jn 18 [36]).

50. do that for which thou art come. The revisers' knowledge of classical Greek has here overpowered their common sense. The AV 'wherefore art thou come?' is undoubtedly right, the situation in Jn 13 [27] being altogether different. The word for 'Friend' is ill-omened, as it has been used in 20 [13] and 22 [12]. Judas is both a discontented labourer and a guest without a wedding garment. This word would be better translated 'Companion,' the word for 'friends' in Jn 15 [13, 14] not being the same. Companionship may last for a time

when there is no friendship, but to such companions the Lord can but say at last 'Why are you here?' (contrast Jn 6 [67]). There is a great sermon on this text in McLaren's *Expositions of Matthew*, iii.

51. Peter (Jn 18 [10]) had refused to do what the Lord had asked of him in the garden, and now does what compromises His Master's cause (cf. Jn 18 [36]). He thus prepares for his denials: after the attack upon Malchus he did not dare to be discovered.

52-54. Matthew has here preserved for us sayings of the Lord which explain His teaching about non-resistance. Cf. 5 [38-42] and note there. (1) Force always recoils upon those who employ it. Even in the life of the world, as Metternich said, 'You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them.' But the Lord speaks to the Church. With the world's weapons the world will always win; and the place of the Church's sword is in its sheath. (2) The use of force is an expression of distrust of God. God's legions, had He willed the cup to pass, would have been far more effective than the twelve tribes, whom the Christ was refusing to call to arms. Nothing but prayer was necessary, if only the prayer could have been rightly made. (3) Resistance to the world's hostility sets aside God's declared will: cf. [56]; Lk 22 [53] (end); Jn 18 [11]. Suffering is the path marked out for the Lord and for His people. Could we avoid it, we should prove the witness of Scripture to be untrue. This witness is not found only in such passages as Is 53, but in the lives of all who as prophets and saviours of their people foreshadowed the work of the Lord.

55. Though our Lord forbids resistance, He is not 'meek and mild'; His answers to His enemies are always full of point and spirit. This display of force is an absurdity. His whole action since Palm Sunday has disproved their fear of a rising. If it has not, why has He not been arrested before?

57-75. The trial before Caiaphas and the Jewish mockery (cf. Mk 14 [53-65] and notes; Lk 22 [54-71]). Matthew's additions and alterations of the Marcan story are slight, but characteristic. His hostility to our Lord's judges leads him to say that they sought for 'false' witness, their decision being already taken and only requiring justification. He leaves out words and details which he thinks unimportant. He adds the solemn adjuration by the divine name ([63]), which Mark's Gentile readers might hardly have understood. He adds 'Henceforth' ([64]), thus giving a wider meaning to the Lord's words than is apparent in the Marcan account, and explains (with Luke) the meaning of 'Prophesy' ([68]), though perhaps incorrectly.

58. St. Peter's following was most courageous in view of his violence in the garden; but it was bound to end in failure, as he was now spiritually 'afar off.' At best he can but 'see the end.'

61. If we accept the view that Jn 2 [13-22] is a misplaced leaf of the Gospel, our Lord's words in Jn 2 [19] were probably the basis of this charge (cf. notes on 21 [12] ff.). In any case our Lord had publicly threatened the Temple, a fact most useful in inflaming the passions of the populace at Jerusalem against Him, as afterwards against St. Stephen (cf. Mk 15 [11, 29] and Ac 6 [13, 14]).

63. The triumphal entry had been a claim to Messiahship, and the parable of the Husbandmen a claim to divine Sonship. Our Lord answered this charge, as the questions of His Person and office were the real questions at issue (cf. 1 Tim 6 [13]). It would have been useless to notice the other charges. Similarly, the real hostility of the world to the Church is based upon the Church's claims, and the moral and religious demands which it makes upon the world in consequence. Other charges largely refute one another.

69-75. Peter's denials. Matthew intends to follow Mark, but in Mk 14 [69] he seems to have read (cf. AV) 'a maidservant,' not 'the maidservant,' and so supposes that a different one is intended. In [73] his addition explains the meaning of the Marcan text, but he seems to have been as puzzled as we are by *epibalon* (Mk 14 [72]). St. Peter has forgotten what he said in 26 [35], and the Lord's warnings. But had he really renounced his Master, he would have not been where he was.

XXVII. In this chapter Matthew again closely follows Mark, but inserts fulfilments of prophecy and some questionable traditions.

3-10. The end of Judas. It is impossible to place any confidence in this striking story for the following reasons: (i) Mark (14 [11]) had apparently not learned from St. Peter the sum paid to Judas, nor is it probable that it was known. (ii) The NT has a second story of the death of Judas in the note inserted by Luke into Peter's speech in Ac 1 [18, 19], and this is inconsistent with Matthew's. (iii) Matthew's story is apparently based, like his addition in 21 [2], upon a passage of Zechariah misunderstood, and upon the fact that there was a cemetery for strangers

known as 'the field of blood.' The reading of Zech 11 12. 13 (not Jeremiah, as stated by Matthew, who seems to be thinking of Jer 18 2 f. and 32 6 ff.) may be either 'unto the potter,' or 'into the treasury' (RV and RVm); and Matthew's story is so told that there seems to be some kind of fulfilment whichever reading be adopted. That there is no real analogy between 'prophecy' and 'fulfilment' here is made plain in the Introduction to 2-Zechariah; but the Jewish Christians seem to have thought that the treachery of Judas was foreshadowed in the words of 2-Zech, and built up the story round it. If so, we have an example of the growth of legend. Even the suicide of Judas may be founded upon 2 S 17 23, Ahitophel's action throughout foreshadowing that of Judas (cf. Ps 41 9 cited in Jn 13 18).

11-26. Jesus and Pilate (cf. Mk 15 2-15 and notes; Lk 23 2-25). Matthew follows closely Mk 15 2-15, but adds 19 and 24. 25 from an unknown source, perhaps an early Palestinian *Acta Pilati* (cf. 62-66, 28 11-15).

11-14. Mark's story is hardly intelligible without Lk 23 2 and Jn 18 33-38, the latter being perhaps derived from 'the other disciple' of Jn 18 15. Pilate's question in 11 was not susceptible of a direct answer. In our Lord's 'Thou sayest' the word 'Thou' is probably emphatic. To say that He claims to be King of the Jews is to use the language adopted by Pilate from the high priests (Lk 23 2), not our Lord's own language. The claim to be the Christ meant no doubt the claim to be the King of the Jews; but the associations of Jewish kingship were such that our Lord would never have employed the word, though He spoke of the Kingdom freely (cf. Jn 18 36). If Pilate was to do his duty to the emperor, it was necessary for him to know that the 'kingdom' claimed by the Lord was in no way of a character to produce a revolutionary movement, and John tells us that our Lord explained this to him within the prætorium. Mark's story deals only with what took place outside. Pilate, accustomed to the volubility of Orientals under accusation, does not understand our Lord's silence: but words were as unnecessary now as at the trial before Caiaphas (26 63). It was for the high priests to make good their charges of disloyalty, and they had no evidence to produce. Pilate would know of the triumphal entry; but he would also know that the Lord was a 'prophet' or teacher; and that, instead of beginning an insurrection, He had been simply teaching in Jerusalem day by day ever since. He thus regards the attack on the Lord as due to professional jealousy (cf. 18 and Jn 18 29-31). It is at this point that Lk 23 6-12 must be introduced. If our Lord was charged with seditious teaching, it was plainly His Galilean teaching that was in question; and Herod, as Pilate gladly recognizes, was the right man to deal with it. Our accounts of the Passion are most fragmentary, since nothing is further from the mind of the evangelists than the creation of a complete and self-evidencing story; but their harmony and the light which they throw one upon another are (leaving aside 'Matthean additions') very remarkable.

17. they were gathered together. Mk 15 8 explains the meaning. The trial was interrupted by the clamour of a crowd which had come to ask for the release of Barabbas. The crowd probably did not even know that the Lord had been arrested. Matthew's language (20) strangely suggests that the high priests and elders went down into the excited crowd and argued with its members on the respective merits of Jesus and Barabbas. Nothing is more likely than that in the previous week they had done their utmost to incense the crowd against Jesus, especially by the charge that He meant to destroy the Temple; but it was now too late to alter the mind of the crowd. The priests could, however, stir it up to greater fury; and that is what Mark says that they did.

19. There is of course nothing impossible in the incident here described, but it is very improbable. Pilate's wife would only have communicated with him when 'sitting on the judgement-seat' by a private note or message. Thus the story requires (i) a Roman lady keenly interested (as some were) in the religion of the Jews; (ii) one who took her dreams very seriously; (iii) the subsequent revelation of her action either by herself or by her messenger. Since Matthew has not told us the evidence upon which he relies, we cannot judge of its value.

21-23. Pilate is 'a lath painted to look like iron.' Matthew makes the best of him; but he is as foolish as he is weak. The mob has come in accordance with prescribed custom to ask for the release of Barabbas, and it will take nothing else. Even had the Lord been as popular as Pilate supposed, the crowd would only have been irritated against Him by Pilate's apparent attempt to use Him to keep the popular hero in durance. A mob does not give reasons for its action, nor is it generally of any use to argue with it. The attempt to do so, while refusing what it regards as its right, only

rouses it to fury. The cry 'Crucify him' was probably not an expression of the crowd's deliberate will, but of its irritation with Pilate. All through he tries to throw his responsibility upon others instead of bravely doing his duty. With a master like Tiberius the charge of leniency with insurrection would probably be fatal. Caiaphas knew this and acted accordingly (Jn 19 [12]). Pilate might be as rude to the priests as he liked; but flouts and jeers are a poor consolation for defeat upon the main issue.

24, 25. Again very improbable. Even if Pilate had known the meaning of this piece of Jewish symbolism (Dt 21 [6, 7]), he would hardly have demeaned himself to use it; while still less would the crowd have cursed themselves in words, though they did it by their action.

27-30. The Gentile mockery. The soldiers would be legionaries recruited in the East. They would know nothing about Jesus; and their insults were probably directed less against Jesus than against a Jew's claim to royalty. The point of Pilate's superscription over the Cross was similar.

35-50. The Cross (cf. Mk 15 [22-37] and notes; Lk 23 [33-46]). Matthew adds to Mark nothing of historical value. In [34], influenced by Ps 69 [21], he (or more probably his Palestinian tradition) substitutes 'gall' for myrrh, obscuring the real purpose of the draught in order to provide a verbal 'fulfilment.' In [43] he provides a further fulfilment from Ps 22 [8], which makes the Jewish authorities to their own condemnation make use of the words of the righteous Psalmist's enemies.

45. all the land, i.e. of Israel (cf. Am 8 [9, 10]). It is hardly conceivable that this should have been related by Mark if it had been untrue. The Apostles, and probably Mark himself, were at Jerusalem at the time. The ninth hour (cf. 1 K 18 [29]) suggests the offering of the evening sacrifice.

46. We cannot fathom the meaning of these words on the Lord's lips; but, coming as they do from Ps 22, we should note their original meaning. There is no suggestion of spiritual dereliction. The mind of God is discerned by the Hebrews through the experience which He sends or permits, and the Psalmist asks why God has left him to the fury of his enemies. The Psalm, like Is 53, with which it may be closely connected, ends on a note of joy and victory, as the Lord well knew; there is no suggestion of doubt or despair. But the present anguish is terrible; help is long in coming; what purpose has God in view in the Passion which is taking place? The Greek differs slightly in Mark and Matthew, but in both it is clear that the reason sought lies in the future, not in the past (cf. Jn 9 [3]). To our Lord, as to ourselves, the mystery of suffering was not fully explained. It was necessary, He knew, to the fulfilment of God's purpose, and the greatness of that purpose fully justified it. But why such suffering is necessary is obscure to us, and apparently all was not plain even to the Lord. The link is very close between this saying and Gethsemane; and Heb 5 [7] may refer to either or to both. The idea sometimes suggested of a real separation between the Lord and the Father, due to the bearing of human sin, is altogether to be rejected as contrary both to the Christian doctrine of God and to our Lord's direct teaching (Jn 16 [32]).

51-53. The portents. The rending of the veil is found in all the Synoptists; there was no longer a divine presence to be veiled (23 [38]). It must not be interpreted to mean that 'the way into the holy place' (Heb 9 [8]) was now open, since the Lord's redeeming work yet needed completion by His glorification and the gift of the Spirit. The other portents rest upon Matthew's authority alone. We have here almost certainly the first appearance of 'the harrowing of hell,' a story more fully told in the Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus. The Lord, the first-fruits of them that slept, brought back with Him from death the OT saints who had been waiting in the *limbus patrum* for the accomplishment of His redemption (cf. Heb 12 [23]). Matthew believes that they had already their glorified bodies, and perhaps that the rending of their sepulchres by the earthquake enabled them to rise, though their actual rising was put off until the Resurrection of the Lord. The fundamental thought in the harrowing of hell is a true one. If Christians are risen and ascended with Christ, so must be the saints of old; the efficacy of His salvation cannot be for ourselves alone (cf. 1 P 3 [19], 4 [6]). But the NT does not suggest elsewhere any bodily resurrection before the Lord's return.

54-61. The friends of the Lord (cf. Mk 15 [39-47] and notes; Lk 23 [47-56]). Matthew merely abbreviates Mark's narrative. The statement that Joseph was a disciple seems only to mean that he had believed our Lord's proclamation of the imminence of the Kingdom (cf. Mark).

62-66. Pilate and the guard. A Matthean addition, in close connexion with those to come in 28 [2-4, 11-15]. All are more

than questionable. For (i) it is extremely unlikely that the Jewish authorities knew that our Lord had foretold His Resurrection in any sense which could tempt His disciples to steal His Body for a fraudulent purpose. (ii) Pilate hated the priests, and would have been extremely unlikely to accede to such a request. If the high priests wished to guard the tomb, they could do it themselves. (iii) In no one of the Gospels do the holy women show any knowledge that the legionaries either are, or have been, on guard. Had no lover of the Lord been near the garden on Holy Saturday?

The idea of the sealing probably comes from Dan 6 [17]. Nothing is more common in legends than this repetition of the details of old stories.

XXVIII. **The Resurrection.**

1-8. The women at the tomb (Mk 16 [1-8] and notes; Lk 24 [1-11]; Jn 20 [1, 2]).

1. There is probably no difference in meaning between Matthew's and Mark's notes of time. The word *epiphoskein* apparently may be used without any reference to light, and mean 'drawing on' (cf. Lk 23 [54]). Matthew may omit to mention the women's intention to embalm, since according to his account the tomb was sealed and guarded.

2-4. A Matthean addition. Matthew seems to mean that the women witnessed all that he describes. That an angel should appear to terrify Roman soldiers may have been accordant with the desires of Jewish Christians, but surely not with the ways of God. Matthew does much to spoil Mark's beautiful story. It should be observed that all the narratives give not an account of the Resurrection (which is assumed), but an account of the manifestations of the risen Lord. The difficulties with which the history is beset largely arise from the fragmentary character of our information. Cf. the essay on *The Evidence for the Resurrection*; also Swete, *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion*; Sparrow-Simpson, *The Resurrection*.

5. Fear not ye. 'Ye' is emphatic. The soldiers may fear, but the Resurrection brings only joy to those 'seeking' Jesus.

7. Cf. note on 26 [31, 32]. There is no inconsistency between this direction of the angel and appearances of the Lord in Judæa; nor does Matthew see any, as [9] shows. It is possible that the Lord's intention to manifest Himself to the Apostles first in Galilee was frustrated by their unbelief; and that He only appeared to them in Jerusalem because otherwise they would have been scattered, and only returned to Galilee as men who had lost their faith. But this supposition is unnecessary. The words 'he goeth before you' suggest the Shepherd visible to His flock at the beginning of their journey, and leading them from one place to another; while the words 'there shall ye see him' speak of an appearance to the Church as a whole, including the women themselves. That this solution is not an artificial one is shown by 1 Cor 15 [6].

9, 10. An appearance to the women (cf. Mk 16 [9]; Jn 20 [14] ff.). A strange incident, as the Lord merely repeats the angel's message. The language here is difficult to reconcile with appearances to the Apostles in Jerusalem, as the Marcan narrative is not. This story is probably a confused Jewish Christian combination of the Marcan story with that of our Lord's appearance to Mary Magdalene. With 'they took hold of his feet,' and with 'go tell my brethren,' cf. Jn 20.[17].

11-15. This Matthean addition tells us one thing of interest—the Jews' answer to the witness of the empty tomb. The body of the Lord had been handed over to one of His disciples and buried in that disciple's garden. What had become of the body His followers best knew. But Matthew's own story is extraordinary. It involves far more than our acceptance of [2-4]. The account given by the soldiers is apparently believed by the Sadducean high priests, and accepted by the assembled Sanhedrin. All agree to bribe the soldiers, not—be it observed—to say nothing and see if anything will happen, but themselves to declare that they have slept at their posts, and that the very thing has taken place which they were sent to prevent. If this comes to Pilate's ears, the unfortunate soldiers are to put their trust in the high priests' influence with him. Caiaphas was no fool. He would probably have said that there was not a word of truth in the soldiers' story of the angel, and handed them over to Pilate for execution (cf. Ac 12 [19]). Such stories as this are like those of the Apocryphal Gospels. They greatly confirm our confidence in the truth of the Gospel narratives as a whole by showing how little the early Christians possessed the faculty of plausible invention.

16-20. The appearance of the Lord in Galilee and the last commission. Matthew ends his Gospel not with his own words, but with the Lord's post-resurrection teaching. Perhaps there is no other

book in the literature of the world which possesses so splendid a conclusion.

16. We hear for the first time of this trysting-place on a particular mountain. But 1 Cor 15 [6] almost demands it. How otherwise could the Apostles have gathered the scattered and discouraged disciples together?

17. Our Lord's appearance is in royal majesty, and fitly closes the Gospel of Jesus the last Redeemer. The doubters are likely not to be found among the eleven. Matthew would hardly have believed that, even if he had read it in Mark. He means that many others besides the Apostles were present. It is entirely consistent with spiritual manifestations that they should not be equally clear to all.

18. No more than elsewhere does Matthew necessarily give our Lord's *ipsissima verba*. His own personal outlook is as plain in his report of our Lord's words here as is Luke's in Lk 24 [46-49]: e.g. he insists upon the observance of the new law ([20]). But Matthew has shown himself an invaluable recorder of our Lord's teaching; and the words here given, if rightly interpreted, occasion little difficulty.

All authority: all created being has been brought under the Lord's rule—angels, men, and nature. Even in His life on earth all power was His, though His use of it was trammelled by the limitations of the flesh (cf. 7 [29], 8 [8] f., 9 [6], 11 [27], 26 [53]); but now God has once and for all given to the Son all authority and power in heaven and earth for the fulfilment of His Father's will. In Him all things, however widely separated, will find a final unity (cf. 1 Cor 15 [24-28]). No doubt our Lord's claims here go beyond 11 [27], where the reference seems to be to revelation. But the glorified Lord necessarily speaks in accents different from those of His earthly life; and the later witness of the Apostles to our Lord's position requires His own witness as its foundation. Their own spiritual experience, however satisfying in its own place, would surely have been insufficient.

19, 20. The Apostles are reinstated in their office in spite of their failure during the Passion. It is given to them to evangelize the world. The work of 'discipling the nations' is not completed when allegiance is pledged, and union with God bestowed. The observance of the new law is as necessary as baptism into the Messianic community. 'In one sense all has been done; in another sense all remains to do' (Westcott, *Revelation of the Risen Lord*, 161). Matthew's witness to the teaching of the risen Lord in these verses is widely rejected on two grounds. It is said (i) that, had our Lord so spoken, the hesitation of the Apostles, as revealed in Ac 10-15, would have been impossible; and (ii) that the baptismal formula here found is long antedated (cf. Ac 2 [38], 8 [16], 10 [48], 19 [5]; 1 Cor 1 [13-15]). The first objection is without foundation. For (*a*) the Lord's world-wide commission has been prepared for both by the Baptist's teaching and by His own (cf. 3 [9], 8 [11, 12], 10 [18], 21 [43], 24 [14], 25 [31-46]), while the witness of Luke and John is even clearer than that of Matthew (cf. Lk 2 [32], 24 [47]; Ac 1 [8]; Jn 10 [16], 12 [32]). Here, just as in the case of the Passion, our Lord began with veiled suggestions of what God's purpose might be, keeping back the full truth until the minds of His followers were ready for it. (*b*) The story in Acts presents no difficulty. The Apostles, in bearing witness first to their own nation, did exactly as the Lord had bidden them to do, not only in His first charge (10 [5-15]), but in His later instructions (10 [16-23]). Witness had to be borne to Israel, before the Son of Man came to Jerusalem in judgement. But when Philip preaches to the Samaritans (Ac 8 [5] ff.), the Apostles approve; nor is there any objection made to the evangelization of Greeks at Antioch (Ac 11 [20-23]). The Pharisees themselves, and the Jews of the Dispersion, gathered proselytes, even apart from the Lord's words; why should not Jewish Christians have done so? (cf. Is 42 [6], 49 [6], 56 [6-8], etc.). The great controversy that arose was not about the evangelization of the Gentiles, but about the intercourse of Jewish Christians with them (Ac 11 [3]), and their freedom from the obligation to observe the Mosaic Law (Ac 15 [4, 5]).

The second objection is more serious. That the sacrament of baptism has the authority of the Lord behind it is almost certain (cf. *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 421), but the witness of Acts makes it also almost certain that baptism at first was into the name of Jesus Christ, and not formally into the name of the Blessed Trinity. There is, however, no indication in the text that Matthew understood the Lord to have prescribed any particular formula. 'Into the name of' means rather 'into the possession of' or 'into union with' (cf. McNeile and Box *ad loc.*); and the teaching of the Lord had made clear both the union of the Lord with the Father and the union of the Holy Spirit of promise with both. Their name is one name. It is quite likely that Matthew here expresses our Lord's teaching in language which the Lord Himself did not actually

employ, but not that he has misrepresented its character.

20. Our Lord's promise of His abiding Presence (cf. 18 [20]) recalls Ps 91 [15] and the promises to Moses (Ex 3 [12]), Joshua (Jos 1 [5]), and Jeremiah (Jer 1 [8]). The Presence of Jesus, the Shekina, is the Presence of God.

Bibliography

Commentaries: Allen (*I.C.C.*), 1907, critically valuable; Plummer, 1910, and McNeile, 1915, more widely useful; Montefiore, new edition, 1927, a convenient record of Continental criticism; Zahn, 2nd edition, 1910, conservative but critical and sound; Wellhausen, 1908, and Klostermann (in Lietzmann's series), 1926, subjective but important for textual criticism. Rawlinson's Commentary on St. Mark (*W.C.*, 1927) is valuable for Matthew also. The Commentaries of St. Chrysostom, St. Thomas Aquinas (*Catena Aurea*), Maldonatus, and Bengel are of abiding value, as also are Trench, *Notes on the Parables* and *Notes on the Miracles*, and R. M. Benson, *The Final Passover*.

Light from Jewish Sources: Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* and *Jesus-Jeshua* are both valuable, and Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism*.

OUR LORD'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Our Lord uses the OT in various ways. Sometimes He refers to it as a record of the past (Mt 5 [21, 27], etc., 12 [3, 4], 24 [37-39]); sometimes He appeals to it in its original meaning (4 [4, 7, 10], 9 [13], 12 [3-5], 13 [14, 15], 15 [8, 9], 21 [13, 16, 42], 22 [37-39], 23 [38]) for His own guidance or for that of others; whilst we find Him continually interweaving its language with His own (5 [4, 5, 34, 35], 6 [6], 7 [23], 9 [36], 11 [23], 13 [32, 41, 43], 19 [26], 21 [33], 24 [7, 21, 24, 29-31], 25 [31], 26 [28, 38], 27 [46]) and showing thereby how profoundly He was in sympathy with its highest teaching. Everywhere our Lord's use of Scripture is worthy of close attention; and it is sometimes illuminating to note the context of the words which He employs that we may enter more closely into His mind. But there is another way in which He uses the OT, and to ourselves it presents a difficulty. He regards it as rich in prophecies of Himself, of His Passion and Resurrection, and of the preaching of His Gospel to the world (cf. Lk 24 [25-27, 44-47]; Jn 5 [39, 45-47]). The Scriptures, He says, though not themselves the source of eternal life, bear witness to Him, in whom it is to be found; and not to come to Him is to reject their teaching. This witness He finds alike in the Law, in 'all the prophets,' and in the Psalms; and He blames as 'foolish and slow of heart' those who do not recognize its reality. Nor is He content to speak only in general terms. His claim to be the Christ presupposes that the Christ and His Kingdom have rightly been expected; His whole way of referring to the Passion and the Glorification to follow shows that He regards them as so clearly foretold that the truth of God is bound up with their accomplishment (16 [21], etc., 26 [24, 54]; cf. Lk 22 [37], quoting Is 53 [12]). Like St. Paul (1 Cor 15 [4]) He seems to regard not only His Resurrection, but the day on which He will rise, as foreshadowed in the OT (cf. n. on 16 [21]); while, in view of the close connexion between Lk 24 and the early chapters of the Acts, we can hardly doubt that the references to the OT in Ac 2 [22-36], etc., have His full authority. Other examples of fulfilment are found in Mt 11 [10], 17 [11, 12], 22 [43-45], 26 [31, 64]; Jn 3 [14], 8 [56]; and our Lord more than once seems deliberately to provide fulfilments (Mt 21 [1-5]; Jn 19 [28-30]). If then, in deference to modern criticism, we altogether set aside the 'old-fashioned' argument from prophecy, we set aside our Lord's teaching. It is one thing to say that to the Jews the word 'fulfilment' had a wider meaning than we have been accustomed to give to it (cf. note on 1 [18-25]), and another to say that prophecy never supplies 'history written beforehand.'

But now we must face the difficulty. Modern scholars in no way deny that the highest ideals of the OT find noble fulfilment in the Lord and His Kingdom, or that we may rightly apply to them the OT words. But their effort has been to discover the original meaning of these words in relation to the circumstances under which they were spoken; and in almost every case the result has at first sight been to deprive them of their evidential value. Ps 110, e.g., is probably a Maccabæan psalm, and originally referred to the great priest-king Simon;

Ps 16 [9-11] originally referred not to resurrection, but to preservation from death; while Is 53 was originally no prophecy of the Lord, but referred to the sufferings either of Israel, or of the faithful members of it, and to their approaching triumph. Thus the argument from prophecy, as used by our Lord and the Church after Him, seems to have been based upon misunderstanding, and to be without value for ourselves. What answer can we make to this contention? Perhaps modern knowledge, which has created the difficulty, may enable us to overcome it.

We observe then first that our Lord and the Apostles are not primarily concerned with the original meaning of the language of the OT, but with its meaning as part of the canonical Scriptures; and these are not always the same. The meaning of words is seldom exactly fixed; and this is especially true when we have to do with divine things and an advancing spiritual experience. Continuity in religion is of great importance; but, if the old language is to be retained, it must be reinterpreted, and in Israel reinterpretation went very far. Just as the people of God took old Semitic folklore and sacrificial worship, and transformed them in view of God's advancing revelation of Himself, so they took their own early literature, and transformed it in a corresponding way. The divine name of Ex 6 [3] is almost certainly older than the Exodus, and it did not at first have the meaning given to it in Ex 3 [14]. The sacrificial worship goes back to a time when the gods were regarded as requiring food, and the blood in which vitality was thought to reside (Gen 8 [21]; Ps 50 [7-13]); but it came to express far higher thoughts than these with the passing of the years. So it was with history and prophecy. Not only were the old stories which gathered round the primitive sanctuaries reinterpreted (Hos 12 [3, 4]), and the events of history revalued (Hos 1 [4]), but much which the simple reader takes in the OT for history is not history but Midrash, narrative created or transformed to convey moral and spiritual truth. The real purpose, e.g., of the old narrative of which St. Paul makes use in Gal 4 [21-31] was probably to contrast the position of Israel, the nation supernaturally born, with that of the Ishmael tribes of the desert; and St. Paul's use of it is substantially justified. So, again, the scribes treated the prophets with startling freedom. They combined, and altered, and added to their writings to make them applicable to a later day. Indeed, we have come to see that 'the original meaning' of OT words is sometimes more difficult to ascertain than the critics of the last generation supposed, and less important. What chiefly matters is the meaning which they came to bear, and which they do bear when we read them as part of Scripture. If e.g. Amos, and perhaps the first Isaiah, were originally prophets only of doom, they are, as our Lord read them, and we read them to-day, prophets of supernatural hope. If Ecclesiastes once preached only of the worthlessness of life, to us he preaches only of its worthlessness apart from God and immortality. In all these cases the later additions qualify the old words, and give to them a higher meaning. So once more with Hebrew poetry. The Song of Songs became part of Scripture as describing the love of God for His people, and of His people for Him; while the Psalms themselves often came to bear a far deeper meaning than they at first possessed. They form the hymn-book of the second Temple, and should be so interpreted. Such psalms as the 2nd, the 45th, and the 110th probably spoke to the Jews of our Lord's day, as they speak to us, of the Messiah and of His people; and they would have thought as little of their original meaning as the simple Christian thinks to-day. Thus, when the Lord says that the OT bears witness to Him, He is speaking of the OT as He and His contemporaries read it, and not of the older materials of which it is so largely formed. Again and again we find that the meaning which He gives to the old words is simpler and more natural than that 'original meaning' which the scholar discovers for us. It is, e.g., far more natural to apply Ps 110 [1] to the Messianic sovereignty of the Lord than to apply to it the divine support granted to Simon the Maccabee. No doubt the Lord and the Apostles found even deeper meaning in the old words than the Jews had found before them, but all that they did was to carry reinterpretation to its final stage.

This, however, is not all. Interpret as we will, this at any rate is clear. The OT Scriptures have in fact borne a marvellous witness to the Lord and His Church all down the ages. Is it not reasonable to believe that the witness which they have borne God intended them to bear, and that He guided the long process of their formation with this end in view? The Bible, like the book of nature, is a witness to God, and each is what it is, however apparently fortuitous the process which

made it what it is. The witness of the one is thus no more discredited by modern criticism than the witness of the other by modern science. When St. Paul, looking back on the past history of the people of God, says that 'these things happened unto them by way of example, and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come' (1 Cor 10 11), does he not tell us something which has a wider application than that which he himself has immediately in view? God's hand is to be seen, not only in the facts of the past, but in the record given of them. If God's purpose in Christ was an eternal purpose, is it any wonder that the history of Israel itself, and of the prophets and redeemers of Israel, should foreshadow the Lord's experience, and that the record itself should make clear the reference for those who have eyes to see? The Church has surely found the Lord in Joseph and Moses and David and Isaiah and Jeremiah because He was there; and, if we too find Him, we find what we were meant to find. There may be false and foolish mystical interpretation, as there may be false and foolish historical interpretation; but *abusus non tollit usum*, and the long arm of coincidence is hardly long enough to stretch from one end of the Bible to the other. The 'fulfilments' that we find are very different one from another; God has provided alike for 'the wise and the unwise.' In the Palm Sunday Gospel, one will think most of the ass, and another of the gentleness of Him who rode upon it; but both fulfilments are there. About mystical interpretation we may think as we will Belief in it, like belief in inspiration itself, is not so much a belief that we bring to the Bible, as one which we derive from our study of it; and the facts are before us, if we care to look at them. All that we would here urge is that this interpretation, as we find it in the NT, has little in common either with Alexandrian allegorizing, or with the fanciful interpretation of the Rabbis, and is in no way discredited by modern criticism.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE

By Charles Gore

Introduction.—The moral beauty of St. Luke's picture of our Lord's life will be acknowledged on all hands. To it alone we owe a large number of the narrative pictures and records of parables which have fastened themselves most vividly upon the imagination of men—the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Shepherds, the Manger, the Child in the Temple, the Raising of the Widow's Son, Martha and Mary, the Woman who was a Sinner, the Company of Ministering Women, the Rebuke of John, the Good Samaritan, the Rich Fool, the Shepherd with the Lost Sheep upon his shoulders, the Prodigal Son, the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Ten Lepers, the Pharisee and the Publican, the Zeal of Zacchæus, the Weeping over the City, the Prayer of Jesus for His Executioners, the Penitent Thief, the Journey to Emmaus, the Ascension. When we read this list we cease to wonder why legend from the 6th century made St. Luke an artist. Again—now from the spiritual rather than the æsthetic point of view—what a debt we owe to St. Luke who has enriched our records of the Master by so many touches recalling His constant dependence upon the Holy Spirit in His public work and in His inner life, His constant practice of prayer, His horror of riches and love of poverty, and the honour He paid to womanhood, in the most deeply fallen and diseased as well as in the purest and best! There is hardly a cynic to be found who would refuse to cry, Thank God for Luke!

His Gospel is of course only the first of two volumes of one work—the Gospel and the Acts of Apostles—which are covered by the same preface, and which carry the story from the birth of the Forerunner and the birth of the Christ, through His Ministry, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, through the coming of the Spirit to perpetuate His work on earth in the Catholic Church, down to the time when the Gospel had spread from the centre of Judaism which refused the Christ to the centre of the world empire, in which the best heart of man showed signs of welcoming Him—'they will also hear.' And the same characteristics—the same vivid descriptiveness, the same humanity and charity, the same joy in the grace and miraculous power of Christ and His Gospel—are apparent in the whole work. The whole is one Gospel of the grace of God

and of the truest humanism. When the symbols of the 'four beasts' were allotted to the four evangelists, we understand why St. Mark should finally have got the lion and St. John the eagle, but we should have liked St. Luke to have had the man and not the ox.

Authorship.—Second-century tradition unanimously ascribed both books to Luke 'the beloved physician' and companion of St. Paul—a Gentile Christian (as seems clearly implied in Col 4 [10, 11, 14]). And criticism confirms the attribution. The points of this confirmation are the following: (1) that the Gospel and the Acts are by evidence of style and spirit and vocabulary to be assigned to one author; (2) that the author of the *we* sections of the Acts, i.e. the sections which imply that the writer was himself one of St. Paul's company (Ac 16 [10-17], 20 [5-21 18], 27 [1-28 16]), is the author of the whole book, who in his finished work incorporates the notes he had made during his travels with Paul, and is the author therefore of the Gospel as well as of the Acts; (3) that of the companions of St. Paul of whom we hear, no one can be found more likely than Luke to be the author. The evidence of medical knowledge and interest in the Gospel and Acts has been exaggerated; but something remains. What is more obvious is that the author was an educated man of literary habits, and that his compositions betray two influences—the influence of current Hellenistic style and the influence of the Greek Bible. If Luke was, as appears, a Gentile, educated as a physician, who was attracted by Judaism and converted to the New Israel, probably before he became St. Paul's companion, those influences would be very intelligible. Thus the main reasons why we should hold to the tradition of authorship are that there is nothing to account for its unanimity, except its truth, and that the internal evidence is quite agreeable to the tradition. The argument for the unity of the Acts and for the unity of the Gospel with the Acts has been decisive; the best authorities may be said to be Sir John Hawkins (*Horæ Synopticæ*), Sir William Ramsay (*Luke the Physician*), Richard Rackham (*Acts, W.C.*), and Adolf Harnack (*Luke the Physician*). Hobart (*Medical Language of St. Luke*) has been severely cross-examined by Cadbury (*Style and Method of St. Luke*), but he has not reduced the evidence to nothing.

Of Luke we know very little. He is mentioned only three times in the New Testament, and in all three cases in conjunction with his fellow-evangelist Mark (Col 4 [10, 14]; Phm [24]; 2 Tim 4 [11]). He was St. Paul's companion and 'fellow-worker'—not apparently a 'fellow-prisoner,' for Aristarchus and Epaphras are so named, but not Luke. Tradition makes him an Antiochene, and that may well have been the case. He cannot have been one of the Seventy, as the Gospel chosen for his Feast suggests, nor the unnamed companion of Cleopas on the walk to Emmaus, as has been imagined; for his preface clearly implies that like the author of Hebrews (Heb 2 [3, 4]) he was not one of the original witnesses of Christ, but only a hearer of them.

His Method of Composition.—He was by no means the first, he tells us, to attempt to write an account of Christian origins (1 [1]); and the analysis of the Gospel has proved conclusively that he had before him in its composition St. Mark and Q. For this see above, *The Synoptic Problem*. The material of these two documents he appears to have edited freely, but not so as to make substantial alteration in the sense. Down to the beginning of the Passion they account for considerably more than half of his narrative. During the Passion he depends upon St. Mark, but also plainly on some other authority. His account of the appearances after the resurrection depends on no known source. But his preface asserts that accurate knowledge was his object, and that he had diligently followed along with the events by the help of first-hand witnesses; and his experiences as recorded in the Acts, and the names he mentions in both parts of his work, give us very sound hints as to whom he consulted and had for informants. Thus besides Mark himself, and St. Paul from whom he must have learnt much (but who was not an eye-witness of our Lord's Ministry or of the earliest events in the life of the Church), we hear of the circle of ministering women (Lk 8 [2], 23 [49], 24 [10]) with Mary the Mother of Jesus (Ac 1 [14]), and of Mnason an original disciple (Ac 21 [16]), and of Philip one of the Seven (Ac 21 [8, 9]) with whom he had opportunity of intercourse for two years at Cæsarea (Ac 24 [27]), and of Mary the mother of Mark and her slave-girl Rhoda (Ac 12 [12, 13]), and of two people, a man and a woman, from whom he could have got his peculiar information about the court of Herod (Lk 8 [3]; Ac 13 [1]), and of Cleopas to whose testimony we may owe much of 24. At times, as in the first two chapters of his Gospel, we feel he must be using not merely oral information, but a document, different from either Mark or Q. Thus we picture him gathering

information from the 'eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word' at Jerusalem and Cæsarea, and sometimes receiving a written document. It is probable that first he put together his own gathered material, including the vanished document Q, which we may believe to have been a Greek version of the collection made by St. Matthew, consisting mainly of words of the Lord. The internal evidence points to the conclusion that the large portions of Mark, which are incorporated in blocks into the Gospel as we have it, were incorporated into an already existing document; and this 'first draft of Luke' was probably drawn up during the two years of St. Paul's captivity at Cæsarea, A.D. 57-59, (see *The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel*, by V. Taylor, with pref. by Selwyn, S.P.C.K.). Afterwards, during St. Paul's captivity at Rome, when Luke and Mark were brought into close fellowship, the former would have become acquainted with the latter's report of Peter's teaching. The disciples of Jewish Rabbis were accustomed to preserve their masters' teaching, in memory only, with the greatest accuracy; and Mark may have had his Petrine record only 'by heart.' But it would seem much more likely that he had already written it down. Certainly before St. Luke composed his full 'Gospel' he had Mark's document before him. It is supposed by Streeter and Taylor that the first draft of Luke's Gospel did not contain the first two chapters, but that the chronological data at the beginning of 3 with the genealogy mark the beginning of the first draft. It is possible, however, that they only mark the beginning of the Ministry, which was the beginning of the Gospel proper. The material of the first chapters Luke must surely have got in Palestine, probably from the circle of 'the women' or from one of them, and it would then naturally have formed part of his first composition. But the question is not important. The matter of more importance is that Luke at any rate—a Gentile and not a Jew—wrote down what he learned and observed, and did not trust to his memory. Thus as in the Acts we have his 'travel diary' incorporated and probably other brief documents used, so in the Gospel as it lies before us we have collected the record Q, and the other records carefully gathered at Jerusalem and Cæsarea, put into shape probably at Cæsarea itself (Proto-Luke), but completed later—perhaps by the addition of the Nativity record, which, however, must have come from Palestine, and certainly by the Marcan record of the preaching of Peter (see Intro. to Mark).

Date and Trustworthiness.—This account of the origin of Luke's Gospel makes the actual date of the composition of the finished document a matter of no great importance. Rackham and Harnack contend that Acts must have been written up to date, or the book could not have ended so abruptly as it does without a hint given that startling events followed immediately, and that St. Paul's forecast of the future (Ac 20 [25]) was not fulfilled. The present writer thinks this argument very strong. But most writers lay stress on Lk 19 [43], 21 [20] as indicating that the language ascribed to our Lord has been modified by reference to the actual events at the destruction of Jerusalem, and that the Gospel in its present form must date some appreciable time after A.D. 70. The suggestion that the author of the Acts must have used Josephus' *Antiquities*, a book which was not published till A.D. 93, cannot be admitted (see on Ac 5 [36, 37]; *H.D.B.*, i, 30, and Sanday, *Inspiration*, 278). But whether St. Luke wrote his finished Gospel in A.D. 80 or in A.D. 65 has, as regards its trustworthiness, very little importance if it is recognized that St. Luke was a trustworthy historian, who took pains to get at first-hand evidence; that the narrative, so far as it does not depend on Mark, was drawn up at Cæsarea by A.D. 59; and that, whether or no the first draft included 1 and 2, the document or recital contained in those chapters must probably have been already in Luke's hand or mind (see below on 1).

For the trustworthiness of what Luke derives from Mark reference must be made to the Introduction to Mark. There it appears that Luke occasionally shows signs of timidity in reproducing Mark, and softens or omits expressions which seem irreverent to our Lord or disrespectful to the Apostles. That would be of a piece with the tendency of the Acts to ignore the somewhat acute differences among the leaders in the Church which are prominent in Galatians. Luke was certainly a lover of peace, and would shrink from shocking his readers. But we must remember that he does recall the sharp quarrel [*paroxysmus*] between Paul and Barnabas in the Acts, and, in the Gospel, Peter's denial and the 'slowness of heart' of the Twelve in believing in the Resurrection. Again he somewhat modifies the apocalyptic element in our Lord's teaching as reported by Mark, at least in respect of the immediate coming of 'the end,' while Matthew enlarges and emphasizes it. But

there is no appreciable enhancement of the miraculous in his Gospel as compared with Mark; and the bulk of what we owe only to Luke is what mankind has welcomed as most self-evidencing.

As regards the portion of the Gospel which must be judged to have belonged to Q, because it also appears in Matthew, what is chiefly noticeable is that while St. Matthew presents the material in blocks, St. Luke presents it in much smaller fragments, and aims apparently at giving each saying or group of sayings its proper place; though sometimes we shall find isolated utterances without any connexion with what goes before or after. The greater parts of the fresh material which he had gathered for himself in Jerusalem or Cæsarea or elsewhere, he so arranges (9 ^{51}-19 ^{28}) as on first reading to present the appearance of events occurring, or utterances made, in the course of a continuous journey. Closer examination does not justify this impression. But Luke, we gather, is always vague and loose in his chronology. Besides the discourses of our Lord which we owe to Luke alone, his special material is memorable for the narratives of the Birth, the Passion, and the Appearances of the risen Lord.

It should of course be recognized that modern archæology has almost forced upon critics of St. Luke a verdict of remarkable accuracy in all his allusions to secular facts and events—that is, if we reckon the Acts with the Gospel; for this see Rackham, xliv ff., and Sir William Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, and *Was Jesus Born at Bethlehem?* (As to the dating of incidents in the beginning of his Gospel by reference to imperial facts see on 1 ^{1} and 3 $^{1\text{-}2}$). Perhaps the greatest living authority on ancient history, Eduard Meyer, has called the work of Luke 'one of the most important works which remain to us from antiquity' (*Anfänge*, I, viii); and Meyer has certainly no prejudice in favour of religious tradition.

We are bound, then, by all the evidence to approach Luke's Gospel as the work of a competent historian who combined with an enthusiasm for the work of God which he is describing both that sincere desire for accurate information which his preface claims, and the best opportunities for obtaining it. No doubt a reader who approaches it with his mind made up that the supernatural and the miraculous can have no place in history, or at least are not practically credible, will find a way of disposing of the evidence. But an open-minded person will feel the record in the main convincing. Whether here or there he will suppose that imagination has coloured the facts, or a mistaken impression distorted them, will depend upon considerations which vary from person to person, or in the same person from period to period. The impression of veracity both as to the words and works of Christ ought, we conclude, to remain solid throughout.

Luke's Introduction.—Authors for the most part write their introductions after they have finished their books, and so probably did St. John and St. Luke. St. Luke's preface is one masterly sentence in good Greek literary style. It is a model of simplicity, modesty, and brevity. He had before him a number of attempts to draw up a narrative of the 'great fulfilment.' Among these were plainly St. Mark's Gospel and the Q document, consisting mostly of the Lord's words. It would not appear that he had any other documents of a comprehensive kind, but several brief records, such as the Nativity narrative, there probably were. He does not in any way condemn the 'many' documents which already existed, but they did not satisfy him. They left room for another, having exactly the same intention as its predecessors—simply to set down in writing what the original witnesses and evangelists had delivered to the newly founded churches as 'the tradition.' Accordingly he has taken great pains to follow along with (or trace out) the course of events accurately from the beginning. We note that he makes no claim to divine inspiration, though doubtless he was truly inspired, but only to the competence which results from careful investigation and full opportunity. And the way in which he treats the narrative of Mark and Q does not suggest any other claims made on their behalf. He has set to work, then, to construct an orderly and comprehensive narrative (cf. 'all things' and 'in order'). It is certain that Q was neither the one nor the other. And in the light of Q, and still more in the light of what he had himself received from first-hand witnesses, Luke could not have been satisfied with Mark by itself when he read it. Perhaps besides these he had nothing else except fragmentary records. So he has written what we call his Gospel and the Acts—the things which Jesus 'began both to do and teach' when He was visible on earth, and the things He went on doing and teaching through His Spirit in the Church. And he puts it all into the

form of an address or 'open letter' to someone who must have been a Roman official, for he calls him 'Your Excellency' (Ac 23 [26], 24 [3], 26 [25]). Theophilus may have been his real personal name. It was a common enough name alike among Jews (Jedediah) and among Gentiles. But it is as likely as not that St. Luke was writing at Rome; and if a Government official was attached to the Church, it would probably have been inexpedient to publish his real name, and 'Beloved of God' would serve well. It is implied that he was already not ignorant of the Gospel. The word *catechethes*—(informed Ac 21 [21, 24] or instructed Ac 18 [25])—is not decisive, but it is most probable that 'Theophilus' was at least a catechumen of the Church, if not a full member. St. Luke wrote no doubt to give this man in particular the more certain, because the more exact, knowledge of the truth which he was competent to give him, but with his eye on a far wider audience. His whole work is an attractive *apologia pro Christianis* addressed to an influential Roman. Finally, we need only to note that St. Luke falls into line with the rest of the books of the New Testament in that he is not writing to give him or those whom he is addressing first knowledge of the things he is writing about. The preliminary instruction is taken for granted. The object now is to make it more perfect.

We should notice that the word translated 'in order' is applicable to any comprehensive and consecutive composition, and need not imply a strict chronology. Chronology, as we shall discover, is not St. Luke's strong point.

I. 5-II. 52. The Birth of the Forerunner, the Birth of Jesus, and a Picture of His Childhood.—It would appear that (except perhaps the last section) the opening narrative is a translation of Aramaic or Hebrew documents. They are deeply Hebraic and very primitive. The Divine Incarnation is not announced, but only the arrival of the Messiah: and they must surely have been composed before the hope that Israel as a whole would welcome Him had entirely vanished. There are in the Old Testament a few records of births to which something wonderful was attached, and we are reminded here of the birth stories of Isaac (Gen 18), Samson (Jg 13), and Samuel (1 S 1, 2). We suppose, then, that this document must have been drawn up in the primitive Jewish community, probably at Jerusalem. We can hardly doubt that the Psalms are compositions by some poet full of the Hebrew spirit, diction, and method, which we need not doubt expressed the real sentiments of the person into whose mouth they are put, but were put into shape for them. As to the source of the whole narrative and its historical value, see further the art. on *Virgin Birth*, pp. 315 ff. We shall take it for granted that our readers have a copy of the RV with full references, so as to be able to appreciate how reminiscences of the Old Testament occur in almost every verse.

I. 5-25. The Conception of John.—The change of style from preface to narrative is startling. Luke can and does write excellently in the style of the LXX, but here, as has been said, he is probably translating, or using already translated, a document of much earlier date.

5. The Course of Abijah (see 1 Ch 24 [10]) was the 8th of 24. Each Course served in the Temple for a week in turn, and the members drew lots for their functions. The coveted function of burning the incense on the golden altar in the Holy Place at the morning and evening sacrifice could only fall to a priest once in his life. The angel appears to Zachariah between the altar and the golden candlestick. The priest was within the Holy Place—the congregation without.

11. An angel in the Bible who presents himself to a human being appears simply as a man. Whether the 'apparition' was to the outward eye, so that it would have been seen by an indifferent bystander as well as by the subject of it, or whether it was 'subjective,' we cannot determine and need not enquire. It suffices that a real 'word of the Lord' came and was received, and that the spirit of the man entered into real conversation with God. In the experience of the older prophets the communication is direct. Moses and Isaiah see the Lord. In later days Jewish reverence suggested the mediation of angels, and the divine communications are of this type. It would seem that in 'veridical visions,' or real communications from God, while the essential substance is divine, what we may call the clothing of the vision or communication is supplied by the subconscious mind of the subject.

13-14. Cf. Hannah in 1 S 1. John = Johannan—'Jehovah hath been gracious.' The whole of Luke's Gospel is radiant with joy.

15. Cf. Jg 13 [4, 7, 14]. This does not correspond exactly with the requirement of the Nazirites, but cf. *H.D.B.*, iii, 500: for **great** cf. 7 [28]. **filled with the Holy Ghost**: cf. [35, 41, 67] and 2 [27]. The narrative impresses upon us that the coming of the Christ was accompanied with a wide

outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Samson was inspired of the Spirit of God mightily, but in him the gift of supernormal physical strength is taken for a mark of inspiration. Later, in the period of the prophets, the idea of inspiration was deeply spiritualized. But since then for a long period there had been no prophets—no outpourings of the Spirit. Now a new outpouring was manifest.

17. In fulfilment of the prophecy of Mal 4 [5, 6], looking back to Is 63 [16]. The object of the forerunner is to provide a new Israel to welcome the Christ. The Fathers of Israel had become ashamed of their posterity, and the communion of saints needed to be restored.

19. The developed doctrine of angels belongs to later Judaism. Gabriel, 'Man of God,' is named in Dan 8 [16], 9 [21]. In En 1 [40] he is one of the four angels of the Presence, and is 'set over all the powers.' (In Tob 12 [15] we hear first of the seven archangels.) Here he is the angel of revelation; and it was through him that 600 years later Mohammed claimed to have received revelations which appear in the Koran.

20. Zacharias received the sign he asked for ([18]), but in the form of a chastisement.

25. **my reproach**: cf. Gen 30 [23] and 1 S 1 [11]. It should be noticed that not only the songs of Zacharias and Mary and Simeon are in metre, but that [14-17], with much of the Annunciation and Visitation and Presentation stories, have the character of Hebrew poetry.

26-38. The Annunciation.—The narrative is of exquisite loveliness and needs little comment. But the text as it is represented in the RV has been disputed at its central point. A Latin MS. of the 5th century ([e]) is found to omit [34], 'And Mary said . . . seeing I know not a man?' and to substitute [38], 'Behold the handmaid,' which is omitted later. Granted this reading, it is contended, there is no clear indication of a miraculous conception: and this reading may be original (see Streeter's *Four Gospels*, 267). But, apart from all theological questions, on purely critical grounds the suggestion is quite unacceptable, because (1) There is a close parallelism with the earlier narrative of the annunciation to Zacharias: [33]=[17], [34]=[18], [35]=[19] (see Lowther Clarke in *Theology*, August, 1926, 86-87). (2) 'The angel answereth' in [35] assumes a *question* preceding, not an assent. (3) A miracle is assumed in [36-37] like that in the case of Elisabeth, but presumably greater. (4) The definition of Mary as 'virgin' twice over in [27] has significance. Thus on critical grounds the suggestion must be dismissed. On the other hand, the misplacement of [38a] by a careless scribe, and, in consequence, its subsequent omission, is quite intelligible.

28. **highly favoured** or **endued with grace** (*gratia plena*), i.e. a pre-eminent example of divine favour, is repeated in [30]; 'Non ut mater gratiæ, sed ut filia gratiæ appellatur' (Bengel); **Blessed art thou among women**, which occurs in [42], probably is not anticipated here in the true text.

32. John also was to be **great** ([15]), but **Son of the Highest** marks Mary's child as Messiah, the promised offspring of David's line, whose Kingdom should have no end (see 2 S 7 [12-16]; Ps 89 [3, 4, 20-29], 132 [11, 17], 110; Is 9 [6, 7], 11 [1] ff.; Mic 5 [2-4]).

34. Zachariah ([18]) expressed incredulity, asking for a sign. Mary only asks for explanation.

35. The Holy Spirit and power of God is to come, as the overshadowing cloud of Old Testament theophanies, upon Mary, and impart to her the power to conceive a child without the normal male element. **Son of God**, like **Son of the Most High** above, would not to Mary (or to Joseph) convey more than the idea of the promised Messiah to be supernaturally born. 'Wherefore also,' i.e. because supernaturally born, 'he shall be called Holy,' etc.

38. Mary is the second Eve—so 2nd-century Fathers loved to call her. Her obedience reverses Eve's disobedience. The only legitimate attitude of man to God is represented in her word; and (as always) the divine purpose of God for man waits for man's assent and correspondence (cf. [45]).

39-56. The Visitation.—Another lovely story, and most surely a woman's story. Ain Karin, a few miles west of Jerusalem, in a beautiful valley of the hill country, is the traditional scene. Mary would have had to go some eighty miles by the shortest route. Note again the mention of the Holy Spirit ([41]). The coming of the Christ is surrounded by prophesyings. We should believe that the prophesyings, as reported, were uttered in fact. It is only the poetical form of them which we should ascribe to an editor.

42, 43. **Blessed art**: these words are re-echoed by Mary herself ([48]). 'My Lord' is a title of the Messiah in Ps 110 [1] and (according to the MS.) Ps. of Sol. 17 [38].

46. **And Mary said.** The MS. evidence suggests that St. Luke wrote 'she said.' But it is surely absurd to attribute the

song to Elisabeth, with Harnack. [48] (cf. [49]) is enough to show that; and while so much of Hannah's song is reproduced, the reference to the barren woman, so apposite to Elisabeth's case, is omitted.

46-55. The Magnificat is largely based on Hannah's song (1 S 2), but is full of other Old Testament allusions. If this whole group of stories contains real history, they must be based on Mary's witness, and we can feel confident that, whoever actually composed this hymn, it expresses her mind. The glory of it lies in its public-spiritedness. After an expression of thankfulness for the unique divine favour shown to herself, Mary loses thought of herself in the wider thought of the fulfilment of the divine promise, long nourished through evil times in the heart of the humble poor (the 'humble folk who do God's bidding,' Zeph 2 [3]), constantly made sport of by 'the proud,' 'the princes,' 'the rich,' but now at last coming to its triumph in Israel. Mary was a model woman who kept her own counsel, but was full of a noble Jewish patriotism like the mother of the Maccabean martyrs.

56. One can only wonder why she returned home immediately before the crisis of the birth of Elisabeth's child.

57-80. The Birth and Circumcision of John.

62. This is strange, for Zacharias was dumb but not deaf. The Syr. Sin. version has 'they spoke to his father.' But dumb people are so often deaf also that the mistake is not unnatural.

66. **laid them up in their heart:** cf 2 [19, 51].

67-79. The Benedictus, a sort of poetic summary of Old Testament prophecy by an old man, for the moment at least both priest and prophet. The first stanza ([68-75]) summarizes the ancient prophecies of the reign of God in His people Israel, and proclaims the arrival of their fulfilment. It bears upon it the stamp of days before Israel had rejected the Christ. The last stanza ([76-79]) proclaims the vocation of the Forerunner, now an eight-days-old infant, in view of an immediate revelation of God's love and power.

69. **horn**: a symbol of effective strength (cf. 1 S 2 [10]; Ps 18 [2]). The phrase = a mighty Saviour.

76. Once again, after centuries of silence (Ps 74 [9]), the voice of the prophet is to be heard in Israel.

77. The prerequisite of the Great Salvation is fundamental repentance and forgiveness. This was in effect John Baptist's theme.

80. Note the contrast with the phrase descriptive of the childhood of Jesus. There is nothing here about 'favour with men.' He was an ascetic of the desert—a solitary. **shewing**: the word is used of the proclamation of an official on his assumption of office; here of John's self-announcement, like the old prophets, under the pressure of the Word of the Lord. He appears suddenly as the new Elijah.

II. 1-20. The Birth of the Saviour: its Proclamation by the Angels: its Verification by the Shepherds.—The fact of the Birth at Bethlehem has been for long years contemptuously rejected by foreign and some English criticism (Renan, for instance, begins his Life of Jesus with the words, 'Jesus was born at Nazareth'), and the reason alleged by the evangelist (or his source) for bringing Joseph and Mary to 'the city of David' has been widely ridiculed. How could such a method of taking a census have been practicable? But a quite new face was put upon the matter by the discovery among the Oxyrhynchus papyri of an order (A.D. 104) of a Prefect of Egypt running thus: 'Seeing that the time has come for the house-to-house census, it is necessary to compel all those who for any cause whatsoever are residing out of their nome to return to their own homes that they may carry out the regular order of the census' (Deissmann, *Licht von Osten*, 201; Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, 72). This and other discoveries of census documents have caused Luke's statement to assume historical importance in books concerned only with Augustus's administration of the provinces (e.g. Pelham's *Outlines of Roman History*, 385; see also Ramsay as below). There was a regular cycle of censuses every fourteen years. Probably they go back to (about) the date required by Luke. Herod may very probably have felt himself compelled, like another 'rex socius' in A.D. 36 (Tacitus, *Ann.*, vi, 41) to institute a census for the satisfaction of the Emperor. Luke distinguishes this census as 'first' no doubt with reference to the later census which, as connected with taxation, caused an uprising (Ac 5 [37]). At present there would have been no question of taxation by Rome. Also Mommsen found evidence of an earlier Governorship of Quirinius (4 to 2 B.C.), but after, not before, Herod's death. Tertullian, however, expressly says that it is certain that the census recorded by Luke took place 'per Sentium Saturninum.' So it would appear probable that Luke made a mistake as to the date when Quirinius succeeded to Saturninus. Ramsay, however, does not admit this. The whole matter is full of

controversial detail, and may be studied in Ramsay's *Bearings of Recent Discovery*, xix-xxi, which (with its reflections on 'advanced critics') is very well worth study. The outcome of the whole controversy is that no one is entitled to laugh at Luke's statement (or, perhaps we should say, the statement of the document he quotes), even if it be not perfectly accurately worded.

4. We must suppose that Joseph had some property in Bethlehem, but [39] implies that he was more than *visiting* his espoused wife in Nazareth: they were both *living* there. By taking her away with him, 'great with child' as she was, he made her effectively his wife and her child his own, according to Jewish ideas. What exigencies led to his taking her to the inn we cannot say.

7. 'Every male that openeth the womb' (Ex 13 [2, 12]) is a 'firstborn,' whether there be others born afterwards or not. In Justin's tradition the manger was in a cave. It should be noted that in the New Testament it is only the conception, not the birth, which is marked as miraculous.

8-20. The story of the shepherds. All the world loves it. Some consider it beautiful romance and some true history. Our verdict will depend on how far we believe the Spirit of truth 'brooded over' the record of the Christian origins, and how far we believe that there was an inventive genius in the earliest Jewish Church capable of an imaginative effort of such a high order.

10. to all the people, i.e. Israel.

14. The RV follows the Vulgate reading, 'hominibus bonæ voluntatis.' (The Greek New Testaments first printed were from very late MSS., and the Vulgate again and again presents a better text.) But the excellent phrase 'men of good will,' based on the Vulgate, does not represent its real meaning. It means 'men in whom God is well pleased.' 'There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked.' For the whole phrase cf. Lk 19 [38].

17. The story of the excited shepherds created a temporary astonishment in the village. But Mary kept a resolute silence.

21. The Circumcision.—From a modern Jewish Service of Circumcision Oesterley quotes: 'From the eighth day and henceforth may his blood be accepted, and may the Lord his God be with him.' Thus the Circumcision is a prelude of the Cross.

'The year begins with Thee,
And Thou begin'st with woe;
To let the world of sinners see
That blood for sin must flow.'

The ceremony need not have taken them to Jerusalem. That was their own choice. But the emphasis is on the name rather than on the rite. 'Jesus' is the Greek form of 'Joshua'='Jehovah is Salvation.' (Circumcision, we should observe, should never be made parallel to Baptism. It is the keeping of the Law, not the entrance into the Covenant. Its proper Christian parallel is mortification, as in the Collect.)

22-38. Presentation in the Temple.—Another lovely picture—the humble peasants with the poor man's offering, the inspired old man with the child of world-wide hope in his arms, and the still older matron. It is full of symbolism, and there is nothing to hinder its being true to fact.

22. their purification: in spite of the grammar 'their' must refer to the mother and child. Thus it became them to fulfil all legal requirements. Strictly, of course, the mother was 'purified,' the child 'redeemed.' They need not have gone to Jerusalem, but it was near. For the obligation see on Lev 12 [4-8] and Ex 13 [2, 12, 15]: cf. 22 [29], 34 [19, 20]; Nu 3 [13], 8 [16].

to present him: cf. the Collect in the Prayer Book. Jewish tradition connects this redemption of the firstborn with consecration to priesthood (Box, *Virgin Birth*, 96 ff.).

25. The Consolation of Israel='the days of the Messiah' in Rabbinical phraseology. Note the frequent allusion to the Holy Spirit.

29. The words for 'lord' and 'servant' are properly 'master' and 'slave.' Unlike our modern instinct the New Testament treasures such conceptions, however incomplete.

32. Simeon's prevision goes beyond that of the angelic choir of 2 [10]: cf. especially Is 49 [6].

33. According to Jewish ideas Joseph was 'his father.' So here and elsewhere such phrases are used by Luke. But it is noticeable that the like phrases never occur in Mark, who has no record or suggestion concerning the birth such as would guard their meaning.

34. Cf. Jn 9 [39]. So much would have been anticipated (see Is 8 [14]; Zeph 1 [12], 2 [3]). **a sign:** cf. Is 11 [12], 13 [2] LXX.

35. Following the great hymn *Stabat Mater*, we naturally treat this verse as a prophecy of the Crucifixion; but any such sifting of Israel and partial rejection as Simeon's words imply would account for this parenthetic anticipation of sharp pain to the mother: the divine purpose is to let the secret hearts of all men appear

clearly by their attitude towards the Christ.

36. Anna is a representative of the northern tribes. She is described as being not less than 106 years old.

39. St. Luke plainly has no idea of the long intervening series of incidents recorded in Mt 2. And 'their city' implies that they had *both* lived at Nazareth before.

40-52. The Childhood and the Visit to the Temple.—The first and last verses are of the greatest value: they present us with our Lord as **becoming full of wisdom** (margin) and **advancing in wisdom** as in stature. As He appears among the doctors He is presented to us as a child of astonishing promise: and later He was found universally attractive (52). The reply of the youthful Jesus to His Mother in 49 is of special value, because it indicates already a sense that God only was His Father in such sense as made Him even in childhood independent in a measure of His parents and of other outside influences. The mother, as always in history, stands for the claims of home. But the reply does not, as some have supposed, seem to disown Joseph as His father physically, so as to exhibit knowledge of the circumstances of His birth. However, that must remain among the hidden things.

50. This is very natural. The parents knew that He was the predestined Christ: but they might still fail to understand this and much else in His conduct and words.

51 beautifully indicates that the independence of 49 did not mean any lack of obedience or considerateness. It is probable that Joseph, of whom we hear here for the last time, died before our Lord's public ministry.

III. 1-20. The Preaching of John the Baptist.—'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ' was the preaching of John (see on Mk 1 1-4). Luke marks the point with an elaborate chronological note. On the idea that 'proto-Luke' began at this point see above, p. 209*a*.

1. If the **fifteenth year** is reckoned from Tiberius's association with Augustus in the imperial position throughout the provinces ('ut æquum ei jus in omnibus provinciis esset') in A.D. 13, or 11 (Mommsen), it would bring us to 27 or 25 (*H.D.B.*, i, 406). Pilate was procurator from A.D. 26. Herod Antipas and Philip received their tetrarchies in 4 B.C. Lysanias was the name of a king of Abilene who was put to death in 36 B.C.; but there is evidence of a later Lysanias tetrarch (Ramsay, *op. cit.*, 297 f., and below, *Chronol.*, p. 731*a*). Annas had been deposed from the high-priesthood formally, and Caiaphas substituted (A.D. 15 to 18), but the former practically retained control. John, however (18 13), appears to correct Luke. Luke seems anxious to give both here and in 2 1 rather the political background than exact chronology.

3-17. On John's mission see below, pp. 280-281; also on Mt 3. Luke's account depends on Q and borrows a phrase 'baptism of repentance unto remission of sins' from Mark, but he has independent information. We should notice that while Matthew describes 'ye offspring of vipers,' etc., as addressed to 'many of the Pharisees and Sadducees' (cf. 12 34, 23 33), Luke says 'to the multitudes'; he also adds (10-14) to John's preaching an account of his answers to the enquiries of different classes as to their duty—quite on the lines of the old prophets.

14. **be content with your wages** is not contrasted, as commonly supposed, with wanting higher wages, but with pillaging the people in addition to their wages.

15. cf. Jn 1 19 f.

16. **and with fire.** The addition of 'fire' to 'Holy Spirit' is not in Mark, and seems to obscure the sense. It was to be the function of the Christ to give not merely the ceremonial cleansing, but the effective gift (cf. Jn 3 5; Ac 11 16). 'Fire' is apparently expository of 'Spirit'—at once cleansing and consuming. In Is 33 14 it is the coming of God, to His true people's infinite delight, which is to the wicked 'devouring fire' and 'everlasting burnings.'

18, 20. **The Imprisonment of John.**—This statement might give the impression that the imprisonment followed immediately, and Jn 3 24 corrects this impression. On the event see Mk 6 17 and Mt 14 3.

21-22. **The Baptism of Jesus**: see on Mk 1 9 f. and Mt 3 13 f.—The special features in Luke are (1) the characteristic addition of 'and praying,' and (2) the giving the Holy Spirit bodily form. Mark and Matthew say only that *Jesus* saw the vision of the Spirit descending as a dove. Jn 1 32 represents *John also* as seeing the vision. Luke gives it more definitely corporate form.

22. A 'Western' reading is 'Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee,' but the omission of *agapetos* in the first clause, as well as the substitution in the second, strongly suggests assimilation to Ps 2 7. On *agapetos* as meaning 'only' see on Mark. The divine utterance involves a reference to Ps 2 (the anointed

king) and to Is 42 [1] (the servant). In the latter passage LXX translates 'my soul has received him and welcomed him.' Here it is 'in whom I have found satisfaction.' The descent of the Holy Spirit was our Lord's ordination to His ministry: now 'he began' (23).

23-28. The Genealogy: see *Virgin Birth*, p. 318.—Matthew (see p. 130) intends to give the throne-succession, St. Luke the actual descent. St. Luke probably had an Aramaic or Hebrew document differing from Matthew, but added to it the links from Abraham back to Adam. This is characteristic. It declares the universality of Christ the second Adam, and suggests perhaps a miraculous creative act in the generation of the second as of the first.

IV. 1-13. The Temptation of Christ: see below, p. 281*a*; also on Mt 4 [1-11].—Here only the specially Lucan points are touched. It is not apparent why he alters the order of the second and third temptations in Q (which is probably rightly preserved in Matthew; see 'Get thee hence, Satan'), nor why he omits the reference (see Mk 1 [13] and Mt 4 [11]) to angelic ministrations. In the second temptation he introduces words (6) which make very distinct the conception of Satan as still in some sense retaining, and misusing, an authority over this world originally entrusted to him by God. This idea of the fall of the angels provides a background for the fall of man which is deeply suggestive. The universe was already spoilt before man came into it. Also the final words 'for a season' (only in Luke) are noticeable. Not only now did Jesus feel 'the power of darkness' (22 [53]).

The three temptations provided answers to the three questions: (1) Why, if Jesus was the Christ, would He not protect Himself? (Mt 26 [53]; Mk 15 [31]). (2) Why did He not work such a 'sign from heaven' as would compel belief? (Instead, He trusted to moral authority, backed only by miracles of mercy, and once a symbolical miracle of judgement.) (3) Why did He choose the way of the Cross instead of the normal ways to earthly sovereignty?

14-15. The Departure to Galilee.—Here Luke is clearly unconscious, like Mark and Matthew, of the earlier ministry of Jesus in Galilee and Jerusalem, recorded by John.

16, 30. The Rejection at Nazareth.—This section clearly corresponds with Mk 6 [1-6] and Mt 13 [54-58]. It is not contradictory but quite independent. Luke suggests that the visit occurred near the beginning of the Galilean ministry, which he knows (23) had actually begun at Capernaum. The passage is very striking. Jesus was rejected at His own village—from jealousy at the fame and popularity of one whom they despised as a person they knew all about (Mk 6 [3]), and (in this passage) because He seemed so lacking in local patriotism. With the scene in the synagogue we naturally cf. Ac 13 [16] ff.

19. Jesus omits the end of the verse 'and the day of vengeance of our God.' For the present it was the day of opportunity. But the day of judgement was to come (21 [22], 11 [49] f.). On this verse has been based the idea that our Lord's ministry—'the acceptable year of the Lord'—lasted only one year according to Luke (see *Chronology*, p. 731*a*). The fact seems rather to be that St. Luke does not trouble himself about exact chronology. The suggested interpretation of this verse is a perverse literalism. The 4th Gospel gives us a much more prolonged ministry; and considerations of psychology—the 'slowness' of the disciples—seem to require it for their training.

22. On 'Joseph's son' see p. 318.

23. This reference to Capernaum is curious, for the first visit to Capernaum which Luke records follows this visit to Nazareth. Some are bold enough to refer to Jn 4 [46] ff.

31-44. A Sabbath in Capernaum: Divers Miracles.—In all these incidents Luke follows Mark, and we shall only comment on the variations he introduces. He does not use Mark's Calling of the Four Disciples, but has a quite independent narrative (5 [1-11]).

40. For Mark 'he healed many' he substitutes **every one of them.**

44. For 'Galilee' most important MSS. substitute 'Judæa.' It is very difficult to account for the substitution by a scribe of 'Judæa' for 'Galilee'; but, on the other hand, Luke is following Mark here, and to introduce Judæa is to introduce an alien idea. Some suppose that he uses 'Judæa' for 'Palestine' as a whole (cf. 1 [5], 7 [17]; Ac 2 [9]). But why should he have substituted it for Mark's word?

Here we are in the presence of abundant instances of demoniacal possession, and find clear evidence not only that the people and the evangelists accepted them as real, but that our Lord Himself did. Sometimes, indeed, He spoke about the devils in parables (11 [24]), and sometimes His actions with regard to them may have been misunderstood (see on 8 [32]); but on the whole there is no room for doubt that Jesus Himself accepted as a fact the

activity of both good and evil spirits, and intended us to accept it (cf. the clauses of the Lord's Prayer as in Matthew, which, rightly punctuated, bids us think, every time we pray, of spirits in heaven, continually honouring God's name, adorning God's Kingdom, and doing God's will). Moreover, it is not a matter of natural knowledge but of spiritual insight. In His positive spiritual teaching our Lord speaks consistently as one infallible. We cannot therefore reject the belief in spirits good or bad, and their activity as mere delusion, without serious consequences. Moreover, it is to be had in mind that our most experienced missionaries commonly declare that within their own experience they find the evidence of diabolic possession irresistible.

V. 1-11. **The Miraculous Draught of Fishes.**—Here St. Luke begins and ends with passages closely resembling Mk 4 [1] and 1 [19-20]—the call of the two pairs of brothers, Simon and Andrew, James and John, whom he introduces quite incidentally. But he supplies a quite independent motive for their leaving all and following Jesus—namely, the deep impression of awe and sinfulness made upon Simon Peter by the miraculous draught, and the amazement in the whole group. It is gratuitous to suggest that the miracle described in Jn 21 [1-14] is a doublet of that here described by Luke. John no doubt knew Luke's account and records the later incident, differing in its particulars in so many respects, as an action of the risen Lord recalling to the mind of the disciple an unforgotten experience of the early ministry. That is implied in the words in which 'that disciple whom Jesus loved' recognized Him by His action, and "saith unto Peter, It is the Lord.' To come back to Luke's story. Few narratives are so full of encouragement to workers in the cause of the Kingdom, liable as they are to a sense of hopelessness due to failure in their efforts—'we have toiled all night and taken nothing.' It prepares us also for Ac 10, where again Peter is called to 'launch out into the deep,' and helped by a sign.

8. For the effect upon Peter cf. Job 42 [5, 6] and Is 6 [5]. The realized nearness of the divine power generates a sense of terror and sinfulness (cf. Otto's *Idea of the Holy*, viii). But it passes into the will of surrender and renunciation (11). This is the first instance in which Luke notes the value in our Lord's eyes of absolute renunciation (cf. 14 [25-35]).

Then follows the second 'Marcan insertion': 5 [12]-6 [11].

12-16. **The Leper Healed:** see on Mk 1 [40-45] and Mt 8 [1-4].—Note that St. Luke here inserts (last words) 'and prayed,' but had omitted them previously (4 [42]) where Mark inserted them (1 [35]). We need not suppose that Luke literally copied Mark. Where he used his narrative, he rewrote it, having it fully in mind.

17-26. **The Paralytic Healed:** see on Mk 2 [1-12]; Mt 9 [1-8], where all its deeply interesting features are commented on.

17. Luke alone notes the presence of what looks like a deputation from Jerusalem to take observations, mingling with the ecclesiastical authorities of the neighbourhood. Observe that the healing power of Jesus is apparently ascribed to the Lord, i.e. the Father.

19. **through the tiles.** Luke seems to be adapting Mark's words for the benefit of readers not familiar with the flat mud roofs of Palestine.

24. Nothing seems more gratuitous than the denial that our Lord from the beginning of His ministry, while His Messiahship was being studiously concealed, called Himself by the non-committal title of 'the Son of man' or 'the man': see below, pp. 290*b*-291*a*.

27-39. **The Call of Levi and the Conversation about Fasting:** see on Mk 2 [13-22]; Mt 9 [9-17].—In Mark it is Christ's conduct which is called in question, not that of the disciples.

32. May we dare to regret Luke's insertion of the words to repentance? No doubt the call is to repentance; but the point is that the call of Jesus goes out only to those whose conscience refuses to allow them to think of themselves as righteous.

34. This lovely comparison of the disciples to the sons of the bride-chamber round the bridegroom—a happy company forgetting themselves in order to do honour to their companion—warrants in a measure Renan's famous description of the early ministry as an 'idyllic' period.

39. The parables of the new cloth on the old garment and the new wine in the old bottles are quite intelligible and full of significance as indicating the depth of the change which Jesus demanded in the religious world. But how about this verse which Luke alone adds? Is it simply that he knew of a fragmentary utterance of the Lord which he introduces here, as we shall find him doing elsewhere, without any real connexion—in this case because it concerned old wine and new, though the meaning was quite different? Or may it not really have belonged here, and been intended forcibly to represent

to the Pharisees the perils of mere conservatism? Conservatism draws on a long experience in order to disparage novelties. It appeals to the wisdom of many generations and the approved value of tradition. But it quenches all sense of the need of something new. Christ had come offering something new and demanding a fresh start, and they had not the smallest desire for anything of the sort.

VI. **1-5. Plucking the Ears of Corn on the Sabbath:** see on Mk 2 [23-28]; Mt 12 [1-8].

1. RVm retains the reading of some MSS., *deutero-proto*, 'the second-first Sabbath.' It has been a puzzle from ancient days. But for that very reason it may be the right reading, even if inexplicable to us. St. Gregory of Nazianzus made a joke about it—that he had sooner explain it in the pulpit, because when you are addressing a crowd it is easier to explain what you do not understand than when you are meeting an individual questioner.

5. Here again it is gratuitous to suggest that our Lord did not refer to Himself as Son of man, but meant only that 'a man' or 'mankind' is Lord of the Sabbath. There is no example in the Gospels of His recognizing in men generally a right to ignore a divine ordinance, such as He recognized the Sabbath to be. A traditional saying perhaps to this effect is quoted below, p. 279*b*, but there is nothing quite like it in the Gospels. What He taught was (1) that the purpose of God in this ordinance had been misunderstood; (2) that general laws admit of exceptions under necessity; (3) that He Himself had authority to reinterpret or even supersede earlier divine ordinances.

6-11. The Sabbath and the Withered Hand: see on Mk 3 [1-6]; Mt 12 [9-14].—Luke omits Mark's words 'with anger,' probably as disparaging to the Lord (see above, p. 209*b*). In [6] he adds right hand to Mark. 'The medical mind,' says Ramsay, 'demands such specification.'

11. We should note that the Pharisees had accumulated grievances against Jesus —that He claimed to forgive sins; that He consorted with publicans and sinners; that He neglected fasting; and finally that He broke or commended the breaking of the Sabbath.

12-19. The Appointment of the Twelve: see on Mk 3 [13-19].

12. Note the emphasis on the praying before the ordaining.

13. Luke adds to Mark 'whom also he named apostles.' Apostles means simply 'envoys' or 'missionaries.' In the first Jerusalem Church it had no doubt become a technical name for the Twelve. That Christ now intended them to be 'apostles' is implied in the very fact that He proceeded to send them out, like the Seventy later. Whether more than that is true may be left uncertain.

15. **the Zealot:** cf. Ac 22 [3], where Paul calls himself a 'zealot of God.' But here it seems to mean that the extreme militant party, later known by that name, was already in existence, and that Simon belonged to it. The variations in the naming of one of the Twelve is remarkable. He is called Thaddæus by Mark and Matthew, but 'Judas of James' here and in Ac 1 [13]. And the confusion becomes greater if we take note of the alternative name *Lebbæus* in Mt 10 [3] AV. Luke, we observe, takes no notice of the identity of Matthew with the Levi of 5 [27]; and not one of the evangelists identifies Bartholomew with John's 'Nathanael.' Nothing is more remarkable in the history of the earliest Church than that most of the Apostles seem to have excited no individual interest, and remain to us names and nothing more—in this case even the name being involved in doubt.

17-19. The last of these verses recalls Mk 5 [30]. It seems to describe a healing power in the body of Jesus, responsive, without any action of His will, to the touch of the sick. The rest is only in Luke. Like Matthew he notes the presence of a great multitude immediately before the sermon which follows. Matthew seems to suggest that He withdrew from the multitude up a mountain to instruct His disciples alone; but at the end (7 [28]) the multitude is still with Him. Luke, on the other hand, makes Him come down from the mountain, whither He had gone to pray, and where He had specially appointed the Twelve, till He got to a 'level place' where the multitudes thronged Him, and where He addressed His disciples in their presence. But 'the level place' might only have been a fold in the mountain. Luke's account reads like that of an eye-witness.

20-49. The Great Sermon.—It will be assumed that the reader has studied Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, and comment here will be limited to what is peculiar to Luke. It is fairly certain that Matthew groups together, according to his custom, discourses or 'words' which were in fact delivered, as Luke represents, on different occasions. Thus the sermon in Luke is one consecutive whole. In Matthew, 5 [13-37], the whole of 6, and 7 [6-14] appear to interrupt it. Luke in this respect

represents Q more accurately. And his introduction to the sermon suggests the information of an eye-witness. But even where the general meaning of Luke's sermon coincides with that of Matthew, the differences are considerable. In answer to the question—raised here and elsewhere—Which gives us more exactly the words of Christ? Dr. Burney (see *The Poetry of our Lord*) is surely right in laying stress on the poetical or rhythmical form of our Lord's teaching (p. 84); on the whole, though not without exception, Matthew preserves the rhythmical forms better, Luke more often reducing them from Hebrew poetry to Greek prose. This means that Matthew is generally, though not always, nearer to the *ipsissima verba* (p. 88). But we must also recognize that our Lord would probably often have repeated the same instructions in slightly different forms—so that, for example, the Beatitudes in Luke and those in Matthew may quite well both be authentic, and both forms of the Lord's Prayer. (On the Beatitudes, however, see Burney, 167-168.)

20-26. Luke's **Beatitudes** differ from Matthew's in being (1) specifically addressed to the group of the disciples ('ye') considered as poor, hungry, sorrowful, and destined to be hated and boycotted 'for the Son of man's sake,' and (2) accompanied by corresponding woes on the rich ('you that are rich'), prosperous, joyful, and popular. The especial stress thus laid on the evils of wealth, which is frequent in Luke's representation of the Lord's teaching, is, we cannot doubt, true to the fact. But it is not *mere* poverty that our Lord blesses, but the poverty of a particular group 'for the Son of man's sake.'

22. separate you, i.e. excommunicate (cf. Jn 16 [2]).

26. Cf. Jn 5 [44], where our Lord exposes the danger of living by the standard of 'good form.'

27-38. On the Right Attitude towards Enemies.—Our Lord expresses Himself proverbially: and proverbs (in all nations) often illustrate the meaning intended by an extreme example. Such an example cannot be translated literally into a universal rule (see below, p. 285). We notice that our Father's 'mercy,' which we are to imitate ([35. 36]), is compatible with judgement where occasion demands it. But the point is obvious that Christ's flock are individually to go to the extreme in self-suppression and joyful endurance of wrong, and to let no ill-treatment affect their unalterable benevolence to those who wrong them (cf. 1 P 2 [18] ff.).

35. never despairing: this is the usual meaning of the word. But the AV 'hoping for nothing again' is what the antithesis 'from whom ye hope to receive' suggests, and the word may well have borne this meaning also.

37. This refusal to judge on our own account is compatible with a readiness to announce or apply divine judgements, when we are sure they are divine, like the prophets and our Lord Himself.

38. This appeal to experience—'measure for measure'—was a favourite one with Jewish teachers.

39-49. Warnings to Teachers and Others: see on Mt 15 [14], 7 [3] ff.

40. This saying is also in Mt 10 [24], but in a quite different sense. Here it gives the true principle of teaching—that it should not proceed from the position of a 'superior person' dogmatically informing one permanently inferior, but that it should recognize a spiritual equality, and enable the taught to rise to the level of the teacher, as St. Paul explains (Col 1 [28]). 'Perfected' here=fully equipped. It is a vital Christian principle that there is in Christianity no 'esotericism'—no higher knowledge confined to a superior class—no 'ecclesia docta' essentially distinguished from the 'ecclesia discens.' And as soon as we recognize the principle of spiritual brotherhood between teacher and taught, we recognize also the inseparability of teaching from character. The teacher is not a mere voice imparting an abstract doctrine, but a person influencing a person ([41] ff.). A bad man may, as far as words go, utter true doctrine, but his real self is sure at last to find expression ([43]).

VII. **1-10. The Centurion's Servant:** see on Mt 8 [5-13].—The differences between Matthew and Luke in detail are remarkable; probably Luke is giving Q more fully and accurately than Matthew, who abbreviates narratives. In Luke only are we given (1) the introduction of the centurion, as a well-disposed and liberal pagan, to Jesus by 'the elders of the Jews' ([4-5]), and (2) the mission of his friends as intermediaries ([6]). But if the great 'universalist' saying, with which Matthew the Jew concludes his narrative, was in Q, we cannot see why Luke the Gentile should omit it. The words of the centurion in both reports are most remarkable. Just as he himself has under Herod an authority in the army which in its sphere is absolute, so he sees in Jesus under the supreme God like absolute authority in the world of nature within His sphere. The authenticity of these words is unmistakable, and so is the recognition by Jesus of the

equal power of faith, whether in Jew or Gentile, to win blessing from God. We gather from Luke here and in 23 47 and Ac 10 1 and 23 17 a favourable impression of centurions, which is confirmed by Polybius, vi, 249. There are many features of the case distinguishing it from that in Jn 4 46 ff.

11-17. The Widow's Son Raised.—This is from Luke's own 'collection.' It is a supreme example of the pity that has power in it: cf. the Collect for XI after Trinity. For the word of power (14) cf. Jn 11 43. 'Judæa' in 17=Palestine. The narrative is added here to give point to the reference in 22 to the dead being raised up. Jairus's daughter (8 41 ff.), like Eutychus in Ac 20 10, was possibly not really dead; but no doubt can be admitted as to this case. As in His dealings with the leper, our Lord ignores the ceremonial pollution involved in touching leper or bier.

13. Neither Mark nor Matthew call Jesus the Lord before the Resurrection. But Luke does so frequently (see 10 1, 11 39, etc.). And he represents Peter as so calling Him (12 41).

18-23. The Message of the Baptist: see on Mt 11 2-6.—Luke makes no mention of John being in prison, but he had been imprisoned by Herod in the fortress of Machærus, east of the Dead Sea, because, according to Josephus, Herod was afraid his influence would lead to an insurrection. That John, helpless, forsaken, and in solitude, should have experienced doubts as to what he had once enthusiastically believed is quite natural. For our Lord's reference to Is 61 1 cf. 4 18. Streeter thinks that to show the relation of John to Jesus was one of the chief aims of Q—whence this and the following passage.

24-35. The Testimony of Jesus to John: see on Mt 11 7-19.—Luke inserts 29, 30 as to what classes did and what did not accept the teaching of John. We may harmonize the conclusion of Matthew with that of Luke by saying that the wisdom of God's action is justified outwardly by its visible effects, and inwardly in the minds of those who have spiritual vision.

36-50. The Anointing of the Feet of Jesus.—Probably to be distinguished from the anointing in the house of Simon the leper (Mk 14 3-9; Mt 26 6 ff.); recorded also (with correction as to the woman's action and identification of the woman with Mary of Bethany) by Jn 12 1-8. Mary may well have heard of this earlier action, so favourably received by Jesus, and repeated it at the supper at Bethany shortly before the Passion. The chief reason for supposing Luke's story to refer to the same occasion is that in each account the host is named Simon. But it was a common name. Luke's account is quite independent and strongly marked by his characteristics. In no case is there the least ground for accepting Gregory the Great's identification of the woman who was a sinner or Mary of Bethany with Mary of Magdala. Plainly Luke does not identify them. They appear to be three distinct women. Gregory's view has been rejected by many later Roman Catholic scholars, especially in France (cf. *H.D.B.*, iii, 283).

36. Luke loves to mention these entertainments given to Jesus by Pharisees and publicans (cf. 11 37, 14 1 ff., 19 5 ff.).

37. The city is probably Capernaum. Bottles of ointment are said to have been commonly carried by ladies (cf. Is 3 20).

47. We are to understand the loving act of the woman as the outcome of her sense of forgiveness—which she may perhaps have received only as she listened to the preaching of Jesus. Here we have only the public announcement of her absolution. The forgiveness is represented distinctly in 47 as the *cause*, not the result, of her loving action. The host is presumably suggested by the one 'who loveth little,' because in his own estimation he had little need of forgiveness. The beautiful story requires little comment, but deep consideration. There has been controversy over this passage as to the relation of faith and love in winning forgiveness. But the lesson of the passage, as of many others, is that the faith which does not inevitably issue in love is no real faith such as Jesus blessed. We notice again and again the welcome which He gives to *acts* of love.

VIII. 1-3. **The Ministering Women.**—Only in Luke. The part played by Mary of Magdala at the burial and resurrection is by him alone not mentioned. The preaching tour was presumably in Galilee. The disease of Mary is only mentioned here and in the later appendix to Mk 16 9. From Joanna Luke presumably gets information about Herod (cf. Lk 23 55). Other information he may have got from Mary Magdalene.

4-15. The Parable of the Sower and explanation: see on Mk 4 1-20; Mt 13 1-23. —Luke shortens Mark. Notice, however, the phrases (15) 'in an honest and good heart' (*kalos kagathos* is the Greek for 'a gentleman') and 'with patience.'

16-18. Parable of the Lamp: see on Mk 4 21-25.

19-21. His Mother and His Brethren:

see on Mk 3 [31-35]; Mt 12 [46-50].—Again Luke shortens Mark. For [21] cf. 11 [28].

22-25. The Stilling of the Storm: see on Mk 4 [35-41]; Mt 8 [23-27].—Mark's interesting details omitted.

26-39. The Gadarene Demoniacs: see on Mk 5 [1-20]; Mt 8 [28-34].—Again details are omitted. The only original point is in [31] **into the abyss**, in place of Mark's 'out of the country.' This record is of a piece with the other healings of demoniacs. The point of them all is the demonstration of the supreme power of Jesus over evil spirits. But in this case it is easy to see that the supposed permission given by Jesus to the devils to go into the swine may easily be due to some gesture of His, mistaken by Mark's informant, presumably Peter. The terror of the swine is not difficult to account for.

40-56. Jairus's Daughter and the Issue of Blood: see on Mk 5 [21-43]; Mt 9 [18-26].—Luke appears to soften Mark's phrase about the impotence of the physicians. But he leaves the phrase which suggests a healing power in Jesus' clothes going forth from Him without any specific act of His will.

IX. 1-6. The Mission of the Twelve: see on Mk 6 [6-13]; Mt 9 [35]-10 [1].—Luke abbreviates or incorporates Mark with these notable differences: The words 'by two and two' are transferred to the mission of the Seventy. Stress is laid on the purpose of the mission—'to preach the kingdom of God' or 'the Gospel.' And he changes Mark's 'a staff only' into 'no staff.' This last may be a mere mistake—a failure in correct recollection of Mark's words. And the definition of the purpose may be only a correct inference from Mark's 'that men should repent.' Luke also omits the interesting detail about the use of unction by the Twelve as a means of healing.

It is a momentous addition to the idea of Christ's healing power that He should be able to transfer it to others. St. Luke, we notice, adds 'power' to Mark's 'authority.'

It is an important moment when the Twelve, first chosen to be 'with Jesus' (Mk 3 [14]), supported all together by the Faithful Women, are now dispersed—in pairs, Mark tells us—with independent authority and powers delegated from Christ, on the mission of the Gospel, and dependent on the hospitality of those to whom they are to preach.

7-9. Herod's Perplexity: see on Mk 6 [14-16]; Mt 14 [1-2].—Herod's anxiety is connected with the extension of Christ's work by the mission of the Apostles. It is to be remarked that Luke, with special information about Herod, does not countenance the idea that *he* imagined Christ to be 'John the Baptist risen from the dead.' Luke treats that as only a popular phantasy. In Herod what he heard led only to curiosity (see 23 [8]).

10-17. Return of the Twelve: Feeding of the Five Thousand: see on Mk 6 [30-37]; Mt 14 [13-21]; Jn 6 [1-14].—Luke abbreviates Mark—it strikes us as rather perfunctorily. If he only got possession of Mark's narrative after he had written his first draft, he would doubtless have been hindered in his use of it by the limitation of the containing capacities of his roll. In [10b] he appears to make a mistake. The scene of the feeding is obscure. But Mark forbids us to locate it at Bethsaida (6 [45]), and Luke himself postulates 'a desert place' ([12]). There is no reason to think Luke was acquainted with the topography of Galilee.

After this Luke takes no note of Mk 6 [45]-8 [26]. On this 'great omission' see *The Synoptic Problem*, p. 37*a*. That Luke should have omitted Mark's account of the healing of the blind man and the feeding of the four thousand may be easily accounted for by considerations of space, and by Luke's habit of being satisfied with recording one typical incident of each kind. But that he should have omitted the walking on the sea, and the discourse about the unwashen hands, and the Syrophœnician woman, and the healing of the deaf-mute, is much more surprising; and it makes the hypothesis that, for some reason which we cannot discover, he had not possession of this whole section of Mark tempting, but not convincing. In incorporating Mark, Luke was plainly hampered by lack of space.

18-27. The Confession of Peter: see on Mk 8 [27]-9 [1] and Mt 16 [13-28].—Luke follows Mark, but omits the rebuke of Peter. He prefaces the passage with the mention of our Lord 'praying alone,' and later ([28]) adds 'his own glory' to 'the glory of the Father.' He also introduces the idea of the taking up the cross 'daily.' The whole passage is of crucial importance, but had better be studied first in Mark and then in Matthew. We should notice that while St. Matthew strengthens, St. Luke weakens, the apocalyptic colouring of Mark's phrase about the Kingdom coming with power. On the whole subject of Christ's prediction of the Kingdom see below, pp. 296*b*-297.

28-36. The Transfiguration: see on Mk 9 [2-13]; Mt 17 [1-13].—Again Luke begins with the mention of our Lord's praying. The

other additions on his part are: (1) that he specifies the subject of the conversation of Moses and Elijah with our Lord as being His approaching decease or *exodus* (cf. Ac 13 [24] for His *eisodos*). Thus is made plain the essential connexion of the Transfiguration with the Passion. Before Jesus suffered, to prepare the innermost circle of disciples to bear it, they were given the vision of His glory and the assurance of the divine authority of the Christ, 'my son, my chosen one.' 'In transfiguratione,' says Leo the Great, 'illud principaliter agebatur ut de cordibus discipulorum scandalum crucis tolleretur.' (2) That he calls attention to the exact condition of the Apostles—how they were first asleep and then awakened, and the point at which they became afraid. This looks like a touch given to the picture on first-hand evidence. (3) That he explains Peter's eagerness to build tabernacles by the apparent departure of the two witnesses. Mark tells us that the three disciples were enjoined not to communicate what they had experienced till after the Resurrection. It was to be a secret even from the rest of the Twelve. Luke ([36]) tells us they obeyed this injunction. But even they did not effectively learn the lesson which should have enabled them to pass without any failure of faith through the experience of the Passion (see later [44, 45]).

37-45. Another Demoniac Healed: see on Mk 9 [14-32]; Mt 17 [14-23].—Everyone has noticed the dramatic contrast between the glorious vision on the Mount and the painful scene below. Mark, whom Luke abbreviates somewhat grievously, in this case shows more interest in the boy's symptoms than Luke. But Luke adds the touch about 'the majesty of God.' It should be remarked that Matthew and Mark disconnect this second prediction of the Passion from what precedes, while Luke connects it.

46-48. The Reproach of the Disciples' Ambition: see on Mk 9 [33-37]; Mt 18 [1-14].—Luke compresses, but adds a final explanatory phrase.

49-50. A Reproof of John: see on Mk 9 [38-40].—'He that is not with me is against me' (11 [23]) is a warning that neutrality in the cause of Christ is impossible. 'He that is not against you (Luke) is for you' is an assurance that real zeal for Christ, though it be uninstructed, is still something to the good. St. Luke's substitution of 'you' for Mark's 'us' (i.e. Christ and His disciples) suggests that he supposed the incident to have occurred on the mission of the Apostles when the Master was not with them. Perhaps he had independent information. It is a very valuable warning to the Church of Christ not to seek to suppress activities for Him which He may acknowledge, though they proceed from those who are not of our company.

Anyone watching St. Luke's ruthless curtailments of Mark's narrative in the preceding passages, compared with the freedom of expansion in the sections where he is independent of Mark, will be convinced that he must have incorporated his Marcan additions after his first draft was made, and when his available space was very limited.

51-XVIII. 14. Discourses of Jesus Journeying towards Jerusalem.—There now follows a long section in which Luke combines his own gathered information with Q without any sign of Mark. And the whole matter is so grouped as to appear to be, what it cannot really be, episodes in one journey leading eventually to Jerusalem and to the Passion: see 9 [51, 57], 10 [1, 38], 11 [53], 13 [22], 14 [25], 17 [11], 18 [31, 35], 19 [1, 28, 29, 41-45]. They cannot really belong to the same, the final, journey. For 13 [31] ff. must have been spoken in Galilee or Peræa, Herod's dominions (cf. 18 [35]). Again the journey described through Samaria (9 [52]: cf. 17 [11]) would not have brought them to Jericho (18 [35]). Again at 10 [38] they appear to be at Bethany—too soon. St. Luke shows throughout little care for consideration of chronology and geography, and he shows no signs of recognizing that Jesus paid a number of visits to Jerusalem, as St. John tells us, and apparently by different routes. The discourses, however, grouped in this section are of surpassing value and mostly of self-evidencing authenticity.

IX. 51-56. A Reproof of James and John.—The additions to [55] mentioned in RVm must be discarded on grounds of MS. evidence, but are very well worthy to stand in the text. At any rate, the appeal to Elijah's example brought upon James and John only the Lord's rebuke: and that could be for no other reason than that they now belonged to another kind of 'spirit' (almost in the modern sense of a temper of mind—a sense which is hardly to be found in the New Testament).

It is very important that we should consider what sort of judicial or punitive action it is which our Lord repudiates: it is the demanding divine vengeance on our adversaries—in Elijah's case, innocent people. But our Lord does not repudiate all idea of divine judgement, and He pronounces tremendous judgements Himself on those whom He recognizes as the real and deliberate adversaries of God. There

is a sort of Neo-Marcionism much in fashion to-day which would have us think of judgement and wrath as altogether alien to God—an idea which is quite alien to the New Testament.

51. What Luke had previously called our Lord's *exodus* he here calls His *assumption*.

57-62. The Requirement of Absolute Renunciation.—From Q: see on Mt 8 19-22.

58 must belong to a period after our Lord had been compelled to escape from Galilee. The incident 61-62 is added by Luke, and increases the impression of peremptoriness on our Lord's part. The fact is that our Lord, perceiving that there was no prospect of a gradual change for the better in the general mind of the people, was resolved on creating a new Israel, however small, with a wholly new spirit; and with that end was demanding of those who would be His 'disciples' absolute renunciation of natural ties (cf. 14 25-26; also Lev 21 11; Nu 6 6-7; Ezek 24 16). St. Francis of Assisi is one who followed Him in this. Thus the new Israel was inaugurated in a small group, who had to the full what was later known as the spirit of 'Religious.' But this was not required in the young churches addressed in the epistles (see below, p. 289*a*). Here this stern sifting out of would-be disciples was perhaps a preparation for the mission of the Seventy.

X. 1-12. The Mission of the Seventy.—Only Luke has this. It is an extension of the 'apostolate' in its most general sense. It does not appear that they were recognized, like the Twelve, as holding after the Resurrection any official position in the Church. Some, however, have attempted to find an explanation of the quasi-apostolic authority allowed to certain individuals in the first days, though they were not of the Twelve, nor had received special commission like St. Paul, in the hypothesis that they were of the Seventy.

1. **two and two**: cf. Mk 6 7. Luke transfers to the Seventy the first part of the address assigned by Matthew to the mission of the Twelve (Mt 9 37-10 23). It must have been in Q: see on Matthew.

5. Cf. 24 36.

6. **a son of peace.** The Jewish phrase 'a son of'='belonging to' in a general sense.

9. The Seventy have the same healing powers as the Twelve (cf. 17).

13-16. A Sentence of Judgement: see on Mt 11 20-24.—The last verse, peculiar to Luke, certainly implies that at least temporarily the Seventy were official representatives of their Master who was to follow them.

17-20. Return of the Seventy.—We should notice that not even the raising of the dead seems to have been regarded as so great a work of power as controlling the devils. The world, Jewish and pagan, seems to have lived in perpetual fear of demons, and anyone who plainly had the mastery of them, and could even delegate that power to others, was a saviour indeed.

18 recalls Is 14 12 and also Rev 12 9. But in this vision of the Apocalypse Satan's fall is from 'heaven' to 'earth,' where he still has power—'earth' and 'sea' having a spiritual signification. Here what is suggested is a fall from all power (if men have but faith), and our Lord sees a sign of this in the victory of the Seventy over the demons.

20. They are not to rejoice in personal power, but in spiritual status—that their names are found in the Book of Life.

21-24. The Joy of Jesus and His Authority, and the Congratulation of the Disciples.—From Q: see on Mt 11 25-30.

21. We should note especially how the personal spiritual life of Jesus was lived 'in the Holy Spirit.' Jesus regards learning, like wealth, as a manifest obstacle to true religion; but He has in view a particular kind of learning, which He saw in the scribes, ministering to pride and contempt of others. He too would have 'scribes' among His disciples, but truly instructed unto the Kingdom of God (Mt 13 52).

22. Neither in Matthew's form nor here does this saying fairly admit of a 'reduced' meaning. The word for 'all things' expresses the idea of a quite general authority committed by the Father to the Son, but the context suggests especially an authority to reveal. The following words express such an absolute mutual knowledge as cannot be otherwise than eternal. 'To know the Father' and 'to know who the Father is' mean the same thing.

23, 24. The congratulation of the disciples implies that they who are of His company have witnessed the fulfilment of the ancient hope. This also is from Q: see on Mt 13 16-17.

25-37. The Good Samaritan.—The opening resembles 18 18, and the preliminary conversation follows Mk 12 28-34: see on that. The combination of Dt 6 4 with Lev 19 18, which is by Luke put into the mouth of the lawyer, was probably already current. But the great story is only in Luke and needs no comment, only constant remembrance and imitation. On

the mystical interpretation, which is very edifying, see Trench, *Parables*, 319 ff.

35. On the Latin word for **thou spendest more**—*supererogaveris*—is founded the phrase 'works of supererogation' as=whatever is done over and above an express requirement.

38-42. Martha and Mary: see Jn 11 [1], where they are introduced as well-known persons living at Bethany. Their characters as there represented fit in well with the intimations here. St. Paul in 1 Cor 7 [32-35] describes the contrast between the busy life of the married woman and that of the consecrated virgin in terms suggesting knowledge of this narrative.

42. **Few things are needful, or one** seems to have the best claim to be the original reading. Martha wanted to provide a more abundant meal for the honoured guest: so she complains of Mary's inactivity. Jesus replies that the simplest meal is quite enough. Mary has been wiser in seizing the opportunity for spiritual instruction of which she shall not be deprived. The 'one thing . . . needful' is the single dish: but a spiritual meaning is suggested.

XI. **1-13. Prayer and the Lord's Prayer:** partly from Q: see on Mt 7 [7-11], also 6 [9-13].

1. Another striking reference to the prayers of Christ.

2. Our Lord may well have delivered 'the Lord's Prayer' in different forms on different occasions. But on grounds of rhythm Burney gives reasons for believing Matthew's form (6 [9-13]) to be the more original (*Poetry of our Lord*, 113).

3. 'Give us day by day our bread for the coming day' seems to be the most probable translation.

4. Luke seems to change 'debts' into 'sins' as more intelligible to the Gentile world, but leaves 'indebted' in the second half of the clause. Also he gives us 'for we forgive' instead of Matthew's 'as we have forgiven.' Both expressions would be attempts to represent the Hebrew or Aramaic tense.

5. This analogy, as that of the unjust judge (18 [2]), is startling indeed as applied to God; but nothing could better present the value of importunity. Our Lord constantly emphasizes that prayer is *asking*; whatever other elements may enter into it: in both forms of the Lord's Prayer, however, the order of the petitions forces us to subordinate our personal wants to the honour of God and to His purposes.

13. Even when Christ is appealing to the natural goodness in men, He will not let us forget our corruption. Luke's word is strong—*huparchontes* (being by nature) *poneroi* (bad or mean). Characteristically Luke interprets 'good things,' which probably stood in Q as in Mt 7 [11], by 'Holy Spirit,' wherein are all good things combined.

14-23. An Accusation Refuted: see on Mk 3 [20-30]; Mt 12 [22-30].—Probably the passage stood in Q, and Luke does not take it from Mark. But the information in Mk 3 [21, 22] is very interesting. Here we notice only the points peculiar to Luke—the demand ([16]) for some startling miracle of a cosmic kind—a demand to which Jesus never would respond—and the retention of 'the finger of God,' where Matthew alters to 'the Spirit of God' (for it can hardly have been the other way). The 'Spirit of God' in the Old Testament is His active energy. The aim of Jesus was not to teach men to believe in evil spirits—as to that they needed no teaching—but to teach them to believe that they were conquered.

24-26. The Devil Returning: see on Mt 12 [43-45].

27, 28. Who are Blessed: cf. 8 [21].—Mary was pre-eminently one of these: see 1 [38].

29-32. The Sign of Jonah: see on Mt 12 [38-40] (Q must have lacked the clause Mt 12 [41], which seems to be a misinterpretation). It should be observed that both in [31] and [32] 'a greater' is neuter, 'something greater.'

33-36. The Light in a Man's Soul: see on Mt 5 [15] and 6 [22].—St. Luke preserves probably the original connexion in Q.

33 is a doublet of 8 [16]. Such repetitions are very rare in Luke.

36. **having no part dark.** Most consciences have blind spots.

37-54. Judgement on Pharisees and Lawyers: see on Mt 23 [25, 23, 6, 27, 4, 29, 34, 13].—St. Luke has information as to the occasions of these tremendous denunciations (cf. 7 [36] and 14 [1]): see below, p. 289.

41. Cf. 12 [33]. Matthew's version is to be preferred. It is conjectured that Luke's version may have arisen through a translator reading the original Aramaic *dakki* (cleanse) as *zakki* (give alms).

44. Contact with a tomb entailed ceremonial defilement; hence they were whitened before Passover (cf. Mt 23 [27]).

45. Luke introduces this mark of distinction between Pharisee and scribe or 'lawyer.' The Pharisees was the name of a party; lawyers or scribes were authoritative officers, most of whom, however, were Pharisees.

46. Cf. Ac 15 [10].

49. In Matthew 'I send unto you' appears as a word of Jesus; in Luke it is

ascribed to 'the wisdom of God.' The 'said' appears to point to some recognized scripture; but it would seem that it must be a late utterance, later than Chronicles, which mentions the murder of Zachariah, and we cannot identify it.

53. Peculiar to Luke. The hostility of the scribes and Pharisees reaches an acute point of exasperation. These denunciations are indeed fearful. We need not suppose that all Pharisees and scribes fall under them. We may hope it was evident at the time whom in particular Jesus was addressing Himself to. But it cannot mean less than that these vices of hypocrisy, formalism, and obscurantism were characteristic of the classes denounced.

XII. 1-12. **Against Hypocrisy:** see on Mt 16 [6], 10 [26] ff., 12 [31] ff.; Mk 3 [28].—St. Luke at starting appears to be drawing upon information of his own. But the whole substance of the discourse must have been in Q, appearing as it does in Matthew, though in different connexions. Jesus must have spoken often against hypocrisy, by which He meant all conduct which primarily has regard to respectability—to the outward appearance of things and their public reputation, rather than to the spiritual reality as it is in God's sight. The point of our Lord's warning is one which in our days we are disposed to depreciate and set aside as unworthy fear. But our Lord did not shrink from it. It is the certainty of final exposure, if not before men in this life, then finally at the day of judgement before angels as well as men. It follows that nothing really matters except what God, whom nothing escapes, and the Son of Man, the final Judge, whom no one can deceive by outward appearances, think of us. Men may despise us, persecute us, and kill our bodies. But there is nothing in all this really to be afraid of. The power (or rather authority) to inflict total ruin upon body and soul belongs to God only. Therefore there is only one rational fear, and that is the fear of God:

> 'Fear Him, ye saints, and you will then
> Have nothing else to fear.'

Elsewhere we learn that this is a rational fear in another sense—because we know that His judgements are not arbitrary, and He has made plain to us in conscience on what principles they will be based. God only sees the heart, and can discern between mistaken judgements, such as may lead men to speak against Christ in ignorance, which is easily forgiven (see 1 Tim 1 [13]), and wilful rejection of the most evident signs of divine co-operation, which is blasphemy against the Spirit and is essentially unpardonable. (Of course, wherever the grace of repentance produces a welcome to the light, pardon is ready.) The disciples of Jesus who accept the Holy Spirit's leading may trust to His guidance in the dark days of persecution. A marked characteristic of the life of the first Christians in the Acts is their constant sense of this guidance.

It is often supposed that 'blasphemy against the Spirit' means resistance to the inward light and therefore bears witness to an inward activity of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the most rebellious. No one can deny such an activity. But in the NT there is no recognition of the presence or action of the Holy Spirit except in the prophets, in Christ, and in His Church after Pentecost. And in this case, as in the case of Ananias 'lying to the Holy Spirit' (Ac 5 [3-5]), or of the Jews 'resisting the Holy Spirit' (Ac 7 [51]), the resistance contemplated is not to an inward movement, but to manifest external or miraculous evidences of the 'finger' or 'Spirit' of God.

13-21. **Against Covetousness.**—Peculiar to Luke. The days would come soon when the Christian Church would have its courts of justice to right wrongs committed by one brother on another (cf. Mt 18 [15-18] and 1 Cor 6 [1-7]). And the judgements of such Christian courts would be the judgements of Christ. But they will be judgements among brethren who have all accepted the standard of Christ. And He knew that the Jewish world was rejecting, not accepting, Him. It was possessed by motives of self-interest, not by the motives of the Kingdom of God. Therefore in such a world Christ has at present no office of Judge. He can only warn such a world against the motive which lies behind all its disputes—the acquisitive motive, the motive of avarice (cf. Jas 4 [1-2]). Man's true 'life' does not lie in acquisition of material things which are not real wealth. In the parable ([16-21]) note in the rich fool's speech ([18]) the constant recurrence of 'I' and 'my,' indicating an overmastering sense of private property.

22-24. **Against Anxiety about Material Prospects:** see on Mt 6 [25].—Here Luke returns to Q. Seek the Kingdom of God and its interests, and you can trust to being provided for in respect of the necessary things. It should be of course remembered that our Lord's assurance concerns only such necessary things (cf. 1 Tim 6 [8], and the Psalmist's experience,

Ps 37 [25]). The memorable sentence ([32]) is in Luke only. Christ was acting like the prophets of old who, when their world would not listen to them, turned to the faithful remnant. So Christ turns to His 'little flock.' They are the true Israel. They have ultimately nothing to fear.

35-40. Of Watchfulness: see on Mt 25 [1-13], 24 [43-51].—Of this and the following sections exactly how much stood in Q we cannot feel sure. The beautiful point in [37b] is peculiar to Luke (cf. Jn 13 [3] ff.). We should contrast the saying in 17 [10]. What we are to *say* is one thing: what the Lord will *do* is another.

41-48. The Stewardship: see on Mt 24 [43-51].—Peculiar to Luke is Peter's enquiry, to which our Lord replies by implication in the affirmative. Luke, we observe, constantly presents our Lord's discourse as arising out of questions—seldom, however, directly answered. The stewardship in the household (which existing officers of Israel had abused) is now to be handed over to the Twelve, with Peter at their head (though not without a solemn warning): cf. Mt 16 [19], 18 [18]; Jn 20 [23]; Mk 12 [9]. The discrimination to be exercised in God's judgement ([47-48]) is also peculiar to Luke.

49-50. The Fire and the Baptism.—For the fire cf. 3 [16, 17]; Ps 78 [21]; Mal 4 [1]; and for the baptism Mk 10 [38]. The baptism Christ expects is no doubt the Passion and Cross: only this could really set Him free; but the baptism can be shared by those who do not actually suffer martyrdom in the restricted sense.

It is important to bear in mind how straitened our Lord must have felt all the years of His ministry by the restriction of His mission: cf. Mt 15 [24]; Jn 12 [24].

51-53. Not Peace, but a Sword: see on Mt 10 [34-36].

54-59. Interpreting the Time.—Mt 16 [2-3] are probably not in the true text, and Luke alone gives us this impressive warning. His contemporaries can read the weather signs, but not the signs of the Kingdom coming with penetrating judgement and glorious privilege. And why, He asks, do you not exercise in the most important direction your natural faculty of judgement? When you are threatened with legal penalties you act with all speed to exempt yourselves from them before it is too late. Why do you not show the same expedition in exempting yourselves from the coming judgement of God? (cf. in a different context Mt 5 [25]). We should note that our Lord accuses 'the multitude' of hypocrisy ([56]) in failing to exercise a right judgement in His case, because it was a wilful failure. They might have had their eyes open. Their failure came because they lived in the external world of appearances, not in the world of spiritual realities—which is the essence of hypocrisy: see above, p. 225*a*.

XIII. 1-5. The Galileans and the Tower.—Peculiar to Luke and continuous with the last passage. Pilate behaved with sudden savagery from time to time. It was for this reason he was finally disgraced. Some such act in connexion with some group of Galileans who had come to offer sacrifice at the Temple had occurred. And a tower had fallen and crushed eighteen persons. 'Judgements,' people said. To this our Lord does not demur. But not on these particular groups. They were no worse than others. He anticipates a universal judgement, and a fall, not of one tower, but of Jerusalem altogether—a judgement not on a few but on all, and a judgement from which there is only one way of escape. This saying must, we should judge, have been spoken in Jerusalem and nowhere else.

6-9. The Parable of the Fig Tree.—Still continuous with what immediately precedes, and peculiar to Luke. There is still time for national repentance. The fig tree in the vineyard of God, which bore no fruit (which is Israel or perhaps specially Jerusalem), is still being dunged in hope by the vine-dresser (which is Christ). But if there is no change of mind among those who are refusing His message, their doom is certain. It is surely perverse to suppose that this parable is the only basis in history for the miracle of Mk 11 [12-14, 20, 25]. For, first, there is no passage in Mark which bears more evident traces of coming from a precise eye-witness; and, secondly, the point is different in the parable and the miracle. The parable (spoken at an earlier visit to Jerusalem) shows the gate still open. The miracle, though no application is given to it, shows it shut. It is a miracle of pure judgement upon fruitless professions.

7. these three years. Luke gives no indication of the length of our Lord's ministry. But if these words come from a late moment in the ministry, they are not unnaturally interpreted as describing it in a vague phrase.

10-17. The Infirm Woman Healed.—In Luke alone, though it has great similarity with other Sabbath miracles. The special point of interest in it is that our Lord is here presented to us ([16]) as looking out on the physical diseases of the world and seeing there the work of an alien will, a will

of mighty power hostile to His Father and Himself—'Satan hath bound her': cf. 'An enemy hath done this.' This suggests that the Church should never be in an attitude of mere resignation to human misery, but always in active hostility to it. If that were really so, then the Church's work, like our Lord's, would put its adversaries to shame and redound to the glory of God (17).

18-21. The Mustard Seed and the Leaven: see on Mk 4 30-32; Mt 13 31-33.

22-30. Are only a Few to be Saved? see on Mt 7 13, 22-23 and 25 10.—Our Lord Himself observes that only a few are in fact entering the narrow lane by the strait gate. But here seemingly the question which is asked Him—akin to the question which presents itself to the mind of the seer in 2 Esd 3, and that which is being asked all the world over to-day—is the general question, Is salvation only the privilege of a few? To which He refuses any answer. For instance, He does not foreclose St. Paul's optimistic hope that 'all Israel shall be saved.' He only says in effect: 'See at any rate that thou art in the way: and it is a difficult enterprise: mere familiarity with me will not secure it for you; nor will it be availing to plead your descent from Abraham or the priority of Israel's privilege.'

31-35. The Danger from Herod.—Only in Luke. This incident must of course have occurred either in Galilee after John's execution, or in Peræa at the point indicated in Jn 10 39-40. Our Lord did in fact disappear from Galilee to avoid Herod's designs and continue His mission. But this explains why He can entertain no real fear of any designs of his. This leads to the lament over Jerusalem (see on Mt 23 37-39), which, it has constantly been noticed, as uttered by our Lord, involves several visits of our Lord to the capital. To avoid this conclusion some critics point to Mt 23 37 where these words follow the passage 34-36, which (in a different connexion) in St. Luke (11 49) but not in Matthew are seemingly ascribed by our Lord to some recognized scripture. This may be right, though we cannot identify the scripture. But Matthew ascribes the whole to Christ, including the lament, without any suggestion of quotation. And Luke ascribes the lament, which he gives in a different connexion, to Christ Himself. It is very precarious then to suggest that Matthew is right in connecting the two passages, but Luke is right in ascribing the former to an unknown scripture; and we should be right in maintaining, against them both, that the lament contains the words not of Christ but of a former prophet. This is the more arbitrary as St. Luke records another similar lament of our Lord's over Jerusalem in 19 41-44, and gives here a most natural connexion for the first. Also 35b (cf. Mt 23 39) seems obviously to belong to Christ speaking in His own person.

32. that fox. Jesus discerned the hand of Herod behind this attempt to frighten Him out of his territory.

35. There is properly no *desolate* in the text. But there can be no mistake about the general meaning. As introduced here by Luke the latter part of the verse reads like a prophecy of 19 38. In St. Matthew, however, it occurs after the triumphal entry (see on Mt 23 39).

XIV. **1-6. The Cure of the Man with the Dropsy.**—This is one of numerous cases in which our Lord accepts entertainment in a Pharisee's house and enters into controversy. In this case He perceived that He had been brought in with a malevolent design. Thus He did not wait to be attacked, but challenged them on the old subject of healing on the Sabbath, and reduced them to silence. We observe that our Lord 'took'—better 'took hold of'—the man in order to heal him.

7-11. On the Behaviour of Guests.—There is certainly humour in our Lord's words. What He says is based on Pr 25 6 f. The point is that if their object is to have honour paid to them, the right way is the way of humility. The final proverb (cf. Pr 18 12, 29 23) appears to have been often on our Lord's lips (cf. 18 14 and Mt 23 12). Our Lord chose two qualities to exalt into the highest place of estimation in His Church—universal charity and humility. Whether any institution or individual is really Christian can best be judged by this double standard.

12-14. On Invitation to a Feast.—There is irony here in our Lord's words. He assumes that the object of the host is to give and not to get. Then, He says, choose to entertain those who cannot possibly make any return for your hospitality. Then God will recompense you. There is to-day not a little so-called charitable work the motive of which is at least very mixed, and it 'gets its reward' (see Mt 6 2, 5, 16), but not from God. There is a Rabbinic saying quoted: 'Let thy house be opened wide, and let the needy be thy household.'

13. **the maimed:** a medical word peculiar to Luke in the New Testament.

15-24. The Great Supper.—All the first four paragraphs of this chapter appear

to be referring to the same entertainment. One of the guests made a pious remark on the blessedness of the Messianic banquet, obviously implying that he was sure to be there. Our Lord feels Himself to be in false atmosphere. He replies with a parable illustrating the evasion of the divine invitation by wealthy people on various excuses. So their places are taken, even under compulsion, by the miserable at the command of the indignant master of the feast. The object of the compulsion is that there should be no room left for those first invited. The words **compel them to come in** were lamentably misapplied, and with lamentable results, when St. Augustine found in them the justification for imperial pressure to compel heretics to unite themselves to the Church.

19. I go: better 'I am starting.'

21 refers only to the poor of the city (? the lost sheep of the house of Israel).

23 passes out into the country (? the Gentiles).

24. Our Lord appears to identify Himself with the master of the feast.

25-35. **The Demand for Absolute Renunciation.**—This is a tremendous paragraph. Our Lord is followed on His way by multitudes attracted we may suppose partly by His miracles, partly by curiosity, partly because He took the side of the poor, partly by a half-hearted desire to be disciples of such a teacher; and He turns and addresses to them the sternest, the most repellent claim—the claim for absolute renunciation of all natural ties and every kind of self-interest as the first condition of discipleship. It should be remembered that when our Lord speaks of 'hating' and 'loving,' it is of the will directed towards action that He is thinking, not of the feeling or emotion: cf. 16^{13}.

27. The ignominious but familiar figure of the unhappy provincial whom the Roman Empire had found dangerous and condemned to be crucified, and who is on his way to his death of agony, bearing the instrument of his own punishment, is the figure which Jesus chooses to represent the condition of discipleship. So far ($^{25-27}$) Luke is drawing on Q. Then he introduces from his own collection of our Lord's sayings a vivid picture of the necessity for thinking well before embarking on so tremendous an enterprise, and reiterates the claim for absolute renunciation ($^{28-33}$). He adds to this words which must have stood in Q, and which Matthew reports in a different context, justifying this tremendous claim by the metaphor of salt; which means that our Lord's new community is to act as a preservative in the world, sharply distinctive and different from the world about it; and half-hearted service is as worthless as salt which has lost its savour ($^{34, 35a}$). Finally, He challenges attention in a phrase He seems constantly to have used (^{35b}). On all this see above on 9^{38}, and below, pp. 288*b*-289*a*.

XV. 1-32. **The Parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, the Lost Son.**—For the first see on Mt 18^{12-14}: cf. Jn 10^{11-13}. Here the tone changes. Those who had no reputation to lose were flocking to listen to Jesus, and the scornful attitude of the Pharisees towards them led Him to explain the principles of His action and the method of the divine love. Again there is irony. **The righteous persons who need no repentance** are the self-satisfied Pharisees. But He has no use for the self-satisfied. The joy of God is in the recovery of the lost who know their own misery. There underlies all the three parables the assumption that such is truly the natural state of all men who have their eyes opened to the reality. But this implication is unexpressed. On the surface it would appear that the ninety-nine sheep in the proper pasture, the coins in the purse, the elder son in the father's house, are the normal persons: and they are called to recognize by familiar examples that God is acting in conformity with ordinary human feelings when He sets His heart on the one that is lost and welcomes its recovery as His supreme joy.

It should be noticed (1) that throughout these parables our Lord is thinking of 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' to whom alone He is 'sent,' rather than of the heathen world. Thus the prodigal son would have its primary application to the publicans, broken men who had hired themselves out to the heathen masters to get a livelihood; (2) that the phrases 'in heaven,' 'in the presence of the angels,' 'heaven' ($^{7, 10, 18}$) are synonyms for God, according to the contemporary Jewish instinct of reverence.

Theologians have found a difficulty in the fact that in the last parable God, in the person of the father of the prodigal son, is represented as wanting no act of atonement from the returning prodigal—nothing but the self-abasement of the return. And critics of theology have made much use of the supposed difficulty. And assuredly any theory of the Atonement which leads us to imagine that there is in the heart of God any other requirement of the individual sinner than that of penitence and self-humiliating return—

any reluctance to meet penitence with plenary absolution—is very much in the wrong. (But the Great Atonement will be made on behalf of Israel corporately—the true Israel which has welcomed the grace of God.) What alienates from God is self-satisfaction, which leads us to imagine that there is nothing so very wrong with us, and to treat with contumely the disreputable sinner. How deeply the early Christian Church felt the meaning of these parables may be judged by the abundance of representations of the Good Shepherd.

16. An apposite Jewish parable is quoted by Edersheim: 'When Israel is reduced to the carob tree, then they become repentant' (see RVm).

31. There is a beautiful tenderness here towards the strict observers of the Law (cf. F. W. Robertson's sermon on 'The Prodigal's Brother').

XVI. 1-12. **The Unjust Steward.**—There are difficulties in the details of this parable, because we do not know the economic habits of Palestine sufficiently to understand the relation of the steward to the proprietor. But these difficulties are unimportant. Its main lesson is plain. It is not too much to say that the popular difficulties among us about it have been due to two stupid mistakes—that 'the lord' who 'commended the unjust steward' was the Lord Jesus or God, and that 'make to yourselves friends *of* the mammon of unrighteousness' is an encouragement to adopt the ways of the money-grubbing world. The RV has removed the occasion of these childish mistakes; but unfortunately the RV has not passed into current speech.

The parable is spoken to 'the disciples.' We shall not do wrong if we think chiefly of the Twelve and remember that Judas, who loved money, was among them. In [10] our Lord intimates that some 'unfaithfulness' in respect of money was observable in the company—that is, some desire to cling to it, corporately at least. They were as monks vowed to poverty individually, but still capable of corporate greed. So our Lord tells them the story of the steward reported to his master for wasting his property, who thereby loses his position, but has a moment of time left him before the blow falls. So he uses this moment with cleverness and decision. Probably at some sacrifice of his own perquisites, as well as his master's interests, on the instant he secures his future position by gaining the goodwill of the tenants. So the master when he finds it out declares that he was a clever rogue. And our Lord says, 'Why leave this cleverness to rogues? Let the children of light imitate, not the worldliness, but the cleverness of the children of darkness. You too have your momentary hold on things of this world—its money, for example, which is the common instrument of unrighteousness. Convert it, then, swiftly and unhesitatingly to your own purposes—the purpose of your world—the eternal world. Give it away at once in such manner as to secure yourselves friends in that eternal world, which abides when all that belongs to this world has passed "like a dream when one awaketh."'

10-11. Remember that your unfaithfulness to the trust committed to you in such small things is a sign that you will be equally unfaithful in the higher things. It will bar your promotion to higher service.

12. Money is a worthless thing, and belongs to a world alien to yours. But if you misuse what you have of it, you show that you are not to be trusted with the higher stewardship. Then in conclusion Luke incorporates from Q the peremptory requirement that the disciple of Jesus should have only one Master—he cannot serve money and God at the same time (see on Mt 6 [24]). There was a Rabbinic saying, 'The rich help the poor in this world, but the poor help the rich the world to come.'

14-18. **Three Short Sayings** from Q: see on Mt 11 [13]; Mt 5 [18], 5 [32], and 19 [9].—(Plainly in the whole of this chapter Luke is bringing together teachings of Jesus on his favourite topic of the love of money; but the two latter sayings are quite irrelevant to this topic, and Luke seems to insert them here because he will not leave them out and has no special place for them.)

The Pharisees, like 'men of the world' everywhere, having heard the Lord's admonition of His own disciples, mocked with customary cynicism at the very idea that human beings can rise to indifference to money ([14]). And our Lord warns them that the world's opinion does not matter—only God's estimate of values—which is very different ([15]). Then He warns them further that their world, which they think so secure, and in which they hold so high a place, is passing away very rapidly. The law and the prophets (which are their final court of appeal) have passed away in a sense with the Baptist. The good news of the Kingdom has gone forth, and a crowd of rough outsiders is gaining access to it with violence. Their day of supremacy has passed ([16]). Then there is appended a modification of this radical

estimate of the situation. The Law was divine even in its minutest prescription (see on Mt 5 [18]). There is nothing in it which shall not receive realization in the new Kingdom, only it will be a realization which will leave them outside ([17]). Matthew's interpretation of this saying is different: see on Mt 11 [12].

Then, without connexion with what precedes, St. Luke introduces our Lord's simple and unconditional affirmation of the law of indissoluble marriage, as to which see 1 Cor 7 [11]; Mk 10 [11-12]; Mt 5 [32], 19 [9].

19-31. Dives and Lazarus.—The point of this parable is that it says nothing about moral considerations. It simply presents a picture of a rich man in his luxury and a pauper in his misery asking for crumbs. Then the scene shifts into the other world, where their relative positions are absolutely changed; and the ingrained habits found in the rich man, now in ignominy and torment, which lead him to take it for granted that Lazarus will still be at his service ([27]) and that the importance of warning his five brothers will be obvious ([27-28]), are shown to have no relation to eternal moral realities. No more appalling comment on the principle asserted just above ([15]) could have been imagined—no more startling disclosure made of the worthlessness of the estimates of value 'in good society.' Everyone should read Dr. Pusey's sermon preached to a fashionable congregation in London on 'Why did Dives lose his soul?' (*Selected Occasional Sermons*). But it cannot be said too often that the point of this parable is not to reveal to us the moral grounds on which the two individuals described were treated as they were, but simply to terrify those who live by the world's estimate of the relative importance of different individuals with the spectacle of its utter worthlessness and the assurance of its complete reversal. Our Lord is giving no fresh teaching about conditions in the other world. He simply assumes that the Jews are right in believing that there are abodes of joy and of misery for souls beyond death: and that which He is picturing is Hades or the intermediate state, in which both Dives and Lazarus find themselves, which is not to be identified with the ultimate world after the 'Day of the Lord' and the Resurrection. It is the world in which our Lord's activity in spirit after His death is represented to us in the unique passage of 1 P 3 [18-4 6].

XVII. **10. Sayings concerning 'Scandals,' Forgiveness, Faith and Service.**—St. Luke here seems to combine sayings from Q and Mark with matter from his own collection. There is no obvious connexion between the four subjects.

1-2. See on Mt 18 [6-7]; Mk 9 [42].

3-4. See on Mt 18 [21-22]. Here we have an indication that the Christian's abstinence from 'judgement' of his brother is not to be unconditional: cf. 10 [10]. But forgiveness is always to be prompt, as often as repentance and confession is forthcoming.

5, 6. See on Mt 17 [20]; Mk 11 [23]. Luke distinguishes the 'sycamine'=mulberry tree from the 'sycamore' (19 [4]).

7-10. Only Luke. He describes the conduct of the average master—a fairly hard man. A nobler kind of master is described in 12 [37], and one more like Jesus Himself. But God often seems to us in His dealings with us hard and inconsiderate (cf. 19 [21, 22]), and we are to serve none the less to the uttermost point of His demand, and when we have done so entertain no high thoughts of ourselves. We have simply done our duty. 'Miser est,' says Bengel, 'quem Dominus servum inutilem appellat (Mt 25 [30]); beatus qui se ipsum.'

The Anglican article takes this text as condemning the idea of 'works of supererogation' (see above on 10 [35]), i.e. the idea that merit can be acquired and stored up, for our own benefit and that of the whole Church, by any actions or choices which transcend the positive command of God laid upon us. This idea it would be out of place to discuss here. But our Lord is not thinking of any such actions or choices. He is thinking of a situation where God's 'commands,' i.e. positive requirements, seem grievous and inconsiderate, i.e. when there is no alternative between absolute and unflinching obedience and positive disobedience. And the text therefore does not seem to apply directly to the question of the possibility of storing up merit by doing more than is required of us. But it may be noted that the idea of merit which could be shared had its origin in the Christian Church specially in connexion with the martyrs, and in their case there was no opportunity for any action going beyond what was required of them—no alternative between glorious martyrdom and the ignominy of apostasy.

11-19. The Ten Lepers.—Luke only. The scene of this miracle is remote from Jerusalem or from Peræa, on the border between Galilee and Samaria. Jesus tests their faith by bidding them go and present themselves as men who have been cured while the disease was still upon them (cf. 5 [14] and parallels). They all have faith

to go, and all are cleansed; but the nine, Jews, take it as a matter of course: only one, and he a 'stranger,' or better 'foreigner,' has the responsive love which prompts to express gratitude. St. Luke loves to record all the instances of Christ's commendation of Samaritans.

20, 21. the kingdom . . . cometh not with observation. Luke only. Here the meaning of two words must be examined: (1) The word for *observation*, or the corresponding verb, describes *careful* observation or *scrupulous* observance. Thus our Lord, who as usual gives no direct answer to the question of the Pharisees, bids them remember that when the Day comes it will require no narrow observation to detect it, and that no one need be attended to who would call attention to it as to something which might be overlooked. This would naturally lead on to some such announcement as we find in [24] and elsewhere of something portentous and unmistakable, which none could fail to see. But the final clause suggests something quite different from such an apocalyptic disclosure. What then (2) is the meaning of *entos humôn*? The words naturally mean 'within you,' but can mean (as RVm) 'among you' or 'within your borders' (see *Vocab.*). It is quite intelligible that our Lord should have impressed upon them (as upon Nicodemus, when He told him that it required a new spiritual vision even to *see* the Kingdom of God) the truth that the Kingdom of God has its roots in the heart, in the converted will. But it is hardly conceivable that he should have told the Pharisees that the Kingdom was in fact *in* their (quite unconverted) hearts. And we should accordingly prefer the other meaning—It is among you as I am among you, and this little band which follows Me. But you have not eyes to see it (cf. 11 [20]; Jn 1 [26]). Jesus then, giving no answer to this question of *when* it will appear, directs their thoughts to the spiritual nature of the Kingdom of God, which is to be discovered by no minute examination of external things, but which, if they had ears to hear and eyes to see, they might discover among them even now.

22-37. A Day of the Son of Man.—St. Luke gives us in two divisions—here and in 21 [5-36]—what is combined in Mt 24. This probably means that Luke found an apocalyptic discourse of our Lord in Q, which he gives us here, and another, the circumstances of which were clearly indicated, in Mk 13, and he gives them both separately in the final form of his Gospel. As we study this—the earlier—discourse we perceive that there are different 'days of the Son of man' which appear to be referred to—the final 'parousia' ([24]), the judgement on some particular city or place (presumably Jerusalem) from which escape is possible, like Lot's escape from Sodom ([26-32] and [37]), and some selective judgements on individuals—one taken and another left ([33-35]). We notice the phrase ([22]) 'one of the days of the Son of man' as implying that He will have many 'comings' or days of judgement on individuals, on whole cities, and finally on the whole world. This general impression is confirmed as we read all the apocalyptic matter contained in all the Synoptic Gospels, and we cannot resist the further impression of confusion in the minds of those who heard and reported our Lord's words. But we see clearly enough that there are in fact—plain to anyone who believes in God—'days of judgement' on individuals and 'days of judgement' on nations, and we are bound to expect the final day when God shall come into His own in His whole creation; and if we believe that the Father has 'committed all judgement to the Son,' we shall recognize each of these days of judgement as 'days of the Son of man.' This will enable us to understand the passage before us. It, and Mk 13, should be studied in separation, before the 'conflation' of the two in Mt 24.

22. He prepares the disciples to expect their severest trial of faith (cf. 18 [8]) in periods ('the days will come': cf. 5 [35], 21 [6], etc.) when God seems to do nothing, and wickedness appears to flaunt itself unashamed and successful (cf. Ps 73). In such periods they are not to follow false lights. When finally God takes action there will be no possibility of mistake about it ([24]). But before the triumph of the Christ must come His humiliation ([25]). The coming of God in judgement will, as of old, find the world unprepared ([26-30]). The wise man, when he receives warning of the act of God, will lose not a moment in escaping ([31-33]). But all these verses ([26-32]) must clearly refer not to the final cosmic judgement, but to a particular judgement on some nation or city—primarily to Jerusalem. On the other hand, the next verses suggest judgements on individuals. There can be no security for the individual against divine judgements. God's unerring stroke can sever one from another, however closely associated ([34, 35]). And is it asked *when* these judgements are to be expected, the answer is that whenever the individual or nation or world at large is ripe for judgement, then, as unerringly as vultures

gather to the carcase, so unerringly will foregather the ministers of God's wrath.

XVIII. 1-8. **Importunity in Prayer.**—Luke only. Another of those strange parables (cf. 11 [5-8] and 19 [21-23]) teaching us that if God seems inattentive or hard, we are to accept it as if He were so, and act accordingly. The trial of faith will be such that one cannot but wonder whether it can hold out at all. Nevertheless, finally God will act and vindicate His people.

7. **longsuffering** is often used to express the attitude of God—watching triumphant evil and yet not acting, either till the occasion is ripe, or to give the offender time to repent (Jer 15 [15]; Rom 2 [4], 9 [22]; 1 P 3 [20]; 2 P 3 [9, 15]; Wisd 15 [1]; Ecclus 5 [4]). **over them**, or 'in their case.'

9-14. **The Pharisee and the Publican.**—Luke only. The judgement on religious self-satisfaction.

11 and 13. Notice 'standing' as the normal attitude of prayer. The Temple, we observe, was used for private prayer. To fast on Mondays and Thursdays was a mark of advanced Pharisaism.

14. This is not a specially Pauline use of 'justified,' but its normal use—see *Vocab*. Of the two men, one by the side of the other, it is the publican, not the Pharisee, who goes home with the divine approval upon him.

15-17. **The Children Brought to Jesus.**—Here follows a fourth 'Markan insertion' (see on Mk 10 [13-16]). Luke omits the notice of our Lord's indignation with the disciples, i.e. the Twelve, and (strangely) the blessing of the children.

18-27. **The Rich Young Man: A Counsel of Perfection:** see on Mk 10 [17-27]; Mt 19 [16-26].—One can imagine the satisfaction with which Luke would have incorporated this incident. On the difficulty of the opening question and answer see above on Mt and Mk.

28-30. **The Reward of Complete Renunciation:** see on Mk 10 [28-31].—Luke in substituting 'for the kingdom of God's sake' for Mark's 'for my sake and the Gospel' is perhaps nearer to the original words. Luke alone, we notice, adds 'wife' to the things renounced.

31-34. **The Passion again Foretold:** see on Mk 10 [32-45].—Luke adds that all that would happen would be in accordance with the Scriptures, but omits (strangely) the accurate forecast that Jesus would be first 'delivered' to the Jews. Also he omits the subsequent question of James and John, perhaps as discreditable to the Apostles; but ([34]) he notes the profound mental blindness of all the Apostles.

35-43. **The Blind Man near Jericho:** see on Mk 10 [46-52].—St. Mark's narrative is much more vivid. Luke substitutes 'as he drew nigh unto' for Mark's 'as he went out from' (see also 19 [1]). He had additional information about this visit.

XIX. 1-10. **Zacchæus.**—Luke only. The narrative is full of life.

2. He was a high officer in the Roman customs department. The Jews called him a 'sinner,' which is said to imply that he was a 'fallen' Jew. But cf. Gal 2 [15], which shows that a Pharisee could naturally so characterize a Gentile; [9], however, seems to imply that Zacchæus was a Jew.

8. Not 'I have been in the habit of giving,' but 'I promise now to give half of my possessions to the poor, and out of the other half to make fourfold restitution of all wrongful exactions of the past (besides, no doubt, never repeating them).' There would not perhaps have been much of his fortune left. But Christ gives him His full blessing without total renunciation of property on his part.

11-28. **The Parable of the Pounds:** see on Mt 25 [14-30], the parable of the Talents.—So it must have stood in Q. The second motive ascribed to our Lord by St. Luke in speaking it to His disciples—'because they supposed,' etc. ([11])—would suit equally either form of the parable; and both forms carry the same lesson of the need of courage for the full use of opportunities during the Lord's 'absence,' though some details are different. But in St. Luke's version a quite different theme is introduced—the story of the nobleman who went away to receive a kingdom, and when he returned had need to punish his rebellious subjects. (This story recalls the history of Archelaus in 4 B.C.) It does not appear to have been our Lord's custom to introduce two themes into one parable; here, then (and in Mt 22 [1]), we seem to have a conflation of two originally distinct parables. Probably St. Luke so received it. And when he ascribes to our Lord a double motive for speaking it when He did, 'because he was nigh,' etc., and 'because they supposed,' etc., in the second phrase he would be thinking of what belongs equally to both the parables, but in the first to what belongs to an originally independent parable of *the Rebellious Subjects*. For the promised Son of David was approaching His capital only to be repudiated, and would go far away to receive His Kingdom, and return with the terrors of inevitable judgement.

29-44. **The Entry into Jerusalem as a King:** see on Mk 11 [1-11].—There are

differences of detail in Luke—he omits some 'speaking details' in the earlier part of Mark's account, and adds points to the latter part—the specific mention of the King (38), the uninterpretable phrase 'peace in heaven' (contrast 2 14), and the refusal of Jesus to rebuke His disciples. The phrase in 37 'even at the descent' reminds us that Luke had visited what is perhaps the most impressive scene in the world. Then he adds to Mark's account the Great Lamentation—on which see below on 21 5. The imaginative descriptions of a siege in Is 29 3, Ezek 4 2, 26 8, Ps 137 7. 9 are almost verbally identical with our Lord's: they are simply the normal features of ancient sieges.

45-48. The Cleansing of the Temple: see on Mk 11 15-18.—Luke here passes very cursorily over Mark's narrative till he comes to the Teaching in the Temple. He represents the Cleansing as if it occurred immediately after the Triumphal Entry. He omits his detailed account of the Judgement of the Fig Tree. But this is not more strange than many other of his omissions from the same record.

XX. 1-8. Christ's Authority Questioned: see on Mk 11 27-33.

9-19. The Wicked Husbandmen: see on Mk 12 1-12.

9. Note addition 'for a long time': cf. 19 12 'a far country.'

18. Luke adds this, which is a sort of summary of Is 8 14. 15; Dan 2 34. 35. 45.

19. **they feared the people.** We should notice that from 18 43 onwards Luke mentions 'the people' and their state of mind, as an important element in the situation, some sixteen times. This information must have come to him from an independent source.

20-26. The Tribute to Cæsar: see on Mk 12 13-17.

27-40. Question of the Resurrection: see on Mk 12 18-27; Mt 22 23-33.

35. We notice that Luke represents our Lord as speaking of 'the resurrection' as if it concerned the righteous only (cf. 14 14). But it is 'the resurrection from the dead,' not 'the resurrection of the dead' (cf. Phil 3 11). For the opposite use see Jn 5 29.

37-38. The argument is in effect that the relation of the patriarchs to God is so personal and close that it cannot but partake of God's own everlastingness. 'All live unto him': only to us do they die.

41-44. Is the Christ to be the Son of David? see on Mk 12 35-37; also see above, OT 54.

45-47. The Scribes Condemned: see on Mk 12 38-40.

XXI. 1-4. The Widow's Mite: see on Mk 12 41-44.

5-36. Prophecy of the Destruction of the Temple: see on Mk 13 1-37; Mt 24 1-51.—We have seen that Luke found in Q a discourse of our Lord's on 'the day of the Lord,' or 'the day,' or 'the days of the Son of man,' which he reproduces in 17 20-37, and which Matthew also reproduces, but merging it in the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple which he found in Mark, of which St. Luke gives us the equivalent in the passage now under consideration. It is, however, very difficult to say whether Luke is here depending on Mark or giving a report from some other source, and (if the latter) whether this section was already in his first draft, before he made acquaintance with Mark's Gospel. Leaving these questions unsolved, we will here assume acquaintance with Mark, and concern ourselves especially with what is peculiar to Luke, noticing, however, to start with, that, whereas Matthew enlarges the 'private' question of the four disciples (Mk 13 3-4) as to when the destruction would occur and what signs would herald it, so as to include also a question about 'the end of the world,' Luke retains the Marcan question in its original simplicity. We get then here our Lord's distinct prophecy of the overthrow of the Temple (5-7), followed by the questions 'when' and 'with what preceding signs' (7), on which our Lord, giving no direct answer, proceeds to discourse on the duty of never being disquieted by the expectation of divine judgement, or the rumours and false claims which belong to such times of expectation, or the commotions, human and physical, which accompany them—for 'the end is not immediately' (8-11). All this would refer equally to any period preceding some particular judgement, or the general and final Day of Judgement. Also the disciples are not to be perturbed by persecutions which await them from the Jews. These are to give them their opportunity for witness (12-13). They will be provided with the fitting 'apologia' in the courts; but they must be prepared for hostility even in their own households and even for martyrdom. Even so, 'not a hair of their head shall perish.' 'In their endurance they shall make their souls their own' (16-19). But they are to recognize Jerusalem as already doomed (20-22; cf. 1 Th 2 16). In all this Luke follows Mark's course; but here he translates Daniel's mysterious language about 'the abomination of desolation' into a plain intimation that Jerusalem is to be surrounded with foreign

—no doubt Roman—armies, and that the Christians are not to hesitate but to escape at once. The terrors of those days are then enlarged upon, ending in the slaughter or enslavement of the Jews and the total destruction of Jerusalem and its desolation through a series of 'times of the Gentiles' (23-24: cf. Rom 11 25). Then follows a picture of the final 'end of the world,' or coming of the Son of Man in judgement (25-27). This is the background provided for the particular judgement prophesied—here in our Lord's discourse as in those of the ancient prophets (see below, p. 297*a*). Meanwhile, in the awful terror of these days of judgement on Jerusalem and on the world at large, the disciples are to exhibit a paradoxical spirit. Amidst the terror of men they are to exhibit the radiant countenances of those who see their day dawning (28). Then follows the parable of the Fig Tree (31), and the assurances that 'these things' (the judgement on Jerusalem) shall come to pass before the present generation shall have passed away, and that our Lord's words cannot fail of fulfilment (32-33). Then follow warnings that 'the day' will find the world unprepared, and they will need to maintain constantly the attitude of detached watchers awaiting its arrival (34-36).

No doubt our Lord did emphatically and distinctly predict, within the future experience of those already alive, the destruction of the Temple. No doubt His prediction of the judgement of Jerusalem was given in the more veiled form of Mark rather than the more explicit form of Luke. But we cannot think that it would have required any supernatural enlightenment to enable Luke, before the destruction had actually occurred in A.D. 70, to anticipate that it would come through the Roman armies besieging and destroying Jerusalem. Thus whenever actually Luke published his two volumes or rolls, this passage and the previous one (19 43-44) are not to be taken as proving that he could not have written them before A.D. 70. On the relation in our Lord's teaching of the destruction of Jerusalem to the end of the world see below, p. 297*a*. We note that Luke omits our Lord's reference to His own ignorance 'of the day and the hour' of the end, and therefore the contrast between 'these days' and 'these things,' which He foresaw with infallible certitude occurring within the present generation, and 'that day,' the date of which lay outside His ken, as He then was, and would always remain, outside the ken of His disciples. But he clearly interprets our Lord's words so as to prepare the minds of his readers for 'times of the Gentiles' covering a long period.

37-38. Then follows a brief notice, corresponding to Mk 11 11, 19, as to the order of each day from the Triumphal Entry to the day of the Last Supper. Luke speaks of Jesus going with His disciples to pass the night on the Mount of Olives, and in 22 39-40 he appears to fix Gethsemane—though it was low down on the steep slope—as 'the place'; whereas Mark takes them to the top of the Mount and over to Bethany.

The 'Ferrar' group of MSS. here insert in Luke's narrative (as having taken place presumably on the Thursday morning) the story we are familiar with in Jn 7 53–8 11 of the woman taken in adultery. Certainly it does not belong to that place, and it would be thoroughly in place in St. Luke. But most probably it was a fragment of tradition, probably true in fact, which was written down and for which different scribes tried more or less successfully to *find* a place somewhere in the Gospels. If it had really stood here in the original copies of St. Luke, there is no sufficient reason why it should have been left out.

XXII. 1-6. See on Mk 14 1-2, 10-11. Strictly speaking 'Passover' preceded the 'Feast of Unleavened Bread' (Nu 28 16 f.), but the terms had come to be used indiscriminately, as sometimes Josephus.

3. The treachery of Judas was a problem to the Christian conscience, and an opportunity for the enemy to blaspheme. Luke and John (13 2, 27) both regard him as possessed by Satan. His offer appears to have induced the priests to act immediately before the feast began.

4. Only Luke mentions the Temple guard and its officers (cf. 52; Ac 4 1, 5 24, 26). It consisted of Levites.

7-13. **Preparation for the Passover:** see on Mk 14 12-16; Mt 26 17-19.—Luke alone adds the names of the disciples sent. It is most probable that Jesus had already made arrangements with the friendly householder, who very probably was John Mark's father, whose 'upper chamber' became after the Resurrection the meeting-place of the Twelve (Ac 1 13), and whose house is further referred to, presumably after his death, in Ac 12 12. This explains Mark's presence at the capture of our Lord (Mk 14 51-52), and we may owe to him, watching from some place of concealment, the account of what happened in Gethsemane while the disciples were asleep. The additional details which we

find in Luke, Mark himself may have given him.

We will assume (see on Mt 26 [17]) that John is right when he corrects Mark (and Matthew and Luke, as depending on him) as to the nature of the Last Supper. It was not the paschal meal proper, but a supper observed as a farewell supper with His disciples, probably because He thought it likely the Jewish authorities would attempt to arrest Him before the Passover Feast began on Friday evening. This is really implied in Mk 14 [2]. Nor do the accounts of the supper suggest the ceremonial of the Passover meal, when it was necessary to supply four 'individual' cups of wine for each participant, not a 'common cup.' The drinking of the one cup was a ceremony known to the Jews at the 'Kiddush' or *sanctification* (of the Sabbath), and may have been in use by our Lord among His disciples, as well as the blessing and breaking of the bread, at their common meals. The Last Supper was thus a farewell meal of fellowship with a paschal character, because it was compulsorily celebrated in anticipation of the morrow—but was converted by our Lord into an anticipation of the sacrifice of Himself and of the feast upon that sacrifice. When they had come to recognize Him as their true Passover (1 Cor 5 [7]), and to learn the true meaning of the Eucharist, it was quite natural that the exact nature of the Last Supper should have been misunderstood, and the misunderstanding was corrected by St. John.

14-20. The Last Supper.—In view of what has just been said the expression of deep desire ([15]) may naturally be interpreted as a cry of disappointment. He had hoped to observe that one more Passover: now He knows that He will only observe it there where the figure has passed into the full reality. Then presumably the Lord and the disciples broke bread together and ([17]) there was 'handed' to Him (according doubtless to a recognized custom) the common cup of which He partook (this is implied in the 'henceforth'), and which He handed round to them. Notice that this was His *last earthly supper* (henceforth, never again): but of the Passover He had said He had hoped to eat it, but was not to do so.

Then follows, according to the RV as well as the AV, the institution of the Eucharist. Whatever be the case with regard to St. Luke, the received account of that institution is as certain historically as anything connected with our Lord. It was part of the 'tradition' received by St. Paul after his conversion at Damascus and in his intercourse with Peter at Jerusalem, which he was bound to deliver to the churches of his foundation (1 Cor 11 [23] ff.: cf. 15 [1-11], 11 [2]), and it is confirmed in the Petrine tradition as given by Mark and the Palestinian tradition as given by Matthew. If that is not historical nothing is. The account in our text of St. Luke follows closely on St. Paul's. But important Western MSS. leave out all the words in [19] after 'body' and the whole of [20]; and, so read, the text presents an appearance of a Eucharist in which the delivery of the cup of wine preceded that of the bread, and the Lord's description of the bread stops at the word 'body,' while no spiritual meaning is assigned to the cup. In view of St. Luke's inevitable familiarity with St. Paul's tradition and practice, and the general practice of the Church witnessed to by the tradition in Mark and Matthew, it is most improbable that Luke should have presented such a maimed and misleading account. And of the MSS. which support the reading of RVm (the 'shorter text'), some place [19a] after [16]. The author of this commentary thinks that Canon Bate has reached the best solution (see *J.T.S.*, July, 1927, p. 362), viz. that the original text of Luke ended with [18]. He gave no account of the institution of the Eucharist, any more than St. John did. We may conjecture that, writing at Rome, and intending his history of Christian origins for the reading of educated Romans, he thought it better to keep silence about the great sacrament, which could not be intelligible to them (the report of which became in fact the occasion of gross scandals), and simply recorded the preceding love-feast. Accepting this solution we shall refer our readers to the commentaries on 1 Corinthians, Mark, and Matthew for the meaning of the Eucharist. It will be observed that if Canon Bate's suggestion is approved, Luke does not, as regards either the preliminary supper or the institution of the Eucharist, put the cup before the bread. In the first the eating is assumed: of the second nothing at all is said. As to St. Paul's language in 1 Cor 10 [16, 21] see *in loc.*, and the author's *Can We Then Believe?* note 10, pp. 202–203.

21-23. The Betrayal Foretold: see on Mk 14 [18-21], which St. Luke abbreviates.

24-30. Which should be the Greatest.—A lamentable controversy renewed: see above, 9 [46]: cf. Mt 20 [25]; Mk 10 [40]. St. Luke introduces here what Mark and Matthew had put much earlier, and he puts the painful discussion immediately after the Institution, whereas [27] seems

to refer to the washing of the feet (Jn 13 [1-20]), which suits better with the beginning of the supper. Here and throughout the Passion Luke seems to be drawing upon his own collection.

25. **Benefactors.**—The reference is to the title *Euergetes* bestowed on kings and occasionally on governors.

26. For the word chief cf. Ac 15 [22] and Heb 13 [7, 17, 24].

29. The word for 'appoint' is that used for 'making a covenant.' Dr. Westcott is probably right in translating these words, 'and I appoint unto you, inasmuch as my Father hath appointed to me a kingdom, to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom,' etc. (cf. Mt 19 [28]). They were not only to share the Messianic banquet, but to sit on the seats of the judges of the New Israel. For 'the twelve tribes' cf. Jas 1 [1]. It should be noticed that these repeated disputes could hardly have occurred if Peter had been appointed to any such primacy among the Twelve as would have made him something different in kind from the rest.

31-34. **Peter Warned:** cf. Mk 14 [27-31]; Mt 26 [31-35] (for the request of Satan which God grants cf. Job 1 [8-12], 2 [4-6]).—A very remarkable passage in which our Lord first addresses Peter as representative of all the Twelve ('you' plural), and then addresses him individually, anticipating both his failure and his recovery. For the 'sifting' see Am 9 [9]. Judas would prove to be 'chaff'; but also a great deal in all the Apostles would have to go before the whole would be 'proof' (see Jas 1 [3]).

35-38. **The Two Swords.**—This passage must be interpreted as ironical. If our Lord had really intended the disciples, now to be deprived of His protection, to arm themselves in self-defence, two swords would have been no use. He must have known that Peter and another had armed themselves with swords, and, after reminding them how Providence had supplied their needs in the past without any preparation on their part, He must have gone on ironically to suggest that now perhaps they had better equip and arm themselves, and when He was told of the two swords, have said, still ironically, 'That is enough.' When Peter began to use one of the two weapons, he was promptly rebuked. No misinterpretation of a text, which has powerfully influenced the Church, has been more unwarranted than that which interprets the 'two swords,' both assumed to be in the hands of Peter, as the ecclesiastical and the civil authority. We should note here our Lord's definite reference ([37]) to Is 53.

39-46. **The Agony.**—Luke's informant apparently thought that in going where they did (i.e. to Gethsemane, which he does not name) they were going to their usual place of retirement for the night (21 [37]: cf., however, Jn 18 [1]). There is a discrepancy in detail here with Mark. Luke makes no use of Mark's vivid narrative (see Mk 14 [32-42] and Mt 26 [36-46]) of the thrice-repeated prayer and the rebuke of the sleeping disciples, though [46] may be taken from Mark; but according to both AV and RV he gives us the sweat of blood. Mark himself may have been a concealed eye-witness of the scene, and may be the source of the information, though in his Gospel he gave only the story as Peter used to relate it. The MS. evidence, however, makes it doubtful (see RVm) whether [43-44] occurred in the original text. If not, they would represent a tradition very early incorporated in the text. Streeter, however, contends for their originality. It must be observed that where the Epistle to the Hebrews wishes to show that our Lord was 'in all points tempted like as we are,' he points not to the temptation in the wilderness, but to Gethsemane (4 [15], 5 [7]).

42. We cannot fail to see here and above ([40]) the phraseology of the Lord's Prayer, though in 11 [2] 'Thy will be done' does not occur. It is possible (see 11 [1]) that the 'certain place,' where the Lord's Prayer was given to the disciples, was Gethsemane.

44. The Greek word *agony* (only in Luke) does not mean physical suffering, but acute anxiety (see *Vocab.*).

47-53. **The Betrayal and Arrest:** see on Mk 14 [43-52]; Mt 26 [47-56].—Luke does not record the kiss of Judas. But he records the Lord's rebuke of the use of the sword and the healing of the wounded servant. He also alone describes the 'high priests and captains of the temple and elders' as present. There are considerable differences of detail in Mark, Luke, and John. Doubtless there was great confusion, and it was only moonlight.

54-65. **The Scene in the High Priest's House and the Denial of Peter.**—Mark and Matthew imply that the trial followed immediately and Peter's denial took place then. Luke distinguishes two stages—a detention of Jesus in the court of the High Priest's house, and a first mockery of Jesus, blindfolded, by His captors; and he places Peter's denial there. He alone records Jesus turning to Peter and looking at him. This was followed ([66]) by the assembly and the trial 'as soon as it was day.' John explains further that

it was not strictly the High Priest's house, but his all-important father-in-law's (Annas), where this occurred, and that a preliminary examination took place there before Annas sent him on to Caiaphas.

66-71. The Trial before the Sanhedrin: see on Mk 14 [55-65]; Mt 26 [59-68].—But Luke is independent. He relates neither the evidence offered of the intention of Jesus to destroy the Temple: nor any explicit acknowledgement on His part of Messiahship (such as the 'I am' of Mark), nor any actual condemnation of Him to death for blasphemy—only His declaration that henceforth He would be at God's right hand, which is a reference to Ps 110, and so *implies* Messiahship, but without any mention of the Second Coming. According to Luke, that was enough; but they took Him before Pilate on a totally different charge.

XXIII. **1-12. Before Pilate for the First Time and before Herod.**—Luke gives a very clearly defined account of the charge against Jesus made by the Sanhedrin before Pilate: (1) attempted sedition; (2) refusal of tribute; (3) rival claim to kingship (see RVm). The charges were quite contrary to the facts, and Pilate did not believe them; according to Luke, he makes an explicit declaration of 'Not guilty.' (We need John's account of the explanation Jesus gave to Pilate of the nature of His Kingdom.) But on hearing of the origin of His movement in Galilee, he sent Jesus to Herod, who was near at hand—no doubt hoping to get rid of the responsibility for the case. Herod was full of curiosity about Jesus, which, however, owing to His persistent silence, was quite unsatisfied. Nothing followed except a renewed mockery of Jesus and a renewal of friendship between Pilate and Herod. As has been remarked already (p. 208*b*), Luke had some special source of evidence about the proceedings of Herod. His report to Pilate must have been that he could get nothing from the prisoner, and that the case was obviously one for the governor. The quarrel between Pilate and Herod, now made up, may have been due to Pilate's violent treatment of Herod's subjects alluded to in 13 [1].

13-25. Before Pilate again: Barabbas Preferred: see on Mk 15 [6-15]; Mt 27 [15-26].—Luke is independent, but gives the same impression as Mark of Pilate's surrender to the chief priests and the multitude; only it appears more clearly in Mark that the multitude at first only wanted the liberation of Barabbas, and the chief priests only the condemnation of Jesus: then they coalesced. It is probable that Pilate behaved no worse than the average Roman official would have done. It was, as we should say, more than his place was worth to excite a popular tumult by refusing to condemn one accused, however unjustly, of disloyalty. The Romans thought very lightly of crucifying any troublesome provincial. Luke gives no account of the pressure brought to bear on Pilate (Jn 19 [12]), or of the last mockery of Jesus. But in spite of small differences the general agreement and the dignified simplicity of the narrative of the Passion in all the Gospels are most impressive.

26-32. Jesus Led to Calvary: see on Mk 15 [21-23]; Mt 27 [32-34]; and John's correction, 19 [17].—Luke alone gives us the picture of the band of sympathizers, especially women, who followed Jesus, and His words of warning.

31. The horrors of the judgement imminent upon Jerusalem will infinitely exceed anything men now are witnessing.

33-49. The Crucifixion: see on Mk 15 [22-41]; Mt 27 [33-56].—It is curious that the actual 'title' over the Cross is given differently by all the four evangelists. Luke alone narrates the two first 'words from the Cross'—the prayer for His persecutors and the welcome to the penitent bandit. We think of one of the band of women, who must have come as near as they were allowed to the scene of horror—especially of Mary of Magdala—as treasuring and repeating these words. It is much more easy to believe them authentic than invented. No doubt the first applies specially to the soldiers, who were only doing their terrible duty. But Peter extends the ignorance even to the rulers (Ac 3 [17]: cf. 1 Cor 2 [8]). The penitent bandit may well have known something of Jesus in Galilee and may have repudiated the idea that such a mild and submissive man could be the royal Christ. Now he took in the truth, and his confession is frank, and the absolution, or more than absolution, is worthy of the King. Some ancient authorities omit [34a], and it may be one of several pieces of authentic tradition admitted very early into the text of Luke, perhaps even by himself.

Of the mockery, more vividly described in Mark, Luke tells us less, but all to the same point—that if He really were what He pretends to be He must show His power to release Himself, even at the last moment. Luke does not give us the great question 'My God, my God, why didst thou desert me?' but in the words 'parting his garments,' 'cast lots,' the

people 'behold,' the rulers 'scoff,' the references are plain to the same Psalm (22 [18, 7]).

35. his chosen: cf. 9 [35].

36. According to Mark, the myrrhed wine offered before the crucifixion was not offered in mockery; nor the vinegar at the ninth hour, according to Matthew and John.

45. the sun's light failing need not describe an eclipse, which is impossible at the time of the Paschal full moon. **the veil** was the double curtain which hung between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies.

46. The 'last word'—addressed to the Father: which Stephen (Ac 7 [59]) imitates addressing himself to Jesus.

47. Luke reduces the centurion's cry to something more natural. Also in his whole account of the trial his emphasis is on the innocence of Jesus (cf. Ac 3 [14]).

50-56. The Burial: see on Mk 15 [42-47] and Mt 27 [57-61].—Luke is independent, but in the same sense as Mark save that he notices, like Matthew and John, that the tomb had never been used: the rolling of the stone to cover the tomb is not mentioned, but is implied in 24 [2]. Only John mentions the spices inserted into the grave-clothes by Joseph. Mk 16 [1] and Lk 23 [56] do not agree as to when exactly the 'spices and ointments' were prepared by the women.

XXIV. **1-11. The Morning of the Resurrection: the Empty Tomb:** see on Mk 16 [1-8]; Mt 28 [1-8].—On the evidence of the Resurrection see below, p. 301, and also on the apparent discrepancies cf. p. 284. Mark fails us at [8], and Matthew, Luke, and John are quite independent of one another. We should remember that in the very earliest days, before St. Paul's conversion, the Church at Jerusalem had a formulated statement of a quasi-credal character about the sacrificial death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus and about His appearances after the Resurrection. We need not assume that the slight difference in phraseology in 1 Cor 15 between [4] and [5] (where the clauses begin with *hoti*) and those in [6] (where they do not) means that where the *hoti* ceases the formulated statement which St. Paul 'received' on his conversion ceased also. It probably covered the appearances down to [7] inclusive. In Jerusalem, where James was so highly honoured, the appearance to him is not likely to have been omitted. This formulated statement St. Paul assumes to belong equally to all the apostolic preachers. It would be taken for granted; but they would also each relate what he specially wished to relate about his own or others' experiences. All the evangelists relate (what the formulated tradition omitted) the first announcement to the women, with not more than the usual amount of discrepancy between the accounts of eye-witnesses of any event. After that the main discrepancy lies between Matthew, who relates no appearance in Jerusalem (except to the women), and Luke, who relates none in Galilee. St. Paul (1 Cor 15 [5-7]), however, refers to appearances in both places. So also John. The probability is that Luke, when he wrote his first draft at least, did not know of the appearances in Galilee; and also that those in Jerusalem, which were contrary to the first intention of Jesus (Mk 16 [7]), were rendered necessary by the 'unbelief' (Lk 24 [11]) of the Apostles at the first report.

2. The stone was apparently rolled away to show the emptiness of the tomb, from which Jesus had already vanished (cf. Mk 16 [6]).

8. they remembered: a reminiscence given to Luke probably by one of the women themselves.

11. disbelieved: Luke emphasizes this (cf. [25]).

12. Peter's Visit to the Tomb.—On MS. evidence it is doubtful whether this verse belonged to the original text. It is possible that those are right who think that Luke must himself have issued two 'editions' of his work. But it may be a scribe's insertion from Jn 20 [3-10].

13-35. The Walk to Emmaus.—One of the gems of Luke's Gospel, full of detail. It is doubtless an authentic report probably communicated to Luke by the Cleopas whom he names. Cleopas (Cleopatros) is a Greek name, and suggests a Galilean like Andrew or Philip. Our Lord's appearances after the Resurrection were in different forms (Mk 16 [12]). He appeared and disappeared. He was difficult to recognize. He passed out of the grave-clothes and out of the tomb. Closed doors were no obstacle to Him. He was living in a higher mode of being in which 'matter' was wholly under the control of the purpose of the spirit. Hostile critics have amused themselves—foolishly surely—with the imagination of our Lord dressing Himself appropriately for the various appearances. But the clothes were part of the 'manifestations,' which were all condescensions to material or carnal conditions out of which He had passed. So of the 'eating' ([42-43]: cf. Ac 10 [41]).

13. And behold—so Jewish a phrase,—

may indicate an Aramaic and written source.

25-26. Note the insistence that all had been according to the Scriptures. As to death and resurrection our Lord's reference is doubtless to Is 53 and cognate Psalms, especially 22. If the Christ had not suffered and died, a very important, though hitherto altogether neglected, element in the Old Testament would have meant nothing. It demanded fulfilment: and the Jews ought to have seen this. The reference to 'Moses' would, one may suppose, have been to Gen 3 [15], 12 [3], 18 [18], 22 [18], 26 [4], 28 [14], 49 [10]; Nu 24 [17]; Dt 18 [15] ff. But this discourse is among the hidden things, as also that of [45].

30. Cleopas and probably his friend had not been at the Last Supper. Nor can this have been a Eucharist. But the actions and gestures of Jesus were familiar, probably in frequent 'breakings of bread' with His disciples.

33. the eleven. John corrects—Thomas was absent.

34. It is remarkable that the incidents of this first appearance to Simon Peter were not by him left on record.

36-49. The Appearance to the Disciples.—The authenticity of the previous record carries with it the authenticity of this also—for it was all part of one continuous experience of the two. It must be the same appearance as that of Jn 20 [19-23]; but Luke received only what concerned the identification of Jesus and the instruction given to the disciples on the fulfilment of the Old Testament.

36. The latter part of the verse is rendered doubtful by the MS. evidence. It appears to have been introduced from Jn 20 [19].

39. The reference is clear to the prints of the nails. But the next verse was probably not in the original text (see Jn 20 [20]).

44-53. Last Discourse.—The story appears to be continuous to the end of the chapter, but the impression is corrected in the opening of Acts (1 [4]). Luke generally shows himself indifferent to considerations of chronology, and it cannot be assumed that when he was writing the end of the Gospel he was ignorant of the forty days' interval.

44-48 may have belonged to the discourse on the first evening; but [49] obviously is subsequent to the return of the Apostles from Galilee.

44. while I was yet with you: this phrase represents the fact that He was no longer 'with them' as Lazarus or the widow's son had returned from the state of death to be 'with' their friends. **the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms.** This is the only occasion where our Lord is represented as explicitly recognizing three divisions in the Old Testament canon. Perhaps 'the psalms' stands for all 'the writings,' including Daniel, a book which was certainly much in our Lord's mind. But the limits of the Hagiographa were not yet fixed, and, beyond the Psalms and Daniel, our Lord shows no signs of using them.

46. It is one thing to say that we find vicarious suffering and death and victory over death postulated in the Old Testament for the Divine Redeemer of Israel; but it is quite another to say that there is anything to suggest the 'three days.' We may reasonably think that, as in Matthew, we have here attributed to Christ something more than He said.* Nor can the contents of [47] be said to have been 'prophesied' precisely.

50-53. The Last Parting: see Ac 1 [4-11], where the Ascension is recorded in detail. Here, if the omissions (suggested by the MS. evidence) of the last clause in [51] and the words **worshipped him and** in [52] are made (see RVm), nothing remains which can be said to suggest an ascension strictly. But St. Luke appears to have meant this as a description of the Ascension (see Ac 1 [2]), though he gives the fuller account at the beginning of his second volume. There is not in the New Testament any real description of the Ascension except there, though it is alluded to as a definite event frequently in the New Testament (see below, p. 313).

52. with great joy . . . blessing God. No words could more appropriately conclude Luke's Gospel.

* See, however, on Mt 16 [21].

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN

By W. Lock

Introduction*

(1) **Intrinsic Value.**—The book embodies the latest statement of Christology in the New Testament; it was written after, and apparently with knowledge of, the Synoptist narrative, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it holds in equal poise sides of truth and life which are often placed in opposition to each other. (i) On the one side, the human nature of Jesus, His weariness, His thirst, His tears, His self-control, His love of His friends, His care for His mother, His reverence in prayer, His sense that His work is accomplished; on the other, His Divine Nature, as the Word and Son of God, revealing the nature and work and purposes of God, carrying on the Divine work, recreating the Creator's handiwork. It is in this respect most close to Hebrews. (ii) On the one side, simplicity of style and thought; on the other, philosophic and mystical depth. There are chapters (e.g. 11, 14, 15) which are more read in simple cottages than any other parts of the Bible; others to which the philosopher and theologian constantly return. 'Read it and weigh it and consider the view of life which it contains' was Bishop Creighton's advice to a dying man in need of comfort. 'I meditate on the Scriptures, especially the Gospel of St. John, and my creed rises up of itself with the ease of an exhalation, yet a fabric of adamant,' was the climax of the poet Wordsworth's account of the growth of his faith. (iii) On the one side stress on individual relation to the Saviour and to God; on the other, 'institutional religion' with the formation of a Church apart from the world, with stress on its unity, a training of the disciples to carry on their Master's work of forgiveness and of shepherding His sheep, with spiritual birth and nourishment conveyed through Sacraments. 'The book is fighting more consciously than the Synoptists for that inalienable idea of all deepest religion, unity even external and corporate among all believers' (von Hügel). In the English Prayer Book the Occasional Services for Baptism, the Eucharist, Marriage, Burial, Ordination, all borrow from it.

(2) **The Writer's Purpose and Method.**—The writer is a pastor, an evangelist even more than an historian. He is himself very conscious of the life which faith in Christ has brought himself; and he is interested in others who have not the same consciousness; his object is that *they too* (19 [35], 20 [31]) may have a fuller faith in Jesus, both as the Jewish Messiah and as the Son of God (cf. 1 Jn 2 [22, 26]) with a message for all God's children. His object is 'to make Christians convinced Christians' (Sanday) or rather 'vital Christians,' whose faith shall give them fuller life (cf. 1 Jn 5 [13]). He writes (as in 1 Jn) that their joy may be full, that they may share the life of Christian fellowship. He writes also not for himself alone, but in the name of a community of believers (1 [14-16]); it is interesting to notice that in the Muratorian Canon it is said that it was revealed to Andrew that 'John should relate all things in his own name, aided by the revision of all of them.' To do this he first explains Christ's Nature as a Revealer of God's Truth and Restorer of His handiwork (1 [1-18]); then, out of the many incidents which he remembers or which lay before him in earlier Gospels, he makes a selection (he only gives the events of some twenty days in the life) of a few actions and discourses of Christ, first illustrating His manifestation to the world (1-12), then His return to God from whom He had come (13-20), and His subsequent guidance of His Church (21). In making this selection his principles seem to have been (i) to supplement the Synoptist narrative, adding the Judæan ministry, and only repeating the same events when he can add to them some notable facts or sayings or can correct the date; (ii) to connect the events with Judæa and the Jewish festivals and to show how Christ fulfilled the Messianic offices of Prophet, High Priest, and King, and was greater than all Jewish patriarchs and prophets; (iii) to show that there were germs in the Lord's action and teaching which had outlined the development of the later Church—moving from Judæa to Samaria, looking forward to the inclusion of Greeks, pointing to a spiritual worship, independent of place and requiring the sacrifice of self rather than of animals; yet a worship embodied in Sacraments—the thoughts of cleansing and of feeding appearing constantly throughout the whole Gospel; (iv) perhaps

* See also the note appended to commentary on the question of authorship, etc.

also to suggest to Greek readers that Christian teaching expressed to the full all truth of character that underlay Stoic teaching and all religious aspiration embodied in the mysteries; and that Christ Himself was One greater than their deities and heroes (*v.* notes on 1 [18], 2 [9], 9 [6], 11 [1], 14 [1]). The incidents are felt by him to be symbols of God's eternal working; they come to him illuminated by all that has happened in the history of the Church; he is 'a writer who has lived the Gospel that he propounds' (Loisy), to whom water and wine are rich with a new meaning, who has seen thousands spiritually fed, the eyes of spiritually blind opened, the dead in sin quickened into life. And the sayings of the Lord have been repeated, taught, illustrated, and expanded by himself in his teaching, parts possibly even written down before the compilation of the Gospel, so that it is often hard to draw the exact line between the Lord's own words and those of the evangelist. 'Yet though seen only across John's soul, it is Christ's self we see. He is not John's creation' (Lebreton). Further to the incidents he adds his own comments—partly for Greek readers, explaining Aramaic words (1 [38, 41, 42], 4 [25], 9 [7], 20 [24]); partly—chiefly for Jewish readers—pointing out fulfilment of prophecy (7 [38], 19 [36, 37]); partly explaining ambiguous sayings in the light of later events (2 [21], 7 [39], 11 [51], 18 [9], 21 [19]); but mainly pointing out the result of each incident in producing faith or unfaith, the latter being traced to moral causes, so that the work is 'the Gospel of rejection' (Richmond) as well as of acceptance, 'a spiritual tragedy of unapproachable grandeur' (Westcott). The writer seems to say throughout: These things were written for an example and warning to you. The Jews lost all the blessings we received because they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God, because they had no love for God, no open mind for His truth, or because their lives were evil. Judas, though so near to the Lord, lost Him through his love of money. Besides being a warning to his readers, this probably had also an apologetic purpose, defending the claim that the Gospel was a Gospel for all men against the objection that, so far from this being true, the Lord's own nation had rejected it. As such it is exactly parallel with Rom 9-11.

(3) **Literary Character.**—The book has a carefully planned unity; the end is in view from the beginning (1 [29], 19 [36]); the divisions of the subject are clearly marked; there is a steady climax in the events; a growing revelation of Himself and of His Father by the Son; we watch His 'hour' all the time, as it delays, approaches, arrives. But within this unity two threads intertwine, the one, incident; the other, spiritual idea. Which is the primary? Some hold that the spiritual is primary, the historical incident quite secondary; that the writer wishes to show the work of the Word of God in the world, and for that purpose borrows from the Synoptists *or invents* incidents, miraculous or not, which will illustrate the greatness of it, recording miracles more striking than in the Synoptists, and adding points to emphasize their greatness (2 [6], 5 [5], 9 [1], 11 [39]). If this were so, it would be useless to look for exact chronology, to attempt to identify all local allusions, or to harmonize facts with the Synoptists; the literary character will be that of a spiritual romance, 'a poem, not a history' (Drummond), 'a pictorial embodiment of spiritual truth' (*ibid.*); it will rank with and have to be judged by the same canons of interpretation as Nathan's parable or the Book of Jonah in the Old Testament, as *Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained*, or, more exactly, as *Pilgrim's Progress*. This theory is, in some respects, attractive; it gets rid of some historical difficulties (e.g. 4, the conversion of Samaritans; 11, the omission of the raising of Lazarus from the Synoptists); in some cases (e.g. in 4, 6, and 9) the symbol might easily have suggested the incident; other incidents can be explained as illustrative expansions of Synoptic sayings (cf. 11 with Lk 15 [32]). A great deal of the spiritual value of the book will still remain, and the book will show that the impression of the Lord's Personality was so great both in His lifetime and in His subsequent effect upon the Church that it could only be represented by striking miraculous incidents. But there are decisive objections to this view. Great stress is laid on the fact that the miracles were wrought before eye-witnesses (20 [30]); the writer believes strongly in the harmony of the spiritual with the material as shown in the Incarnation itself and in the Sacraments, and all the earlier facts are treated as on the same level as the undoubtedly historical fact of the crucifixion. 1 John shows that he was face to face with Docetic tendencies (4 [2, 3]), to which the only reply could be historic facts; again, many of his facts explain points in the Synoptists which call for explanation (cf. Scott Holland, *The Fourth Gospel*, Intro-

duction, 1); a comparison of the Prologue with the rest of the Gospel, or of 1 John with the Gospel, shows that the writer clearly is conscious of a difference between his own technical language and that of the narrative where he is controlled by facts and traditional record. The literary character is then that of a history; it has to be classed with the Acts or in classical literature with Tacitus or Thucydides. Like any historian, he tries to explain the principles which actuate his hero or which affect His action; only he has to deal with One who, as no other, had revealed the essential principles which underlie the world's history, and so made manifest the Father's nature, and the realities of spiritual life. The writer records deeds wrought in time, but he sees the eternal in the temporal.

(4) **The Date**—(i) *Terminus ad quem.*—The book is quoted and classed by Irenæus as part of the world-wide fourfold Gospel; it was used by the Valentinian Gnostics as well known, and as such must have been recognized as authoritative earlier than A.D. 150. Teaching very similar about the 'Word of God' is found in Justin Martyr; about 'living water,' 'the bread of life,' 'the relation of the Son to the Father' in Ignatius, sufficient to make it probable that the book was known to them, so that it can scarcely be later than A.D. 115.

(ii) *Terminus a quo.*—If 21 is by the same author as 1-20, the date must be after the crucifixion of St. Peter, possibly after the death, certainly after the extreme old age, of the loved disciple. Apart from 21, there is no reference to any *event* later than the Resurrection (2 [22]) and Pentecost (7 [39]). But the incidents and discourses suggest more than this. They imply an organized Church, with spiritual worship and two central Sacraments: there is apparently still bitter opposition from Jews, or perhaps Jewish Christians unconvinced of the divinity of Jesus; on the other hand, there are others, probably Greek Christians, who explain away the reality of His human life. There is also need to guard against an undue exaltation of the Baptist's work, as if there were still disciples of his (cf. Ac 19 [4]); there is a deep strain of mysticism, of the relation of the Son to the Father, of the union of Christians with Christ, akin to that of the Oriental mysteries; a stress on knowledge and truth akin to the Gnosticism and syncretism of the 2nd century. Striking similarities with the mystical description of the union between the Christian and Christ, between the Father and the Son, are found in the writings of the Mandæans, an early Gnostic sect in Mesopotamia, but their date is uncertain; their priority to our Gospel is quite unproven (cf. J. E. Carpenter, *The Johannine Writings*, Part II, Lecture II, note). There are also striking similarities with the language of the Hermetic books, the utterance of Egyptian religious devotees, influenced by Greek philosophy and perhaps by contact with Jewish books of Wisdom in Alexandria; but there is no probability of dependence of our author upon either of these sources (cf. J. E. Carpenter, *op. cit.*, Lecture III); and this strain in the Gospel is adequately accounted for by Jewish mysticism, such as finds fuller expression in the 'Odes of Solomon.'

The writer seems to class himself, in contrast to his readers, with the eye-witnesses of the human life of Jesus (1 [14]); he knows the Synoptic narrative as found in St. Mark, and probably in St. Luke, but treats them with great freedom; he also knows St. Paul's teaching, and perhaps refers to his letters (1 [14-17]). This and the allusions to the Baptist favour a fairly early date—the mystical element perhaps a later date. Yet the Christology is not in essence higher than that in Colossians and Hebrews; the mystical sense of union with Christ not higher than that of St. Paul (e.g. Gal 2 [20]; 2 Cor 4 [10]); the stress on unity not greater than in Ephesians, with which our Gospel has a very close affinity. The date may then be any year after *c.* A.D. 75. All tradition connects it with Ephesus, so that it represents the attitude of the devout orthodox communities of Asia Minor in the last quarter of the 1st century. The incidents of the earthly life have since been reflected in the Church's life; the promises made to the Apostles of love, joy, peace, have been found true by all Christians (Gal 5 [22]).

(5) **Authorship.**—The author was a Jew by birth, thinking in Aramaic, writing a Greek style partly influenced by Aramaic (cf. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 1922, but *v.* Moulton, *Gk. Gr.*, ii, 32), tracing salvation to the Jews (4 [22]), noting the fulfilment of Jewish prophecies, proving Jesus to be the Messiah, grieved at the rejection of Him by the Jews: yet a Jew who has welcomed the inclusion of the Gentiles, who is acquainted with Greek religion and philosophy, and possibly with Philo's attempt to recommend Judaism to Greek thinkers (it was to Ephesus that Apollos the Alexandrian had come [Ac 18 [24]]); a man of

literary skill in the structure of the book, using earlier Gospels yet feeling free to adapt them to his own purpose; yet also a mystic who has felt the secret union of his own spiritual life with that of the living Christ. He never (except possibly in 21 [25]) speaks in the first person; he may refer to himself as 'he that hath seen' in 19 [35]; he includes himself among those who saw the human life (1 [14]); and he introduces anonymously 'a disciple whom Jesus loved,' who is attested by others as being the author (21 [24]); and the identification of him as the author may explain the absence of any name given by him to that disciple. Both style and subject make it almost certain that he was the author of 1 Jn. All these facts point to the loved disciple as the author of at least 1-20, writing in his old age. If the indications of a later date outweigh them, then the author was probably a disciple of the loved disciple; the latter was, if not the author, at least the authority for the Gospel.

External evidence carries us one step further. All MSS. and all tradition give his name as John, who is sometimes described by Irenæus as 'a disciple,' as 'an elder,' less often as 'an Apostle,' and is said to have written after a revelation made to the Apostle Andrew (Muratorian Canon). Doubtless all these authorities thought of John, the son of Zebedee, which would be consistent with his position and character in the Synoptists. But there are two grounds for hesitation: (i) there is some evidence—not indeed very strong (cf. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Records*, iii, 112-120)—the evidence of late writers quoting Papias, that John as well as James was put to death by Jews, which could not be later than A.D. 70. (ii) There is also evidence of the existence of two Johns at Ephesus in the 2nd century, and it is suggested that the work of the second has been attributed to the first. This is possible, but scarcely likely, in the face of the strong Church tradition. In modern times the suggestion has been made of composite authorship: either an early collection of the Lord's discourses by John, fitted in to an historic narrative by a later writer (Wendt, Eng. Tr., 1902), or an historical narrative by an eye-witness, expanded by some theologian interpreting the facts as the work of the Word and in the light of later experience; to whom is sometimes added a final redactor, adding explanatory notes and adapting the Johannine to the Synoptic Gospels (Macgregor in *Expositor* for August, 1922). Such theories do emphasize different elements in the book, but these differences are quite consistent with the work of one author.

(6) **Relation to the Synoptists.**—The writer clearly knew the outline of the Synoptic narrative; in many details he seems to show a knowledge of St. Mark (though the facts are explicable as independent recollections of two eye-witnesses), possibly of the other evangelists; but there are differences between the whole Synoptic account and his which are hard to explain. (i) The Synoptic narrative was clearly drawn up by one whose acquaintance with the Lord was mainly in Galilee, but it leaves hints of work in Judæa (Mk 3 [7, 8]; Mt 23 [37]). John wishes to supplement this with knowledge that he has of work in Judæa, and fits it in to their account (3 [24]; cf. Mk 1 [14]). But even when they narrate the same events, there are differences, especially in dates (the cleansing of the Temple, the day of the Crucifixion). It is possible to explain these differences (*v.* notes), and it has to be remembered that neither the Synoptists nor John aim at complete biographies; the Synoptists deals with some forty days, John with only twenty in a ministry of three years; each is dominated by a spiritual motive, drawing out elements that bear upon some permanent side of the Gospel message. (ii) But the style of the Lord's discourses is so different. True, but this is partly (not wholly) due to difference of scene and auditors; the Synoptists contain one section different from the other discourses which they narrate, and akin to those in St. John (Mt 11 [25-30]); and it has to be remembered that both accounts are translations from Aramaic, each influenced by the translator's own style, though this is doubtless far truer of St. John, who often combines comments of his own with sayings of the Lord in a way which is hard to disentangle. (iii) But the substance of the Lord's revelation of His own nature is different; in the Synoptists that of a great spiritual teacher trying to hide his claim to be the Messiah; in St. John teaching about His own relation to the Father, and accepting the recognition of His Messiahship from the first. This difference, again, is mainly due to the difference of the auditors. In St. John He is conscious of His Messiahship from the first, but He is afraid of a Jewish conception of the Messiah as an earthly king; He accepts the expression of it from His close followers (1 [41], 11 [27]), and from Samaritans who had no such conception, but think of Him as a prophet (4 [25, 29]); He flies from the Jewish conception of an earthly kingship

(6 15), and to the last will not speak plainly to the Jews in Jerusalem (10 24, 12 34). Somewhat similar is the difference about the Parousia, the future Presence of the Lord. To the Synoptists it is a return in glory after a short time, though with a warning that no one on earth knows the time; to St. John it is mainly a Spiritual Presence of the Living Lord in the heart, which has become real since Pentecost, but he still looks forward to a future coming to judgement (5 27). As with St. Paul in his later epistles, the reality of a Real Presence through the Spirit's action throws into the far horizon the thought of the Final Coming. Nor is it much otherwise with regard to the Lord's relation to the Father. St. John is full of his stress upon it; He works as the Father works; He says only what He has heard from the Father; He and the Father are one thing; they who have seen Him have seen the Father. The Spirit that He will send is the Father's Spirit; He is in the Father, and the Father in Him. But to the Synoptists also He is the unique Son of the Father; He spends whole nights in communing with the Father; He claims that all things have been committed to Him by the Father, and He calls all to come unto Himself; He claims to override the Law, to forgive sins, to judge mankind. The natural outcome of such claims would be the fuller Revelation given to the disciples in face of His approaching death; and sayings given then would be dwelt upon, expanded, illustrated, under the influence of the mystical relation and closeness to the Living Lord after His ascension, by those who felt that they were living in Him and He in them. The writer seems to say: 'If you wish to know what the Lord really was and can be to His members, you must hear what He was to those most intimate with Him in His earthly life, and what He has proved to be to us since.' His life on earth has found a reflection in the life of the Church since under the inspiration of His Spirit.

Prologue—*The Purpose.*—The writer explains the essential nature of Him whose life he is going to narrate.

(i) St. Mark had described him as Son of God, and said nothing about His birth; St. Matthew and St. Luke had dwelt on the details of His supernatural birth; St. Matthew tracing his descent from Abraham; St. Luke from Adam, and ultimately from God; John carries His existence back into eternity. He was in a real sense God; His life was throughout a Revelation of the Father: not the first Revelation but the fullest, embodying all that the Jews had meant by God's indwelling among His people, by God's glory, by God's wisdom, by a Son of God, and all that Greeks and Philo had meant by the *Logos*—yet a fuller Revelation than any previously given. He was greater than Moses, greater than John the Baptist, carrying all that had been meant by the *Logos* to a diviner level. He was God's Son in a unique sense.

(ii) That life was at every moment a test of man; it drew a sharp dividing-line between those who accepted and those who rejected it. The reader must always remember that in its bearing upon himself. The Father's only-begotten Son had come willing to make all men children of God; He had made the writer and those who had seen the earthly life such children; He had come offering grace and truth, and they had received them. Would his readers also receive them? That depended upon their own receptivity. He was still alive, offering the same gifts to all who would come to Him.

Form.—Two thoughts intermingle rather strangely: (*a*) the description of the Word, (*b*) the references to the work of John the Baptist; one of the latter, 15, interrupts the connexion of thought between 14 and 16 and seems misplaced, and should probably come after 18. Further, the parts under (*a*) are of a more poetic rhythm than those under (*b*) (Burney, 40 ff.). Hence it is possible that (*a*) was composed separately, and (*b*) introduced later under the influence of the stress on the Baptist's work in Mk 1 1-4, and to guard against the exaggeration of the Baptist's position.

Materials Used.—There is a conscious reminiscence of (i) Gen 1, 'In the beginning,' the contrast between light and darkness, the stress on all things having been created by God. (ii) The praises of Wisdom in Pr 8 22-26, Wisd 7 22-30, and Ecclus 24, with perhaps a reference to Job 28. (iii) The Pauline epistles, with the stress on 'grace' (Romans, Galatians) and 'fulness' (Ephesians, Colossians); and perhaps Hebrews ('truth').

For a suggestion of the influence of Stoic religion upon the praise of Wisdom in the Jewish descriptions of it cf. Rendel Harris, *Stoic Origins of St. John's Gospel.*

It is not very material whether it was written first before the narrative, or as a postscript, like a modern preface, after it (so Harnack); in either case it sums up the main thoughts of the narrative. The stress on the work of the *Logos* in creation leads on to the miraculous works. The

stress on the *Logos* as God's interpreter leads to the large element of discourse and revelation; light and life are the constantly recurring notes, and there is the same attitude to the position of John the Baptist. At the same time it is noticeable that the more technical theological terms, 'the word,' 'grace,' 'fulness,' 'declare,' never recur, even in the Lord's own words; the writer seems conscious that they are later terms, and is controlled by historic tradition from putting them into the Lord's mouth.

The whole section should be compared with Mt 11 [25-27], and with Col 1 [15-17], Heb 1 [2-4]. Just as 1 Cor 15 [3-5] was the germ of the historical portion of the Creed, so were these passages of the theological portions.

I. 1. **In the beginning** recalls Gen 1 [1] (cf. Pr 8 [22]). The work of the Word was as wide in Redemption as in Creation

the Word. The Greek *Logos* has so many associations that it is difficult to decide which of these is included here and which is primary. It can be explained by Jewish antecedents alone; Creation had been ascribed to God's uttered word (Gen 1 [1]; cf. Ps 33 [6]); His word was the healing power which healed those bitten of serpents (Wisd 16 [12]); it was the 'stern warrior' who destroyed the firstborn of the Egyptians (*ibid.*, 18 [15]). It implied God's transcendence, as standing above the world, coming into contact with it, revealing and executing His will. But it was also one of the most favourite words of Greek philosophy, and that in varying senses; with Plato, the reason in the mind of God, which embodies the 'ideas' of all created things and which makes them what they are; with the Stoics, the indwelling force in the universe which sustains it in life, a diffused spirit or law guiding and controlling its being; it emphasized the immanence of God. Further, Alexandrine Jews, especially Philo, had tried to adapt these Greek conceptions to Jewish thought; with him the *Logos* was the embodiment of the divine powers which acted upon the universe, the intermediary between God and man, the interpreter of God's will to man, the High Priest of man to God, at times so personified that He could be called 'divine' and even 'a second God.' It is almost certain that such teaching was known to St. Paul and to the author of Hebrews and consequently to John, and that therefore there is a conscious attempt here to attract Greek readers by embodying much of their thought and yet showing that it was inadequate, that the *Logos* was essentially God with a real personality, that all creation was His action; matter was not evil in itself, man was akin to God, and the *Logos* had really been manifested in an historic life. Yet the primary conception is Jewish; it is of the transcendent God coming to create and to reveal, offering new gifts of grace and truth and sonship, and the last word lays stress on *declaring*, on interpreting. 'In the beginning was the *Word*' is a more primary thought than 'In the beginning was Mind' (R. S. Bridges). Notice that Ignatius (*ad Magn.*, viii) contrasts it with Silence.

The two underlying thoughts are well combined in the summary: 'The *meaning* of the Infinite was *spoken out*' (Streeter) in the actions and words of Jesus.

In the beginning—put first exactly as in Gen 1 [1]; it was the Creator coming to re-create His creation where spoilt by sin and to carry it forward to eternal life (cf. 5 [17]); but, as with 'Wisdom,' his existence was 'before God's works of old,' 'or ever the earth was made' (Pr 8 [22] ff.: cf. Jn 17 [5, 24]). **with God** (Pr 8 [27]; Wisd 9 [4]): the Greek preposition perhaps expresses the closest companionship, 'face to face' with God, 'heart to heart' (cf. 5 [19], 10 [30]). Nay, more; He was not merely divine, not to be described as a God of the second rank (Philo), but one who had the values of God Himself, His words words of life eternal (6 [69]), Himself an object of worship (20 [28]).

3. Moreover, all creation was His work; there were no intermediate agents to spoil His handiwork, to make matter evil in itself, to make anything common or unclean (cf. Rom 14 [14]; 1 Tim 4 [4]); but everything could in its measure reveal God: the inanimate world His power and divinity (Rom 1 [20]), all animate beings His indwelling life, and man His light, the power to see and show forth moral goodness and spiritual truth.

5. But this revelation has always been thwarted, though never entirely obscured. God separated the light from the darkness (Gen 1 [4]), but the darkness has always been there and is there still; but as it was said that 'against wisdom evil doth not prevail' (Wisd 7 [30]), so it is true now. He was the Light which enlighteneth every man. The way for him was prepared by God. John was His witness; not the light itself, let no one exaggerate his position (1 [20], 5 [35])—but a witness that His work was to be universal. He was the true light. 'The Light which lighteneth every man' may refer to the light of

conscience which is universal and given at birth (cf. Ac 17 [24-28]; Rom 1 [19, 20]), but more probably to the light of Christ's teaching which enlightens not Jews only but all the world, the writer adapting what Jews said of 'the light of the Law which was given in our nation to enlighten every man' (*Test. Levi*, 14).

10, 11. As in Creation He had been present and yet the world had not recognized His Presence (cf. 1 Cor 1 [21]; Rom 1 [18-32]), so it was now. He came to what was specially His own country (cf. 4 [44]; Mt 13 [57]), and yet His own people, the Jews, did not receive Him (cf. Rom 9-11). But to all who welcomed Him, who believed all that His revelation meant, He gave the privilege of becoming children, not slaves; children not of Abraham but of God Himself, for they received a new spiritual birth given by God Himself (cf. 3 [3-8]). (There is in [13] a striking Latin variant which is frequently quoted in the earliest Fathers: instead of 'for they were born,' it reads, 'for he was born' (*qui natus est*), referring to the Virgin Birth, Christ's birth from God enabling Him to make others children of God. But this reading is not found in any Greek MS., and the thought unduly anticipates the next verse.)

14. the Word became flesh: the thought is akin to Rom 8 [3]; Heb 2 [14], but here expressed in a strong, dogmatic, vivid form, the central message of the New Testament, emphasizing the reality of the human life and death (cf. 19 [35], 1 Jn 4 [2, 3]), leading up to the stress on the flesh as the true food of man (6 [53]), and so the uplifting truth to which every priest's thought goes back after each Eucharist. **and dwelt among us:** 'dwelt' or 'tabernacled' (margin) perhaps suggests a temporary dwelling (cf. 2 Cor 5 [1]), but much more the 'Shechinah,' the indwelling of God among His people and in the Temple: so Wisdom is described as saying: 'I *dwelt* in high places. . . . Then he that created me . . . said, Let thy *tabernacle* be in Jacob. . . . In the holy *tabernacle* I ministered before him' (Ecclus 24). The Wisdom which had tabernacled in Israel now tabernacles in us, i.e. in the Christian Church (cf. *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, x: 'We give thanks to Thee, Holy Father, for Thy holy Name, which Thou didst make to *tabernacle* in our hearts'). **and we beheld** His glory: this must certainly imply eye-witnesses of the Lord's life in the circle to which the writer belonged. **his glory** takes up the Old Testament thought of God (cf. 12 [40, 41]) frequently used in the later Targums as a periphrasis for God (Burney, p. 37). It will refer to the whole life, with perhaps special reference to the glory of the Transfiguration when He was proclaimed as God's beloved Son (Lk 9 [32, 36]; 2 P 1 [17, 18]; Heb 1 [3]). The word 'only-begotten' in itself only means 'unique,' and as such is applied to Wisdom (Wisd 7 [22], from which John may have borrowed it), but with the addition 'from the Father' suggests 'begotten as Son,' only-begotten. **grace and truth:** so Wisdom had said of herself: 'My branches are branches of glory and grace' (Ecclus 24 [16]); and the Old Testament often combines the thoughts of mercy and truth as characteristic of Jehovah (Ex 34 [6], and especially Ps 85 [9]: 'That glory may *dwell* in our land, *mercy* and *truth* are met together'), but our author substitutes 'grace' to recall St. Paul's teaching (Romans, Galatians) of 'grace' as the free and forgiving love of God which draws out man's powers; but behind the technical sense lies the thought of the attractive graciousness that was in the Lord (Lk 2 [52], 4 [22]). And *truth* will mean not only truth of teaching about God (4 [23], 8 [32], 16 [13]), but also *reality*—everything was real about Him, and He made our lives real (6 [32], 15 [1], 17 [3]). 'Grace and truth' are the outcome of 'graciousness and reality.'

15 is perhaps misplaced; it so obviously breaks the close connexion between [14] and [16]. 'Fulness' is again St. Paul's technical word; it here combines the thought of the divine fulness dwelling in Christ ([14], cf. Col 1 [19]) with that of Christ's 'fulness' handed on to His Church (cf. 3 [35]; Eph 1 [23]); and this given as God always gives His gifts, one after another, as men are capable of receiving them (cf. Philo, *De Poster. Cain.*, 43). The Law itself was a real gift (cf. Rom 7 [7-14]) for a time, but grace and truth came into being in Jesus Christ, an eternal reality, no mere sketch (cf. Hebrews), and that in a constantly growing measure—to him that hath new gifts are constantly being given.

18. But the writer feels that he must guard against an exaggeration. In spite of all that the Word was, no man has even yet ever gazed upon God. As both Jewish and Greek philosophers would insist, He exists beyond the power of entire representation; yet the only-begotten Son—or perhaps the reading should be 'one who was at once only-begotten and God' (cf. [1, 14]) manifested Him as far as human life can manifest Him, and knowing all His secrets—the phrase

perhaps intentionally recalls the scene in 13 23-25—did interpret His will to man. The word **declared** (here only in the Gospel) may combine two suggestions: (i) He did what Jehovah alone had done before: cf. Job 28 20-27, 'It (Wisdom) is hid from the eyes of all living, . . .' but at creation, 'Then did he (Jehovah) see it and *declare* it.' (ii) He did for all men what the Greek 'declarers' (from the same verb), the teachers of the proper rites, the interpreters of omens and messages from the gods, did for the Greeks.* There may possibly even be an implied contrast with Apollo the mouthpiece of his father Zeus—'the declarer of his father's will to all mankind' (Plato, *Rep.*, 427). Cf. Wisd 8 4: 'Wisdom is privy to the mysteries of the knowledge of God.'

The fact that 'the Word' has embodied all that the Old Testament ascribed to 'Wisdom' implies that all that Christ wrought on earth was the work of wisdom as well as of love.

19-51. The preparation for the ministry: (*a*) by the work of John; (*b*) by the choice of followers. The narrative commences with the exactness of a diary: four different days are mentioned, and the third day after the fourth (2 1) makes a complete week. The evangelist may possibly have seen a symbolism in this number seven (cf. Gen 1), but the absence of any mention of two of the days is against this, and the exactness points rather to the recollections of an eye-witness recalling the decisive moments of the start of his own spiritual life. A somewhat similar exactness is found at the end, in describing the days of the last week, when the Crucifixion and Resurrection finally confirmed his faith (12 1, 13 1, 18 28, 19 31, 20 1, 26).

19-34. The work and witness of John: (*a*) *Negative.*—He is not himself the Christ or Elijah or the prophet (cf. Dt 18 15; Mal 4 5), but only preparing the way for one greater (Is 40 3; cf. Mk 1 3). Notice the triple denial (20) showing the need that still existed of guarding against an exaggeration of John's position. Ac 19 1-7 shows the existence of a group of the Baptist's disciples then at Ephesus. **in the midst of you** is perhaps quite literal, as if Jesus was at the moment standing in the crowd, but more probably already 'living among you' as one whom you have not recognized (ctr. 29).

(*b*) *Positive.*—Jesus is the Lamb of God and His Son. **the Lamb of God:** to the Baptist this title may have been suggested (i) by Isaiah, whom he had quoted with regard to himself (23), signifying the Servant of Jehovah, led as a lamb to the slaughter, bearing the sins of others (53 7-12), one greater than and different from himself, patient, and gentle under the Shepherd's guidance, with 'the royalty of inward happiness'; he himself might wash away sin, Jesus would remove it wholly: (ii) by the apocalyptic conception of a lamb as a leader against the forces of evil, as the Messiah (1 Enoch 89 45, 90 38; *Test. XII. Patr.*: Jos. xix, 8, quoted in Charles's *Comm. on Rev.*, I, cxiii). Both thoughts may have been combined: 'Go, follow Him: He is a leader who can save you from sin and will lead you to victory.'

To the evangelist in the light of the crucifixion the word would have further reference to the Paschal Lamb (cf. 19 36; 1 Cor 5 7), to the sin-offering (1 P 1 19), with, perhaps, an allusion to Gen 22 8, the Lamb provided for Himself by God for sacrifice.

which taketh away the sin of the world: probably this description is by the evangelist himself; the personification of the principle of sin and the use of 'the world' both point to this. Or, possibly, the Baptist, still following Isaiah, said 'who bears our sins' (cf. 31), and the evangelist, feeling the inadequacy of this, expands it into 'who **takes away the sin of the whole world.**' **taketh away** may well combine the thoughts; he removes by His Presence all thought of sin and evil, He takes upon Himself the suffering caused by sin (Mt 8 17), He removes it by forgiveness (cf. 1 S 15 25), and also He lifts it up upon the Cross for God's condemnation (cf. 1 P 2 24) to win for others atonement and the power of not sinning. To the Baptist the first two of these meanings would be real, to the evangelist all of them.

the sin: the evangelist sees the unity of all sin; elsewhere he applies the forgiveness to the actual sins of each individual (20 23; 1 Jn 3 5). So all the Western Liturgies: 'qui tollis peccata mundi.'

32, 33. abode, abiding: this is emphatic. In the Old Testament the Spirit is generally given temporarily for some particular task; in the New Testament as a permanent indwelling, enriching the whole personality.

34. the Son of God: taking up the voice at the baptism of Jesus recorded in the Synoptists.

* Surely this suggests a more favourable view of Greek religions than the author of this Gospel is at all likely to have taken.—C. G.

35-53. The choice of individual followers. Stress is laid on the Lord's immediate insight into the character of each (42-48), and on the widening of vision of those who come to Him (39, 'ye shall see'; 50, 51); the sight of Him in His home for one day suffices to make them eager to find others to share the sight: He is a leader whom they follow readily (37, 38, 40, 44). His attractive graciousness (cf. 14) wins them at once. This is the first note of the 'gospel of discipleship.'

39. the tenth hour: probably 10 a.m.

47. an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile: worthy to be named after Jacob, but only after his name had been changed to Israel (cf. 31, 51; cf. also Ps 15 3 of the true worshipper in the Temple).

51. The promise recalls the opening of the heaven at His baptism (Lk 3 21), and the ministry of angels during the Temptation (Mk 1 13), so that the thought is partly, 'You shall see what it has been given to me to see'; but the words come from Jacob's vision (Gen 28 12), with the difference that the Son of Man is compared not to the ladder ('upon it,' LXX), but to Jacob at the foot ('coming to alight upon him'). The true Israelite, following the King of Israel, will see constantly what Jacob saw once. As Jacob saw it when starting from home and heard the promise that God would be with him and bless his errand, so the followers of Jesus will see now, as He starts on His ministry and throughout it, God's angels coming to help the Son of Man; and this need not be limited to the Son of Man in His life on earth, but extended to Him as living in His Body, the Church (cf. Heb 1 14). The fulfilment is not to be looked for so much in particular visits of angels (but cf. 12 29, 20 12) as in the thought of the permanent work of angels as intermediate agencies between God and man, carrying up man's prayers and bringing down God's answers. The evangelist would probably see one fulfilment in Ac 7 56, others in the visions and angels of the Apocalypse. In Jewish apocalypses they frequently appear as bringing His revelations to the apocalyptist (cf. Rev 1 1 and *passim*). A Greek Christian would probably realize how this fulfilled the conception in his pagan religion of the inferior divine beings, 'who stand between God and mortal man . . . interpreting and ferrying across to the gods the messages from man and to men the messages from gods, from the one prayer and sacrifices, from the other commands and responses to sacrifices' (Plato, *Symp.*, 202 E., who is speaking of Love as one of these divine beings. Cf. Philo, *De Somn.*, 1, xxiii-xxxii for a rationalizing of Jacob's dream).

the Son of man: three usages lie behind the New Testament use of this phrase: (*a*) 'a son of man' as little more than a periphrasis for man, mainly with stress on his weakness, but also in Ps 8 4 on his lordship over creation (cf. Heb 2 5-9). (*b*) 'One like unto a son of man' (Dan 7 13), of a supernatural being in human form, who, as the representative of the saints of the Most High, takes the kingdom.* (*c*) 'The son of man' in the Similitudes of Enoch as the elected Judge who will execute judgment at the end of the æon. The Lord takes this phrase; it is only found in His own mouth except in Ac 7 56 (with which cf. His own saying, Mk 14 62 and perhaps *inf.* 3 13); in some places He clearly uses it of Himself;† sometimes of His Passion and subsequent glorification; sometimes of His coming to execute judgement; here apparently as one about to take the kingdom (49 and 3 3; cf. Mk 1 15: 'The kingdom of God is at hand'). As contrasted with the Son of God it emphasizes the reality of His human nature (1 14); as with 'the son of David' the universality of His nature and message; as with 'a son of man,' 'sons of men,' His perfect representation of human nature.

II.-XII. The ministry to the world, ending in rejection.

II. Two incidents, each illustrating the *change* which Jesus was to introduce into the world, with the difference of the setting of each intentionally emphasized: the first at a social festival, to which He had been invited, in a Galilean village, a miracle, an act of sympathy, increasing the joy of life; the second at a religious festival, to which He goes of His own initiative, at Jerusalem, in the Temple, non-miraculous, an act of sternness purifying worship. The result in Galilee, gratitude and faith in Him; in Jerusalem, criticism and faith in His name only.

1-11. A miracle—and one on a striking scale (6); it should be compared with Elisha filling the vessels with oil (2 K 4), and contrasted with Moses turning water into blood at the commencement of his work. It is possible that these may have been in the writer's mind, but scarcely possible (as has been suggested) that he

* But is there any ground for supposing that for the author of *Daniel* the 'one like to a son of man,' who represents Israel, is any more a real being than the beasts who represent the world empires? In the *Similitudes* no doubt 'that Son of Man' is intended to be a real being.—C. G.

† Sometimes of Himself as He was during His ministry.—C. G.

was also aware of the legend found in some parts of Greece that water was turned into wine at the festivals of Dionysus (*Classical Quarterly*, April, 1920). What is more certain is that the writer meant to emphasize the happiness brought by Jesus, and that it summarizes the brightness of the early Galilean ministry in the Synoptists (Mt 11 [19]; Mk 2 [16]); also it falls in with his constant purpose of pointing out the inadequacy of Jewish cleansing; water brought for that is changed into something richer and more gladdening, into wine which was afterwards used for the Eucharist—the wine of the Spirit (cf. Eph 5 [18]); and behind that the evangelist would wish to hint that He had come to gladden all social joy at which He is invited to be present, to enrich all gifts placed at His disposal, keeping the best to the last, that He had come 'not to destroy, but to fulfil,' and that this is true for many who do not know the giver of their joy.

4. what have I to do with thee? The words can be translated, 'What is that to me and thee?' i.e. 'Never mind, don't be worried' (Burkitt), or, 'What is a little thing like that to you and me?' (Souter); but the common usage of the phrase supports the idea of putting aside intervention, and it is conclusive that this corresponds with a similar treatment of His mother in the early Galilean ministry (Mk 3 [33]). The mother, quick to see the needs of *home* life, knowing how in the home she has always looked to Him when anything was wanted and He has always supplied it, turns now to Him, but He courteously puts her aside. This is a wider sphere: He must be left to act when He feels the moment has come. She presses Him no more, but is quite sure that He will act and makes things ready for Him. 'Mine hour is not yet come' contains a double meaning: for the mother at the moment, 'the time for acting here is not come'; to the Lord Himself and to the evangelist, 'the hour of my public manifestation with all that it implies of rejection has not yet come' (cf. 7 [30], 8 [20], 12 [23], 13 [1], 17 [1]). The evangelist may also think of the mother as the type of human nature conscious of the need of the world, unable to satisfy it, bidding others look to Him for that, and having to leave the satisfying to the Christ who knows the right moment for acting, and confident that He will act then.

11. The result is the first manifestation of His glory (1 [14]), of the indwelling of the Creator's power in Him, and on the part of the disciples a more absolute committal of themselves to be His followers ('on Him': ctr. [23]).

13-22. The second change: the purification of worship. The main purpose is to clear worship from the thought of selfish gain ([16] 'a house of merchandise'). The sellers of animals for sacrifices and the money-changers—either to change foreign coin or larger Jewish coins (two different words are used) into the Temple shekel—were necessary, but their presence in the Temple courts was not necessary, and had become a source of profit to Annas and the priests. It has been suggested that a second purpose was to put an end to animal sacrifices, but that is very unlikely, and is entirely absent from the Synoptist account; yet it is possible that the evangelist, writing later, when the Christian Church had given up animal sacrifices, saw in the driving out of the sheep and oxen (which he alone mentions) a prophetic anticipation and a contrast between animal offerings and Christ's free-will offering of His own body, the thought of the Lamb of God being still in his mind. The relation to the Synoptic account is difficult. Conceivably the incident happened twice; more probably they are two records of one event. The Synoptists, who have no early Judæan ministry, bringing it into the last week because of its influence upon the opposition of the priestly party; or John transferring it to the commencement as so typical of the change which the Lord came to introduce; and seeing in it a fulfilment of Mal 3 [1-5], the Lord suddenly coming to the Temple as a purifier, and perhaps of Zech 14 [21]: 'There shall be no more a trafficker in the house of the Lord of Hosts.' John seldom repeats an incident that is fully recorded in the Synoptists; but here he does so in order to record a saying about the destruction of the Temple, and perhaps to correct the date of the incident. Notice, too, that he records a saying which explains the charge made against the Lord on His trial (Mk 14 [58]), for which the Synoptists suggest no explanation.

16. Cf. Is 56 [7]; Jer 7 [11]: 'my house' altered into 'my Father's house' (cf. Lk 2 [49]).

19. Destroy: half-ironical; act as you do and you will be sure to destroy yonder place of worship; and yet in three days—perhaps meaning little more than 'in a short time' (cf. Hos 6 [2])—I will raise up some other centre of worship. The Lord may also have had the different meaning, 'Destroy this body of mine (cf. Mt 12 [6]), and I will raise it up quickly.' The dis-

ciples so interpreted it after the resurrection (21) of the Lord's literal Body, and St. John probably sees the fulfilment of it in the Church, which St. Paul had likened to the Body of Christ; so that to Him it meant that in Christian worship the Church would take the place of the Temple.

20. Forty and six years: probably reckoning from the commencement of Herod's restoration of it in 20 B.C.

22. the scripture, e.g. Ps 16 10, quoted in Ac 2 27.

23. believed on his name: contrast **believed on him** (2 11). They did believe that He had a message from God, that there was truth in what He said; they were willing to listen to Him further, and inclining to think Him a prophet.

25. he knew: more exactly, as He watched each man He always recognized what was in him. This recalls the recognition of individual characters in 1 42-47, and leads up to the interviews in the next two chapters.

III., IV. Two discourses illustrating the two incidents in 2. A new cleansing and a new worship, each spiritual. Also two illustrations of 2 24, of the Lord's recognition of what is in man—the circumstances of each as different as possible: a man from the Pharisees with well-known name, a ruler, by night coming to enquire of Jesus, recognizing Jesus as a new teacher but left critical, still asking questions, the Jews not receiving the witness; in the other case, a woman from Samaria, unnamed, of doubtful character, meeting Him accidentally in open daylight, recognizing Jesus as a prophet and the Messiah, telling others, the Samaritans believing.

III. 1-15. A new birth, wrought by the cleansing of water and the Spirit, leading to a knowledge of heavenly things (cf. Heb 6 1-3), and connected with the death and exaltation of the Son of Man (cf. Rom 6 3, 4). This change is based upon the prophetic anticipation of a new heart and a new spirit (Ezek 18 31; Jer 31 31-33), and should be compared with the Rabbinic phrase 'a new creation,' as applied to a proselyte after his baptism, and with the Lord's call in the Synoptists for a change of heart (Mk 1 15), and for becoming as little children to win entrance into the Kingdom (Mt 18 3). St. Paul expresses the result as 'adoption,' St. Peter (1 P 1 3, 23, 2 2) and here St. John as new birth. This has its nearest analogy in the language of the mysteries, which offered new birth, new knowledge, and immortality to the initiated. The Lord probably used it quite independently, and St. John preserved it, wishing Greeks to recognize that the Church gave them all that the mysteries promised.

2. we know: Nicodemus represents his fellow-teachers (ctr. 11).

3. born anew: the Greek word may mean either 'anew' or 'from above,' and probably was meant to be ambiguous (cf. 19 11 note). To Nicodemus it meant only 'again' (cf. 4 and 1 P 1 3); to the Lord and the evangelist also 'from above' (cf. 8).

the kingdom of God: here and 5 only in the Gospel, but cf. 18 36. St. Mark makes it part of the Lord's first announcement (1 15). It is not merely the sovereignty of God in men's hearts, though it requires spiritual vision to see this, but a kingdom into which subjects have to enter (5) and obey the King's rule.

5. of water and the Spirit: perhaps intentionally ambiguous; to Nicodemus it would mean 'of John's baptism' (which the Pharisees had rejected, Lk 7 30) and of mine; to the evangelist, who may have been face to face with some Christians who knew only John's Baptism, and were perhaps content with it (cf. Ac 19 1-7), it meant with full Christian sacramental baptism, which gives new life as well as cleansing from the past (Tit 3 5). It is also possible that there is a reminiscence of Gen 1 2: 'the Spirit moving on the face of the water,' a fresh suggestion (cf. 1 1) that the Messiah's work was to be a re-creation, as universal as the Creation.

8. The wind bloweth: again intentionally of double meaning: the wind and the Spirit; the result is that not only the Spirit, but everyone born of the Spirit has something in him, not to be explained by merely natural causes (cf. 1 Cor 2 14 and Wisd 9 14-18).

11. we know (cf. 2): possibly 'the Baptist (cf. 1 34) and I' (cf. 1 51 note), though the Lord may already be associating His followers with Him in the witness; and the evangelist might interpret it as applying to all Christian teachers.

12. earthly things will refer to the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven *upon earth*; **heavenly** to all that lies above the earth—the 'many mansions' in the Father's house, the relation of Himself to the Father (cf. 14-16). For the thought cf. Mk 4 13.

The effect on Nicodemus is not recorded, but 7 50, 19 39 show that the incident left its mark upon him. He should be compared with the rich young man of Mk 10 17-22. It would be interesting if he could be identified with a Nicodemon, a rich counsellor who provided water on one

occasion for the pilgrims to the feast (cf. Wetstein and *Encyl. Bibl.* s.v.).

13. 'There is no one else who can tell of heavenly things; a mere man cannot do it': perhaps a reminiscence of Dt 30 [11f], applied by St. Paul to Christian Truth (Rom 10 [6]; cf. also Pr 30 [4]). This verse may be the evangelist's own comment on [12] (cf. Eph 4 [9]).

who is in heaven: omitted by many MSS. If read, they may be either (*a*) the Lord's own words, 'who while on earth still has heart and home in heaven'; or (*b*) by the evangelist, 'who *now* (while I write) has returned to heaven and is there.' If they are omitted from the text they will be the work of some scribe in the latter sense, which have been taken into the text from a side-note.

14. This too may be the evangelist's note. Two thoughts are implied: (*a*) Christ's death will be a source of salvation, like the serpent of brass (Nu 21 [9] and Wisd 16 [5-7]). (*b*) Christ's death (cf. 8 [28], 12 [33]) will be the means of His exaltation to God's right hand. The word for 'lifted up' was not used of the serpent, and is probably borrowed from Is 52 [13] of the servant of the Lord '*exalted* and glorified' (cf. its use in Ac 2 [33], 5 [31]).

16-21. The evangelist's comment ('the only-begotten Son,' 'believing on the name,' 'doing the truth' are only found in his comments: 1 [12, 14, 18], 2 [23]; 1 Jn 1 [6]), tracing unbelief to moral causes. The contrast between light and darkness was perhaps suggested by Nicodemus coming by night, but cf. Eph 5 [8-14]. The 'judgement' here is that which the readiness or the refusal to accept God's message throws back upon the past life of each.

16. gave his Son, i.e. at the Incarnation, perhaps also with special reference to His death (cf. Rom 8 [32]), carrying on the thought of [14].

22-30. An incident illustrating the discourse with Nicodemus. The Baptist himself testifies to the superiority of Christ's baptism. The fact that there were still followers of the Baptist (Ac 18 [25], 19 [3]) leads the evangelist to record this which had not been recorded in the Synoptists. [24] is perhaps specially inserted with reference to Mk 1 [14]; all this took place before the Synoptic account opens. A Jew is puzzled by the two baptisms: how does John's differ from that of Jesus? how do both differ from the ceremonial cleansings of the Law? These were among the first questions that needed an answer (cf. Heb 6 [2]). John answers that both himself and Jesus can only do what God has given each to do; his position was only that of a bridegroom's friend, Jesus was Himself the bridegroom. The simile of marriage between God and His people springs from the Old Testament, but Jesus from the first applied it to His relation to His followers (Mk 2 [19]), and it is fully expanded in Eph 5 [22-32] and Rev 21.

my joy: 'my' is emphatic. The joy which is mine as friend. Contrast 15 [11]: the joy which is mine as bridegroom.

31-36. Another comment by the evangelist, suggested partly by [30]: 'the superiority of Jesus has been proved by those who have accepted His witness'; partly by the interview with Nicodemus (cf. [32] with [11]).

33. All of us who accepted the witness have found the message true, and have signified that to others by attaching our seal to the statement (cf. 2 Cor 1 [18-20]) 'God is true,' for His messenger speaks truly, and God giveth to Him His Spirit in full measure. [35] is ambiguous, as the text supplies no nominative or dative with 'giveth'; it might mean 'God giveth His Spirit to Him whom He sent,' or 'He whom He sent giveth it to those who accept Him' (cf. 1 [16]). The words may be meant to include *both*: God giveth *Him* the Spirit, and *to us in Him*; but [35] shows that *to Him* is the prominent thought. God has not only given Him a true *message*, but also absolute power (cf. Mt 11 [27], 28 [18]).

IV. **1-42.** An interview and discourse carrying on the thought of 2 [13-22], and another illustration of 2 [25], of Christ's insight into the heart ([29]). The main truths are: (*a*) There is to be a new worship, spiritual, real, for all men ([24-42]); (*b*) though springing out of Judaism it will be accepted by Samaritans; (*c*) and by women as well as by men. Incidentally it is also leading up to 6 [27] f.; The Lord can satisfy spiritual needs: the food that is found in doing the Father's work ([31-34]); the water that brings eternal life ([14]). Further, He is shown to be one greater than Jacob, who only gave a well to satisfy natural thirst, and greater than Joseph, able to divine thoughts, the Saviour not of one nation, but of the world ([29, 42]). The incident is doubtless recorded by the evangelist as illustrating the subsequent growth of the Church to embrace Samaritans (Ac 8). It is difficult, but not impossible, to combine this narrative with the Lord's command (Mt 10 [5]) not to go to any city of Samaria, and with the treatment of Him by Samaritans in Lk 9 [52], and with the impression given in Ac 8 that Philip was the first to preach Christ in Samaria.

For this incident only deals with one village; the command of Mt 10 only with a temporary mission; the incident of Lk 9 [52] is explained there by the fact that Jesus was on His way to Jerusalem. On the other hand, Lk 10 [33], 17 [16] illustrate the Lord's generous praise of Samaritans (cf. Mk 7 [24-30], the interview with the Syrophœnician woman). For the allegorical treatment of the whole scene, see below. With the incident cf. Mt 10 [41, 42].

2. Cf. 1 Cor 1 [17]. For the first time the Lord associates His disciples with His work (cf. 2 [11] note).

5. Sychar: almost certainly the modern 'Askar, a small hamlet about half a mile from Jacob's well' (G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, c. 18).

6. the sixth hour: probably 6 p.m.

9. Jews have no dealings with Samaritans: if genuine, probably a note by the evangelist, but omitted by many MSS., and so a note by some later scribe (cf. 3 [13]).

10-14. It is interesting to compare Gen 21 [19], God opening the eyes of Hagar and 'she saw a well of living water.' For the application to spiritual thirst, cf. Is 55 [1]; Ps 42 [2]; Ecclus 15 [3]. 'She (Wisdom) will give him water of wisdom to drink.' For the Greek thought cf. Marc. Aurel., vii, 59: 'Dig within: within is the fountain of good; ever dig, and it will ever well forth water.'

18. This is the point at which the treatment of the whole incident as allegorical is most strongly suggested. According to it, the woman represents the whole nation: her marriage is a symbol of the nation's relation to religion (cf. 3 [29]); her five husbands correspond to the five gods whom the Assyrian settlers brought with them to Samaria (2 K 17 [24-34]: they are there counted as seven for the five nations, but in Josephus as five: 'five nations, each bringing its own god'); the present, who is no husband, to either the hybrid religion of a combination of the worship of Jehovah with that of the heathen gods—'they feared the Lord and served their own gods' (2 K *l.c.*)—or the reverence for Simon Magus, 'the great power of God' (Ac 8 [10]). This would lead up very naturally to the religious problem ([19-21]) and help to explain [38]. The whole would then be an allegory of the subsequent conversion of Samaria by the Church. On the other hand, there is no improbability in the woman having had five husbands (cf. Mk 12 [23]), and the whole incident is so vivid, the details so exact, the movement of the narrative, step by step, so natural, that it is very hard to believe that there was no such actual scene. Possibly the evangelist knew of some such, and as he pondered over it saw the deep significance in it.

22. the Father: emphatic; when once the full meaning of God's Fatherhood is known, there will no longer be separation and intolerance between His children (cf. 11 [52]). The Samaritans, a type of all heathen (cf. Ac 17 [23]), know Him not as such. The Jews do know Him as Father of their nation and as their Saviour, and the message of salvation for others goes forth from them (cf. 1 [11, 12]).

23. and now is: probably a comment by the evangelist, pointing out the fulfilment of the Lord's words (cf. Rom 12 [1]; 1 P 2 [5]). Cf. Wisd 6 [16]: 'Wisdom goeth about seeking such as are worthy of her.'

24. God is a Spirit, or better, **God is Spirit,** and as such (*a*) unlimited in time or place (cf. 3 [8], 5 [17]; Ac 7 [49], 17 [24]; Is 31 [3]: 'their horses are flesh and not spirit'); (*b*) a supernatural energy communicating itself to man and lifting worship into reality. Consequently real, genuine worshippers will not be formal like the Jews nor ignorant like the Gentiles, but will make the true offering of themselves, the offering of grateful sons to a Father akin to them in spirit. As in 2 [15] the evangelist may have felt that this implied the abolition of animal sacrifices (cf. Heb 9, 10, especially 9 [14]), but that was scarcely in the Lord's thought, as 'spirit' is not the antithesis to material things, but to formality of motive. Hence there is here no condemnation of ritual, if it is kept in its right place. Notice the contrast of [21] with the anticipation of Is 66, that all nations would come to worship at Jerusalem.

25. he will declare unto us all things. The Samaritan conception of the Messiah may have been partly based on the analogy of Joseph, the interpreter of dreams, the diviner (cf. [42] note).

26. Contrast 10 [24], where Jesus refuses to say clearly that He is the Christ. That was to Jews who were regarding the Messiah as an earthly king; this to Samaritans interpreting Him as a prophet.

27. with a woman: which a Rabbi would not do in public.

35-37. In the earthly harvest there is a long time to wait between sowing and reaping; here the reaping can be done quickly, as others have sown (cf. the prophecy of miraculous fertility in Am 9 [13], 'the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that

soweth seed'). The 'four months' may be proverbial, or else points to the date of the incident as happening in December. The sower is Moses, or perhaps the Lord Himself, the reapers the Apostles. [38] seems to imply that the Lord had already associated His followers with His work (cf. [2]); but more probably is a later saying, added because akin in subject to [35-37]. There is perhaps a reminiscence of Jos 24 [13]; the Apostles winning the Samaritans to Christ will be like the Israelites entering Canaan.

39-42. Notice the stress on the different stages of faith, the evidence of others, one's own conviction. **the Saviour of the world:** elsewhere in the New Testament only in 1 Jn 4 [14], so perhaps due to the evangelist, but a Samaritan might well believe that a Jew who would save him could and would save anybody. Contrast 'the saviour of Israel' (Old Testament *passim*) and cf. Wisd 16 [7], 'the saviour of all.' Is it possible that there is a conscious reference to Joseph's new name (Gen 41 [45]), Zaphenath-Paneah, one translation of which was *Salvator mundi* (Vulgate)? One greater than Joseph, one who had saved a far wider world!

44. In the Synoptists this proverb is applied to Galilee (Mk 6 [4]; Mt 13 [57]) and especially to Nazareth (Lk 4 [24]); so that it has been suggested that some sentence such as 'but he entered not into Nazareth' has dropped out (Bacon); but this is scarcely consistent with [45], and the evangelist, ever fond of finding new applications of the Lord's sayings, may have applied it to Judæa as the natural home of the prophets (cf. 1 [11]).

IV. **46-V. 9.** Jesus as Healer. Two miracles to illustrate this, again in circumstances as different as possible: the first in Galilee, on a Gentile, a young man, in answer to the intercession of others, wrought by a message from a distance, and the result belief of the whole family; the second in Jerusalem, on a Jew, a grown-up man, one among a crowd with no friend to help, Jesus taking the initiative, acting in the sight of all, and the result controversy and persecution.

46-54. This should be compared with the healing of the centurion's servant (Mt 8 [5-13]; Lk 7 [1-10], but not in Mark), and it has been thought to be a different account of the same story, but the differences are great, and our evangelist prefers to find new incidents to supplement the Synoptists rather than to record the same. Notice again the stress on the growth in the stages of faith ([48]; cf. [42], 6 [30-33], 20 [29]).

46. nobleman, or a 'king's officer' (margin), possibly the centurion of Mt 8 [5], more probably a different person; perhaps Herod's steward (Lk 8 [3]), whose wife is found soon after ministering to the Lord (cf. [53], 'himself believed and his whole house'), or Manaen, Herod's foster-brother (Ac 13 [1]).

48. Cf. 10 [38], 14 [11]. The words, though spoken to the centurion, are in the plural: you, like those around you, are slow to believe My word without first seeing a miracle wrought. This draws out the centurion's faith, who at once returns, though Jesus does not go with him.

V., VI. Two incidents, one in Jerusalem, one in Galilee, each leading to controversy and to Christ's reassertion of His claims: the first ending in judgement passed on His opponents, the second in a severe testing of His followers. Some critics have suggested that the two chapters have been accidentally transposed. This would have the advantage of enabling us to identify the feast of 5 [1] with the passover of 6 [4], and would bring 7 [21] into closer connexion with 5 [2-9] to which it refers.

V. **1.** Unless the chapters are transposed, this festival cannot be identified with any certainty; the reading differs between 'a feast' and 'the feast,' and there is nothing in the context to suggest which feast it was (cf. 6 [4] note).

2-9. Cf. Mk 2 [1-12], the healing of the paralytic, and Mk 3 [1-6], the controversy about the Sabbath. It is very natural that the controversy should have arisen in a similar way in different places, so that there is no reason for treating them as different accounts of one incident. Both illustrate the Lord's insight into suffering and its cause, and His readiness to heal those who would obey Him. Possibly the evangelist sees in this man a type of the Jewish nation, stricken for a long time with spiritual sickness, seeking cure in its own religious places, yet finding none to help; then helped by Christ; sins now forgiven; men freed from Sabbath observance, given new life and the power to sin no more. Even the thirty-eight years may suggest the length of the nation's wandering in the wilderness (Dt 2 [14]) before beginning the march to the Promised Land (cf. 4 [38] note).

2. a pool: perhaps 'the Virgin's Pool,' a natural spring, whose waters are intermittent, south-east of the Temple (Conder), but it is impossible to be certain, the very name being doubtful, Bethesda, Bethsaida, Bethzatha, all having support from the MSS. (cf. *H.D.B.* and Sanday,

Sacred Sites and Scenes). The name of the pool is not found elsewhere: the evangelist perhaps thought the name symbolical, whether Bethesda a 'house of mercy,' or Bethzatha, 'house of the sheep.'

3*b* and **4.** An explanatory gloss by some later scribe (cf. 3 [13] note).

14. in the temple: had he gone to return thanks for his healing?

17. Two thoughts are included: 'The Father's work did not end in Creation: He is Spirit, unlimited by time or place, always upholding the world (4 [24]), giving and restoring life: even the Sabbath does not stop that'; and 'I am His Son, commissioned to carry on His work, to heal and forgive sin' (cf. Mk 2 [10]). Cf. Philo, *Leg. all.*, i, 3. 'God never ceases working, but as it is the property of fire to burn, of snow to chill, so of God to work' (Holtzmann).

18. brake the sabbath: cf. [16], but more probably (cf. [9, 10]) 'was teaching that the Sabbath was not binding' (cf. Mt 18 [18]).

his own Father: His Father in a special sense, in a way in which He was not the Father of others (cf. Rom 8 [32]), and He Himself was 'only-begotten': cf. 1 [18], 3 [18].

19-47. The Son's defence of His claims ([19-29]); the witnesses in His favour ([30-37]). The Son takes His seat on the judgement throne and pronounces judgement on His opponents ([38-47]).

The claims of the Son are (i) to give life (cf. 4 [53]), the life being essentially spiritual life, but illustrated by the gift of natural life. The Son is not a mere channel of the Father's life: He has life in Himself; He is free to give it forth or to withhold it as His judgement and will decide. (ii) To judge, a judgement already being exercised (3 [18]), but to find its completion hereafter. This is perhaps a spiritualizing of the apocalyptic view of two resurrections (cf. Rev 20). The believer has life here, but will rise to a fuller life hereafter. This claim rests upon the anticipation in Enoch of 'the Son of Man' as Judge (cf. 1 [51] note); but 'the Son of Man' becomes 'Son of Man' to emphasize that it is His human nature which qualifies Him for sympathy with men (cf. Heb 2.[14-18]) and for true judgement of their motives. The thought of the future day, of judgement at the Parousia, is not common in the Gospel, but cf. 11 [24].

25. and now is: very probably a comment of the evangelist (cf. 4 [23]) in the light of subsequent miracles and of many conversions to spiritual life. It is also possible that other verses in this section are the words of the evangelist himself, e.g. [23, 26, 27, 28, 29].

30-36. Witnesses in support of His claims:

(i) **another,** i.e. the Father, the testimony being borne both to the Lord's own consciousness and to men's hearts as they feel convinced of the truth of His words (cf. 6 [44]).

(ii) **John the Baptist,** whom the Pharisees had rejected (Lk 7 [30]), so that they still needed salvation. He was indeed not the light (1 [8]), but he was a lamp which is kindled, lit up by another, and then gives light for a time only; the phrase is both laudatory—perhaps suggested by Ecclus 48 [1], 'Then stood up Elias the prophet *as fire*, and his word burned *like a lamp*'—and yet deprecates exaggeration of John's work.

(iii) **His works,** whether miraculous or not (10 [25], 14 [11]; cf. Mt 11 [5]).

(iv) **The Father**—with the recognition at the baptism.

(v) **The Scriptures**—with special reference to Moses.

The Old Testament Scriptures bore their witness by pointing to the greater Revelation that was to come; the Law was not able to give life and righteousness, but it prepared the way for grace. The whole argument is akin to that of St. Paul, especially in Gal 3; Rom 7.

42-47. Judgement on His opponents. Their want of faith due to moral causes (cf. 3 [16-21]). They care more for men's approval than for God's; and so do not even understand their own scriptures; Moses will condemn them. The thought of this section is carried on in 7 [15-24], and perhaps that has been accidentally transposed from here. The prophecy of [43] would be full of meaning to the evangelist as he thought of the many anti-Christs claiming allegiance in his own time (1 Jn 4 [1-6]).

VI. The Feeding of the Five Thousand. The evangelist again (cf. 2 [13-22]) repeats an incident fully given in the Synoptists: his account is closest to that of St. Mark, perhaps due to literary dependence, but he adds fresh details (Philip, Andrew, the boy), which point to a separate eye-witness. He repeats it (*a*) for its great importance, illustrating the Lord's compassion for, and power of dealing with, the needs of large masses, the effect of His blessing upon a little, His use of the disciples as His agents, who are left with broken fragments still to deal with, His care that nothing be lost (cf. [12] with [39]); (*b*) because it leads up to the discourses and illustrates the Eucharist. It is a

pendant to 3, emphasizing the presence of the Spirit as carrying on in the second Sacrament the life given in the first; to 4, showing Christ's power to give spiritual nourishment; to 5 in the reassertion of His claims in spite of controversy: and a further instance of His insight into men's hearts (15, 26, 61; cf. 2 25). There is a striking analogy to the incident in Elisha's life (2 K 4 42-44), which may be in the evangelist's mind—a prophet, and far greater than Elisha!—also to God's feeding of the Israelites in the wilderness (cf. Ps 107 3-9), so that it carries on the thought of 5 17.

Here again attempts have been made to treat the story as invented to illustrate the Lord's power to feed the *spiritual* needs of masses with His teaching (cf. Am 8 11) and with the Eucharistic food. The facts that the manna was frequently treated as God's greatest gift (cf. 1 Cor 10 3), that there was an expectation of a banquet in the Messianic Kingdom, and that 'the treasure of manna should again descend from on high' (*Apoc. of Bar.*, 29), and that Philo had identified the *Logos* with the manna, would all support such a view; but again the details are strikingly vivid, and the incident is recorded in the Synoptists, and runs back to the earliest sources for the life of our Lord.

4. The question has been raised whether 'the passover' should be omitted from the text, mainly on the ground that there was an early tradition that the Ministry lasted only one year. For a careful statement of this view, *v.* Hort in W.H., II, *Notes on Select Readings, ad loc.* If this were omitted, 'the feast' now near at hand is the Feast of Tabernacles, which arrives in 7 2. But there is also an early tradition of a three-year Ministry. St. Mark's Gospel seems to imply more than two years, and the evidence of MSS. and of versions is unanimous in favour of the insertion (*v.* C. H. Turner in *H.D.B.*, i, 407).

12. All the Synoptists narrate that the disciples took up the remaining fragments; John only that the Lord commanded them to do so. It illustrates a natural carefulness on His part, and a sense of the open-handedness of God's giving, as in the story of Elisha; but 39 suggests that it illustrates His equal care that no soul be lost; it witnesses to the sacredness of the food (cf. the treatment of the Paschal Lamb, Ex 12 46); and the Church has acted on the same principle in the regulation that none of the consecrated elements be carried out of the Church. There is the further suggestion that the Church was left with materials for dealing with future needs of men, women, and children.

15. The miracle, following close upon the death of the Baptist (Mt 14 12, 13), makes the crowd look to Jesus as their leader against the Romans. It is the temptation of Mt 4 8; Lk 4 5 (*inf.* 14 30 note). He sees it as such and withdraws (some MSS. read the stronger word 'flies') all by Himself, quite alone. This explains the *compulsion* put on the disciples (Mk 6 45) (a word only used there of His action to them) to cross over to the other side.

16-21. Cf. Mk 4 35-41. The Lord, though absent, is watching His followers from afar and coming in the hour of need, to be their companion and their guide. The evangelist's addition 21, perhaps a reminiscence of Ps 107 30, 'He bringeth them unto the haven where they would be,' suggests a comparison with God's work (cf. 5 17). Cf. also Job 9 8, 'who (God) walketh on the waves of the sea.'

26-71. Not one discourse, but several, the teaching deepening as the circle of hearers narrows.

(*a*) 26-40 To the crowd in the open air. Christ the bread of life.

(*b*) 41-51 To 'the Jews,' probably in a synagogue. The bread of life His flesh—for the life of the world.

(*c*) 52-59 To 'the Jews' in a synagogue. His flesh and His blood the true food and drink.

(*d*) 60-66 To many disciples. The Spirit the giver of life.

(*e*) 66-71 To the Twelve. He Himself the Holy One of God.

The discourse starts from the Feeding, and the Lord had already the thought of His coming death before Him (5 18), but St. John may well have combined with the first address (cf. St. Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount) portions of subsequent controversy and appeal, and coloured the language in the light of the Eucharist, which was instituted exactly a year later, adding probably explanatory notes of his own (e.g. 33, 46, 50, 58).

27. Notice the sharp antithesis. *Work* out not your earthly livelihood but your spiritual and eternal; yet after all it will be God's *gift* to you. The objectivity of the gift and the necessity of faith in the receiver are the two pivots of the whole discourse. **sealed**, i.e. put His mark upon Him as His own accredited agent empowered to do His work; perhaps also put His seal upon Him as the spotless Lamb of God, meet for sacrifice: 'In Jewish ritual the victims were examined and sealed if perfect' (Westcott).

33. Very possibly a note by the evangelist, bringing the giving of the bread up to the present moment.

35. Cf. 4 [14].

42. Cf. Mk 6 [3].

44. draw: cf. Jer 31 [3], 'with loving kindness have I drawn thee.'

What then is the spiritual food which is here promised? Three thoughts seem to be included:

(*a*) Perhaps His teaching (cf. the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees): the truth able to satisfy the needs of the soul (cf. [45], *taught, heard, learned,* and [63]; Am 8[11]).

(*b*) His human life, His 'flesh': with grace sufficient for all mankind. So far the giving of the manna and the feast upon the Paschal Lamb will have suggested analogies.

(*c*) But 'the blood' carries the thought beyond these to His death. There is nothing in the Old Testament to suggest this, and it may conceivably be suggested by the common meal and self-identification with the object of worship in the 'mysteries'; this may be compared with (though there can scarcely be any conscious reminiscence of) the primitive conception of tribal worship in which the worshippers were supposed to feast upon their god, or some animal that represented him, in order to draw its strength into themselves. To the disciples the meaning would have become clear just a year later, when the Lord identified His body with bread and His blood with wine, but at the time it was a hard saying. The flesh has to be eaten, the wine drunk: that is, each follower must realize the meaning of the life of service and the death of sacrifice with all its atoning value, and accept service and sacrifice as the notes of his own life, and, for this, eat and drink the elements in the Eucharist, which symbolize and convey the Divine life which makes service and sacrifice possible to him, and enables him to fill up the sufferings of the Christ (Col 1 [24]; Phil 1 [29]). The Incarnation and the Atonement are both present in the thought.

62. This challenge may intentionally have a double meaning: (*a*) to the disciples at the moment a harder trial yet to be faced (cf. 14 [1-3]); a conviction that He who had disappeared could never be their King, could never restore the Kingdom to Israel; (*b*) to the evangelist and all disciples who had seen the results of Pentecost a reassurance after His crucifixion, a proof that He had entered on his real Kingdom.

63. the flesh profiteth nothing is difficult after [55] and 1 [14]; perhaps, 'the human life' is by itself useless and will pass into forgetfulness, unless the Spirit, 'the quickening Spirit' (1 Cor 15 [45]), comes to make it eternal in the heavens and in the hearts of men. Possibly it may be a warning against a 'magical' partaking of the body in the Eucharist (cf. the warning of 1 Cor 11 [27-30]).

the words that I have spoken should perhaps be translated 'the things about which I have spoken' (i.e. the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood) (Burney).

65. Cf. 3 [27], and notice the frequency of 'give' and 'gift' throughout this chapter and in 17.

69. the Holy One of God: the thought is not of personal holiness, but of consecration for His task (cf. 10 [36] and 1 Jn 2 [20]). In the Synoptists it occurs in Mk 1 [24]; Lk 4 [34] only. With the whole scene cf. Mk 8 [27-30].

70, 71. What a contrast with [15]! then a crowd anxious to make Him a king; now twelve—who will soon be only eleven—who recognize His true character.

VII. Another scene, nearly six months later than the last, occurring at the next great festival, the Feast of Tabernacles. It is uncertain how far this extends; almost certainly it includes 7 and 8, probably also 9 and 10 [21] (*v.* note on 10 [22]). 7 and 8 are entirely occupied with controversy, and the result is division and suspense; in 7 mainly among the rulers, the majority deciding on His arrest, Nicodemus protesting against its injustice; in 8 mainly in the crowd, some believing, but others prepared to stone. The words 'not yet' give the keynote of the section (7 [6, 8, 30], 8 [20]).

The two great thoughts connected with the festival were *light* and *water*; perhaps originating with a Canaanitish autumn festival to invoke the sun and the rain during the coming months, it had been taken by the Jews as a harvest thanksgiving for all the fruits of the earth, and associated with the thought of the pillar of fire and the water from the rock during the wanderings in the wilderness. These were recalled in each festival by lighting up the candelabra in the Temple courts, and pouring out before the people water drawn and brought thither from the pool of Siloam; and looked forward to a future refreshment and illumination in the future. This explains the Lord's stress on light (8 [12]) and 'living water' (7 [38]); cf. Thackeray, *Schweich Lectures*, 1920.

15-24 is full of reminiscences of 5, and

possibly is misplaced and should be transferred to the end of 5. With [15] it is interesting to compare the Galilean comment (Mk 1 [22] and also Lk 2 [47]).

17. One of the central principles of all learning, especially religious. Growth in knowledge depends on the state of the will and the determination to interpret knowledge into action. [18] and the parenthesis in [22] are probably notes of the evangelist.

35. **the Dispersion among the Greeks:** i.e. the Jews scattered abroad in the Greek world (cf. 1 P 1 [1]). This is exactly the method followed by St. Paul, making the Jewish synagogue the starting-point for preaching to Gentiles.

37, 38. Both punctuation and meaning are doubtful: (*a*) With the full-stop at 'drink' (so RV), 'his' must refer to the believer. All believers will become sources of living water to others, and 'the scripture' may refer to such passages as Is 44 [3-5], 55 [1], 58 [11], though they scarcely go so far as this. More probably (*b*) the stop should be after 'on me,' and 'his' will refer to the Messiah, and 'the scripture' will be Zech 14 [8] and the account of the water flowing from the rock in the wilderness (cf. 1 Cor 10 [4]). In this case the reference to Scripture may be the evangelist's note. Again, the word 'belly' is ambiguous. It may be quite literal, i.e. the living water will flow from the Messiah, or possibly metaphorical, meaning Jerusalem as for Jews the centre or navel of the universe (cf. Thackeray, *u.s.*). So Zech 14 [8], 'living waters shall go out from Jerusalem.' The suggestion that it is a mistranslation of some Aramaic word meaning either 'throne' (R. Harris) or 'fountain' (Burney) seems unnecessary.

39. **not yet was Spirit,** i.e. not yet in the fullest sense in which Christians received it at Pentecost. It does not deny the existence of the Spirit (cf. 1 [33]).

52. Two of the minor prophets, Nahum and Jonah, were Galileans, but a Judæan crowd might easily ignore them (cf. 1 [46]). The conjecture that the reading should be, as in the Sahidic version, '*the* prophet,' is possibly right (A. J. Grieve in Peake's *Commentary*).

VII. 53-VIII. 11. Almost certainly not a part of the Gospel. It is indeed possible that its absence from most MSS. might be due to the loss of a page in an early MS. (cf. A. C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*), but the fact that some MSS. place it at the end of the Gospel, others after Lk 21 [38], looks as if it were a separate fragment, the history of which was uncertain; and the style is not very Johannine. Probably it is the story contained (according to Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii, 40) in the Apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews—of a woman accused before the Lord of many sins—preserved because of its essential value and fitted in by different scribes at points which seemed to them appropriate—here as illustrating 7 [24], 8 [15], and affording a striking contrast between the false judges hastily condemning and the true judge saving. The teaching is that sinners are no true judges; that His own primary duty is not to judge but to save; so, while He recognizes she is a sinner, he lets her go unpunished and sends her to live a higher life.

VIII. 6, 8. **he stooped down:** probably to spare the woman's sense of shame, and perhaps that of her accusers too, in His presence. **he wrote upon the ground:** the same phrase is found in Jer 17 [13], 'They that depart from me shall be written in the earth because they have forsaken the Lord, the fountain of living waters,' which suggests the thought that such judges and such judgements were to be 'written on sand' and pass away (cf. *Theology*, April, 1924, p. 225).

12-20. The claim to be the light of the world was suggested at the moment by the lights lit in the women's court (cf. [20]) recalling the fire by night which guided the Israelites through the wilderness. He is to be a guide to those who **follow** and **walk** (cf. 4 [38] note), but His light is for the whole world (cf. 4 [42], and ctr. 5 [33-36]). With the whole section cf. 5 [31, 32, 37, 45].

20. **in the temple:** cf. 18 [20]. **in the treasury,** i.e. in the women's court, near the chamber in which the Sanhedrin sat—where He was most in danger of arrest and yet . . .

21-30. Warning of spiritual death to those who will not come to Him for the light of life ([12]); cf. Lk 13 [1-5].

24. **that I am he:** the Greek is only **I am** (as in [28, 58]; 13 [19]), which is ambiguous, either (*a*) 'I am that which I claim to be,' i.e. here 'the light of the world coming from above' ([12, 23]), or (*b*) 'I am the eternally living one' (cf. [58]), suggesting that his life is one with the Father's (cf. 10 [30]), and that His judgements are the Father's judgements (cf. [28]), perhaps consciously adopting Jehovah's name, 'I am' (Ex 3 [14]; Dt 32 [39]; Is 43 [10, 11]).

25. RVm is to be preferred: **How is it that I even speak to you at all?** (cf. [43] and Mk 9 [19]). The tone is that of sad despair, the words being perhaps accompanied

by some despairing gesture. Why waste my words like this? I have much that I have to say *about* you, but now I must say it out in judgement upon you for the whole world to hear.

28. When ye have lifted up: My death will not be My own doing (22), but yours; but it will be (what you do not intend) an exaltation (cf. 3 14 note) and a proof of what I really am and that My judgements are true.

31-59. The promise of true knowledge and spiritual freedom. The controversy here reaches its bitterest, and many have felt that its awful sternness (e.g. in 44) is unworthy of the Lord and represents the later controversies of St. Paul with the Judaizers. It is true that the thought of 'freedom' is rare in the Gospels (in St. John only here, in the Synoptists only in Mt 17 26), and the language here is akin to that of Rom 6-8, 9 7; Gal 5, and of Heb 3, and it is quite possible that the evangelist has expanded what the Lord said with notes of his own coloured by the later controversies. But the Baptist had given the Jews warning against trusting in descent from Abraham (Lk 3 8; cf. Lk 16 19-31); and is the controversy likely to have been less bitter against the Lord than against the Church afterwards? Is His language here more awful than that in Mt 23; Mk 4 12; Lk 13 1-5? Is it unworthy of a loving prophet, eager for His countrymen's salvation, conscious that He has it in Himself and his message to save them, and then watching them turn away from Him? There is severity in true love.

31. those who believed him: perhaps less strong than 'believed on him' (30); those who believed the drift of His teaching, but did not commit themselves to follow Him (cf. 1 11, 2 23).

35. Perhaps a reference to Ishmael cast out of the house (cf. Gen 21 10; Gal 4 30).

37. RVm is probably to be preferred: 'hath no place in you,' 'finds no corner in your heart.'

40, 41. The argument deepens: they are no true sons of Abraham; he believed the message which he had from God (cf. 56); no, nor true sons of God; He loves His Son, and you do not, though the Father sent Him.

41. fornication: possibly literal, with allusion to slanders about His birth: 'we, unlike you'; but this gives no real antithesis to the following words: more probably metaphorical, 'We are not sons of other gods, like the heathen or like the Samaritans' (cf. 48 and 4 18): God is our Father (cf. Is 63 16, 64 8).

43. Why do you not understand this *utterance* of Mine? because you have no ears for spiritual speech (cf. 1 Cor 2 14; 2 Cor 4 3, 4).

44. He was a murderer, as you his children intend to be (5 18; 7 20): the reference is chiefly (cf. **from the beginning**) to the tempting of Eve (cf. Wisd 2 24, 'through envy of the devil came death into the world': Rom 5 12; 1 Jn 3 8), but perhaps also to Cain's murder of Abel (cf. 1 Jn 3 12). These words and possibly the following may be a note by the evangelist. 'When he [i.e. the devil, but *v.* RVm] speaketh that which is false, he speaketh what is true to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of it [the lie].' The alternative translation (in RVm) is also possible but less likely.

56. Abraham rejoiced in the hope of seeing My day, i.e. the day when in his seed all nations of the world should be blessed; and he saw it—but when? In spiritual vision in his lifetime (cf. 12 41 and the Rabbinic illustrations in Burney, 111 note), or perhaps in Paradise? But Heb 11 11-19 suggests that the sight was literal in his lifetime. 'These [including Abraham] all died in faith, not having received the promises, but **having seen them and greeted** them from afar.' . . . So Abraham would have seen them partially fulfilled in the birth of Isaac and in receiving him back alive 'in a parable' after being prepared to sacrifice him.

58. Cf. 24 note.

IX. 1.-X. 21. One connected section: the blind man healed and believing; the believer in Jesus cast out of the Jewish fold (23, 35); the prophecy of a new flock, with a new Shepherd, a new door, and other sheep. It falls into line with 4 and 5 as a more striking work of healing (blind **from birth**), with 8 dwelling on Christ as the Light of the world, with 3, 4 and 6 in the association of the Apostles in the Lord's work; and leads up to 11 a greater miracle still, and to 12 the visit of Greeks. To the evangelist the scene would be rich with thoughts of similar enlightenment in the later history of the Church. He might think of the conversion of St. Paul (Ac 9 17, 18) and many another Jew.

1-34. The Lord Himself gives a symbolical application of the miracle (39-41), and the evangelist probably sees in it a sequel to 8. The Jewish leaders had shown themselves blind—yes, and from their birth, was not their father the devil?—but the Lord showed that He could heal a man blind from birth!

The words **that he should be born blind** probably go only with the last half of the clause. Did this man sin himself (and so was struck blind), or did his parents sin, so that he was born blind? Was it his own or his parents' fault? There is no reason to suppose that the disciples knew from the first that he was born blind. The Lord waives aside argument at such a moment; we are face to face with suffering, and must act, not discuss causes. Perhaps he also wishes to discredit the belief that suffering was always due to sin (cf. Lk 13 [1-5]).

7. 'The waters of Siloam which go softly' had been used by Isaiah as a symbol of Jehovah's nourishment and support of His people (Is 8 [6]); so the thought may be, 'Go to God's source of healing'; but the evangelist seems to draw an analogy between the literal meaning 'sent' or 'conducted' (i.e. from the Virgin's Pool to Siloam) and Christ sent from the Father (cf. 8 [42], 10 [36]), so that He sees in it an analogy to Christian baptism (cf. Ac 9 [18]).

24. Give glory to God, i.e. tell the truth (cf. Jos 7 [19]).

39-41. The Lord's own interpretation of His miracles of bodily healing: they are meant to illustrate His power of spiritual healing (cf. Mk 2 [10]; Mt 11 [25]). For the literal healing compare this inscription of A.D. 138 to Asclepius: 'A blind soldier was warned of the God to take the blood of a white cock along with honey and to mix together an eye-salve and for three days to anoint the eyes with it, and he received his sight and came and gave thanks publicly to the God.'

X. 1-18. The false shepherds and the true. The shepherd was not then, as with us, the hireling of another, but the owner, the sheep-master, and so was a type of the ruler of the people; the stress here is not on folding the sheep, but on leading them out to find pasture, perhaps because the Lord's main thought was of leading the Jews out from Jerusalem into the larger flock in which there would also be Gentiles drawn out from their folds, all to form one flock. These sections may have been spoken at the same time as 9, or added here by the evangelist as akin in subject. They should be compared with Ezek 34. Christ claims first to be the door; through Him—in His Spirit and authorized by Him and (as He speaks of the future) through His Church—all shepherds must enter in. So [9], if any man, i.e. *anyone wishing to be a shepherd*, enter in, he shall be saved himself and be the leader of his flock and shall find pasture for them (cf. Nu 27 [16, 17]; 1 Tim 4 [16]). The context here and the analogy of Numbers, 'Let the Lord . . . set a man over the congregation, which may go out before them, and which may lead them and bring them in, that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep that have no shepherd,' makes it certain that these words apply primarily to shepherds, not to 'sheep,' however truly they may by inference be applied to all converts to Christianity. In [8] 'all that came before me' is limited by the context, all who came claiming to be the leaders of the people, the reference being mainly, if not only, to those 'Jews' (9 [22]) who were now misleading the people. For 'thieves and robbers' cf. Mk 11 [17], 'a den of robbers.' He had come that His followers might have life and have enough to give to others (cf. 6 [13]).

11. 'The good shepherd': perhaps with conscious reference to Ezek 34 [23] 'I will set up one shepherd [cf. [16]] . . . even my servant David,' who represents the Lord, the true shepherd (Ezek [12]; Ps 23 [1]).

The **good** shepherd. The Greek word perhaps suggests, not simply morally good and faithful but ideal, attractive, 'good as seen'; the sheep follow the music of His voice; men see the beauty of His self-sacrifice (cf. 12 [32]).

16. Based on Ezek 34 [13], the prophecy of the bringing home of the dispersed Jews, but here expanded into the calling in of the Gentiles; they, too, are his sheep, and all must be united (cf. 12 [20]; Mt 25 [32]). For the stress on unity cf. Eph 4 [1-5].

22-39. The last appeal to the Jews. He cannot speak more plainly to them. Like the Synoptists, John shows that the Lord had not clearly proclaimed His Messiahship to the crowds. They have His own statement of His true nature; they have His works. They must put faith in them if they are to reach fuller knowledge (cf. 7 [17]). The section carries on the thought of 5 [17]; it recalls and explains 'the Holy One of God' (6 [69]) and of 'sent' (9 [7]), and leads on to the striking contrast in 16 [25, 29]. The language recalls 10 [3, 10, 12], and may have been spoken at the same time; if the reading of RVm ('at that time') is correct, it would bring down 9 and 10 and perhaps 8 to the Feast of Dedication. This would make the thoughts of the new fold and the self-sacrificing shepherd appropriate to the moment, as that festival commemorated the purification of the Temple by Judas Maccabæus after its pollution by Antiochus, and also the martyrdom of Eleazar and the mother and her seven sons under Antiochus, whose

death was regarded by the Jews as a ransom for their nation's sin (4 Mac 6 and 17).

30. A stronger claim than 5 17. 'Unclouded openness of the mind of the Son to the mind of the Father, that was the essence of His Being . . . a profound inner sense of harmony and indeed unity of will' (Sanday).

34-36. This is not so much a declaration of His nature as of His claim to be listened to and believed in; if judges who acted in God's name could be called gods, surely He who was consecrated by God Himself and commissioned to speak may use the lesser title—God's Son. It is akin in its *ad hominem* baffling appeal to that in Mk 12 35-37.

38. **that ye may know and understand**: better 'that ye may know and frequently know again and again.' The primary conviction has to be realized again and again in the events of life.

40-42. The followers are taken back to the place where they first learnt to follow, to recall their first enthusiasm, and to remind them of 'the Lamb of God who was to take away sin,' before the great trial comes.

XI. The raising of Lazarus. The climax of the miracles of healing—(the young (4 47), the grown-up man (5 5), the blind from birth (9 1), the dead; also one longer dead than Jairus's daughter, and the widow's son in the Synoptists—and the justification of the Son's claim to give life (4 50, 5 21, 8 52). His claim to be the Christ and the Son of God is already recognized (cf. 27 with 20 30) in the close circle of His friends (ctr. 10 24). It also looks forward to the death and resurrection of the Lord Himself, as if to prepare the disciples to face that. Hence its insertion here may be compared with that of the Transfiguration in the Synoptists, each dwelling on death and a life beyond death. The courageous saying of Thomas is also significant in the light of his subsequent hesitation and conversion. Side by side with the Lord's miraculous power His human feelings are emphasized: His loving friendship (3, 5, 36: note the imperfect tense [5 and 36], '*all the time he was loving* each member of the family'); His courage (9); His efforts at restraining His feelings; His tears; His dependence upon the Father; His gratitude; His command to others to complete His work.

The incident is treated as historical; might not a Greek Christian feel as he read it, 'A greater than Heracles is here'? but like all miracles is also symbolical. It teaches (*a*) that spiritual life is independent of the fact of death; it begins here and continues there; 'it is a spiritual energy of eternal being in knowledge and love' (J. E. Carpenter) (cf. 17 3); (*b*) that therefore the dead are still living (cf. Lk 20 38 'all live to him'), and therefore can become living influences in our lives (cf. 12 2); (*c*) that those long dead in sin can be recalled to spiritual life by the power of Christ (cf. Eph 2 1-7, and especially Lk 15 32, 'This thy brother was dead and is alive again,' and for the effect of the miracle Lk 16 31). The omission of this miracle by the Synoptists, in the light of the subsequent importance attached to it here (47-53), is hard to explain, but it is only a part of the omission of the Judæan ministry by them, and even in this Gospel it is possible to exaggerate the importance of it. It is quite clear apart from it that everything was tending to the rejection and arrest and death of Jesus.

2. Perhaps a later note. It anticipates 12.

4. Cf. 9 3.

9. Cf. 8 12, 9 4, 12 35, 13 30.

17. **four days**: the spirit being supposed to wander round a tomb for three days on the chance of returning to the body, and on the fourth day to leave it (cf. Westcott on 39).

28. **The Master**: better 'the Teacher' (cf. Lk 10 39). There was a new lesson to be learnt.

33. **groaned in the spirit**: perhaps 'put strong pressure upon his spirit' (cf. Mk 1 43), 'restrained his grief'; or 'chafed' at the sight of the sorrow caused by death, and perhaps at their want of faith in His teaching about the nature of death (cf. 40 and Mk 8 12).

44. Stress is perhaps laid upon this in order to point the contrast described in 20 7.

49. **being high priest of that year** does not in the least imply that the evangelist thought the office of High Priest a yearly one, as he is not dating the event; but it is full of irony—the High Priest of that year which was going to give his words so much more significance than he knew; perhaps with reminiscence of the High Priest's original function of predicting the right action by Urim and Thummim (Nu 27 21; Ex 28 30). Probably also there is an implied contrast with the Eternal High Priest, whose offering was to avail for the whole world, and whose prayer is to follow in 17.

53. **they took counsel**: stronger than 5 18, 7 32.

55. **to purify themselves, i.e. from cere-**

monial defilement (cf. Ac 21 [24]). Perhaps an implied contrast with Christ's purifying His disciples, which is going to be described in 13 [10], 15 [3] (cf. the contrast between John's baptism and Christ's in 1 [33], 3 [25-30]).

XII. The double result of the public manifestation illustrated by four contrasts: (i) Mary giving lavishly, Judas grudging and dishonest. (ii) The Judæan crowd full of curiosity; the High Priests determined on the death of both Jesus and Lazarus. (iii) The Galilean crowd welcoming Him as King; the Pharisees feeling their discomfiture. (iv) Greeks wishing to see Him, the Jews with their eyes blinded (cf. [21] and [40]).

1-8. The Supper at Bethany. Another scene recorded in the Synoptists (Mt 26; Mk 14; and cf. Lk 7 [36-50]), but repeated by the evangelist as he is able to add the individual names, Martha, Mary, Lazarus, Judas, and to explain the actions of each; also probably to correct the date, as the Synoptists place it on Wednesday in the last week, connecting it closely with the betrayal by Judas. The suggestion that St. John has altered the date to make it correspond with the day on which the lamb was chosen for the passover (Ex 12 [3]) is also possible, but the analogy would probably have been more drawn out. Martha and Mary, full of gratitude for their brother's restoration to life, each does her best to show it; the Lord, conscious that His own death is near at hand, interprets Mary's action in reference to it, and praises her action (cf. the praise of the widow's mite in the same week: Lk 21 [1-4]). The house filled with the fragrance is perhaps a proof of the writer's presence at the time, but if the Rabbinic saying, 'Oil spreads its fragrance from the chamber to the hall: so a good name reaches from one end of the world to the other' (quoted by Westcott), was as old as this, the evangelist may be saying symbolically what the Lord said literally in Mk 14 [9].

6. took away (not carried) is right, but the imperfect tense should be noted: 'used from time to time to take away'!

7. Leave her to her purpose of keeping it for My embalming: that is what she meant (perhaps Mary's anxious love foresaw that His life was in danger), and that is what she has done. I shall have no other embalming. Ignatius also interprets this scene symbolically: 'For this reason the Lord received ointment upon His head that he might breathe incorruptibility upon His Church' (*ad Eph.*, 17).

11. went away and believed: in both verbs the imperfect is used, perhaps intentionally less strong than the aorist in 2 [11], 11 [45], 12 [42]: 'were beginning to leave their side and to put confidence in Jesus.'

12-19. The welcome to the expected King—but a King who comes on no warhorse (cf. Zech 9 [9]; Zeph 3 [14-20]). **Hosanna** (Ps 118 [25]): perhaps a mere shout of triumph, Hurrah! or a prayer, 'Save now' (LXX), 'God save the King.'

20-36. Greeks coming to worship will have been already proselytes, but to the Lord and to the evangelist the scene must have suggested the later incoming of all Gentiles. The Lord's answer is not one of direct welcome, rather of postponement. It will be only by My death that the full meaning of the Son of Man's work will be known, and then those who wish to enjoy its blessings must lose their life in following Me.

27. An exact analogy to the Agony in the Garden: the soul troubled at the prospect of death; a prayer for deliverance considered but put aside; a prayer of submission; the answer to that prayer (cf. Heb 5 [7]: 'He was heard for his godly fear,' or better for His 'reverent handling' of His prayers). After narrating this the evangelist naturally would not repeat the account of the Agony.

28, 29. The voice intelligible only to him who is prepared to hear it (cf. Ac 9 [7], 22 [9]).

31. Cf. Lk 10 [18]; Rev 12 [8, 9].

32. 'lifted up from (but better "out of") the earth,' so as to include not only the Cross, but the exaltation at God's right hand (cf. 3 [14] note, 8 [28]). **will draw** cf. 6 [44] note. For **all men** there is a variant which may mean either *every man* or *all things*: if the latter, implying the reconciliation and harmony of the whole universe (Col 1 [20]; Rom 8 [19]).

37-43 and **44-50** seem to have been accidentally transposed. The final warning of the Lord, so nearly akin to [35. 36], probably concluded the scene, after which the evangelist, as usual, summarized the result, quoting Is 53 [1] and 6 [10]. This latter verse is also quoted by the Lord Himself (Mk 4 [12]) and by St. Paul (Ac 28 [26]). It is the natural utterance of anyone who (like Isaiah) has had a vision of something really glorious, has told others of it and meets with no response. There must be some divine purpose in this blindness! What that purpose is was revealed to St. Paul (Rom 11 [25-32]). The right reading in [40], 'and I *shall* heal them,' perhaps shows that the evangelist feels that the hope was being fulfilled.

XIII.-XX. The Return of the Son to God.

XIII.-XVII. The Last Supper and High-Priestly Prayer. The supper is clearly the same as that in the Synoptists. The evangelist had no need to repeat the institution of the Eucharist; that had been narrated and was being regularly celebrated. He adds additional facts and discourses which carry forward the main thoughts of his Gospel. But he apparently alters the date, suggesting that it was the night before that of the Paschal meal, so that the Lord's death took place at the time when the Paschal Lamb was being offered (cf. 13 [1, 29], 18 [28], 19 [36]), whereas the Synoptists treat it as the Paschal meal (Mk 14 [12, 14]; Mt 26 [17]; Lk 22 [7]). Either St. John has altered it to suit the symbolism, or more likely the Synoptists call it the Paschal meal because as they looked back upon that year they saw that it had become the only Paschal meal they ate, and that the Lord had treated it as such. The chapters then dwell on the thoughts which were in the Lord's mind when He instituted the Eucharist: in 13-16 the thoughts most closely connected with the Agape, in 17 those connected with the offering to God in the Eucharist. The Eucharist as spiritual food had been dealt with in 6. Can we trust the record as historical? or are they later thoughts read back into the Lord's mouth? No doubt it was a scene which would live in the memory of anyone present, and the disciple whom Jesus loved is mentioned for the first time: 'Most of all in the supper discourses we are brought face to face with Jesus as He lived' (E. F. Scott). The thoughts are extraordinarily appropriate to the moment; as at present arranged, there is a natural progression —first conversation with individual Apostles; then the Lord's soliloquy, speaking to the group who stand by in awed silence; then the Prayer. Further, the thoughts have many points of contact, some even verbal, with the Synoptists, and the account was accepted by the Church, already acquainted with the Synoptic narrative. Yet the form has gone through the writer's mind, a mind accustomed to comment upon and expound the Lord's sayings, a writer who has probably taught them frequently to others. 'Distinct as the sources are, their waters are so intermingled that skilful indeed were the eye that could distinguish them. The revelation comes authentically from Jesus, but to-day it is across the soul of St. John that we behold it. . . . Yet though seen only across John's soul, it is Christ's soul that we see. He is not John's creation' (Lebreton). The lateness of the date at which they were recorded is a proof that the promise of the Lord in them had been found to come true; and it is interesting to note that the three special gifts which the Lord promises (My love, My joy, My peace) are the three which St. Paul classes first among the fruits of the Spirit. There was a strain of Jewish mysticism springing out of the Rabbinic interpretation of the Song of Songs and some of the Psalms, which may have influenced both the Lord Himself and the evangelist, and can be seen fully developed in a later stage in the Odes of Solomon (cf. Abbott, *Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet*; Bert, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 75-99).

XIII. **1, 2.** The narrative stands in contrast to the past—the hour is come (ctr. 2 [4], 7 [8, 30, 39], 8 [20])—and in preparation for the future passing to God ([3]); every incident onward to the end is an act of love, which word occurs forty-six times in 13-21, only nineteen in 1-12. The outer world is excluded, yet at first the Lord's words and actions have a double effect; over against Peter stands Judas.

6-20. The feet-washing has a double meaning: (i) The example of willingness to do the humblest deeds of service (1 S 25 [41]; 1 Tim 5 [10]), suggested by their rivalry which should be the greatest (Lk 22 [24-27]), and typical of the Lord's whole life (Phil 2 [7]). (ii) The need of constant cleansing before the Eucharist and by the Eucharist. It stands in contrast with Jewish ceremonial cleansing (11 [55], 18 [28]), and is typical of the cleansing power of the teaching (15 [3]), cleansing their souls from impulsiveness, from dulness of apprehension, from despondency, from fear of persecution, from the fear of separation from Himself. (iii) The evangelist may also be thinking of the cleansing power of Christ's coming death (1 Jn 1 [7]).

7. thou shalt know hereafter: cf. [12] and 1 P 5 [5] (probably a reminiscence of this scene).

10. Perhaps a proverb, but at least implying their previous baptism, if only that of the Baptist.

11. him that should betray him: but in Greek the present tense is used, implying that the treachery was already begun: Judas had already been to the High Priests.

21-30. The treachery of Judas. As a host to a favoured guest, the Lord hands to Judas 'the sop,' apparently at this

time 'flesh of the Paschal Lamb with unleavened bread and bitter herbs tied together' (Edersheim)—perhaps a final appeal to him to be trustworthy. Had the incident of the one guest without a wedding garment 'cast out into the outer darkness' (Mt 22 13) been intended as a warning to Judas? The last words, **it was night**, are probably added as symbolical of spiritual darkness (cf. 9 4, 11 10, 12 35, and 1 Jn 2 11). Judas was sure to stumble and not know whither he was going (cf. Mt 27 3, 4).

XIII. 31-XVII. The Lord alone with the loyal disciples. The Son of Man is already glorified: He has cast out the evil; Judas has begun the work which must end in the death, when He will be seen in all His true essence as the expression of perfect love, the Father's own love. His new commandment is probably defined in the following words (cf. 15 12); but possibly it refers to the command, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' the purpose of which was to enable them to love one another.

36. thou shalt follow hereafter looks forward to 21 19, and, doubtless in the writer's mind, also to Peter's death (*ibid.*).

XIV.-XVI. Three main thoughts coincide with the three chapters: peace (14), love (15), the Spirit (16), but they cross and recross each other, and the thought of permanence underlies 14-15; the words 'abide,' 'abode,' occur sixteen times in these two chapters. There are, however, difficulties of arrangement: 14 31 seems to have been intended as an ending, and 16 5 is surprising after 13 36, 14 5. Many editors would rearrange thus: 13 1-30, 15, 16, 13 31-38, 14.

XIV. First ground of reassurance. They need not be troubled (1, 28: the word used recalls the Stoic virtue of 'impassiveness,' calmness in face of danger); He gives them His own peace. He will leave them, but only for another part of His Father's house; He will prepare a place for them and take them there soon. Thomas, who had expected that a visit to Jerusalem would mean death for them all (11 16), is prepared to follow, but wishes in the name of all to know the way; it is to keep in touch with Him, to follow His footsteps, to believe His message, to live His life; so they will see the Father, for He has revealed the Father's abiding nature. His words, His deeds were the Father's; those who believe in Him shall be able to do even greater works, for if they ask, but only if they ask in His name, His spirit, loyal to His teaching, He will answer their prayers and the Spirit of Truth shall guide them. Those who love Him will be loved by the Father and by Himself, and both will dwell with the believer with a spiritual Presence which the world cannot understand. The Holy Spirit will teach them; there is no need to be troubled; He is going to the Father who is greater than He.

1-3. The translation is uncertain as the verbs may be indicative or imperative; probably 'ye believe in God' (cf. 17 8): 'believe also in me' (cf. 10, 11). This suits best the constant stress on growth in faith.

3, 4. I will come again, and take you to myself: probably meant primarily to them, I will return on earth with the Messianic Kingdom (cf. 16 30); later it would be interpreted of the spiritual union between Himself in heaven and them on earth, they already risen with Him, He already dwelling in them (Gal 2 20; Eph 2 6); and beyond both of these the union between Him and them, when both had passed through death and they were once more 'with Christ,' which would be far better (Phil 1 23; cf. 17 24). All this fulness of meaning may have been clear to the Lord's vision.

8. Philip had helped to bring Nathanael and Greeks to see Jesus (1 46, 12 20), but had not yet understood all that was implied in that.

12. The Lord is always kindling in His followers the expectation of greater results. It was so during His lifetime (1 51, 5 20); it will be so after He is gone. The reference is probably to the bringing in of the Gentiles (12 24).

13. in my name: acting in My spirit and carrying on My work.

16. Comforter, in Greek **Paraclete**: better **Advocate** or **Helper**. This is its technical use in classical Greek and in Philo, who applies it to the *Logos* as intermediary between God and the world; it reappears in this sense in Ecclesiastical Latin and was borrowed by Rabbinical Hebrew. But it is rather wider than our 'Advocate' as being applied also to any friend who came to support a man on his trial, who represents him, interprets him to the Court. So the Spirit was to represent and interpret the Father and the Son to them (cf. Whitaker, in Gore, *Can We then Believe?* 204). This meaning is brought out fully in 16 8 (cf. Mt 10 20); here there is also attributed to Him the work of teaching (14 16, 26, 16 13) and of consoling (16 20). The last combined with the thought of 2 Cor 1 3-7 led to the translation 'Comforter,' 'Strengthener.'

26. The work of the Spirit twofold: *fresh* teaching based upon *recollection* of the Master's words.

27. peace: that kind of peace which is specially Mine (cf. 15 [9, 11])—the 'peace of courage' ready to face all dangers (ctr. Mk 4 [40]).

28. my Father is greater than I again bears a double meaning: to His hearers 'greater in relation to the Incarnate life, able to do far more than I have done in my life' (cf. [12]); to the evangelist probably of the Essential Life—'greater as the source of all my Being.' Throughout the section the coming of the Spirit, of the Son, of the Father Himself, is treated as one and the same.

30, 31. The Synoptists (Mk 14 [42]; Mt 26 [46]) place the words 'Arise, let us be going,' at the end of the Agony; to their historical view the reason is 'he that betrayeth me is at hand'; to the Lord's spiritual insight, 'the prince of this world cometh.'

30. the prince of this world (cf. 12 [31], 16 [11]), i.e. 'the devil': he who will prompt His followers to fight and Himself to strive for an earthly kingdom (cf. 6 [15], 18 [10, 36]): the exact analogue of the temptation in Mt 4 [8]; Lk 4 [5].

XV. Second ground of reassurance. His love and His joy will be theirs, if they abide in Him and in love with one another. For He is the Vine, the life of all the branches, if they abide in Him; they are His friends; He is laying down His life for them; He has told them the full truth; they must not expect to be treated better than their Master, whose message has been rejected by those who have not known Him or His Father. The Spirit will come to help them, and they must be His witnesses.

1-8. If the Lord left the upper room after 14 [31], the vine carved over the Temple entrance may have suggested the simile; if He were still in the room, perhaps the use that He had made of the fruit of the vine as symbol of His blood had done so. But it rests on the prophetic use of the vine as a symbol of the Jewish nation (cf. Ps 80; Is 5, used in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen [Mk 12], and Jer 2 [21], where 'a noble vine' is in the LXX 'fruit-bearing,' and 'a right seed' is a 'true' seed; cf. also Ecclus 24 [17], where Wisdom is compared to a vine). The nation had been the vine, but His Father has pruned it; He has cut off the unworthy branches, taken unto Himself the true Israel—but even that needs pruning. Now He is the Vine, real and permanent; not merely the root, but the whole, the source of life in all the branches; but this still needs pruning. Judas has been cast out; the rest are being 'cleansed' by the washing of the feet and washing away of their fears, and they will need constant cleansing, each by the other.

The simile of the vine expresses the same thought of the Church as the Body of Christ, with Christ as the Head (cf. 2 [21] and St. Paul *passim*). The thought of the branch cut off is analogous to the withering of the barren fig tree (Mk 11 [12]).

6. he is (lit. was) **cast forth:** cf. 13 [30, 31] (as Judas had been); Mt 21 [43]; Mk 11 [12-14, 19-21] (as the Jewish nation had been).

8. so shall ye be: rather shall ye become, or show yourselves to be, my disciples: discipleship a constant growth (cf. 10 [38] note).

11. my joy: ctr. 3 [29] and cf. 1 Jn 1 [4].

15. friends: cf. Lk 12 [4]. The Jewish Christians would feel that they were thus placed on a level with Abraham (cf. Jas 2 [23]); the Gentiles that they were ranked with the Stoic ideal of Wisd 7 [27]: 'Wisdom maketh men friends of God.' Philodemus: 'We may declare the wise to be the friends of the gods, and the gods the friends of the wise.'

20. Cf. 13 [16].

24. Cf. the Synoptic teaching about the sin against the Holy Spirit (Mk 3 [29, 30]).

26. Cf. 14 [26] note. **which proceedeth from the Father:** certainly of the mission to earth of the Spirit, always coming to do the Father's work (cf. Ac 2 [33]). The verb was afterwards used of the eternal nature of the Spirit, and this may have been in the evangelist's mind; in either case the words may be a note by him.

XVI. The Spirit's help. They must expect excommunication and persecution, but they will have this forewarning to help them ([1-4]); and they need not grieve too much at His leaving them; that is necessary that He may send them His Spirit ([5-7]), and He will both plead their cause before the eyes of the world ([8-11]) and will teach them more of the Father's mind about future things, which will be His own teaching too ([12-15]). He must go and they will grieve, but their grief will soon be turned into joy; they will see Him again; He will teach them more plainly still, and His Father will answer all prayers offered in His name ([16-24]). They have put faith in Him as having come from the Father; true, in spite of that, they may desert Him for a while, but ultimately they will have peace in the assurance of His own victory over the world ([25-33]).

5. See note on 14 *ad in.*

8-11. The metaphor is that of a law-court. The synagogue rulers have held their court and excommunicated the Christians (9 [22, 34]), but there is a Court of Appeal, the court of the Lord (cf. Is 5 [3]), held before the eyes of the world. There are three charges to be dealt with: (*a*) On which side did sin lie? The Jews plead that Jesus was a sinner and impostor (cf. 9 [24], 18 [30]); the Christians answer, Nay, the Jews were lawless and murdered the Righteous Man (cf. Ac 2 [23], 7 [52], Jas 5 [6]). (*b*) On which side lies righteousness? The Jews plead it comes from obedience to the law; the Christians reply, Nay, it comes only as a gift from Christ, who is with the Father and sends His Spirit (cf. Ac 2 [36], 3 [15], 24 [25]; Rom 10 [3]). (*c*) Who was the person condemned at the trial? The Jews reply, Jesus the malefactor; the Christians reply, Nay, it was the unjust judges and the Prince of this world prompting them (cf. Rom 8 [4]). Such are the pleadings, and in each case the spiritual reality of the Christian life as contrasted with the blindness of the Jews shows that God gives the judgement on their side. Each statement is quite intelligible as spoken by the Lord Himself, but they come to the evangelist lit up by the experience of the trials of the Apostles in the Acts and by the teaching of St. Paul about the true nature of righteousness. This promise would also strengthen the Apostles in their teaching about sin, righteousness, and judgement (cf. Ac 24 [25]).

13. he shall declare unto you the things that are to come, i.e. things that were to come to the Lord Himself: explain the meaning of His death, resurrection, ascension, but also give the guidance in future problems (cf. Ac 15 [28]).

21. Notice the extraordinary optimism of this saying: a woman's joy is not selfish, but that a man is born into the world—to enjoy its blessings and to help its needs. Had He learnt this from His mother?

22. 'I shall see you again' may well include the appearances in 20, 21, and His watching of their acts in the future.

27. ye have believed; cf. 11 [27], 20 [29, 31].

XVII. This prayer has long been called the High-Priestly prayer, and almost certainly was regarded as such by the evangelist in recording it and by the Lord in uttering it. For (i) as the High Priest on the Day of Atonement prayed for himself, for the priests and Levites, for the whole congregation of Israel, so the Lord for Himself, for His Apostles, for all believers and the whole world. (ii) On the Day of Atonement the people were declared *clean* before the Lord; The High Priest (Ex 28 [3]) and victim (Dt 15 [19]) were sanctified ([19]); there was a prayer 'Sanctify us by thy commandments' ([16]); it was 'a day of great joy to God' ([13]). (iii) There is probably intended a contrast between Caiaphas, High Priest 'of that year' (11 [49]) with his worldly policy and the Eternal High Priest. (iv) The language is closely akin to that of the Hebrews; there is the same stress on the *cleansing* of the true worshipper (Heb 9 [14-23], 10 [2]), on *sanctification* (Heb 10 [10, 14, 22]), on *perfection* (Heb 7 [11, 28], 10 [14], 12 [2, 23]), on Christ as High Priest (Heb 5 [5-10], 10 [1-18]).

At the same time two points are to be noticed: (*a*) *In substance:* it is unlike the High Priest on the Atonement Day in that there is no mention of sin or pleading for forgiveness. It is the prayer of the faithful High Priest of the good things that are come (Heb 2 [17], 9 [11]); it is the offering of human life at its best; of His own accomplished work, of the Apostles' acceptance of Him and allegiance, of the faith of their converts and of the whole world; it is the recognition that 'all things come of thee and of thine own have we given thee' (1 Ch 29 [14]). It is a prayer for further support and further protection and sanctification. The Son thanks the Father for all His gifts, and for the work which He has enabled Him to do in expressing the Father's love for men in His human life; but He prays for further help; the death lies before Him; may He be strengthened to glorify the Father, to show His love for man in that; may He be carried through it to that union with the Father which will enable Him in yet fuller measure to unite men to Himself, and through Himself to the Father, in a life of love and truth until the whole world comes to believe. The prayer is addressed to the Father of all (cf. 11 [52]); but stress is laid on His holiness, His separation from sin, and His justice ([11, 25]), which deals differently with the good and the bad. It has points of contact with the 'Lord's Prayer' (1 [6, 12, 15]) and with the Synoptic narrative of this night, the praise of their allegiance (Lk 22 [28]), the danger from the evil one (*ibid.* [31, 32]), His self-consecration for them *and for many* (Mk 14 [24]). It is most interesting to compare and contrast it with St. Paul's farewell (Ac 20 [18-25]; 2 Tim 4 [6-8]) and with the High Priest's prayer on offering sacrifice in 2 Mac 1 [24-29]. It

is interesting too to compare and contrast it with the kingly prayer of David in 1 Ch 29. There is the same recognition of God's gifts to man, of man's willing gifts to God, the same stress on God's righteousness, the same prayer for God's future help. David passes from prayer to sacrifice a thousand bullocks, a thousand rams, and a thousand lambs. Christ passes to the sacrifice of Himself, 'the Lamb of God.' David leaves the building of the earthly Temple to his son, Christ that of the Temple of His Church to His followers. It is the prayer of a King as well as that of a High Priest. This may have been in the Lord's own mind and in that of the evangelist; if not, it is a witness to the natural feeling of man to God when faced with the task of a great spiritual work to be done for Him.

(*b*) *In form:* there are phrases not quite natural at the moment, e.g. [3], the reference to Himself in the third person (perhaps the whole verse is a note by the evangelist); the description of the work the disciples have already done ([10, 20]). Probably the evangelist thinks of it as the prayer which the High Priest spoke in substance on this night, but *which He is still praying behind the veil*; thinks of it also as the model of the Church's Eucharistic Intercession. For the prayer was uttered on the night of the institution of the Eucharist; it expresses the spirit of that, 'the Church's divinely ordered ceremonial method of self-identification with the sacrifice of Christ.' There the Church offers its praise and thanksgiving for all God's gifts to it throughout the past, especially for the human life and death and resurrection of the Son; there it thinks of Him as still within the veil, offering Himself for the salvation of the whole world; it pleads that entire self-sacrifice as its ideal; it prays to be united with it and to be able to go forth to a life of faith in the truth and of the services of love, sharing the joy of its Lord, until the whole world shall believe.

3. Perhaps a note by the evangelist dwelling on Christ's work as appealing to the Gentile Christians (the only true God) and to the Jewish (the Messiah): cf. 4 [23].

12. That the scripture may be fulfilled (cf. 13 [18]). The reference to Judas is perhaps the evangelist's note.

15. from the evil one: cf. 13 [2]; Lk 22 [31]; 1 Jn 2 [13, 14], 5 [18]: but the parallelism with 'from the world' ([16]) makes it more probable that the word is neuter, 'from all that is evil and harmful.'

The ideal priestly prayer is that of a Son, ever dwelling on the righteous, holy character of the Father ([1, 11, 24, 25]), recognizing that all that He has is a gift from the Father and must be given by Him to others (note that the word 'to give' occurs seventeen times); the prayers are for others in the order of responsibility for them (self, those nearest to Him, all believers, the world); praying for their protection and growth, and realizing that such growth can only reach perfection in union with each other and with God.

XVIII., XIX. The arrest, trials, and crucifixion. No mention is made of the agony in Gethsemane: that had been fully recorded in the Synoptists; and our Gospel has a parallel to the Agony in 12 [27], to the prayer in 18 [11]. Two thoughts dominate the narrative here: (i) the royalty of Jesus; (ii) the fulfilment of prophecy.

(i) *The royalty of Jesus*: Jesus admits His kingship and declares its true character, a Kingdom of the Truth; He is crowned, if only in mockery, by the Jews; declared King by Pilate, and proclaimed as such—a proclamation which he refuses to withdraw—in the three well-known languages of the empire. He acts with royal majesty, as master of the situation throughout: going freely to death (18 [2, 4, 8]), securing the safety of His followers, controlling Peter's violence, reminding Pilate of the limits of his authority, bearing His cross for Himself, handing over His spirit freely to the Father. In contrast to Him are seen (*a*) the Jews—loud, violent, unjust; breaking the requirements of their own judicial rules, openly proclaiming that Cæsar is their king. (*b*) Pilate—with whom there is great sympathy, as we watch 'the contest in him between the Roman sense of justice and the official's desire to carry on the king's government at the least possible cost of friction' (C. H. Turner)—and yet he condemns the innocent; he yields to a crowd of turbulent provincials whom he had been sent to control.

(ii) *The fulfilment of prophecy* (18 [9, 32], 19 [24, 28, 36, 37]).

XVIII. **2.** For an interesting suggestion that this garden was the place in which the Lord had given the Lord's Prayer, cf. *Texts and Studies*, i, 3, 123. It would give a touching poignancy to the prayer of Mk 14 [36, 39] and the question here (18 [11]).

5. I am he: cf. 8 [24] note.

6. Cf. 7 [44], 8 [59], 10 [39]. Perhaps a conscious reference to Ps 9 [3]: 'While mine enemies are driven back, they shall fall and perish at thy presence' (cf. Is 11 [4]).

9. Cf. 17 [12]. It is scarcely a *fulfilment*; rather a new application on a lower plane

of what was spoken with reference to a higher (cf. 12 [33] note).

12. As a rule John omits the Jewish trial, already recorded in the Synoptists, but adds this which had not been recorded; it was probably an informal preliminary examination (as before a grand jury) to see if there was evidence sufficient for a formal trial, and held before Annas because of his strong personal influence.

14. Cf. 11 [50], and for a similar cross-reference 11 [2].

15. another disciple: possibly, though not necessarily, the disciple whom Jesus loved.

22, 23. Cf. Ex 22 [28] and ctr. Ac 23 [2-6]. It is the Lord's illustration of Mt 5 [39] and an exact fulfilment of Is 50 [6].

28-XIX. 16. The trial before Pilate. **the palace** is probably Herod's palace on the west of the city; so that the Lord is led right across the length of Jerusalem. It was a Gentile's house, and might have leaven in it, so the Jews will not enter; the mention of their desire to avoid pollution is probably satirical—men who were set on injustice and murder ([31]) so careful not to stain their hands with leaven! The decision to put Jesus to death for blasphemy had already been taken (Mk 14 [64]); but this could only have been carried out by some act of mob violence, as with Stephen; they wish their act legalized by the Roman authority. This led to crucifixion, which was not a Jewish penalty, and so gave an exact application of the Lord's own words that He would be lifted up (12 [32, 33]).

36, 37. These verses should be put side by side with 3 [5] and 6 [15]. The entrance to His Kingdom has been shown to be the work of the Spirit; He has avoided the attempt to make Him an earthly king; now its real nature and its real subjects are declared. Its origin is not of this world; but it is a reality in the world (cf. Lk 22 [29, 30]). The whole purpose of His life is to witness to the truth; He is doing it now (cf. 1 Tim 6 [13]). This double line of defence was often re-echoed in the trials of Christians before the Roman authorities (cf. Ac 24 [12] ff., 25 [8]).

The conception of the Kingdom as one of truth would especially attract Greeks.

38, 39. The question, **What is truth?** is not that of 'jesting Pilate' (Bacon, Essay I); rather of 'cynical Pilate,' of the man of the world, who has so often presided at trials and found it so difficult to be sure on which side lay the truth. There is no mention elsewhere of this custom under the Roman rule in Palestine, but it would have been a natural way of pleasing the people at their festival, and a parallel is quoted by Deissmann from Egypt in A.D. 85, where a Roman governor says to a prisoner, 'Thou deservedst to be scourged . . . but I make a present of you to the crowds.'

XIX. **5. Behold the man!:** either an appeal to their pity (Surely you would not crucify such an one) or to their scorn (Surely you need not fear what such an one can do). Both thoughts may be included.

7. Cf. 5 [18], 10 [36]. The political charge failing, they fall back on the religious.

9. The Lord gives no answer to this question: it is unimportant as a ground of acquittal or condemnation. He answers the next question which affects Pilate's own conduct.

11. The Lord appeals to the official's sense of responsibility (cf. Wisd 6 [1-11]). **from above:** perhaps intended to have a double meaning—to Pilate 'from the emperor,' to the Lord and the evangelist, and perhaps to Pilate too, 'from God' (cf. 3 [27], 6 [65]) (='from the Lord,' 'from the Most High' in Wisd *l.c.*). The Apostles lay the same stress on the Divine authority of civil government (Rom 13 [1]; 1 P 2 [13]). 'He that delivered me unto thee' is clearly the High Priest or the Jewish nation (18 [35]). They ought to know more of God's will, to be more able to recognize His Son and His Christ.

13. The Pavement: probably that in front of the palace; the meaning of 'Gabbatha' is unknown, perhaps 'the ridge,' the 'high ground.' The evangelist makes no attempt to see any symbolism in the name.

15. no king but Cæsar: the antithesis of their historic claim to independence, to have God only for their King (cf. 8 [33]).

17. bearing for himself RV: perhaps not meaning more than 'himself' (cf. Ac 9 [34]), but more probably 'for himself,' i.e. as any other criminal would do (cf. Plut., *De s. num. vindicta*, 9, though the phrase there is only 'bears his own cross'); scarcely 'for himself and not for Simon,' whom later Gnostics held to have been substituted for Jesus (Iren., I, xxiv, 4). Did the evangelist mean 'for his own purposes'?—i.e. not for those of Pilate or the Jews, but that He might learn obedience by the things which He suffered (Heb 5 [8]), be made perfect through suffering, and make propitiation for the sins of the people (*ibid.* 2 [10, 17], 10 [17, 18]), and set an example to His followers (Mk 8 [31]). It is also interesting to compare (as many of the Fathers did) Gen 22 [6].

Golgotha: in Latin Calvaria (from

calvus, bald), whence our Calvary; possibly so called from the ground being shaped like a skull; traditionally and perhaps rightly (cf. Sanday, *Sacred Sites*, 67-77) the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

20. Similarly a decree of Julius Cæsar appointing Hyrcanus Ethnarch was ordered to be posted publicly both in Greek and Latin. The evangelist loves to think that the Roman official had recorded the real truth, in contrast with the chief priests.

23-25. Another of the evangelist's contrasts: a group of (perhaps four: cf. Ac 12 [4]) soldiers, seeing what they can get for themselves, and a group of four sorrowing women. The tunic woven throughout is mentioned as leading up to the quotation of Ps 22 [18], perhaps to suggest that the Lord was all the time a real High Priest, whose coat was not sown of two parts but of one piece (Joseph., *Ant.*, III, vii, 4). Philo says that the *Logos* wore the whole world as his robe and would not rend it, a similar but not the same thought (*De profugis*, xx).

26-30. Three sayings not recorded in the Synoptists are given, all emphasizing the strength of true human feeling: the thought for His mother, the sense of thirst, the joy in an accomplished task. **Behold thy mother!** It is possible that the evangelist saw a symbolic meaning in this, the mother representing the Jewish Church, which is now to be taken and cared for by the disciple: but the simple natural care for the desolate woman is the central point (cf. 1 Tim 5 [4, 16]).

28. that the scripture might be accomplished (Ps 69 [21]): probably a note of the evangelist (cf. [24]). The thirst too may be symbolical—the sufferer's spiritual thirst for God (Ps 42 [2]) and for souls has met so little response! But the literal meaning must not be lost.

29. hyssop was used for cleansing both at the Passover and at the Covenant Sacrifice (Ex 12 [22]; Heb 9 [19]), and may have been meant to be symbolical, but it was probably a small herb which could not have served this purpose. Probably the reading should be 'a javelin' (*hysso* being mistaken for *hyssopo*). There is no MS. authority for this change, but it has been described as the most probable emendation of the MSS. in the whole New Testament (*v.* Field, *Otium Norvicense, ad loc.*).

30. It is finished, i.e. the task (17 [4]), and now the cup of suffering (18 [11]). The last words perhaps emphasize the freedom of the Lord's last act; He handed over His spirit freely into His Father's hands (Lk 23 [46]) as a deposit which He could trust to receiving back (cf. 1 P 4 [19]; 2 Tim 1 [12]).

31. Dt 21 [23]. The requirement applied to all days, but the sight of dead bodies would be specially offensive to the crowds on a Sabbath and in the Paschal week. The stress on the blood and water may be meant to emphasize the reality of the death, as against Docetism (cf. 19 [17] note; 1 Jn 4 [2-3]), but more probably something unusual in the death; which the evangelist interprets symbolically as representing the cleansing power of the death (1 Jn 1 [7]) and the satisfying water of the Spirit (7 [37-39]); so practically the two Sacraments (3 and 6). Death did not stay the sources of cleansing and satisfaction of spiritual need. The eye-witness is probably the evangelist himself (cf. 20 [30]); in which case '*he* knoweth' may refer to himself or to Christ, a solemn appeal to 'that master,' 'that saviour' (cf. 1 Jn 2 [6], 3 [3, 5, 7, 16], 4 [17]); or the eye-witness may be some other person for whose truthfulness the evangelist vouches. The evangelist sees in this event the fulfilment of two Old Testament passages: **a bone of him shall not be broken**—that showed that He was the true Paschal Lamb (Ex 12 [46]), perhaps also 'that he was a righteous man' (Ps 34 [20]; Lk 23 [47]); and **they shall look on him** (more exactly **to him**) **whom they pierced**, cf. Zech 12 [10], where the Jews, penitent and returning to Jehovah, look with remorse on some prophet whom they have rejected and put to death (cf. Zech 11 [12], quoted in Mt 27 [9]). So the thought here is that of the remorse of the Jews when they see the Lord coming to judgement (cf. Rev 1 [7]); or it may be 'they shall look for salvation to him,' the evangelist sharing St. Paul's belief that all Israel shall be saved (Rom 11 [25, 26]: cf. Mt 23 [39]).

38. The moment of danger brings to light the secret hidden loyalty of two followers. The sense of injustice, always alive in Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, stings him into action.

XX. **The Risen Lord.**—No details are given of the Resurrection, but the evidence is given—the empty grave ([2]), the undisturbed grave-clothes ([6, 7]), the appearances ([11-29]). The first appearances are in Jerusalem (as in Luke), which is consistent with later appearances in Galilee, though the exact details are difficult to harmonize. Our account is additional to the Synoptic record, and, as in the earlier Church tradition quoted by St. Paul (1 Cor 15 [3-8]), the choice is apologetic, quoting appearances both to well-

known individuals and to groups of disciples; it illustrates the striking phrase used in the *Acta Johannis* (91) of the appearance of the risen Lord as having 'a unity with many faces,' 'a unity in divers forms.'

1-10. Mary alone is mentioned, as leading up to 11-18, but she may have had companions (cf. '*we* know,' 2); though some editors see a conflation of two narratives, (*a*) 1, 11-18, (*b*) 2-10.

6, 7. The undisturbed grave-clothes are a proof that the body has not been taken away, but has passed supernaturally away, leaving them undisturbed (cf. Latham, *The Risen Master*). This is perhaps added here to refute the Jewish charge that the disciples had taken Him away (Mt 27 64, 28 13), perhaps with intentional contrast with 11 44.

9. *Faith* was still necessary, because they did not yet understand the prophecies (cf. Lk 24 26, 27). But the conjecture is attractive that the word 'not' has fallen out in 8, 'he saw and yet believed *not*.' This suits better 10 (cf. Lk, *l.c.*; Mt 28 17).

11-18. Appearance to an individual. Effect: (*a*) to console sorrow; (*b*) to give the assurance that the risen Lord knows those whom He had known in life; (*c*) to entrust the living with fresh tasks.

17. Touch me not: but better: 'Do not keep touching, clinging to me' (cf. Mt 28 9); the meaning is twofold: (*a*) Do not hold Me back from My passage to the Father, whence I can send the Spirit (16 7), nor delay to carry out your proper task. Each has higher work to do. (*b*) Do not cling to Me, as if things were to be as when I was on earth; I go to My Father, and the approach to Me must be spiritual worship (cf. Mt 28 10). It is perhaps implied that some ascension took place on Easter Day, all subsequent appearances being descents from above. **my Father and your Father, my God and your God:** the same Father and the same God, but yet each in a fuller, more realized sense to Him than to them, and so kept separate still.

19-23. First appearance to the disciples as a group. Effect: (*a*) the gift of peace; (*b*) the gift of joy; (*c*) commission to represent Him in dealing with sinners. These are all gifts promised on the last night (14 27, 15 11, 16 22, 13 20, 17 18). The first day of the week is repeated thrice (1, 19, 26) as the day on which Christians might expect such blessings at their weekly meetings.

22. The breathing may be a conscious contrast with Gen 2 7 (cf. 1 Cor 15 45). Christ completes and carries forward God's creative work (cf. also Ezek 37 5 ff.; Wisd 15 11). It is hard to correlate this gift with that of Pentecost. Possibly the evangelist is only combining this and that gift, or else *this* is the first gift of the Spirit, *that* the gift of its expression and public exercise, somewhat akin to the gift of life at conception and at birth. For the stress on dealing with sin as the central message of the Gospel cf. Lk 24 47; Ac 2 38. The gift is not here the power of deciding between right and wrong actions, as in Mt 18 18, 'whatsoever *things*,' but of dealing with persons, '*whosesoever sins*' (cf. Ac 2 41, 5 1-11, 13 10-12; 1 Cor 5 4; 2 Cor 2 6); their decision is treated as at once ratified in heaven (cf. 16 23). To whom was the promise given? Probably to the group of Apostles only (cf. 17 18); this is in accordance with their separateness in 13-17; and the whole scene implies a small room. When St. Paul exercises the power, he acts on his own authority both for inflicting a penalty (1 Cor 5 3, 'I have judged') and for remitting it (2 Cor 2 10, 'I have forgiven'), but in each case appeals to the whole Church to make his action effective (1 Cor 5 13; 2 Cor 2 8). The forgiveness of Christ's minister is valid, but it is of great importance that the community as a body should make it fully effective to the person, by receiving the forgiven into full fellowship and not so treating the unforgiven.

24-29. Second appearance to the group. Effect: (*a*) the gift of peace; (*b*) the only doubter convinced. It is striking that Thomas is still present and welcome at their common Sunday worship; he is convinced by the signs of suffering, of suffering and death triumphed over. It is interesting to compare 1 Cor 14 24, 25. **My Lord and my God:** from the time of Domitian, A.D. 81-96, the Emperor was called 'Our Lord and God' (cf. Suet., *Dom.*, 13); the evangelist may well have seen the contrast. **blessed are they that have not seen:** we might have expected the future, but the words have proved so often true in the history of the Church (cf. 1 P 1 8, possibly an allusion to the saying) that the past is used. Wetstein quotes a striking saying of the Rabbi Simeon: 'A proselyte is dearer to God than the crowd which stood round Mt. Sinai; they would not have received the law without the great sights there. The proselyte has not seen, yet comes and devotes himself to God's service.'

30, 31. Conclusion. The writer's purpose (cf. Introduction, pp. 240*b*, 241*a*).

XXI. Appendix. The writer's purpose

in adding this seems to have been (i) to show the continued guidance and support of the Church in its work by the risen Lord; (ii) to explain the future of the two disciples who had been most prominent in 1-20, and to correct a mistake about the second of them. The theory of Canon Streeter that one purpose is to counteract a current expectation of a speedy coming of the Lord, which had lately been revived by the persecution of Domitian and by the Apocalypse of John, does not lie on the surface and is scarcely consistent with the ambiguity of [21-23]. The writer, if not the same as that of 1-20, is one thoroughly steeped in the spirit of those chapters. As there, the Lord appears as the Lord of the common meal ([13]; cf. 6), as the Good Shepherd ([16, 17]; cf. 10), shows insight into the hearts of others ([17]), passes from dealing with the group of disciples to dealing with individuals (cf. 20 [19-26]): also the disciples are too awed to question Him ([12]; cf. 4 [27], 16 [19]); the writer stops to explain His words ([19]; cf. 7 [39], 12 [33], 18 [9]); and the symbolism of the narrative shines clearly through it, though left unexplained. There are slight differences in the vocabulary, but not sufficient to require the theory of a different writer.

1-14. Third appearance to a group of the disciples. For the details cf. Lk 5 [3-10]; Mt 14 [28-31]. The writer perhaps consciously contrasts this scene with those; the risen Lord carrying forward the guidance of a larger body of fishers (seven perhaps a symbol of completeness); the net then breaking, now unbroken; St. Peter equally impulsive but now reaching his goal. He may also wish to show that there were appearances in Galilee as well as in Jerusalem, but the main symbolism is to show that the Lord continued to guide His Church, pointing them to the right, the lucky, side (Qy. the inclusion of the Gentiles), leading them to complete success, St. Peter having the chief hand in the work, and the unity of the Church being preserved (cf. Ac 10, 15). The number 153 is probably meant to be significant, perhaps by some cabbalistic interpretation of numbers (cf. Rev 13 [18] and Westcott here). Jerome on Ezek 47 [10] says that both Latin and Greek writers on natural history mention 153 kinds of fish; if this was known to John, he would see the symbolism in the number here; but Oppianus (whom alone Jerome names) was too late in date to have been known to John. In either case the significance is the universality of the Church, and perhaps the variety of its members (cf. Ac 2 [9-11], 17 [26]). Such success is not complete without the common meal, for which both He and they provide the food and He distributes it (cf. 6 [11, 27]). The *third* appearance is pointed out, perhaps as a symbol of completeness.

15-19. Jesus and Peter. Jesus as the Good Shepherd arranges for the feeding of His flock (cf. Heb 13 [20]; 1 P 5 [4], both perhaps reminiscent of this scene). St. Peter is restored to his position as leader; thrice tested to recall his triple denial (13 [38] and Mk 14 [29] = 'more than these'), and is left 'following' (13 [36]), even to the Cross. Two Greek words are used for love, and perhaps there is an intentional contrast—*agapan* the highest spiritual feeling (15 [9-13]), used in the Lord's first two questions; *philein*, of natural affection, used always by Peter and in the Lord's third question, St. Peter using the humbler word and the Lord accepting that. But both words are applied to the disciple whom Jesus loved (20 [2], 21 [20]) and to Lazarus (11 [5, 36]), so that it is doubtful whether the distinction is to be pressed. The lambs may be either the young, or perhaps new converts; the sheep the old or well-established Christians, perhaps in each case both. The one will want feeding, the others guiding.

18. This saying is perhaps suggested by what had just happened ([7]); in itself it is only a contrast between youth and old age. Peter will have to learn 'wise passiveness of age' no less than the vigorous activity of youth, but all the while there will be another to care for him, i.e. perhaps primarily God Himself (cf. Is 46 [3, 4], 'Even to old age I am he, and even to hoar hairs will I carry thee; I have made, and I will bear; yea, I will carry and deliver thee'). But 'carry thee' suggests carrying out to burial, and 'stretching forth the hands' suggests crucifixion, when 'another' will refer to the human agent; the writer, writing after Peter's death, rightly so interprets it (cf. 2 P 1 [14], a reference to this saying). The 'Quo vadis, Domine' story is a striking comment on 'whither thou wouldest not.'

20-23. The saying of Jesus is perhaps only meant to rebuke Peter's curiosity; if so, we are not justified in pressing it further. But it probably meant that the Lord did will that the loved disciple should remain alive (1 Cor 15 [6]) and loyal (cf. the stress on 'abiding' in 14) till His coming; and this was misinterpreted to mean that he would never die; he himself (for he seems to be still alive [24]) denies that this was ever meant. In this case

the coming of the Lord is still thought of as future. Others think that the words imply that the disciple had died; if so the coming must be thought of as something past, perhaps the destruction of Jerusalem.

24. 'we know,' i.e. probably the elders of the Church in which the Gospel was written.

25. Cf. 20[30] and 1 Mac 9[22]. 'The rest of the acts of Judas, and his wars, and the valiant deeds that he did, and his greatness, they are not written; for they were exceeding many.' The singular I suppose is the evangelist himself or possibly some later scribe. Is the writer thinking not only of what 'Jesus began to do' in His earthly life, but also of what He continued doing through His Spirit (cf. Ac 1[1])? If so, how true his statement is!

So ends a Gospel written that all its readers may have a fuller life; it should be read side by side with the First Epistle of St. John, a letter which was perhaps intended (as Bishop Lightfoot held) to be circulated with it as an epilogue. That will show that the fuller life intended was to be a life of joy and of fellowship—fellowship with all loyal Christians, and through fellowship with them fellowship with the Father, understanding and furthering His purposes in Creation, and fellowship with the Son, understanding and furthering His purposes in redemption by a life free from sin and a life of active love, for the Gospel illustrates Christ's touch on each stage and circumstance of life—birth, marriage, vocation, friendship, disease, and death—ennobling, enriching, restoring, conquering.

The epistle also shows that the Gospel sprang out of an atmosphere of keen controversy—controversy denying the Divine Sonship and also the real Humanity of the Lord; and we see the ideal controversialist not stopping to refute with dialectic argument the false view, but restating as strongly as possible the facts of the past which justified the true. In this respect it is like the Epistle to the Hebrews; in both there is the strongest statement of the Divine Nature and of the human sympathy and tears; both emphasize the high-priestly work and prayer of the Lord; both end with the thought of Him as the great Shepherd of the sheep brought back from the dead. In other respects the Epistle to the Ephesians affords a striking analogy: for it illustrates the Divine purpose of giving man the true sense of sonship, planned from the foundation of the world, realized in the life of the Lord, and in the breaking down of barriers between Jew and Gentile in the new spiritual life of love to the brethren; that epistle is one long thanksgiving to God that the High-Priestly Prayer of Jn 17 is being fulfilled. It is well also to remember that the evangelist knew well the whole outline of the history of the Christian Church in its first generation; he seems to think of the Lord's life as illustrated by and reflected in the influence of His Spirit upon His Body the Church. That too began with an abiding indwelling of the Spirit; in that too there followed a time of gladness and praise in social life; in that too there were gifts of healing and of raising the dead; in that too a movement from Judæa through Samaria to Greeks; in that too growing opposition from the Jews—a growing leading by the Spirit into truth. It would be fanciful perhaps to attempt to trace a more exact analogy between the life of the Lord in this Gospel and the life of the Church in the Acts of the Apostles; but it is always illuminating to ask of each event or discourse in the Gospel not only what was its significance when it happened, but also what was its significance to the evangelist when he recorded it; more illuminating still to ask, What has its significance been to the Church in the Christian centuries? What can it be to us now? What messages of hope or of warning has it for the future? When our evangelist wrote, the Synoptic record was known, but that was concerned mainly with Christ's manifestation of Himself to the world; our evangelist wishes to say: 'You will never know what He really was, unless you know also what He was to those who were His closest intimates in the earthly life, and what we have found Him to be still in the influence of His Spirit from above.'

Bibliography

Commentaries: Holtzmann in *Hand-Commentar zum N.T.*, 1891; Westcott in *Speaker's Commentary*, 1880; Westcott, with Greek Text, 1908; R. H. Strachan (Student Christian Movement), 1917; W. Bauer in *Handbuch zum N.T.*, 1925.

Discussions: Sanday, *Authorship and Historical Character*, 1872; T. Zahn, *Einleitung in d. N.T.*, vol. ii, 1899; Loisy, *Le Quatrième Evangile*, 1903; Drummond, *Character and Authorship*, 1903; Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, 1905; E. F. Scott, *The Fourth*

Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology, 1906; E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Historical and Religious Value*, 1910; F. von Hügel in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1911; Gardner, *The Ephesian Gospel*, 1915; Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. iii, 1920; H. S. Holland, *The Philosophy of Faith and the Fourth Gospel*, 1920; Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, Lecture VIII, 1920; Burney, *The Aramaic Origin*, 1922; G. Bert, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 1922; Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 1924; C. F. Nolloth, *The Place in the Development of Religious Thought*, 1925; Lord Charnwood, *According to St. John*, 1925; P. V. Smith, *Historical Importance*, 1926; J. E. Carpenter, *The Johannine Writings*, 1927.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE GOSPEL

By Charles Harris

At present the main current of critical opinion runs strongly counter to the direct apostolic authorship of the 4th Gospel, and that not only on the Continent, but also (though to a considerably less degree) in this country. Such leading authorities as Professors V. H. Stanton, Swete, and C. H. Turner have abandoned it, at least in the full sense (but see below). Professor Sanday in the last years of his life was strongly influenced in the negative direction by the arguments of von Hügel, though he died before reaching a final decision. Professor Burney, as the result of a very thorough investigation, sums up definitely against apostolic authorship, and follows Professor H. Delff in assigning the book to a young disciple of Jesus resident at Jerusalem, well educated, of good social position, and belonging to the circle or family of the High Priest. On the other hand, the traditional view is still influentially maintained in England, and has recently found expression in Dr. Nolloth's work *The Fourth Evangelist* (1925), and in *The Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Evangelist*, by H. P. V. Nunn, whom Dr. Wm. Temple in his Preface commends as 'a scholar well qualified to help us in clearing our minds about a matter on which I find myself convinced that prejudice has obscured the judgement of even great authorities.' Dr. Scott Holland also and Canon Richmond have laboured in the same sense; and Dr. Armitage Robinson has recently given an enthusiastic appreciation of Dr. Holland's interpretation of the 4th Gospel. So there are weighty recent authorities on the conservative side, and some of us, as we watch the course of criticism and attempt dispassionately to appraise it, are disposed to believe that the traditional view will ultimately re-establish itself. It is to be noticed that adverse critics mostly ignore the strength both of the external and of the internal evidence for direct apostolic authorship. Professor J. Drummond's massive argument, which deals exhaustively with the external evidence, has been ignored rather than answered by his successors. This is true even of such outstanding works as Streeter's *The Four Gospels* (1924), and J. E. Carpenter's *The Johannine Writings* (1927). It is therefore well that Drummond's summing-up should be quoted: 'The external evidence (be it said with all due respect to the Alogi) is all on one side, and for my part I cannot easily repel its force. A considerable mass of internal evidence is in harmony with the external. . . . On weighing the arguments for and against to the best of my power, I must give my own judgement in favour of the Johannine authorship' (*Inquiry*, 414). It is also worth remarking that Westcott's forcible argument for apostolicity, drawn from the internal evidence, though frequently now described as antiquated, has never yet received a detailed refutation, and must for that reason be regarded as still retaining much of its original value.

Carpenter's strange theory that this Gospel is the work not of an individual, but of a 'school,' or 'fellowship,' or 'group of teachers,' whose chairman may possibly have been an elder named John (*op. cit.*, 226, 250, etc.), seems to have nothing important to recommend it. As Streeter truly remarks: 'The word "school" is one of those vague seductive expressions which it is so easy to accept as a substitute for clear thinking. . . . [This Gospel] is a book of which every chapter reflects the genius and experience of a tremendous personality—and all through the personality reflected is the same. . . . [Moreover] the style, the gift of imaginative description, and the spiritual elevation of . . . the appendix, suggest the work of the same master mind that conceived and wrote the Gospel (*op. cit.*, 459, 382, 472).

One of the strongest arguments for apostolic authorship is the extreme unlikelihood that anyone except an Apostle could have succeeded, at so late a date as *c.* A.D. 95, in winning acceptance for a new history of Christ's ministry so divergent from, and in some respects actually con-

tradicting and correcting, the established Synoptic tradition. Streeter does not entirely ignore this consideration. For example, he says: 'The masterful way in which the author deals with the narrative of his predecessors [favours] the hypothesis that he was a personage who possessed, and was recognized as possessing, a claim to write with independent authority' (425). But what adequate degree of 'independent authority,' we may ask, could have been possessed by a writer who, according to Streeter, was neither an Apostle nor even a disciple of Jesus, but was simply one who, as a mere child, had *seen* the Lord? When we further reflect that, according to Streeter, John the Presbyter had probably 'not seen a great deal' of John the Apostle, and that 'not more than a few facts recorded in the Gospel were derived from him' (433), our conclusion must surely be that a writer with so little claim to first- (or even second-) hand knowledge as this could hardly have commended successfully to so conservative a body as the Christian Church so revolutionary a reconstruction of the established tradition of Christ's ministry and teaching as the 4th Gospel contains.

Streeter is on firmer ground when he contends that the Gospel has suffered somewhat from clumsy editing, and that in several cases there have been accidental transpositions of paragraphs or sections. Most of the rearrangements which he suggests on 80 ff. have much to commend them. We may perhaps also explain by accidental displacement the apparently wrong position of the Cleansing of the Temple (Jn 2^{14-22}).* It may be added that there is a certain number of somewhat improbable interpretations of sayings of Jesus (e.g. 2^{21}, 12^{33}: cf. 18^{32}) which look like editorial notes. Such phenomena as these are also found in not a few classical writings; but they are not usually regarded by critics as throwing any doubt either upon the accepted authorship, or upon the substantial integrity, of the works in which they are found.

With regard to the relation of Papias to the 4th Gospel, he certainly used John's First Epistle (Eusebius, *H.E.*, iii, 39), and therefore probably the Gospel also, since both are from the same pen and closely related. Papias's use of the 4th Gospel is now widely accepted even by liberal critics, as, for instance, by Streeter, who, however, maintains that Papias ascribed it, not to John the Apostle, but to a 'presbyter' or 'elder' of that name. This, however, in face of the attitude of Irenæus towards the question of authorship, seems unlikely. Irenæus was an admirer and close student of Papias, regarding him as an authority not only for doctrines but also for history. The presumption, therefore, is that Papias ascribed the Gospel to the Apostle, though, like Irenæus, he often spoke of him (in thoroughly Johannine fashion) as the disciple of the Lord,' or as 'the Presbyter'—a term which is better translated 'Elder,' 'Ancient,' or 'Venerable,' because this John (whoever he was) occupied the position rather of a Patriarch or Archbishop than of an ordinary Presbyter. Further, it is evident that Eusebius, who studied Papias with attention, found nothing in his five books of *Exegeseis* inconsistent with the attribution of the 4th Gospel to the Apostle. There is also direct evidence, though not very strong, that Papias actually stated that the Apostle wrote it. An ancient Preface to the Gospel, found in two MSS. of the Vulgate (one of the 9th, the other of the 10th century) affirms that 'The Gospel of John was revealed and given to the Churches by John while he was still in the body, as Papias, called the Hierapolitan, a dear disciple of John, related in his *Exoterica* [a blunder for *Exegeseis*].' This statement, which we gather from its form is based upon a Greek authority, may, as Zahn contends, be trustworthy. At any rate it harmonizes with the early evidence.

On the other hand, entirely unworthy of credence is the statement found in the 8th- or 9th-century epitome of the 5th-century History of Philip of Side (himself an unreliable authority), and repeated by the interpolator of the mediæval Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolus, that John, as well as his brother James, was 'put to death by the Jews'—presumably at an early date in Palestine. Dr. Lock (see p. 243*a*) is too indulgent when he speaks of this late and dubious evidence for the Apostle's martyrdom as 'not very strong.' If an argument based upon such weak evidence had been advanced in favour of a traditional conclusion, it would certainly have been laughed out of court. It has been effectively disposed of by Dr. Armitage Robinson in a note in his *Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 64-80.

Beyond doubt the external evidence for the apostolic authorship of the 4th Gospel is exceedingly strong. How strong it is can best be appreciated by those who realize that in the field of classical literature conservative views upon questions

* See, however, below, p. 281*b*.

of authorship, historicity, and date have for some time past been decidedly in the ascendant. Even the Platonic Epistles, which in the last century were almost universally rejected, are now again received as genuine. This, we believe, will also be the case with the Gospel of St. John, just in so far as the strong theological prejudice at present prevailing against it in many critical circles is not allowed to dominate the enquiry and to dictate its result. In this connexion the opinion of Eduard Meyer, a classical scholar of outstanding reputation, is worth alluding to. Though he does not himself believe that John the son of Zebedee wrote the Gospel, he treats as ridiculous the current denials and doubts of critics that the author intended to represent himself as being actually 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' and further as John the Apostle. 'This,' he writes, 'was the mask which he assumed' (*Ursprung*, i, 314). With Meyer's we may compare Streeter's similar statement: 'The Beloved Disciple, then, will be an Apostle; . . . and that the Apostle the author had in mind was John, can hardly, I think, admit of serious doubt.' Meyer's and Streeter's statements, if accepted, completely dispose of the theory of St. John's early martyrdom. Admittedly the codicil (Jn 21 [24]), written in Ephesus about A.D. 95, ascribes the Gospel to St. John. It could not possibly have done this, had St. John been known to have been put to death in Palestine some forty or fifty years earlier.

The argument that the Gospel cannot be authentic because it represents our Lord's Messiahship as acknowledged from the beginning of His ministry, is less strong than at first sight appears. It is evident, even from the Synoptics, that the followers of the Baptist who attached themselves to Jesus did so at least *in the strong hope or incipient belief* that He would prove to be the Messiah whose immediate coming John proclaimed. Nothing more than an incipient hope or belief of this kind need be implied in Jn 1 [41]. Nathanael's confession (1 [49]) is of an undeveloped type based on popular Messianic ideas, and Jesus received it coldly. In Jn 6 [15] Jesus definitely refuses to accept the rôle of Messiah as popularly understood. At other times He spoke ambiguously (10 [24]). His clearer declaration of His Messiahship to the Samaritans (4 [26]) was due to the fact that they took a prophetic rather than a political view of the Messiah's functions.

By general admission 21 [24], 'This is the disciple which beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things, and we know that his witness is true,' is a codicil, added, not by the author himself, but by certain intimate associates, presumably the elders of Ephesus, who bore this impressive witness to the genuineness and reliability of the Gospel when they published it. This codicil, which, being contained in all MSS., is contemporary, and from its language seems official, affirms unambiguously that at least the appendix (21), and by inference the entire Gospel, was written by the Beloved Disciple himself, and not by any supposed pupil or literary executor (see 21 [7, 20]). That the Beloved Disciple was John the son of Zebedee, plainly appears from 21 [2]. Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, and James the son of Zebedee, who are there mentioned, are impossible as authors; the two unnamed disciples are exceedingly unlikely. We conclude, therefore, that the contemporary codicil, written by men who must have known the truth, testifies that the beloved disciple is John the son of Zebedee. Entirely incorrect, therefore, is the frequently repeated statement that the earliest unambiguous evidence for Johannine authorship is furnished by Irenæus and Theophilus (*c.* A.D. 180). On the contrary, direct Johannine authorship is affirmed by the absolutely contemporary codicil.

The expression in the codicil, 'wrote these things,' affirms (*a*) direct authorship, and (*b*) authorship of the entire Gospel. It is not satisfied in the least by Professor Stanton's minimizing interpretation that the Apostle left a few rough notes behind him, on the basis of which someone else composed the Gospel.

Further evidence for direct authorship by an eyewitness is afforded by the words 'that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled' (1 Jn 1 [1]; cf. Jn 1 [14]). This forcible statement is explained away rather than explained by Stanton's strange suggestion (endorsed by Streeter) that the author as a mere child, too young as yet to be a disciple, had a few times seen Jesus. His solemn and emphatic affirmation is a claim not only that he was a personal disciple of Jesus, but also that he belonged to the circle of privileged intimates. The allusion to 'handling' naturally implies (as the majority of commentators recognize) that he was one of the chosen witnesses of the Resurrection (see Jn 20 [20, 25, 27]; Lk 24 [39]).

The foregoing argument that the author intended to describe himself (allusively but unmistakably) as John the Apostle, is

greatly strengthened by the circumstance that he never mentions John the son of Zebedee by name, and always calls John the Baptist simply 'John.' It is a subtle point, but very impressive. Surely it is only the real John the son of Zebedee (or, as a scarcely possible alternative, a forger of wellnigh unimaginable subtlety 'assuming his mask') to whom such a remarkable feature points as the author.

It is further of great importance to realize that recent criticism, both Jewish and Christian, has been strongly reacting against the view that used to prevail, that the Gospel is in its whole tone Hellenistic and dominated by Hellenistic philosophy; and that it is allegorical rather than historical. Upon the last point Streeter's opinion is important: 'John could not, consistently with his purpose [of combating Gnosticism, which denied that God had been manifested in the flesh], have recorded as history any event which he did not himself believe to have actually occurred. . . . The obvious presumption then, is that he derived [the miracle at Cana and that of the raising of Lazarus] from an authority which, whether mistakenly or otherwise, he regarded as . . . authentic' (*op. cit.*, 388). The Jewish Encyclopædia regards this Gospel as an important authority—more reliable in many respects than the Synoptics—for the Rabbinical ideas current in Palestine in the period before A.D. 70. It also accepts not a few of its historical and biographical statements as trustworthy. Swete, Stanton, Burney, and others who reject —at least in any adequate sense—its apostolic authorship, insist strongly on its fundamentally Jewish and Aramaic character; on its carrying the testimony of, or having been wholly written by, an intimate disciple of Jesus, who was fully acquainted with Jerusalem; also on the value of its historical framework, and even of its discourses, at least as to their main substratum.

When, however, we come to consider the positive theories of these mediating critics, we feel that they raise more difficulties than they solve. Thus the theory advocated by Delff, and accepted by Burney and Turner in England, that the author was not an Apostle, but a young disciple resident at Jerusalem, labours under enormous difficulties. It involves, for example, the following extreme improbabilities: (1) that the Beloved Disciple was not one of the chosen three, or even an Apostle; (2) that though not an Apostle, he was present at the Last Supper, and was assigned a place of honour second only to Peter's own; (3) that in spite of his special intimacy with Jesus, he is unmentioned in the Synoptic Gospels and unknown to subsequent tradition.

The ascription of the Gospel to any other John than the son of Zebedee is beset with serious historical difficulties. Early Christian tradition knows of no primitive John of Ephesus other than the Apostle. Papias, who flourished early in the 2nd century, is supposed by many to have known of two eminent Ephesian Johns, viz. the Apostle and the 'Presbyter.' But Irenæus (*c.* A.D. 180), who was a diligent student of his writings (now unfortunately lost), so far from distinguishing, expressly identifies John the Apostle and John the Presbyter. No authority earlier than Eusebius (not even Dionysius of Alexandria, as quoted in Eusebius, *H.E.*, vii, 25), discovered in Papias two primitive Ephesian Johns; and the single passage which Eusebius (who wrote in the 4th century) is able to quote from Papias as favouring his own theory of two Johns is both obscure and ambiguous. Critics of such different standpoints and presuppositions as Bousset, Zahn, Burney, Salmon, Bardenhewer, Gutjar, Lepin, H. J. Holtzmann, Chapman, and Nolloth, maintain that Eusebius has misinterpreted Papias—the motive of his misinterpretation being his strong desire to find a primitive non-apostolic author for the Apocalypse, a work which he intensely disliked. Streeter concedes (*op. cit.*, 449) that Eusebius was actuated both by this motive and by a disinclination to believe that a Millenarian like Papias had received instruction from an Apostle. He even says that 'this passage in the Preface of Papias was, by the 3rd century, the only evidence that could be produced for the existence of such a person [as John the Presbyter].' Nevertheless, he accepts Eusebius's theory of two Ephesian Johns, and assigns the Gospel to the Presbyter. (See the full discussions in Nolloth, *The Fourth Evangelist*, 58 ff., and Chapman, *John the Presbyter*, 9 ff.)

Upon the whole, we believe that a careful survey of the evidence leaves us in the position, not that there are no difficulties in maintaining the authorship —in a sufficiently full sense—of John the Apostle, but that there are less difficulties about this hypothesis than about any other. As one reads the Gospel and the accompanying Epistle, the conviction becomes irresistible that the author in all sincerity lays the greatest stress upon his having been an eyewitness of what he

records (see especially 1 Jn 1 [1] ff.); and this implies that he was one of the innermost circle of disciples, and therefore an Apostle, and also (for reasons already given) John the son of Zebedee. Again, if the author of the 4th Gospel shows intimate knowledge of Jerusalem, and if he had some sort of influence with the High Priest's household (though it is not quite *certain* that it was he who introduced Peter into the High Priest's palace), is it not quite possible that a well-to-do fisherman of the Lake of Galilee may have had a business connexion in Jerusalem? We hear of the fish trade, the fish gate, and the fish market there. Moreover, the family of Zebedee was fairly prosperous (Mk 1 [20], 15 [40-41]), consequently St. John may have had a good education for a layman, and it would have been quite possible for him to acquire that share of rabbinical learning with which modern rabbinical scholars usually credit him, even although from the standpoint of the scribes he was an unlearned person without professional training (Ac 4 [13], see Rackham *in loc.*).

On the other hand, certain passages which contain strong indications that they proceed from an eyewitness strike us also with a certain sense of improbability. Such are the account of the rapid conversion of a number of Samaritans (though if this was a fact it helps to explain the success of Philip's subsequent Samaritan ministry), and the mysterious eucharistic discourse in 6, which, though in substance authentic (cf. 1 Cor 10 [3]), contains teaching which we should have expected would have been given at the very close of the ministry, and then only to the Twelve. Again there is the difficulty raised by the silence of the Synoptics concerning the raising of Lazarus, though it must be acknowledged that nowhere are the evidences of an eyewitness more convincing than in 11; and that the enthusiasm of the triumphal entry is not easily explicable without the occurrence of some such striking exhibition of saving power to focus the attention of the Passover pilgrims in Jerusalem upon Jesus.

As to the difficulty about attributing the Gospel and the Apocalypse to the same author, we propose in this place to omit its consideration. It is a difficulty touching the latter, not the former work, and must be dealt with in its proper place.

On the whole, the right conclusion seems to be that the traditional position as to the authorship of the 4th Gospel involves much less difficulty than any of the rival theories.

THE TEACHING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST

WITH AN OUTLINE OF HIS LIFE

By CHARLES GORE

A. Our Materials.
B. Outline of the Life.
C. The Method and Aim of the Teaching.
D. The Substance of the Teaching of Jesus.
   (1) The Gospel of the Kingdom.
   (2) The Doctrine of God
   (3) Implied Doctrine concerning Himself.
   (4) Sin and Atonement.
   (5) The Gift of the Spirit.
   (6) The Church and the Kingdom.
   (7) Personal Immortality.

IN approaching this subject, so attractive and so momentous, we need to take to heart the warnings of the past. One-sidedness—attention to one aspect only of the teaching or of the person of our Lord—has been the bane of the Church. In the main bulk of the theology of the Middle Ages either the Deity was allowed to obscure the humanity, or the humanity was valued mainly in the interests of sacramentalism, as the humanity of the glorified Christ, communicated to us for our spiritual renewal. Both these tendencies to emphasize unduly one aspect of truth had a dangerous effect in withdrawing attention from our Lord's properly human nature and experience. Under the influence of the Reformation the all-important subject became 'the scheme of salvation'; and, in our own country, Dean Church has reminded us how in old-fashioned Evangelical pulpits 'preaching Christ' came to mean preaching what was supposed to be St. Paul's doctrine of justification and atonement to the great neglect of the Lord's ethical teaching. The Tractarians rectified the balance in one way: they taught much out of the Gospels; but it was chiefly on our Lord's teaching as applied to the individual life, and was largely occupied in emphasizing the severity of its personal claim. Frederick Maurice was a deep thinker and prophet who initiated a much-

needed reaction by again bringing to light the social bearing of our Lord's teaching; but it was Seeley's *Ecce Homo* which first startled our English world with its wonderfully vivid picture of the Christ as the inspirer and teacher of the 'enthusiasm of humanity.' Latterly, Germany, France, and England have been deluged with popular humanitarian accounts of Jesus of Nazareth, most of them purely humanitarian—ignoring or repudiating anything in the Gospel picture which is supernatural. Some have even repudiated as belonging to His teaching the whole element of sternness, denunciation, and judgement. This sort of one-sidedness has been assisted by a literary criticism of a very arbitrary and destructive kind. This accounts for the extraordinarily different pictures of the Christ drawn for us on purely humanitarian lines by different schools of critics. It is hard to recognize the same person in the Christ of the *Vie de Jésus* or *Das Wesen des Christentums*, or the works of the same school in England, on the one side, and on the other side, in the world-renouncing fanatic of Schweitzer and the apocalyptic school. All these accounts of our Lord do indeed give us assistance. For no one of these schools or tendencies but represents, all the more vividly perhaps for its one-sidedness, a real and important element in His character and message. But they are manifestly one-sided and arbitrary to a strange degree in their critical selection of material. No doubt we need to deal critically with our material. It is mere folly to seek to represent everything in the four Gospels as verbally and infallibly true, or as on the same uniform level of trustworthiness merely because it is there. The facts are against any such view. We must deal with the Gospels critically. There remains material of somewhat different levels. But in estimating our material according to its level, we must seek to estimate it impartially. Nothing but disastrous misunderstanding will accrue from taking what we like, or judge to be probable, and leaving what we do not like, or judge to be improbable, by some arbitrary standard. We must, with much mortification of our own proclivities, if necessary, see what sort of a picture of the Lord's character and teaching the documents as a whole really present to us. We must not seek to induce the word of the Lord to sound according to our own likings. Let us apply ourselves then to consider our materials.

A. **Our Materials.**—In the main obviously our materials consist of the Gospels; and, of the writings claiming this name, the canonical four are the only ones of any importance. Dealing with these with a criticism which seeks to be fearless, open-eyed, and impartial, but at the same time to be reverent and free from any destructive bias or any *a priori* refusal of the supernatural or miraculous, we seem to the present writer to arrive at results which can only briefly be set down here, as conclusions the grounds of which must be sought elsewhere in the present volume or outside it. At least they will suffice to explain the basis of the estimate here presented of our Lord's teaching. The early Church tradition about the 2nd Gospel is accepted as trustworthy—that it was written by John Mark, whose associations with the apostolic circle in Jerusalem were intimate from the beginning, who was for a brief period the companion of his cousin Barnabas and Paul on their first missionary journey, but who is chiefly to be thought of as the companion and interpreter of Peter, whose memories of the actions and teachings of Jesus, probably given in the main as instructions to converts in the churches of his foundation, and given again and again, form the bulk, though not the whole, of his Gospel. This fundamental record, if, according to tradition, it was issued as a whole after St. Peter's martyrdom at Rome, was probably written down gradually during the years of Mark's association with Peter.

Again the traditional ascription of the 3rd Gospel to Luke, 'the beloved physician' and companion of St. Paul, is also accepted. His motive in writing it is described in his admirable preface. This document, which forms one work with the Acts of the Apostles, uses St. Mark's record and also an early record, especially of the words of our Lord, identical with, or closely similar to, the source used in the 1st Gospel. But it also appears to consist largely of information derived from original witnesses, especially some of those named in the course of his work, with whom he was in familiar contact for longer or shorter periods.

The Gospel 'according to Matthew' is based upon St. Mark, but it also makes use of a document which in all probability was the collection of the 'Oracles' written, as Papias tells us, by St. Matthew 'in the Hebrew language.' But we cannot tell exactly how much it contained. Our present 'St. Matthew' is not a translation from the Hebrew or Aramaic, and at certain

points it contains otherwise unsupported matter which it is not in all cases easy to regard as trustworthy. The account of our Lord's teaching which follows will be based upon St. Mark and St. Luke, and the whole 'Sermon on the Mount' and collection of parables in St. Matthew. Beyond this, where St. Matthew's unsupported narrative is relied upon, the reliance will be briefly justified.

[The late Dr. Burney's *The Poetry of Our Lord* (Oxford Press, 1925) should be consulted for its valuable presentation of the evidence both that our Lord habitually cast His teaching in the traditional forms of Hebrew rhythm (83-4, 101 ff.), and that on the whole these forms are better preserved in the Gospel according to Matthew than in Mark and Luke (86 ff., but cf. 113); also that their preservation in the 4th Gospel tends to authenticate in part the record there of our Lord's discourses (84 f., 94). Observe some interesting remarks on the form of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew and Luke, giving preference to the former (112 f.).]

The 4th Gospel is still the subject of constant discussion. The writer of this article, on the whole, believes it to have been rightly ascribed to John the son of Zebedee as in a real sense its author, though with assistance from others, and to have been issued at Ephesus in his extreme old age, at the end of the 1st century. It must have been written in part to supplement the records of Mark and Luke, with which he was acquainted, and to preserve in memory an outline of our Lord's life, and of particular events and elements of His teaching, which would otherwise have perished; in part to correct those earlier records where they were mistaken in detail; but especially with a doctrinal object—to maintain the then gravely imperilled doctrine of the incarnation, showing our Lord as very God and very man; and all this with the authority which belongs to an original witness, gifted with an intense perception of the value of even minute facts, an original witness, moreover, who was both one of the Twelve, and also 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' It is quite consistent with this to recognize that, though the discourses in this Gospel are always based upon real words of the Lord, yet the historical memory is mediated through long years of meditation, and it is not easy to distinguish the memory from the comment. But it must be noticed that many critics who cannot accept the traditional view of the 4th Gospel, or cannot accept it completely, are agreed in recognizing that it presents an historical tradition, based on the evidence of a disciple familiar with Jerusalem, which must be allowed to supplement, and at points to correct, the Synoptic record both of the work and of the words of Jesus. It is indeed almost inconceivable that the Messiah should not have presented Himself or made His appeal to His people at Jerusalem, as the 4th Gospel relates, before His last visit, when His rejection is already manifest and His death is in full view: and the Synoptists in various ways postulate such earlier ministry there (see Richmond, *The Gospel of the Rejection*, 4 ff.).

The account then here attempted of the teaching of Christ will be based upon the Synoptic record and supplemented by that of St. John. This course is justified by two considerations: first, that St. John's Gospel is confessedly later and supplementary; secondly, that it records mainly our Lord's teaching in Jerusalem, where He became almost from the first conscious that His message and claim was destined to be rejected. It is, to use Richmond's phrase, 'The Gospel of the Rejection.' 'He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.' Where He should have been welcomed as 'in His own country' (Jn 4^{44}; cf. 7^{41-42}), He found no footing and no fair hearing. It is because our Lord became so early conscious of rejection at the centre of Jewish authority and life that He 'withdrew' (Mt 4^{12}) into 'Galilee of the nations,' and there alone found the opportunity of laying the foundations of 'the Gospel of the kingdom' and gathering the nucleus of the New Israel. It must be added that in the Synoptic record we appear to be given a more vivid and original impression of our Lord's method in teaching. We shall start, therefore, from the Synoptic record and lay our foundations there.

Outside the Gospels we have the references and implications of the Epistles. We may, nay we must, in reason believe that St. Paul was well acquainted with the tradition current in the apostolic circle at Jerusalem of the words and works of Christ. Occasionally he quotes this tradition as of final authority as regards facts (1 Cor 11^{23}, 15^{1} ff.), and four times he quotes or refers to words of Christ as an end of controversy (1 Cor 7^{10}, 9^{14}; 1 Th 4^{15}; Ac 20^{35}; 1 Tim 6^{3}). In the first two instances such words exist in the Synoptic record. The words quoted in the speech recorded in the Acts are an

addition to our knowledge. The reference in Thessalonians leads us to believe that our Lord may have said something about the *parousia* which is lost to us. Substantially, however, St. Paul adds very little to our knowledge of the teaching of the Lord, though we shall find no reason to believe that he did not interpret it aright. Nor, though we accept St. James's Epistle and the 1st Epistle of Peter as genuine, and these Epistles seem to be saturated with the Lord's teaching, do they in fact add anything to our knowledge of it in detail.

Have we any other sources of knowledge? Substantially, no. The learned Jewish scholar, Joseph Klausner (*Jesus of Nazareth*, Danby's trans., Allen and Unwin), has searched the earliest Jewish records and can find no addition to our knowledge. 'The Gospels say that [Jesus] performed signs and wonders through the Holy Spirit and the power of God; the Talmud stories allow that He did indeed work signs and wonders, but by means of magic. In the Gospels Jesus' opposition to the Pharisees and Scribes and their "rote-learned precepts of men," and His own teaching as to what constitutes true religion, are held up for admiration; the Talmud, however, avers that He was "a sinner in Israel," and "a scoffer against the words of the wise." . . . "Jeshu [of Nazareth] practised sorcery and beguiled and led Israel astray." ' He can find no fresh information then in the Jewish tradition. There are, however, certain sayings ascribed to our Lord which occurred in the text of the lost 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' and are reported by Origen, Jerome and others, or which are quoted by early Christian writers without any mention of their source, or are found in recovered fragments of papyrus, to which very brief attention must be given. In Dr. Montagu James's *Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1924, 1-37), all these fragments will be found with the materials available for estimating their worth. The following *may* represent a genuine tradition: (1) 'He that wondereth shall reign, and he that reigneth shall rest,' pp. 2, 26. (2) 'And never be ye joyful, save when ye behold your brother with love,' p. 3. (3) 'It is placed among the greatest sins, "if a man have grieved the spirit of his brother," ' p. 5. (4) 'If ye be in my bosom and do not the will of my Father which is in heaven, out of my bosom will I cast you away,' p. 7. (5) 'And the Lord Himself being asked by someone when His kingdom should come, said, "When the two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female, neither male nor female," ' p. 11. (6) 'On the same day, seeing one working on the Sabbath, He said unto him: "Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou doest thou art blessed: but, if thou knowest not, thou art cursed, and a transgressor of the law," ' p. 38. (7) 'Ask ye for the greater things, and the small shall be added unto you; and ask for the heavenly things, and the earthly things shall be added unto you,' p. 35. (8) 'Be ye approved money changers.' (9) 'He that is near me is near the fire. He that is far from me is far from the kingdom.'

[Of the above (5) and (6) may indicate that St. Paul's expressions in Gal 3[28] and Rom 14[22-23] are based on words of the Lord.] It may be added that the word *epiousios*, translated 'daily' in the Lord's Prayer, was represented in *the Gospel according to the Hebrews* by a word meaning 'for to-morrow'—probably rightly, p. 4. Some words ascribed to Jesus in the Oxyrhynchus papyri (3rd century) are interesting, especially His answer to the question: ['Who are they that] draw us [to] the kingdom that is in heaven?' 'The fowls of the heaven . . . the fishes of the sea [are they that draw you]. And the kingdom of heaven is within you,' and 'Wheresoever there are [two, they are not without] God: and where there is one alone I say I am with him. Lift up the stone and there shalt thou find me: cleave the wood and I am there' (26-27). But it is not possible to ascribe historical value to these words. And the conceivably genuine sayings quoted above neither appreciably add to the knowledge of our Lord's doctrine derived from the canonical Gospels, nor modify it.

Our account of the method and substance of the teaching seems to require a preliminary *outline* of His life. (On its political, religious, and social background see previous Articles; also Klausner, *op. cit.* This last book is written from a hostile Jewish point of view, but is very valuable for its information.)

B. **Outline of the Life of our Lord.**—According to St. Luke and St. Matthew, Jesus was born at Bethlehem, the City of David, a few miles south of Jerusalem, some years before the death of Herod the Great (4 B.C.). Joseph, his reputed father, was apparently recognized as belonging to the descendants of King David, and Jesus, his reputed son, was accordingly regarded as 'of the seed of David.' This does not appear to have

been disputed (see p. 318 on the Virgin Birth). According to the accounts, however, it was strictly the *conception*, not the birth, that was miraculous). The mystery of His birth appears to have been kept as a profound secret, only to be disclosed even to the Apostles after they had believed in Him on the evidence of His life, death, resurrection and the coming of the Spirit. The belief in Jesus of the original witnesses was to be based solely on their own experience. It is to be noticed also that the birth narratives of the Gospels contain nothing which suggests more than that the child of Mary was to be the promised Christ. There was no announcement of a divine incarnation. At the time of His conception or His birth divine intimations of the coming of the Christ are recorded to Elizabeth, Mary's cousin, the mother of John the Baptist, to a little group of shepherds, to the pious Simeon and Anna in the Temple at Jerusalem, and to *magi* from the East; and the magi alarmed the old King, almost frenzied with suspicion in his last furious days. The consequent danger to the child caused Joseph, after another divine intimation, to escape with the mother and the infant into Egypt; and when they returned after the King's death, they returned not to Bethlehem—Jesus never appears to have visited Bethlehem after He left it as an infant—but to their old home in the north of Palestine at Nazareth of Galilee, whither it would not seem that any rumour of anything exceptional had penetrated; and nothing miraculous or extraordinary appears to have occurred in connection with the home at Nazareth.

Of the childhood of Jesus we know nothing except that He was brought up as a pious Jewish child with all the reverent care which Mary and Joseph must have bestowed upon Him. The incident in the Temple, when at twelve years old he was taken to the passover, discloses Him as a child of remarkable spiritual perceptions and as already possessed with such a sense of divine sonship as made Him—not indeed independent of external influences, but beyond being dominated by them. He had something to be loyal to which was better than the tradition of Israel even at its best. That tradition, however, He reverently received. He was deeply versed in the Scriptures. He was sure that salvation was of the Jews, and that the Scriptures must be fulfilled. He was not the less sure of that when He found how perverted was the tradition which had attached itself to these Scriptures. He shows Himself, in His Temptation and in His later ministry, acquainted with the three divisions of the Canon, the Law, the Prophets, and 'the Psalms'—this last term apparently signifying the later books as a whole, including not the Psalms only, but Daniel. He shows no acquaintance with the disputed books, Esther or the Song of Songs or Ecclesiastes. The question whether He shows acquaintance with the Jewish Apocalypses, outside the Canon, will be noticed later. There is no sign of any acquired knowledge in the mind of our Lord except what He would have acquired in His home or in the Synagogue. Greek culture was around Him in Galilee, but there is not a trace of it in Him. He never seems to have visited the brilliant Syro-Greek cities in Galilee or Decapolis. Again, there is not a trace of Oriental influences such as appeared among the Essene colonies of Judæa, except so far as influences from the East had already entered into the Scriptures. So far as external teaching went He was purely a Jew nourished on the Jewish sacred books, and receiving in them the word of the Lord. As we study His teaching we shall observe the evidences of a mind extraordinarily receptive and perceptive, both in regard of nature and of man: but there is nothing to suggest any such knowledge of nature or of history as, in His days, would have been miraculous. All that appears supernatural in Him, as we see Him during His ministry, is what comes from His inner relation to the Father, and from the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

The prelude to the Mission of Jesus was the Mission of John the Baptist. Jesus and John were second cousins through their mothers. But there is no suggestion in the Gospels that they ever met before the meeting at the Jordan. John's mission was to proclaim the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God, conceived on the old lines of the prophets—by no means to *be* the Christ, but to herald Him and to 'make ready a people prepared for the Lord.' Therefore he sets himself to destroy the self-satisfaction both of the people and of their religious leaders. The judgement of God upon them is imminent, and the Christ is to be its instrument. The scribes and Pharisees he denounces as hypocrites. What is wanted is righteousness of the sort demanded by the old prophets. A new Israel must be fashioned such as God can accept and use. The ceremony of admission to the new Israel John found

in baptism preceded by confession. This washing in the waters of Jordan represented a death to the old life and a birth to the new. The movement found wide support among the common people—little among the leaders. Jesus came to this baptism—not, as it appeared, as a penitent to be absolved, but to receive the divine approval, and also the divine (though not public) consecration to the office and work of the Messiah. The divine voice, 'Thou art my only Son, in whom I have found satisfaction' (whether audible to the outward ear of Jesus and of John, or conveyed only inwardly, like the word of God to the prophets), was primarily a divine recognition of what He already was: but the descending Spirit (whether outwardly or inwardly beheld) appears to have conveyed to Him for the first time the consecrating gift and powers needed for His mission. His consecration was followed by retirement into the wild mountain desert by which the 'hill country of Judæa' descends to the Jordan valley. 'Straightway the Spirit driveth Him forth into the wilderness.' There He was the subject of just those fundamental temptations which must be met by anyone called to a divine mission. In the case of Jesus the temptations were such as would have no meaning except to one who knew himself to be endowed with miraculous power in nature, and to be destined in some sense for world-rule. Would He use His powers to satisfy His own physical needs? Would He rely upon God to support Him in amazing the people by a prodigy in the Temple area? (Edersheim, *Life*, i, 304; Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, 140). Or would He adopt the ways of the world so as to win the world? Here we have presented to us the common temptations of the flesh, of pride, and of worldliness, but in a form adapted to a particular moment in a unique career. Then, Luke tells us, 'he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee.' But we greatly need the detailed correction supplied by the 4th Gospel, which alone explains how closely the ministry of Jesus was affiliated to the Judæan ministry of John, and how the symbolic rite of baptism, later to be filled with a higher power, passed from the prophet to His greater successor (Jn 1 [35-51], 3 [22-30], 4 [1-3], 10 [40-42]). Jesus began His ministry side by side with John in the neighbourhood of the Jordan, and several of His leading disciples passed into His school from that of John, with a preliminary recognition—however sudden and inadequate—that He was what John declared Him to be. We cannot but accept this as a real memory. Wherever the Fourth Evangelist supplements or corrects the Synoptists' record, it seems to the present writer that his evidence is to be preferred. Thus we shall accept the longer ministry (A.D. 26-7 to 29), which is at least not contradicted by the Synoptists, and which seems to be a psychological necessity, if the self-revelation of the Lord and the education and probation of the Apostles is to be an intelligible process. We shall accept also the Johannine account of the preliminary ministry, both in Galilee and Jerusalem (1 [43]-3 [30]), expressly dated 'before John was cast into prison' (3 [24]; cf. Mk 1 [14]), and perhaps the early cleansing of the Temple at the passover. We note the failure of this first act of prophetic authority, backed by unrecorded 'signs,' to meet any adequate response (2 [23-25], 3 [10, 11, 32]). This is followed by the withdrawal first into Judæa and then into Galilee (3 [22], 4 [1-3]). Thereafter follows the Galilean ministry recorded in the Synoptists, beginning with the final and formal call of the first disciples. John records later visits to Jerusalem at divers feasts. No attempt will be made here to dovetail the Synoptic account into the Johannine framework, though at one point (Jn 6) the connection is made plain. We shall notice only that, though Jesus' words and 'works' of authority awakened sincere belief in individuals at the Capital—and when the Synoptists record His final arrival at Jerusalem He is found to have believing friends there—yet He always encounters the uncompromising hostility of the authorities—'the Jews sought to kill Him' (7 [1]). The message of Jesus never had a chance of acceptance there. In the freer atmosphere of Galilee all was different. What we have now to do is to indicate in barest outline the course and outcome of His Galilean ministry.

He is quite silent about His Messiahship. He calls Himself 'the Son of Man'—a title that carried with it no definable claim (see later). He appears as a prophet of divine grace, like the later 'Isaiah,' and as a new rabbi or teacher of marvellous 'authority.' This authority showed itself equally in His words and works. He taught as one who did not merely convey, like the prophets, an occasional message from God—'thus saith the Lord'—but had a continuous fount of authority in Himself—though always in absolute dependence on His Father—to speak about God and His will and His kingdom, revising even the Mosaic Law (Mt 5 [21], etc.; cf. Mk 10 [4] ff.). Whatever

He teaches, there is in His tone an unmistakable note of infallibility (Mt 11 [27]; Lk 10 [22]; cf. Jn 3 [11])—used, however, as we shall notice, with the greatest reserve: and with this authority to teach is bound up indissolubly His miraculous power over diseases and the processes of nature. The conviction of the non-Jewish observer, the centurion, conveys this impression to us most vividly. Jesus, doubtless, was not to him the supreme God, but under God He had absolute control in the kingdom of nature, as the centurion had in his division of the army. That is why he sent to Jesus confident that He could heal his servant. Our Lord's miracles are predominantly miracles of healing: and Klausner has explained to us how the terrible history of Palestine in the period preceding our Lord's appearance would naturally have produced an inordinate amount of poverty, misery, fear and disease, especially hysteria and mental disease (*op. cit.*, 167-168, 266). All this disease our Lord associates with the hostile power of Satan. 'An enemy hath done this.' He fully sanctions the current belief in evil spirits and their power, while He proclaims that power ended for those who will believe in Him. His miracles of healing, as recorded, greatly surpass anything which admits of a naturalistic interpretation, and there is no really 'critical' justification for drawing a line as regards evidence between the miracles of healing and the 'nature-miracles.' We have solid grounds for believing that the Synoptic records rest upon the deliberate 'witness' of the Apostles (Ac 1 [21-22], 10 [36-39]), and no passages in the New Testament bear upon them more vividly the marks of the eye-witness, and in particular of the eye-witness of Peter, than, for instance, the narratives of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Withering of the Fig Tree (Mk 6 [30], 11 [12-14, 20] ff.). There are *real* grounds for suggesting mistaken observation in the case of the Gadarene swine, and for attributing the miracle of the coin in the fish's mouth to later tradition, and for regarding the Feeding of the Four Thousand as a 'double' of the previous Feeding of the Five Thousand. But we cannot dispute the nature-miracles of our Lord generally without making the Gospel narrative radically untrustworthy. Moreover, the miracles and the teaching are inextricably intertwined in the fabric of the narrative, and the originality and ethical character of His 'signs' distinguish our Lord's record decisively from that of reputed miracle-workers in general (see Headlam, *Miracles of the New Testament*, cap. v).

Jesus taught then and wrought 'as one having authority,' and He produced a profound impression in Galilee. At His own city Nazareth, indeed, He was rejected at the outset, because of His lack of deference to local patriotism (Lk 4 [23] ff.); and His 'brethren' (a term which we are justified in interpreting as His half-brothers, see Ep. of James, Intr.) criticized Him and declined to 'believe in Him' (Jn 7 [5]); but the ecstatic veneration of the people knew no bounds. The 'disciples' also, whom our Lord organized into a specific band—'the Twelve' or 'the Apostles'—were full of faith and joy. It must have been in some sense an 'idyllic' period which our Lord describes in the figure of the children of the bridechamber round about the bridegroom (Mk 2 [19]). Nevertheless Jesus 'did not commit Himself to men' any more in Galilee than in Jerusalem: He wanted something better than a faith so largely bound up with the attraction of miraculous benefits, or the sort of faith in Him as the promised King which popular nationalism would have suggested. The notes of growing opposition, we observe, are specially associated with the visits of embassies from the authorities at Jerusalem, by whom He had been all along rejected (Lk 5 [17]; Mk 3 [6, 22] ff., 7 [1]). Jesus is more and more thrown back upon the Twelve. More and more it becomes evident that He is concentrating Himself upon their training. He is preparing for a future beyond the present horizon. Just as the imprisonment of the Baptist by Herod Antipas had been the occasion of our Lord's 'withdrawing' from Judæa into Galilee (Mt 4 [12]), so his execution is followed by His withdrawal from public work in Galilee. Not on the initiative of Herod was Jesus to meet His earthly doom (Lk 13 [32] f.). An additional motive was that there was no chance of getting popular nationalism to understand His mission and purpose. So taking the Twelve with Him (Mt 15 [23]) He goes north to the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, and seemingly makes a journey outside the boundary of Herod's tetrarchy and of the Holy Land, bringing Him round to the Decapolis, and (after a brief return into Galilee) to the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi. That is a crucial moment. There the Lord's deliberate questioning of the disciples, under circumstances very discouraging to Jewish patriotism, elicits Peter's confession of His Messiahship. Henceforth—though it

is not to be proclaimed—that Jesus is the Christ who was to come is an open secret between the Master and the Twelve. But the deepest tragedy follows. Jesus seizes the moment to press down upon the Twelve the meaning of His Messiahship, which He interprets primarily in terms of 'the suffering Servant,' who is to be rejected and slain, and so only to become the Redeemer of His people. Neither Peter, it appears, nor the rest can bear this announcement of coming rejection, shame, and disaster. After this, amidst deepening anxiety in the little band around Him, Jesus set His face towards Jerusalem foreseeing plainly what the end will be, but with the confident vision of divine vindication beyond death. This, however, is quite outside the mental horizon of the Twelve. Not even the vision of the Transfigured Lord conveyed to the three who witnessed it any permanent assurance.

The arrival at Jerusalem begins with a triumphant welcome, which our Lord deliberately accepts, as He approached the city from Bethany. This expression of enthusiasm was no doubt chiefly due to the crowd of Galileans present in Jerusalem for the Paschal feast, whose old feeling of reverence and devotion was not quenched. But nothing explains the particular occasion and manner of its revival like John's account of the Raising of Lazarus and of its effects both on the Jews of Jerusalem and on the Passover pilgrims, who were crowding the city (Jn 11 [45], 12 [9, 17, 18]). It was followed by the (? renewed) sign of the cleansing of the Temple. It would seem as if there might have been a Galilean uprising in Jerusalem to acclaim Him the Messiah, if Jesus would have accepted the rôle of the nationalist King. But nothing is further from His thoughts. Nothing in the Gospels is more impressive than the record of His public teaching in the Temple during the last days. But His attitude towards the religious leaders of the people is wholly uncompromising—culminating in tremendous denunciations. And He takes no notice of the transitory enthusiasm of the entry. It need not have been the same group who shouted 'Hosanna!' on Sunday afternoon and 'Crucify Him!' on Friday morning, but at least the enthusiasm of 'the crowd' had been quenched by the marked unresponsiveness of Jesus to the kind of faith which alone they were prepared to offer Him (e.g. Lk 14 [25] ff.). In His private discourse to His disciples (Mk 13) announcing the doom of the Temple and of Jerusalem, with its outlook upon the larger future, or again at the institution of the Eucharist and in the discourses narrated only by St. John, beginning there in the Upper Chamber, our Lord's attention is shown wholly concentrated upon giving His disciples their preparation for the future; a preparation which would avail thereafter, though at the present moment their ears were closed and their intelligences paralyzed. There follow the Betrayal and the failure of the disciples' courage, and the trials and condemnations of Jesus. In the Jewish court before the High Priest He is condemned as guilty of death for blasphemy, in virtue of His final open declaration of His Messiahship and His divine triumph immediately to begin ('henceforth': 'from now'; Mt 26 [64]; Lk 22 [69]); before Pilate He is accused as pretending to be King of the Jews, and so a danger to the Empire. Pilate perceives clearly enough that the charge is not in fact honest or true: but it was more than his place was worth to resist the demand of the Jews, and he condemns Him to execution by the painful and ignominious method of crucifixion. It was the Roman way of getting rid of all provincials who were troublesome; so that the spectacle of crucifixion, as we should judge from Josephus, was lamentably familiar in Palestine. The accounts in the Gospels of the passion and death and burial of Jesus are majestic—overwhelmingly majestic—in their simplicity. It is the supreme example in history of the seeming failure of the good and the seeming weakness of God. 'He delivers His strength into captivity and His glory into the adversaries' hand.' It generates, in the mind of anyone who sees in the mission of Jesus the climax of the divine action for the salvation of mankind, a peremptory demand for a divine vindication of the Christ as actual as the seeming failure. Such a vindication was given, but only to the group of believers. A vindication on the most public scale was reserved (Mk 8 [38]; Jn 14 [22]).

At the beginning of the Acts, the Apostles are presented to us, with the little company of other disciples around them in Jerusalem—even before they had 'received power' by the gift of the Spirit—as a group wholly changed in disposition from what they had been forty days before. They are radiant with a hope and confidence never again to fail or be discouraged. They have, as it were, been driven round a sharp corner into a quite different outlook. And what has accomplished that remarkable change is their

experience of the Resurrection of Jesus. The sight of the empty tomb on the third day after the crucifixion had been succeeded by the appearances which had convinced them that God had vindicated His crucified Son and that His holy flesh had not seen corruption, but been raised to new life—of a kind quite new in human experience—and then to divine glory. The primary function of the Apostles was to be witnesses of His resurrection as of something they had beheld and their hands had handled. Before St. Paul's conversion, probably some five years after the crucifixion, their witness had been formulated into the quasi-credal statement which St. Paul says he 'received' and held and taught in common with all the other Apostles (1 Cor 15 [1-7]). This was their summary credential. The detailed record of different appearances given us in the three Gospels (for St. Mark is wanting here, the last leaf of his Gospel having apparently been lost, or the book as it passed from St. Mark's hand having been unfinished) are convincing in their realism, but are quite independent, and show no anxiety at all for detailed consistency. St. Mark and St. Matthew tell us that the message of the 'young man' to the women at the tomb was to bid the disciples go into Galilee where they should see their Lord. And this St. Matthew tells us they did. St. Luke ignores this, and tells us only of appearances in Jerusalem. St. John tells us of appearances in both places. There seems at this point a somewhat startling discrepancy. But probably St. Luke supplies the clue. He shows us the disciples as slow of belief, calling the first news brought by the women 'idle tales.' St. John tells us it was eight days before they were all convinced. It would seem that our Lord's first intention was (as so often before) baffled by their 'slowness of heart'; and it was only by repeated appearances in Jerusalem that they could be made ready to go and meet Him in the old scene of their discipleship in Galilee, where the larger group of believers in Him could share their vision. But if the records of appearances are singularly independent, they are singularly in agreement as to the nature of the risen body of the Lord which they suggest. The actual appearances are real and material. But the careful narrative in St. John suggests that His body had passed out of the grave clothes leaving them to collapse (see Latham's *Risen Master*), and St. Matthew that He had passed out of the closed tomb, which was only opened to show that He was gone. They all suggest that after the Resurrection He was not living in any place, as in Jerusalem or in Galilee, or moving by natural means from one place to another. He had passed into a higher mode of being, such as would seem to have suggested to St. Paul his idea of the 'spiritual body'—a body that is in some sense material, but raised above all the limitations of material life as we now know it: which yet admitted of such 'materializations' as that He could appear in different forms and apparel, and even eat and drink with the disciples, and teach them 'the things concerning the Kingdom of God'—'matter' being now no hindrance to spirit but at its absolute disposal. Such is the last representation given us of the Lord on earth, until, after the 'forty days,' the cloud (which like the cloud at the Transfiguration seems to represent the tabernacle of God) received His rising form out of the sight of men.

C. **The Method and Aim of the Teaching.**—To expound our Lord's teaching is a very different task from that of expounding the doctrine of a philosopher like Aristotle or Philo, or of a systematic theologian. The aim at least of all these is to develop a coherent and thought-out system, satisfactory to the intellect. Our Lord's object was quite different. He came to announce and inaugurate the Kingdom of God, which the prophets of old, and John the Baptist of yesterday, had declared should come, and which now was actually come upon men. The teaching of the Old Testament about God and man He takes for granted. Any explanation of His own relation to the Kingdom is reserved. Only it is made plain that the coming of the Kingdom means a quite fresh departure. The Baptist had already made a break with the tradition of the Pharisees and the scribes—the authoritative teaching body of the Jewish Church: and he had demanded a new Israel based on something better than racial descent. Following on him, Jesus has plainly broken alike with the scribes and with the nationalists. What He is demanding is a moral awakening—a quite new spirit—in the heart of the common working people. He demands no special 'learning.' He teaches by proverbs and parables and the spectacle of wonderful works of mercy. His point of view in all this is the point of view of the Galilean peasant. All His talk is in their language. And while He holds out the hand to people classed as disreputable, He chooses those

who are to be His agents among well-to-do workers of good character. His alert interest in all things human—His new emphasis on the Fatherhood of God—His welcome to the outcast—His brotherly spirit—His homely manner of teaching—His constant reiteration of proverbs, maxims, and stories—all these things attract, as His miracles of mercy attract. But a man has no sooner begun seriously to listen to Him than he finds out that a tremendous claim is being made on him. The Father is not merely benevolent, He also demands much—even all. The Kingdom is a pearl for which a great price must be paid. The crowds press upon Jesus, the merciful and wonderful healer: but He appears to be as far as possible from wishing to make a multitude of converts on easy terms. He seems, on the contrary, to be even repellent. On the whole it is evident that His aim is not present success or numbers of adherents, but the preparation of a solid nucleus of men and women so absolutely committed to the service of the Kingdom that they have cast all self-regard and all prudence to the winds; and from these He asks an absolute faith, and a complete detachment—the attention of their whole minds and the loyalty of their whole hearts, without any regard to their traditional prejudices or their personal or family interests. It is in this circle that the meaning of His teaching gradually discloses itself in view of the future. But some points need to be noticed in more detail.

(1) Jesus' Galilean teaching (as in the Sermon on the Mount) is largely proverbial; and the proverbs of all nations are apt to be couched in an extreme form, and to be frankly one-sided or contrary to one another. We say 'Penny wise, pound foolish,' but then again, 'Take care of the pence, and the pounds will take care of themselves'; or 'Look before you leap,' but again, 'He that observeth the wind shall not sow.' Each proverb is needed by different people or at different times, but they have no regard to verbal consistency. So it is with our Lord's demands now for recklessness and now for prudence. The proverbial method makes it very necessary not to isolate and build upon any single statement or to take it with a misapplied literalism. Because Jesus addressed to certain people in a certain situation the instructions 'Resist not the evil,' 'He that taketh thy coat let him have thy cloak also,' 'Give to him that asketh thee,' 'Swear not at all,' 'Leave the dead to bury their own dead, but go thou and preach the Kingdom of God,' it does not follow that these maxims can be translated into general propositions for all Christians. Our Lord Himself consented to be put on oath: and used force, of a kind, in cleansing the Temple: and ordered some people to remain in their homes: and blessed Zaccheus who kept half his earnings: and claimed justice of the High Priest (Jn 18 [23]). The Church from St. Paul downwards has refused, and rightly, to convert these occasional counsels or orders into general laws.

(2) The parables of Jesus are confessedly masterpieces from the literary point of view. Parables were in use among the Jews (Klausner, 265), but the earliest Christian Church did not continue the use of them. We may conjecture that they felt the parables of the Master must be left to stand alone. They are of various kinds. Some are merely stories with a moral, like the Rich Man and Lazarus. Some are allegories of the spiritual world found in the ordinary life of men or processes of nature. They seem to be based on a deep principle that anything normally and widely human, whether observed in the conduct of a good or of a bad man, is something which must have its spiritual analogue in God and His kingdom. The range of observation indicated in the parables is wide. There is the king and his courtiers, his wars, his treaties and his feasts; there is the judge and the prisoners; there is the proprietor and his steward and his servants; there is the merchant with his long journeys and the provision he must make for his absences; there is the banker and the pearl merchant, and the fisherman and the shepherd and the agriculturist; there is the father and the mother, and the sons of different dispositions; there is the inn and the innkeeper; there is the marriage and its attendants; there are also the trees and the birds and the flowers. In all these varied scenes spiritual truths are found under a veil—such indeed as one day are to be manifest to all, but at present are to be won only by careful attention. All indeed will attend to the story; but only those 'who have ears to hear' will catch its meaning. So the parables act as a judgement. They discriminate the real seekers from among the careless and the obstinate. Some of the parables, e.g. the seed growing secretly, do indeed make a deep demand on thoughtfulness, but it is only spiritual thoughtfulness that is wanted. The elaborate ingenuity devoted by commen-

tators to the details of the story has been wasted. The lesson lies in its main point. It is not an elaborate riddle to be guessed, but a means of enlightening the imagination and stimulating the will of those who earnestly seek to live 'according to God.'

(3) The form of the teaching of Jesus is such as to fix itself easily in the memory. This is true of both proverbs and parables. Also (see above ref. to Dr. Burney, 278*a*) our Lord in His teaching habitually followed the method of Hebrew poetry—that is, its 'parallelism.' This may be 'synonymous,' where the first clause is repeated in substance in the second, e.g. 'The disciple is not above his master: nor the servant above his lord'; or 'antithetic,' where the second clause is the opposite of the first, e.g. 'Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit: but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit'; or 'synthetic,' where the second clause enlarges or explains the first, e.g. 'Call no man your father upon earth; for one is your Father, even God.' Such teaching can easily be remembered even by us in its *ipsissima verba*. And of course in days before printing teachers depended much more than we do on their pupils' memory, and the disciples of a Jewish rabbi were specially expert memorizers.

(4) The teaching of Jesus is almost wholly ethical. It has for its aim the production of a new spirit and type of character—the character fit for the Kingdom of God. True, it makes certain great theological assumptions, as that God had really revealed Himself through the prophets to Israel, and that the Scriptures could not fail of fulfilment (see above, OT 3*b*, on our Lord's teaching about the Old Testament). It is true, again, that His teaching about the divine Fatherhood and the occasional glimpses given into His own relation as Son to the Father, and into His universal presence with His disciples, as well as His later teaching about the coming of the Spirit, which is implied in St. Luke and recorded in St. John—all this amounts to a fresh revelation of truth or reality given in a tone of infallible certitude (see below, 292*a*). So also does the language used at the institution of the Eucharist. We must not minimize or ignore the element of positive divine disclosure concerning the Father and Himself and the Holy Spirit implied in the Lord's words even in Galilee. But it is not on this that the stress is laid. It is implied throughout that where 'the eye is single' and the will ready for every sacrifice, all the requisite understanding will follow as a matter of course.

(5) There is no appeal to any learned class. Jesus treats 'academic' learning, like wealth, as a hindrance to entrance into the Kingdom—though we must not forget what kind of learning it was that was represented by the 'scribes or 'lawyers' (cf. Lk 11 [52]): but none the less He makes the greatest possible demand on thinking freely and justly. No teacher ever showed more belief than our Lord in the capacity of the ordinary man to think rightly, if he be only sincere and open-minded. He did not, except rarely, use the dogmatic method. It would seem as if He feared to stunt men's growth from within thereby. He very rarely gave plain answers to plain questions. He left men to find out things for themselves from their growing experience. Thus, though there is a constant demand on His disciples for faith, even absolute faith in Himself and in His words, yet it is not the sort of faith which passively accepts a dogmatic lesson. So far from deprecating free thinking in those who listened to Him, our Lord demands it (Lk 12 [57]; Mt 13 [52]; 16 [11]). The sort of faith He asks for is such as is staggered by no claim of sacrifice, and restrained by no limit of apparent possibility. It seems to follow from such considerations that anyone approaching the Gospels from a predominantly intellectualist point of view, or in a mainly critical frame of mind, or possessed by the love of system, is pretty sure to be 'offended' or to fail to understand. It is also fairly plain that if Jesus really intended the founding or reformation of any sort of continuous and coherent society, such as demands an established doctrine, His teaching as given in the Gospels must be regarded as merely preparatory—as the initial stimulus or illumination rather than the final provision. The same conclusion, as we shall see, is suggested by its extreme claim.

D. **The Substance of the Teaching of Jesus**—(1) *The Gospel of the Kingdom and its Moral Requirements*.—The subject of our Lord's initial teaching in Galilee is described in general as 'the Gospel (good tidings)' or 'the Gospel of God,' or 'the Gospel of the Kingdom of God' or 'of heaven' (Mk 1 [14-15]; Mt 4 [23]; Lk 4 [43]). It is the last that is the most illuminating description. The prophets of old had announced a good time coming when injustice, cruelty, sensuality and misery should be no longer dominant, but the reign of Jehovah in truth and righteousness, justice and mercy, peace and plenty,

should be visibly and permanently established in Israel, and should attract all nations to itself, whatever resisted it from outside having been utterly overthrown. The Psalms of Solomon (*c.* 50 B.C.) had shown this hope still dominant among the Pharisees, but not in its highest form. In the contemporary Apocalypses the hope was taking a quite 'other-worldly' form alien to the Jewish tradition. But it was in its older prophetic form that the Baptist proclaimed the Kingdom to be 'at hand,' and it was this message that Jesus took up. 'The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand' (Mk 1 15). It was as agents of the Kingdom that the disciples were called and afterwards constituted Apostles. They were now to be 'fishers of men' to bring them into the newly spread net of the Kingdom. For the Kingdom, it soon appeared, was more than at hand. In germ at least it had actually come. It had already come upon men in the coming of Jesus (Lk 11 20): for all his prophetic glory, John the Baptist was still outside it, but the disciples were inside (Lk 7 28): they already could rejoice as seeing and hearing for themselves all that prophets and kings of old had only desired (Lk 10 23): the Pharisees should recognize it as already among them (Lk 17 21). It is planted as a seed which is to grow to a great tree: it is as a leaven which is to leaven the lump; it is a fisher's net which must be expected to gather of every kind. As to His own relation to the Kingdom Jesus says nothing explicitly: all His attention is directed to explaining its ethical character—the character which the citizens of the Kingdom must bear.

The ethical character of the Kingdom is developed in antagonism to the two ideals at present dominating the minds of those who were expecting redemption for Israel. The Pharisees, the real religious leaders of the people, said in effect 'Keep quiet: do not provoke your temporary masters; but keep the law according to the tradition, that is, as it is interpreted by the authorized scribes—keep it submissively and rigidly. That is the only way to appeal to God. That will cause Him to come and redeem you.' But Jesus vehemently repudiated this glorification of legalism. He showed up its moral defects —'Thus have ye made the commandments of God of none effect by your tradition.' He pointed back behind the prescribed observances, such as the Sabbath, to their spiritual motive. He demanded rather internal than external cleanliness (Lk 11 39; Mt 23 25). He deprecated petty rules (Mt 23 23). He 'cleansed all meats' by affirming that the only source of moral evil lies in the will (Mk 7 18-23). He revised the ten commandments by prohibiting not only the outward act of violence, but the first allowed movement of hatred or contempt; by making the purpose of adultery equivalent to the act; by substituting the universal duty of truthfulness for occasional oaths (Mt 5 17-37). He peremptorily required the 'single eye,' and from all religious actions excluded altogether the motive of human regard (Mt 6 1-18). He unmasked and denounced the pride, the inhumanity, the self-display, the avarice, the hypocrisy, the obscurantism which he discovered in the scribes (or lawyers), the Pharisees, and the wealthy. He drew a startling picture of luxury as the vestibule of hell. He bade the religious leaders think again as to the real meaning of their religion. (Our Lord's final denunciation of the Pharisees is in part to be explained by the fact that they stood nearer to Him than any other party. They really stood out for the supremacy of religion. Only they gave so one-sided an interpretation to religion that they were the *misleaders* of the people, and the main hindrance to the cause which, in one sense, Jesus and they were alike set to serve.) Jesus' teaching stood in equally startling contrast to the prevailing nationalism. The hope of the zealot was in military revolution—like that of the Maccabees—and violent overthrow of the existing government. Upon all such trust in force Jesus absolutely turned His back. The 'Sermon on the Mount' is best interpreted on the background of these two antagonisms; but we shall use all our Lord's teaching to illustrate the Sermon. It is a proclamation of unworldliness in its extremest form. It is the poor or those who have no care at all for wealth, those whose concessiveness or submissiveness to injustice knows no limit and who have no desire for place or power or distinction, and those who take up their burden of misery most readily, who are to enjoy the blessings of the Kingdom. These negative characteristics—expressing an extreme renunciation of 'the world' and all its normal desires—are constantly emphasized. But the character of the Kingdom is not to be found in mere negatives. Its positive characteristics are the passion for righteousness and peace and active, unwearied mercy and forgivingness. These features constitute its attraction for all

that is best in unsophisticated people. The positive law of the Kingdom is summarized (Mk 12 [29]) as the whole-hearted service of God and of humanity (our neighbour). But there is no question that the claim is rigorously pressed for an absolute breach with what constitutes worldly respectability. Wealth or the love of wealth, learning with its contempt for the vulgar, selfish ambition striving for place—these are the enemies. The Kingdom is to be manifested as a new community, with quite new standards, in sharp contrast to the world—so that it can purify like salt by sharp distinctiveness, and shine like a light in darkness, and be as conspicuous as a city on a hill. Many great moralists and teachers have taken the world as they found it and striven to make the best of it—have looked to gradual improvement—have been content with compromise. There can be no shadow of a doubt that Jesus' method was the opposite. He refused all compromise; He was not conciliatory; in even violent terms (Lk 9 [57-62], 14 [25-35]) He called men out of the world—a world which prided itself on its high moral and national standards, an intensely religious world in its own way—if they would join the true Israel, the new family of God, where all are to be brothers, each one of absolute value in the sight of God, where there is to be no privilege except the supreme privilege of sonship and service, where all worldly precautions and calculations are defied, and suffering and persecution are joyfully accepted.

It was not, we must observe, asceticism, as generally understood, which was proclaimed by our Lord. Except in His initial fast, He never seems to have sought for or glorified pain or want. He regarded disease as the work of Satan. He never depreciated marriage or the body. He reckoned fasting indeed among normal religious practices, but He instituted no fasts for His disciples. Where men offered Him 'feasts'—of a modest kind, no doubt—He joined in them without scruple. He had no objection to wine. They called Him 'a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber.' He compared His group to 'the children of the bride-chamber round about the bridegroom'—a merry company that is. Only—they had broken with the world with its respectabilities and its securities and its proprieties. They had been called out. They were as mendicant friars with a group of ministering women—surrounded everywhere by a crowd of half-believing, grateful, astonished people, alike attracted and repelled.

We may view all this teaching from another point of view. Every civilization develops its standard of respectability. What outrages 'good form,' what threatens good order, are disreputable sins. Everything else is allowed and palliated. Among the religious Jews the required standard was very high. It made very exacting requirement, social and religious. But its capacity for tolerating and palliating invisible deformities was equally remarkable. Now nothing is more startling than our Lord's absolute refusal to recognize this distinction of respectable from disreputable sins. Certainly fornication or theft or violence is not worse in His eyes than avarice, unmercifulness, contempt, hypocrisy, selfishness, ambition. It is not that He palliates sensual sin. His words where He speaks of it are penetrating and severe (Mt 5 [28] ff.). But He seems to regard it, and the like disreputable sins, as less hardening than respectable sins. 'The publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of heaven before you.' And He treats the whole motive of seeking the applause of our fellows with contempt and as the supreme obstacle to faith (Jn 5 [44]).

We are bound in honesty to recognize the extreme demand for renunciation, or detachment from all the normal interests and claims of society, as not only an element, but a most prominent element in our Lord's teaching, though we occasionally detect more conciliatory features also—the recognition of goodness in ordinary men, the blessing promised to normal kindnesses, even to 'the cup of cold water only,' the refusal to detach certain persons from their families, the full acceptance of Zaccheus with less than total abandonment of his money-getting. In explanation, however, of the extreme demand, we must recognize that (in Lk 9 [57], 14 [26], etc.) our Lord was dealing with a particular situation. He was sure that no general movement of reform was possible. He had come unto His own, and His own had not, as a society, received Him. He must create a wholly new group—a little flock which had broken utterly with the actual Israel—with its spirit, its tradition, its expectations and its objects of admiration. That explains His intense insistence on total detachment for His disciples—and His repellent attitude towards all that offered less. The group which He was fashioning to meet the future after He was gone—the

new Israel—must be bare and naked of all worldly and national prejudices, and ready for anything. After a great seeming failure, the history of the apostolic age tells us that Jesus succeeded in getting what He wanted. And after the foundation of the first churches we note that the apostolic Epistles make no claim, similar to our Lord's, for *actual* detachment. There the assumption is that, while there are special vocations involving total renunciation, the mass of the Church members will be living the normal life of married people with families, good members of the Christian community, and good citizens of the Empire. It does not appear that there was to be in the Christian societies no public justice, or legitimate claim on property, or power to maintain it. We need not suppose that this change of attitude was contrary to the mind of Christ. It was the same mind—the same spirit—finding expression under different conditions. And Church history suggests that the detached life of full renunciation is always needed side by side with the normal family life. No Christian Church gives any fair representation of the Gospel standard in which the Religious Life—the life of the evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity, and obedience—is not evidently before men's eyes.

It is one thing to recognize that the Lord's claim for actual renunciation was not meant to be a universal law, and quite another thing to explain it away, as we Englishmen have been apt to do. Also below the claim for renunciation of normal civil and family life lies a claim for detachment from worldly *motives* which St. Paul and all true leaders of the Christian life in later days have understood to be necessary always and for all. Those who in response to democratic or socialist aspirations draw attractive pictures of the Kingdom of God as Jesus preached it—the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God—are doing quite right if, and only if, they do not allow it to be forgotten that 'the pearl' has to be purchased at a 'great price'—the rigorous purging and disciplining of motives and character.

Finally we must notice the respect for women shown by our Lord, which doubtless He intended to be a principle of the Kingdom. In this respect there was a higher and a lower tradition in Israel. The higher is represented in prophetesses like Deborah and Huldah, and the ideal matron of Pr 31, and the daughters of Job who had 'inheritance among their brethren.' It is represented also in Joel's prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit upon the daughters as well as the sons of Israel. On the threshold of the Gospel it is represented in the Mother of our Lord. It is to this higher tradition to which He attaches Himself in His conspicuous reverence for women, however deeply fallen, in His acceptance of the company of ministering women, and in His dealings with the Samaritan at the well. The equal spiritual worth of women with men is thus implied, but nothing is found bearing on their relative functions in society.

(2) *The Doctrine of God.*—What, then, our Lord set out to proclaim was 'the Gospel of the Kingdom,' set in sharp antagonism to current ideas, Pharisaic or nationalist. He described in vivid phases the moral character necessary for those who were to enter the Kingdom. But the Gospel of the Kingdom depends upon the character and will of the King. In His teaching about God, Jesus takes for granted and builds upon the teaching of the prophets of Israel, concerning the justice and love of the Almighty Creator of all that is. If later Judaism in its zeal for the divine transcendence and fear of anthropomorphism had tended to depersonalize God, fearing to pronounce His personal name and substituting the word 'heaven' or 'heavens' for 'God' (see, for instance, 1 Mac 4 [10. 24]), Jesus by His constant use of the word 'Father' emphasizes personality, and He shows no fear of 'anthropomorphic' language. It is in terms of human purpose and human feeling that He would have men think about God. His 'naive' language is as far removed as possible from the language customary to philosophy. He teaches, of course, the divine omnipresence, and that 'God is spirit' in a sense which excludes the idea of His presence or favour being limited to a particular shrine, but there is not a sign in His language of the influence of the doctrine of the divine 'wisdom' or 'word' whereby the later Judaism, influenced in part by Greek philosophy, felt its way towards a distinction between God as transcendent and God as immanent in His creation. (In Lk 7 [35], 11 [49] 'wisdom' means the wise purpose of God.) Later, in their interpretation of the Incarnation, Paul and John were to make use of this doctrine, though it is to be noticed that St. John makes no use of it except in his prologue. But it is quite absent from our Lord's language. The element of

novelty in our Lord's teaching about God is to be found in His emphasis on the divine Fatherhood. 'Doubtless thou art our Father,' 'I will be to him a Father,' the prophet and the psalmist had cried. But no one before had taught as our Lord did the care of God for every individual soul, or interpreted fatherhood as an active, forward movement on God's part to save and welcome His lost children one by one. Yet with all His emphasis on the saving love of the Heavenly Father towards the fallen or the outcast, Jesus always, like the prophets, maintains the sense of the freedom and responsibility of man. God will not force a man to accept His love. Man retains the awful capacity to 'lose' His own self. Jesus preaches also like the prophets the inevitable wrath of God upon all unrighteousness and sin. There is an absolute incompatibility between God and the soul which knowingly or deliberately resists Him. And there is no limit to this possible resistance. There is a sin, therefore, which cannot be forgiven either in this age or in the age to come. There is one of whom He says, 'It were better for him that he had not been born—such a one as he.' There is a worm (of remorse) that cannot die, and a fire (of divine righteousness) which cannot be quenched —which 'abideth' upon the soul which refuses the light. If, as we shall see, Jesus implies that men are to find in Him the true image of the Father, there they must find—we should not say side by side with utterly self-sacrificing love, but as an essential element in that love—the 'wrath of the Lamb,' the passion of indignation against all hypocrisy, cruelty, contempt, selfishness, avarice and pride, which expresses itself in the fiery denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees.

It should be remarked that our Lord's teaching about God would suggest a considerable modification of the idea of divine 'impassibility,' as theologians, relying rather on the foundations of Greek philosophy than on the words of the prophets or of Christ, have commonly represented it. There is in God, we seem to learn, what corresponds to human emotion as truly as what corresponds to human thought or purpose. [This sort of language is not rightly described as 'anthropomorphic.' It is not meant to suggest that God is in the image of man: but that rational, spiritual man, and pre-eminently the Son of Man, is the best available image of God.] It should also be noticed that our Lord gives no countenance to the tendency of many modern writers to depreciate the *fear* of God as a servile or needless sentiment. On the contrary, He would have everyone, who is not careful to live as God would have him live, pay regard to His inevitable wrath and judgement. 'Yea, I say unto you, fear him' (Lk 12 [5]; Mk 9 [43-48]). And the Epistle to the Hebrews ascribes 'godly fear' to Jesus Himself, the sinless one.

(3) *Implied doctrine concerning Himself.*—What of Jesus of Nazareth Himself? What is His relation to the Kingdom and the King? The Baptist had been made conscious that Jesus was the promised Christ ('My beloved Son' or 'only Son' would have meant no more than this to him). And the 4th Gospel informs us that his acknowledgement of this was followed by a similar acknowledgement from some of those who passed from his school to that of Jesus—'Thou art the Son of God: thou art the King of Israel!' If so, it was a superficial acknowledgement which their subsequent experiences overwhelmed, and which had to be recovered on a new basis. Jesus taught nothing directly in His Galilæan ministry about Himself; and He silenced the exclamations of the demoniacs. He left men to judge of Him by what they saw (cf. Lk 7 [19] ff.). He called Himself 'Son of Man'—a non-committal title which served only to direct attention to Himself as 'the Man' in some remarkable sense. So much everyone would have acknowledged. Only at last—not long before the final journey to Jerusalem—did He by deliberate and searching questioning draw from the Twelve, through their leader Peter as their mouthpiece, the explicit confession that He was the Christ. This was what Jesus was waiting for and needed, and He pronounced on Peter a solemn benediction (Mt 16 [17]—surely genuine words). His confession, He declared, was a true revelation from God. But it was to remain a secret between Him and the Twelve. The joy of this confession, however, was immediately turned to bitterness. For Peter could not endure the new and terrifying interpretation which Jesus gave to His Messiahship.

The Christ of the prophets was to be the King of Israel, the Son of David, the vicegerent of God's triumphant righteousness. He was to put all the enemies of Israel under His feet. This prophetic vision lent itself to a crude Jewish nationalism, and Jesus in consequence showed no love for the title 'Son of David.' There was also, in what seems to have

been a very restricted circle, another conception of 'the Messiah,' based upon the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch. In this book Daniel's vision of 'one like a son of man' coming in the clouds of heaven, and exalted to universal dominion and glory (Dan $7^{13.14}$)—which is there interpreted of 'the people of the saints of the Most High,' who are to succeed to the world empires symbolized by the 'great beasts'—is reinterpreted of a pre-existing quasi-angelic being—not really human at all—who is called 'the Elect one' and 'the Anointed one,' as well as 'that Son of Man,' and who in the Day of the Lord is to be the glorious agent of divine victory and judgement. In the circle influenced by these Similitudes this celestial being would have taken the place occupied in Jewish tradition by the human-born Son of David. There are many uncertainties concerning the literary history of these Similitudes (see Gore's *Reconstruction of Belief*, bk. ii, c. ix, n. *c*; and *Can We Then Believe?* 181 ff., for justifying references), and their probable influence has been much exaggerated in some recent literature. Certainly our Lord took up the picture in Daniel's vision into His conception of the Christ and of His own chosen name, the Son of Man. But He took it up in a sense quite different from that of the Similitudes. For the Son of Man or the Anointed one was to Him the human sufferer whose glorification lay on the other side of humiliation and death. It is possible, then, that our Lord shows acquaintance with the Similitudes: but, if we accept the testimony of all our documents, it is quite certain there was no general acquaintance with the book or its ideas. Certainly the public to whom Jesus spoke attributed no Messianic sense to the title 'Son of Man' (see Box in *The People and the Book*, 453): He used it freely all the time He was concealing His Messiahship. Certainly also the New Testament shows no recognition of any pre-existing 'Son of *Man*'—when there is question of pre-existence it is of a pre-existing Son or Word of *God*, who only in the fulness of time for our sakes became man. And the vivid Messianic expectation existing round our Lord was all on the lines of the old prophetic tradition of the human-born King, the Son of David.

Jesus, however, radically transformed the current idea of the Messiah. He did this by bringing into the forefront the conception of the Suffering Servant (Is 53), making this the clue to Messiahship and, through it, joining in one the idea of the human-born Son of David or Son of Man with the idea of the glorified Christ coming with the clouds of heaven. It appears that the Jews had never before our Lord's time identified the Suffering Servant with the Christ (see Box, *op. cit.*, 454). The 4th Gospel would have us believe that John the Baptist did; and the Voice from heaven certainly, in its second clause, identifies Jesus with the Servant. But nothing is more clear in the New Testament than that the idea was deeply alien, unfamiliar, and repugnant to the contemporary Jewish consciousness, and to the Twelve it proved purely a stumbling-block. But to Jesus it was central. He pressed it down upon the reluctant disciples as soon as ever they had confessed Him as the Christ. There is nothing in modern criticism more wilful than the denial that Jesus did identify Himself, the Son of Man, with the Suffering Servant (see as above *Reconstruction*, 377 f.). His constant point was that the Scriptures announced the Suffering Redeemer (Mk 9^{12}, etc.), and of this announcement the central text is Is 53. 'The influence of this great passage of Scripture upon the mind of Christ can hardly be measured' (Box). In the background then of all our Lord's teaching about the Kingdom is the secret, disclosed to the disciples, and finally to the world, that He, the Son of Man, is really the promised Messiah, the Son of David, the Redeemer-King of Israel, but a King in wholly a new sense, who is to be rejected, to suffer, to die as a sacrifice for His people, and only so finally to be raised to glory, and in the day when God shall come into His own to be the agent of His judgement and His Kingdom.

This sense of the glory and Lordship of the risen Christ is what we find filling the minds of the apostolic company with enthusiasm when Jesus had vanished out of their sight. They had recovered themselves, and more than recovered themselves, from their momentary lapse in faith. But this divine Lordship of the Christ—how was it to be reconciled with the unity of God? To the Jew, an apotheosis—the idea of a deified man—was an impossibility. As appears in the article on St. Paul's Theology, it became the special vocation of Saul the Pharisee to show the way of reconciliation. But we are here concerned only with the teaching of Jesus on earth. He led men to believe that He was Christ. But is it enough to say this? No man can read the Synoptic narrative without perceiving that He is inviting the world, and especially training

His disciples, to rely upon Him, as capable of remedying all the physical and spiritual diseases and distresses of men, and of teaching men all they need to know, if only they will believe in Him with a whole-hearted faith. The Son of Man can forgive sins. He can give rest to those who labour and are burdened. All things are delivered by His Father into His hands. He can teach with infallible authority about Him, for He and He alone knows the Father as the Father knows Him. Who accepts Him accepts the Father, and who rejects Him rejects the Father. He is the final and infallible judge of men. Nothing matters to a man except His attitude towards him. We cannot but ask whether this extraordinary claim—reflecting what the Old Testament calls the 'jealousy' of God—which is knit into the whole texture of the Synoptic record, is compatible with mere humanity. Must it not have been a blasphemous presumption in a mere man? We recall the old saying—'Aut Deus aut homo non bonus.' The way of enlightenment seems to lie in the recognition that, 'Son of God' being an acknowledged title of the Messiah, our Lord used it occasionally of Himself in a transcendent sense, which implied a quite unique relation to the Father. The text Mt 11 [25-27] stood in the earliest record of the Lord's words. It suggests an essential, co-equal relation of Father and Son. Again, where Jesus is speaking of His own ignorance as to the moment of the end, He speaks of 'the Son' as one above the angels (Mk 13 [32], Mt 24 [36]). No one could have invented such a saying. He distinguishes Himself again in the parable of the Vineyard as the only ('beloved') Son from all the previous messengers of God who were only servants. We notice that He never speaks to the disciples of 'our Father' (save when He puts a prayer into their mouth), but of 'my Father' and 'your Father,' or 'the Father.' This claim to unique Divine Sonship is more frequent and pronounced in St. John than in the Synoptists. In the former, we may say it is 'heard,' while in the latter it is hardly more than 'overheard.' Still it is there, both constantly implied and occasionally uttered. And more of this self-assertion may well have been forced upon our Lord in Jerusalem than in Galilee. On the other hand, nowhere is the absolute dependence of Jesus upon the Father more emphasized than in the 4th Gospel. May not the case, then, as it appears in the Gospels be stated thus? Jesus of Nazareth came preaching the good tidings of the Kingdom of God. This Kingdom is the sphere in which God manifestly reigns. It is even now coming or come. And as God comes thus near to man to dwell among them, He through whom He comes, the promised Christ, mediating the Father to men, appears as no mere messenger, but as the essential expression of the Father's very self—His only Son. 'He was the Christ—and more.'

(4) *Sin and Atonement.*—There are two ways in which a teacher of truth can approach mankind. He may make the best of society and human nature as it is, and seek to improve it and insinuate reform without suggesting the necessity for any marked break with the past. Or he may proclaim that existing society is on the way to utter ruin, and demand a fresh start, a new birth, a radical change. The latter is the method of Jesus. In Jn 3 He presses upon the good but timid Pharisee, Nicodemus, that what entrance into the Kingdom of God requires in each man is nothing less than a new birth of the divine Spirit. The substantial authenticity of this word of Jesus is shown by its agreement with His constant demand for renunciation and for conversion and second childhood. Like the prophets and the Baptist, and later Peter and Paul, He addresses His contemporaries as 'a crooked generation' flocking down the wrong road. 'Wide is the gate which leadeth unto destruction.' The doom of God is upon them. 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.' Even when he is speaking of men's natural goodness, He acknowledges it as a remaining grace in what is as a whole 'corrupt' (Lk 11 [13]). The human world, then, is to Him a sinful world needing to be redeemed and remade. And of this world, it appeared, He was to be the promised Redeemer, through the expiating sacrifice of His own life. It is quite true that our Lord, as in the parable of the Prodigal Son, would have us think of God as purely good, purely ready to forgive, going out to meet men with a profusion of mercy. Any doctrine of atonement which would represent the Father as wrath and the Son as love overcoming wrath, is palpably un-Christian. But true love requires change of mind and confession and reparation, as a condition of forgiveness (Lk 15 [7], 17 [3]). Moreover, redemption is of Israel, the community, and God deals with man corporately as well as individually. May not, then, the Father require a corporate act of repara-

tion, and may not the Son, the Redeemer of Israel, yearn to make such an act on behalf of the manhood which He has taken? The Old Testament was full of the necessity for sacrifices of atonement for the casual sins of the people, and this necessity was crudely expressed in animal and vegetable victims. The prophets had expressed their sense of the worthlessness of such external victims, and the prophet of Is 53 had found the true propitiation, the true instrument of the new birth of Israel, in the voluntary sacrifice of his life by the Suffering Servant. This was to be the act of reparation divinely required. Jesus interprets the Suffering Servant as Himself, the Christ. He therefore is to give His life 'a ransom for many.' And at the institution of the Eucharist He speaks of the New Covenant which He, the Christ, inaugurates as to be established, like the Old Covenant, in blood—the blood not now of a dumb and involuntary victim, but the Life Blood of the New Man, which represents His self-surrender and obedience unto death. This redemptive sacrifice, this act of expiation or reparation, is vicarious. It is on behalf of 'many,' the multitude of those who shall believe in Jesus. But it is not to remain external or vicarious. They are to 'eat and drink' His sacrificed humanity. What is done *for* them is to pass *into* them. Christ their propitiation is also to be their new life. They are freely forgiven through Him only to become new men in Him. Very briefly we may so summarize the evidence of the Gospels as it is interpreted in the Epistles. It certainly indicates that our Lord treated mankind as fallen, and spoke of Himself as to be its Redeemer in virtue of the vicarious sacrifice which He was to make of Himself even to the shedding of His blood—in virtue also of a mysterious identification of Himself with His people, by their eating of His sacrificed body and drinking of His outpoured blood.

It would have been strange if Jesus, who certainly came 'not to destroy but to fulfil' the old Covenant, had ignored the whole sacrificial system of the Law. In fact while He separated Himself from, and even vehemently denounced, the ecclesiastical tyranny of the scribes and Pharisees, and while He identified Himself with the prophetic preference of mercy to sacrifice (Mt 9[13], 12[7]), yet He never spoke in disparagement of the temple worship; He used the language about it appropriate to a pious Jew (Mk 1[44]; Lk 5[14], 17[14]; Mt 5[23], 23[16-22]), and, apparently twice, purged from profanation the courts of the sanctuary of sacrifice. It is not strange, therefore, to find that our Lord, who addressed Himself to Israel as its predestined Saviour, but could not accept Israel as He found it—who demanded a new Israel, and conversion and a new birth for every individual—should have regarded the old sacrificial system not as meaningless, but as the inadequate expression of a fundamental necessity for the redemption of Israel. The historical witness tells us that it was so; and justifies the estimate of Jesus as the High Priest of our redemption, which we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is true the doctrine has often been caricatured within as well as without the Church, but the universal heart of mankind has welcomed it as hardly any other element in the divine redemption, and it rests firmly upon the self-witness of Christ.

(5) *The Gift of the Spirit.*—The Coming of the Kingdom of God, as foreseen by the prophets, included an abundant outpouring of His Spirit upon the anointed King of David's line, and upon the redeemed Israel (Is 11[2], 42[1], 61[1]; Jl 2[28-29], etc.). In St. Luke's narrative of the Nativity we are called to witness a lively activity of the Spirit in the surroundings of the birth of the Christ. Then all the Gospels chronicle His descent upon Jesus Himself to consecrate Him for His Mission, and St. Luke throughout His Gospel loves to call our attention to His being possessed by the Spirit in all He said and did (4[1, 14, 18], 10[21]; Ac 10[38]). St. Mark and St. Matthew suggest the same (Mt 4[1], 12[18]; Mk 1[12], 3[29]). We also find the Baptist distinguishing the Christ from himself, the Forerunner, as being the Giver of the Spirit (Mk 1[8]), and there are bare allusions later to this coming gift (Lk 11[13], 12[12]; Mk 13[11]). But there is no sign in the Synoptics of any instruction given by the Lord on this subject. At the beginning of the Acts, however, the Twelve are found full of the expectation of the Holy Spirit, and the risen Jesus is recorded to have bidden them to 'wait for the promise of the Father which ye have heard from me. For John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with Holy Spirit not many days hence.' Seeing how full the mind of the earliest Church was of this gift of the Holy Spirit, it seems highly probable that Jesus should have given teaching on this subject such as we find in Jn 3[5-8], 7[37-39], 20[22], and especially in 14 and 16. (In 7[37,38] we should read: 'If any man thirst

let him come to me, and let him drink who believeth on me,' etc. It is out of the Christ, not out of the believer, that the 'living water' is to flow.) Especially in 14 and 16 Jesus at the Last Supper seeks to encourage His bewildered disciples by assuring them that the Holy Spirit will succeed to Himself as the 'Paraclete,' that is the 'agent' or 'representative' of God (see for the meaning of the term G. H. Whitaker in *Can We Then Believe?* 204). He is to dwell not merely *with* them but *in* them (14 [16-17]); and though He is spoken of as a person (masculine), and as 'another' than Jesus, yet His coming will involve the coming or the return of Jesus, as a presence within them, and with Him of the Father (14 [18-23]). The Spirit is not to be a substitute for the Son so much as the means of His consummated presence; so fully is this to be the case that it is worth the disciples' while to lose His visible companionship in order to gain His inward presence by the Spirit, which they cannot have till He is gone from their sight and glorified. And when the Paraclete is come, as being 'the Spirit of the truth' (or 'reality') He will teach them all things, bring to their memory all that Jesus said, and guide them into 'all the truth,' that is the full meaning of Jesus and His coming. He also will bear the witness of Christ within them and through them to the world (15 [26-27], 16 [8]). In the other passages in St. John the Holy Spirit is referred to as the Giver of Life and of the pastoral commission; here, as suits the bewildered minds of the disciples, He is spoken of as the Spirit of assurance and of the truth.

It seems so inevitable that our Lord should have given some adequate instruction to His disciples about this gift of the Spirit, and that which appears in St. John seems so far to surpass what any of them could have imagined—it is so profound and so simple, and so subtly adapted to the needs of their souls at the moment of the Last Supper—that we need not hesitate to accept it as genuine. And it is permissible to believe that the writer of the 4th Gospel, who heard these instructions, wrote them down at a very early date. Doubt has been cast with some reason upon the genuineness of the ascription to Jesus in St. Matthew of the formula, 'The Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost': but in Jn 14-16 we have, as we believe from the lips of Jesus Himself, the thought of Father, Son, and Spirit as distinct 'persons' who are yet so indissolubly one, that the presence and activity of One involves the presence and activity of all—which is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

It must be remarked that in the Old Testament, besides the recognition of the presence and action of the Spirit of God in Israel, there is also a recognition of His spirit (in the sense of His active energy) in the whole of creation and in the nature of man. In the New Testament, however, there is no allusion to any presence and activity of the Holy Spirit after the Ascension of Christ, except as His gift to His Church. Mankind is conceived of as being so far gone from what God had meant him to be, that he needs a new birth—a re-creation; and this re-creation takes effect by the bestowal of the Spirit afresh to the Church of the redeemed. We need not, we cannot, deny that, in some sense, wherever life is there is the activity of the life-giving Spirit. But we are bound to confess that the consistent message of the New Testament, which has its source in the teaching of Jesus, is not that mankind already possesses the gift of the Spirit, and only needs to have his attention called to it, but that he needs it and must look for it as a fresh gift from the Risen Jesus, and through the definite channel of His Church.

(6) *The Church and the Kingdom.*—We have already recognized that Jesus, perceiving that there would be no general rally of Israel to its promised Messiah, devoted His main attention to the training of a small group of disciples, especially the Twelve—carefully sifted out from among their compatriots, as willing to run all risks, and to cast all ordinary consideration of prudence and ordinary social ties to the winds—to be the carriers of His Gospel and the representatives of Himself. This was the nucleus of the Christian Church. But in our days the question has been seriously raised whether Jesus Himself had anything to do with founding the Church or instituting ministry or sacraments. It has been constantly repeated that Jesus Himself looked forward so exclusively to His coming in glory to judge the world, which He was led to suppose would follow immediately on His death, that He gave no thought to any considerable intermediate period and made no preparation for such a future. We must return shortly to this conception of the delusion of Jesus. But first let us simply consider the witness of the Gospels. It is, indeed, a mistake to speak of Jesus as *founding* the Church. 'The Church' was already in existence.

It was founded at the call of Abraham or the redemption of Israel from Egypt under Moses. It is a name for the elect people—Israel: that is, it is properly the name for the people gathered in assembly which tended to become the name for the people without qualification (Ac 7 [38], 20 [28], see Hort's *Christian Ecclesia*, 13-16). Now our Lord always accepts Israel as being the people of God. When He saw that as a whole the people and their rulers would not have Him on His own terms, He behaved like the prophets of old. He organized the faithful 'remnant' (cf. Is 8 [16-18]). It is possible that in the Second Isaiah 'the Servant of Jehovah' passes into being in the imagination of the prophet an individual Redeemer. But first the term certainly describes the people as a whole, or the faithful remnant. The remnant are the carriers of Israel's vocation. So when our Lord says to His little group 'fear, not little flock, it is My Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom,' He is designating them as the new and True Israel. When He chose 'the Twelve' and constituted them His authoritative messengers (Apostles), their number is determined by reference to the twelve tribes of Israel. At the last they should appear sitting on thrones as judging the twelve tribes (Lk 22 [30]; Mt 19 [28]; cf. Jas 1 [1]). Thus Jesus gave the new Israel a rudimentary organization. It became a body under divinely appointed rulers, the Apostles with Peter as their head. So they appear in the beginning of the Acts, when they fill up their number after the fall of Judas, claiming divine guidance in their selection. Renan called the divine institution of the hierarchy a 'favourite thesis' of Luke. It is certainly assumed as true by him and by St. Paul. And the appeal to the Gospels justifies this assumption. In the parable of the husbandmen our Lord implies that the vineyard (Israel) is to continue in cultivation, only under new management (Mk 12 [9]). In another parable he intimates that the Apostles are now the 'stewards' of His household, acting for Him until He shall come again (Lk 12 [41] f.). The solemn promise (in Mt 16 [18] f.) to appoint Peter, in virtue of His confession of Jesus as the Christ, to be the steward of the House of David, with the power of the keys to open and shut, and the authority to interpret the Law of Israel—to bind (prohibit) and loose (allow) with a divine sanction—may be accepted as genuine, because Peter and the other Apostles are found in the earliest Church exercising this authority without question. It had been taken from the scribes of the apostate Israel and given to the leaders of the new Israel. When Jesus promises to 'build His Church (Israel)' upon the Rock-man, it is not to be interpreted as a wholly new foundation. It is building in the sense of rebuilding (Am 9 [11]; cf. Ac 15 [15-16]). We notice that the authority of the keys promised to Peter only in 16 is made general to all in 18 [18], and is there interpreted as being *disciplinary* authority to exclude from the community, or, as in St. John (20 [23]), to forgive sins and to retain them with a divine sanction. In both senses we afterwards see the Apostles exercising this authority in association with the presbyters or the local church (Ac 15 [28]; 1 Cor 5 [2-5, 12-13]; 2 Cor 2 [10]). Not only does Jesus appear as equipping the new Israel with rulers, but also as instituting 'sacraments,' that is ceremonies of the society which, it appears, are to be the divinely appointed channels of the spiritual 'grace' needed for the new life, thus binding the spiritual life of the individual inextricably into the fellowship of the society. Baptism appears in the Acts from the day of Pentecost onward as the indispensable ceremony of admission into the community of the New Covenant. It is the ceremony which the Baptist had adopted as the symbol of admission to 'the people prepared for the Lord.' It passed from John's circle to that of Jesus (see above, p. 281*a*). There is no reasonable interpretation of its unhesitating acceptance from the beginning of the Christian Church, except that Jesus had so commanded (cf. Jn 3 [5] and Mt 28 [19]). And the similar acceptance of the Jewish rite of laying on of hands as the instrument for conveying the Holy Spirit, both in baptism and in ordination to office in the Church, may probably indicate that that too was an appointment of Jesus on earth. But about the Eucharist there can be no question. St. Paul's account of its institution was part of what he 'received' as from the Lord when he was converted, at Damascus, and more authoritatively when he went to Jerusalem to 'question' Peter. His account is confirmed both in the Petrine tradition of Mark and the Palestinian tradition of Matthew. If that is not historical, nothing is. If the words reported by Paul, 'This do in remembrance of me,' do not recur in Mark and Matthew, that can have no other significance than that they had been so thoroughly understood from the first, and acted upon in the tradition of the churches, that their

constant recitation had dropped out. The denial then that Jesus founded, or refounded, the Church, and gave it a certain rudimentary organization, appears to be as contrary to the evidence of history as anything could well be (see *Ecce Homo*, 39, 128).

But it should be noticed that the idea of a sacrament in the strict sense—that is, an external rite which is the covenanted channel of an inward grace—was alien to the Jewish tradition. It came in with Jesus—fulfilling the function of the Christ as the giver of the Spirit. That was what the disciples are led to expect from Him; and from Pentecost onward the full gift of the Spirit is found to be attached to baptism as completed in the laying on of hands; and Christ's own words attached to the sharing together of the one bread and the one cup the participation in His own life—His sacrificed body or flesh, and His life-blood. Here was found in the most intense sense the fulfilment of the function of the Holy Spirit—the extension of the life of the glorified Christ to His people.

It would appear, then, that though our Lord, in His dealings with the ecclesiastical authorities in the Church of His own time, showed the liveliest sense of the spiritual perils to which 'ecclesiastics' are liable, yet He did deliberately refound the Church while He was on earth, and furnished it with a rudimentary organization by constituting the Twelve His ministers, and the rulers and leaders of His household till He should come again, and by instituting the two sacraments of initiation into His society and of feeding upon Himself as the Bread of Life. Further, He must be acknowledged to have laid down for His society the law of indissoluble marriage (1 Cor 7^{10}; cf. Mk 10^{11-12}; Lk 16^{18}. If the Matthæan 'exception' is really so intended, it must be a gloss which cannot be regarded as a legitimate interpretation); and to have given it the prayer intended to be the norm and pattern of all praying 'in correspondence with God.' But such organization was very rudimentary, and plainly Jesus left His ministers and His people free to deal with questions that should arise and demand solution, as it should seem good to the Holy Spirit and to them. For instance, when later the question was raised, whether converted Gentiles needed to be circumcised, and so become subjects of the Jewish Law, as well as to be baptized, it did not appear that there was any decisive word of Jesus to be quoted against the narrower restriction. Nor do we find any such decisive word in our records. The Gospel was to go into all the world, and the Gentiles would supply the place in the kingdom left vacant by apostate Israel—that was made plain. But whether they were to become members of the New Israel only by becoming proselytes of the Old was left, it seems, for the decision of the Spirit in the Church. That, in fact, the mind of Christ was interpreted aright by St. Paul and those who stood with him we shall not doubt.

What, then, was the relation of the Church—the New Israel—to the 'kingdom of God' which the prophets foretold and which was the substance of the Gospel of Jesus? The good time coming foreseen by the prophets was to have various features, nowhere all collected into one picture. It was to be the re-establishment of a united Israel in joyful obedience to God, under its anointed King of David's line as God's vicegerent, bound to God under a new and better Covenant of grace, enriched by an outpouring of the Divine Spirit upon all its members, and exalted in supremacy among the nations who would rally to it, every hostile and insolent power having been utterly destroyed. It also appeared that the faithful Israelites of old, though long dead, would not be forgotten by God, but would be raised to new life to participate in the Kingdom. Finally, the overthrow of hostile powers, such as Babylon or Edom, is thrown upon the background of something vaster, more portentous and supernatural—a cosmic catastrophe and a universal judgement, on which should supervene 'a new heaven and a new earth' wherein nothing would dwell but righteousness; though with Jerusalem as its centre this new world would still be only the old world reconstituted. Now an unprejudiced examination of the Gospels almost forces us to the conclusion that in our Lord's mind and teaching this Kingdom of God was to be realized in stages. In that the Church was the new Israel, established under the Sovereign Christ as Lord of all—under the New Covenant—fulfilled with the Spirit—having witnessed in the resurrection of Jesus the pledge of the (general) resurrection of the dead—the Church already *was* the kingdom, and the world was to see in its corporate life the 'righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' which is the essence of the Kingdom. In this sense the disciples after Pentecost had already seen the Kingdom come with power. But in another aspect

the Kingdom had still to come. In 'the day of the Lord' He was to bare His arm for the laying low of all hostile forces. But that day had certainly not come. The New Israel appeared as the feeble victim of a hostile world. Jesus, like the prophets of old, had concentrated His attention upon the one conspicuous hostile power which confronted Him, and that, alas! was apostate Israel. With unmistakable definiteness Jesus denounced upon the Jewish nation—upon its city and its sacred and glorious Temple—the judgement of God, and declared that 'this generation should not pass away' till His word was fulfilled. But, like the prophets of old (e.g. see Is 13^{10} ff., 34^{4} f.), He threw this particular catastrophe upon the background of something cosmic and universal, which is apparently identified with it. He uses also the old metaphors—the darkened sun and moon, the quaking earth, the rending heavens, the descending form of the Son of Man, the throne of judgement, the gathered nations, the great assize. These metaphors no doubt are meant to express a reality—viz., the final coming of God into His own in His whole universe, of which the successive judgements on hostile world powers are preludes and foretastes. No doubt also Jesus foretold the judgement on Jerusalem as immediate, and so it turned out. The question is whether He so identified the judgement on Jerusalem with 'the end of the world' as to announce the immediacy of the latter. No doubt the first disciples did, for the most part, expect 'the end' or 'the coming' in their own lifetime. And this expectation has coloured our Gospels in parts—for example, the impression derived from St. Matthew is different from that derived from St. Luke and (still more) from St. John. But there are two passages which seem to show that Jesus definitely refused to assign any date to 'the end.' Side by side with the definite prophecy of the judgement on Jerusalem ('these things') 'within this generation,' stands the declaration 'of *that* day and *that* hour knoweth no one, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father'; and there is the reply to the disciples' question, after the Resurrection ('Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom, or world sovereignty, to Israel?'), 'It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father hath set within His own authority.' There was something which Jesus announced 'within this generation'—something also more mysterious for which He refused to assign any date—declaring 'in the days of His flesh' that He Himself did not know it, and after His resurrection that it was not for men to know it. I think the reasonable conclusion, on the whole, is that He prophesied definitely an immediate judgement on Jerusalem, but refused to gratify the curiosity of the disciples as to the final apocalypse. It must have been the consciousness of this which enabled the Church to modify its apocalyptic preoccupations without any sense of shock. [On this involved and difficult question the present writer may be allowed to refer to *The Reconstruction of Belief*, bk. ii (*Belief in Christ*), v.]

(7) *Personal Immortality and Eternal Life.*—There is, then, a glorious destiny in store for God's people as a whole, and for His whole creation. Jesus reaffirmed that assurance of the prophets. But how about the individual Israelite or the individual man? The belief in personal immortality was a late growth under the Old Covenant. It emerges not as the result of psychological or philosophical considerations, but partly because divine justice required it—the dealings of God with man in this world manifestly failing to realize His justice—partly because the personal fellowship with God allowed to the individual soul seemed to render its total extinction in death unthinkable—partly because the dead heroes of Israel could not be forgotten in the Day of the Lord. They surely must have their part in the Kingdom for which they had laboured, when it should arrive. So the resurrection of the dead Israelites, and then the general resurrection, became the pious belief of the nation, especially of the Pharisees, though it was not shared by the Sadducees—there is no hint of it in Ecclesiasticus—and in some respects it was vague or unsettled. This belief, however, Jesus affirmed. He did what He rarely did. He gave a plain answer to a plain question. When the Sadducees sought to puzzle Him with a problem of the future life, His answer was definitely for the Pharisees and against the Sadducees. All His estimate of human life, moreover, is in terms of the 'life beyond.' He shows no signs of approving that sort of 'selflessness' which depreciates thought for one's own soul and for its future destiny. He would have Dives think that the banqueting hall of selfish luxury is the vestibule of a place of fiery torment. He would have all men fear God 'who hath power to cast into hell.' But this is no arbitrary act of power. There is an inevitableness about

the process of moral judgement, the like of which is found in the processes of nature. Our Lord speaks of the individual 'saving' or 'destroying' His own soul. As he hath sown, so he must reap. With what measure he metes, it shall be measured to him again. 'The Day' only discloses what is already done, though it be a surprise even to the person most concerned. This aspect of 'judgement' as a perpetually self-acting process in this life is specially apparent in the 4th Gospel. But no less is it a process which has its issues beyond this life. 'I will raise him up at the last day,' or 'The wrath of God abideth on him.' For in the nature of things what is unholy and unloving is incompatible with God. Our Lord, then, as plainly affirmed a life beyond for men in general, as He confidently expected His own resurrection. What He expected was resurrection—that is, a perfect life of body and soul, and not the immortality of bare soul, but at the same time, not the resurrection of such a body as we now have, with its present sexual and other characteristics, but such a body as that therein we shall be 'the equal of the angels.' It was, in fact, such an expectation of resurrection that was realized in our Lord's resurrection, which henceforth became for Christians the pledge and prototype of the 'resurrection of the dead.' It is on the pattern of our Lord's resurrection that St. Paul bases his doctrine of 'the body that shall be' (see Phil 3 [21]), whether for those who should be alive at the Great Day or those who have died and 'seen corruption.' This is a subject which suggests many curious questions on which our Lord plainly does not give us any kind of satisfaction—on which He plainly does not wish us to exercise our minds. It is very important to realize this. Our Lord anticipates a Last Day—a day of judgement—a day of transition from this world order to another—a day when God comes into His own in the person of His Christ. That is the day of resurrection both of the just and of the unjust. But it is all couched in traditional metaphors which can give the curious intellect no satisfaction. There are some terrible metaphors about the final state of the lost soul—which suggest questions to which there is no answer: there are also phrases about individual souls immediately after death, both in happiness and misery (Lk 23 [43], 16 [24]), which suggest the question, What is the relation of this 'intermediate state' to the final state after the resurrection? Are all men immediately after death 'in paradise' with Lazarus and the penitent thief, or in the place of torment with Dives? Is there no gradual purgatory of the imperfect? There is no information forthcoming from our Lord. Nothing can be more certain than that while Jesus intended to give His disciples the sure and certain hope of the final victory of God and of personal resurrection to the life immortal, and the awful warning that an individual by sin against the light may destroy his very self and bring it to irretrievable ruin and misery—beyond this He had, as the Son of Man, no information to give us. His teaching was all directed to giving men right ideas about God and their own vocation here and now.

We have come to an end of our long enquiry. We have seen that the Teaching of Jesus as it began in Galilee concerned the 'good tidings of the kingdom,' and that it was directed to making men understand the character necessary for entrance into the Kingdom. This appeared to be in such startling contrast to current ideals that, though Jesus fascinated and attracted men widely by His teaching and His wonderful works, He made few real converts. So He directed His attention to preparing and organizing the few—the Twelve—to be the future messengers, agents, and rulers of the New Israel—those who should believe on His Name. Thus the teaching in Galilee, as the Synoptists represent it, has all a preparatory and preliminary character. It is in part the 'letter that killeth'—the deepening of 'the Law written and engraven in stones'—but in part also it conveys the assurance without which it could not have been 'the Gospel' at all—that redemption and the Redeemer had come, and the door was open to those who had the courage of faith. Nothing, however, seems to be further from the Truth than to find the essence of the Gospel in the Sermon on the Mount. That collection of our Lord's discourses is arresting, challenging, startling, sifting. But it obviously leaves the 'mystery' (secret) of the Kingdom undisclosed (Mk 4 [11]). It remains to the end undisclosed to the crowd. The Twelve alone—gathered in Galilee—can be made the organ for proclaiming the Kingdom in the world. Did they receive fuller teaching? The Synoptists indicate that they did. But it is chiefly in the 4th Gospel that we find it. There we are given a great specimen of teaching by Jesus such as even the Twelve were not ready for in

6, and a public proclamation of grace and the Spirit in 7, and the last teaching to the Twelve beginning in the Upper Chamber in 14-17. These teachings have been the basis of the life of the Christian Church. Without them it could not have been. Without them the teaching of Jesus would be a forecourt with nothing behind it. As the present writer has striven to fashion his account of the teaching of Jesus, he has found himself more and more driven to work upon the conclusion that the 'Johannine Jesus' is not a different teacher from the Jesus of the Synoptists, but that the latter postulates the former as its complement.

Books to be Recommended

There are too many to be mentioned. Long Bibliographies bewilder the ordinary reader. I would recommend for the study of the Jewish background of our Lord's life Klausner's *Jesus of Nazareth* (see above, p. 279). For the teaching Seeley's *Ecce Homo*, Du Bose's *The Gospel in the Gospels*, and Latham's *Pastor Pastorum*. Also, on the whole subject, Sanday's *Outlines of the Life of Christ*. On the 4th Gospel Richmond's *The Gospel of the Rejection* (out of print), H. S. Holland's *The Fourth Gospel*, and W. Lowrie, *The Doctrine of St. John*.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST INCARNATE

By L. Hodgson

'"If He suffered," said the Ebionites, "He was not divine," "If He was divine," said the Docetists, "His sufferings were unreal."' In these words Professor Gwatkin described the first stirrings of those questions which came to form what was later known as the Christological problem; and if the word 'suffering' is taken in its widest sense as meaning limitation by something other than the self (cf. the grammatical terms active and passive), it will cover all the forms in which that problem has arisen both in ancient and modern times.

The question of our Lord's human knowledge is one of the forms in which that problem has arisen in the modern world. In the 4th and 5th centuries it was worked through by the Church in the terms of the 'objective' philosophy of the ancient world, in terms of substance, nature, and hypostasis. But when once the psychological period of philosophy had been initiated by Descartes, it was inevitable that sooner or later it should be raised again in terms of consciousness. What actually forced it to the front was the development of Old Testament criticism, which made it necessary to face the questions raised by our Lord's references to such matters as the story of Jonah and the Davidic authorship of the Psalms. This led to such reformulations of the 'kenotic' theory of the Incarnation as that of Bishop Gore, in which a distinction was drawn between matters of science and history—on which our Lord was held to have shared the knowledge of the men of His time—and matters of divine revelation in which He spoke with the knowledge of God. Since then the discovery of the extent to which Jewish apocalyptic literature forms the background of the New Testament has raised the question whether this distinction can be maintained, whether passages which at first sight look like revelations based on first-hand experience of the divine life in Heaven might not have been uttered by one who was dependent for his ideas upon the religious traditions of the Jewish race.

In attempting to face these problems, it is important to notice at the outset that the question involved is not necessarily that of the divinity of Christ. The truth of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation is taken for granted in this article. The question at issue is one which arises out of the acceptance of that doctrine. It concerns not the fact of the Incarnation, but the conditions under which it could and did take place. If we believe that the Eternal Second Person of the Trinity 'for us men and our salvation . . . was made man,' 'of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,' what did that involve? It is worth while to remark that those who are securely convinced of the truth of this doctrine do, as a matter of fact, feel more free to accept the evidence in the Gospels that tells of the greatness of His condescension on our behalf, shown in His acceptance of human limitations, than those who, isolating the Gospels from their place in the whole of Christian doctrine, go in nervous dread of undermining the basis of their faith.

Our theological point of departure, then, is that in the Gospels we have records concerning the life on earth of God incarnate. This belief can give rise to three methods of attempting to interpret His mind as revealed in His words and deeds.

(*a*) It may be assumed that as Man He shared continuously in the divine omniscience. It is doubtful, indeed, whether this view can be held to represent the considered teaching of any reputable theological school, and it is contradicted by such passages as Lk 2 [52] and Mk 13 [32], and by the articles of the Creed which teach that our Lord was truly Man. But it does represent the practical effect of much Christian speaking and writing, when sufficient care is not taken by those who hold the view next mentioned strictly to observe the distinctions that should be drawn, and it is often found in attacks upon the Catholic Faith, when it is mistakenly held to be 'the Catholic view,' and is set up as a ninepin to be knocked down again.

(*b*) It may be held that in some mysterious way our Lord was able, while on earth, to know 'as God' what He did not know 'as Man'; that in some way 'He possessed knowledge which He could use but did not, holding it in restraint by a *continuous* adherence to the principle of the Incarnation.' This view underlies those attempts at interpreting the Gospels which proceed by distinguishing between the utterances which are to be ascribed to His godhead and those which are to be ascribed to His manhood; but it need not necessarily issue in any such attempt at discrimination.

(*c*) It may be held that since to become incarnate means to enter upon the experience of life under human conditions, the doctrine of the Incarnation involves that during 'the days of His humiliation' He was limited by human conditions in mind as in body. The *prima facie* objection to this view, that it undermines the authority of Christ's teaching, is not necessarily justified upon reflection. 'To err is human' may be a maxim only applicable to our imperfect and sinful humanity, not to the perfect manhood of God incarnate. We have to ask what are the conditions essential to human life as such. In the sphere of knowledge the specifically human activity is the recognition of universals in particular instances of them occurring in time and space. The matters upon which our Lord's mind was exercised, therefore, were those particular traditions, events, etc., presented to Him during thirty years or so of life in Palestine some two thousand years ago; the authority of His teaching comes from the fact that all His judgements upon them were the judgements of One whose inner life was a life of continuous and unbroken communion with the Father. In mind as in body He was human; His words and His deeds (including the miracles) were the expression of His perfect manhood.

For the sake of clearness of contrast each of these three views has been stated in a sharply defined form. In any complete account of the matter it would be necessary to distinguish various modified forms in which each of them may be held, and also gradations between one and another at different points on which different thinkers have taken their stand. To many theologians, for example, the third view here described is only tenable in a modified form, in which the statement that in the days of His humiliation our Lord was 'limited by human conditions in mind as in body' would have to be qualified by the insertion of such a word as 'normally.'

It is clear that this brief statement of these three views raises one of the most profound questions for theological thought, and that any attempt at a discussion of their relative merits would be out of place here. For the purposes of this article it is enough to have shown that both of the last two views are compatible with the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. The test of any method of interpretation must be the extent to which it is able to find room for *all* the passages which textual and literary criticism present to us as genuine records of our Lord's words and deeds, without straining their natural meaning. But three suggestions may here be offered in conclusion.

(1) It is clear that Catholic doctrine does not require us to adopt any interpretation which implies any suspicion of 'docetism' or 'play-acting' in our Lord's human life; on the contrary, it bids us look for and find a real human experience of God incarnate.

(2) The source of most error in the field of Christology is to take our own experience of imperfect and sinful humanity as the standard, and to try to measure Christ's manhood by ours. The Catholic Faith teaches, on the contrary, that in Christ alone we see the one Perfect Man, by reference to whom we are to measure our own approximations to His standard. It is neglect of this point, as suggested above, which gives rise to the *prima facie*

objections to the third method of interpretation.

(3) If, encouraged by this reflection, a man will set about the task of applying that third method of interpretation to the details of the Gospel picture, trying to discover what manner of man it is of whom he reads, it will not be long before he discovers the gulf between that manhood and his own. Almost by accident, as it were, he will stumble upon the language of orthodoxy as he finds One who lives 'by nature' at a level to which he himself fitfully strives to attain 'by grace.' And he will then, perhaps, begin to look more sympathetically upon the second method of interpretation, and to lose some of his impatience with the exegesis to which it has given rise in the history of Christianity. For he will have discovered for himself that by no method of interpretation can we dispel the element of mystery from the Person of our Saviour as He walked on earth in the history of mankind.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE RESURRECTION

By E. G. Selwyn

(1) **Introductory.**—The belief that Jesus Christ rose again from the dead after His crucifixion and burial is shown by the unanimous testimony of the writers of the New Testament to have played a decisive part in the origins of Christianity. Not only does the resurrection of Jesus form the burden of the earliest preaching of those who had been His immediate disciples, but unless some fact supervened upon the crucifixion of sufficient impressiveness to change the whole mind of these disciples, it is impossible to explain how there came to be any such preaching at all. For it is not questioned that they were changed men. Dismayed, terrified, and even cowardly in face of their Master's trial, they yet appear a few weeks later confidently proclaiming that He was risen and enthroned as the Messiah. His crucifixion had certainly not been done in a corner; but so sure were they that it had been fully redressed that they were able to convince large numbers of the Jews of their contention, and this in face of bitter opposition. From Jerusalem the Church moved outwards into other parts of Palestine, and finally into Syria, Asia, and Europe, with the same message, appealing to the resurrection as the fact which proved Jesus to be the Messiah, the Son of God, the Saviour and Judge of men.

This designation of Jesus as triumphant Messiah appears to have been the first and immediate significance which the resurrection had for the Apostles (Ac 2 [36], 10 [40-42]; cf. Rom 1 [4]). But other implications were not slow to follow; and the epistles show belief in the resurrection as playing a vitally important part in the development of the Christian doctrines of God (1 Th 1 [10]; Ac 5 [29] f.; Eph 1 [19]; 1 P 1 [21]), of the Spirit (Rom 8 [10, 11]), of the Atonement (Rom 4 [25]), of the moral life (2 Cor 5 [15]; Eph 2 [5]; Col 2 [13]; 1 Cor 15 [17]), and of immortality (1 Cor 15; 2 Tim 1 [10]). The whole meaning of life, in fact, and especially its experience of suffering, was transfigured by the reversal of the Cross in the resurrection; and the conception of life through death, manifested so plainly in the case of Christ, was seen to be the clue to all true discipleship (Rom 6; 2 Cor 4 [7-15]), and the great secret of the universe itself (Rom 8).

The evidence which these facts afford to the resurrection is of the kind we call circumstantial. This growing body of belief requires some fact in the experience of the disciples to account for it. Even if such a belief could have originated in the first instance in delusion, it is incredible that a delusion should have led to a development of fundamental religious ideas at once so rational and so rich. We are compelled to say that something must have happened after the crucifixion which was commensurate with that event in its objectivity and certainty; which was without doubt something that happened to the Lord Himself; and which rested on attestation which no skill of adversaries could overcome. What that fact was it is the task of the historian to elucidate.

(2) **The Documentary Evidence.**—The earliest direct documentary testimony we have to the resurrection is that of St. Paul in 1 Cor 15. In this chapter, written not later than the middle fifties of the 1st century, St. Paul reminds his readers of the teaching he had given them in person some five or six years previously; and he says that that teaching was identical with the instruction he had

himself received on the subject. We are thus taken back to within ten years of the crucifixion of our Lord. (For the chronology cf. the discussion in the Introduction to McNeile's *St. Paul.*) The form of his summary of the facts about Christ's resurrection, moreover, suggests that it was an agreed statement. It falls into two parts. The first (3-5) has all the marks of a primitive *credo*, probably composed originally in Aramaic (cf. the use of 'Cephas'); for it not only contains the death, burial, resurrection, and appearances of Jesus, but notes that the death was 'for our sins,' that the resurrection was 'on the third day,' and that both were in fulfilment of Scripture. The second part (6-9) contains further allusions to the appearances of Jesus, closing with that which had been experienced by the Apostle himself; the purpose of this second section being to reinforce the evidence for the resurrection, to expand its significance, and to account for St. Paul's own title to be an Apostle (cf. *Essays Catholic and Critical*, 291, 292, 307).

St. Paul does not state in these verses precisely how he conceived of Christ's resurrection; but his conception can be inferred with a high degree of probability from the context, as well as from other passages in his writings. Thus, it is reasonable to suppose, in view of his Pharisaic training, that he believed in the empty tomb, short of any statement to the contrary; while his emphatic assertion that Christ 'was buried' seems to require such a belief. This is further borne out by the Apostle's teaching about the glorified or spiritual bodies to which Christians could look forward at the Parousia—teaching based on his view of the transformation through which the Lord's body had passed at His resurrection (cf. also Rom 8 11; Phil 3 21; and cf. the levitation in 1 Th 4 17). We see him here, as Lake points out (*The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 218), occupying a mediating position between Jewish and Greek ideas. As against the Greeks he insists that resurrection involves more than a revival or continued existence of the soul only; while as against the usual Jewish view he urges that the risen body will not be in the 'flesh and blood' of our present 'corruption' and 'humiliation' (1 Cor 15 42, 50; Phil 3 21), but will be transfigured and changed. This doctrine, moreover, presents close affinities with an utterance of Jesus Himself on the condition of the risen life (Mt 22 30).

Before passing to the evidence of the Gospels, it should be noted that Acts, apart from its general witness to the changed lives and characters of the Apostles, bears out St. Paul's testimony in one important detail. This is the religious observance by the primitive Church of the first day of the week in addition to the Jewish Sabbath (Ac 20 7; cf. 1 Cor 16 2). Some unusually strong cause must have operated to produce so startling an innovation as that involved in the institution of the Christian Sunday. But there is no suggestion in any of our evidence that this observance had any other root than the association of that day with the Lord's resurrection. It thus affords strong corroboration to that note of time ('on the third day') on which St. Paul insists so plainly and in which all the other evidence agrees with him.

When we turn to the Gospels we are presented with a far more difficult problem. Not only do the narratives differ in several important particulars, but it is exceedingly difficult to trace, even as regards the Synoptic Gospels, any filiation of the documents which is more than conjectural. Mark, which is elsewhere regarded as our earliest and most reliable source of information, here breaks off short (at 16 8) after recording the discovery of the empty tomb by the women. There may have been an ending which is lost; but the linguistic considerations are indecisive (cf. R. R. Ottley in *J.T.S.*, July, 1926), and suggestions that it underlies Matthew or John are little more than surmise. Mark may have had good reasons for stopping where he did. Luke's narrative is of no less importance, however, than Mark at this point. Whatever view be taken of the Proto-Luke hypothesis, there are very strong indications, not only that Luke used a distinct non-Marcan written source for his narrative of the Passion and resurrection, but that he used it as the groundwork into which he afterwards fitted the Marcan matter. This document, moreover, presents primitive characteristics which point to a date contemporary with, and perhaps earlier than, Mark (cf. V. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, ii. for a detailed study of the evidence). In Mark and Luke, therefore, we have two independent narratives of the resurrection, written not more than ten years after St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. Both writers, moreover, had good opportunities of access to reliable information. St. Mark was the friend of St. Peter, his mother had a house in Jerusalem, and he was at different periods the companion of

St. Paul. St. Luke was St. Paul's travel-companion on some of his journeys, accompanied him on his last visit to Jerusalem, and was in all probability either there or at Cæsarea during the Apostle's two years of confinement in the latter place. Of neither Matthew nor John can we speak so definitely. Matthew appears to be based on Mark, so far as we can compare the two; and his description of the great commission in Galilee has the mark of primitive grandeur about it. On the other hand, here, as in his narrative of the crucifixion, there are signs of a tendency to heighten the supernatural element, which suggests that the record has been amplified in transmission. John's account, which is the fullest of all the Gospel records, stands in a peculiar position. Literary dependence of John on any of the other evangelists cannot be conclusively proved in respect of this part of his narrative; though Streeter gives persuasive reasons for the view that John was acquainted with Luke, or more probably Proto-Luke, and also with Mark. What is more important is that John's narrative, of the resurrection as well as of the Passion, is inwardly consistent and homogeneous, particularly in regard to the chronological details; and it is important to observe that in these latter points Luke's special source (or Proto-Luke) probably corroborated John.

In addition to the canonical Gospels, there are fragments of two apocryphal Gospels, one of them of considerable length, which contain narratives of the resurrection. The longer is *The Gospel of Peter*, a document of Gnostic tendencies emanating probably from Western Syria; and recent examination of it (*J.T.S.*, April and July, 1926) does not appear to have convinced scholars that the date (about A.D. 150) originally suggested for it by its first English editors is seriously at fault. The 'Gospel' may, of course, contain some genuine traditions which are independent of the canonical Gospels; but, if so, we have no means by which to discriminate or check them. *The Gospel of the Hebrews*, amid much that is legendary, contained, according to a quotation of St. Jerome, an account of an appearance of Jesus to James. The characterization of James in this fragment is more true to what we know of him from Acts than one would expect, if the fragment were simply a haggadic amplification of St. Paul's statement that the Lord appeared to James; while the allusion to the breaking of bread (without mention of a cup) recalls the scene at Emmaus. Was James possibly the unnamed companion of Cleopas? But, in general, it may be said that neither of these *apocrypha* can be used by the historian as evidences for the resurrection.

(3) **The Interpretation of the Evidence.**—The Gospels present us with four distinct traditions of Christ's resurrection, of which at least three (Luke, Mark, John) are, from a literary point of view, mainly independent of one another. It is inevitable that in such a case there should be differences, and even discrepancies, between the narratives; and some of these it is not probable that we shall ever be able to explain. Two processes must be thought of as having been at work in the circles from which these traditions emanated. One is the legendary tendency, by which, once the initial stimulus of a great personage or event is given, gaps in the records are filled in, or obscurities removed, by insertions or explanations which appear to the popular mind appropriate. The other process is that which is derived from the serious desire of a number of people to discover more fully what occurred and their perseverance in taking steps to do so. In the case of our Lord's resurrection, the first of these tendencies cannot be ruled out; the apocryphal Gospels witness at least to that, and the tendency is occasionally visible even in Matthew. But the countervailing tendency is even more marked, and that especially in two respects. On the one hand, it is clear from Acts and 1 Corinthians that the resurrection was from the earliest times a central doctrine of the faith, and one on which the leaders of the Church were bound to make and to require authoritative statement; and the tendency to make legend would be constantly checked and corrected by the fact-interest of those in authority. On the other hand, we have the clear testimony of St. Luke that there were many persons in the 1st century who had endeavoured to narrate what the eye-witnesses recorded of their experiences of Jesus, and that he himself wished to use the exceptional opportunities he had had of obtaining information to a like purpose, so that Theophilus might have an accurate account of the things he had been taught. It is plain that St. Luke claims here, both for himself and for others, the simple resolve to know and state the truth; and the existence of such critical enquiry at the back of our Gospels is a fact of the highest importance for the formation of a just estimate of their historical value.

The method which will here be adopted for interpreting the evidence will be based on the principle of taking Luke as the ground-work and comparing the other accounts with his. The reason for choosing Luke rather than Mark is not only that his narrative is more complete, but also that it is substantially as early as Mark, if not earlier. Whether we consider that the substratum of Luke's narrative of the Passion and resurrection was the evangelist's own earlier handiwork or not, it is probable that he revised it to some extent, as he revised Mark before publishing the Gospel as we have it. But in that case his revisions of Mark are a useful index to the way in which we may suppose he revised his non-Marcan document; and these are not of a kind to discredit the revision. His revisions of Mark are not characterized, that is to say, by any marked tendency to heighten the miraculous and amplify the earlier document with legends. His alterations are mainly stylistic, dictated by his historical aim and his artistic sense. He is more a man of the world, and writes as such, removing obscurities, smoothing down roughnesses, and drawing, when necessary, on his own abundant sources of information. We have no reason to think, therefore, that he has altered his primitive documentary source in any important particulars, except so far as was necessary to make room for his insertions of Marcan matter; while, if that source was in fact his own work, the likelihood of such modification is still further decreased. Finally, it is to be observed that St. Luke's narrative, by reason of its spontaneous and half-concealed cross-references, gives the impression of resting not on the testimony of any individual so much as on that of different groups in a community whose evidence, given from different points of view to a common tradition, has been explored and sifted by the evangelist.

E.g. Lk 23 ^{53} makes no mention of a stone being rolled against the mouth of the tomb, but 24 ^{2} takes it for granted: with 24 ^{4} cf. 24 ^{23}; 24 ^{34} unconsciously dates the appearance to Simon within a few hours; 24 ^{12}, commonly called a 'Western non-interpolation,' is substantially borne out by 24 ^{24}.

(*a*) *From the Crucifixion to the Discovery of the Empty Tomb* (Lk 23 ^{49}-24 ^{12}). —Luke concludes his story of the Cross with a brief picture of a group of our Lord's acquaintance, including women who had followed Him from Galilee, standing some distance away, spectators of the end. They saw then how Joseph of Arimathæa came and took His body down from the Cross, wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a rock-hewn tomb which had not before been used for burial. The women escorted Joseph from the Cross to the tomb and watched how the body was laid within it, before the stone was rolled against its mouth. The time was the late afternoon of Friday; but it was possible for them to return to the city and buy spices and ointments before six o'clock, when the Sabbath rest supervened.

Very early on the first day of the week they went to the grave to embalm the body. They found, however, the stone rolled away, and on entering saw that the body was no longer there. Perplexed and dismayed at this, they were surprised by two men in shining raiment standing over them. Before this 'vision of angels' (24 ^{23}), they were filled with awe and prostrated themselves; and the mysterious visitants asked them why they sought 'the living with the dead,' and reminded them of the Lord's prediction in Galilee of His suffering, death, and resurrection. They then returned to the city and told the story of their experience to the Eleven and the rest of the company of disciples. The story, however, seemed absurd, and little credence was given to it. The principal women concerned in the episode were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Joanna, who is elsewhere described by Luke (8 ^{3}) as the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward.

This is a straightforward narrative; and, in view of Luke's known interest in, and apparently close acquaintance with, the women of the Gospel story, it is reasonable to suppose that it comes from one or more of those mentioned at its close. Its unity, even if we suppose that the account of the burial is based on Mark, is the unity of a story told him from their point of view. It is important, therefore, to consider what light the other evangelists throw upon it.

Mark gives the names of the women immediately after recording the entombment, and mentions Salome instead of Luke's Joanna. In any case, however, the number of the group was more than three, and the three who brought the tidings of the empty tomb (Luke) were not necessarily the same as the three who bought spices for the embalming of the Lord's body (Mark). The discrepancy between Mark and Luke as to the time when the spices were bought is more difficult, Luke placing it on the Friday and Mark on the Saturday evening; but Mark's chronology of the Passion is so unsatisfactory that there would seem no reason

to doubt Luke here. Mark describes the women's entrance into the tomb, but speaks of 'a young man sitting on the right-hand side' instead of the 'two (angelic) men' of Luke. His message also differs materially from theirs, in that it contains an explicit command to 'go and tell his disciples and Peter that he leadeth you forth into Galilee: there shall you see him as he said unto you.' Matthew names only the two Marys as the subjects of this episode, and provides a highly coloured explanation of how the stone was rolled away; but otherwise he substantially supports Mark as to what happened when the women entered the sepulchre, though he differs again from Mark as to the effect this had on the women's immediate action.

John's differences from Luke, on the other hand, are of a quite distinct character from those of Mark and Matthew, and appear to reflect his peculiar 'doctrinal' interest and standpoint. No mention of women is made in connexion with the embalming of our Lord's body, which is carried out by Joseph and Nicodemus at the time when they laid His body in the tomb. Only Mary Magdalene, again, is explicitly mentioned as visiting the tomb early on the first day of the week; though her own words, as recorded in Jn 20 [2], imply that she had companions. It is she alone, according to John, who bears the tidings of the empty tomb; and she takes the news not to the whole body of disciples, but to Peter and the beloved disciple. They thereupon run to the grave and verify her report for themselves and then return, one of them having realized what had happened. There follows an appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene, followed by her recognition of Him, and His command to her to go and tell His 'brethren' of His ascension to the Father.

The reconstruction of the scene at the tomb is far from easy, and it was probably no more easy for those who first essayed to record it than for ourselves. A number of women were involved in the episode, and it is improbable that they all acted together throughout; different persons had to be told of their news, and this would have involved visits to different houses. What Luke is concerned to tell is that the news was communicated; and he gives the names of the three women chiefly concerned in what was related. Again, the women's experience itself cannot have been easy to relate. It had impressed itself on them as having a supernatural character (Lk 24 [23]), and different members of their group may well have described it differently, and indeed have seen and heard different things. Luke's 'two men' may represent his interpretation of the fact that two versions of the angelic message were in existence, and that Mary Magdalene at any rate, only a few hours later, was said to have seen two angels in the tomb (Jn 20 [12]). In one important particular, however, both the Marcan and Lucan versions of the angelic message agree. In both alike their announcement of the Lord's resurrection is immediately followed and illustrated by a reminder of something which the Lord had said to His disciples. This alone would be important for the light that it throws on the psychology of the experience, which contained a vivid calling to mind of former teaching. But that is not all. While the utterances thus called to mind were spoken on different occasions, they had much in common; for both alike (Mk 8 [31]=Lk 9 [22]; Mk 14 [27, 28]=Mt 26 [31, 32]) were predictions of His own death and resurrection. It is true that in the latter case the prediction is concluded by a cryptic sentence about leading the disciples forth into Galilee, and that it is this feature which is emphasized in Mark's angelic message. If, however, the substance of the angelic message was a calling to mind of our Lord's own teaching as to what would befall Him, it is probable enough that different utterances would stand out most clearly in different minds. The important fact was that through this experience which was thus linked on to their earlier teaching the women came to visualize the possibility of their Master's resurrection; and it was this which was greeted with incredulity by the disciples.

Mark's version suggests that either he or his informant interpreted the angelic reminder literally as meaning that Jesus would appear to them in Galilee; and it may well have been that it did in fact provide the disciples with an important motive for returning thither. In any case, the belief that appearances took place in Galilee would tend to endorse that interpretation. Yet it should seriously be considered whether the real meaning of the *logion*, and of the reminder of it, was not somewhat broader. Its original context, with the quotation from Zechariah, points to something allusive and mysterious in the expression, and the suggestion (by Sir E. Hoskyns in *Theology*, vii, 14 ff.) that by 'Galilee' our Lord meant the Gentile world

waiting to be evangelized deserves careful consideration. In any case, what the Lord's words at the Last Supper portended was in the first place the resurrection, and after that a reassembly of the flock and a new kind of journey into Galilee; there was no definite allusion to Galilee as the place for His appearances. In the Galilean appearances which Matthew and John record, indeed, the point of greatest emphasis is the vocation of the Apostolate to evangelize the world. Luke, on the other hand, may well have chosen to omit this saying, even if he knew of it, and have preferred to record as the substance of the angelic message an often-repeated piece of Christ's teaching which was expressed in simple and almost formal language. His plan, as Acts shows, embraced not only the resurrection itself, but also that large sweep of events with which the resurrection and the vocational appearances which followed it were pregnant. He had his own way of recording the Lord's promise to His flock (Lk 12 [32]), and his own way of relating how the promise found fulfilment (Ac 1 [6-8]).

(*b*) *The Tidings and its Verification.*—Luke's story of the women's action has already been told. Mark differs here, however, saying that 'they went out and fled from the tomb; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they anything to any man; for they were afraid' (Mk 16 [8]). What he describes is the immediate effect upon the women, which was to make them silent; and that silence would in itself constitute a not unimpressive conclusion to his Gospel. But it is incredible that they should have kept such a secret locked in their hearts for very long; and, if the Gospel continued, it may be surmised that it went on to tell how one or more of the party went to tell the Apostles. It is possible that we should find here the explanation of the somewhat confused sentences in Lk 24 [9, 10]. Their composite appearance would be intelligible on the hypothesis that Proto-Luke was without [10b], and that Luke added this sentence later when he met with Mark's account of the women's silence. In any case, if, as we have urged, the substance of the angelic message lay in the recall of earlier utterances of our Lord, it is probable that the bearing of these broke only slowly on their minds, bringing with it the resolve to take the practical step of imparting the news to the disciples.

Luke gives us important indirect evidence as to the verification of this news by some of the apostolic band, when he makes Cleopas say to the stranger on the road to Emmaus that 'certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not' (24 [24]). Even if the statement in 24 [12] of a visit by St. Peter to the tomb is no part of what St. Luke wrote (cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 142 ff.), the words of Cleopas are a sufficient indication of the evangelist's belief that the tomb was visited by members of the apostolic company. There is nothing corresponding to this in Matthew. John, on the other hand, gives the names of two at least of the disciples who visited the tomb, and describes in vivid detail what they found. The credence we give to John's narrative (20 [3-10]) will depend on the presuppositions with which we approach it. Its doctrinal implications will be considered later. Here it suffices to point out that the broad historical fact to which it testifies—viz. the verification by members of the apostolic circle of the news that the tomb was empty—is supported plainly in the Lucan narrative. It may be added that John's remark to the effect that 'as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise from the dead,' is in keeping with what the other Gospels tell us as to the part played by the witness of the Old Testament in developing the understanding of the disciples. The closely detailed description of the position of the grave-clothes, moreover, is not easily accounted for unless it goes back to the testimony of an eye-witness (cf. Latham's discussion of it in *The Risen Master*).

(*c*) *The Appearances.*—Matthew and John contain two records of appearances shortly after the discovery of the empty tomb. In Matthew (28 [9, 10]) our Lord appears to the women as they are running to bring the disciples word of what they have found. In John (20 [11-18]) the Lord appears to Mary Magdalene who has returned to the sepulchre and lingers there after Peter and the beloved disciple have left it. Various considerations suggest that we have here a 'doublet,' i.e. two versions of the same tradition. Chief of these is the fact that both narratives represent our Lord as giving a message for His 'brethren' (Mt 28 [10]; Jn 20 [17])—an unusual phrase which was probably found in the tradition. The substance of the two messages is, moreover, not so dissimilar as appears on the surface. In John it is the announcement of the ascension, in Matthew the command to go into Galilee. But it is clear that for

Matthew this command meant more than that they should see Him there. For the one appearance to the disciples which he goes on to recount is concerned not only with their seeing Him, but still more with the world-wide commission and the promise of His abiding presence which He then gave them. And these are two activities of the ever-living Christ which are constantly connected in New Testament thought with His ascension.

Granted, however, that we have here a 'doublet,' the determination of the facts behind the tradition presents a difficult problem to the historian. On the one hand, we have the silence of Luke, who is usually lavish of information on any matter touching the women of the Gospel story. On the other, there is the vivid detail of the Johannine narrative, which is its own best evidence of veracity. The solution of the problem must depend on the view taken of the 4th Gospel as a whole. Those who believe that it rests on real reminiscences of the beloved disciple will not find it difficult to suppose that Mary Magdalene, or some other member of that group which had stood beneath the Cross (Jn 19 [25]), desired that Luke should not tell the story, and that he honoured the request; while others will tend to regard this narrative as yet one more instance of how the Fourth Evangelist tends to subordinate historical to doctrinal truth. They will also point to the similarity of the message with which the women are charged in Matthew to that which, according to both Mark and Matthew, the angel gave the women at the tomb, and will urge that this also is a 'doublet.' In that case, the conclusion would be that tradition had come to transfer the message from the angels to the Lord Himself; that Matthew represents this development in its simplest form; and that John carries it still further by amplifying the details and by giving the *logion* about 'Galilee' a particular doctrinal interpretation.

To return to the Lucan narrative. Luke speaks of two appearances of the risen Lord as taking place on the afternoon of 'the first day of the week.' One was an appearance to Simon Peter, of which he does not give any description, but contents himself with the announcement of it by the apostolic company to the two who had been absent at Emmaus. It is implied that this appearance took place during the period occupied by the walk to and from Emmaus; and St. Paul gives it the first place in his enumeration of the Lord's appearances. The reticence of the evangelists with regard to it suggests that it was an experience of ineffable wonder and power. The appearance of our Lord on the way to Emmaus, on the other hand, is described by St. Luke with a spontaneity and a fulness which leave on the mind an ineffaceable impression of truthfulness; so that it is easier to believe that things happened so than that any author could have composed the tale. The record is too familiar to need recital here; and it will suffice to draw attention to its principal features. Just as the Lucan record bears the stamp of a narrative told from the women's point of view, so the Emmaus story has about it the note of an eye-witness's reminiscence —the reminiscence, that is to say, of Cleopas or his companion. Here, too, moreover, as in that earlier case, Luke makes it clear that the indications of outward fact which pointed to the resurrection were accompanied, and indeed prepared for, by a development in the understanding on the part of those who received these indications. Jesus remains a stranger to these two disciples until He has brought their minds to a point at which the truth will be something more to them than a truth of bare, external fact. This He does by unfolding to them the great secret of the Scriptures, that the Messiah was to enter into His glory through suffering—a doctrine which He had more than once taught His disciples during His ministry, beginning from the time when St. Peter had confessed His Messiahship, but which up to the end (cf. Lk 22 [24]) they had failed to apprehend. His exposition came to them now with a new force and appeal, kindling again faith and hope and recollection and penitence in their hearts. Finally, there came the recognition of who the Stranger was, as He took bread and blessed and brake it and gave it to them in the house at Emmaus. The action, no doubt, was characteristic, and recalled to their minds not the scene at the Last Supper (for they had not been there), but those breakings of bread in the past which had been foreshadowings of the Eucharist, and which they may well have witnessed. Then, in a moment, He was gone, leaving them to piece together what they had heard and seen that afternoon with the reports they had heard beforehand, and to pass to the rational conviction that He had conquered death. They found, when they reached Jerusalem, that that faith was already shared.

It has often been asked why St. Paul makes no mention of this appearance

of Jesus in his letter to the Corinthians; but reasons are not difficult to conjecture. The only appearances of this first Easter day which he records are those to St. Peter and to the Twelve; and it is these only, since the subjects of them were those in highest authority in the Church, which belong to the 'credal' part of his statement. From this standpoint the appearance to Cleopas and his companion was part of the unofficial tradition of the Church but not of 'dogmatic' rank. At the same time, to record the Emmaus appearance after those to St. Peter and the Twelve would have been to fly in the face of chronology. Luke's narrative, moreover, has a special psychological interest which goes beyond the primary needs of an 'evidence' of the resurrection. The story is told, not simply to record the fact that Jesus appeared, but to show how faith in the fact came into being in the minds of His disciples. We cannot be sure, indeed, that this faith came to full maturity until they reached Jerusalem and heard the explicit announcement that Christ had risen and had appeared to Simon. There is a sense in which the narrative stands slightly aside from the central stream of the evidences of the resurrection and derives its peculiar value from that fact.

On that same evening there followed an appearance of our Lord to the Twelve, which both Luke and John record; and the two accounts may well be presented in parallel form:

Lk 24 [36-49].	Jn 20 [19-23].
And as they thus spake, he himself *stood* in the *midst* of them, [*and saith unto them, Peace be unto you*]. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? And wherefore do reasonings arise in your hearts? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. [*And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his* feet.] And while they still disbelieved for *joy*, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here anything to eat? And they gave him a piece of broiled fish. And he took it, and did eat before them.	When therefore it was evening, on that day, the first day of the week, and when the doors were shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and *stood* in the *midst*, *and said unto them, Peace be unto you.*
And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and *remission* of *sins* should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high.	*And when he had said this, he showed unto them his hands and his* side. The disciples therefore *were glad* when they saw the Lord.
Lk 24 [36-49].	Jn 20 [19-23].

Literary dependence of John on Luke here would be probable were it not for the fact that those phrases in Luke (enclosed in brackets above) where verbal resemblance to John is most pronounced are probably not part of the original text of Luke. On the other hand, the resemblance is so close in point of substance that we can hardly avoid regarding these passages as two versions of the same tradition. Luke is concerned with three points—the manifestation of the risen Lord, the exposition of Scripture, and the world-wide commission to preach in the power of the Holy Spirit the Gospel of forgiveness—and to the first and the last of these John has direct parallels. Each narrative, moreover, brings out in its own way the double character and purpose of the appearance as at once evidential and vocational, Luke adding the further point that both these lessons were reinforced by the Lord's exposition of Scripture. The broad fact, moreover, which both evangelists attest, of an appearance to the Twelve following upon that to St. Peter, is endorsed by the testimony of our earliest documentary witness, St. Paul. It is significant also, though the fact may be held to point to more than one conclusion, that the summary of the resurrection faith recorded as given by St. Peter in Ac 10 [40-43] has close affinities with the Lucan narrative in Lk 24 [36-49].

Very strong reasons would be needed to justify us in rejecting the historicity

of this appearance of Jesus to His disciples on the evening of the first Easter day, resting as it does on the concordant testimony of St. Paul, St. Luke, and the Fourth Evangelist. The principal ground adduced for such rejection is the existence of another tradition, to be observed in Mark, Matthew, and the Johannine appendix, to the effect that the appearances of the Lord took place in Galilee. Mark, it is urged, by his version of the angelic message at the tomb, clearly points to Galilee as the *locale* of the appearances; Matthew, though he records an appearance to the women near Jerusalem, betrays no knowledge of an appearance to the Twelve or other male disciples except in Galilee; while John, in his last chapter, records a prolonged appearance (or two appearances) in Galilee, which is manifestly centred to a special degree in St. Peter. From this it is inferred that the appearances, including that to St. Peter which St. Paul names first in his list, took place in fact in Galilee —some would say in Galilee only; and that Luke and John, or the tradition which they followed, transferred them, on grounds of what may be called historical and religious propriety, to Jerusalem. We propose to consider this contention.

We have already observed that the angelic message in Mark tells by no means so much in favour of the Galilean theory as is often claimed. Not only does Mark make it clear that the message was a reminder of an utterance of Jesus at the Last Supper; but the utterance in question was as much a prediction of His death and resurrection as it was a promise that He would lead them forth into Galilee. Luke's narrative suggests that this was the sense which the message was intended to convey. At the same time, the Lord had spoken thus about a 'leading forth' into Galilee, though it is probable that He meant by it more than they yet knew; and nothing is more likely than that Mark, or even the apostolic company itself, should have understood it as a literal command to go to Galilee after the resurrection. Many other reasons can be conjectured for a journey of the Eleven to Galilee at this time, all the more if they received on the first Easter day such a commision to preach the Gospel as both Luke and John record; for it would unquestionably then be necessary for them to return for a space to their own people and to settle their affairs. Practical convenience would therefore conspire with an undoubted word of Jesus to cause them to go to Galilee. So far as the evidence is concerned, moreover, the appearance 'to five hundred brethren at once,' attested by St. Paul, cannot be placed anywhere but in Galilee. Matthew and John, again, both record appearances in Galilee, and in both there is this common factor, that the Lord's appearances are concerned precisely with that vocation to the Gentile world which, as we have seen, was probably intimated in the *logion* of Jesus at the Last Supper. [This seems clearly to be John's meaning in the story of the miraculous draught of fishes, numbering 153 (Jn 21 [11]: cf. W. Bauer in Lietzmann's *Handbuch* and Lagrange in his *Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*).] At the same time, there is nothing in Matthew which is inconsistent with appearances of Jesus first, and for evidential purposes, in Jerusalem. He does indeed record such an appearance, though it is to two of the women and not to Apostles. The real difficulty, then, can be narrowed down to the language of Luke, who appears to exclude a journey to Galilee when he records the command of the Lord to the apostolic company to 'tarry . . . in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high' (Lk 24 [49]), and whose narrative, whether in the Gospel or in Acts, apparently leaves no place for Galilean appearances.

The most fruitful line of approach to this problem is not that of enforcing a harmony upon the different narratives, but that rather of emphasizing the distinct interests and standpoints of the several evangelists. Each evangelist's mind is dominated by his own special purpose and conception, and it is precisely at the close of his story that we shall expect that purpose to be most plain. In the case of Matthew, written probably for the Church at Antioch, the primary aspects of the resurrection which he wishes to impress upon his readers are the wonder of the fact and the universality of the kingdom with which Christ has been invested by the Father, and of the commission to extend it with which He Himself invests the Church; and the evidential significance of the appearances falls into the background. In the case of John the primary interest is doctrinal. He is a theologian, and is concerned to emphasize his conception of our Lord as 'the resurrection and the life,' calling into being by His breath the Church to be the 'new creation.' Only later does he add records of an appearance in Galilee, showing that he knew of the tradition and had means of filling in

some of its details. Luke, on the other hand, writes avowedly as an historian whose concern is primarily with the main march of events. Like all the historians, he claims, and must be accorded, the right to select from among the facts those which fall under the plan of his work. And we must remember that that plan was not confined to the story of our Lord's life. Already, before Luke or even Proto-Luke (if we adopt that hypothesis) was written, Luke had penned much of what is known as his travel diary; and we cannot dissociate the plan of the Gospel from that of Acts. That plan is geographical as well as historical, the first book coming to a conclusion at Jerusalem, the second at Rome—each of them the capital city of the area in which the great events take place, and each the pregnant mother of events that were still to come. It would, therefore, have been wholly contrary to the artistry of Luke's Gospel, as well as to the real significance of the facts as he saw them, if he had turned aside at the close in order to record appearances in Galilee.

At the same time, the possibility must be allowed for that both Luke and John, the one by his historical and the other by his doctrinal interest, have been led to 'telescope' some of the facts which they record. Allowance must also be made for the size of the papyrus rolls, which may have imposed on each evangelist some foreshortening at the end. In Luke's case this technical difficulty was inexorable, though he compensated for it in Ac 1. John, on the other hand, may have found that he had foreshortened more than the roll required; and the vacant space so left may have determined him to add Jn 21. John clearly seems to have done this in the case of the ascension and the gift of the Spirit, both of which he makes part of his doctrine of Christ's resurrection; and the consciousness of having done so may have been one reason for later adding the appendix. But by the opening verses of Acts Luke also admits that there is much behind the narrative in his Gospel which he has not there told. It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that into his account of the appearance to the Twelve he has packed sayings of our Lord which were spoken either on more than one occasion or at least with more than one reference. Thus Lk 24 [47-49] may represent the substance of the charge rightly recorded by Matthew as having been given in Galilee; for the sentence in [49b] containing the command to 'settle in the city' until they received the gift of the Spirit might have been spoken in Galilee no less than in Jerusalem. More probably, in the present writer's view, we should suppose that the charge to remain in the city was addressed to the Church as a body rather than to the Twelve only, and that the Lord's mother and brethren were those immediately charged to remain. Unlike John, Luke (24 [33, 36]) implies that these were present when our Lord appeared on that first evening. Luke's language, moreover, in Ac 1 [13, 14] implies that at the time of the ascension the Church at Jerusalem had, so to speak, a double headquarters, one consisting of the Eleven, the other of the women and Mary the mother of Jesus and His brethren. That this second group had an individuality of its own corresponding to its peculiar personal relationship to our Lord may be regarded as certain in the nature of things. That it had also a special importance in relation to the Church is attested not only in the Gospels (cf. especially Jn 2 [12], 19 [25] ff.), but also in Acts, where James the Lord's brother appears as head of the mother-Church in Jerusalem and as the natural president of the whole apostolic council (Ac 15, 21). It is significant, further, that the appearance to James, of which St. Paul speaks, falls easily into place, if it occurred at Jerusalem between the appearance to the 500 brethren in Galilee, and that to 'all the apostles' at the ascension. It seems, therefore, probable that the Eleven, or some at least of them, did journey to Galilee before the ascension, partly to see to their affairs and partly to communicate the news of the resurrection to believers there; and that appearances of the risen Lord took place there. It was not, however, essential for Luke's purpose nor wholly in keeping with his plan that he should recount these. They constituted, as John implies, an 'appendix' to the main story. The continuity of the Church in Jerusalem was carried on during these two or three weeks by the Lord's mother and His brethren and others of their group, who remained in the city by His command; and it was to them that the Galilee party returned before the ascension. From the historian's point of view Galilee was in no sense a centre for the propagation of the faith, and no church arose there: the hearth-stone of both faith and church was Jerusalem.

Luke concludes his Gospel with a narrative of how Jesus led them out to Bethany, blessed them, and 'was parted

from them.' Doubt as to the text at the end of 24 [51] prevents our being sure whether Luke definitely referred here to the ascension; though Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, 142 f.) has given reasons for supposing that the words 'and (was) carried up into heaven' are authentic. With or without the words, various features of the passage point to the view that Luke understood by this parting the ascension; and the absence of any note of time as to when it occurred is of a piece with the 'telescoping' already mentioned. The record of the ascension will be considered in the Note appended to this article.

(4) **Summary of the Facts.**—The above review and analysis of the evidence indicates that, while we cannot wholly or with certainty reconstruct the sequence of events during the forty days, the main facts which led to belief in our Lord's resurrection stand out well attested and clear. It cannot reasonably be denied, unless we are to refuse all value to the testimony of the evangelists, that very early on 'the third day' the women found the tomb where they had seen the Lord buried empty; that the meaning of this was revealed to them through an angelic message recalling teaching of the Lord Himself; and that their report of the empty tomb was verified without delay by members of the apostolic company. Nor can it be reasonably denied that in the course of that day Jesus appeared to St. Peter, to two disciples on the way to Emmaus, and to the apostolic company gathered at evening in Jerusalem; and that in the course of these appearances He brought to mind the prophecies concerning Him and expounded them in the light of what had happened. The main purpose of these appearances that day was evidential, i.e. that they should believe the fact of His resurrection and understand its relation to His death and to all that they knew of God. It is probable also that He gave them that same day the promise of the Spirit, and the charge to publish this Gospel throughout the world in the Spirit's power. In the course of the following weeks some at least of the disciples journeyed to Galilee. It was there in all probability that the scene occurred to which St. Paul alludes when he says that Jesus 'was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.' Be that as it may, it seems clear from Matthew and John that the appearances in Galilee were of a markedly vocational type. It was there, with all the associations of earlier missions around them, that the Eleven would be able to realize most vividly the nature and scope of the new task to which they were called. The period spent in Galilee may have been of two or three weeks' duration. When they returned to Jerusalem, they heard that the Lord had appeared to James. But their faith was now ripening to a point where they needed no further palpable proofs. On the fortieth day after the first Easter Jesus led them out to Bethany, and there blessed them, and was lifted up from them, a cloud receiving Him from their sight; and they knew that, when He came to them again, it would be in the power of the invisible Spirit.

(5) **The Interpretation of the Facts.**—The earliest interpreters of the facts above outlined are the evangelists themselves; for each is an interpreter as well as a narrator. Without any question they intended their readers to understand that the tomb was empty because the Lord had been raised from the dead, and His appearances were a further certificate of this fact. Yet even in the earliest times, as the 1st Gospel shows, other interpretations of the facts were put forward; and these have successors in our own day. The most important are those which depend on driving a wedge in some way between the empty tomb and the appearances, ascribing the former to folly, fraud, or force, and the latter to purely psychological conditions. As regards the former, the claim that the disciples had removed the Lord's body by stealth (Mt 28 [13]) offers at once the oldest and the least tenable alternative to the Christian tradition; while the suggestion that Jesus was not really dead, or that the women went to the wrong tomb, involves doing violence not only to the evidence but also to common-sense. Secret removal of the Lord's body by the Romans is the only form of this hypothesis which deserves consideration. If anyone, however, will endeavour to reconstruct the situation on such a hypothesis, he will find the difficulties overwhelming. The only cause which we can conjecture as leading Pilate to change his mind as to the disposal of our Lord's body would have been a superstitious fear that He might somehow rise again; and, if that motive really existed, it would certainly have led the Roman governor to nip Christianity in the bud by letting his action be known, so soon as the preaching of the resurrection began. Had Roman soldiers re-

moved the body, or had such a statement had the slightest foundation in fact, the Jews must have given it currency, and the Romans would have had good cause to encourage the notion. The saying, still current when the 1st Gospel was written, that the disciples removed the body by stealth represents, in fact, the bankruptcy of all attempts on the part of the Jews to suggest any other explanation.

The interpretation of the appearances which ascribes them to purely psychological conditions, i.e. which regards them as the product of some kind of hysteria, is equally incredible in view of the results which they had in the disciples' minds and characters. At the same time, the attempt to apply psychological principles to these experiences is not only justified but necessary. There are two lines along which we may approach such acts of perception as are involved in the records of our Lord's appearances. One is that opened up by modern physical science, the other that of psychology; and the emphasis we lay on either will depend on our general conception of our Lord's risen body and its manifestations. That we are not dealing with normal cases of perception is clear from various details of the narrative. Thus, our Lord appears 'when the doors are shut,' 'vanishes,' manifests Himself on the same afternoon to St. Peter in Jerusalem and to the two disciples at Emmaus, is 'carried up into heaven.' Do these manifestations mean that, being normally invisible, He invested Himself from time to time with 'matter' or 'mass,' so that anyone present at the time could have seen and touched Him; or that the disciples were given 'visions' of Him which involved mystical rather than sensible perception? Those who favour the former view, which has behind it the weight of tradition, will point to those features of the records which appear to emphasize the concrete externality of our Lord's body in these appearances, and will urge that the dividing line between the spiritual and the material has worn very thin in modern physics. Upholders of the latter view, on the other hand, will urge that, while each appearance to the disciples involved a real presence to them of the risen Christ acting on each occasion upon them in His risen body, this did not involve any such materiality as that an indifferent spectator in the Garden or on the way to Emmaus or in the Upper Chamber would have seen any form or heard any words or witnessed any action (such as being touched). There really was such action and speech *ab extra*, but it was not mediated through external matter. The present writer has developed this view fully elsewhere (*Essays Catholic and Critical*, essay on 'The Resurrection'), and the reader may be referred thither for a detailed discussion of the matter. Whichever line of approach we adopt, the reality of our Lord's manifestation of Himself to His disciples after the resurrection is seen to be required by the evidence.

In reviewing the evidence of the resurrection, we find that we have to do, then, with the assured facts of the empty tomb, with real self-manifestations of Jesus, with a concurrent opening of the disciples' understanding of Scripture, and with the use of a Eucharistic symbol as a means of recognition. No one of these, so far as we can judge, could have been dispensed with if the stupendous fact of the Lord's complete triumph over death, and the Father's acceptance of His sacrifice on the Cross, was to be not only unequivocally attested but also integrated with the deepest elements of His disciples' and the Church's faith. What that involved for our Lord's body is beyond our comprehension; terms such as sublimation or etherealization are little more than symbols of our ignorance and wonder. The claim of faith is that the Lord passed at the resurrection into a new and more glorious mode of being, involving every essential element of His manhood. And so far as historical evidence can certify such a fact, we may say that the testimony of the writers of the New Testament is clear, convincing, and sufficient.

Bibliography

(*a*) **Literary Criticism**: Besides the standard books of Hawkins, Sanday, Burkitt, etc., on the Synoptic problem, Streeter's *The Four Gospels* is especially important; also A. M. Perry, *The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*; and Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*. (*b*) **Historical Criticism**: Schmiedel's article 'Resurrection,' in *E.B.* contains what is still probably the most formidable presentation of the advanced critical position. See also Kirsopp Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*; and Gardner-Smith, *The Narratives of the Resurrection*. (Notes by the same author in *J.T.S.*, April and July, 1926, should be read in connexion with this.) On the orthodox side, the principal English

studies are those by James Orr, *The Resurrection of Christ*; W. Milligan, *The Resurrection*; W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*; and J. M. Shaw, *The Resurrection of Christ*. The resurrection was also the subject of separate essays in *Foundations* (Streeter) and *Essays Catholic and Critical* (E. G. Selwyn). The late Fr. R. M. Benson's *The Life Beyond the Grave* contains a profound contribution to the interpretation of the resurrection.

APPENDED NOTE

By Charles Gore

I. On the Ascension: and II. On the Implications of the Resurrection

I

All the narratives of the resurrection imply that our Lord's body had passed into a condition new to human experience. It appears that He passed out of the grave-clothes, leaving them to collapse (Latham's *Risen Master*, i); and passed out of the tomb before it was opened to give access to the disciples; and manifested Himself in different 'forms' to different persons (the clothing of the human form being doubtless part of the manifestation). We learn that He could even 'eat' and 'drink' with His disciples, and submit Himself to be handled as having 'flesh and bones.' But these manifestations we should also gather were (what may be called) condescensions for evidential purposes. He was not living anywhere as at Jerusalem or in Galilee so that He could be found there. He had no need to walk from place to place. He had passed into a higher mode of being out of which He 'appeared' in whatever form He willed, superior to all obstacles, and into which He disappeared again. Here we are presented with a mode of being on which St. Paul presumably bases his distinction between the mortal and corruptible body of man as he now is and the 'spiritual' body of the resurrection.

Now the last of our Lord's appearances is that described at length by St. Luke in Ac 1 [6-11], when before the eyes of the disciples He 'ascended up where he was before,' and a cloud, probably the cloud of the divine presence which we hear of in the Old Testament, received Him out of their sight. After that there were no more appearances on earth. Christ is described as 'in heaven' or 'in the heavenlies,' whence He manifests Himself to St. Stephen and to St. Paul in a blaze of glory; and St. Paul speaks of 'the body of his glory' (Phil 3 [21]), while he also describes Him as 'quickening spirit' (1 Cor 15 [45]). The ascension was an incident real and objective in the same sense as the other appearances, and having the same sort of evidential purpose; that is, it signified under the intelligible symbolism of physical elevation that 'the man Jesus,' whom the disciples had known on earth, was exalted into the heaven of divine sovereignty or to the 'right hand of God'—the incidents having been really seen, though the things represented ('ascent into heaven' and 'the right hand of God') are realities which under our present conditions of experience can only be represented to us symbolically. But the questions arise in our minds: Did the ascension represent any change of state to Christ Himself in His own consciousness? Was there to Him any distinction between His risen or His ascended state, such as seems to be suggested in Jn 20 [17]? Was He not during the forty days already in heaven? To the disciples the ascension was no doubt an event at a particular moment, and is so alluded to in Jn 6 [62]; Eph 1 [20], 2 [6], 4 [8]; 1 Tim 3 [16]. The lesson which it taught was a lesson allied to that taught by the earlier appearances, but a distinct lesson. But as to whether there was any change of state to our Lord's own consciousness, as to whether there was for Him any middle state between mortality and glory, we had better confess that we know nothing. A large element of agnosticism as to questions which have no practical bearing on human redemption seems to belong to our deepest wisdom.

II

The fact of the resurrection of our Lord suggests ideas about the destiny of 'matter,' as at last to become the absolute vehicle of spirit and no longer any hindrance to its free activity, such as obviously lie outside our present experience, but which the modern analysis of 'matter' should surely prevent us from describing as impossible or absurd. (The New Testament, we should observe, never uses the term 'matter' except in the sense of 'wood,' and never concerns itself with the metaphysical question of the relation of mind to matter or spirit to body. Nor is there any careful consistency either in St. Paul's or St. John's use of the terms 'spirit' and 'flesh.' Christ is called by St. Paul 'quickening spirit,' while elsewhere it is stated or plainly implied that He has a spiritual body or body of glory. St. John represents our Lord as speaking of His 'flesh and blood' as the spiritual food of the future, pointing forward to

His own ascension, and in the same breath disparaging 'flesh.' And in 2 Jn [7] he appears to speak of Christ as still 'coming' in flesh. Nevertheless, we think they convey their meaning sufficiently plainly if we do not expect of them a meticulous use of words.) We do not think it is our business in this commentary to deal at large with the relation of the Christian faith to philosophy or science. But some observations should be made as to the bearings of the Christian postulates upon these enquiries.

Acceptance of the bodily resurrection of Jesus is in the last resort an act of faith —of faith based (at least for reflective and speculative minds) upon philosophical as well as religious and evidential grounds. The philosophic mind demands 'coherence,' and hesitates to admit into its system of beliefs an event which is not only unparalleled, but also in the metaphysical sense unique, unless it can be shown to cohere closely and naturally with some general theory of the meaning and purpose of the universe, which approves itself to the speculative intellect as rational and credible. The Church has always claimed for the basic doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus that it possesses not only religious but also metaphysical value, as throwing light not merely upon the destiny of man but also upon the destiny of the material universe, and its relation to spirit.

Already in the Pauline theology the resurrection of the Lord is not only perceived to involve the resurrection of the members of His body (Rom 6 [5]; Col 2 [12-13], 3 [1-2]; it is in fact called 'the resurrection of the dead' [plural] in Rom 1 [4]), but is also treated as *a cosmic event*—an event which possesses eschatological as well as historical significance, for it is an earnest and anticipation of the future glorification of the whole universe. St. Paul teaches that at the general resurrection the world of nature, which at present is subject to 'vanity' (i.e. futility), will be delivered and glorified together with redeemed humanity. 'The creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God' (Rom 8 [18] ff.). Both here and elsewhere the Apostle asserts or implies a series of positions which the Church defended as fundamental in its conflict with Gnosticism, and which exercised a profound influence upon the entire development of Christian thought. They are briefly these: (1) That material nature, in spite of its present subjection to 'vanity,' is originally and fundamentally 'good,' not evil; (2) that matter and spirit are not antagonistic but complementary; (3) that the human body, as well as the human spirit and soul, is the subject of Christ's 'redemption' (Rom 8 [23]), and in consequence shares the same eternal destiny; (4) that at the resurrection the entire physical universe will be perfected and glorified, and will become a suitable environment for redeemed humanity. (5) It is important also to observe that neither St. Paul nor any other writer of the New Testament leads us (like some of the Jewish apocalypses under Oriental influences) to believe that at the Last Day the present universe will be annihilated and its place taken by an entirely new one; they maintain the position of the old prophets that 'the new heavens and new earth' will be the old ones transfigured and transformed. All this coheres with the teaching about Christ's resurrection—that He rose, not merely from Hades, but from the tomb (1 Cor 15 [4]: cf. Ac 13 [34-37]), His 'natural' body of terrestrial 'flesh and blood' having been 'changed' into a 'spiritual,' 'celestial,' and 'glorious' body, yet still retaining its identity.

Thus when Christianity went out into a Hellenistic world deeply possessed with a sense of 'matter' and 'body' as evil or as the cause of defilement to the soul, and of death as the liberation of the soul from its material prison-house for ever, it carried with it the grounds of a deep antagonism. The hostile position very soon confronted it in the organized movements of Docetism and of the multifarious Gnostic schools. The beginning of this antagonism we discern already in the New Testament. Christianity was keen to assimilate both the ideas and the terms of Hellenistic philosophy to express its own ideas: but at the same time it was forced carefully to guard and vigorously to assert its own distinctive message—especially as to all creation being good and destined for a glorious future, and in particular as to the resurrection of the body both in our Lord's case and in that of mankind in general. We do not think it is our business to pursue the history of this antagonism: we will content ourselves with presenting only one specimen of the Christian contention—from Irenæus (A.D. 180) in his controversy with the Gnostics who maintained the future annihilation of the material universe as something radically evil: 'The *substance* (*hypostasis*) and (?) *material* (*ousia*) of the universe will not vanish away, for He who created

it is true and steadfast. But the *fashion* (*schema*) of this world passeth away, that is in those respects in which sin has taken place. And when this "fashion" has passed away, and man is remade and has reached his climax in incorruptibility, then there shall be the new heaven and the new earth, in which new things man shall abide ever new and conversant with God' (*Hær.*, v, 36).

Enough perhaps has been said to indicate that Christianity showed itself from the first resolutely opposed to any depreciation of matter or the body or nature as evil in itself, and resolutely insistent on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body as distinguished from the Greek idea of the immortality of the bare soul, and found the grounds of its belief and action in the corporal resurrection of Christ.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF OUR LORD

By Charles Gore

That Jesus Christ was conceived in the womb of His mother Mary by the empowering action of the life-giving Spirit of God without the intervention of her already espoused husband—which means that His entry into our world, like His manner of leaving it, was accompanied by a miraculous act of God—has been an article of the Church's creed both in East and West from subapostolic days (see below): but that this was so, as a fact of history, has been very widely denied or doubted in recent years, and the question demands frank examination.

I

The Virgin Birth was certainly not part of the original apostolic message. It was not among the grounds on which original belief in Jesus was claimed. Belief in Him as the Christ, as Lord, and as Son of God was claimed by the original Apostles on the ground of what they had themselves seen and heard during their experience extending over 'all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto the day when he was received up from us' (Ac 1 [21-22]). (It was claimed also on the ground of their subsequent experience of the Holy Spirit and on the ground of ancient prophecy, but of nothing else.) St. Mark's Gospel consists mainly, as we have very strong reason to believe, of St. Peter's personal account of this experience (the conclusion, however, being lost—see above, p. 122). The 4th Gospel, again, professes to be a personal witness (cf. 1 Jn 1[1]), and that the witness of 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' (Jn 21 [20, 24]), and I think we must agree with Eduard Meyer (*Ursprung*, i, 314) that the writer intends us to understand him to be John the son of Zebedee. Thus the historical record of both these Gospels is kept within the limit of the apostolic experience as defined by Peter in the Acts. This limit excluded any account of our Lord's birth or childhood. If our Lord was in fact born at Bethlehem in a marvellous manner, and if He Himself was conscious of it (as to which Lk 2 [49] is not decisive), certainly He never called attention to it by speaking about Bethlehem or visiting it (see above, p. 280). If therefore there was a divine providence presiding over the incidents of our Lord's appearance in the world, certainly we must judge that it was God's intention that His first disciples should come to believe in Him in virtue only of what they saw in Him or heard from Him, and that their converts' faith should be based on the word of those whom He specially trained and inspired to be His witnesses.

It has, however, been noticed that St. Mark's Gospel contains none of the references to Joseph as the father of Jesus which occur in the other Gospels where the Virgin Birth is either related or referred to. Where Matthew reads 'the carpenter's son,' Mark has 'the carpenter' (Mt 13 [55]; Mk 6 [3]): but it does violence to the general evidence of the relation of the 1st Gospel to the 2nd to suggest that the 1st contains the original expression which the 2nd alters. The alteration is probably of the 2nd by the 1st from a motive of reverence. As to St. John's Gospel, important early Fathers read the text of Jn 1 [13] as beginning 'who was born' instead of 'which were born' (see above *in loc.*). The text then literally translated runs 'who was born not of bloods, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of a man (i.e. a male or husband), but of God.' This would be an exact description of

the birth of our Lord as recorded in St. Matthew and St. Luke—not of the mixture of human seeds, nor of natural human desire, nor by the act of a husband, but by the act of God. But it is not probable that the reading of these Fathers is to be preferred to that of the MSS. It must, however, be acknowledged that the phrase, as read in our texts, is not at all a natural description of the regeneration of those who through Christ have become sons of God. What seems to be almost certain is that St. John describes it in terms which are only really applicable to that on which our regeneration depends, namely the birth of Him who was 'the Word . . . made flesh.' St. John, we should conclude—writing as he did some twenty years at least after St. Luke's Gospel had published to the world the Virgin Birth of the Lord—shows that he recognized it. Also there is, as many good scholars perceive, a fairly plain instance of irony in the mention (Jn 7^{42}) of the Jewish objection, 'Hath not the Scripture said that the Christ cometh of the seed of David *and from Bethlehem*?' If it may thus be taken for granted that the 4th Gospel bears witness to, though it does not narrate, the miraculous birth, and if that Gospel really conveys to us the witness of 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' then we must remember that to this disciple the dying Lord committed His mother. He became her son. And the testimony of the 4th Gospel would, like that of St. Luke, naturally run back to Mary herself.

St. Paul claims to be an Apostle because of something in his own experience—Jesus had appeared to him (1 Cor 9^{1}). He had derived his apostolate 'neither from men nor through man' (Gal 1^{1}). But after his conversion he had received the already formulated witness of the Twelve as to certain parts of their experience of Jesus, which he made it his business to hand on to the churches which he founded (1 Cor 15^{1-8} and ^{11}, 11^{23}). Neither the revelation to himself, however, nor the apostolic witness had apparently any reference to the circumstances of our Lord's birth. St. Paul says only that He was born of a woman, as a Jew, of the seed of David. The structure of St. Paul's theology certainly did not have the Virgin Birth as part of its foundation. We cannot dogmatize as to whether he knew it even at the end of his life. He certainly never alludes to it. The same is true of all the other New Testament writers—unless, indeed, as the present writer thinks not improbable, Rev 12^{4} refers to the danger to which the Holy Child was exposed at His birth, implying knowledge of Mt 2^{13} ff. Certainly the faith of the world in Jesus as the Christ and the Son of God was to rest on nothing else than the personal testimony of the 'chosen witnesses' coupled with the witness of the Hebrew scriptures to 'him who was to come.' This does not necessarily mean that the writers of the New Testament did not know anything about His birth. The argument from silence is very precarious. But certainly there is no sign of such knowledge anywhere except in St. Matthew, St. Luke, and (we must certainly add) St. John.

II

But when men had believed, whether Jews or Gentiles, they must have wanted to know about the birth of their Lord. And when St. Luke issued his Gospel he had the full story to tell them, and the last words of his preface, 'the things wherein thou wast instructed,' would not suggest that it would be substantially a new story to Theophilus. There is not any real evidence justifying the supposition that this Gospel was ever issued without the first two chapters (1^{5}–2^{52}), or that the careful statement of the preface, 'having traced the course of all things accurately from the first,' does not refer inclusively to these chapters. Now recent investigation has in many ways vindicated St. Luke's claim to trustworthiness as a historian. This does not mean that he is infallible. For instance, it may be that we should accept Tertullian's suggestion that Saturninus should have been substituted for Quirinius in 2^{2}. But the possibility of the 'first enrolment' postulated by Luke as the cause of Joseph's visit to Bethlehem has been vindicated, and the manner of the enrolment, as at the subject's place of origin, has been curiously confirmed (see on Lk 2^{1-3}). Nor can we fail to see whence St. Luke could have got his information concerning the birth. The story reads like a woman's story, as has been often remarked. St. Luke shows a special interest in the group of women, some of whom accompanied the Lord in His ministry, and were witnesses of the Passion, and saw Him after His resurrection. He specially mentions them as associated with the apostolic band in the first days at Jerusalem, and as having 'Mary the mother of Jesus' in their company. It is something more than a conjecture that St. Luke got his information about the birth of Jesus from this company or one of them

—possibly from Mary herself. Whether he put the story into his own words, or received an Aramaic document which he translated and incorporated in his own work, need not be decided. It should be noted that the striking contrast in style between St. Luke's preface and the narrative which follows should not be made too much of in favour of the hypothesis of an Aramaic document. For the preface, like St. John's preface, was very likely written last, and in general we see two influences at work upon St. Luke affecting his style—the influence of ordinary Greek literature and the influence of the LXX. The opening narrative of his Gospel is markedly in the style of the LXX.

Mary, according to St. Luke, kept her secret close (2 [19, 51]), but she could not have failed to secure its preservation before she died—partly because of its intrinsic importance, partly as a safeguard against scandal. It is possible that Jn 8 [41] is meant to imply that the slander current later among the Jews was already afloat; and it is almost certain that the insertion of the names of only four women—Tamar, Rahab, Ruth the Moabitess, and the wife of Uriah—in the genealogy in Matthew, drawn up probably before anything was known of the Virgin Birth of Jesus, was meant to show that there might be blots even on the scutcheon of the Christ. What other motive can be suggested? Certainly if Mary had a sacred secret preserved in her heart, she must have taken care that it should not perish at her death.

Thus we can venture to say that if St. Luke was at all true to the claims of his preface, the record of his first two chapters must rest upon Mary's word mediately or immediately. We may make what we will of the three angelic appearances occurring in these chapters without affecting the main issue. Again we may suppose that either St. Luke, or one whose document he incorporates, after the manner of ancient historians put the feelings or utterances of Zachariah and Mary and Simeon into the lovely poems which the narrative contains: but the heart of the record is in Mary's experience. It seems to some of us self-evidencing in its divine simplicity, altogether surpassing what could be ascribed to the inventive powers of the primitive Christian community. At the least no critic has the right to put the narrative of Luke aside as if it were not an impressive piece of evidence. Two features of it need specially to be noted. First that it contains no suggestion of anything more than that the child to be born was to be the promised Christ. 'Son of the highest' and 'Son of God' (Lk 1 [32, 35]) would not in the context suggest anything more to Jewish ears. And this is all the substance of the message to the shepherds (2 [11]) and the disclosure to Simeon (2 [26]). The story then was certainly no *product* of the faith in the divine incarnation as St. Paul and St. John proclaimed it. The other feature to be noticed is that the expectations associated with the birth (1 [32, 33] and Zachariah's and Simeon's songs) are such as could hardly have taken such jubilant shape after the tragedy of the actual rejection of the Christ by Israel. The warnings of 2 [34, 35] would then surely have taken a different tone.

Finally there is not any ground for the suggestion that we have not St. Luke's original text before us (see notes on 1 [34, 35] and 3 [23], and cf. Lowther Clarke in *Theol.*, August, 1926, p. 87).

III

Now we turn to the Birth-narrative in the 1st Gospel (1 and 2). As to the relative dates of the 1st and 3rd Gospels we can make no statement with any confidence. But it is quite evident that the two narratives of the birth must be pronounced wholly independent. They are not strictly contradictory. They admit fairly easily of being fitted into one another. But they are wholly independent. Matthew could hardly have written 2 [23] if he had read Lk 2 [4]; or Lk 2 [39] if he had read Mt 2. And the first point that strikes us is that if St. Luke's story is from the point of view of the mother, Matthew's is wholly from the point of view of Joseph. *If* it be true that Jesus was thus conceived under circumstances calculated to arouse Joseph's suspicions, and *if* that 'just man' had his suspicions allayed by the communication to him of an extraordinary fact, everyone must admit that he would have wished to leave some testimony to clear his wife's character in the event of his death. And the story in Mt 1 and 2 has all the appearance of being based on such a testimony. It is markedly Joseph's story—his suspicion, his intention, the intimation he received, his action to protect the mother and child, the later guidance given to him, and his later measures of precaution.

We cannot, however, if we pay attention to principles of sound criticism, attribute the same value to the unsup-

ported testimony of the 1st Gospel as we can to St. Luke's. The 1st Gospel may very probably be based upon St. Matthew's 'Hebrew' collection of 'oracles,' but as it stands the Greek book cannot be St. Matthew's work; and there are features in it which we justly suspect to be more or less legendary, although the great bulk of it is strictly historical. What may be said with some confidence is that here in these first chapters we have a document recording Joseph's experiences which has been worked over by an author whose predominant interest was to find prophecies in the Hebrew scriptures of all that actually occurred to Jesus the Christ. The 'prophecies' referred to in Mt 2 [18] and [23] are not in the least likely to have suggested the occurrence to which they are related. The same cannot be said of that quoted in 2 [5]. The Jews already expected Christ to be born in Bethlehem (Jn 7 [43]). Also the translation of the Hebrew word *almah* (young woman) in Isaiah's prophecy by the Greek word for 'virgin' in the Greek Bible might have produced an expectation among Greek-speaking Jews that the Christ should be born of one who was still a virgin; but there is no evidence that it ever did so prior to the time when the news went abroad among the new believers that Jesus had so been born. All things considered, the present writer would not be disposed to attach a great deal of importance to the story in the 1st Gospel if it stood alone. Its value lies in the fact that in spite of its complete independence of St. Luke's narrative it agrees with it on the fundamental point of the virginal conception of Jesus, and that the story of His birth and infancy is told, so noticeably, from the side of Joseph. Incidentally it should be remarked that though it would be pedantic to refuse to use the current phrase 'the Virgin Birth,' all that is recorded in the Gospels is a virginal *conception*. There is nothing to suggest that the actual birth was not normal, though later legend affirmed that also.

IV

A difficulty urged from very early days against the general historicity of the two narratives has been the occurrence of the two contradictory genealogies of Mt 1 and Lk 3. To-day, however, this difficulty is not serious. (1) There was not in St. Paul's mind—who was a well-trained Jew—any doubt about the fact that Jesus was born of the seed of David (Rom 1 [3]). Moreover, Heb 7 [14] implies that it was not disputed. (2) Zech 12 [12], occurring in a very late document (see n. *in loc.*), bears witness to the existence, centuries after the Return, of a group of male descendants of David recognized in Israel, whose posterity would doubtless have been solicitous to trace back and preserve their genealogies, no doubt with great liability to mistake; and the two genealogies—both genealogies of *Joseph*—adopted by the two evangelists may well have been based upon traditions or documents existing in different parts of the group reckoned as of the family of David. They would probably have been drawn up before any question had arisen about Jesus being really Joseph's proper son. (3) It was necessary to show that Jesus was, according to Jewish reckoning, really the son of David, but the Jewish reckoning was largely putative or artificial. Thus, where a man died childless, his brother could take his widow, and, if he had a son, that son would be reckoned in law not to belong to the real father but to his deceased brother. So also, if the narratives of the nativity are true, a child born to Mary after her betrothal to Joseph, and by him acknowledged, would have been legally Joseph's son. 'The genealogy,' says Dr. Burkitt, 'presents the legal rather than the physical descent. Our Lord was the legal son of Joseph, and became so by the fact that Joseph took Mary as his wife before she had brought forth her firstborn son' (Taylor, *The Virgin Birth*, quoting Burkitt. I make the statement on their authority). The point of the genealogies is, then, that Jesus was, though not physically, yet really by Jewish reckoning, 'the son of Joseph.' Thus frequently in all the three Gospels, which either explicitly narrate or imply (St. John) our Lord's birth of a virgin, Joseph is still spoken of as His 'father.' It is through Joseph, not through Mary, that Jesus is the son of David in their eyes. And they suffer the phrases to remain, while their precise narratives guard the sense in which they would have us understand them.

V

Again it has been objected that mankind has been constantly prone to invent miraculous incidents in connexion with the births of their heroes. This is true, and there are a few incidents in the Old Testament connected with the births of heroes where we may see the tendency at work. But there is nothing in Jewish traditions of national heroes like a birth

of a virgin, and nothing in Jewish expectations of the Messiah to suggest that He should so be born. However we may account for the fact that *almah* (young woman) in Is 7 [14] had been translated by *parthenos* (virgin) in the Greek Bible, there is no reason to believe that it had excited any such expectation among Greek-speaking Jews. Of course, there were abundant stories, in the Eastern, Egyptian, or Greek heathen worlds, of women becoming pregnant by gods or semi-divine beings: but Gen 6 [1-8] is the only trace of such a myth among the Jews, and that associated the idea only with what was most impious. Dr. Lowther Clarke (see above, p. 317) has dealt exhaustively with these stories. No doubt even the myths of paganism may express a deep human instinct or aspiration, which may have something of divine purpose in it, and what the heathen had dreamed may find divine fulfilment. But in fact Harnack's conclusion appears to be true: 'The conjecture that the idea of a birth from a virgin is a heathen myth which was received by Christians contradicts the entire earliest developments of Christian tradition.'

VI

To summarize the historical evidence for the Virginal Conception of our Lord—we can see that there was a good reason why (supposing it to have been a fact) it should not have been part of the original message of the Apostles or of the grounds on which faith in Jesus was claimed. We may add that still it ought not to be placed among the *grounds* of faith. Also it is easily intelligible why Mary and Joseph so long as they were alive should have kept their secret close, if they had a secret. But it is unlikely that they should not have taken steps to leave the true events on record, if such divine events there were. Further, we have found that there is good reason to believe that St. Luke's narrative of the birth rests on the testimony of Mary conveyed perhaps through the circle of 'the women,' while there is some rather striking internal evidence in St. Matthew's quite independent account that it rests on Joseph's story. The narratives are the more credible because they are inconsistent with the idea that it was the belief in Jesus as the Incarnate Son of God which *produced* this conviction of the Virgin Birth. There was clearly no such dogmatic interest at work. The interest which the narratives presuppose is only in the arrival of the expected Christ, and that had never been associated in Jewish belief with anything else than a natural birth in the family of David.

Exactly whence and when and how the story of the Conception and Birth of Jesus became known we cannot tell. If the 1st and 3rd Gospels gave the news first—which is improbable—yet the dates of these Gospels cannot be exactly fixed to general satisfaction. What we can say is that the Virgin Conception of our Lord, as stated in these Gospels, was at once welcomed for truth, and from the beginning of the 2nd century appears as a leading clause in the earliest credal statements of East and West. In St. Ignatius's striking words (*c.* A.D. 110): 'The virginity of Mary and her childbearing, and in like manner the death of the Lord [I think he means the atoning value of His death—"on our behalf," as he suggests elsewhere], are three mysteries of loud proclamation which were wrought in the silence of God.' Ignatius already shows the signs of the credal formulation of the chief moments of our Lord's life, and they are His birth of the Virgin, His Passion, His resurrection. The Christian philosophers Aristides and Justin Martyr, whose lives cover the first half of the 2nd century, bear the same witness. So do the newly recovered Odes of Solomon. We cannot but concur in Dr. Rendel Harris's conclusion: 'Everything we know of the dogmatics of the early part of the 2nd century agrees with the belief that at that period the virginity of Mary was a part of the formulated Christian belief' (*Apol. of Aristides*, 25). And there are not discoverable any believers in the Incarnation—that is that Jesus was the eternal Word or Son of God made flesh—who were not also believers in the Virgin Birth. Those who rejected it were Cerinthus and some of those known as Ebionites, who believed that Jesus was originally a mere man upon whom the divine Spirit descended at His baptism and made Him the Christ. The true idea of the Incarnation and the fact of the Virgin Birth appear in early Church history as indiscerptible.

VII

What are we to say as to this? We may well deny the right of the human reason to pronounce the judgement that an Incarnation of God in humanity could not have happened otherwise. We must remember that the structure of the doctrine of the Incarnation was first built by St. Paul, who shows no knowledge of the Virgin Birth. But plainly the idea that

Jesus is really the Son of God in our nature is deeply congruous with the asserted fact, and has in history made men ready to believe it. Again the idea, into which St. Paul throws his whole weight, of Jesus as the New Man, sinless in the midst of the universal sinfulness of humanity, and the only source of the new manhood of the sons of God, is an idea profoundly congruous with belief in the fact. What was needed was a fresh start for humanity. God gave it that fresh start in Jesus, the Redeemer. He was true man, but new man. As new man He appeared wholly free from the knowledge and taint of sin. He was the new creation of God—in continuity with the old, for it was the common flesh of man that He wore, and the properly human spirit and consciousness through which He acted; but also in respect of His perfection and sinlessness He was in marked discontinuity with it. Anyone who accepts this impression of Jesus as at once truly man but certainly new man, will welcome the asserted fact that in the physical basis of His human life there was not only continuity with the common stock of manhood—in that He derived the substance of His flesh from Mary—but discontinuity also, in that there was a new creative act of the divine Spirit which alone gave the chosen mother the power to conceive and bear her Son.

Of course, those who refuse to believe in any physical miracle under any conditions will not be persuaded. But we may hope that such negative dogmatists are becoming old-fashioned. And the ground on which to meet such thoroughgoing objectors to miracle is the ground of the Gospel records of the life of Jesus, and especially of His resurrection. No one would claim for the virginity of the Lord's conception anything like the strength of evidence which there is for the miracles of the life, or for the resurrection. But if on the evidences of the life, the death, and the resurrection, coupled with all the subsequent experience, reaching down the ages, of spiritual strength and new life manifest in those who have believed—if on such evidences a man gives himself up to believe in Christ, or even is disposed so to do, the idea of the Virginal Conception—the new-creative act of God—will surely appear to him deeply congruous with what he has already believed or is disposed to believe; and granted this disposition, the evidence of the fact supplied by the Gospel narratives will appear firm and sufficient.

Finally it should be noticed that though there appear to be those in England who affirm their whole-hearted belief in the faith of the Catholic Church concerning the Person of Jesus, but deny or doubt the miracle of the birth, it must be said that it is not so on the Continent—nor probably in England generally. I cannot find anything which can justify the belief that the Catholic faith in Jesus, as St. Paul and St. John first taught it, could be maintained apart from the belief in His corporal resurrection, or that the belief in His corporal resurrection is in the least likely to be maintained where the belief in His Virgin Birth is denied. Within living memory in England, as well as on the Continent, it has appeared that disbelief in the virginity of our Lord's conception is found to carry with it in the long run disbelief in the corporal resurrection also. Individuals may stand, no doubt, in mental positions on which man in general could find no permanent resting-place. It is not for their fellows to judge them. But it is for the Church to maintain the witness of the fact as at once the explanation and the safeguard of the idea.

[For fuller treatment of this subject see Box's *Virgin Birth of Jesus*, and Lowther Clarke's article referred to above; also Ramsay's *Was Jesus Born at Bethlehem?* For the kind of reasoning against which the above article is directed reference may be made to Lobstein's *Virgin Birth of Christ*, and for a verdict of 'not proven' Vincent Taylor's *Virgin Birth*.]

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

By E. J. Bicknell

Authorship.—The Gospel of St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, at least in their present form, come from the pen of one and the same author. This is proved by identity both of style and language, by the dedication to Theophilus and the clear reference back in the Acts to the previous treatise, and by the general character and outlook of both books.

The tradition of the Church unanimously assigns them to Luke, whom St. Paul, according to the most probable

rendering, calls '*my dear doctor*' (Col 4 [14]). This is definitely stated by the Muratorian Canon, a list of books accepted by the Church of Rome before the close of the 2nd century; by Irenæus (180), who was in touch with Gaul, Asia Minor, and Rome; by Clement of Alexandria (180); by Tertullian (180), representing the Church of North Africa; and by many later writers. Justin Martyr (150) quotes from the Gospel, and classes it among the 'Memoirs drawn up by the Apostles of Christ and those who followed them.' The heretic Marcion (140) used a mutilated version of the Gospel, but rejected Acts as out of harmony with his peculiar views. The preface shows that the Gospel was not intended to be anonymous. As in the case of secular historians, the author's name would be given on a title attached to the roll. Tradition has preserved it.

Any examination of the internal evidence for the authorship must start from the 'we-passages' in the Acts. Certain sections are written in the first person plural (16 [10-17], 20 [5]-21 [18], 27 [1]-28 [16]. The Bezan Text [p. 327] includes also 11 [28]). They have every appearance of being extracts from a travel-diary, and most critics agree that the vividness and accuracy of their narrative go to prove that they come from an eye-witness. If we work out from the Epistles who of St. Paul's known companions were with him during the periods covered by the we-passages, and were absent in between, they suit only Luke and Titus. The latter may be set aside without hesitation, though it is an unsolved problem why he is never mentioned in the Acts, unless, indeed, 2 Cor 8 [18] refers to Luke, and 'the brother' means the brother of Titus, which would explain Luke's unwillingness to put him forward. On the other hand, the mention of Aristarchus three times in Acts fits in with the naming of him side by side with Luke twice in the Epistles. Thus independent evidence strongly supports tradition.

But the question still remains whether the author of the travel-diary is the author of the rest of the Acts and of the Gospel. A close examination of the language shows that either the diary and the rest of the book come from the same pen, or else that the final editor has worked over the diary so thoroughly that its original style has been quite obliterated (see Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, 182 ff., and Harnack, *Luke the Physician*, ii). Of these two alternatives the former is far the more probable. There is no reason to doubt that the author, who is no clumsy or careless compiler, but a literary artist, is doing what several secular historians of antiquity have done (e.g. Velleius Paterculus, Dio Cassius, Arrian, and Herodian), and deliberately allowing the first person to stand, so as to convey the information that in these passages he is giving first-hand evidence of scenes at which he himself was present. If he is making a false claim, why limit it to these passages?

An argument has often been drawn in favour of the authorship of Luke from the use of medical terms in both books. This argument has now been shown to be precarious. Many of the terms turn out on examination not to be medical at all. Further, an equal proportion of such terms are to be found in writers who certainly were not doctors, such as Josephus and Lucian (see Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke*, Harvard Theological Studies). At the same time the language is fully consistent with medical authorship, and Ac 28 [9,10] suggests that the writer had a share in the honour because he had had a share in the treatment. (RV 'healed' would be more accurately rendered *treated*.)

Another point is of importance. The discoveries of archæology made during recent years have in a most surprising manner vindicated the accuracy both of Acts and of the Gospel. On all sorts of little points connected with the names both of persons and places the author has used a most careful discrimination. He gets the titles of the magistrates in the various cities right. He is most precise in mentioning the boundaries of the various provinces and districts. Nowhere can he be convicted of a mistake. On many points on which he used to be supposed to be in error he has now been proved to be correct. It may be said that archæology has for ever disproved the possibility of dating Acts in the middle of the 2nd century, as was done confidently by a former school of critics. Acts reflects the conditions which prevailed during the first century and then passed away. This trustworthiness in matters of detail supports the view that the writer was largely an eye-witness, and leads us to rely on him where his statements cannot be tested. (For the evidence of archæology see the writings of Sir William Ramsay, especially *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, *The New Testament in the Light of Recent Research*, and *Luke the Physician*.)

The objection is sometimes made that Acts is in hopeless contradiction to

the Epistles of St. Paul, especially in its account of the Council of Jerusalem. This will be considered in detail later. Meanwhile we will only state summarily that an interpretation of the facts can be given which involves no serious discrepancy between the two accounts. There are, no doubt, real differences in detail, due to the different angle from which the subject is approached and to the difference of purpose which animates the two writers. It may be true that Luke smooths over the conflict of opinion over the admission of the Gentiles, which was really more serious than we should gather from his narrative taken alone. On the other hand, we may well exaggerate the relative importance and size of the struggle, merely because a large proportion of early Christian literature which has survived is connected with it. Galatians is a pamphlet issued in the heat of conflict, and under such conditions not even an apostle gives an unbiassed picture of the situation. Moreover, the first Christians did not share our interest in unearthing the details of past scandals. They rightly considered that past divisions might well be allowed to be left in peace. When we allow for the fact that Luke was primarily an evangelist, interested in the spread of the Gospel rather than in passing phases of controversy and seeking to give an account of Christianity which would commend it to Theophilus, we find nothing in his record inconsistent with its composition by a companion of Paul. Alleged discrepancies on other points will be dealt with in the notes. It is strange at first sight that he makes no use of Paul's Epistles. But we should remember that Paul may not have kept copies: at this period they were regarded as no more than occasional documents. Such a neglect of their evidence is far more intelligible at an early date than a late, and in one who was a companion of Paul than in one who was not. The latter would be on the look-out for such sources of information; the former would trust to memories of personal intercourse.

Nor must we pass over the very considerable amount of correspondence between the Epistles and Acts, the more impressive because it is indirect and incidental. In Ac 19[21] compared with Rom 1[13] and 15[23-25] we find a striking coincidence. So, too, the names of the minor characters agree, with sufficient variation to prove that their mention is independent. We shall see also various points on which Gal and 1 and 2 Thess confirm Acts. The most remarkable is the cross-correspondence between Acts and the Epistles on the subject of the collection for the saints. The references are plainly independent, but supplement one another in a way that is quite remarkable (see Emmet in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. ii; Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* is still of value). The author plainly knew Paul personally. No one has ever succeeded in drawing a convincing picture of him from his letters alone. Acts supplies the needed factor, a portrayal by an eye-witness supplementing yet harmonizing with the data of the Epistles.

Purpose and Plan.—In considering the subject of the book we must insist that in the author's plan the Gospel and Acts form one continuous whole. Some argue from the abrupt termination of Acts and the use of 'first' instead of 'former' in Ac 1[1], that he contemplated a third volume. This is possible, but the positive arguments in its favour are weak. The manner of ending can be sufficiently explained on other lines, and Luke elsewhere uses 'first' as applied to two things, while he never uses 'former.' Confining ourselves, then, to the two volumes that we possess, we must regard them as a single composition, and the preface to the Gospel as covering both parts. The title added later, '*Acts of Apostles*,' only roughly and superficially describes the real character of the second part. We miss the point unless we realize that the true protagonist throughout Acts is still Jesus Christ. The Gospel describes what He 'began to do and teach' in His earthly ministry; the Acts describes what He continued to do and to teach through His Church inspired by the Spirit whom He sent (1[1-2]). It is true that in the first half of the book the visible hero on the earthly stage is the Church, or perhaps its leader, Peter, and in the second half Paul, but behind them in all their activity stands the unseen figure of the living Christ directing and empowering them through the Spirit. The problem that faced Luke was to give a coherent picture of the spread of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome, so as to present it as the extension of the rule of Christ on earth, until it is firmly planted in the very centre of the Roman Empire (cf. 1[8]). Out of an immense amount of available material he has selected and arranged what he needed for this purpose. His aim is not simply to record but to interpret facts. He shows that behind the march of earthly events there can be seen the guidance of the ascended Christ. His point of view is frankly supernatural. Not only does his

narrative include frequent miracles, but the daily life both of the community and of individuals is full of the working of the Spirit. The Christian, as in the Pauline Epistles, is first and foremost one who is possessed and controlled by the Spirit of Jesus. The Church is in literal truth His body, though the metaphor is not actually employed in Acts. Everywhere his idea of the Church is that of a visible organized society, owing its existence, as did Israel of old, directly to the creative act of God. Men are called into the Church. They do not form it, as a human society is formed, by coming together. So too the Apostles owe their authority to divine appointment. Even critics who disbelieve in the historical accuracy of the book admit that their position appears as unique and unchallenged. The almost illimitable authority which St. Paul claims for himself as an Apostle in dealing with the affairs of the Church of Corinth is anticipated from the first. Again the regular use of sacramental means of grace is indisputable. Baptism and the laying on of hands are not primarily valued as aids to subjective devotion, but as means through which God acts. The ministry is from above, not from below (see on these points the notes on 2^{42-47} and 11^{30}). St. Luke's belief in the Church as a supernatural society cannot be seriously disputed. It is unfair to Luke to judge him by the standards of a scientifically impartial historian of to-day. He is concerned not merely with historical but with religious truth. This does not mean that we are not to use modern critical methods in the endeavour to discover how far he has given us a historically true picture of the origin of Christianity, or to do our best to get back to the sources that he used, since historical truth can only be vindicated by historical methods: but it gives the right point of view from which to approach the work. There are good reasons for holding that on the whole he was a careful and painstaking historian, and has given us a substantially accurate picture of events. For Christians, however, the far more important question is whether his interpretation of the meaning of the Christian Church is the right one. In giving an answer to this our verdict will be determined by other than purely historical considerations.

If this, then, was the primary aim of Luke, to glorify Jesus, for whom did he write in the first instance, and what secondary purposes shaped his narratives? The dedication to Theophilus—whether that was his real name or a symbol of his friendliness to religion, or, possibly, if he was a Christian, a name assumed at baptism—shows that the books were addressed to the educated pagan world. The address 'most excellent' designates him as a Roman official of high rank. The Gospel is plainly intended for Gentile readers. The Acts, too, is written from the standpoint of cultivated society. It presents Christianity as a religion attractive to the civilized world. All through stress is laid upon the compatibility of membership in the Church with loyalty to the empire. The Gospel and Acts make plain that the death of Christ was due to Jewish jealousy. The accusation of being a revolutionary and of heading a rebellion against Cæsar is publicly declared to be groundless both by Pilate and Herod. Pilate wished to acquit him. So in the Acts, when a similar charge is brought against the first missionaries, it is shown to be false, the invention of Jewish malice. The first time that the question of the legality of Christianity is brought up before an imperial as opposed to a local magistrate, namely at Corinth, the verdict is in favour of Christianity (18^{12-17}). So, too, the Asiarchs are shown to be friendly to Paul (19^{31}). When Paul is accused of being a mover of insurrection and a disturber of the peace, both Agrippa and Festus agree that he is innocent (26^{31-32}). In the same way Paul appears as the champion of Greek civilization in conflict with Oriental magic and superstition (13^{6} ff., 19^{18}). Throughout Roman soldiers and officials are represented in a favourable light (e.g. 10^{1}, 27^{3}). From another aspect Luke presents Christianity as a religion that makes an appeal to universal human nature, and that on its best side. This appears not only in the parables peculiar to his Gospel, which give it largely its special character, but also throughout his writings. Cheerfulness, kindness and goodness are the characteristics of the Christian life. We see much of the 'joy and peace in believing.' Just those qualities which the ordinary man appreciates are to be found displayed in the common life of the Christian fellowship. Some of these characteristics are often said to be Pauline, and indeed they are prominent in the Epistles, but that is only because they were typical of primitive Christianity.

Further, this presentation of Christianity is in part a defence against the denunciation of the Jews. Acts has been called the earliest apology for the Church. The enemy throughout is not Jewish

Christianity, but Judaism. As against the Jews it is maintained that Christianity is the true Judaism. Thus it is no new religion. It has its roots far back in the distant past. It enjoys all the prestige and mystery of an ancient faith. On the other hand, though it has sprung out of Judaism and inherited its spiritual treasures, it is clearly distinct from it. It has no share in its nationalism and exclusiveness. The Jewish nation has rejected the true Messiah, sent by God in fulfilment of ancient prophecy, and thus forfeited its claim to be the people of God. Its divinely granted privileges and hopes have now passed to the new Israel, the faithful remnant who have accepted Jesus as Messiah. Membership in the new Israel, the Christian Church, is open to all who will repent and believe. The old particularism is for ever abolished. Christianity is as wide in its outlook as the Roman Empire. If we hold that Acts was published after the fall of Jerusalem, we may see an implicit argument that the destruction of the city was no disproof of the claims of Christianity, but rather the reverse. It was God's judgement on those who had fallen away from His purpose. In short, Luke presents the Christian faith as the religion for all men, involving no disloyalty to the Roman Empire or to civilization.

Date.—For the date of Acts three periods are possible. (1) Some authorities date it about A.D. 64. In support of this view it is argued that the simplest and most natural explanation of the ending of Acts, without any account of the result of Paul's trial before the emperor, is that it had not yet taken place, but he was still in prison. Again, this early date would explain the failure to use the Epistles. Acts also contains much primitive language and thought, though this may be due to his sources rather than to Luke himself. Still, its presence uncorrected suggests an early rather than a late date. We find also various casual reminiscences of names—improbable after many years (e.g. 17^{5}, 19^{33}, 21^{16}, 28^{11}). Against this view it is argued that in Lk 21^{20}, as compared with Mk 13^{14}, the fall of Jerusalem is implied. But the change of language may admit of another explanation, namely that Luke has translated a most obscure Jewish phrase for the benefit of Gentile readers. What he adds is at most only an inevitable detail, and some of his phrases are clearly borrowed from Old Testament prophecies. The entire absence of any other possible hint anywhere else in either book might be used to support the early date. A more serious objection is that this theory demands the placing of the composition of Mark almost impossibly early. While in itself it would leave ample time for the drawing up of the 'many narratives' referred to in Lk 1^{1}, it is difficult to date Mark much before A.D. 65. Some good scholars, however, assign to Mark a considerably earlier date. Others, again, hold that Luke had read Josephus' *Antiquities*, which was first published in A.D. 93. This, as we shall see, is highly disputable.

(2) A second possible date is about A.D. 75. This fits in with all the evidence. In this case we can explain the point at which Luke leaves off by the purpose of the book. He has traced the march of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome, and there leaves Paul preaching it publicly without hindrance. What could form a better climax for his apology? The structure of $28^{30\text{-}31}$, as compared with other passages, suggests that it records the duration and character of Paul's ministry in Rome, and implies that after two years a new ministry began elsewhere. But the aim of the book was not a biography of Paul, but a history of the spread of the Church and of the passing of salvation from the Jews to the Gentiles. In the closing scene this development of God's purpose is reaffirmed. Hence he is content to leave Paul, as he had earlier left Peter, when he had played his part as an instrument in the carrying forward of the divine plan to its goal in Rome. No individual, however important, was of any account beside God's world-purpose. So from his silence about the fate of Paul no inference can be drawn. Doubtless he and his readers knew well what it was.

(3) Those who hold that Luke had read Josephus, or even heard him lecturing at Rome prior to the publication of his book, must date Acts about A.D. 90 or 95. This is not necessarily inconsistent with Lucan authorship, but presents certain difficulties. The later the date, the harder it is to explain the failure to use the Epistles and the retention of so much primitive thought and expression uncorrected. Further, could the tone of friendliness to the empire have survived the persecution of Domitian? Nero's outburst might be assigned to caprice, and was short-lived. This was deliberate and prolonged. The book presupposes the possibility of friendliness between the Church and Roman officials. It would need strong evidence to support

such a late date. Between the two earlier dates we leave the choice open, though we incline to a date about A.D. 75.

Analysis.—There is general agreement that in one sense the book falls into two halves somewhere about 15 [35], though the exact line of division is disputed. In the second half Paul holds the stage.

But perhaps a better division is suggested by the method of composition. As Professor C. H. Turner shows (*H.D.B.*, i, 421), 'The picture is cut up, as it were, into six panels, each labelled with a general summary of progress.'

A. 1 [1]-6 [7]:
The Church in Jerusalem and the preaching of Peter (Summary, 6 [7]).

B. 6 [8]-9 [31]:
Spread of the Church in Palestine; the preaching of Stephen and hostility of the Jews (Summary, 9 [31]).

C. 9 [32]-12 [24]:
Spread of the Church to Antioch; conversion of Cornelius and further persecution by the Jews (Summary, 12 [24]).

D. 12 [25]-16 [5]:
Spread of the Church to Galatia; St. Paul's first missionary tour leading up to the Council of Jerusalem and its decree (Summary, 16 [5]).

E. 16 [6]-19 [20]:
Spread of the Church to Macedonia, Greece, and Asia (Summary, 19 [20]).

F. 19 [20] to end:
Arrival of the Church at Rome and St. Paul's journey as a prisoner (Summary, 28 [31]).

Sources.—In Lk 1 [1] the author claims to have used the best sources available. In the case of Luke one of the chief sources is known. It survives intact, namely Mark. We can observe how Luke uses it. And the observation should make us very cautious in any attempt to reconstruct the sources that underlie Acts. For it is certain that it would have been impossible to have reconstructed anything like Mark by even the most careful scrutiny of Luke. It is true that he has omitted very little. He often rewrites the narrative of Mark, and makes it more artistic, but does not change its general sense. In dealing with the words of Jesus, he keeps even closer to Mark, though at times he interprets them. The probability is that he would treat his sources in Acts along the same lines, though perhaps he would not feel quite the same reverence for the words of the Apostles as for those of the Lord. If we did not possess Mark, even the limits of that source could never have been discovered by any scrutiny of Luke. He is too good an artist to leave exposed the joins of his sources. He tells us what he wishes us to know and no more. A stupid or clumsy writer would have given away far more. We are justified therefore in holding that any attempt to get back to the sources behind Acts can give us no more than more or less probable conjectures (see Burkitt in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ii, 106 ff).

Starting from the first appearance of the we-sections in 16 [10], we conclude that the bulk of the remaining material rests upon the evidence of Luke himself. It is pedantic to limit his eye-witness to those passages only that are actually in the first person. Other passages naturally cohere with them; and if the first person does not appear, that is simply because the subject-matter does not afford the opportunity for its appearance. How could Luke insert it into a speech by Felix or Paul, or into the description of what other people were doing? The information for the period during which he seems to have been separated from Paul could easily have been obtained by word of mouth from Paul or the various companions whom he mentions by name. In certain sections (e.g. 19 [13] ff.) it has been conjectured with more or less probability that he is repeating pieces of local gossip, less trustworthy than the rest of the narrative. Still, all this part has a definite unity. The chronology is fairly well marked. The course of events is traced with something like completeness. It bears the marks of a vivid first-hand record by a contemporary.

When we deal with the earlier chapters the case is very different. In the story of the Church at Jerusalem we get little more than a series of detached pictures of primitive Church life. The chronology is of the vaguest. The sequence of events is often by no means plain. Not till we get to Paul's first missionary tour do we seem to find anything like a consecutive story.

This is in no way surprising. If Luke did not visit Jerusalem till about A.D. 56, much had happened in between, and it would not be easy to construct a full and accurate account of a stage of Church life that had long been left behind. Yet during his visit to Jerusalem, and even more during his long stay at Cæsarea, he would have had the opportunity of conversing with many of the leading actors in the early Church. Philip is the most natural source for much of the information. He

also met Peter and James; and Paul would give him full information about the trial and death of Stephen. Both then and later on he was in close touch with John Mark, whose mother's house was the centre of the life of the earliest Christian community. The account of Peter's escape, which includes the name of the maidservant there, is singularly vivid, and reads like a personal reminiscence. We must also remember the presence of other early disciples, like Mnason, mentioned incidentally in 21 [16]. Further, the absence of Pauline theology in the early speeches is a weighty argument for their accuracy. In short, Luke had every chance of picking up first-hand information about the events of that time, though such may well have been affected by the lapse of years and the passing away of the old conditions.

If we go on to ask whether he used not only oral but written sources, as the preface to Luke suggests, only tentative answers can be given. Many attempts have been made to trace out such written sources, but none have won general acceptance. One of the best known is made by Harnack, who tries to break up the narrative by considering what persons and places are most prominent in its particular sections. Plainly the story of events at Jerusalem must in some sense have originally come from Jerusalem, and the story of events at Cæsarea from Cæsarea, and so on, but this does not go far to prove an original Jerusalem written source, or an independent Cæsarea source. Such methods only lead to definite results if they can demonstrate that change of place or person is accompanied by differences of style or phraseology or outlook. Attempts have been made to show this, but the differences discovered are so minute and subjective that they fail to carry conviction. The case differs from that of the Old Testament, where plain contradictions in the narrative, which point to the use of sources, are reinforced by no less plain differences of style, language, and outlook, so that results have been reached which win general acceptance, at least in their main principles. A result of this attempt to break up Acts into sources would be that it might lead us to regard certain chapters as giving us two parallel accounts of one and the same event, though Luke failed to recognize them as such. It is conceivable that, e.g., the imprisonment of Peter and John in 4 is really the same as that of the Apostles in 5, the two records having come from two independent sources and having been placed side by side. Though we must allow for the possibility of such doublets in the account of the early community at Jerusalem, that need not seriously affect our understanding of its life. It would be more serious if we were to accept the suggestion that the two visits paid by Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, one at the time of the famine (11 [30]) and the other at the time of the Council (15 [2]), were really duplicate traditions of one and the same visit. That would show a grave misunderstanding by Luke of the course of events, and we should be left with only the most shadowy chronology. There are indeed serious difficulties in harmonizing Acts with Paul's own account in Galatians, but they refer to details. It is almost incredible that a constant companion of Paul should have fallen into such a far-reaching error. Therefore, unless all other explanations fail, we may confidently reject such a conjecture. It is only mentioned here to show that it has been considered. So, too, in the commentary we shall assume that even in the earlier chapters the order of events is correct. In any struggle with the authorities incidents repeat themselves in very much the same way: and in the life of any community there is much that is monotonous.

Another important theory, put forward by Professor Torrey (in Harvard Theological Studies), is that the whole of the first part of Acts, down to 15 [35], is a verbatim translation by Luke of a single Aramaic document. In its original form it has not won much approval, but there is widespread agreement that he has drawn attention to facts that have been unduly neglected. There are a few passages which, as they stand in the Greek, are almost impossible to translate. But if they are put back into Aramaic, they become intelligible, and the mistake in translation can be explained. There are also other expressions which suggest Aramaic idioms and constructions. Some of these will be noted in the commentary. Whether they are to be found all over these chapters or only in certain sections, is open to question. Only if they can be proved to occur everywhere must we necessarily suppose a single and continuous document. Otherwise all that we are justified in assuming is the use in particular sections of Aramaic sources. Whether these were put into Greek by Luke himself, or whether he received them already translated is again a question that cannot be answered. But if it can be shown that Aramaic sources underlie his

narratives, it means that they ultimately go back to early sources composed in Palestine and probably in Jerusalem itself.

To sum up, there is every reason to hold that Luke had access to good authorities and traditions. We may expect correct and accurate information. That does not mean that we should judge his aims and methods by those of the scientific historians of our own day. We only claim that his history is as trustworthy as could be expected from a Greek doctor of the 1st century, who took pains to collect the best information available and interpreted it in the light of his own experience of life in the Christian Church. We must allow for the lapse of time between the writing and the actual occurrence of the events: we must also allow for the absence of many facilities of gathering and testing information which we enjoy to-day. But we believe that a detailed study of his narrative will show that it is the record of an honest and painstaking writer.

Lastly, we must face the objection which has been urged that the presence of miracles in his narrative impairs his authority as an historian. We must begin by pointing out that other contemporary historians record miracles, but that this is not usually held to destroy their value. The question, however, goes deeper and raises problems of philosophy and theology. We believe that the God who is revealed in the Bible is a living God who may reasonably be expected to act on special occasions in unusual ways. Whether He has actually done so or not, is a matter of historical evidence. When we turn to the New Testament we find that the miraculous cannot be eliminated from its record. The Gospels have the miraculous woven into the very fibre of their being. The fact of the Incarnation itself involves a direct act of God of a unique and unprecedented kind. Granted that it is unreasonable to exclude miracle from the Gospels, unless, indeed, we are prepared to abandon entirely their historical accuracy, we should expect to find the continuance of miraculous powers in the opening days of the Church. St. Paul bears witness to the presence of such powers in his own experience. There is, therefore, no solid ground for rejecting the evidence of Acts *a priori*. At the same time the evidence for all miracles is not equally good. In days when all men, Jews and heathen alike, expected extraordinary events to accompany religion as evidence of supernatural power, it is possible that some normal happenings may have been mistaken for miracles. Or, again, we to-day may be able to explain certain wonderful happenings that appeared miraculous to men of the 1st century. Every case must be considered on its own merits. All that we insist is that it is unreasonable to distrust Luke because he records miracles. Again, it has been observed that there are fewer miracles in the latter half of Acts, where he is in closer relation to the events recorded. This need not imply that the earlier chapters are less historical. The greater proportion of miracles may well be due to the peculiar conditions of the first days of the Church and to the wider field covered in the narratives.

The Text.—The Uncial MS., D (*Codex Bezæ*), which contains the greater part of Acts, certain early Latin copies, the Syriac versions, and three Greek cursive MSS., present a form of text marked by considerable variations, usually additions, and known as the Bezan Text. It also obtains some support from quotations in early writers. The theory has been put forward that it represents an earlier edition of the book issued by Luke himself, while the ordinary text represents a revised and somewhat shortened form sent to Theophilus. This has not won much acceptance. In the other books of the New Testament also this type of text is marked by striking variations, and it is more reasonable to suppose that this characteristic is due to a common cause. In Luke the Bezan Text is on the whole marked by omissions, which would necessitate the view that there it represents a later revision, while the ordinary text represents the original version. Moreover, a study of the variations in Acts does not on the whole support their authenticity. While in many cases they show accurate local information, they are often trivial and look like attempts to fill out the text by rather obvious conjectures or explanations. There is no reason to suspect any particular ecclesiastical or theological tendency in them. They might have been made by any reader familiar with Asia Minor, and must be quite early. The most probable explanation of the phenomena is that they represent additions made while Acts was already a popular book among Christians, but had not yet come to be regarded as sacred or inspired. (For a defence and translation of the Bezan Text see Wilson, *The Acts of the Apostles*. The fullest and latest treatment of the problem is by

Professor J. H. Ropes in vol. iii of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. He regards the Bezan Text as essentially secondary.)

I. 1-5. **Introduction.**—The opening sentence links up this book with the Gospel. The shortness of the address suggests that the two were issued without a long interval between them.

2. The order of the Greek suggests that 'through the Holy Ghost' goes with 'given commandment.' The application of the thought to the activity of Jesus in His earthly ministry comes in unexpectedly. But from the first He was filled with the Spirit, and was designated Messiah by a new outpouring of the Spirit at His baptism. Hence the phrase draws attention to His full Messianic authority. In His earthly life He had done all in the plenitude of the Spirit. It is the same Spirit that He is about to outpour on His Messianic community.

3. **by the space of forty days** means at intervals during forty days. The sentence summarizes the appearances recorded in the Gospel. It is a great tribute to the honesty of the account, that no attempt is made to put detailed instructions on future church policy into the mouth of the risen Lord. Later writers, orthodox and heretical, could not resist the temptation to claim His express authority for their own views. The kind of teaching that Luke means is that given in the Gospel and in the following verses. The 'kingdom' or rule of God is a wider conception than that of the 'Church,' which is intended to be the instrument of its realization here on earth.

4. **assembled** literally means 'eating salt together' (RVm), and may refer to the meals recorded in the Gospel, but it often came to mean only 'assembling.' The command only deals with the immediate future. For the **promise of the Father** compare Lk 24 [49]. An early tradition records that the Apostles were bidden to stay in Jerusalem twelve years.

6-11. **The Ascension.**—Luke's defective sense of time, which is one of his limitations as a historian, appears here. Was this the same, or a later and distinct occasion? The 'therefore' may point to an appointment made at the previous meeting.

6. The question was a natural one according to current Jewish ideas. The outpouring of the Spirit was commonly associated with the coming of the new age, which was expected to include the giving of the Kingdom to Israel, or at least to its faithful members. This might be understood in a limited nationalistic or materialistic sense, but the devout Jews would interpret it in a spiritual sense. What is rebuked is not the expectation, but the impatience.

7. Early Church life was governed by the expectation of the immediate return of Christ. The New Testament in the plainest manner discourages any undue curiosity about the time (cf. Mk 13 [32-33]). Men are to live so as always to be ready. In spite of this men in all ages have tried by ingenious calculations to work out an exact date. That is not religion, but silliness.

8. These words correct any selfish or narrow view. They suggest a long period of expansion. They describe exactly the plan of Acts, which records the spread of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, which in the *Psalms of Solomon*, a Pharisaic work of about 50 B.C., is described as 'the ends of the earth.'

9. The outward form of the Ascension was a condescension to human imagination and the ideas of the time. The 'cloud' is best understood not as a literal cloud resting on the hill-side, but as the cloud which in the Old Testament symbolizes the divine glory. The parallel to the Ascension is to be found in the Transfiguration. Then Jesus entered into the cloud, and after receiving the vision returned to the life of earth. Now He did not return (cf. Lk 9 [34-35]). The departure was of such a kind that the disciples realized that they were to expect no more appearances such as those which they had enjoyed during the forty days. In the New Testament there are relatively few references to the Ascension as an event separate from the Resurrection, though the fact is always assumed. The reason seems to be that Christ is regarded as entering into His full glory on Easter Day.* Thus the purpose of the visible ascension was to serve as a lesson to the disciples rather than to mark a change in the life of Christ. Possibly the mention of the Ascension has no place in the true text of Lk 24 [51]. If so, it was reserved for the beginning of Acts, and the Gospel only

* Neither St. Paul nor St. John appears to take this view. St. Paul regards both the Lord's Resurrection and His Ascension as reproduced in the experience of His people (Eph 1 [20-23], 2 [5, 6]; cf. 4 [8-10]), and as one day to be reproduced even in their bodies (1 Th 4 [16, 17]). In the 4th Gospel, the Passion, the Resurrection, and the Ascension are, as is generally recognized, regarded as different stages of one process of Glorification. But the teaching of Jn 20 [17] is clear; and that of Jn 14 [12] and similar passages must be interpreted by it. The entry into heaven, and the final return to the Father (Jn 14 [2, 3], 17 [24]), seem always, as in Hebrews, to be connected with the Ascension (cf. Rev 11 [11, 12]).—ED.

records a departure after one of the other appearances. But if it be retained, there is no reason to suppose that when Luke wrote the Gospel he believed that it had taken place on the evening of Easter Day. Between [49] and [50] there may have been an interval of time. Luke's chronology is often vague and compressed.

10 continues the vision. The young men are clearly angels. Their message confirms the truth that this is a final appearance. Jesus will return at some future date in the full glory of God.

12-14. The Waiting Community.—This small band of believers represents the visible result of the coming of Jesus. They are centred round the Apostles. The upper chamber may be identified with that in the house of Mary, the mother of Mark, which was later the headquarters of the Christian community. It was also probably the scene of the Last Supper. The women (the Bezan Text adds 'and children') may include the wives of the Apostles, but would also include the holy women who had attended on Jesus. This is the last mention of the Blessed Virgin in Scripture.

15-26. The Completion of the Twelve.—The prominence of this incident, which alone is reported during this period, marks the importance attached to the corporate authority of the Twelve, as the official witnesses of the Resurrection, and the heads of the new community appointed for that purpose by Christ Himself. The initiative lies with Peter. The selection of candidates rested with the community ([23]).

Peter's speech raises the whole question of the use of the Old Testament by the first Christians, of which this is the first example in Acts. Pious Jews regarded the Scriptures as in literal truth the Word of God. Their conception of inspiration, as the language of [16] suggests, seems to us almost mechanical. For them the human side hardly existed. Further, they ascribed to David himself the authorship of the entire psalter, and treated such verses as these which are quoted here as verbal predictions of future events made in the power of the Spirit of God. Such methods of interpretation cannot and ought not to be ours. We are bound to read such passages in the light of modern scholarship. The same Spirit has given us a fuller understanding both of the divine method of inspiration and of the circumstances under which the Old Testament was composed. While we believe that it in very truth contains the word of God, we do not believe in any mechanical inspiration, and we are prepared to accept the teaching of the best modern scholars as to the date and authorship of particular writings and their original meaning for the age for which they were written. We possess also an historic sense and idea of development which were wholly lacking in the 1st century among the Jews. Accordingly, we are prepared to accept the verdict of scholarship that both these psalms which Peter quotes were composed later than the time of David; that they were intended to apply in the first instance to the circumstances of their own day, and the authors had no foreknowledge of the details of the treachery and death of Judas. With their methods of interpretation Jewish Christians searched the Scriptures to find detailed predictions of events in the life of Christ or of the early Church. As here, they sought for literal anticipations of later happenings, and they often found such where it is hard for us to-day to see any connexion at all. The best that we can do is to try to understand their purpose. In many cases we shall find that underneath their unscientific and unhistorical treatment there lies a real perception of spiritual principles.*

Here appeal is made to the Old Testament to explain a difficulty and to obtain guidance for future action. First, the fall of an apostle was a stumbling-block to many. How could Jesus have chosen Judas? The scandal was removed when it was discovered that the treachery and its due punishment had been foretold by David in Psalms, and could be viewed as a part of God's eternal counsel. Secondly, a verse from another psalm seemed to enjoin the filling up of his vacant place. To the Jews of that time this method was convincing; to us it seems to be arbitrary. At the same time it is our duty to seek to understand the past in the light of God's purpose, and to desire His guidance for the future. The study of Scripture, the record of God's dealing with His people, is still one of the great means to this end. But our methods cannot be so uncritical. Here we should find in these psalms a characteristic expression of the tribulations of God's servants, which included the treachery of friends. It was fitting that Jesus should share in this typical human affliction. So, again, when some great leader falls we should not despair. History shows that God is able to raise up another

* For a different view cf. footnote on 2^{22-36}, and Additional Note on Matthew, *Our Lord's Use of the O.T.*—Ed.

to take his place. To us the necessity that the Scripture 'must be fulfilled' is not mechanical but moral.

18-19 are best taken as a parenthesis, inserted by Luke or his source, to explain the fate of Judas, not as a part of Peter's speech. The tradition is difficult to reconcile with the account of his death in Mt 27 [3] ff. Both contain traditions that he came to a bad end, and both connect his death with a field in Jerusalem that bore an ill-omened name, and afford explanations of the origin of its name.

20. The first quotation is from Ps 69, and in its original context marks the climax of the writer's imprecations upon his enemies. The second, from Ps 109, is also an imprecation by the Psalmist. Both were taken as not only calling down, but foretelling, just punishment.

24-26. The use of lots is due to a literal imitation of the Old Testament. The Urim and Thummim, for instance, were sacred lots (cf. Pr 16 [33]). Recourse to such means to ascertain the will of God is a sign that the Spirit has not yet been received, and never recurs after Pentecost. It marks a period of transition. Matthias is never mentioned again in the New Testament. This is a strong argument for the truth of the incident. No motive for its invention can be found. In [24] 'Lord' is probably Christ. This is the first example of His continued activity (1 [2]). If so, we have here the earliest recorded prayer to Him.

II. 1-4. **The Gift of the Spirit.**—The previous chapter pictured a small community waiting for a week at least for the fulfilment of the promise of the Spirit. The arrival of the Feast of Pentecost would stimulate their expectancy. The language used, literally 'was being fulfilled,' suggests the night before the festival. For the Jews the day began at what is to us 6 p.m. of the day before. Great stress is laid on the disciples' unity. The place of meeting was probably the upper room. Others suggest the Temple, since there is evidence that on the eves of great festivals the priests opened the doors of the Temple and allowed worshippers to enter and prepare for the feast. In that case the 'house' would be one of the many chambers of the Temple. This would allow space for a gathering such as that described below, which would be impossible in the narrow streets of the city. Another possibility is that, between [4] and [5], the company moved from the upper room to some part of the Temple buildings, such as Solomon's Porch. Their excited demeanour as they passed through the streets would attract attention.

2-3. Both wind and fire were regular symbols of the Spirit. The Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic words for spirit, wind, and breath are one and the same (e.g. Ezek 37 and Jn 3 [6-8]). Indeed, the very term 'spirit' is a metaphor borrowed from breath. A man loses all power when his breath leaves him; therefore it is supposed that the breath is the source of life and power. So, too, any extraordinary exhibition of power of any kind, from the physical feats of Samson or the artistic skill of Bezaleel to the vision of the prophets, are assigned to some more than human breath or spirit in the man, namely the breath or spirit of Jehovah. Again, in all religions fire is a regular and natural symbol for the divine energy that purifies, illuminates, and quickens. In [4] RV brings out the exact meaning of the Greek. The gift of the Spirit was one, bestowed on the community, or at least on the Twelve corporately. Individuals shared it.

4. The common idea of 'speaking with tongues,' encouraged by the Proper Preface for Whitsunday in the Book of Common Prayer, is that it was the gift of speaking with foreign languages, to be used for the evangelization of the world. This interpretation seems at first to be supported by [8] and [11] below. The objections to this view are drawn in the first instance from the New Testament itself. Not only is there nowhere any mention of the possession of such a truly remarkable gift, but it would have been superfluous. All present at Pentecost would be familiar with Aramaic or Greek, or both. Round the Mediterranean Greek was spoken practically universally. Local dialects lingered only in remote districts. The one hint of any language difficulty in the New Testament, namely at Lystra (14 [13] ff.), is an example of this. In the Eastern dispersion Aramaic was the vernacular. Further, in the other passages in Acts where speaking with tongues is mentioned or implied (8 [17], 10 [44-46], 19 [6]), there is no suggestion of any gift for preaching. Rather it is viewed as marking the visible approval by God of the acceptance into the Church of a new class of convert, the Samaritans, the Gentile Cornelius, and disciples of John Baptist. In 1 Cor 14 it is expressly contrasted with and ranked below 'prophecy,' that is inspired preaching, because, while the latter benefits others, this gift serves only to edify the speaker. It is at best an expression of fervent inward

devotion, addressed to God rather than to man.

1 Cor leaves no room for doubt that speaking with tongues is a psychological phenomenon, not particularly uncommon, which has been investigated and explained by modern science. In our normal waking life our speech is under the control of our conscious mind. The sounds that we utter are directed by our reason working through the higher centres of the brain, though this control may be partially disturbed by any emotion. But if the higher centres of the brain are put out of action by, say, a drug or an illness, or some overwhelming emotion, the rational and critical faculty is overpowered, the control of the conscious mind is relaxed, and the individual may give vent to his feelings by pouring forth a flood of meaningless syllables, which he and those who hear him may take for an unknown language. This impression is deepened if the sounds include definite words of his own or another language. Further, in this abnormal state whole sentences of some genuine foreign language may be produced which have at some time past been overheard. Even though they may not have been understood or even consciously remembered, they have remained stored up in the unconscious mind, which misses nothing and forgets nothing. When the conscious control is removed they may well up.

This explanation fits in with all the evidence of the New Testament, including this passage; the situation depicted in the previous chapter of a group animated by a single purpose and waiting in a tense expectancy for the fulfilment of the promise of the Spirit, stirred by the arrival of a festival on which there was a divine fitness that the gift should be bestowed, is one in which the group would be highly suggestible. The uprising of some strong corporate emotion would be easily caused, and indeed all the outward phenomena of this chapter might be expected to occur.

Then the event happened. It is best to suppose that the wind and the fire were elements in the vision. They were mental elements corresponding to nothing in the material world. The hearing of such sounds and the seeing of flames of fire can be paralleled by the experiences of seers and mystics in all ages. They would be the natural expression of the vivid expectation or apprehension of the coming of the Spirit. It has, however, been suggested that the wind was the wind which always rises at the dawn, and the fire was the rays of the rising sun penetrating through the narrow windows of the room, and that these formed the material out of which the mystic experience was constructed. The dawn of a new day formed the divinely chosen sacrament of the coming of a new dispensation, the stimulus to the corporate realization of the arrival of the Spirit, the suggestion through which the waiting Church realized His coming (cf. 1 K 19 [11-13]. For similar occurrences see James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 248 ff.).

5-8. It is plain that Luke, or his source, believed that foreign languages were actually spoken. As we saw, words or sentences of foreign tongues might well be uttered. 1 Cor 14 [13], and [27-28] prove that sometimes the tongues could be interpreted. It is further argued that foreign pilgrims in the Temple would recite doxologies in the words that they used at home. If the disciples had overheard such praises, they might repeat them under the abnormal conditions. This would suit [11]. The difficulty is to imagine what foreign languages these could be. The Western Dispersion used Greek, and the Eastern Dispersion used Aramaic, in their synagogues. It is improbable that Jews who lived in towns would know any local dialects that lingered in the more remote areas. If the word 'dwelling' in [5] be pressed, these men were not pilgrims, but residents in Jerusalem who had retired there to spend their last days in the holy city. In any case, the names in [9-10] designate not the native heathen inhabitants of the various lands, but Jews. The list is drawn up from the point of view of Jerusalem, beginning from the East and passing to the West.

A better explanation, therefore, is to suppose that the sounds were meaningless in themselves, but that they became charged with meaning to those hearers who were in sympathy with the corporate emotion of the group. Recent cases can be quoted of religious gatherings where foreigners, who did not know English, felt themselves able to enter into the meaning of English speakers. As they recounted their religious experiences, helping out their phrases by tones and gestures typical of a markedly emotional type of religion, others who did not comprehend a single word, but shared a common outlook and attitude, knew what was being expressed, and were able to join in the common experience. Such an explanation accounts for the language of Acts, especially if it goes back to one who was not present or had not heard speaking with tongues. It also fits in

with [13] (cf. 1 Cor 14 [23]). Those who were unmoved or unsympathetic would suppose that the speakers were drunk or mad.

Thus psychology vindicates the substantial truth of the occurrence. But even though we can regard the narrative as a record of an abnormal event, as accurate as we could expect in a pre-scientific age, there still remains an element that is best called symbolic or prophetic. Luke is concerned not only to relate facts, but to interpret them for edification. We must allow for this purpose in seeking to understand the form which the narrative has assumed. It is deliberately presented so as to lead us to see in the results of Pentecost a divine reversal of the punishment of the Tower of Babel (Gen 11). Then, as the penalty of human pride, the unity of the race was shattered by the infliction of diversity of language. The different tongues were viewed as the lasting result of this. Now, by the descent of the Spirit, a new power for unity entered the world, and the sign and pledge of this was a common understanding and a common speech. The speaking with tongues was thus to be viewed as a foretaste of the new unity of mankind which the Spirit was to accomplish. This idea has moulded the form of the narrative throughout, and must be allowed for in estimating its historical worth. A further allusion which may have influenced the manner of telling the story is the Jewish belief that at Sinai the Law was proclaimed in all languages, but only Israel attended to the voice of God. If it were certain that at this date the later custom of connecting the commemoration of the giving of the Law with Pentecost was already established, the allusion would be undoubted.

Psychology enables us to explain the external phenomena, but can neither prove nor disprove the reality of direct supernatural intervention. Granted that there is around us a supernatural order, there is nothing unreasonable in believing that the overwhelming religious emotion was caused by a genuine impact of the divine, a supernatural imparting of power. To say that it was due to group-suggestion is only at most to describe the channel through which it was experienced. But the evidence of the miracle is to be found not in the abnormal phenomena, but in the abiding change of life. The outward signs were only symptoms and by-products of the supernatural change. In themselves they are not necessarily evidence of the action of God. St. Paul implies that they occurred equally in heathen worship. The subliminal is not always the sublime. Rather, the fruits of the Spirit are the real test of the presence of the Spirit. The changed character of the disciples and the new type of life that they exhibited prove the existence and working of a more than human power. Both the community and individuals tended to reproduce the mind and character of Jesus. This is a new fact and demands an adequate cause. It cannot be explained in terms of what had gone before. The cause that Christians have always assigned is that Jesus had bestowed the Spirit whom He had promised. The abnormal psychical phenomena, which attracted such attention at first, tended to disappear, and at the last seem to have died out. The new powers of the Christian life persisted and developed. They are the true evidence that the gift of Pentecost was due to the direct act of God (cf. Anderson Scott, Art. IV in *The Spirit*).*

14-36. St. Peter's Speech.—It was an accepted literary custom among Greek historians to compose discourses and to put them into the mouths of speakers, as representing not a report of what they did actually say, but a general statement of what they might been have expected to say. It would therefore have been in full accord with the customs of the heathen world if St. Luke had composed suitable speeches and put them into the mouths of St. Peter and the other Apostles. But there are solid grounds for believing that though the form of the speeches is due to St. Luke or his source, they contain a substantially accurate summary of apostolic preaching. The Jews were accustomed to treasure up and hand on with meticulous accuracy the sayings of their Rabbis. The Apostles became the Rabbis of the new Christian community. As such their sayings would be recorded and repeated. Further, early preaching largely centred round the interpretation of texts of the Old Testament which were held to prove that incidents in the life of Jesus the Messiah or in the history of the Christian

* The action of the Spirit, in accordance with Jn 14-16, is primarily illuminative (cf. Jn 14 [26], 15 [26. 27], 16 [7-11]). The clearness of St. Peter's faith, and his new insight into the meaning of all that has taken place, are manifest before his audience knows anything of his character; indeed it is largely the faith and the insight which produce the character. For the correspondence between Jn 14-16 and the early chapters of Acts cf. T. D. Bernard, *The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ*, xvi, and for the nature of the Spirit's gift, his Bampton Lectures, *The Progress of Doctrine*, iv.—Ed.

Church had been predicted in Scripture. There is evidence that among the earliest Christian writings was a collection of such 'testimonia' or proof-texts, used to show that Jesus was the Messiah and the Christian Church the true Israel. Internal evidence supports the literal accuracy of certain of these speeches. They show a primitive type of Christian thought, unaffected by the later teaching of St. Paul. Instances of this will be noted in the commentary. And there are a remarkable number of coincidences between the speeches of St. Peter and St. James and the Epistles which bear their names.

15-21. The aim of the quotation from Jl 2 [28-32] (LXX) is to interpret from the Scriptures the meaning of this strange event. In any case, it is impossibly early for men to be drunk. The Jews reckoned their hours from six to six, so that the third hour would be nine o'clock. This is the literal fulfilment of the prophecy. 'In the last days' is substituted for 'after this,' to bring out the idea that the present age was already passing away and the new age arriving. The coming of the Spirit was a foretaste of the new age. The last words, 'call upon the name of the Lord,' lead up to the next section, which declares that Jesus is both Lord and Christ.

22-36. To the ordinary Jew the fact that Jesus had been crucified was a proof that He could not be the Christ. His crucifixion demonstrated that God had rejected His claim and that He was a blasphemer. In support of this Dt 21 [23] (LXX) was quoted: 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.' No text played a larger part in early controversy. 'Jesus is accursed' became the watchword of the unbelieving Jews (cf. 10 [39]; Gal 3 [13]; 1 Cor 12 [3]; Ac 13 [45], etc.). In face of this objection Peter argues that Jesus is the Christ. (1) His death had a place in the counsels of God from the beginning. It was not an accident or defeat, but a predestined part of the divine purpose. (2) His betrayal by the Jews and condemnation to death by lawless, i.e. heathen, men had been reversed by God in the resurrection. (3) This act of God in raising Him from the dead had been predicted by David in Ps 16 ([27] implies a belief in the empty tomb. His body did not see corruption). The words could not apply to David himself, but looked forward to the ideal king of his house, whose coming had been promised (Ps 132 [11]).* (4) The fact that Jesus had been able to send down the Spirit whom He had promised proved that He was indeed exalted. There is a probable allusion to Ps 68, which spoke of a mighty conqueror entering into the presence of God. In the Targum, that is the Aramaic paraphrase used in the Synagogues, he was said not to 'receive gifts,' as in the Hebrew text, but to bestow them (cf. Eph 4 [8]). (5) This position as anointed king and Lord had been foretold in Ps 110 by David, who foresaw one of his descendants, whom he styled his 'Lord' or master, set by Jehovah in the highest place of honour in heaven.

27-40. A practical appeal follows to repent, accept Jesus as Lord, and by baptism be transferred from the old Israel, which had shown itself a perverse and disobedient generation doomed to destruction by refusing Jesus as Messiah, into the new Israel, which He as Messiah had reconstituted upon faith in Himself. So they would receive a share in the gift of the Spirit. Throughout this speech the appeal is to Israel.

39 refers to the Dispersion. There is as yet no thought of the Gentiles, except perhaps so far as they should become proselytes to the old Judaism.

Several points emerge in this speech which call for notice.

(1) The language of [22] (cf. [37-38]) is perfectly natural to those who had known Jesus in His earthly life. The Greek title Nazarean, which constantly occurs in these chapters, is probably translated correctly, as in the RV, simply 'of Nazareth.' The actual words 'of Nazareth' occur in 10 [38]. It gives the name by which He was commonly called among His contemporaries. Later Christian writers would increasingly have avoided speaking of Him as 'a man.' The phrase suggests an early date and a place where there were many eye-witnesses of His life. So, too, only here and in the passage in 10 is there any allusion made in the New Testament, outside the Gospels, to His mighty works as credentials of His mission. That, again, is a strong

* In view of Lk 24 [44], it is probable that not only St. Peter's application of Ps 110, but all his applications of the Psalms, have the Lord's authority (cf. 2 [25] ff., 4 [11]). In all NT application of the OT we must take account of the new meaning given to old words, as the faith of Israel grew and its spiritual experience was deepened. The original meaning of words was often different from that which they were understood to bear when they were taken into the canonical Scriptures. Ps 16, e.g., probably was not, when first composed, a Psalm of resurrection; but it had become this before our Lord's day. Thus in Ps 16 [9] the LXX has substituted 'hope' for 'safety' in speaking of the 'flesh,' while 'thine holy one' has probably acquired a Messianic meaning.—H. L. G.

mark of an early date and of authenticity. As an argument they would only make their fullest appeal to those who had actually seen them.

(2) It is sometimes argued that the language of these two passages and others (e.g. ^{36}, 3^{13}, 4^{27}) point to what is called an 'adoptianist' view of His person, that is a belief that Jesus was a particular man of unique holiness, who was raised to divinity by an ever fuller outpouring of the Spirit of God upon Him, as a reward of His progressive moral response to that outpouring. Apart from the difficulty of understanding how a created man could in any intelligible sense of the word become God, this view involves a serious anachronism. It supposes that the Christian Church was already giving a precise and formulated answer to a question that had not yet even been asked. A practical and unformulated belief in the divinity of Christ, an attitude towards Him, which in the long run was seen to be incompatible with any other belief, preceded for a long period any attempt to think out and put into words what that attitude really implied. Christianity was, in the first instance, as one of its titles shows, a 'Way' (i.e. of life; cf. $19^{9.23}$, 24^{14}). The Jews, unlike the Greeks, were concerned with righteousness and worship, and had little interest in speculation. The first Christians were content to be immersed in the task of Christian living and to leave questions of theology unraised. In these early speeches there is no explicit mention of the pre-existence or divinity of Christ. At the same time they imply a devotional attitude towards Him and a faith in His redeeming power, from which the later and more developed statements of belief irresistibly followed.

(3) Much discussion has centred round the title 'Lord' (Kyrios), which is applied to Christ in ^{36} (cf. also 4^{33}, 7^{59-60}). It has been argued that this title was borrowed from the mystery-cults which centred round some saviour-god, who was worshipped as Lord, the word Kyrios being applied to the gods of mystery-religions as contrasted with the old Olympian gods (cf. 1 Cor 8^{5}). While in the Jewish church of Jerusalem Jesus had hitherto been regarded as the Christ anointed by the Spirit of God, in the predominantly Gentile church of Antioch He came to take the place of the god of a mystery-cult, was styled Lord, and treated as a divine redeemer. From Antioch the title spread not only to the new churches founded by Paul, but to the mother-church at Jerusalem. On this theory the language of Acts reflects not the actual use of the Jerusalem community but the early, though not quite primitive, language of the church at Antioch. The writer has read back into the very earliest days ideas and language with which he was familiar, but which rightly belong to a somewhat later stage of development. This view presents a plausible account of the development of Christian doctrine, and is fully consistent with many passages of the New Testament. But there are many serious objections to it. Admittedly there is scanty evidence for the use of the title in Syria. A more natural explanation can be given which fits all the evidence and supports the accuracy of Acts. The first disciples were strict Jews. Whenever a Jewish origin and explanation offers itself for any title or idea or custom of the early Church, it has a right to the most serious consideration. It is perverse to hunt for an origin in heathen religion when an origin in Jewish thought lies near to hand. The Jews detested all forms of pagan worship. To suppose that the first Jewish Christians overlooked or tolerated the transformation of Christianity into a mystery-cult on a level with the heathen mystery-religions without a protest is absurd. Of any such protest there is no trace anywhere in the New Testament. The difficulty becomes acute in the case of Paul the Pharisee, of whose beliefs we possess a full record. Whatever controversies he had with Jewish Christians, they were not about the person of Christ. Further, in 1 Cor 16^{22} he preserves a phrase, Maranatha, which is best translated 'Our Lord, come.' Its preservation in Aramaic shows that it was a watchword going back to the earliest days. It may well have been the traditional formula with which the celebrant at the Eucharist ended up his prayer. It proves that the title 'Lord' originated among Christians who spoke Aramaic, and they would most naturally be the primitive church at Jerusalem. The Synoptic Gospels show that Jesus in His earthly life was usually addressed by His disciples as 'Rabbi.' Only rarely, and under special conditions of need or emotion, is He addressed as Lord, as by those who wished to acknowledge themselves as His slaves. But the fact of the Resurrection deepened the awe of the disciples, and this expressed itself in the adoption of the customary title 'Lord.' If further sanction were needed it would be found in the words of Ps 110 quoted by St. Peter, which

Jesus Himself had applied to the Messiah to show that he was not only the Son, but the Lord of David. The title did not in itself convey any idea of divinity. Kyrios was used of any master, or of the Emperor. The vocative was a form of address in Greek corresponding to our 'Sir.' The Aramaic phrase as used by Peter, probably meant not 'the Lord,' but 'our Lord.' Yet, when the title had once been adopted in Greek, it lent itself readily to the idea of divinity. Besides its use in the mystery-cults, it was the translation in the LXX for the divine name Jehovah. When the Gospel spread in the heathen world Christian teachers undoubtedly made use of language borrowed from the mystery-religions to express Christian ideas, many of which are common to all religions. Such is found in certain passages in St. Paul's Epistles. All that we are concerned to maintain is that Christianity did not borrow any of its distinctive beliefs or customs from paganism.

(4) A similar question has been raised about baptism, which is first mentioned in [41]. The view has been put forward that Luke has antedated its employment in the Christian Church, and that it was introduced later, probably by the Seven, in dealing with Gentiles. It is true that if 1 [5] stood alone we might infer that baptism by the Spirit was intended to be a substitute for baptism by water, but other passages make clear that this was not the view of Luke. It is a pure conjecture to suppose that this verse comes from a document which held another view. Rather baptism is an inheritance from Judaism. In all religions ceremonial washings and purifications are to be found. So proselytes were commonly baptized to represent the washing away of the defilements of heathenism and the entrance into a new life. They were also styled, in virtue of their entrance within the covenant, 'new creatures.' The novelty of John's baptism lay in the fact that he called on Jews, members of the covenant-people, to submit to baptism. The Kingdom of God, the new age, was at hand, and only those who were spiritually prepared would be able to enter into its privileges. Men must repent, and by expressing their repentance by the outward act of baptism would be sealed for the coming Kingdom. Another was at hand who would have power to bestow not only the water-baptism of preparation, but the baptism of the Spirit, that is of the power to share the life of the Kingdom. Many of Christ's disciples had been baptized by John. After joining themselves to Him, they continued the practice (Jn 3 [22], 4 [1-2]). Such baptism is to be regarded as on a level with John's, that is preparatory for the Kingdom. Whatever difficulties surround Mt 28 [19], there is no reason to doubt that Jesus approved and enjoined the custom of baptism. At Pentecost the Spirit descended, filling the Christian community with the power of a new life. Thus its members were baptized not only with water, but with the Spirit. Their earlier baptism was completed. The first instalment of the blessing for which they had been sealed was received. The new baptism did not supplant but consummate the old. Henceforth Christian baptism is to include both, the outward sign of water-baptism and the inward grace of new power to live the life of the Spirit-filled community. There is no contradiction between them. So it is in full accord with Jewish ideas that the Apostles should from the first baptize new members. By baptism they were transferred from the old Israel, or the world, into the new Israel, the people of God. Thus they became as it were 'proleptic' members of the Kingdom of God.

42-47. The Primitive Church.—The picture should be compared with 4 [32-35]. It is therefore a convenient point at which to put together the chief characteristics of the new community.

To the outside world it appeared simply as the formation of a new sect within Judaism. At a later stage it is explicitly called 'the sect of the Nazarenes' (24 [5, 14], 28 [22]). 'Sect' was not in the least a term of reproach, and involved no charge of disloyalty to Israel. It is applied both to the Pharisees and to the Sadducees (26 [5], 5 [17]). Believers were regular in the observance of Temple worship (3 [1]). They observed the Law. Side by side with the worship and life of Judaism they had their own meetings for Prayer and worship ([42, 46-47]). They organized themselves into a synagogue, probably called the Synagogue of the Nazarenes, though the title does not actually occur. There was nothing schismatical in this, since any ten Jews could form one (cf. 6 [9]). They would be allowed to have their own beliefs and customs, so long as these did not openly conflict with the ordinary life of Judaism. The chief difference which marked them off from other Jews was that they added to the common belief in a Messiah the assertion that they knew who the Messiah was. He had already appeared in the

person of Jesus of Nazareth, who would soon return in full Messianic glory. They regarded themselves as the true Israel reformed by Jesus the Messiah. From the first they regarded themselves as a supernatural society, formed by the act of God. The new Israel owed its existence to the divine choice as did the old. It was not in any sense a society founded by men for their own edification. We do not know at what stage the term 'church' (*ecclesia*) was adopted. It is found first in 5^{11}. In the Greek translation of the Old Testament it is the word used to describe Israel as called together for worship (cf. its use in 7^{38}). Hence it was the natural word to express the new post-Messianic Israel. The idea, if not the name, was there from the first. From this point of view we can understand the unbounded authority of the Apostles, the twelve who had been trained and chosen by Jesus the Messiah to be the nucleus and rallying point of His new Israel. They were, above all, witnesses to the truth of the Resurrection (4^{33}). Throughout Acts the Gospel is regarded not as the teaching of certain ideas, but as the witness to certain facts of history, together with the interpretation of those facts.

No less important is the type of life and character which the new community exhibited both individually and corporately. It was a movement of immense vitality. Certain words frequently occur in descriptions of its activities, and express its typical energies and attitudes, as do 'liberty,' 'fraternity,' and 'equality' those of the French Revolution. Chief among these is 'fellowship.' In 4^{32} the most accurate translation is 'They continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and the fellowship.' So, too, the Greek word for 'common' is from the same root as fellowship. Everywhere there is a great sense of togetherness. The common meal, whatever else it signified, at least expressed the idea of brotherhood. The sharing of all possessions was no communism imposed by law. It was the unpremeditated impulse of those who were so filled with the spirit of fellowship that they literally loved one another as truly as themselves. It is a libel on their enthusiasm to suppose that it originated from any calculation that the end of the present age was at hand, or from any economic scheme. One of the most remarkable facts of the New Testament is the place which is assigned to charity or love (*agape*). If the word is not entirely new, it assumes new importance in Christian living. And *agape* is the virtue of *koinonia*. Though the word itself does not occur in Acts, the excellencies that it denotes appear at once as the fruits of Pentecost. If it is not named, it is exhibited in the whole life of the community, not as a mere emotion, but as a sustained and practical activity. In St. Paul's famous hymn of love we get a picture of the human character of Jesus. In other words, in this display of fellowship the Church was reproducing in every field of its life the characteristic attitude of Jesus Himself. It was demonstrating in the most direct way the truth that it was really filled with His Spirit.

In close connexion with words and phrases that denote fellowship are those that denote such attractive qualities as joy and gladness, or, again, boldness (*parrhesia*), a glad fearlessness, such as comes when men feel that they are at one with themselves, their fellows, and with God. These first Christians felt themselves in the most literal sense of the word to be 'a new creation.' They lived in a new world. To use a modern phrase, there was a 'transvaluation of all values.' For them it was no metaphor to say that the new age, the Kingdom of Heaven, had already arrived. That in part was the meaning of the term so inadequately translated 'repent.' It denotes a change of mind and outlook. It has regard to the future no less than to the past. And the mind into which men are to be changed is the very mind of Christ.

There is no wonder, then, that this new movement won popularity among the people (^{47}), as did the early Franciscan movement. Besides a spirit of cheerful fellowship such as appeals to the ordinary man, there were many works of healing. Strange occurrences such as the speaking with tongues would at least increase the awe with which its leaders were regarded.

If we ask what exactly the first disciples meant by 'the breaking of the bread,' we have not the evidence to give any very definite answer. The double use of the article suggests that the phrase was a more or less official title. It was probably a reproduction of what had occurred on the night of the Lord's betrayal, that is a meal on the analogy of the Last Supper followed by the Eucharist. Such seems to have been the practice both at Troas (20^{7} ff.) and at Corinth. Later, the meal was separated from the Eucharist, and, as the agape or love-feast, continued to exist as a symbol

of fellowship or a means of charity. In any case, in these first days the breaking of the bread included a real meal for the satisfying of hunger. In [46] the Greek may mean either 'from house to house' (AV) or 'at home' (RV). The meetings would be held in the largest houses that could be got, and are contrasted with the meetings in the Temple. Under the peculiar conditions of this close-knit community life in Jerusalem such daily celebrations were possible. We do not hear of them elsewhere for several centuries. Usually the Lord's Day was the day on which Christians gathered together for the Eucharist.*

47. The Greek of this verse is almost untranslatable. The words rendered 'to them' mean 'together.' The AV follows an inferior reading. Probably this is a case of mistranslation of an Aramaic original. There is an Aramaic word which in the dialect of Judæa means 'exceedingly,' but in ordinary Aramaic means 'together.' The translator might easily fail to understand the local difference. The sentence may really mean 'The Lord added daily those who were being saved exceedingly,' i.e. in great numbers.

III. 1-10. A Typical Work of Healing.—The ninth hour, i.e. 3 p.m., was the time of the evening sacrifice. In [6] the use of the 'name' is to be noted. Among the Jews, as in the ancient world generally, a name was far more than a label for a person. It seemed to contain as it were something of his personality. In magic, to know the name of a spirit was to have the power of compelling it to do the will of the man who possessed the knowledge. And in the Old Testament the 'name' of God means all that is revealed of God, His character, and in places is used as if it had almost an independent existence of its own. Here 'in the name of Jesus' means by the authority of Jesus. This use of it by Peter, as contrasted with its misuse in 19[13], brings out the contrast between religion and magic. Stress on the praise and thanksgiving of those who had been healed is one of the features of Luke's writings.

11-26. St. Peter's Second Speech.—[12-16] develops the full significance of the miracle. [17-26] is an appeal to repent and accept Jesus as Christ. Solomon's Porch was a colonnade or cloister outside the Temple on the east. It became the regular meeting-place of the Christian community (5[12]).

12-16. The general theme is that the work of healing proves the abiding presence and power of Jesus. The titles applied to Him all serve to bring out the truth of His Messiahship. Thus He is the 'Holy and Righteous One' (cf. 3[14], 4[27, 30], 7[52], 22[14]). Both terms have their roots far back in the Old Testament. Jehovah is above all holy and righteous. Israel, as the people of Jehovah, is called to be holy and righteous (cf. Is 52[11]). The Messiah, who is anointed to represent Jehovah to Israel and Israel to Jehovah, must possess both these qualities in the highest degree. He sums up in His person the character and vocation of Israel. In later Jewish writings the same epithets recur, though they are not united, except in the Book of Enoch, where they are applied to Israel as the Messianic people. Their employment brings out the unnatural character of Israel's conduct. They had rejected One who, by His perfect obedience, expressed fully all that they were called to be, and, by choosing a murderer, had forfeited their claim to these titles. They had transferred themselves to the ranks of the unholy and unrighteous. Hence the need of repentance.

Again, the title 'Prince' (cf. 5[31]) belongs to the vocabulary of the Messianic hope. Its exact origin is doubtful. The LXX employs it in Judges of Israel's deliverers. It is also used of Joshua. This may be the allusion here. Jesus is the new Joshua (in Greek the names are the same) leading His people into the promised land. The title often denotes a pioneer who led an expedition to found a colony.

Here, again, there is no thought-out doctrine of the person of Christ. Rather, Jesus here is interpreted in terms of the heroes of Jewish history. He is the new David, fulfilling all the prophecies of the ideal king of David's line. Like David,

* Two phrases in Ac 2[42] are of special importance: (i) *The Apostles' teaching.* In the first age systematic instruction was given after baptism rather than (as later) before it, the work of the 'evangelist' being distinguished from that of the 'teacher.' Thus it may be as serious an error to suppose that St. Peter knew no more than he preaches to the unbaptized in Ac 1-5, 10, as it would be to suppose that St. Paul knew no more than he preaches in Ac 13. On the content of the traditional instruction presupposed in the NT see *The Bible in the Church*, OT 12, and *The N.T. and the Catholic Creeds*, 378 ff. (ii) *The breaking of bread.* St. Paul in 1 Cor 11[23] ff. gives us the formulated tradition of the Palestinian Church (cf. 1 Cor 15[3]), to which Mark also bears witness. We have therefore every reason to believe that the breaking of the bread here mentioned (cf. [46]) is identical with the Lord's Supper. Cf. *The Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 295*b*, *The Theology of St. Paul*, 422, and *Sacraments in the N.T.*, 397, 398.—Ed.

He is at first defeated and banished by His enemies, but by God's help returns to claim His kingdom over God's people (2 [29] ff., 4 [25] ff.). He is the great deliverer, bringing both salvation from enemies and conditions of new life. He is the new Moses, fulfilling the prophecy of Dt 18 [15]. In its original context it seems to foretell a line of prophets who will continue the work of Moses. But it was often taken to mean a single prophet. The Jews expected a last and greatest prophet who should herald the Messiah. Whether they ever identified him with the Messiah is doubtful. During His earthly life Jesus was regarded primarily as a prophet. He was in a sense His own forerunner.

The Greek word for servant (*pais*) ([13]) may mean equally 'son' (AV). It has the ambiguity of the English 'boy.' Does it convey an allusion to the suffering Servant of Is 53? That Jesus had consciously identified Himself with the Servant of the second Isaiah is certain. In 8 [32-34] (cf. 2 [23]), in virtue of this identification, His sufferings and death are interpreted as having a sacrificial and redemptive value (cf. [18]). It has been objected that this use of the term must have originated among Greek-speaking Christians, and is antedated by Luke in these chapters.

The Hebrew word in Isaiah can only mean 'servant' or 'slave.' In LXX it is translated by *pais*, which Hellenists sometimes misunderstood to mean 'son' (e.g. Wisd 2 [13, 16, 18]). It is argued that while Christians might have spoken of Jesus as the *pais*, i.e. the Son of Jehovah, they would never have called Him the 'slave' of Jehovah. That would be an impossibly low Christology. Later Christian literature, except the Didache, always used the term in the sense of 'son,' and added epithets to prevent misconception. But this argument is not conclusive. 'Slave' did not carry the degrading associations for a Jew that it did for the Greeks and does for us. In OT it is freely applied to Abraham or Moses. It is also applied to David, just in those passages where the promise of the Kingdom to his house is most clearly set forth (2 S 7 [5-8, 20-21], etc.; Ps 89 [3, 20], in close connexion with the idea of son). In Jewish prayers, in reference to David as the type of the Messiah, it frequently occurs (cf. 4 [30]). In the *Didache*, an early Jewish-Christian document, in a primitive eucharistic prayer based on Jewish prayers, Jesus and David are called by the title in the same sentence. In short, there is no reason to doubt that the application of the term to Jesus might well have arisen in Aramaic Christian circles. Whether it was at first used only in a general sense, and if so, how soon it was connected with the ideal figure of Isaiah, we cannot tell. Though the Servant was not commonly identified by the Jews with the Messiah, nor was there any current expectation of a suffering Messiah, yet the title might well be brought into connexion with that of the Messiah. The claim to fulfil the two ideals made by Jesus was facilitated by the fact that both sum up the vocation of Israel in a single figure. They are probably already united in the voice at the Baptism (Mk 1 [11]).

17 preserves an indisputably primitive trait, the allowance that is made for the people's ignorance. It suggests the hope of repentance. This thought goes back to the days when it was still hoped that the majority of the Jews would be converted. It is in sharp contrast to later expressions when it had been made clear that as a whole they would persist in their rejection of Jesus.

19 affords a clear expression of primitive belief. Jesus is enthroned in heaven waiting to return in full Messianic glory. The 'times of restoration of all things' is the final establishment of the Kingdom of God after the judgement. Meanwhile those who repent will be refreshed, that is by the power of the Spirit sent down. Life in the Christian fellowship here and now is a partial anticipation of the life in the coming Kingdom.

26. raised up refers not to the Resurrection, but to the words of Deuteronomy just quoted. It means 'placed on the stage of history.'

IV. **1-22. The Beginnings of Opposition.**—It was natural that the first attack on the new sect should come from the Sadducees. In contrast to the Pharisees they were lukewarm towards the Messianic hope in every form and disbelieved in any resurrection. They had also been primarily responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus. As consisting of the worldly and comfortable, they feared any Messianic disturbance which might provoke the intervention of the Romans and lead to the upset of the established order (cf. Jn 11 [48-50]). The grounds of hostility that appear in this chapter and in the next are in accord with this attitude. They were annoyed at unrecognized teachers preaching in the Temple ([13]). Still more intolerable was the subject of their preaching, not simply the abstract doctrine of a

resurrection, but the assertion of a concrete case resting on the evidence of eye-witnesses (2). Further, this risen Jesus was declared to be Messiah, and this might easily lead to a popular rising like those which had proved disastrous (cf. 17, 5 24, and the comparisons made by Gamaliel, 5 35 ff.). This would probably include the attempt to take vengeance on them for the death of Jesus (5 28).

The Pharisees at present inclined to a benevolent neutrality. They regarded the sect as harmless. With much of their ethical teaching, with their preaching of the Messianic hope in a spiritual rather than in a temporal sense, and with a belief in the resurrection they would be in full accord. The belief in the actual resurrection of Jesus seemed absurd, but time would put that right. If the Nazarenes were deluded, at least their delusion was on sound lines. It is also possible the sect included a few Pharisees whom they would be unwilling to desert in face of an attack by the Sadducees. Even at a far later date support was given to Paul under similar circumstances (23 6-9).

1. The Sadducean party consisted chiefly of the rich High-Priestly families who had charge of the Temple and grew wealthy on the trade carried on in it. If we read 'chief priests,' as in RVm, the term is probably used to include not only the High Priest but those who had held the office and other leaders. The Captain of the Temple was a priest, second in authority only to the High Priest, who superintended the Temple guard.

6. According to the Law, the High-Priesthood was an office for life, but in actual practice, from the time of Herod, it had been treated as at the disposal of the supreme civil power. Annas had been deposed by the Romans. Of John and Alexander nothing is known for certain, but the mention of their names points to a local source. These verses describe the meeting of the Sanhedrin, in which at this date the Sadducees and Pharisees were probably about equally balanced. The majority of the scribes were on the side of the Pharisees. The court had supreme authority both in civil and criminal cases, though they had lost the power of inflicting the death penalty.

7. The word used for **power** is different from that used for 'authority.' The question suggests the use of some magical incantation which would be an offence against the Law (Dt 13). The charge is parallel to that made against Jesus Himself of healing by the power of evil spirits.

11. This passage from Ps 118, already applied by Jesus to Himself (Mk 12 10-11), became one of the commonplaces of early Christian apologetics. In its original context it applied to Israel, and was easily transferred to the Messiah in whom the destiny and purpose of Israel was summed up.

12. **salvation** is in Greek literally 'the salvation,' that is the Messianic deliverance of God's people. This was popularly viewed both in a crude and nationalistic sense, and in a more spiritual sense.

13. The exact meaning is that they perceived that they were men who had had no training in the Jewish schools, and (some of them) recognized that they had seen them formerly in the company of Jesus.

18. The authorities were in a difficult position, especially in view of the favour of the people towards the Apostles. No definite crime had been committed. Accordingly they are dismissed with vague threats in the hope that this will check the spread of the movement.

23-31. The Church's Prayer.—O Lord (24) is not the ordinary word, but a stronger one meaning 'sovereign' or 'master.' It is found in early Christian prayers, and is still used in Eastern Liturgies. The persecution (25) is interpreted in the light of Ps 2, which foretold the futility of such rebellion against God's anointed King. Also the same word 'Servant' is applied first to David and then to Jesus. 31 suggests a repetition of Pentecost. Such a recurrence of ecstatic speech would be in full accordance with what modern science would expect. So, too, many parallels to the experience of the room being shaken could be quoted from recent times.

32-35. The Inner Life of the Community.—How long an interval has elapsed since the former account we cannot tell. The only apparent development is some rudimentary organization for the distribution of the funds under the care of the Apostles. The opening words of 34 regard the condition as a fulfilment of the prophecy of Dt 15 4.

36-37. The Case of Barnabas.—This is given partly as being a notable instance, partly to act as a foil to the case that follows. The 'Son of exhortation' or 'consolation' was a popular interpretation of his name. Like many pieces of popular etymology in the Bible, it is probably wrong. The name seems to mean 'Son of Nebo,' a demon.

V. 1-11. Ananias and Sapphira.—There is no reason to doubt that this incident is

historical. Such a blot on the ideal fellowship of the first days would hardly be invented. Nor can any symbolical meaning be discerned in the names. They are given simply because they are historically true. Again, the story is true to psychology. Granted the mental atmosphere of the time, suggestion would be the psychological channel through which the sudden result can be explained. The details that arouse suspicion are the rapid burial of Ananias, apparently without his wife's knowledge (9), the treatment of Sapphira by Peter, and the lack of any investigation by the authorities. But we are dealing with an Oriental town where modern methods were unknown, and the details may have been compressed. As in the case of Pentecost, the story is prophetic in character, primarily concerned to emphasize spiritual lessons. The act is regarded as a sin against the Spirit-filled body and therefore against the Spirit of God Himself. It is a breach of fellowship, which is the very life of the Church. Further, we come very close to the ideas which both in the Old and New Testaments underlie excommunication. This is primarily the cutting off of the offender from the life of the people of God, and therefore his forfeiture of the divine blessing and protection which such membership carries with it. It is consequently expected that the powers of evil will take advantage of his defenceless position and inflict suffering or even death (cf. 1 Cor 5 3-5; 1 Tim 1 20). So here two members of the Church had by their inward disloyalty severed themselves from the life of the body. Peter does no more than declare what is an accomplished fact, and the result of its public apprehension is death (cf. death as a punishment for the profanation of the Eucharist in 1 Cor 11 30). The effect both on the Church and on those outside was to deepen the sense of the 'numinousness' of the society. It was felt to be charged with the death-dealing holiness of God.* In 11 we meet for the first time the word 'church' (*ecclesia*) as applied to the Christian body.

12-16. A period of growth, of quite uncertain length. The movement spreads outside Jerusalem. 13 is obscure. The 'rest' may mean either the Christians other than the Apostles, or the non-Christians. So, too, the words 'join himself' literally mean 'fasten himself.' The verse probably asserts the supremacy of the Apostles, who stood out apart from the rest; or it might mean that the people as a whole magnified the Christian body, but kept at a distance from them. This might be due to the threats of the priests, or to awe at the supernatural powers that they seemed to display. Or, again, there may be a mistranslation from the Aramaic.

17-42. The Second Arrest.—While there is the possibility that this is a duplicate account of the arrest in 4, it is more naturally regarded as a second and independent attempt by the authorities to suppress the new movement in view of its continued growth. Such attempts must always present a number of similar features (cf. e.g. the arrests of the 'suffragettes' in modern days). The new developments are the increased hostility of the Sadducees (33) and the declared attitude of the Pharisees. This last is in full accord with the traditional policy of the party to wait on God until He should be pleased to send the Kingdom. It would come when Israel really kept the Law. Meanwhile attempts to bring it in by force were to be discouraged on all grounds. 'An angel of the Lord opened the prison doors' (19) is a common Jewish way of describing an occurrence in which the intervention of God is plainly to be discerned. The escape may well have been due to human help regarded as sent by God. So in 2 K 19 35 the pestilence that destroyed the army of Sennacherib is the work of the angel of the Lord. There is no mention of any miracle before the Sanhedrin.

The names 'Theudas' and 'Judas of Galilee' have aroused considerable discussion. Josephus records that a Theudas led a very great multitude to the river Jordan, promising to divide it before them, and was captured and executed by Cuspius Fadus, who was the Roman Governor, not earlier than A.D. 44, that is many years after the date of Gamaliel's speech. Either, then, Luke has blundered in putting his name into the speech, or he is referring to some other leader with a similar name. Theudas is a common contraction for many names, and revolts of various kinds were abundant at this time. Nor is the 'four hundred men' of 36 easily reconcilable with the account of Josephus. We must therefore leave it open whether Luke or his source has committed an anachronism or not.

Further, the rebellion of Judas took place in A.D. 6-8, but in the book of Josephus called the *Antiquities*, the crucifixion of the sons of Judas is men-

* It should be observed that both 1 Cor 5 5 and 11 32 suggest that the infliction of death has a purpose of mercy behind it.—ED.

tioned in the paragraph which follows after the account of the rebellion of Theudas. It is argued that the order of the names in this speech is due to a careless reading of Josephus by Luke. Not only has he committed a blunder by mentioning Theudas at all, but he has put the two rebels in the wrong order. Both these mistakes can best be explained by the reference to Josephus. If this is admitted, Acts must be dated quite late, since the *Antiquities* was not published before about A.D. 93. In spite of the acceptance of this theory by reputable scholars, the arguments against it are strong. The general account in Josephus is very different, and the mistake would involve an almost incredible amount of carelessness on the part of Luke. It is probably a mere coincidence which has been exaggerated. If any weight is to be attached to it, the solution is probably to be found in the sources common to Luke and Josephus. If we allow the existence of more than one Theudas the difficulty simply disappears.

VI. 1-7. **The Seven.**—The last chapter ended with a note of triumphant perseverance through shame and suffering. But we now reach the series of events which led to the break-up of this first period of Church life. The position of the Church as a sect within Judaism localized at Jerusalem could not last. It must either go forward or go back. Either it must develop on lines of its own and diverge increasingly from the old Israel, or it must sink back into the common life and be reabsorbed. The change did not come through any statesmanship on the part of the Apostles, or as the result of any thought-out scheme, but rather through the rough pressure of outside circumstances. Events, that at first sight seemed hostile to its very life, proved to be the means of entrance into a fuller life. The old comfortable fellowship was shattered only that it might be enlarged.

The occasion was a development of organization to meet a sudden emergency. The community had included from the first both Hebrews, i.e. Palestinian Aramaic-speaking Jews, and Hellenists, i.e. Greek-speaking Jews. The former tended to despise the latter, partly owing to their closer connexion with the Holy Land and partly because Hellenists who lived among the heathen were accused, often with good reason, of a tendency to laxity. The Hellenists had their own synagogues, where the Scriptures were read in Greek, even in Jerusalem. This division reproduced itself in the Christian body. The Hellenists as the smaller and weaker party would be sensitive to any grievance. By this time the distribution of goods had taken the form of a daily ministration, whether of money or food we are not told. There appears something like a list of needy widows. It is even possible, though it is not stated, that the supply of funds was running short as the disciples increased. At Jerusalem a large part of the population of the city lived on religion. We should like to know how far Christians continued to receive alms from the Temple charities, after they had joined the new sect. The apparently unlimited time that many believers were able to spend on the practice of religion suggests that they had no occupation. On all these points we can only conjecture, but some shortage of funds may have helped to produce the crisis.

The appointment of the Seven was an emergency measure. There was not any idea of founding a ministry that should last throughout the ages. The Lord's return was expected at any moment, or at any rate quite soon. The choice of the Seven was only intended to tide over the interval. Yet it remains true that in their method of appointment we see the presence of all those elements which have marked ordination in the Catholic Church throughout the ages. We may also safely infer from Luke's method that he wishes us to regard it as a typical example of ordination in the Apostolic Church. The initiative lies with the Apostles (2). The action is that of the whole Church in the power of the Spirit. The Greek word for multitude is that regularly used to denote a religious community. The candidates are chosen by the community, who recognizes that they are 'full of the Spirit.' Here we find the idea of vocation. The candidate must not only feel that he is inwardly called by the Spirit, but the truth of his call must be tested and approved by the Church.* The community as a whole presents them, and the Apostles

* Nowhere, either in the OT or in the NT, is there apparently any suggestion that an inward call consciously experienced is necessary before entering the *regular* ministry of the Church, and the assertion of its necessity is often a serious hindrance to suitable men. Inward calls, to be tested and approved by the Church, belong both in the OT and in the NT to the 'prophets'; and valuable as are prophetic gifts, they are not necessary to the office of the presbyter or deacon. In the NT the call to the presbyterate comes from without by the Apostle or prophet (Ac 14^{23}; 1 Tim 1^{18}, 4^{14}, etc.); the ordinand recognizes in this the call of God, and receives ordination, inwardly persuaded that he thus does God's will. No inward call appears to be necessary beyond this *inward persuasion*.—ED.

pray over them and lay their hands upon them. All these elements have their place in our present services of ordination. The underlying idea of the laying on of hands is, as we have seen, the transference of authority. The Church meets a new crisis. The Holy Spirit has raised up members of the body who are gifted for the new work. The body is given the insight to select and approve them. The Apostles, as the divinely appointed organs of the body, impart due authority to perform certain functions on behalf of the whole body. In the Church, as in any organism, the putting forth of a new organ to meet a new need is a sign of vitality. To distinguish between a 'local' and a 'charismatic' ministry in the primitive Church is a false antithesis. All ministry is charismatic, since it is done in the power of a special endowment of the Spirit.

We do not know why seven were appointed. It was a sacred number among the Jews. But more probably it corresponded to some detail of organization. There may have been seven centres for Christian gatherings. Their names are all Greek, but it is precarious to conclude that they were all Hellenists, since many Jews had Greek names. Were they in any real sense the first 'deacons'? The title is never used, though the verb from which the name deacon is derived is employed (2). In 21 8 they are spoken of as 'the seven,' and Philip is styled 'the Evangelist.' There is a certain Church tradition in favour of regarding them as the first examples of the later deacons. We must not expect at this time and under these conditions to find definite titles for specialized offices. All we are entitled to see is the beginning of a division of functions in the Church. Later 'deacon' became specialized into a title for a particular order. No such purpose was as yet present in the mind of the Church. The real difficulty, which we have not the evidence to solve, is that they are by no means limited to the kind of work for which they were selected. Both Stephen and Philip at once become prominent in preaching. We must not, however, expect strict specialization.

7 gives us the last of the summaries which describe in general terms the life of the Church. There is no hint of the period of time which it is meant to cover. The priests are probably those of the humbler orders.

8-15. The Ministry of Stephen.—The importance of his work in the light of later events can hardly be overestimated. The precise nature of his teaching we will consider when we come to his speech. The important point is that it roused for the first time the hostility of the Pharisees against the Christians. He laid himself open to the charge of undermining the authority of the Law, and that touched their most cherished convictions. It was just on this point that Christ Himself had aroused their hostility. The Pharisees, once roused, were more likely to be dangerous than the Sadducees. They had the support of the people. It is significant that a pupil of Gamaliel now takes the lead. Whether [9] mentions one or three or five synagogues is uncertain. In any case, Stephen's work was among Hellenists, and may be compared to the later work of Paul. The chief argument would be whether Jesus was the Christ or no.

VII. **1-53. Stephen's Speech.**—This appears at first sight to our Western minds to be largely irrelevant; but, if we consider it in the light of the prevailing methods of argument, it is really most able. The one common ground between him and his opponents was the Scriptures. These he interprets in the manner common in the Rabbinical schools, and especially in the form developed at Alexandria. His speech in many places shows the influence of the LXX, which he follows in preference to the Hebrew text. Also he makes use of traditions, not always consistent with the Old Testament, which are found elsewhere, as in Philo, the Alexandrian Jewish writer.

The main lines of argument may be summarized thus:

(1) God's relation to His people is shown by Scripture to be independent of Canaan, the Temple, or the Law. Thus He appeared in foreign lands, e.g. Mesopotamia and Haran. He was with His people in Egypt, and appeared to Moses in Midian (cf. [33]). The mention of Shechem in [16], as the first piece of Canaan owned by the Patriarchs, is a reminder that it now belonged to the hated Samaritans. Again, until the time of Solomon Israel had no temple, only a tabernacle which had been made by the direct command of God after the pattern shown in the vision. Even Solomon's structure (the word implies a contrast between a movable tent and a permanent house) was not an abiding and complete realization of the meeting-place between God and His people. The prophet had declared it to be unessential.

(2) Scripture showed that Israel had persistently rejected God's ministers. They had been jealous of Joseph and Moses. Joseph had been betrayed, but in

the end proved their saviour. Moses had been driven away, but raised up again to deliver them. They had always persecuted their prophets. It was on a line with this that they should have rejected Jesus and killed Him, but that He should have been raised up to be their Saviour.

(3) God's covenant was earlier than, and independent of, the Law. Even when the Law had been given through the mediation of angels (a current belief regarded as enhancing its sanctity), Israel had from the first disobeyed it. When the Righteous One came who perfectly fulfilled it, they killed Him. Even the Law itself pointed to the coming of a new and greater prophet, a second Moses, who should supersede it, and the prophets had foretold the coming of a Righteous One. These predictions had been fulfilled in the person of Jesus.

This speech has a character of its own that is evidence of its genuineness. While on many points it anticipates the teaching of St. Paul, it is in general method closer to the mind of the unknown author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who was undoubtedly an Alexandrian Jew. Indeed, this Epistle supplies the best illustration of the general background of thought which is indispensable for a correct understanding of Stephen's speech. The contrast is always implicit between this visible and material world, which is transitory, and the eternal world of ultimate reality; or, again, between this world or age, and that which is to come. The one stands to the other as shadow to substance, or type to fulfilment. On this view the Old Covenant, the Law, and the Temple belong to this age and world. They are at best partial and temporary foreshadowings of eternal realities. They are intended to pass away. There is no reason to suppose, with Knox,* that the earlier devotion to the Law was regarded as a mistake. Rather, if the new age has in some sense arrived, if Jesus the Messiah has by His death inaugurated a new covenant, it implies that the old covenant and all that belonged to it is already passing away. At the coming of Jesus in glory it will be abolished. Even during this period of transition its binding authority may be questioned. If by baptism believers have been transplanted into the coming Kingdom and received the Spirit, what need is there to go on keeping the Law? Further, there were sayings of Jesus Himself to which appeal could be made. They had roused the attention of such as Stephen, whereas they had been passed over by the majority of the Church. As time passed, inevitably elements in His teaching that had been ignored might come into their own and assume a new prominence. He had foretold the destruction of the Temple, and as Messiah could claim to abolish the old Law. While there is no evidence for any widespread laxity in the observance of the Law among Hellenists, there were tendencies both in thought and conduct which could prepare the way for such views as are here attributed to Stephen. Indeed, the charge is similar to that brought against Jesus Himself. At the same time, as far as we can tell, the direction of this new movement was at present negative rather than positive. Its full meaning was to be discerned later when Hellenists carried Stephen's principles to their logical conclusion and admitted Gentiles to the Church without demanding observance of the Law. But even now it was irreconcilable with the current Rabbinic belief that the Law was eternal and unchangeable and coexisted with God from the beginning.

In the speech itself the slight differences between its statements and those of our text of OT are due to the Septuagint, or to independent traditions. The most serious is that in ^{42}. Amos has in place of Rephan, 'Chiun,' the Assyrian name for the planet Saturn. It must refer to the later idolatrous worship of Assyrian gods, which is to be punished by exile in Assyria. Such could not have been known in Egypt. But most scholars regard the whole verse in Amos as a later interpolation. Stephen uses the verse to charge Israel with idolatry from the first and, perhaps unconsciously, substitutes for Damascus 'Babylon,' the typical later oppressor. In ^{53} 'according to the commandments of angels' is clearly the right meaning, but can hardly be got out of the Greek, which seems to be a mistranslation of an Aramaic preposition. If so, the speech goes back to a Jerusalem source.

VII. 54-VIII. **1. The Death of Stephen.**—Whether his speech was cut short or whether the abrupt ending is intentional is doubtful.

55 describes a prophetic ecstasy, a vision of God in the power of the Holy Spirit. Jesus is seen sharing 'the glory of God.' The title 'Son of Man' is found only here outside the Gospels. It is clearly used in the same sense in which Christ Himself claimed it in Mk 14 ^{62}, and denotes, as in Daniel and Enoch, a superhuman figure. The repre-

* Cf. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, ii.

sentation of Him as standing, not sitting, as in all other instances, shows that this is not a mere conventional picture, but an authentic reminiscence. He stands, having risen from His throne to succour and welcome His disciples. It is important to observe not only that prayer is made to Him, but the character of the prayer. While Jesus Himself had commended His spirit to the Father, Stephen commends his to Jesus. He is in effect treated as divine. The word 'Lord' in [59] (RV) is an insertion. It should run 'calling upon' (the regular word for prayer) 'him, and saying.'

As the Jews had lost the power of inflicting capital punishment, either this was an isolated case of lynch law, and the trial before the Sanhedrin (6 [15]) ended in something like a riot, or, more probably, the Roman power was at the moment too weak to interfere. The incident may fall about the end of A.D. 35, when Pilate had been superseded, his successor had not yet arrived, and serious disturbances had broken out in Galilee. For the moment Roman authority was in abeyance. Caiaphas certainly would not have the will, and might not have the power, to prevent the carrying out of the sentence that the Law pronounced on blasphemy.

The persecution in Jerusalem was probably in the main one of Hellenists by Hellenists. The Apostles were not disturbed. They were known to be strict observers of the Law. And Stephen's burial was carried out by 'devout,' that is law-observing, Jews.

VIII. **1-4. Its Effects.**

3 may imply that others were put to death (cf. 9[1] and 26[10]), but this is not conclusive. The threats may only have been threats, and the statement of 26[10] may only be a generalization from the case of Stephen. Certainly many cannot have been killed, for fear of Roman investigations.

4 sums up the result. We get for the first time a Christian dispersion. The same verb is used as was used for the dispersion of the old Israel (so also in 11 [19]).

5-24. Philip at Samaria.—By going to Samaria Philip passed outside the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin. If the article is pressed, 'the city of Samaria' must mean Sebaste, which was mainly heathen. But the converts seem to be Samaritans, who claimed to be, and by race largely were, true Jews, in spite of the contempt of the Jews themselves. They expected a Messiah of some kind, and so would be prepared to receive the message.* Simon appears as the first example of Oriental sorcery, which was one of the great foes both of Græco-Roman culture and of Christianity. The obscure phrase of [10] means that he claimed to be something like the Messiah (cf. 1 Cor 1 [24]). In the signs and wonders wrought by Philip he recognized a power greater than his own. This new departure required the approval of the Mother-Church at Jerusalem and of the Apostles. Peter and John are sent down by the Twelve, perhaps in imitation of the time when Jesus had sent them out two by two. Philip had only baptized the converts with Christian baptism. He had apparently not attempted to lay his hands on them. Nor had they displayed the visible signs of the receiving of the Spirit, such as speaking with tongues, which were still expected to mark His coming. The converts then were in the position which the disciples had been in before Pentecost, marked out as members of the Kingdom, but not yet empowered to share its life. This was remedied by the laying on of hands, followed by some external sign of the outpouring of the Spirit. Thus God Himself approved the admission of a new class of convert into His people. The story raises the question of the relation of baptism to the gift of the Spirit. Normally baptism and the laying on of hands formed one rite. Here alone do we find any mention of their separation. We must beware of reading into the life of the primitive church the clear-cut and fixed order of a later date. Only with this caution can we speak of this as a 'Confirmation,' and compare the coming of the Apostles to the visit of a Bishop to-day.* Philip did not lay on

* The Samaritan conception of the Messiah seems to have been that of a prophet like unto Moses (Dt 18 [15] ff.). Thus the Lord could, quite early in His ministry, claim the title in Samaria (Jn 4 [25, 26]) as He could not safely do in Judæa or Galilee; and His work in Samaria may both have encouraged Philip's and made it easier.—ED.

* The NT doctrine of 'Confirmation' is everywhere the same, though not clearly worked out into a formal 'theology' of the sacrament. Cf. *The Theology of St. Paul*, 421*b*, and *Sacraments in the N.T.*, 398*b*, 399*a*. The chief points are these: (i) The term 'Baptism' often covers both baptism in the later sense, and the laying on of hands, the latter being at first confined to the Apostles as its sole ministers. (ii) It is the laying on of hands, as in the OT (Dt 34 [9]), which confers the gift of the Spirit, the exact position of those 'only baptized' (Ac 8 [16]) not being clearly indicated. Thus it is fairly clear in view of Ac 2 [38] that the baptism of Ac 2 [41] included both parts of the rite. The converts in Ac 2 received the laying on of hands, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, while those of Ac 10 [44-48] perhaps did not, since the Holy Ghost had been already bestowed. Cf. also Ac 19 [1-6]; 1 Cor 12 [13]; Tit 3 [5]; and Heb 6 [2], where the context

hands, probably because his authority was limited and this was reserved for the Twelve. Or it may simply have been due to hesitation about receiving Samaritans direct into the new Israel. Their admission must have raised various problems about whose solution we can only conjecture. They did in some sense keep the Law. But could they be permitted to go on worshipping in their own Temple on Gerizim, as the Jewish Christians did in the Temple at Jerusalem? In any case they could not worship at Jerusalem, and thus we get a body of Christians in whose religion Judaism had no place. This would be a step towards the admission of the Gentiles.

Simon's request (19) marks the difference between the Christian view of sacraments and the magical view, common in heathen circles. For Christians sacraments convey a real 'gift of God,' but one that demands a moral response. It can only be received and enjoyed by faith. On the magical view they act mechanically. By doing the right act compulsion, so to say, is put upon God. Simon is not mentioned again in Acts, but Christian tradition has much to say about him. He is represented as appearing at Rome, and as there and elsewhere having contests with St. Peter. Many of the stories about him are clearly legends, but there is probably a nucleus of historical truth. He has given his name to the sin of 'simony.'

25 emphasizes the fact that the Kingdom had now plainly by the will of God been opened to a new class. We heard of no preaching on the way to Samaria.

26-40. The Ethiopian Eunuch.—Luke gives a series of anecdotes which are plainly derived from personal intercourse with Philip. But they are selected with a purpose. By Dt 23[1] no eunuch was to be admitted to the assembly of the Lord. It is that true this is cancelled in Is 56[4], but the letter of the Law prevailed over the prophecy whose full fulfilment was reserved for Christianity. A man is admitted into the Kingdom belonging to a distant race, not a Jew, though in touch with Judaism, but shut out from full membership in the old Israel. This was an isolated case, probably never known to the Church at large, but another step to the admission of the Gentiles.

26. an angel of the Lord is an OT phrase, and here simply means divine guidance. **the same is desert** probably refers to Gaza itself (32). The incident is an excellent instance of the need of guidance in interpreting the Scriptures. Neither the Old nor New Testament was ever intended to be read in separation from the living tradition of the community in which it was composed. The passage is quoted from LXX, which explains the differences from our ordinary English text. Here, beyond all doubt, the reference is to the suffering Servant of Isaiah, as explaining the sufferings and death of Jesus in face of the objections of the Jews.

AV inserts 37: 'And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.' This is absent from the best authorities, but must be quite an early insertion, as it is known to Irenæus by A.D. 180. It gives a simple confession of faith made before baptism, in the form familiar to the author of the verse. Such a confession is most primitive and is the origin of the later Creeds. What strikes us in the present case is the small amount of preparation that can have been possible.

39. Was baptism in this case by immersion? This is suggested by the language of St. Paul, but we do not know that it was universal, and early Christian art represents affusion. The Didache allows affusion as an alternative in case of need.

IX. 1-19. The Conversion of Saul.—This, again, is a direct result of the death of Stephen. The narrative returns to Jerusalem and Saul. The Sanhedrin possessed a certain moral authority over all Jewish communities, though it had no means of enforcing its will. But the commission to bring Christian Jews to Jerusalem goes far beyond this. The possibility of such action suggests that Roman authority was for the moment weak. Probably Aretas was at this time in possession of Damascus, whether he had gained it by force or by peaceful means. He would be willing not to interfere with the proceedings to gain the moral support of the Jewish authorities in his struggle against Antipas. So later (24, cf. 2 Cor 11 32) the governor who represented Aretas, supported the Jews in their plot to kill Paul after his conversion. This explains the possibility of drastic action against Christians at Damascus, which was not possible elsewhere. It is to be

shows the great importance of the laying on of hands in the mind of the writer. Plainly it was intended to be a sacrament of abiding importance, though the strange phenomena at first frequently following it might pass away. For the biblical and patristic teaching cf. Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, and (for a different view) Darwell Stone, *Holy Baptism*. —Ed.

observed that there was some sort of Christian community there already which still attended the synagogues, as well as fugitive Christians from Jerusalem. Psychology has studied the mental processes of conversion, and attempts have been made to explain the narrative of Acts on these lines. Though the conversion appears to be sudden, it is really preceded by a long period of unconscious preparation in the mind. Paul had been strongly influenced both by the arguments and by the martyrdom of Stephen. He had repressed his leanings to Christianity (cf. 26 [14]). The vehemence of his zeal for persecution shows that they were at work in his unconscious mind. The outbreak of the repressed Christian complex into consciousness was occasioned not by any definite external influence, but by the fatigue of the journey, leading to a weakening of the control of the conscious mind. The unconscious complex was projected by Paul on to the external world, and appeared as the voice of Christ speaking from outside. So all visions and voices which are perceived in these abnormal conditions are really forms of thought, the creation of the mind's own activity which it fails to recognize as such. Again, the blindness was mental, the effect of his unwillingness to see himself as a Christian. Sight could only be regained by complete and conscious acceptance of Christianity. Such blindness is often found when a man refuses to understand and accept what is incompatible with his conscious attitude. Thus Paul's conversion was the solution of a conflict which had for some time been going on unconsciously in his mind. The vivid experiences which accompanied it and the variations in the different accounts of these experiences are such as we should expect. As a man looks back, he finds it difficult to describe what he has gone through, and, as time passes, memories of the experience and later reflections upon the experience become intermixed.*

But though psychology can explain the mental mechanism of conversion, it cannot either prove or disprove the objective reality of the new belief thus attained. Because we have come to know something of the psychical means through which Paul passed to a belief in Jesus as Christ, that does not in the least show that the event was not a direct act of God, that we can only call a miracle. There are in it elements that transcend normal human experience. The real proof that St. Paul was in touch with supernatural and objective reality is to be found in the transforming and quickening of his whole life that followed. If the vision were an illusion, it is strange that it should show itself to be a lasting source of power and harmony in his life. Truths perceived in visions have to be tested in the same way as those gained in the ordinary way. Thus while psychology renders such a narrative as this intelligible to us in a way that was not formerly possible, it leaves open a full belief in the reality of the supernatural and the personal action of the ascended Christ (cf. Thouless, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*, 187 ff., and c. xvii). St. Paul himself classed it not with ordinary visions, but with the appearances of the risen Christ to the Apostles (1 Cor 15 [8]). The report of the conversion also affords us a good opportunity of testing Luke's methods as an historian. It can be compared with two similar reports in 22 and 26. We observe at once that though the main outline is the same, he is at no pains to smooth

* The psychological view above described, though attractive, is exposed to serious difficulties. (i) St. Paul, though familiar in his own experience with visions, seems to have regarded this appearance of the Lord as fundamentally differing from them, and as of the same character as the appearances to the Eleven after the resurrection. Cf. not only 1 Cor 15 [5-8], but 1 Cor 9 [1]. The words 'last of all' (1 Cor 15 [8]) differentiate the appearance on the Damascene road from those of Ac 18 [9] and 23 [11]. The appearances to the Eleven cannot be explained by the new psychology, and it is not likely that a 'vision' would have been accepted as putting St. Paul's call to apostleship on the same level as that of the Twelve (cf. Gal 1 [1] and 2 [7]). In Gal 1 [16] the word '*en*' is probably instrumental, and should be translated 'by.' Cf. Lightfoot *ad loc.* (ii) There is no evidence that St. Paul had been strongly influenced by St. Stephen, and very little that he had repressed leanings to Christianity. He never refers to Stephen except casually in Ac 22 [20], nor does he use Stephen's line of argument, while he always insists upon his entire good faith as a persecutor, and ascribes his conversion to the sovereign grace of God. Cf. carefully Ac 23 [1]; 24 [16]; 1 Cor 15 [9, 10]; 1 Tim 1 [12-16]. The 'goad' of Ac 26 [14] is not a metaphor likely to be employed of the 'prickings of conscience.' It is more suited to external troubles, such as St. Paul's disappointments as a persecutor. Moreover, even if St. Paul did occasionally experience leanings to Christianity, they must have been, in view of his strong assertion of his good faith, far too slight for their repression to produce a psychological complex. (iii) It is almost impossible to explain the words of the Lord to him as the product of his subconscious mind. He would have known neither the Lord's habit of twice using the name of those with whom He remonstrates (Lk 10 [41], 22 [31]), nor His characteristic way of remonstrating by asking the reason of the action which He condemns (Mt 14 [31], 26 [50]; Mk 5 [39]; Jn 18 [23]), nor the mystical doctrine of the union of the Church with Christ, which never appears in the public evangelistic preaching of the Apostles.—ED.

away slight divergencies in detail. Thus in 22 stress is laid on the piety of Ananias, as is natural in a defence before a Jewish mob, but it is strange that no mention is made of his vision. On the other hand, in 26 no reference is made to Ananias at all, and the command to go to the Gentiles is assigned to the moment of conversion, while in the other two accounts it is divided between the vision given to Ananias and his own speech to Saul. There is no claim to absolute verbal accuracy. Whether the various reports come from different sources or are in the main Luke's own composition is uncertain. In any case, the story of his conversion was an oft-told tale, and the tendency is for such to grow in repetition. It is impossible for the most honest mind to distinguish between the experiences of the moment and later meditations on them. In Gal 1 we have St. Paul's own references to it. He regards it from a different standpoint, namely an inward spiritual experience, and stress is laid on the personal act of God in calling him. It adds, what Acts passes over in silence, a visit to Arabia, between the conversion and the preaching in Damascus. Arabia probably means the desert close to Damascus, and the purpose of the visit was doubtless silent communion with God in order to readjust his life and outlook to his new convictions. Hence its omission by Luke is natural. He is concerned with events as bearing on the progress of the Church and preparing the way for the mission to the Gentiles.

13. saints as a title for Christians is first used here in Acts. In the Old Testament it is often used for Israel as a 'holy nation.' It denotes consecration rather than actual holiness.

18. Conversion is no substitute for baptism even in the case of St. Paul. There is no explicit mention of the laying on of hands, unless it is included in the baptism.

20. The phrase **Son of God** is employed for the only time in Acts. Israel as a nation was God's son. The Messiah, as summing up Israel in Himself, was in a special sense God's Son (cf. [22]). But St. Paul's use of the term goes beyond this, at least in his writings; the Church was divinely prompted to see that the visible and temporal sonship was an expression in time of a relationship that was eternal in the being of God.

26-31. Paul's First Visit to Jerusalem.—This account again challenges comparison with his own record in Gal 1 [18-24]. As regards the general outline they can be reconciled. Both relate recognition by the authorities, and Galatians leaves room for a ministry of preaching in Jerusalem itself, as contrasted with Judæa (1 [22]). Galatians is silent about the part played by Barnabas. Acts suggests that the whole band of the Apostles was present, while Galatians expressly says that he only met Peter and James, the Lord's brother. Luke's information here is shown to be vague. Galatians mentions the brevity of the visit, the cause of which Acts explains. The different impression made by the two narratives is due to the difference of purpose. Paul is above all concerned to show the scantiness of his intercourse with the Jerusalem Apostles, Luke to trace his recognition as a Christian evangelist. [29] suggests that his preaching was limited to Hellenists, and Ac 22 [17-21], assuming that the vision belongs to this visit, shows a recognition that nothing was accomplished, that it was God's will that it should be so, and that he should go to the Gentiles. [30] agrees with Gal 1 [21]. From this time Paul disappears from Acts till 11 [25]. [31] sums up the history of the Church at Jerusalem for an indefinite period after the removal of the disturbing presence of Paul. Probably it now consisted almost exclusively of Hebrew Christians who did not raise awkward questions about the Law and were left undisturbed. About this time the Jews were having their own troubles with Caligula. But the old conditions had been for ever destroyed. The main current of Christian life had moved away. The addition of Galilee for the first time is significant. There is no evidence whatever for the existence of organized Christianity in Galilee during the previous period, though we should have expected that it would have begun there rather than in Jerusalem.

32-43. The Tour of Peter.—The new conditions demanded constant supervision. The stories are singularly vivid and rest on local tradition. They afford evidence of the growth of local Christian communities in Palestine. Though strict Jews viewed tanning as an unclean trade, there is no hint that the Galilean fisherman, Peter, did so, or that in [43] he was taking any step towards a more liberal attitude.

X. 1-XI. 18. The Case of Cornelius.—The space which Luke gives to this incident, and the later reference to it in 15 [7], shows the importance that he attached to it. Though the Italian band has not been identified, he was clearly a Gentile, belonging to the Roman army.

As he clearly had been there some time, and no foreign garrison was posted there till after the death of Herod Agrippa I, in A.D. 44, many regard this incident as placed too early. It may come after 12 [1-23]. Indeed, Peter's whole tour may belong to this period. Cornelius was a God-fearer (2). Round the synagogue in heathen towns there tended to gather a fringe of devout heathen attracted by the monotheism and high standard of morality among the Jews, but unwilling to take the decisive step of becoming proselytes. For men especially the demand for circumcision and the full observance of the Law was most distasteful. Such God-fearers had a more or less recognized position. They attended synagogue worship, observed the moral law, and abstained from heathen excesses. They formed the most hopeful ground in which the seed of the Gospel could be sown. Christianity offered them all that Judaism had offered in the shape of monotheism and pure morality, but also offered them full membership without any submission to burdensome restrictions. No wonder that when Christian preachers appeared they went over in large numbers to the new teaching. This accounts both for the rapid success of Christianity, e.g. in Asia, and also for the intense animosity displayed by the Jews. They saw the fruit of many years of patient labour being swept off by the propaganda of a new and hateful sect who had lowered the standard of requirement. All unwittingly the Jewish dispersion had been preparing the way for the spread of the Christian faith. The first Gentile churches must have consisted largely of those who had had their first lessons in true religion and morality in the synagogue. In Cornelius we find the first example of this most important class. We may also notice incidentally the favourable description of Roman soldiers characteristic of Luke.

Psychology, again, can throw light on the character of Peter's vision and vindicate its truth to life. He was already perplexed in his mind about the problem of the admission of the Gentiles, perhaps owing to the influence of St. Paul, though he was unwilling to face it out. He really desired to admit Gentiles. This unfulfilled desire found expression in the symbolism of the vision. Eating unclean meat was a natural symbol for contact with unclean heathen. The symbol was provided partly by the fact that he was waiting for his dinner, and partly, perhaps, by the memory of the words of Christ which had abolished the distinction between clean and unclean meats. Also the problem of intercourse with Gentiles largely centred round the problem of eating with them, since they did not observe the restrictions of the Law about food. Again, the word translated 'vessel' in 11 properly means a mainsail. This element may well be due to the fact that he had fallen into the trance gazing at the sails of ships out at sea; but it may also suggest the idea of the wide world into which the ships are sailing forth. Joppa was the port from which Jonah had sailed. In short, psychology provides substantial arguments for the historical accuracy of the vision. It is no mere literary composition of Luke or his source, but corresponds to the mental situation. Nor does this analysis in the least diminish the sense of divine guidance or inspiration. The impulse to admit the Gentiles, the desire for their salvation, came into Peter's mind from God. So, too, in the coincidence of the arrival of the messengers from Cornelius we can see the over-ruling of the divine providence. Even if we murmur the word 'telepathy,' that ultimately explains nothing. When we consider the stress that was laid on visions at the time, we can understand why they should be employed as a means of divine guidance. In itself the vision is no more sacred than any other form of thought. What proves its inspiration is its content. The supreme moral achievement was the breaking down of old prejudice under the influence of the Spirit.

28 shows the first effect of the vision. Convinced that he is being led by the Spirit, he enters under the roof of a heathen. Tradition had come to forbid any such intercourse, in order to safeguard the separateness of the holy people.

35-43. Peter's speech is very close in general thought to his earlier speeches. Most of the points have already been discussed.

35 goes a long way towards the breakdown of exclusiveness, but perhaps means no more than is implied in the most liberal parts of the Old Testament. The insertion in brackets in 36 is awkward, and may be a marginal note crept into the text.* It is not clear whether it refers to God (34) or Christ. Others suggest a slight mistake in translation from the Aramaic.

44 marks the climax. While Peter was still speaking, God, so to say, took the

* There is no MS. or patristic authority for omitting these words, and they are quite in place. The point is that the exalted Christ is Lord of Gentiles as well as of Jews.—Ed.

matter out of his hands, and by the visible sign that He had bestowed the Spirit demonstrated that He had called these uncircumcised Gentiles to be members of the new Israel, just as they were. No wonder that the Hebrew Christians who had not yet advanced to the position of Peter were astonished. The phrase 'they of the circumcision' here appears for the first time. Later it is used to denote the strict Jewish party. But though God has thus revealed His will, baptism is not omitted. It still remains the outward sign and formal means of admission into the Church. There is no laying on of hands, since power to live the new life has already been received. We notice that Peter did not himself baptize. Apparently it was not the custom for Apostles to do so (cf. 1 Cor 1[14-17]).

The revolutionary nature of this step is shown by the criticism that it incurred. Peter is obliged to defend his conduct before the strict Jews. The actual baptism could be defended as due to the direct command of God. What is attacked is the treating of baptized Gentiles as equal members with Jews of the Christian fellowship. Clearly Cornelius had not been circumcised. Peter's action implied that he and his family were in no way different from Jewish Christians. In all the later controversy it is important to remember that the point at issue was not simply the admission of Gentiles to the Church, but the permitting them to share the common meal of Christian fellowship. Many of their customs relating to food were repugnant to strict Jews.

XI. **18.** The objection was for the time silenced, but we may doubt how far their acquiescence really went. Probably they regarded this as an exceptional case, due to the direct action of God, not as a precedent. Besides, if the Lord was soon to return, the presence of a few Gentiles on the fringe of the Church might be endured. The position of the God-fearers in relation to the synagogue afforded a precedent.

19-26. The Church at Antioch.—The narrative goes back to 8[4]. The events recorded are contemporary with, if not earlier than, those previously described. Antioch was the third city of the Empire, the capital of Syria, and the residence of the Roman Governor. Christianity now entered into the full current of civilized life. There is some evidence that here the Jews were on exceptionally friendly terms with the Gentiles. This suggests a great opportunity for the Gospel. Josephus records that the Jews had won a number of proselytes, which implies that there were gathered round the synagogues an even greater number of God-fearers.

20 marks a new departure. Perhaps the more strongly supported reading is 'Hellenists,' but the whole context supports the other reading, 'Greeks.' All the Jews in Antioch would be Hellenists except for any stray Jews from Palestine, and Hellenists had been converted ever since the day of Pentecost. But to preach direct to Gentiles was a daring innovation. The majority of these were probably God-fearers, but we are not told so; and they may well have included many attracted direct from heathenism. The account is painfully vague. In 'turning to the Lord' we are probably meant to include baptism. What was their relation at this stage to Jewish believers? The movement soon drew to itself the attention of the Mother-Church at Jerusalem, who sent down Barnabas to investigate. Perhaps the Twelve regarded their work as limited to Palestine. We should like to know more of his original attitude to this innovation. Does [23] imply that he was brought round by the irresistible force of facts, or that he had been sympathetic from the start? His approbation resulted in a large access of converts, when they found that they were not required to submit to circumcision and the Law. 15[1] and Gal 2[11-14] show that these Gentiles were not circumcised, and yet the Jewish Christians, or at least their leaders, did not scruple to eat with them. What effect this had on their relations with the synagogues to which they formerly belonged is again a matter of conjecture. We hear of no decisive breach. Saul was specially equipped in virtue of his training to deal with this new situation. The new body soon attracted the attention of their heathen neighbours. The crowd of Antioch was famous for its wit. The nickname Christian was formed on the analogy of Roman party names, and meant followers of a leader Christ. But the title Christ was unfamiliar to the heathen, and was often confused with a commoner word 'Chrestus,' often used as a proper name, which meant 'a good, kindly fellow,' sometimes with the suggestion that he might not be very strong in the head. Hence we often get the form 'Chrestiani.' Like many other names applied in jest, it became in time accepted as a title of honour. How soon it was given at Antioch we are not told. Tacitus tells us that it had reached Rome by A.D. 64.

27-30. Relief sent to Jerusalem.—This

is the first mention of Christian prophets, a class of persons who played a far more important part in early Church life than we usually realize. They were men marked out by the possession of a gift of the Spirit which enabled them to declare God's will for His people after the manner of the ancient prophets. Even if they spoke in a condition of ecstasy, their utterances were intelligible, and thus to be distinguished from speaking with tongues. They ranked after the Apostles, and their ministry was not limited to any one place. We do not hear of any form of ordination. Probably they were regarded as directly called by God Himself. But both they and their messages were tested by the common mind of the community, which was also filled with the Spirit. The exact relation to the local ministry is obscure. There seems to be no reason why a prophet should not have been a presbyter, since the two functions and the two gifts of the Spirit which marked men out as called to them, so to say, moved on different planes. Here their authority is recognized at Antioch, and their presence suggests constant communication between the two churches. At the end of [27] the Bezan Text adds, 'And there was much rejoicing; and when we were assembled together, one from among them spake, by name Agabus.' If this were accepted, it would be the first of the 'we-passages,' and show that Luke came from Antioch. Even if it be rejected as not being the original reading, it implies a reference to an early tradition that connected him with Antioch. The spiritual value of the contribution was great. Later on, St. Paul laid great stress on a similar collection for the poor Christians at Jerusalem as being both a sign of, and a means of deepening, Church unity. The poverty of the community at Jerusalem, which is usually forgotten by those who advocate a literal imitation of its primitive communism, may have been due to more than one cause. The resources of its members may have come to an end, while the world did not. Christians may by this time have been excluded from any participation in the alms distributed among the Jews. Nor were there many openings for work in the neighbourhood. Judæa was chiefly inhabited by sheep and ecclesiastics, and the main trade of Jerusalem was religion.

The mention of the date of the famine raises a chronological problem. Both Tacitus and Suetonius record various famines in the reign of Claudius, but none that literally spread over the world. But the expression may only mean a widespread famine. Josephus tells us of a famine in Judæa which he calls 'the great famine.' Helena, Queen of Adiabene, a convert to Judaism, sent large assistance to Jerusalem. It seems to have lasted from about A.D. 44 to 48, and to have been at its worst towards the end of this period. Herod Agrippa, mentioned in the next chapter, died in A.D. 44, so that presumably the events of that chapter ending in the departure of Peter happened between the prophecy of Agabus and the actual mission of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem. Luke anticipates the sending of the relief, and then in the next chapter goes back to bring his account of the Church at Jerusalem up to date before picking up again the narrative of the relief.

A second real problem is to relate the narrative of Acts to Paul's own account in Galatians. There he tells us that he paid a first visit to Jerusalem three years after his conversion. This, as we saw, is undoubtedly to be identified with the visit of Ac 9 [26] ff. He then says (2 [1]) that 'After the space of fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas.' The most natural view, and one that is winning wide acceptance among modern scholars, is to identify this second visit in Galatians with the second visit recorded in Acts, and to place it at the time of the famine. The statement in Gal 2 [2] that he went up 'by revelation' would refer to the prophecy of Agabus. The mention of the conference with Apostles and the private discussion about the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles would be exactly what we should expect. In any case, the formal report of Barnabas was long due. On the other hand, to identify this visit in Galatians with the visit later recorded in Acts at the time of the Council involves overwhelming difficulties. In spite of the efforts of Lightfoot and others, the two accounts cannot be reconciled. Further, the South Galatian view allows us to date the Epistle before the Council. (For a full statement of the arguments and of the questions of chronology involved, see Galatians, p. 532.)

In [30] we hear for the first time of 'elders.' There is no record of their appointment or explanation of their office. What relation do they bear to the Seven? Elsewhere it is implied that elders were a normal part of the organization of a local church. Ac 14 [23] gives a typical account of their appointment, and we are meant to understand that that

was St. Paul's regular method in the churches that he founded. The title and the office were taken over from the Jewish synagogues, possibly at the beginning of the Christian Church. If the conjecture is correct that their primary function was to preside at the breaking of the bread, they may have been selected to preside at some of the numerous household gatherings when the number of Apostles available for the function ran short. They may in many cases have been the heads of the households. But even if this was their primary duty, the New Testament shows that others were soon added to it. Among them was the supervision of the business affairs of the church. Hence their receiving the gifts does not in the least imply that the Apostles were all absent. They would be the right people to deal with such matters, whether Apostles were there or not. As to their method of appointment, we can only affirm that any ministry that existed had behind it not only the consent of the whole Church, but the authority of the Apostles. It is reasonable to suppose that the ordination of the elders by St. Paul followed the custom of the Mother-Church at Jerusalem. Jewish elders were ordained by the laying on of hands, and the Christian community would naturally follow this precedent. While there is no precise statement that all the elders of whom we read in the New Testament were ordained by Apostles or apostolic delegates, there is absolutely no evidence for the existence of any that were not. The one theory of ordination that derives no positive support from the New Testament is that they derived their commission merely from the community. It is doubtless true that they act as organs of the community for the performance of certain functions, but they do so because they have received authority to do so from those who are themselves authorized to impart it. We do not maintain that the power to ordain has necessarily been always and everywhere limited to Apostles or apostolic delegates or bishops. It may, for instance, at certain times and places have been bestowed upon, say, the presbyters of a local community acting as a body. All that we insist is that it is a Christian principle that no one should go beyond the commission that he has received. Again, it is likely that functions were at first distributed in the early Church in a different manner from that which became customary in the later Church. Offices may have existed which later disappeared, or became absorbed in other offices. It is not a question of names or titles, but of the authority that lies behind them. In the primitive Church no one performed any function unless he had been marked out by the possession of spiritual gifts for its performance, and his own sense of possessing such gifts needed to be ratified by the judgement of the community. Further, when the function involved definite duties, he was set apart for the execution of those duties by some visible rite at the hands of those who were universally acknowledged to possess authority to ordain. The very scantiness of the information given in Acts about forms of ordination shows that there was no controversy on the subject. It was sufficient to give typical instances.

XII. 1-19. **The Persecution of Herod.**—Herod Agrippa I, not to be confused with his uncle Herod Antipas, who is prominent in the Gospels, was a grandson of Herod the Great and Mariamne. Brought up at Rome, he managed to gain the favour of the Emperor Caligula, who on his accession in A.D. 37 gave him the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias with the title of King, and in A.D. 39 the tetrarchy of his uncle Antipas who had been banished. The next Emperor, Claudius, in A.D. 41 added to his dominions Judæa and Samaria, so that they included all the possessions of his grandfather. Thus the Jews for the last time enjoyed a king of their own. His policy was to win popularity by outward observance of the Law and general political support to Judaism. But his conduct showed that he had no genuine devotion to the moral and spiritual side of Judaism. The attack on the leaders of the Christians is in full accord with his public policy. It may perhaps be dated about the time of the Passover in A.D. 41, when his first arrival in Jerusalem as King was marked by an ostentatious exhibition of piety. He may well have been jealous of the Messianic claims made for Jesus. There is no record of the charge brought against the Apostles, but death by the sword, not stoning, implies a political charge in the king's court. 'Certain of the church,' suggests that there were other victims, but if they had included another Apostle, his name would have been given. James was the first of the Apostles to be martyred. Clearly the Christians had never recovered their old popularity which they enjoyed before the preaching of Stephen.

The story of Peter's release, as it stands, is frankly miraculous. It is just one of those that many modern commentators mark with a query. Even those who be-

lieve that the 'angel' or messenger was in reality a human being, and that local tradition or Peter himself added the supernatural interpretation, under the overwhelming conviction that the hand of God was plainly at work in this unexpected release, are bound to admit that the story is such as would be current at Jerusalem quite soon after the event. The narrative is full of vivid touches which suggest first-hand knowledge. Why should the name of an obscure maidservant which contains no symbolical meaning have been invented? The whole atmosphere is just what we should expect. A very similar story is recounted by Sadhu Sundar Singh of his own release, which raises just the same question (*The Sadhu*, 29 ff.). The house of Mary, the mother of Mark, appears as the centre of Christian activity. It was probably the scene both of the Last Supper and of Pentecost. The whole story may well have come from Mark.

17 is important for the history of the early Church. It implies what is stated definitely elsewhere (15 [13], 21 [18]; Gal 2 [9] and [12]), that James had now come to rank not only on a level with the Twelve (Gal 1 [19]; 1 Cor 15 [7]), but as head of the Church at Jerusalem. We can see here the beginnings of the same process as took place in Mohammedanism, in which the leadership came to reside in the family of the Prophet. The process was cut short first by the death of James, and then by the destruction of Jerusalem, which left the primacy open for Rome, as the one Apostolic Church of the West and the capital of the Empire. At what point James became the official head of the Jerusalem Church we are not told. Probably the Apostles had by now left Jerusalem. There is an ancient tradition that they were commanded by Christ to stay for twelve years. This may be an inference from their actual conduct. On the most probable chronology the twelve years would have by now expired. Perhaps James, the brother of John, and Peter had specially come up for the Passover. The rest may have been warned in time. James, the Lord's brother, would be protected by his well-known piety. Much discussion has taken place about the movements of Peter. The Greek is as vague as the English. 'Another place' might only mean another house in Jerusalem, where he could lie hid till the hunt was over. But the message to James suggests a longer journey. Antioch is a possibility. Later Bishops of Antioch claimed descent from Peter. Rome has been suggested. There is a tradition of some strength which says that he was 'Bishop of Rome' for twenty-five years, which may be dated from this flight. The phrase is an anachronism in any case. If he went to Rome, he went not to preside over the Church, but to lie hid. Rome was the place where fugitives always sought to conceal themselves. But Rom 15 [20] (cf. Ac 28 [22]) may imply that no Apostle had as yet visited the Church, and is certainly hard to reconcile with any long stay.*

XIII. 20-25. **The Death of Herod** (A.D. 44).—The Phœnician cities were dependent on Galilee for their corn. Herod cut off supplies, and so brought them to sue for peace. Josephus gives a somewhat similar, but quite independent, account of his death. He records that his flatterers saluted him in words implying that he was a god. He accepted their homage, but immediately saw an owl perched on a rope above him, which he regarded as an omen of doom. He was seized with pain, and died after five days of suffering. Christians would naturally view such a death as a divine punishment. After his death Palestine reverted to its former position as a Roman province with a procurator of its own. The new governor, Cuspius Fadus, reversed the pro-Jewish policy of Agrippa, and the next few years were marked by bloodshed and disorder. Both under Fadus and under his successor Tiberius Alexander, a renegade Jew, the Church would be able to enjoy a period of quiet, and the Apostles would be able to return with safety.

24 implies a period of steady growth of unknown duration.

25. The reading is doubtful. The best MSS. on the whole read 'to Jerusalem.' If this is accepted it repeats the event of 11 [30], and links us up with Antioch. The difficulty, then, is to attach any meaning to the words 'when they had fulfilled their ministration,' which would naturally come after their arrival at Jerusalem. Some translate 'returned to Jerusalem and fulfilled their ministry,' but this hardly seems possible. Others, again, join 'to Jerusalem' to 'having fulfilled their ministration.' This is doubtful Greek, but might be a literal rendering of an Aramaic construction, and gives the sense required. Probably, however, it is best to take the RV reading. In that case the verse records the return of Barnabas and Saul to Antioch after handing over the alms and perhaps staying for a while to help in their administration. Mark is introduced in

* Cf. Romans, Introduction, p. 445.

order to prepare for the events of the following chapter.

XIII. 1-3. **The Mission of Barnabas and Saul,** a step of incalculable importance for the spread of the Gospel, and the means by which Paul came into prominence. There is no mention of presbyters in the Church at Antioch. This does not imply their absence. Rather the presence of men marked out by more arresting gifts put them into the background. This was especially so as the new departure was initiated through prophets. 'Teachers' seem here to be viewed as men of special gifts like 'prophets,' but apt for giving instruction rather than for preaching. Of Symeon we know nothing. With the mention of Lucius we should compare 11 [20]. Manaen was the foster-brother, or more accurately playmate, of Herod Antipas. So in Lk 8 [3] Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward, was one of the holy women who followed Christ. It is from such sources as these that Luke may have got his information about Herod's court. The word 'ministered' is that from which 'liturgy' comes, and means ministry in organized worship. The will of the Holy Ghost was shown through the utterance of some prophet, which was accepted as inspired by the general consciousness of the Spirit-filled community. This method of divine guidance does not exclude the possibility that such a forward movement may have already been in the minds of some, or even have been openly discussed. The true parallel to the ceremony described in [3] is a dismissal service. It was not an ordination. Paul repeatedly insists that his authority as an Apostle of Christ did not come through man (cf. Gal 1 [1]). The laying on of hands was a form of commendation and blessing for the work. At most it constituted them 'apostles' in the sense of delegates of the Church of Antioch.

4-12. **The First Missionary Tour: Work in Cyprus.**—The first sphere of work, no less than the mission itself, was due to conscious divine guidance. Cyprus was a very natural place. It was in easy reach, and also the native land of Barnabas. There had been Christians there since at least the death of Stephen (11 [19]). It has also been suggested that it could reasonably be regarded as coming within the limits of the authority bestowed upon Barnabas when he was sent by the Church at Jerusalem to inspect the newly formed Church at Antioch. The tour is made over the whole length of the island. Salamis is the port on the east, Paphos on the west. The encounter with sorcery should be compared with that in 8 [9]. Cyprus was a senatorial province. Therefore the title of proconsul is correct. An inscription bearing the words 'when Paulus was Proconsul' has been found in the island. Paulus, like many Romans, was interested in religious matters. His good sense was shown by his recognition of the superiority of Christianity. It is not stated that he was baptized, and indeed at this date such an event would be improbable. But the incident shows the friendliness of a Roman official to Christianity and his willingness to distinguish it from mere Oriental magic and superstition.

9. St. Paul's Gentile name is introduced for the first time and with a purpose. Hitherto he has been Saul, the Jew. Now, in face of the Roman official world and as the champion not only of Christianity but of Græco-Roman culture against decadent Orientalism, he becomes Paul, the Roman citizen, one who could fitly be the Apostle to the Gentiles. Henceforth the order of the names is reversed and his name takes precedence of Barnabas. The change is all the more significant when we notice that the old order is resumed on one occasion and one occasion only, that is when the two go up to Jerusalem (15 [12, 25]). In the old Jewish environment Barnabas resumes his old position, but in the Gentile world Paul, in virtue of his qualifications of birth, culture, and citizenship, takes the lead. Of the origin of Paul's Gentile name we know nothing. The family may have adopted it in memory of some Roman benefactor. There is no reason to suppose that he now took it for the first time in compliment to the proconsul.

13-52. **Visit to Pisidian Antioch.**

13-14 raise many questions to which we can only give tentative answers. The crossing to Perga was natural, but why did 'Paul and his company' (note the change of designation) not stay and preach in Pamphylia? The journey across wild country to Antioch was neither easy nor obvious. Probably they had intended to preach in Pamphylia, as they did later (14 [25]), but owing to the bad climate Paul had an attack of illness, possibly malaria, and in order to recover his health made for the nearest higher ground in spite of a dangerous route and a difficult river to ford (cf. 2 Cor 11 [26], which refers to this journey). This explanation gets support from Gal 4 [13-14], on the assumption that Antioch is one of the Galatian churches to which the Epistle was written. Why, then, did Mark choose such a moment to

desert them? It may have been homesickness. Or possibly he felt that the new plan involved going beyond the commission given to them. His conduct would be more excusable if some fresh missionary enterprise had been definitely proposed. 15 [38] certainly suggests that the journey was not simply for purposes of health. Antioch was a great strategic centre, and Paul may have had his eye on it for some time.

14 ff. gives an example of Paul's regular practice, to work from the synagogue outwards; he would find there a field ready prepared, not only Jews but God-fearers. The contrast with the modern missionary who has to begin from the very beginning and has no ready-made point of contact with those to whom he preaches, is most marked. Pisidian Antioch, which lies, strictly speaking, not in Pisidia but in Phrygia, was so called because it was situated on the border of Pisidia. It was a Roman colony and the capital of the region or district of Phrygia, which was a subdivision of the Roman province of Galatia. The population included Romans, Greeks, Phrygians, and a considerable number of Jews. It was the duty of the ruler of the synagogue to preside over the public service, and to provide for the reading of the Scriptures, the praying and the preaching. Any Israelite (though a priest was preferred) might read, lead the prayers or preach, if invited to do so. This gave a great opportunity to Paul. It would soon be rumoured among the local Jews that the visitors were teachers. In accordance with Luke's regular method we are to regard this speech as a typical example of Paul's speeches to Jews. It undoubtedly represents the kind of appeal that he regularly made. Twice over ([17-26]) God-fearers are addressed by name side by side with Jews.

The general run of the argument resembles that of Peter's speeches. That is only to be expected. The presentation of the Gospel to Jews by the first Christians always proceeded along certain well-marked lines. There is also a certain similarity to Stephen's speech in his use of history, but this becomes less close on examination. To Stephen the centre of interest lay in types and foreshadowings of eternal truths. To Paul history was an actual preparation for the coming of the Messiah. There are, however, many details which are original, and also several coincidences of thought with Galatians. The speech falls into three parts.

(1) **17-25. The gracious dealing of God with Israel, leading up to David, who** was the type of the Saviour whom God had promised to send of his seed (for 'seed' cf. Gal 3 [16]). The Church is the true Israel (cf. Gal 6 [16]).

The mention of John Baptist is a fresh feature, except for the vague reference in 10 [37]. The appearance of some of his disciples at Ephesus (19 [1] ff.; cf. 18 [25]) suggests that his movement had a far wider influence among the Jews of the Dispersion than we should gather from the Gospels.

(2) **26-37. The Good News.**—God's Messianic promises have been fulfilled in Jesus. Not only did John witness to Him, but His crucifixion was in accordance with prophecy, and His rejection by the Jews was reversed by God Himself in the Resurrection, which had been foretold in the psalms and prophets, and marked Him out as the true Messiah (cf. Gal 3 [13]). There is a clear contrast between the official Judaism at Jerusalem and Israel at large. Appeal is made from past ignorance to the mind and conscience of the Jews of the Dispersion.

The language of [29], if pressed, implies that Christ was buried by His enemies. But the phrase may be quite indefinite and simply be the equivalent to a passive. He was taken down and buried. As in 1 Cor 15 [4], stress is laid on the burial as proving the reality of the death. The resurrection is regarded as the reversal both of death and burial.

In [33] 'raised up' refers to the Resurrection, as does the quotation from Ps 2. In its context the verse of the psalm applies to the coronation of the king actual or ideal. Here the Resurrection is viewed as proving the genuineness of His claim to be the Son of God. There is an exact parallel in Rom 1 [4]. This use of the text does not imply any belief that He first became Son of God at the Resurrection, nor does the Messianic content of the title Son of God exclude its deeper meaning. It is sometimes argued that this insistence on the Resurrection is inconsistent with St. Paul's claim to preach only Christ crucified, and therefore shows that this speech is a free invention by Luke. An examination of the Epistles shows that this argument completely misrepresents the truth. Everywhere the mention of the Cross is followed by an allusion to the Resurrection. To Paul it was the Resurrection that gave its meaning to the Cross and marked God's approval of the sacrifice. Attention to Greek usage shows that the phrase 'Christ crucified' means not Christ on the Cross, but rather Christ as He has now become through the Cross. It

denotes not Christ as He was, but Christ as He is now in His risen and ascended life. This speech is therefore in full harmony with the thought of the Epistles (cf. Gal 2^{20}, 3^{1}, 6^{14}). In ^{36} a contrast is implied between David who served God's purpose in his own generation, and then passed away and his body saw corruption, and Christ who saw no corruption, but rose to die no more, and lives to serve the purpose of God as Messiah for all generations.

(3) **38-41. The Practical Appeal to Accept the Gospel.**—The Resurrection guarantees God's forgiveness and acceptance of all who will believe in Jesus as Christ and Saviour. This constitutes a challenge. Refusal of God's offer must mean condemnation.

The assembly as a body welcomed the speech (^{42}), but the next verse suggests that the greater enthusiasm was shown by the God-fearers. The last point might well give the regular Jews reason to pause.

38-39 contain a summary of Paul's teaching on justification by faith, for which he argues in Galatians (e.g. 2^{16}) and Romans. For the Jew the Law was the means of salvation. By performing its commands he earned favour with God. Thus he was justified or put on a right footing with God by a certain amount of obedience. The word to 'justify' is a legal metaphor and means to acquit. His relation to God was viewed as that of an accused person to a judge. If he could show that his life came up to a certain standard, he would be acquitted. This attitude towards God, as St. Paul himself found, did not bring peace. If a man was conscientious, he was always being troubled by scruples as to whether he had done quite enough. God seemed to stand over him as a stern taskmaster never satisfied, criticizing his best efforts, and condemning him for coming short of His requirements. No doubt many Jews did not feel this, but were content with a purely outward standard. But the best felt their inability to live up to the full demands of the Law, which could command but not give the power to perform. On the other hand, St. Paul laid down that the right attitude to God must come first. God asks in the first instance for what He calls faith, not merely an intellectual belief, but an attitude of trust and love such as a small child adopts to a good father. Out of this right conduct will spring. If men really love God they must try to obey Him. Thus our right relation to God, with which true religion begins, depends not on anything that we have done, but simply on our response to God's free offer. Religion starts not with what we do for God, but with what He has done for us. This delivers us from despair and gives a sure ground of hope for the future. Thus the means of salvation is not the Law of Moses, or any other external standard of life, however excellent in itself, but a living fellowship with God based on faith. Such faith is clearly open to all men, Jew and Gentile alike. Christ, by His death and resurrection, has opened the way of salvation to all who will close with the offer.

42-52. The week had given time for reflection, and probably Paul's second speech developed the offer of salvation to the Gentiles apart from the Law. Hence the unbelieving Jews burst into cries that Jesus was accursed. They were also jealous at the success of the new teaching among the God-fearers, which threatened to rob them of the fruits of much labour. Special stress is laid on the turning to the Gentiles, probably because this was the first occasion on which Paul was driven to an open breach with the synagogue. It is also mentioned at Corinth (18^{6}), Ephesus (19^{9}), and at Rome (28^{25}) for special reasons. But it must now have become a regular part of his policy. The direct appeal to the Gentiles is justified by an appeal to Scripture.

48. The translation **ordained to eternal life** is misleading. It suggests a denial of free choice which is not necessarily implied. A better rendering would be '*found to be disposed to eternal life.*'

50 brings out the consequences of the open breach between the Church and the synagogue. The Jews get the local magistrates to expel the preachers as disturbers of the peace. Strictly speaking, it was illegal to preach a new religion. Judaism was a tolerated religion, but it could be urged with a show of reason that if Christians separated themselves from the synagogue, they were no longer entitled to the protection that a tolerated religion could claim. Even so a new cult would not be interfered with, provided that it did not lead to flagrant immorality or to breaches of the peace. Here Christianity could be accused of being a disturber of that public order for which the Roman Empire above all cared, and so an excellent reason could be found for compelling its preachers to move on. Paul claimed that Christianity was the true Judaism and the Christian Church the true Israel. This is one of the chief points in Galatians. But the local magistrates would probably not be willing to

listen to theological arguments. Riots had occurred, and this new teaching was the cause of them. And, after all, St. Paul's point was by no means obvious to the outsider. 2 Tim 3 [11] alludes to sufferings at Antioch, but Acts gives no details. 14 [21] shows that their departure was so hurried that they had not time to give the Church the necessary organization.

XIV. **1-6. Iconium.**—This town lay ninety miles east of Antioch. Though both geographically and politically it was associated with Lycaonia, it belonged to Phrygia, and the inhabitants boasted of being Phrygians. Hence Luke is correct when he distinguishes it from Lycaonia in [6]. In comparison with Antioch it was much more of a native town. The Greek inscriptions there of this date are bad. But in later times, owing to its position, it surpassed Antioch. *The Acts of Paul and Thekla*, a romance compiled at the end of the 2nd century, gives a graphic picture of Paul's doings there. It is based in part on quite early and reliable sources. There were sufficient Jews there to possess a synagogue, and the breach with the synagogue at Antioch did not prevent him from beginning with it here.

5 seems to describe a plot to murder them in a local riot. The 'rulers' are those of the syngaogue. At the first signs of violence the visit was cut short.

7-20. Lystra and Derbe.—Lystra was, like Antioch, a Roman colony, but native influence was still strong there. There is no record of any synagogue or of preaching to Jews. This coupled with silence about any opposition from local Jews, suggests that they were few. The fact that Timothy's mother had married a Gentile proves that they had grown careless about their religion. Derbe was a few miles away. Here, too, there is no mention of Jewish influence. The language of [6] seems to mean that the Apostles spent their time between the two towns, without a long stay in either. They had now passed out of the district of Phrygia into that of Lycaonia, though they were still in the province of Galatia.

11-12. The sudden belief of the people is probably based on a local legend which told of a visit paid by Zeus and Hermes to two peasants. Contrary to our Western notions Barnabas was supposed to be the superior god because he did and spoke less. Again we get correct local colour. An inscription has been found near Lystra to 'Zeus before the City.' The speech is intended to be a typical instance of Paul's speeches to uneducated pagans. It should be compared with his speech at Athens, which is a typical instance of his speeches to educated pagans. It is pure natural religion, and seeks common ground in belief in a good God (cf. Rom 1 [19-20]). Such can hardly be a pure invention.

19-20. The rapid revulsion of feeling is typical of an Oriental crowd.

21-23. The Return.—The natural course would have been to travel direct from Derbe back to Syrian Antioch. The retracing of their steps was due to the desire to organize and stabilize the newly founded churches, which they had been compelled to leave hurriedly. The appointment of elders is to be taken as a typical instance of Paul's methods (cf. Tit 1 [5]). The word 'appointed,' according to its derivation, meant 'elected by show of hands,' but by this time had lost the sense of popular voting. It simply means 'appointed,' probably as the inexperience of the converts and the authoritative methods employed by Paul elsewhere suggest, by his own nomination. Such a return to Antioch was now possible, because with the new year fresh magistrates had entered into office. As those who had ordered their expulsion were no longer in power, their decree lapsed. Also the visit included no public preaching, and was more or less secret.

27 records the presentation of their report to the Church which had sent them out as its delegates for the missionary tour. Judged by its fruits the experiment had justified itself. Gentiles had shown a capacity for faith, and God's blessing had clearly rested upon their efforts. Thus the whole Church at Antioch, by accepting their report, made themselves in effect responsible for the innovation. The results appear in the next chapter. Questions were involved which led to a long and bitter contention.

XV. **1-21. The Council of Jerusalem.**

1-3 record a crisis in the history of the Church up to which the preceding chapters have been leading. The whole question of the position of the Gentiles had to be faced and defined. Much has been written about the differences between this chapter and the writings of St. Paul. On the view which we adopted on p. 350, most of these disappear. The news of the success of the missionary tour was welcomed at Antioch. But how would it be received at Jerusalem? Perhaps the 'men from Judæa' in [1], who are called in Gal 2 [12] 'certain from James,' represent an organized protest from the majority in the Jerusalem Church against this widespread laxity.

It was one thing for an occasional Gentile like Cornelius to be admitted without circumcision by the direct revelation of God; but, if Gentiles were to be admitted wholesale, the authority of the Law would be endangered. How could Christian Jews expect to go on holding intercourse with non-Christian Jews, if they were on intimate terms with Gentiles? Ever since the dispersion which followed the death of Stephen, we may suspect that the conservative element in Jerusalem had been dominant. The more liberal-minded Hellenists had mostly gone elsewhere, and the Apostles had later on also dispersed. James himself was a model of strict Jewish piety.

There were two points at issue which, though they are bound up together, must be kept distinct in thought. First, were Gentile converts to the Christian faith to be required to become Jews first, and so through the Jewish Church enter the Christian Church? Must they be circumcised and undertake to keep the Law? The latter is apparently the contention of the Jews in [1] and of the Pharisees in [5]. The question at this point is one of salvation. It is argued that no one can enter the Messianic Kingdom and share the Messianic salvation here or hereafter unless he becomes a full Jew. There is no trace of any difference of opinion between Pharisees and other Jews, as Knox holds. But, as we have seen, there was even in the old Israel in actual fact a place found for the God-fearers, though their position was somewhat ambiguous. They might be finally saved, but here and now they were not admitted to full intercourse with Jews. So we reach the second question: Granted that the new Israel, like the old, found a place for Gentile converts who were baptized but not circumcised, could they eat and drink with Christian Jews? Would such association defile them? Would it not be best to keep them distinct in an inferior status and frankly recognize two standards of Christian living, expressed by two common meals? This second question runs into the first, and it is not always easy to see which is being discussed. The men from Judæa raised the whole question in its most acute form. The account in Galatians shows that the practical problem immediately followed. Hitherto Jews and Gentiles had mealed together, and Peter had acquiesced. Now he withdrew, and his example carried away the rest of the Jews and Barnabas (Gal 2 [11-13]). It was a critical position, but Paul stood firm and rebuked him openly. He saw that it was contrary to all Christian principles, a denial of the unity of the one body. The immediate result of his protest is not recorded in Galatians, but it is clear that at the Council Peter was once more on the side of Paul. The decision to hold a Council was natural. The way had to some extent been prepared by the informal conference held during the famine visit and recorded in Gal 2 [2] ff. It is significant that while in [3] Samaria and Phœnicia rejoiced over the conversion of the Gentiles, there is a silence about Judæa. Incidentally the verse suggests that by this time various Christian communities had sprung up over Palestine, of whose founding we have no record. The most probable date for the Galatian Epistle is at this point, either on the way up to Jerusalem, or at Jerusalem before the council. The mission from Jerusalem would have just had time to reach Galatia, and the first news of their successes had been sent to Paul. His letter was sent to stay the threatened defection of the newly founded churches. It bears all the marks of strong emotion and of haste. He could not go in person because of the Council.

4 seems to recount a formal meeting of the Church to receive a report from Barnabas and Paul. Perhaps their whole activity was treated as an extension of the commission given originally to Barnabas. But the converted Pharisees insisted in raising the whole question in its most controversial form, which necessitated an official discussion.

6-21. The Council.—All evidence goes to show that Peter was throughout on the side of the freedom of the Gentiles. He wavered at Antioch, but that was due to the same kind of moral weakness that made him deny his Lord. The theory that he headed the Jewish party in opposition to St. Paul can be dismissed. Here his argument is a generalization from the case of Cornelius. If one Gentile could be accepted by God into the Messianic Kingdom simply by faith, why not others? After all, all Christians alike hope for salvation through Christ, not through the Law. Clearly Paul's arguments at Antioch had not failed of their effect. Peter's arguments were continued by those of Barnabas and Paul (notice the order of the names). They appeal to signs and wonders wrought by themselves as no less manifest proofs of God's approval. We may also suppose, as Gal 3 [2-5] implies, that their converts had spoken with tongues as a visible sign that they had received the Spirit (cf. [8]). James

summed up the debate. His proposals have an air of authority. The 'my' in [19] is most emphatic in the Greek. But evidently they won the approval of the whole gathering. We entirely misunderstand the methods of the apostolic Church if we suppose it was a democracy, in which matters of policy were decided by a majority vote. Rather it was a theocracy. The Church waited for the leading of the Spirit through some prophet or speaker, and when that was given and accepted as such by the whole Church under the inspiration of the same Spirit, then it was felt that God's will was manifest. The proceedings were more like those of a Quakers' meeting than of most modern Church assemblies (cf. [28]). So here James, as the duly appointed organ of the assembly, is led to see and declare God's will. In typical Jewish fashion it is based on a passage of Scripture, and the whole Church accepts it.

The passage quoted comes from the LXX of Am 9 [11, 12], to which is added a sentence from Is 45 [21]. The Greek differs from the Hebrew original, which would not have been at all apposite for the purpose. Many doubt whether the essentially Hebraic James could in Jerusalem have quoted from the Greek. Are we then to suppose that the whole speech, if not the whole account of the proceedings, are a free invention? This would be to go far beyond the evidence. The form of the name 'Symeon' in [14] suggests that some ancient and original source is being followed. It is even conceivable that in such a mixed assembly James might have spoken in Greek. But in any case the report does not pretend to be more than the barest summary of the general line of argument, and we may hold that this particular proof-text from Amos was one that was current among Greek-speaking Jews, and in common use to support the liberal policy towards the Gentiles, advocated at the Council by James.

20. The text of the decree and its meaning are both matters of dispute. The points at issue can be summarized thus. The English versions follow the text of the majority of the Greek MSS., which was that used by the Greek Fathers. In this the decree consists of four clauses. But the Bezan texts, the Latin versions, and the Latin Fathers and Irenæus give a version of the decree which consists only of three clauses, 'things strangled' being omitted, though many of them have additions, the most general being a negative form of the golden rule. Few would maintain that this last is genuine, and it is not found in Tertullian. It is argued that 'things strangled' was added in order to explain the meaning of 'blood' as meat containing blood. On the other hand, it is argued that the clause may have been found obscure and therefore omitted. The balance of evidence is so even that a final decision is impossible.

What, then, does the decree itself mean? If we take the Bezan version, it is tempting to take it as a moral law. It prohibits idolatry, murder, and fornication. In this case the liberal party won a sweeping victory. Only ethical requirements were made from Gentile converts. The whole ceremonial law was for them dispensed. This is to our modern minds very attractive, but it is almost too modern and hardly meets the real difficulties of the situation. Further, the translation of 'blood' by 'murder' is open to question. And if these moral requirements were stated, why were not others equally important and equally necessary for Gentiles, such as honesty and truth, added? As a catechism of moral duties it is incomplete.

If we accept the four-clause version, the decree seems to combine both moral and ceremonial requirements. Christians are to abstain not only from actual participation in idolatrous rites, but from the banquets with which heathen sacrifices often concluded, and perhaps from buying in the market meat which came from an animal offered in sacrifice. They are to abstain from fornication, which was in the pagan world, as in India to-day, practised in the temples in the name of religion, and which was often mixed up with heathen feastings. Then they are to abstain from meat from which the blood has not been removed. The real objection to this interpretation is not that it joins together moral and ceremonial requirements. Under the circumstances this was natural. The Council wished to make regulations which might safeguard the common meals of the Church so that Jews might take part in them without running the risk of eating anything that was ceremonially unclean. Gentiles were therefore asked to observe these restrictions, which were in themselves purely outward, so that their fellowship with their Jewish brethren might not be endangered. The food provided must be such that all might partake with a clear conscience. So, too, the observance of the moral law was an indispensable condition of fellowship. Nothing disgusted the pious Jew more than the widespread moral laxity of pagan society. One of their great arguments

for requiring the observance of the full Mosaic Law from Gentile converts was that it was a protection against pagan vices. Hence the formal proclamation of the need of purity and abstinence from idolatry was in part a substitute for this. Accordingly this interpretation of the decree fits in admirably with the general situation. There are, however, difficulties in the way of accepting it. The chief is the meaning of 'things strangled.' Is it not covered by 'blood'? Further, there is no clear evidence that at this date the Jews interpreted the Law of Deuteronomy as enjoining the killing of meat so as to drain out all the blood. They applied it simply to the use of the blood that was shed. If this is so, another line of interpretation is necessary. Accordingly other scholars suppose all the clauses to apply to participation in heathen rites. All four clauses refer to accompaniments of idolatrous worship. Fornication is that practised in the temples. Blood refers perhaps to the rite of blood-brotherhood, and 'things strangled' to certain kinds of sacrifice in which care was taken to shed no blood. Thus the decree deals with the special temptations of converts in Syria, where they were most liable to slip back into idolatrous usages, as are Indian converts to-day. The whole decree inculcates a scrupulous avoidance of things connected with idolatry. This interpretation would suit equally either form of the text and may well be correct.

On any interpretation the decree represents a great victory for the liberal party. It is made quite plain that Gentile converts are not to be called upon to be circumcised, or to keep the Law; and also conditions are laid down to ensure the maintenance of full fellowship between Jewish and Gentile believers. In practice it led to a separation between the moral and ceremonial law. The idea of two churches, or two eucharists, one for Jews and the other for Gentiles, is definitely rejected. The unity of the body of Christ must be a closer unity than that of mere federation. There is no reason to doubt that Acts gives us the actual form of the decree. Its existence is proved by the reference to it in Rev 2^{14} and ^{20}. The difficulty has been raised that Paul makes no reference to it in his dealing with similar problems in the Church at Corinth. But it is quite possible that in the first instance it was given only for the Churches in Syria and Cilicia, which might well be taken to include those just founded in Galatia. The problems at Corinth were different inasmuch as the great body of Christians were Gentiles. And, though the decree is not actually quoted, it is by no means certain that there is not an allusion to it in 1 Cor 6^{13-20}, where the close connexion of the passage with the preceding verses about food strongly suggests that he had in mind the decree. St. Luke, indeed, leaves the impression that the decision of the Council restored peace. We know from St. Paul's Epistles that there followed a long and bitter controversy. The extreme Jewish party looked upon the decree as a regrettable mistake, and organized missions to counteract the influence of Paul. On the other hand, it is plain, even from his own writings, that some who claimed to be followers of Paul gave them only too good an excuse for saying that he had destroyed the only bulwark of morality in abolishing the observance of the Mosaic Law. These are the 'antinomians,' who claimed, in virtue of having received the Spirit, to be above all moral laws. Indeed, Paul hardly seems conscious that those who had never known the preliminary discipline of the Jewish Law, whether as Jews or God-fearers, needed some definite regulations to guide their life and build up good habits of self-control. For converts straight from heathenism, as soon as their first fervour died down, the struggle must have been a severe one. Paul himself had known the full force of a sudden conversion, and his whole life had been filled with a new love of Christ, but the full conversion of many Christians was a much more gradual process. Even after baptism many of the old lusts still survived, and it might well be argued that some form of law was still required. Thus the fear of the Jews that the withdrawal of the restraint of the Law might endanger the moral purity of the Church was not altogether groundless.

Luke's omission of any distinct reference to later controversy is easily intelligible. For him it had been settled at the Council, and he regarded their decision as final. Further, as a Gentile, he was not particularly interested in the Jewish point of view. Nor did the first Christians have that appetite for raking up old scandals that characterizes our own day. Strife that was now over had better be left unmentioned. He does, indeed, hint at Paul's unpopularity among Jewish Christians in 21^{20-21}, but that is because it fits in with his main purpose.

21. The meaning of this verse is not very clear. It may mean that Moses, though he had had a long start, had failed

to convert the Gentiles; therefore let new methods be tried; or, more probably, these restrictions are necessary, because Jewish missions in the past have made many converts, and their feelings must be respected.

22-29. The Letter.—This was a conscious imitation of the method employed by the Jewish Sanhedrin in communicating with the synagogues of the Dispersion. A similar letter is to be found at the opening of 2 Maccabees, announcing the purification of the Temple, and enjoining the observance of Tabernacles. It opens with the words: 'The brethren, the Jews who are in Jerusalem and they that are in the country of Judæa, send greeting to the brethren, the Jews that are throughout Egypt.' Acts may well give the exact text of the letter. The phrase 'the elder brethren' has a primitive ring. The mention of Syria and Cilicia, as well as of Antioch, looks original.

22. The choice of delegates bears witness to the unity of the Church. Silas, who becomes prominent later as Paul's companion, first appears. 16 [37] states that he was also a Roman citizen. Probably he represented the Hellenist section. Judas, who may have been a brother of Joseph Barsabbas (1 [23]), may represent the Hebrew section. The chief object of the letter is the accrediting of the delegates. The repudiation of the teachers from Jerusalem and the decision that circumcision was not to be demanded, are alluded to rather than formally stated. The delegates are to give full details. Notice how the decision is ascribed to the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

33. This suggests that Silas went away, in which case he must have returned by [40]. The Bezan Text states that he remained.

36-40. The Separation of Barnabas and Paul.—As soon as opportunity allowed, Paul was anxious to visit the churches of Galatia and follow up the effect of his letter. The quarrel between the two may have been prepared for by the earlier dispute recorded in Gal 2 [13]. Mark may well have been on his kinsman's side. Barnabas now disappears from history. Probably he stayed in Cyprus, which was his native land, and died not long after, as Mark appears in Col 4 [10] and Phm [24] at Rome, reconciled again to Paul. With [40] cf. 13 [3].

XV. 40-XVI. 5. The Revisiting of Galatia.—The road ran first through Syria and Cilicia, a single Roman province. The churches here may have been largely founded by Paul himself in the period between 9 [30] and 11 [25]. 'Confirming' would include settling down after the recent dispute. Between this province and Galatia lay the non-Roman territory of Antiochus. There is no mention of this. Presumably no missionary work was attempted in it. Derbe and Lystra are named together as being in the same 'region' of Galatia, but in actual fact Lystra and Iconium were in closer relation for purposes of trade and intercourse. Timothy was known in them, but not in Derbe. Silas had been chosen to take the place of Barnabas. Someone else was needed to take the place of Mark; hence the selection of Timothy. At first sight it seems incredible that after writing Galatians Paul should have circumcised Timothy. But his case was different from that of Titus who was a Gentile. He was half a Jew, and as such could reasonably be regarded as subject to the Law. The Council at Jerusalem had never intended to release Jews from the observance of the Law. So the act might well be viewed as conciliatory to Jewish feeling, and as proving that Paul and his party did not set at naught the Law. To understand his true attitude to the Law we must set side by side with Galatians passages in other Epistles, e.g. 1 Cor 9 [19-23]. Further, if during the tour they were to start from the synagogue and stay in Jewish lodgings, the presence of Timothy, if uncircumcised, would be a great difficulty. The decrees of the Council are delivered in Galatia. They had probably already reached Syria and Cilicia.

XVI. 6-10. Divine leading—[6] has caused much discussion. Until quite recent times the almost universal view has been that Galatians was addressed to men living in N. Galatia, the district conquered and settled by the Gauls who invaded Asia in the 3rd century, and which had previously been Phrygian. In that case this verse would record a detour up in that direction during which the churches were founded, and the Epistle must be subsequent to this. To-day, however, the majority of scholars hold that St. Paul uses Galatia in the sense of the Roman province of Galatia, which included a much wider area, covering the cities which he visited on his first missionary tour. The only serious objection to this view is the unanimous interpretation of Galatia by early Christian writers in the other sense. But this can be explained. The Roman province of Galatia, as it existed in the 1st century A.D., was an artificial creation of the Roman Empire, cutting across old racial divisions. During the 2nd century A.D. it was altered, and Lycaonia was separated off and joined

with other districts into a new province. Thus the memory of Galatia as it had existed for a relatively short period during the 1st century was soon lost, and the title was naturally applied to the northern part. Here the Greek compels us to apply both adjectives to the same district. '*The Phrygo-Galatic region*' most naturally means the Phrygian 'region' of the Roman province of Galatia. It might, indeed, mean that part of the country which had once been Phrygian and was now Galatian, but this would be a piece of irrelevant archæology. In any case Acts would hardly dismiss in a brief sentence a journey to a distant place, so fruitful in results as Galatians would require. Nor is there time to allow for such a detour in the chronology of Paul's life. The mention of Asia suggests that the original intention, from which he was diverted, was to make for Ephesus, the capital of the Roman province of Asia. It was his desire to plant the Gospel in the great strategic centres of the Empire. From such an ambition he would hardly turn aside up to N. Galatia. It is an additional objection to the old view that, if the Epistle be addressed to the N. Galatians, there is no mention whatever in any Epistle of the churches of S. Galatia, though Acts records several visits. The only argument against interpreting the Phrygo-Galatic region as meaning these cities is that, according to the best Greek text, the prohibition to preach the word in Asia appears at first sight to come before and not after the going through the Phrygo-Galatic region, whereas they had already visited Lystra, Derbe and Iconium. But many scholars think it possible to translate the words '*they went through and were forbidden.*' Or, what is perhaps better, we may suppose that they were going to enter Asia at once from Iconium, but in accordance with the divine guidance postponed leaving Galatia as long as possible and included Pisidian Antioch in their tour.

7. This relates a second act of divine guidance. The phrase, 'The Spirit of Jesus,' is unique. It implies some special form of revelation, perhaps a vision. Theologically it presents no difficulty. Guidance by the ascended Jesus and by the Holy Spirit are one and the same. To use later terminology, the Persons of the Trinity co-inhere in all their activity. Where one acts, all act.

9-10. Troas was found to be the goal to which they had been led. As we find a Church there later, some mission work was probably begun, but the great event was the vision bidding them cross over into Macedonia. Some conjecture that the man of Macedonia was Luke himself. The first we-passage begins in the next verse, and it is a reasonable speculation from the tone of the narrative that Luke was connected with Philippi. In that case he was perhaps practising as a physician in Troas, and the meeting with Paul may have been accidental. Perhaps he was taken ill.

11-15. The Arrival at Philippi.—That the sail of about 140 miles was accomplished in two days shows that the wind was favourable. No stress is laid on the entry into Europe. Neapolis was the port of Philippi, ten miles away. Paul makes at once for the big town. The description of Philippi as the 'first' town of the district raises difficulties. Amphipolis was still the chief city of that division of Macedonia. Probably it is not an accurate description, but a piece of local patriotism on the part of Luke. The mention of it as 'a Roman colony' is important for the understanding both of the subsequent incidents and of Philippians. The citizens prided themselves on being Romans. In their organization and in the titles popularly bestowed on their magistrates they imitated Rome. In theory every 'colony' was a fragment of Rome itself. Two facts stand out both in Acts and in Philippians, the weakness of Jewish influence and the position of women, which was in accord with the custom of Macedonia. The word for 'place of prayer' suggests not a synagogue, but a walled enclosure, which was all that they could provide. There are no references to any male Jews. Perhaps there were none. Lydia was a proselyte from the Lydian city of Thyatira, where Jewish influence was strong. She was an agent for a firm in her native city, famous for its manufacture of dyed garments. The mention of such wares shows that she was in a good position. She was presumably a widow, and her trade and general conduct afford a typical example of the freedom granted to women in Macedonia. How soon after Paul's arrival she was baptized is not stated.

16-18. The Cure of the Girl Medium.—This incident is in accord with modern psychology. The slave-girl was possessed of psychic powers, and in a state of disassociation used to utter divinations in a voice that was not her normal voice. Such powers were universally attributed to possession by a demon or spirit. The Greek is literally 'having a spirit, a python.' Python was the name of a

dragon slain at Delphi by Apollo, and had come to be used as a term for a ventriloquist. Such persons with dissociated personalities are singularly sensitive to religious influences of all kinds. Hence she kept pestering Paul and calling after him. We must not read into her words more than they contain. 'The Most High God' was a regular pagan expression, and 'salvation' was a widespread term in the mystery cults and elsewhere. At most the words imply a recognition of unusual spiritual power. Paul's rebuke is an instance of strong suggestion. The effect is what we should expect. Acting on a strongly suggestible nature it inhibits, at least for the time, the use of the old psychic powers.

19-24. The Trial.—In early days, as to-day, nothing rouses more bitter hostility to religion than when it touches men's pockets, even though it may be improving the conditions of other men. So here the motive of the attack on Paul was simply loss of money. The scene brings out the general hostility to the Jews and the boast of the citizens that they are true Romans. The rulers, a general Greek term, are in the next verse styled 'magistrates,' that is 'prætors.' Strictly speaking their title was 'duoviri,' but the courtesy title 'prætors' would be given to them in popular speech. The precise legal charge is not clear. It appears as a general accusation of disturbing public order by Jewish propaganda, so as to lead men to conduct inconsistent with loyalty to Rome, but probably included a charge of magic, as shown by the healing of the girl. Evidently there was immense excitement by which the magistrates were carried away, so that the forms of law were neglected. It looks as if in the tumult Paul and Silas were unable to make heard their claim to Roman citizenship. In [22] the garments that were rent off were those of the prisoners rather than of the magistrates. It was a preliminary to scourging.

25-34. The Prison.—The scene is quite intelligible, if we consider the nature of Eastern prisons, as pictured by Ramsay. Each door is only closed by a bar, which readily falls out of its socket if the doorposts are forced apart. The prisoners are held to the wall by chains or stocks, which could easily be detached by the shock. Paul and Silas were in the inner cell which opened only into the outer prison. Oriental prisoners are often incapable of making a dash for safety under such circumstances. There was no time for them to recover their nerve. The jailer was responsible for the safety of the prisoners. The Bezan Text adds that he was careful to secure the rest before he attended to Paul and Silas. Paul, looking out from the darkness of his dungeon into the light, could watch the actions of the jailer, but the jailer could not see into the darkness of the prison. Hence his fear that they had escaped. Again, we must not read into his question the full Christian idea of salvation. The word was in the air and was a commonplace of pagan religion. The events of the night would impress him with the thought that there was something superhuman about these men. To us baptism after such scanty instruction seems strange, but the jailer had evidently shown himself to be well disposed. Here, as in the case of Lydia, the whole household is baptized, though we are not told what it included. The practice is in harmony with the ordinary ideas of antiquity. Religion was not a merely individual, but a family, affair. When the head of a household joined a religion, the rest of the family would normally go with him. Thus infant baptism, even at this early date, is quite possible, though, as in the mission-field to-day, it would be rare. It is also plain from the whole narrative that Paul had organized some kind of Christian community to which the newly baptized jailer would belong.

35-40. The Release.—The magistrates' change of mind may have been due to more than one cause. They may have reflected that they had acted somewhat hastily. Also, as the Bezan Text adds, the earthquake may have aroused superstitious fears. **uncondemned** is the natural translation of the Greek, but hardly represents the phrase actually used. It was in any case contrary to Roman law to flog a Roman citizen. Luke, as a Greek, is vague about Roman technical terms. The correct phrase means 'without investigating our case.' The alarm of the magistrates, when they learnt the truth, was well founded. They might have been seriously punished. But they still asked them to depart. The Bezan Text again hits off the situation. They feared another conspiracy against them when they might be unable to protect them. Under such conditions further work was impossible. So with true Christian wisdom they agreed to go. Behind the narrative lies Luke's desire to defend Christianity before the Roman world. The charges brought against it were false. The condemnation of Paul was due to the weakness of the local

magistrates who had to confess their error. The Roman law was on his side.

XVII. 1-9. **Thessalonica.**—The journey was made along the great Roman road with halts, at intervals of 30 miles, at Amphipolis, the capital of the division of Macedonia in which Philippi lay, and at Apollonia. No stay was made, probably because there was no Jewish community in either place. Thessalonica was a place of great importance from its position both on the road and on the coast. It was the capital of the whole province of Macedonia, a free city and governed by local magistrates, styled correctly by Luke 'politarchs,' a designation hardly found outside Macedonia. Above all it contained a synagogue to serve as a starting-point. Paul's preaching, as usual, centred round two truths, first that the Old Testament Scriptures foretold a Messiah who should suffer and rise from the dead; secondly, that the Messiah is Jesus. His success was greatest among the God-fearers, including ladies of rank. The jealousy of the Jews was perfectly natural. How soon it culminated in the riot is uncertain. The three weeks of [2] seem to cover only the period of preaching in the synagogue. This was presumably followed by a definite breach and the setting up of a separate place of meeting. 1 and 2 Thessalonians imply a visit of greater length. There must have been time for some rudimentary organization, and also for Paul to have received financial help from the Philippians twice (Phil 4 [16]). Also it is clear that the bulk of the converts came direct from heathenism (e.g. 1 Th 1 [9]), and Paul had time to work at his trade (2 [9]).

The charge was engineered by the Jews. They were accused of revolutionary teaching. Their apocalyptic preaching of the approach of the Kingdom of God and of the return of Jesus in power (cf. 1 Th 1 [10]) was perverted into an incitement to overthrow the Roman Empire and substitute Jesus as King instead of the Emperor. Such a charge, similar to that brought against Jesus Himself, was highly dangerous and would alarm the magistrates. It would never do for the imperial authorities to suppose that their city was sheltering plotters against the law and order of Rome. They might lose their privileges. The mob failing to find Paul and Silas, dragged Jason, probably a converted Jew, and other Christians before the court. The magistrates behaved with what must have seemed to them great moderation. The charge of treason was a grave one. They saw that Jason and his friends were not the real leaders, and only took security of them to keep the peace. The effect of this was to banish Paul from the city. His presence would only provoke a renewal of the disturbance, and the consequences would fall immediately on his host. As the Epistles show, his departure was followed by a severe unofficial persecution against all Christians. Further, as long as those magistrates were in office, the decision would be valid, and formed an obstacle against any return. Hence in 1 Th 2 [18] he alludes to it as a device of Satan to hinder his work.

10-15. **Berœa.**—This was still in Macedonia, about 50 miles off. How long Paul stayed here is not stated. He may have used it as a base for work in the neighbouring country, if Rom 15 [19] refers to this time. The regular methods were followed with the usual result. We do not know why Athens was selected as the next place. The Bezan Text inserts that he was prevented from preaching in Thessaly. Throughout this narrative we notice again Luke's apologetic purpose. Apostles are accused, as their Master was accused, of disloyalty to Cæsar. In each case the charge is trumped up by the malice of the Jews, and has no basis in fact, so long as Cæsar only demands what is Cæsar's. Readers are to understand that similar charges against Christianity are equally false, and Jewish slanders are to be disregarded.

15, as tested by the account of the movements of Silas and Timothy given in the Thessalonian Epistles, throws light upon Luke's methods of writing. Silas and Timothy, who had been left in Berœa, rejoined him at Athens in obedience to this instruction, and then were sent back, Timothy to Thessalonica, Silas probably elsewhere. Timothy rejoined him again at Corinth, as stated in Ac 18 [5]. The omission of the intervening meeting and mission is probably not due to ignorance, but to a telescoping of the two incidents to save space. A full description had no value for his purpose. Incidentally the Epistles show that Paul had been hoping to return to Thessalonica, and that his plans at this time were unsettled.

16-22. **Arrival at Athens.**—Paul had entered not only a new province, Achæa, but a new mental atmosphere. This is accurately hit off by Luke, with some of the contempt which Macedonians always felt for the Athenians. As always Paul began with the synagogue, but from the first his activities were not limited to this.

Athens was still the most famous centre of philosophy and education.* He was determined to seize his opportunity. If Christianity could be planted here, the effect on the educated world in all lands would be tremendous. He may have wished to play the part in Athens that Philo did in Alexandria. Accordingly he took advantage of encounters with philosophers in the market-place to create an impression. After all, he was not an ordinary Jew. He had lived at Tarsus, a centre of learning. He could mix in educated society without awkwardness. Moreover, his striking personality would attract attention in a place where men were on the look-out for novelty. 'Babbler' is a piece of Athenian slang. It means a man who picked up things that fell off loaded carts, and so a picker up of second-hand ideas which he had not the skill to make his own. 'Jesus and the Resurrection' seem to have been taken for a new god and goddess. 'Jesus' would suggest to a Greek a god of healing, from its similarity to the verb for 'to heal,' and Resurrection might well have been a companion goddess. The general impression was that he was an outsider, but interesting. The visit to the Areopagus has been interpreted in two different ways. Some think it simply means the hill of that name, and that a concerted move was made to the top of the hill to give Paul the opportunity for an exposition of his teaching in a clear space where there would be no interruptions. The other view is that the Areopagus means not the hill, but the Court which got its name from the hill, and which enjoyed at this time some power of censorship over lectures. This would not be a formal trial, but rather a test instigated by recognized teachers who were both curious and jealous of one who seemed to be a rival.

22-31. The Speech.—This is to be taken as a typical example of Paul's manner of address to educated pagans, as that at Lystra to uneducated pagans. There is no reason to doubt that though Luke was not present, he faithfully reproduces the general line of argument. It opens with a word of studied ambiguity. The adjective translated in RV text 'superstitious,' and in the margin 'religious,' is almost certainly to be taken in a complimentary sense. Paul would not wish to alienate their sympathy by an insult. Athens boasted of its piety. But as a good Jew, who in [16] could only see in the fairest works of Greek art a collection of idols, he could not call them god-fearing, using a word for God which might imply the reality and divinity of their gods, but he uses a word 'demon-fearing.' To the Jewish mind it would convey the suggestion that their gods were evil spirits, to the Greek mind it would only seem an alternative for god-fearing. This subtlety cannot be reproduced in English. The existence of an altar to an Unknown God can be paralleled. Probably it really denoted one of the gods of the underworld whose name it was ill-omened to name. The speech down to [29] is in full accord with the teaching of Stoicism, which included the brotherhood of man, as well as with the Old Testament (e.g. Is 66 [1-4]). The quotation in [28] comes from a Stoic poet, Aratus. The belief in the possibility of what is called 'natural religion' has its parallel in Rom 1 [19-21] and 2 [14-16]. But [30] strikes a new note of moral responsibility. To Stoics God was little more than nature, or a life-force present in good and evil alike. Further, philosophers taught at most the immortality of the soul. The idea of a resurrection must have appeared as a hopelessly unphilosophic barbarism. The assembly was dissolved in laughter. There was no fear of any disturbance or persecution. The Athenians were a polite people. The best mannered among them made a pretence of postponing further teaching to another day. But the appeal had fallen hopelessly flat. We hear of no Christian community in Athens, only of stray individuals. In Athens no respectable woman would have appeared in public. Damaris was therefore probably a foreigner, one of the class of educated courtesans, for which Athens was well known. It is plain from his Epistles that Paul, when he arrived at Corinth, was in a state of profound depression. The entire failure to make any impression on one of the great centres of culture at Athens contributed to this. It is noticeable that at Corinth his manner of preaching the Gospel was very different. Partly this was due to the very different audience, partly, perhaps, to a reaction from his unsuccessful incursion into philosophy. This does not necessarily show that his method of approach at Athens had been wrong. The fault may have lain in Athens itself.

XVIII. **1-11. Corinth.**—His departure from Athens was due to the failure to attract converts. Corinth was in many ways the antithesis of Athens. It was a Roman colony, founded in 46 B.C., on the site of the old Greek city destroyed

* On the Epicureans and Stoics cf. *The Gentile Background of Early Christianity*, p. 25.

a hundred years earlier: the capital of the Roman province of Achaia and the seat of the governor. The population was very mixed, chiefly Greek and Oriental, and containing a considerable number of Jews. A great trading centre and port, it was a busy, bustling place, full of trade and activity. There was some interest in education, chiefly rhetoric. The city was notorious for its profligacy. As there is no mention of the conversion of Aquila and Priscilla, it is probable that they were already Christians. Suetonius, the Latin historian, tells us that about A.D. 49 the Emperor Claudius issued an edict expelling Jews from Rome as a result of disorders instigated by one Chrestus. This is probably a mistake for Christus, and refers to disputes between Jews and Christians. The arrival of Aquila and Priscilla was due to this edict. Elsewhere she is called Prisca, and later in this chapter is mentioned before her husband, which may imply that she was of higher rank than he. As usual, Paul started from the synagogue. Notice the RVm in [4]. The language of [5] suggests an unusual vehemence in his preaching. Under the conditions of Corinth there was no place for the philosophic calm that had marked his address at Athens. His Epistles show that special emphasis was laid on the Cross and Resurrection (cf. e.g. 1 Cor 1 [18-25], 2 [1-5], etc.). Nowhere is he more scornful of mere human wisdom. As always with the Jews the centre of the dispute was whether Jesus was the Christ. The blasphemy of [6] would include the cry 'Jesus is accursed,' that is because He had been crucified. [7] marks the breach with the synagogue. The choice of a house next door sounds provocative, but perhaps it was the only one suitable, and it could easily be found by Gentiles who had come to the synagogue. Titus Justus was a God-fearer, probably a Roman, and Crispus a Jew, but the Epistles prove that the bulk of the converts were Gentiles, and brought into the Church their old pagan laxity both of morals and discipline. The vision is to be regarded as a token of divine encouragement to persevere in preaching in surroundings apparently so unfavourable to morality and religion, and as a promise of protection. We hear of no persecution at Corinth, which would have helped to purge the Church. Instead the dangers come from within, from factiousness and moral disorder. During his long stay the Gospel spread to Cenchreæ, the port of Corinth on the east, and to other parts of Achaia (Rom 16 [1]; 2 Cor 1 [1]).

12-17. The Trial before Gallio.—It is a sign of Luke's accuracy that he describes correctly the government of Achaia at this date. Between A.D. 15 and 44 Achaia had been united to Macedonia, and formed part of an imperial province governed by a proprætor appointed by the Emperor. In [44] it was separated and made into a senatorial province governed by a proconsul appointed by the Senate. Gallio was a well-known person, a brother of the famous philosopher and statesman Seneca, the tutor of Nero. He had been consul and was remarkable for his amiability of character. The date of his arrival at Corinth, as fixed by the discovery of an inscription, namely soon after midsummer of A.D. 51, is of great value for chronology. The Jews as a body possessed the right of self-government among themselves which was organized through the synagogue. Their action now was a concerted act by the whole body, intended to impress the governor. Their accusation was designedly vague. They hoped that Gallio would understand by the 'law' the Roman law, and would decide that Christianity was an illegal religion. But he saw the trap laid for him. Plainly the authorities knew a good deal about the Christian movement, and regarded it as a new sect within Judaism. So he treated the matter as a mere dispute between two Jewish parties which they must settle for themselves. The rebuff to the Jews was popular among the Gentiles who took the opportunity to beat Sosthenes, who had succeeded Crispus as chief man in the synagogue. Gallio, regarding it as a rough kind of justice, turned a blind eye to the proceedings. This is far more probable than to suppose that the Jews in their disappointment beat Sosthenes for managing the matter badly. The Sosthenes mentioned as a Christian in 1 Cor 1 [1] may well be a different person. From Luke's point of view Gallio's decision was of immense importance. It meant that an imperial magistrate, as opposed to the local magistrates before whom hitherto Paul had appeared, had given his opinion that Christianity was a legal religion, entitled to the protection afforded to the Jewish religion by statute, and this decision formed a precedent until it was decided otherwise by some higher court.

18-22. The Return to Antioch.—No motive is given for his return and sense of hurry. It may have been to keep a feast at Jerusalem, as the Bezan Text states, naming the Passover, or to take a contribution from the churches which he had

founded. The Greek of [18] leaves it open whether Paul or Aquila took the vow. There is nothing surprising if it was Paul. He conformed in ordinary life to the Jewish Law. The vow was an act of gratitude voluntarily made to God for some blessing. It was redeemed by offering the hair that had grown during the period, usually 30 days, on a special sacrifice at the Temple. This may account for his haste to get to Jerusalem. The preaching at Ephesus is only in passing, and does not get beyond the synagogue. There is no mention of the formation of a Christian community, though there may have been already Christians in Ephesus (cf. [27]). If he was on a pilgrim ship, it would stop to enable Jews to go to the synagogue for the Sabbath. In [22] the words 'went up' are an almost technical phrase for going up to Jerusalem. In any case such a visit is required. Luke only mentions it briefly, because he is not specially interested in it and was not present, nor has it any bearing on his general plan of writing. The length of stay at Antioch is left unstated.

23. The Third Missionary Tour.—Again he proceeded straight to the churches of South Galatia. The adjectives are put in the reverse order from the former passage, but the district mentioned is probably the same. This time he was allowed to go straight on to Ephesus.

24-28. Apollos at Ephesus.—These verses describe events at Ephesus in the interval before Paul's return. Apollos represented the type of Judaism which had sprung up at Alexandria under the influence of Greek philosophy. Examples of this can be found in Wisdom and Hebrews. Such writers found all kinds of allegorical teaching in the Old Testament. 1 Corinthians shows that many at Corinth contrasted the learning and eloquence of Apollos and his manner of interpreting the Scriptures with St. Paul's, much to the latter's disadvantage. His position when he came to Ephesus is obscure. Perhaps he had come into touch with John Baptist, and regarded Jesus as the Messiah whom he had announced, but had not joined any Christian community. Nor can we be certain what is meant by 'the things concerning Jesus.' The phrase might mean the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, though we should in that case have expected 'Christ' instead of 'Jesus,' or the facts of the life of Jesus. Christianity may in some form have reached Alexandria, or he may have received his instruction elsewhere. There must have been at this time a number of such half-Christians, who had picked up some knowledge or been influenced by the movement at some stage. His method of interpreting the Scriptures would be a powerful weapon in disputes with the Jews.

XIX. 1-7. The Disciples of John.—The narrative now returns to the actions of Paul himself. [1] implies that he had travelled not by the great main road which ran by Colossæ, which he himself tells us that he had never visited (Col 2 [1]), but by a road traversing the higher ground. The mention of these disciples of John raises a large number of problems which we have not the evidence to solve. There are signs that the influence of the Baptist had spread over a much wider area than we should have supposed, and that he had a sect of followers among the Jews of the Dispersion, comparable to the Christian Church. The 4th Gospel which was written in Ephesus at the close of the 1st century seems to find it necessary, even at that date, to insist that John was a forerunner and no more. Disciples according to its regular use in Acts means 'Christians.' In what sense they called themselves such is doubtful. John had foretold that One would come after him who would baptize not only with water but with the Spirit. Perhaps they had heard of this prediction, but did not know that it had been fulfilled. We wonder if they had only just arrived at Ephesus; or, if not, how they had been missed by the other Christians. But clearly there was as yet no organized Christian community. St. Paul did not regard baptism as unnecessary, even in the case of such people who were so good that they seemed to be Christians. [5] suggests that he did not baptize them himself. Apostles usually left that to subordinates (cf. 1 Cor 1 [14-17]). But this was followed by his laying on of hands, and the reception of the Spirit was marked by the same outward phenomena as in the instances mentioned above. Probably this was far more common than we might suppose. Luke mentions it here because it concerned a special class of persons, and it was important to emphasize the superiority of Christian baptism to that of John. So, too, his silence about the laying on of hands in other cases does not imply that it was not performed. He assumes that it would be taken as a matter of course.

8-22. Work at Ephesus.—Ephesus was the capital of the province of Asia and a free city with its own assembly. It was one of the leading centres of Hellenism

and larger than any city that Paul had yet visited. The period of preaching in the synagogue was longer than usual, but is distinguished from the later preaching in the lecture-room of Tyrannus. The Bezan Text adds that he discoursed there from the 5th to the 10th hour, that is after the regular closing hour for all business and trade. He himself worked at his trade from before sunrise till this hour (cf. 20 [34]). The rest of the day, a time of leisure when the room was free, he devoted to preaching. [10] implies that missionary activity was not confined to the city. During this period the churches of Colossæ, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, of which we read in the Epistles, were founded, and no doubt others as well. 1 Corinthians was written during his stay, and it is a fairly certain inference from 1 Corinthians that he paid a flying visit to Corinth, which Acts does not record, because of its brevity and its unsatisfactory result. It is plain that Paul had many subordinates working with him (cf. [22] and Col 1 [7]). The following stories ([11-20]) read rather like local gossip, but hit off the local atmosphere in which Christianity had to make its way. The cures wrought by Paul and relics taken from his person are parallel to modern cures wrought at pilgrimages and healing missions. The psychological agency seems to be auto-suggestion, which works independently of the truth or falsehood of any particular religious belief. It was easily imitated. A belief that the knowledge of the name of a spirit or god compels him to lend his power to work the will of the user of the name can be illustrated from many lands. The details of the story are such as might be expected in cases where suggestion fails to work. Chief Priest can only mean one of a High-Priestly family. The word for 'both' in [16] should probably be rendered 'all.' The prevalence of 'curious arts' ([19]) is in full accordance with the reputation of Ephesus. 'Ephesian writings' were a regular term for magical formulæ. Christians had continued to practise them after their conversion, and were now frightened into seeing the difference between magic and Christianity. The enormous value of the books destroyed sounds like a typical Oriental exaggeration. The whole passage reflects the conflict between Christian faith and pagan sorcery, which was one of its chief antagonists. As in Africa to-day, one of the great blessings brought by Christ was deliverance from the fear of demons of all kinds, and faith in one all-sovereign God of perfect goodness and wisdom. But this took time to realize. The utter opposition between religion and magic was not always clear, and there was an ever-present temptation to regard Christianity only as a new and superior form of magic. That Paul himself claimed to possess gifts of healing is plain from 2 Cor 12 [12] and Rom 15 [18-19]. But these were a gift of God to be used for the benefit of the community and the forwarding of His will. That is a very different conception. And such signs are only a by-product of the Gospel, the successful preaching of which is put first as the chief work of the Spirit.

To this main purpose we return in [21]. **in the spirit** means by the inspiration of the Spirit. In all his activities Paul was guided by the Spirit, through prophets, or by visions and signs. Here we are not told how the awareness of God's will came. 1 Cor 16 [8] declares that his plan at the time of writing was to stay till Pentecost, and then visit Corinth via Macedonia. He also lays stress on the collection for the saints. But his plans were thrown into confusion by the misconduct of the Church at Corinth and the need of an immediate visitation. This statement in Acts refers to his plans as reshaped after his unsatisfactory visit. It is the first mention of going to Rome, but this was the natural goal of his labours. He had planted churches in the great strategic centres of the Ægean. There was already a church at Rome. He wished to link that up with the other churches, and to make it a base for expansion westwards.

23-41. The Riot at Ephesus.—The story is vivid and full of humour. Once again Christianity becomes unpopular when it touches men's pockets. The Temple of Artemis was one of the wonders of the world, and Ephesus was proud of its title of 'Temple-keeper' to the goddess. She was not really the Greek virgin goddess, but the Oriental Nature-deity, the great Mother, and her image, supposed to have fallen down from the sky, was a rude bust of a woman covered with breasts as a sign of fertility. The shrines represented her sitting in state under a canopy. The theatre was the great amphitheatre which still remains. It afforded a large open space for meetings. The Asiarch (RVm) was the Roman official who presided over the games and festivals, especially those concerned with the cult of Rome and the Emperor. Probably he retained his title after the close of his year of office. The presence of several may show that it was

the great festival of Artemis, which would give special point to the appeal of Demetrius. Luke emphasizes their friendliness as proving that the official classes regarded Paul and Christianity with approval, and wished to protect him against an outburst of uneducated Oriental superstition. It also brings out the personal influence of Paul in such circles. We should contrast the bitter antagonism of the Apocalypse to the whole system of Emperor worship in Asia at a later date. The town clerk's speech is clever, and reads like an apology for Christianity. It defends Christians against all the popular charges brought against them. The local assembly had its fixed days of meeting, and could only hold extraordinary meetings by permission of the Roman authorities, which was reluctantly granted. The Roman Empire was above all anxious to preserve order, and such a gathering might be treated as a riot and lead to punishment. The dispute between craftsmen and Christians was one which the ordinary courts could settle. If interference with trade could be proved, the Roman law was always ready to grant redress.

XX. 1-3. **The Visit to Greece.**—The disturbance made an immediate departure the only prudent course. 2 Corinthians shows that at this time Paul was in a state of great distress. Allusions in his Epistles suggest that there had been other difficulties at Ephesus, probably from the Jews (cf. 19 [33]). He may even have been imprisoned there. It was Ephesian Jews who roused the riot at Jerusalem (21 [27]). Also affairs had come to a head at Corinth. He had sent on Titus with an ultimatum, and could not rest till he heard the result. Hence, though there was a great opportunity for work at Troas, he could not take it, but pushed on to Macedonia, where he received good news of Titus's success. From there he wrote 2 Corinthians, or at least the first part of it. Acts omits all this, because it is not a biography. During the stay in Greece, that is at Corinth, he wrote Romans. The plot of the Jews implies continued hostility. Perhaps the ship was a pilgrim ship arriving in time for the Passover, on which there would be every opportunity for a pious murder, without any awkward investigation.

3-6. **From Corinth to Troas.**—RVm with the best MSS. omit 'as far as Asia.' This is probably right, as these men were the delegates of the various churches, bearing the alms for Jerusalem, and therefore travelled with him all the way. If we retain the words, we must suppose that Sopater accompanied him as a personal friend as far as Troas—the verb being in the singular—and then turned back. The delegates had met independently at Troas with the collection. The 'we' narrative here is resumed. There is no reason to doubt that Luke was more or less continuously present to the close of the book, though there was not always either the opportunity or the need to advertise the fact.

7-12. **Sunday at Troas,** a typical instance of Christian worship, as it was practised in the churches founded by Paul. It was perhaps selected so as to include the case of Eutychus. Christians observe not the Jewish Sabbath, but the first day of the week. This is a purely Christian festival, kept in memory of the Resurrection. The Sunday is regarded as beginning at 6 p.m. on the evening before. Christians gather 'to break bread.' This term seems to have included both Eucharist and Agape. The evening was kept in literal imitation of the Last Supper, as was done at Corinth (1 Cor 11 [20]). First there was a common meal; secondly, a discourse by the Apostle, then the Eucharist celebrated by the Apostle ([11]). On this occasion at least it must have lasted into the early hours of the morning. We have only to suppose that, when at a later date the Agape and Eucharist were separated, which seems to be contemplated in 1 Cor 11 [34], the congregation went home to sleep in between and met again in the early morning, and we get a natural transition to the practice of the later Church. In any case the passage emphasizes the truth that the breaking of the bread on the Lord's Day was the central act of Christian fellowship and worship, and the rallying point of the community. Under the conditions in which the churches outside Jerusalem lived, it was impossible to attempt the daily gathering which had marked the first days.

The narrative implies a miraculous act of healing. It may be recorded to bring out the power possessed by Paul, and even to balance the raising of the dead by Peter in 9. The mention of lights may be to show that the cure took place publicly, or it may be to refute current heathen slanders against Christian gatherings, or it may simply be that many lights had been lit as a sign of joy. Such illumination at festal banquets was common in the ancient world both among Jews and Greeks. All Christian services were for a long time to come held in the largest room of a private house belonging to a

member of the community. This was plainly the case here. In the Epistles we read of the church, i.e. the congregation, meeting in someone's house (cf. Rom 16[5]).

13-18. From Troas to Miletus.—If the ship was one that Paul had hired for his party and therefore could put in wherever he wished, his reluctance to visit Ephesus may have been due to the fact that it was not even now safe for him to show his face there. Ramsay, however, holds that he transhipped at Troas, and after an involuntary delay of seven days had to choose between a faster boat, which stopped only at Miletus, and a slower boat that put in at Ephesus. As he had lost the chance of being at Jerusalem for the Passover, he wanted to be there for Pentecost to show his respect for the Law. Accordingly he chose the faster boat, and made use of the stay at Miletus to summon the elders from Ephesus, some 30 miles away.

18-38. Speech to the Elders of Ephesus.—Their ordination has not been recorded, but that is Luke's method. He assumes that his readers have understood that the appointment of elders was Paul's regular custom in every church (cf. 14[23]). The speech was heard by Luke, and there is every reason to believe that he has given a genuine summary of what was actually uttered. It is the only speech in Acts of this pastoral character, and is in the fullest accord with Paul's manner of writing in his Epistles under similar circumstances. It contains the following main points: (1) A vindication of his own conduct and ministry ([18-21, 26-27] and [33-35]; cf. 1 Th 2[1-13]). At the words 'these hands' he doubtless displayed his hands hardened by tent-making. The Epistles show that it was a common taunt against him that he did not live on the offerings of his converts. (2) A statement of his plans ([22-25]). It was God's will that he should go to Jerusalem, though the Holy Spirit, i.e. through Christian prophets, declared that bonds awaited him. It hardly needed a prophet to see the probability of that. It is unreasonable to argue from the words at the end of [25] that the Pastoral Epistles, which imply a later visit to Ephesus, cannot be genuine, because Luke would not have allowed the unfulfilled prediction to remain. That is to read an emotional passage with a gross literalism. All that the words mean is that a return to Ephesus had no place in his plans, as far as he could see. (3) A charge to the elders to exercise their ministry faithfully ([28-32]). They owed their call to the Holy Spirit, who probably made His will known through prophets (cf. 13[1-3]; 1 Tim 1[18]). It is usually held that at this time bishop or overseer (*episcopos*) was an alternative title for elder or presbyter, which simply means an elder man, while overseer brings out his duties. In that case later on the two titles became differentiated, and were used for two distinct offices. When the Apostles died out, the title bishop became reserved for those men who succeeded to their authority. The important point is not the title, but the powers behind the title. It is, however, possible that even here the two classes are not identical. A wave of his hand would be enough to make plain that he was now addressing not all the elders, but only those to whom the further duty of overseership had been given. On this view, all bishops at this stage would be elders, but not all elders bishops. Even so we are a long way off from a single bishop in each area. Nor do we know what their powers at this time included. Behind all local churches, as the Epistles remind us, lay continual apostolic supervision. Paul expects two dangers, persecution from without, and false teaching within. In [28] the subject of 'purchased' is more naturally God, not Christ. But the phrase 'the blood of God' is incredible in St. Paul. Some have conjectured that the word 'Son' has fallen out. Otherwise it is best to translate *blood that is His own*. Incidentally the 'three years' of [31] gives an example of the way of reckoning time. It was really only two and a half years, but fractions are always reckoned as wholes. The affection displayed in this scene is emphasized by the word used in 21[1]. 'Were parted' should be 'had torn ourselves away from.'

XXI. 1-6. From Miletus to Tyre.—For some reason it was necessary to change ships at Patara. The Bezan Text adds a visit to Myra. This is probably correct, but quite unimportant. From there they sailed straight across, sighting the western point of Cyprus. At Tyre there existed a Christian church, but it was unfamiliar to all of them. Its members had to be sought out. The warm welcome that they received is a proof of the real solidarity among Christians. It also possessed prophets, another instance of the important part that they played in the primitive Church. The stay for seven days shows that the vessel was a large one.

7-16. From Tyre to Jerusalem.—We are not told how they travelled from Ptolemais to Cæsarea, or the length of their stay. Philip, last mentioned in

8^{40}, had apparently made Cæsarea his headquarters. He is styled not deacon, but 'evangelist.' The Epistles show that evangelists were reckoned as a class in the Church ranking after the Apostles and prophets, and their authority was not limited to any one place. Again stress is laid on the gifts of prophecy in the Church. No example is given of any utterance by the daughters of Philip, but Agabus reappears and acts quite in the manner of the Old Testament prophets, and by a symbolical action foretells Paul's arrest. Here and in ^{4} Luke marks the approach of the coming crisis, as in the Gospel he marks the approach of the Passion of Christ. The disciple is re-enacting the experience of the Master. In either case there is the temptation to turn aside. In another way this visit is important, since it gave Luke the opportunity of intercourse with Philip, from whom he could get first-hand information about the earliest days of the Church. We probably owe to this meeting the sections about Philip in the early chapters and other sections besides. 'Took up our baggage' is better translated *saddled our horses*. Ramsay, with his knowledge of Eastern conditions, was the first to point out that in the climate of Palestine great expenditure of energy is dangerous to health. The 64 miles to Jerusalem would not be attempted in a single day, even on horseback. Nor would a hurried walk of that length be advisable. So a night was spent with Mnason. We know nothing else about him, but as one of the first converts he would be full of memories of the earliest days at Jerusalem, which had now so long passed away.

17-26. The Church at Jerusalem.—^{17} records a warm welcome, ^{18} a formal audience with James and the elders. The silence as to the presence of any of the Twelve implies that they had all left Jerusalem, probably on missionary work. The salutation of ^{19} was an official recognition of the Mother-Church. It presumably was followed by the handing over of the collection. Luke's omission to record it may show that he regarded it as having failed to promote unity. The leaders of the Jerusalem church were in a delicate position. On the one hand, they were well disposed to Paul. On the other hand, they did not wish anything to occur which might damage their relations with the Jews. Since the persecution of Agrippa they had been unmolested. Though they knew that Paul had been faithful to the compromise of the Council, all sorts of reports were rife, which suggested that he had dispensed from the Law not only Gentile converts but Jews. Hence it was expedient that he should show in the most public and decisive manner possible that he himself was still loyal to the Law. The general plan is clear. Jerusalem was full of Jews from all parts for Pentecost, including the many Christian Jews mentioned in ^{20}. There happened to be four men who had undertaken a Nazarite vow. When such came to fulfil it, they had to make offerings which involved much expense. It was a recognized work of piety for rich Jews to defray these: e.g. King Agrippa I, when he came to Jerusalem in A.D. 41, provided the funds for many Nazarites to shave their heads, as an act of thanksgiving and to win popularity. ^{26} implies that it was necessary for Paul to enter the Temple with them and join in some preliminary purifications. 24^{17-18} suggests that he himself had some thank-offering to make. Apparently the vows did not all expire on the same day. The money for the vows can hardly have come from the collection. Several details in Paul's life at this period, e.g. his treatment by Festus, prove that he must have been in command of considerable resources. His family was seemingly wealthy, and he may have become reconciled to them. Or a relative may have died. Still, in $\text{Phil } 3^{7-8}$, written from Rome, he asserts that he had forfeited everything for Christ. So it is possible that the money came not from his family, but from one of his companions, such as Aristarchus.

27-XXII. 2. The Riot in the Temple.—Paul would not be known by sight to many at Jerusalem, but was a familiar figure to Jews from Ephesus, whose enmity seized the first opportunity to do him harm. The Temple in $^{27-28}$ includes the inner court, round which lay the outer court, the Court of the Gentiles, into which all might come. Between the two was a wall of partition (cf. $\text{Eph } 2^{14}$) bearing an inscription in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin that any Gentile passing within it was punishable with death. It was this holy ground that Paul was alleged to have polluted by bringing a Gentile inside. The House of the Nazarites was in a corner of the inner court. Here Paul was discovered fulfilling the vows. In an Eastern city a tumult is easily spread. The Roman garrison were stationed in the fortress of Antonia, connected with the outer court by stairs (^{35}). The soldiers were prepared to deal with disorder on the occasions of Jewish festivals.

The chief captain is a military tribune or chiliarch, that is commander of a thousand. He was in charge of a cohort (RVm), that is the sixth part of a legion, containing approximately a thousand men. In the confusion Paul had to be lifted over the soldiers' heads. This vivid touch suggests that Luke himself witnessed the scene from among the crowd. Josephus gives further details about the Egyptian, though his accounts are not wholly consistent with one another. He was the latest impostor, who had led out a multitude to the Mount of Olives and promised that the walls of the city would fall down at his command. His following had been dispersed with much bloodshed. The Roman officer supposed that he was now being chastised by his dupes. The Assassins were the extreme wing of the Zealots, who advocated resistance by force to Rome. Their actual name 'Sicarii' was derived from the daggers (*sicæ*) with which they murdered Jews who were viewed as too favourable to peace with Rome. The words 'a citizen of no mean city' are a reference to a line of the Greek poet Euripides, and at once would stamp Paul as a cultivated Greek. The Tribune would welcome a chance of restoring order. ' The tactful use of Hebrew, i.e. Aramaic, the national tongue, won him a hearing.

XXII. 3-21. **The Speech to the Crowd.**—Paul emphasizes skilfully the common ground between himself and his own race. He had to face the fact that, though he himself still observed the Law, yet he taught that Gentiles could become members of the Messianic Kingdom without observing it. He attempts to show that this change of attitude was only brought about by divine compulsion, and that his mission to the Gentiles was due to an express divine revelation, turning him from his own desire to remain in the city. Notice the emphasis on his own zeal for the Law, the description of Ananias as a devout man, though the failure to mention his vision is strange, and the recognition of the mob's own zeal for God, which can hardly be an invention (cf. Rom 10 [2]). The mention of his own vision while worshipping in the Temple implies that he has always been a devout Jew. It is best assigned to his first visit, though neither Acts nor Galatians mentions it. The slight differences from the other accounts of his conversion show that ancient historians made no attempt after that precise consistency that we expect to-day. But the real point at issue cannot be indefinitely delayed. At the first mention of the Gentiles the passions of the crowd break forth.

22-29. **The Scene in the Castle.**—The use of torture to extract information was common. By law a Roman citizen was exempt from scourging. Here, in contrast to Philippi, Paul had both the will and the opportunity to avail himself of his rights. Lysias is a Greek name, and [28] shows that he was not by birth a Roman citizen. His name Claudius implies that he was one of many who bought citizenship during the reign of the Emperor Claudius, when the traffic in such things was notorious.

30-XXIII. 10. **The Examination before the Sanhedrin.***—'Loosed' shows that Paul was in custody, if not in bonds. After all, he had been accused of something like sedition. The desire to consult the Sanhedrin was prompted partly by the wish to keep the Jews in a good humour and prevent further rioting, partly by the need of getting to the bottom of the case and seeing whether there was really anything in it. The account of the meeting is summary. Luke himself was not present. Some case against him must have been stated before he made any reply, and [6] implies much debate which is not reported. Ananias had become High Priest in A.D. 48. His arbitrary action is typical of the high-handed methods of the Sadducean aristocracy. The phrase a 'whitened wall' was proverbial. Tombs were whitewashed in order to warn men not to touch them and incur defilement. [5] is not an apology, but a statement of fact. The High Priest may not have worn any special dress, and Paul's sight may have been poor. He can hardly have failed to know him by sight. Or the words may be ironical. By his unpriestly action he had disguised

* At this point the Passion of St. Paul begins; and, like the Lord's Passion in the Gospels, it is related at what seems a disproportioned length. St. Luke has a love for parallels. Just as in the main body of his story he works out a parallel between the respective preaching, miracles, persecutions, and deliverances of St. Peter and St. Paul, so now he works out the parallel between St. Paul's experience and that of the Lord. First comes the examination before the Sanhedrin (cf. Ac 23 [2] with Jn 18 [22]); then that before the Roman authority; and then after the arrival of Festus, the appeal to Agrippa, recalling Pilate's appeal to Herod Antipas in Lk 23 [7]. In 27, Luke probably has in mind the contrast between St. Paul and Jonah (cf. Ac 27 [18, 38] with Jon 1 [5]). Jonah refuses to go to the imperial capital of Nineveh because he hates the oppressors of his people, and desires their destruction; St. Paul goes willingly to Rome on his mission of salvation. Jonah's presence threatens his mariners with destruction; St. Paul's presence is their salvation. —ED.

his character. St. Paul's act was more than a clever move to divide his opponents. It was based on a real conviction. As his Epistles prove, he held that the Christian Church was the true Israel, and the Christian the true Jew. He had turned his back on nothing. He had only applied the principles in which he had believed all his life. The question at issue was 'the hope,' i.e. the Messianic hope, and 'the resurrection from the dead.' Granted that Jesus of Nazareth had been raised from the dead, he was bound to apply to Him his old Pharisaic hope of a Messiah and of a resurrection. That was only Pharisaism carried to its logical conclusion. Where he differed from the Pharisees was not in principle, but in fact. They did not believe that Jesus had actually risen. But from the Sadducees he differed both in principle and in fact. They had no real Messianic hope and no belief in any resurrection. Plainly the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, who, like James, observed the Law, were tolerated by the Pharisees as being deluded but harmless. The policy of Gamaliel was being continued. The final result was not to clear up the nature of the charge against Paul, but to give the impression that it was based on disputes among the Jews themselves ([29]).

XXIII. **11-24. The Journey to Cæsarea.**—The vision of [11] emphasizes the divine providence overruling human perversity to the glory of God. His will that Paul should witness at Rome was being fulfilled in God's own way. [16] throws light upon Paul's family. It implies that his sister had married a husband who moved in official circles. The narrative suggests that the nephew was quite young. His position as a Roman citizen made his life specially valuable. The Bezan Text accounts for the size of the escort by inserting: 'For he was afraid lest the Jews should seize and slay him, and he afterwards be accused of taking money.' A similar charge of bribery had led to the banishment of Cumanus, a former governor. Accordingly, Lysias was anxious to rid himself of further responsibility by sending him down to Cæsarea, where the governor himself resided.

25-30. The Letter of Lysias.—Luke may be giving the sense, or the letter itself may have been read aloud in court. Such a written statement of a case, when sending a prisoner to a higher authority, was technically called an elogium. It puts Lysias's conduct in the best light. Notice the formal address, 'Most excellent,' the same as that given to Theophilus in 1 [1].

31-35. At Cæsarea.—Antipatris was more than half-way, so that the danger being over, the escort could be diminished. Felix had been appointed as Procurator of Judæa in A.D. 52. He was a brother of the freedman Pallas who had great influence with the Emperor Claudius. According to Tacitus, the Roman historian, he was notorious for his lust and cruelty. The point of his question seems to have been to discover whether Paul was subject to his jurisdiction. Since Cilicia was attached to Syria so as to form one province under a Legate, Paul came from another district of the same province, and so could be tried by Felix as deputy of the Legate of Syria. The Prætorium (RVm) is the equivalent of 'Government House.' It is called 'Herod's' because it had been built by Herod the Great. It was a fortified building.

XXIV. **1-21. The Trial before Felix.**—The Jews arrived bringing a professional advocate bearing a Roman name. Luke gives what is no doubt a summary of his main points. He opens with a compliment to Felix on his efforts to maintain peace, a polite allusion to his policy of sparing no cruelty to keep order and put down brigands. Then he cleverly represents Paul as a disturber of public order all over the empire (literally the inhabited earth) wherever he went, stirring up Jews to disloyalty by preaching another King, Jesus. Then he implies that he belongs to a sect which is officially repudiated by the official leaders, and so has no claim to the toleration which Rome granted to the Jewish religion. Thirdly, he accuses him of an attempt to profane the Temple, which was an offence against Roman law and would inevitably lead to riot. The general impression left is that Paul is a troublesome individual who must be repressed in the interests of that peace which the Roman Empire above all sought to maintain. The inferior MSS. add that the Jews would have dealt with him by their Law, if only Lysias had not violently interfered. Paul in his defence appeals to the knowledge which Felix possessed of the real situation. He asserts that there is no proof against him. He had only been twelve days in Jerusalem, and had come for purposes of worship. He admits that he follows a rule of life which his enemies regard as unorthodox, but he claims that it is the true Judaism. In other words, the point at issue is a question of religion. His loyalty to his nation is shown by the alms which he brought up, and by the purpose for which he was present in the Temple,

not to profane it, but to fulfil a vow according to the Law. Why were not his accusers, the Jews from Asia, present? He ends, as before, by saying that the real difference between him and his opponents lies in his practical belief in the possibility of a resurrection.

22-27. Felix and Paul.—Felix adjourned the case, pronouncing the usual formula 'amplius,' i.e. 'it needs further investigation.' He suspected the truth, and Lysias's letter had declared his belief that he was not guilty of any political offence. He did not want to annoy the Jews. Lysias's absence was a convenient excuse. We never hear of his coming, or of any attempt to get him. On the other hand, the Jews had at least succeeded in shutting up Paul where he could do little mischief. Their own relations with Felix were increasingly unsatisfactory. So Paul was detained, but treated with all consideration. Felix was interested in his prisoner. His case is parallel to that of John Baptist and Herod Antipas. Felix, like Herod, was living in adultery. He had seduced Drusilla, a daughter of Herod Agrippa I, from her husband Azizus, King of the little Syrian state of Emesa. Paul's preaching on self-control would touch an uneasy conscience. Felix is an example of those who enjoy the thrills of religion but make no effort to obey its commands. Paul must have appeared a wealthy man, for a Roman of the rank of Felix would not have been content with a small bribe. Felix was recalled by Nero as the result of complaints by the Jews about his cruelty in putting down riots at Cæsarea. Hence his desire to conciliate them. He barely escaped punishment. The Bezan Text adds that 'he left Paul in ward for the sake of Drusilla,' i.e. she played the part of Herodias.

Luke passes over the two years in silence. For his main purpose they were of little significance. Some have argued that during this imprisonment one or more of the Epistles of the Captivity (Col., Eph., Phm., and Phil.) were composed, but the balance of evidence is decidedly against this. For Luke himself there is every reason to believe that the period was of great importance. He could collect evidence from many sources about the life of Christ and the history of the first days of the Church.

XXV. 1-12. The Appeal to Cæsar.—Festus was a man of very different stamp to Felix and proved a firm and just governor. If he had not died after two years of office, the history of Judæa might have been different. But he knew himself to be inexperienced in Jewish problems. The Jews were notoriously difficult to handle. This explains his efforts to conciliate them so far as Roman justice would allow. His first duty was to clear up arrears of business, which included the case of Paul. The Jews seized the chance to prefer a fresh accusation against Paul. Festus treated the matter with fairness. There is no hint of bribery, and no delay. The charges appear to have been the same as those made before Felix. Festus was naturally impressed by the official attitude of the Jews. In the interval the High Priest Ananias had been superseded by Ishmael, through the action of Herod Agrippa II, to whom had been entrusted the power of nominating to the High-Priesthood. But there was no change of policy towards Paul. In itself there was nothing unjust in moving the trial to Jerusalem. To a new governor the Sanhedrin seemed the natural place for the decision of such a case as this, and by presiding himself he would ensure that justice would be done. But the change of place could not be made without the consent of the accused. Paul then appealed to Cæsar. Every Roman citizen had the right, subject to certain limitations, to claim to be judged by the Emperor himself. Festus conferred with the legal assessors who always sat with the governor in such cases. When they decided that the appeal was in order, it was allowed. Paul clearly saw that there was very little chance of getting justice in Palestine. Even before a fair-minded judge the case could be made complicated by the malice of the Jews. The grounds on which he had been involved in disturbances on several occasions could be so misrepresented, that an acquittal was by no means certain. In Rome the atmosphere would be less prejudiced. There was also the possibility that his enemies would not take the trouble and risk of following up the case. Indeed, we do not know for certain that they did so.

13-27. The Arrival of Agrippa.—This is Herod Agrippa II, son of Agrippa I, and the last of the Herods. When his father died, he was too young to succeed to his kingdom, but was kept at Rome by Claudius. In A.D. 48 his uncle Herod, King of Chalcis, who had married his sister Bernice ([13]), died, and Claudius gave him the kingdom. He was also made supervisor of the Temple, with the right to nominate the High Priest. Later, further principalities were given to him. Bernice (the Greek equivalent for Victoria) was a

rival beauty to her sister Drusilla, and a woman of infamous character. Their appearance was just what Festus needed. On the one hand, Agrippa was a practising Jew, though at this moment he was quarrelling with the Sadducees. On the other hand, from his Roman upbringing he was in full sympathy with the cultivated Gentile point of view. He was qualified to understand the matter in hand, and to give an impartial opinion. Accordingly, Festus held not a formal trial, but rather an informal public hearing, from which he hoped to get some more definite information which he could put in the report to be sent to Rome. It was to Paul's interest to use the opportunity to make a favourable impression, which might be of assistance when the actual trial came on. Nor was he averse to bearing witness to the Gospel before circles to which it was not ordinarily accessible.

XXVI. 1-23. **The Speech before Agrippa.**—The general line of thought is similar to that of the other speeches, but the Greek shows signs of special preparation. The words are arranged so as to be rhetorically effective, and several rare words occur here only in the New Testament. Again he dwells on his own strictness in the practice of Judaism; on his sudden conversion which was manifestly due to divine intervention; on the Resurrection as in full conformity with Jewish belief, and as proving the arrival of the expected Messiah; on the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies by the preaching to the Gentiles, the assumption being silently made that the authority of the Messiah could dispense with the Law for Gentiles. A third account of his conversion is given, which shows the importance that Luke attached to it. The only detail added is the proverb at the end of [14], which may express his own later reflection upon the event. [16-19] give a general summary not only of what he apprehended at the time, but of subsequent revelations. The grammar of [20] breaks down in the Greek, and it is strange for him to claim to have preached 'throughout all the country of Judæa,' unless it is an exaggeration of what he did on his journeys to and from Jerusalem. Some amend it so as to mean 'and in every country, both to Jews and Greeks.' The closing verses lead up to the assertion that Christianity is Judaism fulfilled. Notice that in [7] St. Paul knows of no 'lost tribes.' Nor would it matter if there were such. All the promises to Israel have passed to the Christian Church.

24-32. The Effect of the Speech.—To a Roman like Festus, with no knowledge of Judaism from the inside and used to affairs rather than to theology, this speech must have been largely unintelligible. What impressed him was not the arguments, but the enthusiasm of the speaker. He seemed to be filled with a power not his own. To the men of that day such conditions were commonly explained by possession by a demon. Whether it was a good or bad demon could not always be determined, but in this case clearly he was beside himself through much study. To the ancient world it was not easy to draw the line between madness and inspiration. In reply Paul affirms his sanity, and appeals to the evidence of well-known facts. The personal address to Agrippa was not welcome. His reply, whatever exactly it means, is a polite and ironical closing of the subject. It was really rather bad taste to suggest before a distinguished audience that he had any interest in such an impossible sect. The RV gives a good sense, though it is not clear whether it can be extracted out of the Greek text in the best MSS. It is natural that a Hellenized Jew like Agrippa should use the Gentile nickname Christian, which fitted in with the argument of Paul's speech. It only remained for Agrippa to assure Festus that he could not possibly be undermining the safety of the Roman Empire. [32] seems to relate some public utterance after the private consultation of [30] and [31]. For Luke it is important as another declaration that he had done nothing worthy of death, made by a responsible authority. There may be a comparison in his mind with the acquittal of Christ by Herod.

XXVII. 1-8. **The Journey to Rome: First Stage.**—The duty of conveying Paul to Rome lay with the police. The Augustan band seems to get its name from the title of the Emperor Augustus. It means 'the royal cohort.' It is usually held to be a popular name for a body of officers on detached service, officially called 'frumentarii' or 'corn officials,' from their original function of supervising the transport of supplies for the armies. Such men, who would be constantly travelling to all parts, came to be used for other duties such as couriers, or conveying political prisoners to the capital. Later they became unpopular through being employed as spies. It is known that such an organization existed in later times, but there is no reason why it should not already have been formed. Mommsen, the great classical historian, assigns its foundation to Augustus himself. A title

such as 'Royal,' though borne by legions, was not commonly given to cohorts, though an inscription of the early part of the 1st century seems to speak of the First Augustan cohort, thus confirming Luke's use. It was probably a colloquial rather than an official designation.

On this occasion the party included several besides Paul. The rest may have been criminals condemned to be sent to Rome for the amphitheatre. Paul is clearly treated in a different manner, as befitted a Roman citizen and a man of position and wealth. Luke and Aristarchus travelled with him. There is no hint that either of them were under arrest or involved in his charge. They may have travelled as his slaves. Otherwise it is difficult to see how they would have been taken. Ramsay quotes the example of an ex-consul brought as a prisoner to Rome, whose slaves were permitted to travel with him, while his wife was refused, in spite of her offer to perform menial duties. In [3] the conduct of Julius puts him in a favourable light. Acts always represents Roman soldiers as well disposed. As the season was far advanced, it was not possible to wait for a boat going direct from Cæsarea to Rome. Julius expected to be able to change into another boat in one of the harbours of Asia. Failing that, he might go by the land route from Philippi to Dyrrachium, and then across to Brundisium. Luke had come from Myra to Sidon by the west of Cyprus. He expected to return by the same route. Hence he mentions that this time they kept to the east of it. But, as a matter of fact, that was the ordinary course for west-bound ships. Some MSS. add that Myra was reached in fifteen days. This is probably correct. Myra was one of the great harbours for cross-sea traffic. The boat into which they transhipped was in the imperial service carrying grain from Egypt to Rome ([38]). For such Myra was a regular port of call. If the wind blew from the west, there was a danger that they might be driven on to the dangerous north coast of Crete. Hence they worked their way round by the eastern promontory, Salome, and got under the protection of the land along the south coast. The reason for the long stay at Fair Havens is that west of it the coast slopes to the north and ceases to afford protection from north-west winds.

9-12. The Council.—The Fast is the Day of Atonement. It probably attracted the attention of the Gentile Luke, because Paul was able to observe it while they waited in the harbour. It fell about the equinox. In the ancient world sailing was regarded as dangerous after September 14, and was discontinued on the open sea after November 11. In view of the shortness of time the Council was held, and Paul, as a man of rank and an experienced traveller, was invited to be present. Contrary to all our notions the decision rests in the hands of the centurion as senior military officer present. The ship belonged to the imperial service, and in those days there was no sharp distinction between the two arms of the service. The master of the ship is the sailing-master, and owner should rather be translated '*captain*,' since the Greek word does not convey the idea of ownership. The weight of opinion was in favour of getting on as far as possible. The description of Phœnix, which is usually identified with the modern Loutro, about 40 miles west, which offered the best anchorage on the south coast of Crete, is a standing puzzle. It faces east, not down the south-west and north-west, which is the only possible translation of the Greek. Some have identified it with another bay on the other side of a peninsula, which does face that way and is called still Phineka. But this would be most unsuitable for wintering. It must be remembered that Luke never saw the place, and so may easily have misunderstood the sailors' description of it. Under the circumstances the decision to move on was a natural one.

13-26. The Storm.—Next day their chance seemed to have come. They managed to weather the headland of Matala, but were caught by a sudden tempestuous blast coming down from the mountains of Crete from the north-east. Such squalls were characteristic of that sea and known by the local name of Euraquilo. The ancient type of ship with a single large sail was exposed to a dangerous strain under such circumstances. It had to be allowed to run before the wind, and even so would soon have sunk if it had not got under the shelter of the small island of Cauda. Here the boat was hauled in, ropes were passed round the ship transversely to hold the planks together, as the wet would cause the cargo of grain to swell, and, most important of all, the mainsail (RV gear) was lowered, leaving just enough to be able to manœuvre the boat. The great danger now was that they might be driven right across to the Syrtis, the quicksands off the coast of Africa, if the wind persisted for many days. Hence they did all in their power to turn the head of the ship in another direction. Thus they

drifted westwards. To ease the strain on the ship, it was lightened by throwing overboard the cargo and furniture. In a ship of this type it must have been most difficult to get or prepare food. The strain of the mast would be increasing the leakage, but to cut it away would only lead to drifting on to Syrtis. The situation seemed hopeless. At this crisis the personality of Paul made itself felt, and the author was an admiring spectator of his behaviour at such a crisis. In itself this was perfectly natural. If he had not been a man of extraordinary force of character, he would never have been the hero of this part of Acts. It is therefore unreasonable to regard this incident as an interpolation, as is done by some who are so impressed by the vivid nature of the rest of the narrative as to regard it as the indubitable work of an eye-witness. Further, throughout Acts Paul is guided by visions. Thus the mention of one here is in full accord with what we should expect. He was given a clear insight into God's will for himself and others.

27-44. The Shipwreck.—' Driven to and fro ' is a landsman's way of speaking. A sailor would know that their course would be in a uniform direction. The ' Sea of Adria ' had come to be used loosely in a wider sense than our ' Adriatic ' to cover a large part of the Eastern Mediterranean. The sailors' ears would be quick to detect the approach of land. They were obliged to anchor so as to have a chance of selecting a favourabe spot for landing when daylight came. The four anchors were needed owing to the force of the wind. Anchoring from the stern, though unusual, would serve to keep the head of the boat towards land and make it easier to run it ashore. As the ship was close to land, the sailors saw a chance of securing their own safety, while leaving the ship to its fate. The loss of their skill would have endangered the rest of the company. Paul's vigilance preserved their lives. Again his exhortation to take food, after the protracted loss of regular meals, showed his practical mind. They needed all their strength for the landing. The description is given in strangely eucharistic language, but it is impossible to suppose that it was a Christian Eucharist under such circumstances. There were only three Christians among a crowd of heathen, and there was neither time nor place for a solemn rite. Rather the wording shows how every meal contains in itself the elements of a Eucharist. To the Jews especially all meals had a definite religious aspect, and were begun and ended with prayer. We may compare the action of Christ at the feedings of the five and four thousand. In other words, the sacramental value and meaning were not imposed upon an alien material, but the outward sign naturally corresponded to the inward and spiritual meaning with which it was filled. After the meal the remainder of the cargo was thrown out, that the boat might be lighter and be beached higher. The place selected has been identified beyond reasonable doubt. The bank between two seas is a neck of land projecting out. There the ship, which drew probably about 18 feet, struck a bottom of mud. The forepart stuck fast in the mud, while the stern was battered by the waves and was gradually broken up. This gave time for all the passengers to get safe to land through the shallow water. ' Some on broken pieces of the ship ' should probably be rendered *some on the backs of those from the ship*. The happy ending of their desperate plight was due to a combination of unexpected circumstances.

XXVIII. **1-10. The Stay at Malta.**—Luke, as a Greek, styles the inhabitants barbarians. They were of Phœnician origin. It has been objected to the story of the viper that all the snakes in the island are non-poisonous. There is, however, a snake that looks venomous and is still popularly regarded as being so. The occurrence was regarded as a miracle, even by the natives. Whether it was really so or not we have not the evidence to decide. The title ' *the first of the island* ' (RV ' the chief man of the island ') has been found in inscriptions, and Luke's accuracy is again vindicated. But we do not know whether it was a definite office, or only a title of honour. The Greek form Poplius may be for Publius or Popilius. Either name is Roman, but is a prænomen, that is corresponds rather to our christian name. It is strange that no other name is given.

11-16. The Road to Rome.—If the wreck occurred about the middle of November, three months carries us to the later half of February. This was early, but not impossibly early for a voyage on the open sea, if the weather were favourable and a south wind blew. The wait at Syracuse would be due to the dropping of the wind. They had to make a circuit, i.e. to tack, because, when it sprung up again, it was not directly behind them. It is suggested that Luke here and here alone gives the name of the ship, The Twin Gods, that is Castor and Pollux, because he heard of it by name before he had set eyes on it. Puteoli was a busy port, the kind of place

where a small band of Christians might by this time be expected. The Bezan Text reads 'were consoled, tarrying with them seven days.' This is far more natural. Paul was not his own master to be entreated to stay. The same word in Greek means either 'entreated' or 'consoled.' The arrival at Rome seems to be mentioned twice over. [14] may refer to the 'ager Romanus,' or state of Rome, and [16] to the actual city. Or it may be simply Luke's eagerness to get to the end of the journey. The market of Appius was 100 miles from Puteoli, on the great main Appian road, Three Taverns 10 miles from Rome. The welcome was specially cheering to Paul. Even in Romans there is an undertone of anxiety about his reception in a church which he had not founded. The Bezan Text inserts in [16] the sentence in RVm, which adds a detail that is doubtless correct. But the Greek word is rather 'captain of the camp.' It is improbable that the camp of the Prætorian Guard is intended. Rather he was the officer in command of the camp of the frumentarii or officer-couriers, to whch we have seen that Julius belonged. Paul was not a sufficiently important or dangerous prisoner to deserve the attention of the Prefect of the Prætorian Guard. Paul's imprisonment was not severe. He was only fastened by a light chain to the wrist of the soldier who guarded him.

17-31. Paul at Rome.—The whole scene of his dealing with the Jews is most condensed and presents several difficulties. The *chief of the Jews* are the leading men of the various synagogues in Rome. He was partly influenced by the desire for their support or at least neutrality during his trial. The first speech is on a line with the earlier defences of his position. The hope of Israel is the Messianic hope. The absence of bitterness is remarkable, and is a strong argument for an early date. Later the feeling between the Christians and Jews became inflamed. The reply that they had not yet received any official report about Paul from Jerusalem is not altogether surprising. It may have been delayed by the bad weather. Or the Jerusalem leaders may have decided not to follow up the case or to collect more evidence. But the professed ignorance of 'this sect' is most surprising. It may be that after the disturbances in the time of Claudius, which had led to an edict for their expulsion, the gulf between the synagogue and the Christian Church had widened, and the Church, now almost entirely composed of Gentiles, had ceased to join in Jewish worship. In Romans we read of Christian gatherings in the houses of leading Christians. Probably, however, the ignorance is exaggerated, so as not to commit them to an unfavourable verdict without further consultation. Paul at least had a claim to be regarded as a learned Jew and a leader of the Christians who would give an authoritative explanation of their faith. That Luke at this point makes no more mention of the Christians in Rome is perfectly intelligible. He is dealing with another matter, Paul's approach to the Jews.

Paul's arguments doubtless followed along the lines with which we are familiar. They caused a division among his hearers, but unbelief predominated. The whole scene forms a climax in the presentation of what is one of the main themes of Acts, that the Gospel had been offered to the ancient people of God and rejected, and had now passed to the Gentiles, and that the Christian Church is now the true Israel. The retreating backs as they disappeared disputing down the stairs were the fitting symbol of this truth. The following verses bring out the dawning response of the Gentiles.

As we have seen, Acts gives no hint of what happened at the close of the two whole years. Was Paul acquitted? Did his case go by default? Was he martyred under Nero? Or was his fate still undecided when Luke penned the verse? A case can be made out for all these conjectures.

Literature

Commentaries, on the Greek: Knowling (*E.G.T.*), Page. On the English, Rackham (*West. C.*), Furneaux, Bartlet (*Cent. B.*), and especially Blunt (*Clarendon Bible*). Browne in Indian Church Commentaries is most valuable from a different standpoint. The critical view can be studied in detail in Preuschen and Loisy. The writings of Ramsay are important, also the three books of Harnack (*E.T.*): *Luke the Physician, The Acts of the Apostles, The Date of the Acts and Synoptic Gospels*. Chase: *The Credibility of the Acts*. E. Meyer: *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (vol. iii). J. Weiss: *Das Urchristentum*. Much valuable material for students will be found in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vols. i and ii, edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; and in W. L. Knox's *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*. The article by Headlam in *H.D.B.* is specially valuable.

For expository preaching, Scott Holland's *God's City* is admirable; for less educated audiences, C. J. Vaughan's *The Church of the First Days* is still of great practical use. On the alleged Hellenistic influence on early Christian language and custom, see Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE CATHOLIC CREEDS

By Charles Harris

Until quite recently it has been the prevailing opinion among theologians that fixed creeds did not come into general use in the Church until after New-Testament times. An exception was not infrequently made in favour of the very ancient watchword, 'Jesus [Christ] is Lord' (Rom 10[9]; 1 Cor 12[3]; cf. Ac 2[36]), which Heiler rightly regards as pre-Pauline; but with this single exception it was very generally held that fixed forms of belief were not officially adopted by the Church until towards the close of the 1st century, or the beginning of the 2nd, to which date it is now customary to assign the earliest form of the Apostles' Creed, which is in reality the ancient baptismal creed of the Roman Church.

So far as the actual form and literary origin of the Catholic Creeds are concerned, this view may still be said to hold good in the main. For although in the latest books of the New Testament the Christian Faith is already regarded as a sacred and (in essentials) unalterable 'deposit,' and a decided tendency is shown to embody it in brief authoritative formulæ and dogmatic hymns (see 1 Tim 1[15, 19-20], 3[15-16], 6[20]; 2 Tim 1[13], 2[2, 11-13]; Tit 1[9]; 1 Jn 4[2-3, 15]; 2 Jn[7]; Jude[3, 20]), yet the anticipations of the actual language of later documents are not considerable, and for most purposes the old Roman baptismal symbol, of date about A.D. 100, may be taken as the starting-point of the historic credal development of Catholic Christendom.

The Credal Principle.—Recent research, however, suggests that what may be called the 'Credal Principle'—i.e., the principle that it is lawful for the Church, in the exercise of its power of binding and loosing, to require certain articles of faith to be accepted as a condition of membership—was received and acted upon at a very much earlier date, in fact from the day of Pentecost itself. The three thousand who heard gladly the preaching of St. Peter were baptized into faith in Jesus as both 'Lord' and 'Messiah,' which may or may not have been expressed in a definite formula (Ac 2[36]). Baptism was followed by systematic instruction (*didachē*) in the principles of Christianity (2[42]), some of the items of which may be gathered from the illuminating passage 1 Cor 15[1] ff., where St. Paul tells us that he delivered to his own converts the self-same tradition of faith which he received at his conversion from those who were in Christ before him.

It is evident from this passage that, already before St. Paul's conversion, the central part of the catechetical teaching of the Church of Jerusalem had assumed so fixed and stereotyped a form that it amounted to all intents and purposes to a Creed. This Dr. Eduard Meyer rightly calls 'the oldest Christian document which we possess.'

Heiler is not less express than Meyer in affirming that the dogmatic principle of later Catholicism was fully accepted by the Church before St. Paul's conversion. 'The separation in time,' he writes, 'between Jesus and Catholicism is very small. Apostolic Christianity begins already to become Catholic. The catholicizing of Christianity begins immediately after the death of Jesus. Pentecost is in principle the birth-hour of the Catholic World-Church.' 'Already the primitive Society of Jerusalem, which is depicted in Acts, possessed in germ the three fundamental elements of the Catholic institution of the Church—Dogma, Hierarchy, Sacrament. The Gospel of Jesus was entirely undogmatic. He presented no Christological confession as a necessary preliminary for entry into the Kingdom of God. . . . [But] with the Resurrection experiences [of His disciples] the great transformation completes itself. In place of the Gospel of Jesus comes the Gospel about Jesus . . . not repentance,

not active brotherly love, are decisive for the securing of salvation, but the belief that Jesus is the Messiah. There is salvation in none other; there is also no other name under heaven given among men wherein we must be saved (Ac 4 12). Though the complicated two-nature doctrine may still lie far beyond the view of the primitive Society, yet the Panchristism peculiar to the Christological dogma is already defended by it in full sharpness. The dogmatic exclusiveness of the later Church is clearly recognizable in the Christocentric abruptness. From the faith in Jesus' Messiahship which alone saves runs a direct path to the faith in the Church which alone saves. The Cyprianic *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* . . . lies in the same line of thought as this saying in Acts. . . . The joyful message of the Gospel becomes more and more the *didachē* [teaching]; the believing reception of the Gospel becomes the remaining steadfast in the doctrine of the Apostles (2 42). The Apostles appear as bearers of the teaching-authority. They stand at the head of the Society. The rôle which they fill as the leaders of the Society bears a thoroughly episcopal character' (*Der Katholizismus*, 43, 47 ff.).

There is exaggeration here. It was Jesus Himself who first drew from His Apostles the confession of His Messiahship (Mk 8 27 ff.); and absolute faith in Himself (which demands explanation) is postulated in His whole Ministry.

Moreover, the Apostles certainly insisted upon repentance as necessary to salvation (Ac 2 38); and the whole tone of the Christianity of the New Testament is ethical through and through. There is therefore no *substitution* of theological for ethical religion to be found as we pass from Gospels to Acts. Nevertheless the general character and spirit of pre-Pauline Christianity is vividly and upon the whole accurately represented by the writer.

The Earliest Formula.—St. Paul quotes verbally at least five articles of the primitive Formula of the Church of Jerusalem in 1 Cor 15, the date of which is about A.D. 55. The Formula itself, which St. Paul states that he 'received' as a tradition from others, is, of course, at least twenty years older.

The five articles, quite certainly quoted by St. Paul, are these:

(1) Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.

(2) He was buried.

(3) He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures.

(4) He appeared to Cephas (it will be noticed here that St. Paul preserves the Aramaic form of St. Peter's name).

(5) Then to the Twelve.

The reiterated conjunction *hoti* ('that'), equivalent to quotation marks, shows that St. Paul is not here paraphrasing, but quoting.

After 5 the quotation marks cease, from which Meyer and other critics conclude that the appearances to the five hundred brethren at once, to James, and to all the Apostles, which follow, formed part not of the original Formula, but of a somewhat later addition of the period of James's presidency. It seems more probable, however, that Meyer presses his grammatical argument too far; and that all the Resurrection appearances (except that to St. Paul) belong to the earliest Formula.

This Formula, together with its official exposition, constituted, or at least formed an essential part of, that 'pattern of teaching' whereunto both Pauline and non-Pauline converts 'were delivered' (Rom 6 17).

There is no evidence of a complete *Credo* in the primitive Church of Jerusalem. But considering the importance attached in the primitive period to the Messiah's Session at the Right Hand of God (Ac 2 33-34; cf. Mk 12 36; Ac 3 21, 7 56), and to His Parousia or Second Coming (Ac 10 42; cf. the primitive Aramaic prayer, Come, O our Lord' [*Marana tha*]; 1 Cor 16 22), it is certain that (6) He sitteth at the Right Hand of God; and (7) He shall come again to judge the quick and the dead, were part of the essential faith.

The above reconstruction of the primitive Formula of Jerusalem, so far as it depends upon St. Paul's direct testimony, is accepted by Eduard Meyer, Harnack, Norden, Holl, and others in Germany, and by not a few recent critics in England.

'The bodily resurrection of Jesus,' writes Meyer, 'and His numerous appearances to the disciples, belong to those traditions of Christianity which are the earliest, and were the first to be expressed in a fixed formula. Paul received this formula, from which the Creed has gradually developed, after his conversion, during his time of instruction at Damascus; and he inserts it in the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians. The first two appearances [mentioned by Paul] have been incorporated in the [actual] formula of faith, the fixed traditional wording of which comes out with especial clearness in the twice repeated phrase "according to the scriptures." Quite obviously this

formula goes back to the primitive Church of Jerusalem; and the missionaries who brought Christianity to Damascus, and from whom St. Paul received instruction, had already brought it thence. These firmly formulated doctrinal statements, which Paul took over as a leading feature of his Gospel, and proclaimed more widely than before, form the kernel of the "joyful tidings" of the Gospel, with which the missionaries of the primitive Society went forth into the world to convert it to faith in Jesus as Messiah. Paul had already learnt the contents of this formula, while he was persecuting the new sect with passionate zeal. . . . He perfected (his knowledge of Christian principles) during his fourteen days' visit to Jerusalem to see Cephas and James the authorities of greatest weight in the Mother-Church' (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, i, 11 ff; ii, 209 ff., slightly abridged).

To the above articles of the pre-Pauline Faith of Jerusalem we shall be right in adding one more, viz. 'Jesus [Christ] is Lord.' The plausible arguments adduced in support of the view that the title 'Lord'—at least as a title of 'cult'—originated in a heathen environment cannot stand against the evidence of Acts (1 [21, 24], 2 [36, 47], 5 [14], 7 [59-60], 8 [16], 9 [10-18], 10 [36], 11 [17]), reinforced by 1 Cor 16 [22] (*Marana tha*). These last words, which are wrongly divided and translated in the RV, really mean, 'O our Lord, come.' They are obviously a short ejaculatory Aramaic prayer which St. Paul had taught his Corinthian converts; and since only the Mother-Church of Christendom worshipped and prayed in Aramaic, we may conclude with considerable confidence (1) that even the pre-Pauline Church of Jerusalem spoke of Jesus as 'Lord' or 'our Lord'; and (2) that 'Lord' was used by it as a title not of mere respect but of 'cult.' Accordingly the author of Acts is justified in equating the Christian community with 'all who call upon thy name' (9 [14, 21]), and in representing even the first believers as offering prayer to the risen Lord (1 [24-25], 7 [59-60], RV).

The Atonement and the Resurrection.—Two articles of the pre-Pauline Creed, those relating to the Atonement and the Resurrection, are of especial importance in view of recent controversies.

(1) It has been persistently maintained by numerous critics of weight in Germany, and by a few in England, that the doctrine of the Atonement, or Remission of Sins through the Death of Christ, was a Pauline addition to the Gospel, unknown to the original Apostles.

This theory is refuted by the credal article, 'Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures,' which clearly indicates that the Twelve, even before St. Paul's conversion, had come to regard the death of the Messiah as an event of supernatural efficacy, securing to believers the inestimable benefit of the remission of sins.

It is quite possible that those critics are right who contend that the doctrine of the Atonement did not form part of the public preaching of the Twelve, or even of St. Paul. Neither in Acts 2 [38], 3 [19], 10 [43], nor in St. Paul's missionary sermon at Pisidian Antioch (13 [38-39]), is remission of sins or justification brought into direct relation with the *death* of Christ. The disclosure of this doctrine to the Ethiopian eunuch hardly forms an exception to what seems to have been the usual procedure, because his baptism was a consequence of his study of Is 53, and was in any case a private, not a public act.

Nevertheless, the evidence is strong—indeed, cogent—that the sacrificial nature of Christ's death was taught, *at least after baptism*, both at Jerusalem and in the non-Pauline churches generally, as an article of faith. Thus St. Paul, writing to the Romans, who had learnt their Christianity from other teachers, was able to assume as a matter of course that they were in agreement with him in accepting not only the doctrine of Christ's Lordship in a sense implying that He possessed divine attributes, and was a lawful object of worship (10 [9-15], 9 [5], 14 [9]), but also that of His atoning and propitiatory death (3 [5], 4 [5], 5 [6-11], 6 [6-14], 8 [3]). Additional evidence that the Atonement was central, at least in the teaching of the Twelve given within the Church, is afforded by 1 Peter, which obviously represents the Petrine point of view, even if those critics are right who attribute its literary form to Silvanus. Upon the whole, it seems probable that the author of Acts is not guilty of an anachronism in representing Philip the evangelist as preaching Jesus to the eunuch on the basis of Is 53 (see 8 [29] ff.); and that the Second Evangelist was relying upon good information when he placed in the mouth of the Lord Himself the statements that 'The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many'; and that the Cup of the Eucharist 'is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many' (10 [45], 14 [24]).

The last statement of Mark removes all difficulty from E. Meyer's strongly urged contention that St. Paul's tradition of the Eucharist (1 Cor 11 [23] ff.), which emphasizes the sacrificial character of Christ's death, was in substantial agreement with the eucharistic tradition of the Church of Jerusalem, and indeed probably reproduces it in its primitive and unabbreviated form.

(2) The article, 'and that he hath been raised again on the third day according to the scriptures,' is of not less importance doctrinally, as affording evidence of a strictly official kind as to the belief and teaching of the original Apostles concerning the Resurrection of Jesus.

In the past nearly all critics, including several as negative as Schmiedel, have argued that the words 'and that he was buried,' inserted, as they are, in so pointed a manner between the article which mentions the Messiah's atoning death, and that which speaks of His glorious Resurrection, can have only one meaning, viz. that for St. Paul at any rate the Resurrection of Jesus meant, not the return of His glorified spirit from Hades and its manifestation in some immaterial and purely 'spiritual' manner to His followers, but His objective and literal triumph over physical death, by the raising of His crucified and buried body from the tomb.

The recognition that the words 'and that he was buried' are not St. Paul's own, but are a quotation from the pre-Pauline Creed of Jerusalem, necessitates the further important inference that the original Apostles shared St. Paul's belief in this matter, and that accordingly the story of the empty tomb, which is attested by all four evangelists, and is alluded to in St. Peter's Pentecostal sermon (Ac 2 [24] ff.), as well as in St. Paul's missionary address at Antioch (13 [28, 37]), was not a legend of later origin, but formed part of the primitive tradition. The 'vision' theory is not, of course, thereby disproved, but it is shown not to be primitive. Even from the purely psychological point of view, it was necessary that the Apostles should be convinced of the bodily Resurrection of Jesus, if they were to be brought to the conviction that He had triumphed over death.

They would not have regarded Him as Death's Vanquisher if part of His Personality (and, according to Hebrew ideas, an essential part) had remained under its power.

Transition to the Catholic Creeds.—It is, however, the coeval and co-ordinate confession of faith, 'Jesus [Christ] is Lord,' which is of chief significance for the early development of Catholic dogma. At a later date the conception of the divine 'Sonship' of Jesus, which St. Paul was apparently the first to stress (see Ac 9 [20]); and the pregnant Trinitarian utterance ascribed to Jesus in Mt 28 [19], powerfully influenced development. But before St. Paul's conversion the 'Lordship' and 'Messiahship' of Jesus seem to have been the predominant ideas. St. Peter, even after he had come under the influence of St. Paul's theology, still preferred the primitive titles 'Lord' and 'Christ.' In his genuine epistle he does not in fact use the title Son of God, though the unique filial relation of Jesus to the Father is clearly implied in the phrase 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1 P 1 [3]).

The 'Lordship' of Jesus implied from the first divine and not merely human attributes. His session at the right hand of Power indicated His present omnipotence and (of course) omniscience. Omniscience was still more clearly involved in His function of Judge of quick and dead, which obviously can only be exercised by one to whom all hearts are open and all secrets known. Knowledge of the secrets of the heart was by the Jews restricted to God (Ac 15 [8]; cf. Rom 8 [27]; 1 S 16 [7]); hence the probable application to Jesus of the title 'knower of the heart' (Ac 1 [24]) must be regarded as an instance of the practice, which began very early, of assigning to the glorified Messiah titles and attributes which in the Old Testament are assigned only to Jehovah.

'Kurios' (Kyrios) or 'Lord' (in Aramaic *Mar*, *Maran*, *Marana*) was from the beginning a title of 'cult'; in other words it implied that the Being addressed by this name was a fit object of religious worship. The adherents of the heathen mystery religions were accustomed to invoke their cult heroes and divinities under the title of 'Kurios' or 'Lord,' but it would be quite contrary to the evidence to seek to derive the practice of the primitive Church from this source. Jerusalem was practically unaffected by Gentile culture; and even with regard to St. Paul, the abhorrence which he expresses of Gentile worship, which was to him simply diabolical (1 Cor 10 [20-21]); and his express statement that the supreme and universal 'Lordship' which he attributed to Jesus had nothing in common with the subordinate and limited 'lordship' which the heathen attributed

to the 'gods many and lords many' of their populous pantheon (8 [5]), amount practically to a demonstration that we must look elsewhere than to the mystery religions for the origin of his worship of Jesus. That he merely perpetuated the practice of the Mother-Church of Jerusalem is shown clearly enough by his Aramaic prayer, *Marana tha*, 'O our Lord, come' (16 [22]).

What seems to have occurred is this. As soon as the risen Lord became an object of religious veneration (which was very early, and probably immediately after His Resurrection), the Church of Jerusalem applied to Him the title 'Lord' (in Greek *Kurios*, in Hebrew *'Adonai*, in Aramaic *Marana*), which, from motives of reverence, was almost invariably substituted for the personal name of God in reading the Old Testament scriptures. Its application to Jesus indicated that He possessed divine attributes, was a lawful object of worship, and stood in the closest possible relation—a relation not yet, however precisely defined—to the God of Israel.

Those critics are probably right who consider that the worship of Jesus arose in the first instance spontaneously and instinctively and was not the result of a prior intellectual conviction of His deity, produced either by recollection of His own teaching about His Person, or by inference from His miraculous Resurrection and Ascension. Christ's teaching about His Divine Sonship, as distinct from His Messiahship, had usually been by implication and allusion, rather than by direct assertion. The Church, therefore, would probably have required a considerable period of reflection before it came to realize how high a Christology was in fact implied in it. As for the Resurrection and Ascension, these in themselves were not indications of divinity—not at least for Jews. Enoch and Elijah were believed by all Jews, and Moses and Isaiah by many, to have ascended into heaven, but they were not invoked in prayer or worshipped on that account. The Resurrection and Ascension manifestly set the seal of divine approval upon the teaching of Jesus, and therefore upon His Messiahship, which was explicit in His teaching; not, however, at least so obviously upon His deity, which was only implicitly taught. The best explanation of the rapid rise of the new cult of the risen Jesus is that in and through the Resurrection appearances the Apostles and their companions were conscious of *the direct impact of an overwhelming and obviously Divine Personality, which forced upon all who came within the range of its manifestation an attitude of religious worship*. This was certainly the case with St. Paul, whom the mere appearance of the risen Lord transformed in a moment of time from an enemy into a worshipper. Similarly in Mt 28 [16] ff. the majority of the Eleven are represented as falling down and worshipping as soon as the risen Lord appeared (cf. Thomas's exclamation, 'My Lord and my God,' Jn 20 [28]; and the prostration of the seer, Rev 1 [17]). This is practically Heiler's explanation, who is obviously correct in dating back the 'Kyrios-cult,' as he calls it, beyond Pentecost to the Resurrection.

The worship by the Apostles of a contemporary Rabbi, whose intimate associates they had been for the last two years, even though they acknowledged Him to be the Messiah, called aloud for explanation, and indeed for justification.

There are those who maintain, on the strength of St. Peter's words in Ac 2 [36], 'God hath *made* him both Lord and Christ,' that the Apostles justified their worship of Jesus by the theory of apotheosis. Just as the heathen believed that Romulus, Æsculapius, Hercules, Julius, and Augustus had been exalted to divine rank after death as a reward for heroic achievements, so (it is suggested) the Apostles believed that the unique services to mankind of their own hero and sage had been rewarded by deification.

This theory is quite unacceptable alike in the case of St. Paul (whose attitude towards Greek divinities is clearly expressed) and of the earlier Apostles. These, since they had never been brought into effective contact with Gentile culture, must have shared to the full the national horror of the worship of deified mortals, which finds expression in Wisdom (14 [13-24]), in Josephus (*Ant.*, xviii, 8), and in various passages of the New Testament (2 Th 2 [4]; Rev 13 and *passim*).

It is, of course, true that the early speeches of St. Peter in Acts contain no statement formally inconsistent with the doctrine of apotheosis, but that furnishes no proof that the Apostle accepted it. Considering that St. Peter's mentality and religious outlook were entirely Jewish, we shall be well advised if we accept the alternative explanation of the passage, viz. that in St. Peter's opinion Jesus during the humiliation of His earthly life was not strictly the Messiah, but rather *the person appointed to be the Messiah*—in other words, the Messiah *designate*. Not till His Resurrection was He 'made,'

i.e., exalted, to become 'Messiah' and 'Lord.' The fallacy of the reasoning which deduces the doctrine of apotheosis from Ac 2 [14-36] becomes immediately obvious if we apply it to 13 [16-41]. The specimen of St. Paul's missionary preaching there given also contains no statement irreconcilable with the doctrine of apotheosis; and yet we know from the Apostle's unquestioned writings that he accepted, and taught his converts (of course, after their baptism), a comprehensive theory of the Incarnation of the pre-existent Son of God, the Mediator of Creation as well as Redemption, which is entirely inconsistent with the theory in question. What the evidence suggests is that the teaching given to converts before baptism in the earliest period was extremely simple, and consisted more of facts than of theories. Jesus was the Messiah; Jesus had risen; Jesus was at the right hand of God, exalted to be Lord and Saviour; Jesus now offered remission of sins, the gift of His Spirit, and eternal salvation to all who accepted His baptism with faith and repentance—this was the sum and substance of the missionary preaching both of the Twelve and of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Fuller instruction in the mysteries of the Faith was postponed until after baptism (for the post-baptismal *didache*: see Ac 2 [42]).

It is hardly necessary to do more than just allude to the anachronistic and ultra-modern theory that Jesus was worshipped by the apostolic Church because, though mere man, He possessed 'the value of God.' God, according to Jewish ideas, was an absolutely 'unique' Being, wholly incomparable and incommensurable with creatures. To suppose that any creature, however exalted, could possess His 'value,' would have seemed to the first Christian believers, not only impious, but also ridiculous, as in fact it is.

We are driven therefore to the conclusion that when the primitive Christians came to reflect upon their worship of Jesus, they justified it by identifying Him in some way with Jehovah, the only lawful object of worship for Israelites. Unless the identity of Jesus with the God of Israel could in some way be established, it was evident that the Church had lapsed into polytheism, and was guilty of the sin of idolatry every time it assembled for worship. In the developed theology of the Church, the identity of Jesus with God was ultimately defined as identity of 'substance,' and no other idea is really consistent with St. John's and even St. Paul's implied theology. But in the purely Hebrew Church of Jerusalem, which was familiar only with Jewish forms of thought, and sought its Christology exclusively in the Old Testament, the identity of Jesus with God was probably first thought of as identity, not of 'substance,' but of 'name'—'name' being understood to include 'nature.' The Old Testament records numerous appearances in human form of a mysterious Being called 'the angel of the Lord,' or 'the angel of his presence' (Is 63 [9]), who because 'my *name* is in him' (Ex 23 [21]), was regarded as practically identical with Jehovah, and received the worship due to Him alone (see especially Ex 3 [2-6]). In a similar way, we may suppose, Jesus was at first thought of as One in whom the 'name' (and therefore the 'nature') of Jehovah so effectually and uniquely dwelt, that He was entitled both to the divine title of 'Lord' and to divine worship. However this may be, it is evident that a high Christology developed at a very early date at Jerusalem. An exalted view of Christ's Person as in reality divine finds expression in Stephen's dying prayer, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit' (Ac 7 [59], RV); and (as has often been remarked) the controversy between St. Paul and the Twelve turned, not upon Christology or cultus, but upon such comparatively minor matters as the obligation of keeping the Law, and the status of Gentile converts. Even after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Palestinian Church, and (if the Antiochene provenance of the 1st Gospel be allowed) the Syrian Church also, continued to conceive the identity of Jesus with God as identity of 'name' rather than of 'substance,' as the baptismal formula, ascribed in Mt 28 [19] to Jesus Himself, clearly shows. The employment of the 'name' category of thought indicates that this formula originated in Jewish-Christian circles; and its dissimilarity from the Pauline formula given in 2 Cor 13 [14] marks its independence of Paul. Later, when the Christian movement came definitely under the influence of Greek philosophical ideas, identity of 'name' was interpreted, and not misinterpreted, as meaning identity of 'substance.'

In the present state of criticism, it is hardly necessary to prove at length that the fundamental assumptions which underlie the affirmations of the Catholic Creeds, and from which in due course they resulted by a process of logical development, are already contained in the Johannine theology, and even in that of St. Paul. Even Loisy admits this, and

Heiler has recently declared: 'Paul created the great Christ and Saviour myth, which puts forward the presuppositions of the Christological dogma. . . . The Catholic Christ-Dogmatic could appeal to his religious language. The luxuriously developed Soteriological . . . system of the Catholic-Dogmatic is rooted in the Pauline myth of the Son of God' (*op. cit.*, 52-53). The Pauline doctrine, however, was anything but a 'myth.' It was rooted and grounded in facts and in experience.

What is not quite so obvious, but is nevertheless true, is that even the purely Judaic Christology of the pre-Pauline Church contained elements which (taken in connexion with the historic facts of the Gospel) were bound to develop, even apart from Johannine and Pauline influence, into the full Christological and Trinitarian system of the Church Catholic. Pre-Pauline belief concerning the Person of Christ probably passed (as we have attempted to show) through two stages. The first may be called the 'Messianic-Lord' Christology, the second the 'name' Christology. That the latter did actually develop before the 1st century closed into a rudimentary but quite clearly formulated affirmation of the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity is sufficiently indicated by the typically Hebraic baptismal formula of Mt 28 [19].

It will be convenient to conclude by showing that the entire subsequent dogmatic development was logically involved even in the most primitive stage of Jewish-Christian belief, which found expression in the joyful and triumphant formula, 'Jesus [Christ] is Lord.' For, if Jesus is 'Lord' in the sense that He shares the throne of God and rules the entire universe as His vicegerent, then clearly He is omnipotent; and if omnipotent, then of one nature and substance (i.e. one in fundamental being) with God. There cannot, in the very nature of things, be a plurality of omnipotent beings, for these would limit one another. It follows that, in spite of the clearly recognized personal distinction between Jesus and the Father, He is one Lord and one God with Him; and consequently the worship which He receives is *monotheistic* not polytheistic. His eternal pre-existence as God in the glory of heaven follows of necessity from His consubstantiality. The being of God is eternal—it has neither beginning nor end. Hence to suppose that Jesus is God now, without having been so always, involves a contradiction. To avoid inconsistency, He must be thought of as a Divine Person, who (to use St. Paul's language), having existed originally in the 'form' of God, humbled Himself to be born as man in time, and to suffer a propitiatory death upon the Cross. To affirm this, however, is to affirm the two most fundamental dogmas of the Catholic Creeds, the Incarnation and the Atonement. Belief in the Virgin Birth is not a necessary corollary of belief in Christ's pre-existence, but it is *congruous* with it, and would be sure to be readily accepted as soon as evidence for it was forthcoming, because the analogous 'physical' miracle of the Resurrection was already an article of faith.

With regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, it may be freely admitted that no trace of it is to be found in the earlier —or even in the later—narratives of Acts. Nevertheless, *all the materials needed for constructing it* are already present. The Spirit, who is regarded as the Spirit of Jesus as well as of God, has definite personal qualities and activities ascribed to Him (8 [29, 39], 10 [19], 11 [12], 13 [2], 15 [28], 16 [6], 19 [2], 20 [23, 28], 21 [11]), hardly less distinctly than in the theologies of St. Paul and St. John. Moreover, He is explicitly, as well as implicitly, represented as divine (5 [3] compared with 5 [4]). Such, then, being the devotional attitude of the first Christians towards the Holy Spirit, His position within the Divine Being with the Father and Son thus constituting it a Triad, was assured.

As to 'Binitarianism,' if it ever existed at all as a theory (which is more than doubtful), it would be in some of the less instructed writers of the 2nd century, such as Hermas. In St. Paul and St. John we have certainly an implicit, but unmistakable, Trinitarianism. (The subject has been recently treated with some fulness in A. E. J. Rawlinson's *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, and W. L. Knox's *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, as well as by F. Heiler and E. Meyer in the works quoted. On the contents of the earliest 'tradition' presupposed in the NT see above, *The Bible in the Church*, 11 ff. On the later development of the Creed see A. E. Burn, *Introd. to the Creeds*.)

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By W. J. Sparrow Simpson

I

To understand the nature of the Church we must study, first of all, the teaching and actions of our Lord which bear upon it.

By way of introduction, it must be observed that the religion in which our Lord lived was essentially corporate and institutional: a community, sharply distinguished from the world, where priesthood and sacrifice, doctrine, symbolical rites and sacred books were familiar and habitual. His attitude toward that religion is significant. He taught that its doctrines and principles were divinely given. He heightened those principles, but never abolished them. He insisted that He had come to fulfil, and not to destroy. He constantly appealed to what is written in the Law. He regarded the people of Israel as the original possessors of God's Kingdom (Mt 21 [43]). He taught obedience to the authority of its officers, while warning His hearers against copying their example. Thus he distinguished between official authority and personal character. His recognition of their hierarchical authority was not diminished by their inability to acknowledge Him and their hostility against Him. He conformed to the devotional life and practice of the community, and observed its sacred days, whether ordered in the Law or otherwise.

Our Lord then was certainly no enemy to institutionalism. He would reform the Jewish community from within, not work in rivalry against it from without. There is no reason from Christ's teaching to suppose that institutionalism as such was incompatible with His Gospel. His ideal would have been His acceptance by Israel: the development of Jewish institutionalism into the Kingdom of the Messiah.

Harnack observes that Christ 'while working for this Kingdom of God did not withdraw from the religious and political communion of His people, nor did He induce His disciples to leave that communion. On the contrary, he described the Kingdom of God as the fulfilment of the promise given to the nation, and Himself as the Messiah whom that nation expected' (*Hist. Dogm.*, i, 42). Heiler notes the strong conservative element in Christ's adherence to traditional religion. Jesus recognized the 'Cathedra Mosis' (Mt 23 [2])—an official Magisterium (Mt 23 [13]): cf. Heiler, *Der Katholizismus*, 25-34. Von Hügel says: 'It is in the Synoptists that we get the clear presentation of our Lord's attitude towards the Jewish Church of His time, as one, even at its keenest, analogous to that of Savonarola, and not to that of Luther, still less of Calvin, towards the Christian Church of their day' (*Mystical Element of Rel.*, ii, 118).

The outstanding subject of our Lord's teaching is the Kingdom of God. It is generally recognized that this was His usual theme (Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, 33, 34): not simply God's Fatherhood, but God's Kingdom. This was the Gospel (Mk 1 [14, 15]; Mt 24 [14]). Its meaning is frequently illustrated, but nowhere defined. It has been said that 'there was no need for Jesus to enter into a detailed explanation of what He meant by the phrase, for every child in the country could have told Him' (Bousset, *Jesus*, 71). When our Lord adopted the term He was repeating what St. John the Baptist had already proclaimed. It was a conception very familiar to our Lord's contemporaries. By the Kingdom was meant a divinely created institution located in Palestine, over which the Messiah would preside. It was not a human achievement, but a heavenly gift. A heavenly Person would be manifested in order to establish it. It was partly natural, partly spiritual, and altogether corporate. Its moral and religious qualities doubtless varied considerably with the insight and capacity of its individual exponents. But, broadly speaking, it was a religious community of the kind just described (cf. Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, II, ii, 170).

That something of this nature was in the minds of our Lord's disciples is clear from their competition for official places in the Kingdom (Mk 10 [37]), and from the enquiry (in Ac 1 [6]) whether He would at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel.

When our Lord accepted this phrase to express the substance of His Gospel, it is obvious that His hearers would understand it in the sense with which they were familiar. At the same time, it is certain that Christ habitually transfigured the great phrases which He employed (e.g. Fatherhood of God, Son of Man, Messiah), filling them with unprecedented depth of

meaning. We may reasonably rest assured that He did so here. Yet, unless the Kingdom meant substantially something corporate and institutional, His use of the term would have been to His hearers positively misleading.

But the evidence is not confined to inferences of this nature. What our Lord meant by the Kingdom is seen from His illustrations, which are profuse and extraordinarily varied. It is compared to a sower sowing seed, a field of wheat and tares, a mustard seed, leaven, a treasure hidden, a pearl of great price, a net cast into the sea and gathering of every kind, a king reckoning with his servants, a group of virgins (wise and foolish), an employer hiring labourers for his vineyard, a marriage feast for a king's son. These illustrations are by no means all. Plainly the object which they represent is something complex, which is being illustrated from different points of view. If we study these illustrations as a whole, without losing ourselves in the details, certain leading conceptions come to light.

First, a group of these parables suggests that the Kingdom is a spiritual reality of extraordinary value, which can be the property of each separate soul, and which a man should sacrifice everything to acquire. In other words, the Kingdom is regarded as *an individual possession*.

Secondly, another group of these parables suggests a social organism, a mixed society, a community within the world. The comparisons of mingled wheat and tares, valuable and worthless servants of the same king, wise and foolish virgins associated together, a vineyard entrusted to a group of men, but which in case of their unfaithfulness to the trust can be transferred to other people, denote a corporate, rather than a personal, idea. This corporate conception is strikingly prominent in the net cast into the sea. An organized structure, whose purpose is inclusive, gathering of every kind, creates an obvious distinction between those within and those without. This second group, therefore, represents the Kingdom as *a corporate institution*.

The much debated sentence in Lk 17 [21] —the Kingdom of God is 'within you' (RV text), or 'in the midst of you' (RVm) —would, if the former rendering be adopted, belong to the individual group; if the latter, to the institutional. In neither case can it alter the conclusion derived from these two groups. While it is true to say that the Kingdom of God should be within one as an individual possession, it is equally true to say that one should be within the Kingdom of God as a member in a corporate institution. And these two aspects are supplementary, not mutually exclusive. Recent criticism tends to support the view that the true rendering is 'the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you.' Bousset indeed admits that the saying has been so understood, but dismisses it as paradoxical. But the corporate meaning seems required by the context. Our Lord was addressing Pharisees. Elsewhere He expressly excluded them from the Kingdom (Mt 5 [20]). How could He have declared after this that the Kingdom was within the Pharisees? The Kingdom of God is in your midst was literally true. For where Christ and His disciples were, there was the Kingdom already present (cf. Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, 54, 55).

Thirdly, the Kingdom *exists in successive states*. Like the mustard seed, it develops from insignificant beginnings to extensive expansive maturity. Like leaven, it gradually spreads through the individual or society that receives it. It exists first in an imperfect state, including worthy and worthless; and, although this inclusion is not permanent, it is agelong. Thus the Kingdom is conceived as existing first in this world, and afterwards in the other. It is clearly not merely future, but also already present (cf. Mt 12 [28]: 'then is the kingdom of God come upon you'). Bousset's assertion that this was 'spoken at a moment of great excitement' illustrates the straits to which criticism is reduced in eliminating the idea of present existence from Christ's conception of the Kingdom of God.

The Kingdom then is future, but it it near. There were among our Lord's hearers some who would live to see it powerfully manifested (Mk 9 [1]). It is not only future, but present here and now. So St. John the Baptist is represented as closing the old régime; standing, as Heiler says, between the prophetic past and the Messianic present (cf. Mt 11 [9] ff.). 'From the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.' Lagrange notes that the verb is used in a present sense. In any case, the Kingdom is already in existence. 'The Kingdom of God has begun with the advent of the Messiah, and the first members of the Kingdom are the first believers in His Person and words' (Montefiore, *Syn. Gosp.*, ii, 592).

Fourthly, the Kingdom is that *over which the Messiah presides*. 'To convince a Jew that Jesus was indeed the Christ

was to convince him that in a sense the Kingdom of God was already come and present on earth' (Robertson, *Regnum Dei*, 47). 'The Kingdom, in our Lord's view of it, was unquestionably the Messianic Kingdom, foreshadowed from of old under various guises. *But then it was Messianic in the same sense in which He was the Messiah*' (Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, 284).

II

To our Lord's teaching about the Kingdom must be added *what He taught about the Church* (Mt 16 [18]).

It is necessary at this point to consider some recent critical difficulties and objections.

(1) Our Lord's mention of the Church has been questioned by certain critics, who regard it as read back by the later community into the earlier period.

Guignebert contends that in this term 'my church' we are carried far from the thoughts of Jesus. It has been said that the word is a Pauline creation, and that while St. Paul speaks of the Church of God, he does not speak of the Church of Christ. Still less then could Christ Himself be expected to say '*my* church' (*La Primauté de Pierre*, 63).

Batiffol's reply (*L'Église Naissante*, 104) is that the term 'church' was certainly not a Pauline creation, since it occurs in the Septuagint as an equivalent for 'synagogue' (see also Ac 7 [38]). Also the words 'my church' are not inconceivable on the lips of Christ: for Christ also calls the Kingdom His (Mt 13 [41]). W. C. Allen (*Comm. St. Matthew*) writes: 'There is no difficulty at all in supposing that Christ used an Aramaic phrase or word which would signify the community of His disciples, knit together by their belief in His divine Sonship, and pledged to the work of propagating His teaching.'

(2) The question has been asked, How can we reconcile an intention on Christ's part to found a Church with His declarations concerning the speedy ending of the world? That He had any such intention is said to depend on two passages only in one Gospel, to which nothing corresponds in the other reports. Some critics therefore think that the two passages in St. Matthew are the product of later Christian reflection, reading back into the days of the Son of Man what was only the theory of a later time.

Whatever construction be placed on the apocalyptic passages in St. Matthew, these passages are partially balanced by the definite assertion in 24 [6] 'the end is not yet,' and again by the words in [14], 'The gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world . . . and then shall the end come.' Such universal proclamation would take time.

And further, some of the parables of the Kingdom represent its growth as a gradual process rather than an instantaneous event (cf. Mk 4 [26] ff., especially [28]). Many commentators take this to mean that the Kingdom is of slow development. The parable of the Tares is certainly a parable of judgement, but it does not suggest that this judgement is immediate. Cf. Mt 13 [30]: 'Let both grow together until the harvest.' So again the parable of the Mustard Seed. 'It has quite a good meaning if it refers to the growth of a society on earth, or to the spread of Judaism, or of a transformed Judaism, or to a kingdom of any sort, but it has no meaning at all from the apocalyptic point of view' (A. C. Headlam, *Jesus Christ in History and Faith*, 215; see further Kennedy, *op. cit.*).

The ultimate decision on this matter will largely depend on our conception of the Person of Christ.

The doubt which certain critics have raised, whether our Lord could have spoken in these terms about the Church prior to its existence, rests rather on subjective impressions than on objective proofs. But this question must be considered later when we have before us the evidence not only of what Christ said, but also of what He did.

As represented by the evangelist, Christ declares that His purpose is to build His Church, i.e. to create a spiritual institution which should be peculiarly His. To this Church He promises perpetuity. No deadly forces should prevail against it. Christ spoke of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, meaning authority in matters of religion. That authority was to be exercised by a man. It would be exercised by him as an official in a community of men. The sphere of its exercise would not be in some future world, but here upon earth. And what was done on earth would be endorsed in heaven.

The important question may here be considered: What is the relation between the Kingdom and the Church?

Our Lord (Mt 16 [18]) combines in the same sentence the words 'I will build my church' with the words about giving to an Apostle 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven.' The keys of the Kingdom are to be exercised in the Church. What else can that imply but that the Church and

the Kingdom are at least most intimately associated in the mind of our Lord? Does it mean that He regarded the terms as interchangeable?

It certainly is a striking fact that the expression 'the kingdom of heaven,' which has been truly called 'the central term of the Synoptic Tradition' (Kennedy, *op. cit.*, 287), occurs, comparatively speaking, very seldom in the Pauline Epistles. Whereas our Lord habitually mentions the Kingdom and only twice the Church, St. Paul mentions the Kingdom some fourteen times and the Church about sixty-two. When St. Paul speaks of the Kingdom of God he sometimes thinks of it as future, e.g. 1 Cor 15 [50], 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.' But he also speaks of it as present, e.g. 1 Cor 15 [24]: 'When he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,' where the Kingdom is conceived as presented by Christ to the Father at the end of the world. Again, when St. Paul says (Col 1 [13]) that God 'hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love,' it is difficult to distinguish this from admission into the Church. Lightfoot says: 'The reign of Christ has already begun. His Kingdom is a present Kingdom. Whatever therefore is *essential* to the Kingdom of Christ must be capable of realization now. There may be some exceptional manifestation in the world to come, but this cannot alter its character.' If then the Apostle regarded the Kingdom of God as realized on earth here and now, it is intelligible that he should find it embodied in the Church, and should speak of the Church rather than of the Kingdom.

Robertson (*op. cit.*, 55-56) says that St. Paul nowhere expressly states the relation between the Kingdom of God and the visible society of Christians, the Church of God. But 'obviously the relation is close.' 'That Kingdom finds its visible expression in a society of men united by the bond of personal faith, and living a heavenly life. And this is the Church in its essential idea.' But if they are closely related they are never expressly identified. Robertson thinks that 'it would be going beyond St. Paul's language, and his apparent thought, to speak of the Church even in her glory in the world to come as fully coextensive and convertible with the Kingdom of God' (57). But see Eph 1 [22, 23]. It must be remembered that the Kingdom is represented by our Lord as existing in an imperfect condition on earth. There are those within it here who will not be within it hereafter.

As Loisy says, the Gospel of Jesus had already the rudiments of a social organization, and the Kingdom took the form of a Society. Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom, and what resulted was the Church (*L'Évangile et l'Église*, 153).

It is through baptism that the believer becomes a participator in the Kingdom of God, and this baptism is conferred by the Church. The believer is, therefore, indebted to the Church for his membership in the Kingdom. Moreover, it is through baptism that the believer becomes incorporated into the Church. And the believer's relation to the Kingdom is strengthened and made more intimate through the Word and Sacrament, both of which are the property of the Church. The parallel between the Church and the Kingdom is remarkably close. The Kingdom is on earth: the Church is on earth. The Kingdom includes evil and good: so does the Church. The Kingdom is both present and future: so is the Church. The Kingdom exists in successive states: so does the Church.

There is no doubt, according to Johannes Weiss, that the evangelists applied the parables to the visible Kingdom of God, that is to the Church (*vom Reiche Gottes*, 48). He refers particularly to Mt 13 [37-43].

To our Lord's teaching about the Kingdom and the Church must be added the principal occupation of His ministry. This is generally recognized to have been *the selection and training of the Twelve.* This is a fact upon which a very large number of modern writers are agreed. Among English: Seeley, Bruce, Latham, Scott Holland, Bishop Gore. Among French: Loisy, *op. cit.*, 134. Among German: Bousset, *Jesus*, 63, 64; Wernle, *Beginnings*, i, 117; J. Weiss, *Comm. on Mark*, iii, 13.

The principal passage showing our Lord's method is Mk 3 [13-19], where we note (1) The selection out of many followers. (2) The number selected and its significance (cf. Dt 1 [23]: 'I took twelve men of you: one man for every tribe'). The new selection represented twelve tribes and constituted them chiefs of a spiritual Israel. (3) The two purposes of their selection ([14]): companionship, with the object of instruction; commission, with the object of instructing others—disciples and Apostles (see in Luke). On this selection follows the process of their training: (1) Our Lord devoted Himself chiefly to instructing the Twelve. Parables are for the crowd: explanations for the Twelve. (2) He made them His constant companions. There was a gradual process of self-revelation. (3) He withdrew with them into

retreat (Mk 6 31). This action was unintelligible to our Lord's relatives (Jn 7 34). Their criticism from their standpoint was unanswerable. But His purpose being intensive and exclusive training of the Twelve, the criticism of relatives was entirely beside the mark. Yet it strongly illustrates by contrast our Lord's motives. For the uses made by Christ of this retreat see Mt 16 4. The process of training interrupted by the Passion and Death was resumed during the great Forty Days (cf. Mt 28).

Conclusion.—We may now set side by side what Jesus taught concerning the Kingdom and the Church with what He did in His ministry in selecting and training the Twelve. His actions throw a wonderful illuminating light upon His teaching. He taught that the Kingdom of the Messiah had come. He declared that He would build His Church. His exertions were directed to the formation and instruction of a community. In His relations with the Twelve He was translating His ideals into concrete facts. The consequence of this training of the Twelve was twofold: Christ united them to Himself; Christ also united them to each other, in a unity which was never afterwards broken. In other words, our Lord had actually brought into existence a brotherhood or community. Whether this was or was not our Lord's intention, it was at any rate the natural result of His actions.

III

Out of the teaching and actions of our Lord arose the original Jerusalem community.

Some recent critics of the Whitsuntide incidents confine attention to enquiries whether the gift of tongues constitutes a case of spiritual hysterics or a sudden access of miraculous linguistic power. Whatever be the value of such enquiries, to confine attention to them is to miss the essential significance of the scene. What the incidents are intended to represent is the descent of the Spirit of the living God upon the Christian community, thereby endowing it with supernatural powers, constituting it a divine institution. In other words, Whitsuntide signifies, according to the Acts, the birth-hour of the Catholic Church (Heiler). The gift of tongues represents by anticipation the Catholicism of the coming centuries. The divine foundation makes itself intelligible to all nations. It is a suggestion of universality.

'The primitive Jerusalem community contained in germ three elements fundamental to Catholic institutionalism: Dogma, Hierarchy, and Sacrament' (*Der Katholizismus*, 47). That estimate is true.

The element of dogma is unmistakable. The community acknowledge Jesus as Head and Lord. If the creed of the community was rudimentary, it involved recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, and unreserved surrender to His Person. The hierarchical element finds its beginnings in the appointment of the Twelve, which involved the distinction between Apostles and disciples: that is between official leaders and adherents in general. This appointment was our Lord's own deed, and involved an authority derived not from the generality of believers, but from the Lord in person. Of course, it was in a rudimentary state, for everything must have a beginning. But the principle grew and developed. Heiler recognizes that the distribution of Christians in Ac 15 into Apostles, elders, brethren, anticipates the hierarchical organization of the later Church and the distinction between laity and clergy. This distinction is not in principle a later ecclesiastical innovation. It is clearly seen in the apostolic actions (cf. Ac 1 17). As early as St. Clement of Rome (xl) we read 'the layman is bound by the layman's ordinances.' And further, the beginnings of Catholic sacramentalism are already discernible in the primitive community of Jerusalem.

These three characteristics are summarized in Ac 2 42, where the doctrine of the Apostles and the fellowship and sacramental worship are all enumerated as elements in the Jerusalem community. The sacramental principle is more clearly marked in 1 Cor 11 23 ff., which St. Paul says he had 'received,' i.e. at Jerusalem. It should further be noted that the Church of Jerusalem is regarded by St. Paul as the real centre of Christendom. That Church sent Barnabas to control the community at Antioch (Ac 11 22), etc.

The New Testament principles of appointment to the ministry are quite clear. The original leaders of the Christian community did not receive their authority from the community, but from Christ. ('Have I not chosen you Twelve?', 'I have chosen you and ordained you.') St. Paul's conviction on this matter is unmistakable. That authority, retained at first in their own hands by its original recipients, was presently imparted by a principle of transmission from its possessors. The singular theory that the apostolic authority was partly transferred to a book, and partly replaced by a

ministry authorized by the congregation, has no support in Scripture. What actually happened is illustrated in the appointment of the Seven (Ac 6[3]: 'Look *ye* out therefore, brethren, from among you seven men . . . whom *we* may appoint'). Selection by the congregation: ordination by the Apostles. The appointment of presbyters is illustrated in Ac 14[23].

This transmission of authority was certainly a partial delegation. For the Apostles retained the chief ministerial functions in their own hands. It was in certain cases perhaps a temporary delegation (Tit 1[5]). But whether partial or temporary, in either case the principle of ministerial power conferred by its possessors is plainly illustrated. St. Clement of Rome does nothing more than reiterate the Scriptural conception when he says that 'our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife over the name of the bishop's office. For this cause therefore . . . they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards they provided a continuance (or additional injunction), that if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministrations' (xliv). They provided for a succession of tried persons who should fulfil the office of the ministry (Lightfoot, 135). According to Clement the method adopted by the Apostles was that which we find implied in the Pastorals, i.e. that there should exist in the Church men of distinction with authority to appoint new local officers when the first generation died.

'Appointment to the service of the community was made by the *laying on of hands*,' and this action 'was regarded as conferring the *charisma* necessary to the office' (cf. 1 Tim 4[14], etc.); and as Harnack says, 'the laying on of hands was thus certainly sacramental' (*Constitution*, 26). The best modern account is that by Professor Turner, who says: 'The original ministry of the Church was clearly twofold. There was the *local* ministry of bishops and deacons. There was also the *general* ministry of Apostles, prophets, and teachers. Harnack holds that the superiors of the individual communities owed the high position which they finally attained mainly to the circumstance that the most important functions of the ministers of the Church at large (the Apostles, prophets, and teachers) in course of time, as these died out or lost their significance, passed over to them' (cf. Turner, *Studies in Early Church History*, 9-28).

Turner points out with regard to the earliest Christian ministry: (1) That the principle of mission runs through the whole conception of office in the New Testament (Jn 17[18]; Rom 10[15]; Heb 5[4-5]). Through the Apostles alone came the gift of the Holy Spirit, conveyed by the laying on of hands: they, or those commissioned by them, appointed or ratified the appointment of even the local officials of each infant community.

(2) That these holders of office constituted a hierarchy from the earliest times, i.e. that there existed gradations of order and ministry, and a contrast between the ministries thus graded and the rest. On 1 Cor 12[28] Turner observes: 'If this verse had run, "God hath placed some in the church, first bishops, secondly priests, thirdly deacons, next readers," and so on, its hierarchical character would scarcely have been denied; it does not disappear because the offices mentioned are not the same as those of a later period of the Church.'

(3) That the primitive ministry existed in two types, the local and the general, and that in process of time the local took the place of the general ministry. The only ministry at the very earliest times was that of Apostles, prophets, and teachers. The ministry which exclusively came to prevail was that of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The former was missionary, the latter stationary. The moment the Church began to realize its world-wide mission the missionary ministry seemed the one thing needful. But as city after city began to possess a Christian community, the local stationary ministry came, in the 2nd century, to be the only type.

(4) When did the transition from the ministry of Apostles to the ministry of bishops begin? The Apostles and prophets are in the earliest age the two supreme orders of the Christian ministry (Eph 2[20]). But this ministry gradually disappears. What now exists is a ministry of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Turner maintains that 'it would not be natural to find that there should be one period when the Church possessed a hierarchy of one set of offices, and a second period when others were in their places, and an interval in between during which the Church was not officered at all. And, in fact, even before the first moment at which the original orders began to recede into the background, long ere the apostolic age had closed, the importance of the local ministry of bishops or presbyters begins to assert itself; and it was only as these

gained prominence year by year, and could assume the unfettered leadership of the Christian societies, that the elder offices could silently and unnoticed die away.' Long before the date of Ephesians (4 [11]) 'the Church of Jerusalem had been governed by St. James and the presbyters under the eyes of the Apostles themselves.'

(5) The development by which the earlier system of ministry sank into insignificance and the latter rose into prominence was one which, according to Turner, 'was not only practically complete by the year A.D. 150, but can be traced in germ nearly a hundred years before, was in full activity by the end of the 1st century, and was therefore, we may presume, sanctioned at least in principle by the Apostles themselves.' Turner goes on to call attention to what is so profoundly impressive in the transition from Apostolate to Episcopate, that it took place without controversy and without disturbance, speedily and universally. 'Even under apostolic authority all this would be scarcely likely to have taken place with such rapidity, and still more with such absence of friction, had the process been an absolute reversal of one set of conditions in favour of another and wholly distinct organization, without the intervention of any intermediate stages which should more or less veil the significance of the revolution which was at work. But an absolute reversal is just what it was not. On the contrary, the evidence shows us that on both sides influences were in play contributing to bridge over the gulf of difference, and to render the transition easy from the one form to the other. The general ministry tends to localize itself; the local ministry tends to assume some of the characteristics of the general. In a word, the tendency was rather to merge than to replace.' For example, St. Philip is definitely associated with Hierapolis, and St. John with Ephesus. 'And just as on the one hand the earlier system thus abandoned its most patent differentia, so on the other such of its functions and characteristics as were not part either of its wandering commission or of the extraordinary and temporary endowment of the Church's infancy, were not conceived of as lost simply because the orders to which they belonged seemed to have disappeared. Rather, the apostolic and the prophetic character was still asserted to be part and parcel for all time of the divine equipment of Christianity.' Thus, in the end, the higher ministry merged itself in the lower, and thereby transformed the lower, so that the authority which was inherent in the higher became also characteristic of the lower.

(6) The conclusion of Turner's masterly analysis is that the Bishop of the Ignatian Letters, for example—that is, the Bishop in the sense of the historic Church—is connected with two lines of ancestry. He is, in the name that he possesses, the legitimate descendant of the primitive presbyter or bishop of the local congregation. He is at the same time the legitimate descendant of the Apostles, because he is endowed with special apostolic functions which differentiate him as the embodiment of the original authority of an Apostle.

In great and vital questions the decision did not rest with the local Church, but with the central and original society. It is not Antioch that decided but Jerusalem. And the decision there is unthinkable without the Apostles, and the Apostles as directing and presiding. It is clear that peculiar prerogatives were recognized as belonging to the Twelve. There is no sign anywhere that authority equivalent to this was recognized as existing in any local Church.

The application of priesthood in the Church is definitely connected in the New Testament with priesthood in Israel. The passage Ex 19 [6], 'ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests,' is important, (1) because it represents the corporate priesthood of Israel as a community, and (2) because the Aaronic priesthood, so far from being incompatible with the corporate priesthood of the whole community, was in fact the medium for its accomplishment, and the necessary type of ministry for a priestly community. The passage is further extremely important because (3) it was applied by New Testament writers to the Christian community (1 P 2 [5-9]; Rev 1 [6]: cf. Rom 12 [1]).

Thus the corporate priestliness of the Church as a whole makes the priesthood of the official ministry appropriate: it is suited to the requirements of a priestly community (cf. Ritschl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 115). Justice is not always done to the indisputable fact that it is the Apostles who ascribe to the Church a corporate priesthood. The collective priesthood cannot be eliminated from Apostolic theology. And the priesthood of the Church as a body, so far from excluding the priesthood of its ministers, requires it. The priesthood of the whole body is a priesthood in which every layman shares, but he is not thereby authorized to assume the functions of the official

ministry (cf. Tert., *Exhort.*, 7, who only speaks of what he thinks permissible for a layman 'where there is no assembly of the ecclesiastical order'). Harnack's treatment of this subject of priesthood is very remarkable (*Constitution and Law*, 118). He insists that 'The root of the specific ecclesiastical priesthood is rather the specific sacrifice, as it developed in the conception of the Lord's Supper (the ideas about sacraments, which were just beginning to take a definite form, must also be regarded as secondary influences).'

This development begins very early (e.g. 'Offer the Gifts,' *Ep. Clem.*, 44). It is significant to compare the criticisms on priesthood in Fairbairn (*Christ in Modern Theology*, 49) with the advance towards a Catholic position in the criticisms of Harnack.

If the constitution of the Church developed in all local manifestations of it into one and the same identical form of episcopal ministry, there must have been something in the original nature of the Church to account for this identical development. Just as all local Churches came to have the same Creed, and the same Scripture, so they came to have the same ministry, and this not by a process of artificial conformity but by the genius of the religion. It is really no adequate explanation of this identical development to say that every meeting requires a chairman. For there is no necessity that an individual who presides or preaches when occasion requires should universally develop by common consent in all local Churches into the monarchial bishop, unless an identical principle underlies the development. Tertullian's argument that identity of product implies identity of seed is applicable not only to dogma, but also to ministry. There were lengthy disputes about the Canon of Scripture, but there were practically none about the constitution of the ministry.

The unanimity of Christendom on the principle of the transmission of ministerial authority, and upon the form which the hierarchy should assume, is one of the most deeply impressive facts in the history of the Church.

IV

St. Paul's Conception of the Church

The ideas concerning the Church suggested by St. Paul's celebrated comparison of it to a human body are: that the members are many, but the body is one; that there is and must be a *subordination of the part to the whole*, i.e. every member is to fulfil its appropriated function, but not to exceed it; that the various members, being *differentiated in function*, cannot dispense with each other; that rivalry or separation is disastrous; that the body can effect as a whole what its parts cannot accomplish by themselves; that each member acquires his value by his place in the social body; that the body is *an organism*; and that the whole of this organized human constitution is a *divine creation*.

This illustration St. Paul thus applies to the Church. 'For as the body (i.e. the human body) is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ' (1 Cor 12 [12]). By those last words, 'so also is Christ,' it is beyond dispute that St. Paul meant so also is the Body of Christ, meaning thereby the Church (cf. Gal 3 [16]). That this is what he means is certain, because he goes on immediately to say, 'For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body' ([13]). And presently he adds expressly: 'Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof' ([27]). Then he goes on further definitely to mention the Church, and to give a summary of various ministrations within it. 'And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers,' etc. ([28]), expressly pointing out diversity of functions within the same community. And, just as in the physical body the members have their place and function divinely assigned them, so also it is in the social body of Christ.

The comparison of the Church to the human body and its members is for St. Paul by no means a mere illustration, but the expression of a deep mystical truth. The Body is more than the sum total of its members: it constitutes a unity. And that unity is an organism, the Body of Christ. Of this Body Christ is the Head, the soul and unifying force of this organism. And this Body is the Church (Col 1 [24]; Eph 1 [22]).

St. Paul's doctrine of the Eucharist gives a further illustration of the Church's unity; cf. 1 Cor 10 [17]: 'Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we are all partakers of the one bread' (RV text). This sentence is so condensed that it is not easy to understand. RVm rendering is: 'Seeing that there is one bread, we, who are many, are one body, for we are all partakers of the one bread.' The meaning is that the eucharistic gift is one and the same. Each individual communicant receives the same one gift. But this gift has already been called the

Body and Blood of Christ. Reception, therefore, of this selfsame gift, which unites each believer with Christ, has at the same time and by consequence another effect: it unites all believers with each other. It consolidates them more firmly into one social community.

St. Paul's conception of the Church is best studied in three divisions:

First, *the Church as universal*, or the Church regarded in itself without reference to any particular local manifestation—the Church which is His Body. 'The thought of the Church as the mystical Body of Christ, whose head is the exalted Christ, and whose life-principle is the indwelling Spirit—this magnificent thought is a conception of St. Paul' (Heiler, *Der Katholizismus*, 52). When St. Paul speaks of the Church as 'the Body of Christ,' it is obviously not the local Church, but the world-wide Church, or the Church in itself which he contemplates. And the Church so conceived '*is no invisible community*' to St. Paul; it is conceived 'as constituting sacramentally a special sphere in this world' (Weinel, *St. Paul*, 209). *It is the Church in which God has set the Apostles*, and therefore not the local but the general community. When St. Paul says '*ye* are the Body of Christ,' he cannot mean 'ye Corinthians' as excluding 'ye Philippians,' etc. It must be the collective Church which the Apostle has in mind.

Secondly, *the relation of the local Church to the Church in general*. Harnack says that 'every community was at once a unit, complete in itself; but it was also a reproduction of the collective Church of God, and it had to recognize and manifest itself as such' (*Expansion*, ii, 47). While this statement is very largely true, it is nevertheless liable to mislead, for St. Paul never regards the local congregation as 'complete in itself.' He never regards it as independent of apostolic authority. St. Paul says: 'If any man seemeth to be contentious,' that is asserts the right of the local Church to act independently, 'we have no such custom, neither the churches of God' (1 Cor 11 [16]). Whom does St. Paul mean by 'we'? The simplest explanation is that by 'we' he means we, the Apostles. For the Church in St. Paul's conception is an institution in which God has assigned the chief place to the Apostles. And the Apostolate is not a local but a world-wide ministry. No local Church was ever complete in itself, but subject to ministerial authority beyond itself. And that authority was very considerable. Harnack indeed says that 'the apostolic authority, and what is more the general and special authority of the Apostle as the founder of a Church, invade and delimit the authority of the individual community' (*Expansion*, ii, 47). St. Paul's authority was not simply that of a missionary founder of a Christian congregation. It was above all due to his apostolic commission. The local Church is to be directed by the Spirit. But that direction will not be independent of its Apostle. If the mind of the local Church differs from the mind of the Apostles, there is no doubt which of the two is regarded in the New Testament as the supreme authority. The persistent and invariable overruling and correcting of Corinthian peculiarities by St. Paul leaves no room for any notion that it was ever permissible for the local Church to ignore the authority of its Apostle. St. Paul would have been astonished to be informed that his authoritative directions to the Church at Corinth constituted an invasion of the authority of the local congregation. He had an authority which the Lord had given him. There was in St. Paul's conception no room for local independence without 'the unifying control of the Apostles.' The local Church was not only subject to the authority of its Apostle, but bound to conform to the principles and practice of the Church in general.

St. Paul's conception of the relation between the local Church and the Church in general is clearly seen when he asked the Corinthian community: 'What! was it from you that the word of God went forth? or came it unto you only?' (1 Cor 14 [36]). Did the Gospel originate in the Church at Corinth? Are you the Mother-Church of Christendom? Are the Churches which flourished before you existed expected to come and learn what Christianity is from you? Or are you coextensive with the Christian Church? The idea is that each local congregation is an extension of and offshoot from the original community. The local Church cannot be independent of the whole Church which it represents and reproduces. There must be, when occasion requires, a reversion to type.

If any individual asserts the right of the local Church to act independently of the larger Church, 'we have no such custom, neither the churches of God' (1 Cor 11 [16]). 'The churches of God' are here regarded as constituting an inner spiritual unity, which should find expression in outward visible unity. St. Paul does not regard the Church as a federation of local communities. For St. Paul the Christian

community of each particular place is but the local expression of the selfsame world-wide Body of Christ. Naturally, therefore, the local expression should display identity of principle. 'The idea of free independent and self-governing communities formally exercising discipline of any kind is a modern guess' (Dean J. A. Robinson in Swete's *Early History*, 89). *Congregational independence*, without reference to the larger corporate life of the one Body of Christ, is not Pauline Christianity (see further Turner in *Camb. Med. Hist.*, i, 143).

Thirdly, there is *the relation of the individual to the Church*. According to St. Paul, the individual convert is not brought into relation with Christ so as to leave relation to the Church secondary or optional, but rather brought into relation with Christ through incorporation into the Church: 'For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body' (1 Cor 12 [13]). And the Church into which the individual is incorporated is not the local Church, but the larger Church; not, for example, the Church in Corinth, but the Church which is the Body of Christ, and which has a local representation in Corinth. Conversion is never regarded by St. Paul as equivalent to or a substitute for incorporation into the social organism of Christ's Body.

St. Paul's insistence on the unity of the Church, the Body, and the members involves the conception that union with Christ is secured to the individual convert through union with the organism which is the Body of Christ. Aloofness of Christians from the corporate institution is for apostolic Christianity unthinkable. The distinction between those that are within and those that are without the constitution of the Church is fundamental.

Every individual Christian is a member of the Body of Christ, each with his separate function, gifted by the same one Spirit. As Heiler says, the idea of the one Holy Catholic Church is by the Apostle wonderfully and luminously suggested.

It is exceedingly impressive to find that St. Paul is concerned with the relation of our Lord both to the *individual* and to the *social* aspect of religion. The Apostle laid great stress on Christ's care for the individual unit, the believer's soul. In Gal 2 [20] he wrote: 'The Son of God loved *me* and gave himself for *me*.' Christ died to redeem the individual. The Redeemer's love is conceived as concentrated upon one particular member of humanity; we may say almost as if there were no other to be considered. But then elsewhere St. Paul lays equal stress on the social side of religion. For he taught the Ephesians (5 [25]), 'Christ loved *the church*, and gave himself for *it*.' The Christian Church existed as an ideal in our Lord's mind before it came to have any concrete existence of its own. That ideal our Lord loved and resolved to create. He died in order to make its existence possible. Thus the Church is the object of Christ's love. It is the corporate institution which is redeemed.

There is no contradiction between the two aspects. It is an instance of careful balancing of complementary aspects of the truth. Individualism is corrected by institutionalism. The unit acquires the benefits of Christ's redemption through his incorporation into the Church. Both the individual and the institution are the objects of Christ's love. But the greater includes the less.

This corporate conception of Christianity is all the more remarkable in St. Paul when we bear in mind his conspicuously independent character. It is not disrespectful to this marvellous man to suggest that he would have been a difficult person to manage. His dominating personality, his powerful will, and his unique religious experience display all the elements which make the born individualist. All these characteristics make his insistence upon the subordination of self to the corporate interests of the institution immensely impressive, and this continual emphasis shows how essential institutionalism appeared to the greatest teacher of the Christian faith.

It is being increasingly recognized by modern critics that the Catholic conception of the Church already exists in the teaching of St. Paul. Materials which justify the doctrine expressed in the later Pastoral Epistles lie already to hand in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Paul is 'the pioneer of Catholicism' (Heiler, *op. cit.*, 49). Paulinism is a Catholicizing religion (cf. Wernle, *Einführung*, 178).

SACRAMENTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By F. Gavin

The word 'sacrament' does not appear in the pages of the NT. But the Greek term *mysterion*, subsequently attached by the Eastern Church to those rites called in the West *sacraments*, is used once in the Synoptics (Mt 13 [11] and parallels), with growing frequency in the epistles of St. Paul, and four times in Revelation (1 [20], 10 [7], 17 [5, 7]). In most instances it means a secret which has been revealed; not, as in the later heretical use, one which has been kept hidden save for the few initiated. In no case is the term used for a sacrament in the sense of the later Church, the closest approximation to this sense being found in Eph 5 [32].

By sacrament we have come to understand a rite comprising 'outward and visible signs,' by which is mediated 'inward and spiritual grace,' and which claims Dominical authorization. All three elements are essential: the outward act and 'matter'; the inward grace thereby mediated; the sanction explicitly or implicitly given by Christ Himself. The direct bestowal of grace apart from material means is not properly to be described as 'sacramental,' nor is the observance of religious usages lacking the promise of any special grace, and claiming no divine authorization. The salient factor is the conviction that the transaction described as sacramental claims the sanction of Christ our Lord. It is here that the superficial resemblance of advanced sacramental theology, with its *ex opere operato* doctrine, to magic and superstition demands refutation. The essence of a 'magical' transaction is the imposition, by means of an effective formula or rite, of the will of the user upon another, whether deity, or man, or matter. This type of action fundamentally violates the will of the person—whether human or divine—upon whom the 'magic' is wrought. Completely opposed to this is Catholic sacramental theology, whether as formulated by the later Church or as latent in the pages of the NT. Sacraments do not violate but carry out the divine will: nor do they violate human freedom, since the obstructive will of man may preclude the operation of their grace. 'Magic' and Catholic sacramentalism are thus poles apart.

We must not look for any formulation of sacramental belief and practice in the pages of the NT, or in the earlier period of the Church's life. Such formulations take time to develop, and have been usually elicited by contradictions, diverse usages, or significant departures from the tradition of the Church. There is, moreover, a special reason why a definite sacramental doctrine did not earlier make its appearance in Christian Tradition: the very point of view represented in any definition of sacraments acceptable to the thought of matured Eastern or Western Christendom is characterized by a recognition of the contrast between the 'outward and visible' and the 'inward and spiritual.' Such a recognition was as foreign to early Christianity as to the Judaism from which it sprang. While the conception of grace developed by Jeremiah and Ezekiel (cf. Jer 31 [31] ff.; Ezek 36 [25] ff.) came strongly to the fore in primitive Rabbinic theology, and usages of a purifying and atoning character played an important part in Jewish religion (cf. Ex 29 [4] ff.; Lev 14-19; Nu 8 [5] ff., etc.), the sundering of 'outward' from 'inward,' of 'ceremonial' or 'ritual' from 'ethical' or 'spiritual,' was completely alien to the Jewish outlook on God, Israel, and the world. The rites and ceremonies, which are peculiarly the preoccupation of the redactor of the P code, and which are so frequently left out as irrelevant in the critical study of the OT, constituted a salient element in Pharisaic and Rabbinic piety. It must not be thought, however, that Rabbinism imagined that the efficacy of the sacrifices could be thought of apart either from their divine sanction, explicit or implicit, in God's Will expressed in Revelation, or from the necessity of the proper subjective attitude. As Dr. Moore writes: 'While the Temple was still standing the principle had been established that the efficacy of every species of expiation was morally conditioned—without repentance no rites availed' (*Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, i, 505).

It is in these customs, rites, and injunctions of the Law—written and oral—that we are to look for the types and principles of primitive Christian sacramentalism. In the light of the Catholic Tradition, the evidence of the NT will be considered with regard to, first, the two great sacraments; and secondly, the five lesser sacraments.

(1) **Baptism.**—Proselytes to the Judaism of the first Christian centuries were only

admitted after careful examination, scrutiny of motives, and instruction, followed (after the circumcision of a male convert) by baptism. The *tebilah* or immersion-bath (=baptism) of the proselyte belonged to a group of rites similar to those prescribed in Leviticus (cf. Ex 29 [4]; Lev 12 [1-16 34]; Nu 19 [7-8], 8 [15], etc.). The underlying conceptions of these rites go back to a very primitive level of Jewish religion, when 'sin' was conceived of as comprising inadvertent, as well as conscious, transgressions of the Lord's will, as so infective as to be attached to things as well as to people, and as removable by material means. The extension to the Gentiles of the laws as to unclean and clean seems first to have been made in the 2nd century B.C. (cf. Büchler, *J.Q.R.*, xvii, July, 1926, 1-15). Technically thereafter Gentiles were regarded as 'unclean'; and upon entrance into Judaism would need to 'wash off the stains of idolatry,' as Pharaoh's daughter had done (*Sotah*, 12*b*). The rite* of baptism is as follows: 'When in these days one comes seeking to become a proselyte, he is asked: "Why do you desire to become a proselyte? Do you not know how that in these times the Israelites are afflicted, harried, downtrodden, torn to pieces, and that sufferings come upon them?" If he answer, "I do know, and am not worthy," they accept him at once and acquaint him with some of the lighter and weightier commandments. . . .' (They then tell him of punishments, duties, and awards) 'Know that the world to come is made only for the righteous. . . .' (If he accepts, they circumcise him, and) 'When he is healed they baptize him immediately, two scholars standing by him and rehearsing to him some of the lighter and some of the weightier commandments. When he has immersed himself and rises from the water, he is in all respects like an Israelite' (*Yeb.*, 47). Baptism is by self-immersion; it requires the presence of witnesses; it may not be done clandestinely if it is to be reckoned valid, and is so important that two distinguished Rabbis could debate whether baptism or circumcision constituted the convert a Jew (*Yeb.*, 46*a*). The significance of the proselyte's new status is expressed in the words: 'A proselyte is like a child newly born' (*Yeb.*, 22*a*). He is free from the guilt of previous sins, has begun life afresh, entirely cut off from his past.

* The rite, however, given in Tractates, *Yeb.*, 47, and *Gerim* dates from the 2nd century A.D., and what exactly was in use in the 1st century we do not know.—Ed.

The beginnings of Christianity, according to many passages in the NT, date from the work and acts of John the Baptist. His importance as the Forerunner is the more significant since his chief message was a call to repentance, and his distinctive function that of administering a baptism. The meaning of Johannine baptism may be thus paraphrased: 'Since you, Jews born, have so far fallen away as to put yourselves, like the Gentiles, outside the Covenant, it is incumbent upon you to undergo baptism as a fresh readmission to the fellowship of God's people.* The outstanding NT texts relating to Christian baptism, if adequately considered, would carry us too far afield (e.g. Mk 16 [16]; Jn 3 [3-8]; Ac 2 [38-39], 22 [16], etc.; Rom 6 [1-4]; 1 Cor 12 [12-27]; Gal 3 [26-27]; Eph 5 [25-26]; Col 2 [12-13]; Tit 3 [5-6]; 1 P 3 [21]). For example, St. Paul's sacramentalism is intimately bound up with his whole Christological belief, his doctrine of the Law and the Gospel, of grace, the Body of Christ, etc. What is here suggested should be compared with the discussion in *The Theology of St. Paul*, 421.

The *logion* given in Mt 28 [19] seems originally to have been regarded as a summary of the faith professed by the baptized, rather than as a baptismal 'formula.' In that interesting but puzzling document the *Didache* it is not certain that this text is used as the 'formula' of baptism (cf. 7 [1, 3] and 9 [5]), and Acts seems to show evidence of a baptism without an explicitly Trinitarian formula or statement of belief (cf. 2 [38], 8 [12, 16], 19 [5], etc.).†

Closely allied with this problem is that regarding the growth of the Creed. Such passages as Rom 10 [9]; 1 Cor 12 [3] (cf. 2 Cor 3 [16], 4 [5], etc.); Phil 2 [11] point to a concise summary of belief in the words 'Jesus is Lord.' Yet the history of the Creed 'commonly called the Apostles'' shows that a threefold expansion of Mt 28 [19] antedated the fuller form, which was enlarged by the addition of the historical summary which belonged to 'the tradition.' In a 2nd-century rite of the West, redacted by St. Hippolytus in his *Apostolic Tradition*, we have the triple expansion of the Matthean text (cf. Connolly, 'The So-called Egyptian Church Order,' in Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, VIII, iv, 184-185).

In connexion with Jewish proselyte baptism a formal instruction was given to

* But see on Mt 3 [6].

† This was recognized as a fact by theologians as late as St. Thomas Aquinas, *Sum. Th.*, 3*a*, q. 66, art. 6.

the candidate; and in the form of the rite given in the Tractate *On Proselytes* the final address succinctly states some important implications of belief: 'Happy art thou in Him to whom thou hast joined thyself, who spake the word and the world was; for the world was created only for Israel's sake, nor are there any called "sons" (of God) save Israel only' (*Gerim*, i, 5: cf. Hermas, *Vis.*, ii, 4). Whether the Jewish rite involved the explicit utterance by the baptizand of the words 'In the name of God' is not certain (cf. *Gerim*, i, 7, end; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, i, 45-46). The rite of St. Hippolytus has no proper baptismal formula in the later sense of the words, for the Creed is simply a declaration of the faith of the candidate. Furthermore the act of baptism, save for the fact that the officiant's part is confined to 'laying his hand on the head' of the baptizand (cf. Hauler, *Didascalia apostolorum fragmenta veronensia latina*, 110), was practically self-administered, as in the Jewish usage. Though both the Hebrew and Syriac terms for 'baptize' are reflexive rather than transitive verbs, the Greek word *baptizein* is generally transitive in the received text of the NT. In Ac 22 [16] and 1 Cor 10 [2], however, the middle is used, as it is also in the Western variants in Lk 3 [12], 11 [38], and 12 [50]. Easton concludes that such readings 'testify to the passage of the 3rd Gospel through a circle which preserved certain early traditions tenaciously. . . . It is clear that the NT preserves traces of a baptismal practice which differs liturgically from that found later' (*A.J.T.*, xxiv, October, 1920, 515, 516). The Western readings would seem conclusively to point to a still greater assimilation of earlier baptismal phraseology and usage to that current in Judaism.

(2) **The Eucharist.**—'Though the word *Sacrament* be nowhere used in Scripture to signify the Blessed Eucharist, yet the Christian Church . . . has given it that name and always called the presence of Christ's Body and Bloud therein mystick and sacramental' (J. Cosin, *The History of Popish Transubstantiation*, 1676 edit., 3). In these words Bishop Cosin expresses that sense of the uniqueness of the Lord's Supper which has from the earliest times characterized the Catholic Tradition. The earliest account of it (1 Cor 11 [23-25]) is dealt with in *The Theology of St. Paul* (pp. 421, 422), and the question of Dominical origin in *The Life and Teaching of our Lord* (cf. p. 295*b*). The Institution also appears in the Synoptic Tradition (Mk 14 [22-25] and parallels). The early application of the word 'sacrifice' to the Eucharistic Rite as the great act of Christian worship (cf. *Didache*, xiv, 1),* the sacrificial language applied to it (Ign., *Phil.*, iv), and the enhanced significance, implicitly and explicitly recognized, of the Eucharist itself (*Didache*, ix, 2-4, x, 1-6, xiv, 1-3; Ign., *Eph.*, xx, 2; *Smyrn.*, vii, 1), throw much light on the interpretation of such eucharistic implications as are yielded by Jn 6; Ac 2 [42]; Heb 6 [4-5], 13 [10], and the like. (The accounts of the Feeding of the Five Thousand employ 'eucharistic' language, which has obviously been controlled by the Rabbinic terminology used in connexion with the *Kiddush* and the 'Fellowships': cf. Mk 6 [39, 40] with *Pes.*, vii, 13, ix, 10; *Men.*, 29*b*.) Very early in the stream do the two traditional emphases emerge, later defined in the statement that the Eucharist is both a sacrament and a sacrifice.

But why the name 'Eucharist'? Beside its general meaning of 'thanksgiving' it would seem to have had, even in the NT literature, a special meaning, to which a great number of the texts bear witness. Difficult as is the task of recovering this special sense, it must be attempted. The account of the Institution says that our Lord 'having given thanks' (Mt 26 [27]; Mk 14 [23], of the Cup; Lk 22 [17, 19], of Cup and Bread), or 'having blessed' (Mt 26 [26]; Mk 14 [22]), pronounced the words 'This is my Body . . . my Blood.' Quite naturally and properly do we look to Judaism for both the words and the meaning of these 'blessings.' They were: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, God of the universe, who (*a*) dost bring forth bread from the earth . . .; (*b*) dost create the fruit of the vine.' † Their recital preceded the sacred words which possess such sublime import. The meaning is of great interest: it is God who is blessed or thanked *for* the material things over which the blessing is recited.†

The occasion of the Last Supper was unique. Our Lord, like any other Jewish teacher whose disciples and friends constituted an intimate fellowship (*haburah*), had long been accustomed to usher in the feasts of the Jewish calendar by a supper, the *Kiddush*, which had special significance both religiously and socially. It is such a fellowship-meal rather than the Passover

* On the Eucharist as a sacrifice see note appended to this article.

† Note, however, that the eucharistic 'blessing' seems to be distinguished from that which has taken place at the beginning of the meal (Mk 14 [22]; 1 Cor 11 [25]).—Ed.

*seder** that furnishes the occasion of the Institution: and this meal is unique as the last of a series, and infinitely significant for all time to come for the words spoken by Him who was the Word. As the central feature of the *Kiddush* was the recital of the blessings (*b'rakhoth*), so the Lord's distinctive 'Blessing'—invested in retrospect with all the significance derived from the deepened consciousness of His Person, Office, Life, Death, and Resurrection—coupled with His mysterious words 'This is my Body . . . my Blood' (a *berakha* in a specific and new sense), made 'Blessing' the obvious term to use of the signal event it constituted. Since the Jewish *berakha* or 'blessing' by invocation of the Name (*Ber.*, 12*a*, 40*b*) was thought to release, as it were, the 'creatures' provided by God's bounty for man's use (cf. *Tos. Ber.*, iv, 1), the act of blessing assumed very great significance. If we remember that such blessings blessed God *for* the 'creatures' thus enjoyed by man, we shall see that the Greek word *Eucharist* best corresponded to the earlier *berakha*. The sense of the significance of the blessing pronounced by Jesus, heightened by reflection upon the greatness of both His Person and His words ('This is my Body . . . my Blood'), lifted the word Eucharist, the blessing *par excellence*, into a unique and unparalleled position (cf. Justin Martyr, *I. Apol.*, 65, 66; *Tryph.*, 40, 41, etc.).

The development of early Christian liturgical practice clearly demonstrates the derivation of the maturing rite from Jewish practice, as the scientific investigations in this field show (cf. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*; Völker, *Mysterium und Agape*). As a living commentary on the NT tradition, early Christian writings point indubitably to this fact as well as to another of great importance: it is not only as a sacrament of communion, but also as a sacrifice that the Eucharist held its unique position in the early Church. Beginning from St. Paul (cf. 1 Cor 10 [14-21], where 'Cup of blessing' is the Hebrew *Kus shel berakha*, 11 [17-30]; Rom 15 [16]) the stream of conviction gradually clarifies itself into this twofold statement. Of the course of this development it may be said briefly that eucharistic teaching developed parallel with the nascent Christology of the Church: as in its origin so in its further explication, the evaluation of the Eucharist was based on the estimate of the Person of the Lord who instituted it.

(3) **The 'Lesser Sacraments.'**—For the modern world 'what we understand by "symbol" is a thing which is not what it represents; at that time "symbol" denoted a thing which in some kind of way really is what it signifies' (Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, III, i, 435-436; Eng. trans., ii, 144; iv, 289: cf. Loofs, *R.E.*, i, Leipzig, 1896, 58; Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister*, 212; Heitmüller, *Taufe und Abendmahl im Urchristentum*, 15-16, etc.). This fact must always be kept in mind when we are dealing with records as far removed from us in time as in general outlook. Not more relevant to the consideration of Baptism and the Eucharist is this important fact than to our investigation of those rites, usages, or practices that by the Middle Ages came to be called sacraments by Eastern and Western Christendom alike: Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction. To understand their century-long development we must revert again to the fact that, though environed and controlled by Judaism, the primitive Christian tradition operated in a fashion only to be explained by the overshadowing importance of its Founder's authority. The more clearly we recognize the indebtedness of Christianity to Judaism, the more we are forced to wonder at the independence and dominance of its Christocentric convictions as well in practice as in belief.

Confirmation.—The outstanding note of early Christianity was its control by the Spirit. Unlike many later Christians, the individual believer as a member of the Church felt himself to be possessed by the Spirit rather than to possess Him. The Church as our Lord's Body was indwelt by His Spirit. Hence great importance was attached to that act of initiation by which the individual became a member of the Body, and was granted the gift of the Spirit (cf. Williams in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, 'The Origins of the Sacraments,' 376-423). What came later to be distinguished as Confirmation (called by the Eastern Church 'Chrismation') was regarded as the fulfilment and complement of one single initiatory rite constituted by (*a*) some act of disavowal and repudiation of sin; (*b*) Baptism; and (*c*) the imparting of the Holy Spirit (cf. Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Orthodox Thought*, 316, 358 ff.). The words attributed in Ac 2 [38] to St. Peter sufficiently describe this initiatory procedure: 'Repent, and be baptized each of you in the name of (the Lord) Jesus Christ unto forgiveness of (your) sins, and ye shall receive the gift (Lat. Bezæ *gratiam*) of the Holy

* See, however, on Mt 26 [17] ff.

Spirit' (cf. Ropes, *The Texts of Acts*, 22-23; Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, I, iii). What came later to be regarded as the 'normal' method of imparting the Spirit is best illustrated by Ac 8 [14-17]. The story of Cornelius's reception of the Spirit (*ibid.*, 10 [44] ff.: 'Can any forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Spirit as well as we?') together with the linking together by St. Peter of John's baptism with the promised 'baptism with the Holy Spirit' (11 [16]), and 'the gift of repentance to life unto the Gentiles' (*ibid.*, 11[18]) is very significant as to the knowledge of the writer of the series mentioned above. Whether the phrase used of Priscilla and Aquila in regard to Apollos, that they 'instructed him in the way of God more thoroughly' (Ac 18 [26]), means that the 'baptism of John' ([25]) was supplemented by further Christian rites, is not certain; but in the case of the twelve men at Ephesus St. Paul is recorded to have supplemented the Johannine by baptism 'in the name of the Lord Jesus,' while, when he had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them and they spake with tongues and prophesied (19 [1-6]). For such 'prophecy' through possession by the Spirit we have abundant Rabbinic parallels: the 'Spirit of God' was regularly translated in the Targums 'the spirit of prophecy,' and the usual meaning of 'Spirit' was inspiration for the knowledge of God's will. Jl 3 [1] is applied by the Midrash on Nu 15, 180*a* to the 'world to come, when all Israelites will be prophets.'

Orders.—With this signal phenomenon of early Christianity, the Spirit-guided and Spirit-inhabited Fellowship, may be considered the evidence in regard to the peculiar indwelling of the Spirit in the officials of the Church, particularly in those who are said to impart it. We come here to what was later called the Sacrament of Holy Order. Nu 27 [18-23] and Dt 34 [9] are the scriptural basis for the practice of ordination by laying on of hands in Judaism. 'Moses and the Seventy Elders *were all filled with the Holy Spirit*, and they were filled with the Holy Spirit from the spirit of Moses (yet his spirit suffered no loss thereby)'—(Midrash *Sifre* on Numbers, 76)—represents typical Rabbinic exegesis. In early Christian times the elder (*zaken*) was ordained by laying on of hands (*semikhah*), and candidates were chosen from among the sages' disciples (*talmidê ḥakhamim*) (*Sanh.*, i, 3, iv, 4; *Tos. Sanh.*, i, 1). Apparently in the time preceding the destruction of the second Temple (A.D. 70) each Rabbi ordained his own pupils (*Yer. Sanh.*, i, 19*a*). The 'Elders' (*zekenim*) formed a college, and the local as well as the central board at Jerusalem bore the name of *Sanhedrin*. Three men laid hands upon the ordinand (*Sanh.*, i, 3, iv, 4; *Tos. Sanh.*, i, 1), and the official function thus given was twofold: the authentic exposition of the Law, and the judicial function of pronouncing judgement. *Sanh.*, 5*a* asks about the *reshutha* (=Greek *exousia*) of the newly ordained, and discusses it. What was reflected in ordination was the transmission of the spirit by the ordainer to the ordained, in strict succession from Moses and mediated by the intervening generations. Had not Rabbi Judah ben Baba been willing to forgo his life rather than break the succession, the official discipline of Israel—i.e. the authoritative administration of the Law—would have been forfeited (*Sanh.*, 13*b*; *A.Z.*, 8*b*).

In Ac 11 [30] the *presbyteroi* of early Christianity (cf. Easton, 'Jewish and Early Christian Ordination' in *A.T.R.*, v, 308-319; vi, 285-295), who make their unheralded appearance, seem definitely parallel to the contemporary Jewish institution of *zekenim*. Indeed, it is not only in the case of the *elder*—his functions, his manner of ordination, and the 'character' conveyed—that we look to Judaism for light. Both the 'apostle' and the 'deacon' find their explanation in Judaism, as do, of course, the 'disciples' (understood as the semi-formal group attached to a Rabbi). A few words on the two former must suffice for our purposes. The Hebrew verb *shalaḥ* is used in pre-Christian times in the sense of despatching an emissary or official agent. The passive participle used as a substantive (*shaliaḥ, shaluaḥ*) is very common in the earliest strata of the Rabbinic literature. It may mean 'agent,' 'messenger,' 'commissioner,' 'delegate,' or 'plenipotentiary' (cf. *A.T.R.*, IX, iii, 250-259), and it is very commonly applied to the officiant at synagogal worship (*shaliaḥ ha-ṣibur*: 'representative of the congregation'). The word *shaliaḥ* is distinguished from the alternative form *shaluaḥ* in a very early description of the instruction of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement (*Yoma*, i, 5), and the Talmud in its commentary raises the question: Is the High Priest a 'delegate' or 'plenipotentiary' of man (i.e. of the Sanhedrin through its official 'delegates'), or are the priests 'emissaries not of the people but of God'? (*Yoma*, 19*a* Aramaic: cf. *Ned.*, 35*b*; *Kidd.*, 23*b*). As the priesthood was deemed to possess the Spirit, though

the individual might forfeit its possession (*Yoma*, 73*b*), the position of the priest was doubly enhanced. For the technical sense of official delegate or representative we have ample precedent in Judaism. As the Messianic conceptions of primitive Christianity were related to contemporary Jewish thought, so were the two conceptions of the apostolate. In the light of Jewish parallels, Mk 3[14]; Ac 9[1-2]; the 'congregational apostles' of Ac 13[1] ff., 14[4]; 2 Cor 8[23], etc.; the phrase in Jn 13[16] (practically a restatement of a common Rabbinic dictum), and the like, receive new meaning and interpretation (Mekhilta *Bo*, 3).

In Ac 6[6] ff. we are told of the laying on of the Apostles' hands in the case of the Seven. The 'ministry of tables' has its analogy in the personal apprenticeship which the Rabbi's disciple was bound to exercise to his master. Possibly from the words in Ac 6[3] the word 'deacon' came to be applied to a man ordained to a function and ministry in the Church, not limited to the particular work of the distribution of alms. Cf. the ministry of St. Stephen, the references to 'deacons' in the Pastorals (1 Tim 3[8, 12], 4[6]), and the doubtful passages: Rom 16[1] (of Phœbe); Eph 6[21]; Phil 1[1]; Col 1[7], 4[7]. It was, however, a subsidiary ministry, as contrasted with the roving commission of the Apostles—both in and outside the NT—and with the comparatively fixed and independent authority of resident *presbyteroi*. The root term *shamash* (which survives in Syriac as the root of the word for deacon) was applied in a technical sense to apprenticeship to a Rabbi. According to *Pirke Aboth*, vi, 5, knowledge of the Law is gained in many ways—of which one is 'ministry to the Sages.' While there is no direct evidence of the use of the term *shamash* to designate a grade of the Jewish ministry, the earlier Christian records are not clear as to the deacon's function and status.

We must leave on one side the priesthood in Judaism. It was hereditary and not given by ordination; its functions, while never involved in the depreciatory verdict passed on priests as a class by Pharisaic opinion, seem to play but a minor rôle in the religious life outside Jerusalem; and we cannot trace any claim by Christians to its office as transmitted from Judaism to Christianity. Again we are brought back to the Central Figure of our Faith. From Him begins a new order: all things point back to Him; all institutions and beliefs are felt to derive from Him. But this Central Figure of Christianity was a Jew, and His Apostles and disciples were Jews. His Fellowship was the True Israel, 'the Israel of God' (Gal 6[16]; 1 P 2[5, 9]: cf. Hermas, *Vis.*, II, iv, 1, and *Gerim*, i, 5).

Penance.—Before the Lord's Passion and Resurrection He 'who taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes' (Mk 1[22] and parallels), and enjoined upon His disciples to 'call none their father on earth' (Mt 23[9]) lest the dead hand of Jewish patristic tradition paralyze them and prevent the acceptance of the new revelation, had said to them: 'Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven' (*ibid.*, 18[18]: cf. 16[19]). With this should be compared Jn 20[21-23]: 'As my Father hath sent (*apestalken*) me, even so send I (*pempo*) you. . . . Receive (the) Holy Spirit: whose soever sins ye remit, are remitted unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, are retained.'

As we have seen above, the two functions of the *zaken* in Israel were those of authoritative teaching and authoritative discipline. In Josephus (*B.J.*, I, v, 2) there is an account of the exercise by Pharisees of powers 'to persecute and recall those whom they would; to *loose and bind*.' The power to excommunicate was only one of such powers: the Hebrew and Aramaic terms employed prove that the declaration of matters as 'permitted' or 'allowed,' and the right of decision in questions of casuistry, were also included within their scope (the terms are used absolutely, or with the accusative of the person, or thing: e.g. *Tos. Yeb.*, i, 11; *Pes.*, iv, 5, vi, 2; *Ter.*, v, 4; *Yeb.*, i, 4; *Ned.*, iii, 2, 6, vii, 9; *Eduy.*, iv, 8; *Yer.*, i, 61*b*; *ibid.*, *Ber.*, iv, 7*d*). In fact, the words '(the Sage) opens and no one closes, he closes and no one opens' appear in the early Midrash to Deuteronomy (*Sifre*, Dt 32[25]). For the heavenly confirmation of sentences (cf. Mt 18[18] and 16[19]) properly passed upon earth there are innumerable Rabbinic parallels (cf. notes on Matthew). The very phrases 'in heaven' and 'upon earth' have their Rabbinic parallels in the same context (cf. *Mak.*, 23*b*). To prevent it from being thought that the decisions of Jewish discipline were not necessarily ratified by God, it is only necessary to quote an ancient form of sentence: 'Let such a one be under the curse of the God of Israel' (*A.Z.*, 25*a*; *Ḥullin*, 132*b*), with which may be compared the milder ban of Mt 18[17]: 'let such a one be unto thee as a heathen

and a publican.' The exercise of excommunication by St. Paul in 1 Cor 5 [3-5] illustrates the apostolic power.

It may be objected, however, that there is a wide gulf between the Matthean and Johannine texts. In the one, authority is given to bind and to loose; in the other, to forgive sins. Moreover, since the Johannine Gospel is suspect, its teaching is to be discounted as that of a writer far removed in time and thought from the Lord and His teaching. To this it may be replied that our immediate concern is the interpretation of the text of the NT, on which the Catholic Church has set her seal of approval as inspired; and that, even apart from this consideration, the difference between the two passages is greatly reduced when seen in the light of Rabbinic procedure. Finally, we must remember that the whole basis of religious authority has been changed by our Lord, as the 4th Gospel consistently teaches. It is the Spirit of Christ who now exercises through the ministry of men the authority shown by the Incarnate God to forgive sins (cf. Mt 9 [1-8] and parallels). The greatness of this change may possibly be illustrated by the change of the term *baptize* from a reflexive to a transitive verb: the agent in the initiatory rite of Christianity 'administered' the threefold act, and retroactively, as the medium of the imparting of the Spirit, would naturally become 'agent' in an active sense. In the light of the organic connexion between all the sacred ordinances which later were defined as sacraments, peculiar importance attaches to 'Orders,' 'Penance,' and 'Confirmation'; and all seven are closely bound up with the new conception of the Spirit-guided Body, the Church.

Unction.—In the use of oil in the ancillary ceremonies of the rite of Baptism and Confirmation, as we find it outside the NT, there is undoubtedly a reminiscence of the various uses to which Unction was put in the ancient world. Since anointing was used for kings and for priests, its use by Christians who are 'made a kingdom and priests' (Rev 1 [6]: cf. 5 [10], 20 [6]) is in keeping with the character of their Head, the Great High Priest (cf. Rom 11 *passim*; Heb 7 *passim*; 1 P 2 [5, 9]), who was also the Messiah. The Christ was the Anointed One (cf. Ac 4 [27], 10 [38]; Heb 1 [9]), and His followers have been 'anointed and sealed, and have received the earnest of the Spirit' (2 Cor 1 [21]) by the 'chrism from the Holy One' (1 Jn 2 [20, 27]). The 'seal,' however figuratively understood (cf. Rom 15 [28]; Eph 1 [13], 4 [30]; Rev 5-8 *passim*, 10 [4], 20 [3], etc.), possessed for the Jew a special quasi-sacramental meaning, since it was used of the covenant rite by which the male was made a member of Israel (e.g. *Tos. Ber.*, vii, 13, etc.).

Anointing was also used for comfort and pleasure, as e.g. after the bath (*Tos. Sabb.*, iii, 17). It was also commonly used as a means of healing from disease, as is shown in Mk 6 [13] and Jas 5 [14] ff. There are many Rabbinic illustrations of this second use, e.g. *Sabb.*, xiv, 4; *Tos. Demai*, I, xxiv, 40. One curious tale describes the healing, by Rabbi Joshua, of Hananyah his nephew (*c.* A.D. 110), who had abandoned Judaism for Christianity. Rabbi Simon (A.D. 150), discussing the quality of the oil to be used, allows 'rose-oil' (otherwise the peculiar prerogative of princes), as 'all Israelites are sons of kings' (*Sabb.*, xiv, 4). From the practice of the Church, as described by St. James, the sacrament known as Holy Unction is derived. The presence of the official hierarchy, the 'elders,' as officiants, the conjunction of unction with repentance and forgiveness, and the 'prayer of faith,' all constitute essential elements in the later sacramental rite.

Marriage.—Nowhere more strikingly than in teaching about marriage does our Lord set aside current Rabbinic tradition. He seems to have abrogated the Mosaic permission of divorce, and to have re-established marriage as it was 'from the beginning' (cf. Mt 5 [31, 32], 19 [3-9]; Mk 10 [2-12]; Lk 16 [18]). 'Moses *allowed* you to divorce your wives by reason of the hardness of your hearts' (Mt 19 [8]); and the original ordinance of God must be proclaimed anew by Him whom Moses foresaw (Dt 18 [15]). The principle of marriage enunciated in the Gospels is monogamy for life. The same conviction of the uniqueness and abidingness of the marriage relationship is reflected in Eph 5 [31] (quoting Gen 2 [23, 24]: cf. Mt 19 [5]), where it is called a 'great mystery' and applied 'to Christ and the Church' (Eph 5 [32]).

Both the non-Jewish and the Jewish character of the Matthean texts appear in the light of what has been regarded as the exception ('save for *porneia*') peculiar to St. Matthew. There are good grounds for believing that the word is here used in the technical Rabbinic sense of 'incestuous relationship' (cf. 1 Cor 5 [1] ff., where *porneia* is used of a case of incest): 5 [32] expresses in Greek the characteristically rigorous Shammaite contention. Of the other instances of the use of the word in the NT some are general and inclusive; but the prefer-

able reading of the 'four-clause' text of Ac 15 [20, 29] (for recent discussion cf. Ropes, *Acts*, *op. cit.*, 265-269) would seem to necessitate the meaning 'incestuous relationship forbidden by Biblical law (=Lev 16 [6-18]).' Cf. Gavin, 'Further Note on *porneia*' in *Theology*, Feb., 1928, and previous discussions by Drs. Selwyn and Lowther Clarke, 1927. Pauline practice —e.g. in the 'privilege' of 1 Cor 7 [8] ff.— bears out the argument for the influence of Jewish practice upon the marriage rules of early Christianity: it was not that Christian Tradition *followed* Judaism, but that it developed in direct reaction to it.

However striking may be the Jewish parallels and antecedents of those rites and usages later developed into the Sacraments of the Catholic Church, it is never possible to obscure the stupendous uniqueness and centrality of the Figure of the Founder of the New Covenant. Distinctive practices, like the OT and its theology, were taken over from Judaism, but in the act sustained a radical transformation. Internal evolution, under the guidance of the Spirit, gradually moulded belief and practice into a new form. Above all, it must be kept in mind that to early Christianity the conception of the Church was of vast import. In answer to the question, Did Christ found a Church? we are told that He did; we are as vehemently assured that He did not. Both statements are in part true. Truer still it would be to say that He *refounded* the Church. 'Not for the first time under Gnosticism are the theological conceptions of the Church being formulated; nor should we look to the conviction that Christianity is the true philosophy for the beginnings of Christian theology. From the very beginning a theology of the Church was growing up, under the necessity of making good her claim by the OT as the Holy Scripture shared by Synagogue and Church alike. Central in this scriptural evidence lay the fulfilment of prophecy in Jesus (Ac 9 [20, 22]), particularly in His Death and Resurrection (Lk 24 [45] ff.), and intimately bound up with it even in the NT was the claim of the Church to be the one true people of God' (N. Bonwetsch, 'Der Schriftbeweis für die Kirche aus den Heiden als das wahre Israel bis auf Hippolyt' in *Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn . . . dargebracht*, Leipzig: cf. Ac 2 [21], 4 [27]; Rom 2 [28-29], 4 [12], 9 [7] ff.; 1 Cor 14 [21]; Gal 3 [7, 29], 6 [16]; Eph 2 [17]; 1 P 2 [5-9]). Nascent sacramentalism was conditioned by Judaism, from which its elements were derived; it was controlled by the unique Figure of our Lord; and the theology both of the sacraments and of the Church developed out of the doctrine of the new 'Israel of God.'

Bibliography

(1) **Rabbinic**: The Mishna and Tosefta are quoted by perek (Roman numeral) and mishnah (Arabic). For further information the reader should consult the *Jewish Encycl.*, articles 'Proselytes,' 'Baptism,' 'Ordination'; Schürer's *Hist.*, Eng. trans., iii, 'Proselytes'; and G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era.*

(2) **Christian**: Special studies in English: A. J. Mason, *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, London and N.Y., 1891; Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, Oxford, 1925; N. P. Williams, in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, Macmillan, London and N.Y., 1926, pp. 367-423 being particularly valuable; Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl*, Bonn, 1926; Völker, *Mysterium und Agape*, Gotha, 1927.

APPENDED NOTE ON THE EUCHARIST AS A SACRIFICE

From the end of the 1st century (Clem., *ad Cor.*, 40-44, and *Didache*, xiv, 1) the Eucharist was regarded as a sacrifice in the sense that the Church's 'gifts' were there offered, with accompanying prayers and thanksgiving (eucharistia). It was an 'unbloody sacrifice.' But it so little resembled the animal sacrifices of the Old Covenant or of paganism that some of the apologists seem at first to deny that the Christian Church admits of sacrifices, though then proceeding to modify their denial. From the gifts offered at the Eucharist by the congregation were taken the bread and wine, which were to become by consecration the Body and Blood of the Lord: they were regarded after consecration as having been accepted by God, and by Him filled with new reality and power. One of the oldest of Latin prayers for the altar service runs: 'We make, O Lord, our glorious exchanges: what thou hast given, we offer: that we in turn may receive thyself.' This idea of the Eucharist as a sacrifice is so universal and primitive that it must run back to apostolic times. It may underlie the phrase 'This do (i.e. celebrate this rite) in my memorial,' but it cannot be said to be 'proved' from the NT. What it is more important to observe is that all the language of the NT about the institution or meaning of the

Eucharist presupposes its sacrificial character in another and deeper sense. It was a feast upon a sacrifice, and, therefore, relatively to the worshippers, the consummation of the sacrifice. (It is quite contrary to primitive ideas to put communion into antithesis to sacrifice.) The body there given to us is the body as sacrificed 'for us': and the blood is the sacrificial 'blood of the [new] covenant poured out for many' (cf. Ex 24 [8]; Zech 9 [11]; Heb 10 [29], 13 [11]). Thus the object there presented to us, the spiritual reality which faith 'discerns,' is the divine Victim, the 'Lamb as it had been slain' who is alive for ever in the heavenly places. 'Ye are come unto . . . Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling.' It is on this basis that the sacrificial character of the Eucharist securely rests. All the offerings, prayers, and praises of the Church are united to that one all-sufficient and ever-living sacrifice—there can be no question of any *additional* sacrifice; and we ourselves by partaking of that sacrifice become ourselves an acceptable offering in Him. 'Here we offer and present *ourselves*.' Only here will St. Augustine suffer us to find the consummation of the sacrifice: cf. Heb., *Introd.* (7), pp. 600, 601.—C. G.

THE THEOLOGY OF ST. PAUL

By H. L. Goudge

Introduction.—St. Paul was the first theologian of the Christian Church. To say this is in no way to put him in the Lord's place. Christian theology rests upon facts of history and spiritual experience; above all, upon the facts of the Lord's history and the spiritual experience of His servants; and, during His earthly life, the revealing facts lay for the most part in the future, and the experience peculiar to Christians had not begun. But, when the Lord had been glorified and the Spirit bestowed, the rise of a Christian theology could not be long delayed; and St. Paul was the first and greatest labourer in its construction. Every branch of theology owes a debt to him, not only that doctrinal theology with which we shall be in this article concerned, but moral, pastoral, and ascetic also. Nor was the Church slow to recognize the debt. From the first St. Paul was regarded as pre-eminently 'the Apostle,' the great outstanding teacher upon whom the Church relied. It had no suspicion that it had failed to understand him, or that 'Paulinism' was to be distinguished from its own corporate faith. Nor, except in some critical circles, is it otherwise to-day. Neither in East nor West has the Church changed its mind about St. Paul. However greatly we differ, we all claim him; 'Catholic,' 'Evangelical' and 'Liberal' alike; and each with some measure of justification. He is our greatest teacher about the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments; he is the Apostle of faith, the faith which lays hold upon the living Christ and relies upon Him alone; he is the champion of spiritual freedom. Is he then inconsistent with himself? Not at all. But our popular theologies are partial and one-sided structures; they put asunder truths which God has joined together. To study St. Paul is for us all to study one who has a wider outlook than our own. He will supply us with 'the defence and confirmation' of all that we have yet grasped of 'the Gospel' (Phil 1 [7]); but he will also 'perfect that which is lacking' in our 'faith' (1 Th 3 [10]).

Sources.—What are the sources at our disposal for learning his theology? The chief is his own writings; and we shall here assume that all the epistles which have been assigned to him are his, except the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pastorals. The former is not his, though it is consistent with his teaching (cf. Col 2 [17]). The latter may be his, wholly or in part; we shall use them with reserve, when their teaching stands alone. But light will fall from many sides: from the Old Testament and later Jewish thought; from the teaching of the Lord, whose follower St. Paul was; from that of the elder Apostles, who approved his Gospel (Gal 2 [7-9]); from the mind of the Church, which he did so much to form. Specially shall we attend to the witness of his friend and companion St. Luke. St. Luke was a most intelligent man; he enjoyed for years the closest intercourse with St. Paul, and heard him preach again and again. It is a paradox to say that he did not understand him.

St. Luke will tell us how St. Paul preached the Gospel to the world. St. Paul himself tells us little of this; to confuse his controversial theology with his evangelistic preaching is to misunderstand both. St. Paul in his epistles writes to those who have not only accepted his evangelistic preaching, but received the instruction which followed its reception (Rom 6 [17]; 1 Cor 15 [1-8]); and, though he refers to both, he repeats neither. If e.g. we suppose that Rom 1-3 reproduces St. Paul's evangelistic Gospel, we may go far astray. St. Paul, as St. Luke tells us, preached the Gospel to the Jews and their Gentile adherents very much as St. Peter preached it. He sought to convince them that Jesus was Lord and Christ, and to lead them to personal faith in Him. As a Pharisee he laid a stress upon justification which St. Peter did not, and St. Luke is aware of this (Ac 13 [39]); but we know of hardly any other difference. St. Paul's oft-quoted words to the Corinthians (1 Cor 1 [23], 2 [2]) correctly describe such a sermon as that of Ac 13 [16-41]. He preached Jesus as the Christ, without in any way slurring over the fact of the crucifixion. But he kept his deeper teaching till his converts had made some advance in Christian living (1 Cor 2 [6], 3 [1-3]); and the fact that St. Luke does not report this deeper teaching in his history of the extension of the Church is no indication that he did not understand it. We shall then use St. Luke with confidence, not only as our chief authority for St. Paul's evangelistic gospel, but in all that he tells us about St. Paul's teaching and practice.

St. Paul's Antecedents. — How shall we approach the study of St. Paul's mind? The first thing necessary is to understand his antecedents. He was a member of an Aramaic-speaking family of unimpeachable Jewish orthodoxy (Phil 3 [5]). Though born at Tarsus, a great university city, there is no reason to suppose that he received there any part of his education; if he did, he no doubt attended a Jewish school. (For a different view cf. Ramsay, *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, v and vi.) His own account is that he was brought up in Jerusalem at the feet of the Rabbi Gamaliel (Ac 22 [3]), being no doubt intended for a scribe; and that he was remarkable for his Pharisaic piety (Gal 1 [14]). Thus his attitude to the heathen was originally that which he so well describes in Rom 2 [17-20] (cf. Gal 2 [15]). Profoundly believing in the truth and adequacy of the Mosaic Torah, or instruction, he was confident that he had everything to give to the heathen, and little to learn from them (Eph 2 [11-13]; though cf. Phil 4 [8]). He had apparently little knowledge of Greek literature or appreciation of Greek culture. His few quotations from Greek authors (Ac 17 [28]; 1 Cor 15 [33]; Tit 1 [12]) are such as anyone might know; and the splendid statuary of Athens was apparently to him but a collection of idols (Ac 17 [16]). So, again, he had no sympathetic appreciation of Gentile religion (Ac 17 [29]; 1 Cor 10 [20]), and very little of Gentile morality; his language in Rom 2 [14, 15, 26] does little to qualify the stern condemnation of Rom 1 [18-23]. Nor, once more, is there anything to suggest that he was, except in his vocabulary, much influenced by Greek philosophy, or by Jewish Hellenism, or by the various mystery-cults of the Orient. Of course, the thought of the Hebrews had been long affected by that of other nations. Egypt, Babylon, and Persia had made their contributions, and at a later stage Greece also. The Book of Wisdom is affected by Greek thought, and St. Paul seems to know this book well. Though his psychology is fundamentally Hebrew, we can recognize Greek influence in his use of such words as 'mind' (Rom 7 [25]) and 'conscience' (Rom 2 [15], etc.). Of course, also, as Bishop Lightfoot has shown, St. Paul was more or less familiar with Stoicism (cf. especially Ac 17 [25-29]); no one could move about the Græco-Roman world without becoming familiar with its most influential philosophy. But 'a Hebrew of Hebrews' he always remains; and by 'Hebrew thought, and not Greek or Oriental, his words must almost always be interpreted. Much the same must be said of the supposed influence of Roman imperialism. St. Paul recognized in the state a divine authority (Rom 13 [1-7]), as the Lord had done; he could see, like the Second Isaiah (Is 44 [28]-45 [5]), the providential purpose which its action served (2 Th 2 [6]). He valued his Roman citizenship, and occasionally turned it to good account (Ac 16 [35-39], 22 [25-29]). But he never dreamed of the Christianization of the Roman Empire as an institution. He had an imperial outlook of his own founded upon Old Testament teaching; he looked forward to the reign of 'the saints' (1 Cor 4 [8], 6 [2]). The Lord was at hand; and, when He came, all earthly rule would pass away.

The Hebrew Outlook and its Consequences. — St. Paul's outlook then is the Hebrew outlook; let us consider what this means. The outlook of the

Hebrews was essentially practical; they asked not so much what it was wise to think as what it was necessary to do. Thus they were no philosophers or builders of theological systems. They did not seek by searching to find out God (Job 11 [7]: cf. 1 Cor 1 [19-21]); it was, they thought, for God to reveal Himself when and as He would. But they believed that He had revealed Himself in their individual and national experience, as interpreted by the prophets whom He had raised up to interpret it; and they looked for all further revelation to come in the same way. Thus their interest in God was always interest in His practical activity rather than in the divine nature behind; and the doctrinal statements which they make have always a factual basis and a practical application. No doubt God must exist in order to act (Heb 11 [6]); He is what He is, and the Hebrews could conceive of a divine 'rest' (Gen 2 [2]). But if the Hebrew thinker had been asked about the 'nature' of God, he would have said, as our Lord did, that He was 'spirit' (Is 31 [3]; Jn 4 [24]); and the word 'spirit' in scripture, like the word 'life,' is bound up with the thoughts of motion and activity. It is the purpose and activity of God with which we are primarily concerned, and the Hebrews hardly look beyond them.

Now all this is largely true of St. Paul; and we must not expect him to supply answers to problems which do not occur to him. He is an Apostle always, a representative of the exalted Christ with a message to be delivered just as it stands (cf. 1 Cor 15 [15]; 2 Cor 2 [17]; 1 Th 2 [3-6]). He is a prophet frequently (1 Cor 14 [6]), receiving new truth to declare 'by the word of the Lord' (Ac 26 [16]). Both as an Apostle and as a prophet he speaks with authority, and seems to regard as the gift of the Spirit the very words in which his message is expressed (1 Cor 2 [13]). Though we may trace growth and development in his doctrinal teaching, we do not find in it any real example of a change of mind. But he is never a philosopher; and he is a theologian chiefly because the theologian's task is forced upon him. Historically he has a wide outlook; since, like the prophets before him, he believes that God has an eternal purpose which history is revealing (cf. e.g. Rom 16 [25, 26]; Eph 3 [3-5]). He has a deep insight into human nature and its needs, the fruit of his moral struggles and disappointments (cf. Rom 7). He has a rough and ready psychology drawn primarily from the Old Testament, but enriched in some degree by Greek thought, and greatly by his spiritual experience. Thus it is rather his experience which explains his psychology than his psychology his experience. If e.g. it is sometimes difficult to be sure, when he uses the word 'spirit,' whether he means the Divine Spirit or the human, it is because it is the former which he has found to call the latter into activity (cf. e.g. Rom 8 [4-6]; Gal 5 [16, 17]). But his philosophy of religion is confined to a simple appeal to the witness of nature to God (Rom 1 [18] ff.: cf. Ac 14 [17], 17 [24] ff.), probably with a remembrance of Wisd 13 [1-9] (cf. Ps 19 [1-6]; Is 40 [12-26]), and a few references to the moral and religious nature of man (Ac 17 [26, 27]; Rom 2 [14, 15]); while the intellectual difficulties which his teaching suggests seldom seem to trouble him. He has, e.g., no fear that his doctrine of the Lord and of the Spirit may endanger the doctrine of the divine unity, or his doctrine of the divine sovereignty that of human freedom, or that his doctrine of the Atonement may seem open to objection upon moral and religious grounds. The question in this third example to his practical Hebrew mind is not what will satisfy the mind of man, but what will manifest the holiness of God (cf. Rom 3 [25, 26]). Once more, he has no thought of building up a consistent system of theology which will shine by its own light. As a rule, the teaching which he gives is drawn from him by the immediate practical needs of his converts; and the amount of space which a subject occupies in his writings has sometimes little relation to its permanent importance. He cares little for consistency of language, neither defining his terms nor using them always in the same sense. If then, as we shall find to be the case, St. Paul's theology is in fact wonderfully coherent, the reason is not that he has successfully striven to make it so, but that truth is always consistent with itself. Here as elsewhere his very limitations are the means of manifesting the divine glory (2 Cor 4 [7]); our faith does not stand 'in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God' (1 Cor 2 [5]).

The Approach to his Theology.—Now it is when we understand St. Paul's antecedents and outlook that we see what the right approach to his theology must be. St. Paul had profound religious beliefs before he became a Christian; and, though he added much and corrected much, he did not abandon the truth that was already his. Moreover, when the new truth did not conflict with the old, he retained the old whether or not the new demanded its retention. Thus his theology falls into three divisions. First,

we have those beliefs of orthodox Judaism which the Lord Himself accepted. Secondly, we have the new beliefs necessitated by the new revelation made to St. Paul. Thirdly, we have a certain remainder of Jewish belief which the Lord, as far as we know, neither confirmed nor rejected, and which is no part of that truth as it is in Jesus (Eph 4 [21]), into which it is the work of the Spirit to guide us (Jn 16 [13], limited by Jn 14 [6]). Questions may arise as to the particular section of St. Paul's theology to which particular beliefs should be assigned; but the reality of this threefold division is a necessary consequence of his upbringing and experience.

The Faith of Israel.—(1) We consider then first that faith of Israel to which the Lord Himself set His seal, and which St. Paul held even before he was a Christian. This noble faith had been much enlarged since the early days of Israel's life. Its main articles were four. First came belief in Jehovah, the God of Israel. Second came belief in Israel itself, the Church of Jehovah. Third came belief in the promised Kingdom of God, and the great vindication of God's people which its coming would bring. Fourth came belief in the Messiah, the instrument of Jehovah for the fulfilment of His promises.

God and His Attributes.—(*a*) First, then, St. Paul as a Pharisee believed in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth (Eph 3 [9]). To believe in God is to believe in one God; a God who is not 'the only God' (1 Tim 1 [17], 2 [5]: cf. 1 Cor 8 [5, 6]) cannot be God at all. This one God to all Hebrews was what we now call a personal God, a God 'living' and active (Ac 14 [15]; 2 Cor 3 [3]; 1 Th 1 [9]), with purposes and ways of His own, higher indeed than ours, but capable of being in some measure revealed and understood (1 Cor 2 [9, 10]; Eph 1 [9]). God loved (Rom 5 [8]; Eph 2 [4]) and had compassion (2 Cor 1 [3, 4]); He was angry, when there was righteous cause for anger (Rom 1 [18]), and jealous when His rightful claims were disregarded (1 Cor 10 [22]). He could enter into covenant and communion with men; He could hear and answer their prayers. The Hebrews might sometimes err by thinking of God as more like a man than He really can be, though by St. Paul's day they had learned to guard against this danger; but they never thought of Him as less than personal.

Now it was upon this personal and purposeful God, the Hebrews believed, that the world and men altogether depended (Rom 11 [36]; 1 Cor 8 [6]); and all that God had made was 'very good.' Thus St. Paul never thinks of matter, or of the flesh, as evil in itself or the source of evil, though his language at times affords some excuse for this misunderstanding of his meaning. The Lord, he believed, had a body like our own; and ours can be the temple of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 6 [19]); we can present our members as instruments of righteousness unto God (Rom 6 [13]: cf. 1 Cor 6 [20]), and cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit (2 Cor 7 [1]). Sin, he believed, came into the world, not when Adam was formed of the dust of the ground, but when he disobeyed God; and, if sin has established itself in our mortal bodies, we must not let it 'reign' there (Rom 6 [12]), but bring them into subjection (1 Cor 9 [27]), and look forward to their ultimate redemption (Rom 8 [23]).

But what is God's relation to created things? God to the Hebrews was, on the one hand, 'the Holy One of Israel,' 'high and lifted up' above all created things; they never confused God with the world, or thought of Him as in any way dependent upon it for the fulness of His own life. God Himself was changeless and everliving through the change and decay which belonged to all that He had made (Rom 1 [23], 16 [26]; 1 Tim 6 [16]); and the heaven of heavens could not contain Him. On the other hand, though He had His seat so high, He humbled Himself to behold the things that are in heaven and earth. Not only was the changeless order of the world an order which He had imposed (Jer 31 [35, 36]), but the processes of the world were due to His ceaseless activity (Ps 104 [13] ff.). Thus, though the language of scripture everywhere presupposes man's moral freedom, the divine sovereignty is very prominent. Blessing and disaster come equally from God's hand (Is 45 [7]); human history is the carrying out of a divine purpose, and one day that purpose will be fulfilled (Is 55 [9-11]). We may, if we will, speak of God as 'immanent' in the world of nature and of history; but only if we remember that it is the transcendent God who is immanent and freely bestows His immanence.

Now it is primarily in connexion with the course of the world and of human history that the Hebrews think of God's omnipotence and omniscience. All the power and wisdom which they reveal is God's power and God's wisdom. He does all that is done (Rom 9 [15] ff.), and knows all that there is to know.

That is not to say that God's power and wisdom are exhausted by the world that we see, or that He is unable to act freely within it. On the contrary, it is everywhere plastic to His hand; nothing is too hard for Him. He 'will be what he will be' (Ex 3 14); and can do 'new things' so wonderful that the old will no longer be remembered (Eph 3 20). If it is His purpose that we are seeking to fulfil, there is no limit to the wonders which our faith may claim (2 Cor 12 12).

But even more important than such attributes as these are God's moral attributes. Here the thoughts of the Hebrews rose far above those of other peoples. God had been revealed to them in their history as both a God of grace and a God of righteousness; and it was just for this reason that His other attributes were attributes of attraction even more than of fear. They did not indeed think of the law of right as enthroned above God Himself; but neither did they regard it as an arbitrary creation of His will. Rather it was the expression of His nature (2 Tim 2 13; Tit 1 2), designed for our welfare, and therefore always holy and righteous and good (Rom 7 12). Moreover to the Hebrews, as we have seen, the character of God was always revealed in His practical activity. His righteousness was a living righteousness, manifested even now in His rewards and judgements, and which would find a perfect and final manifestation in His approaching 'day' (Rom 1 18, 2 2-12). His mercy and grace were living mercy and grace, manifested even now in His redemptive activity, and to be more fully manifested in His kingdom of glory.

Now all this was from the first contained in St. Paul's theology, and he brought it with him when he became a Christian. Two points of peculiar importance should be observed before passing further:

The Human and the Divine.—(i) Though man is in some sense made in the image of God (Gen 1 26), there was never any danger with the Hebrews of confusing the nature of the one with the nature of the Other. The Hebrews do not, like the Greeks, think of men as made divine by the gift of immortality. Neither deity itself (Col 2 9), nor divinity, the sum of its attributes (Rom 1 20), is within our reach. To the Greeks, with their gods of like passions with ourselves, the thought of deification presented no difficulty; to the Hebrews it was impossible. Trinitarian conceptions, on the other hand, were perhaps easier to the Hebrews than to the Greeks. Not only was God Himself to be found in the creative 'wisdom' (Prov 8 22-31) which 'holds all things together' (Wisd 1 7; Col 1 17), and in His creative and inspiring Spirit (Job 33 4; Is 61 1), but also in visible manifestations of His presence such as the mysterious Angel of Jehovah (Ex 3 2, 6) and His Shechinah (Ex 40 34). We must however remember that in not one of these manifestations of God is there any confusion of the Creator with the created. Not one is a created being who becomes God or possesses a secondary godhead. All that is done by them is done because God's 'name' is in them (Ex 23 21), because in some undefined way the one true God is so in them, and so operates through them, that it is He Himself who does all that they do.

The Divine Sovereignty.—(ii) The Pelagian outlook is alien to the Hebrew mind. Not only must the initiation of all that is done to fulfil God's purpose be from Him (2 Cor 5 18; Eph 2 9), and all 'glorying' be in Him (1 Cor 1 31); but all is God's work from first to last (Phil 1 6, 2 13), and redounds to the praise of His glory (Gal 1 5; Eph 1 6, etc.). St. Paul's language here is not only the reflection of his religious experience, though the 'twice-born' use it more naturally than the 'once-born,' and Pharisaic legalism made it especially necessary; it arises out of the Hebrew conception of God. Thus there is nothing strange or peculiar to St. Paul about his doctrine of election and predestination. The Hebrews well knew that God's purpose is altogether His own (Eph 1 11), and that it is as eternal as He (Rom 16 25; 2 Tim 1 9); it is this abiding purpose which prophecy both proves and reveals. God has a purpose for His Church (Is 41 8 ff.; Eph 3 9, 10), for the nations of the world in their relation to the Church (Is 43 3 ff.), for the individuals whom He 'foreknows' as the instruments of His purpose (Is 41 2), and even for those enemies of His people whose fierceness turns to His praise (Is 10 5 ff.; Rom 9 17). Above all has God's purpose and foreknowledge rested upon Christ Himself, and 'in' Christ upon the members of His body who are to be conformed to His image (Rom 8 29). No Hebrew who understood his religion would claim the direction of his own life, or murmur at the place which God had here assigned to him (Is 45 9, 10; Rom 9 19 ff.). But though such language may to us suggest fatalism, and raise philosophical problems which St. Paul did not consider, it is not the language of fatalism. The Hebrews had a profound

sense of the necessity of correspondence with God, whether as nations or as individuals, if we are ourselves to have our share in the blessing which He has promised; indeed, no nation knew so well the disasters which follow the refusal of this correspondence. But when such prophets as Isaiah and St. Paul are describing the majestic march of the divine purpose, and the present blessings of the people of God (Rom 8 [26-39]), they do not descend from this high level to inopportune warnings to individuals; there is a time for everything. Moreover, the Hebrew doctrines of election and predestination go back to a time when there was as yet no belief in immortality; and are thus primarily concerned with the vocation of nations and individuals in this present life. St. Paul, when he speaks of these things, is no more thinking of any indefeasible choice of individuals for final salvation than is the Second Isaiah, whose teaching he reproduces. He is thinking of God's purpose being here worked out through His chosen instruments, and of the high position which thus belongs already to all members of the Church. Thus in Rom 8 [30] the course of Christian experience is not described beyond the point already reached; the thought of the future is still to come ([31, 32]). The word 'glorified,' like the words 'called' and 'justified,' is in the past tense, and looks back, as they do, to the beginning of the Christian life. The glory in view is that of being already raised up with Christ, and made to sit with Him in the heavenly places (Eph 2 [6]), of being already in 'the spirit' (Rom 8 [10]) conformed to the image of God's Son ([29]), though not yet in the body.* It is only when, like St. Augustine and Calvin, we attempt to individualize what in the Bible is spoken of the members of the Church corporately, and substitute for the thought of election to privilege the thought of an arbitrary appointment to final salvation, that St. Paul's language rightly repels us.

Belief in Israel.—(*b*) Secondly, St. Paul as a Pharisee had, in a true sense, a profound belief in the Church. The word 'Ecclesia,' which we translate as 'Church,' is derived from the LXX translation of the Old Testament. Its Hebrew equivalent was originally used of the people of God as actually assembled, but before the Lord's time it had come to be applied to the people of God whether assembled or not (cf. for the earlier meaning Ps 22 [22], and for the later Ecclus 44 [15]; Ac 7 [38]; Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, Lecture I). Thus it was Israel which was 'the Church' before the Lord came; and, as we shall presently see, St. Paul regards the Catholic Church as continuing its life. Moreover, it is hardly a paradox to claim for Israel itself the 'notes of the Church.' Israel in the eyes of the Pharisees, however sorely its members might be outwardly divided, was essentially one by the common life derived from Abraham, and by the more spiritual bond of a common relation to God, a common faith and hope, law and worship. The outward divisions were to be only for a time. It was holy, or 'set apart,' by its call to be God's peculiar people; and it was to the honour of the Pharisees that in word and deed they insisted upon this. It was Catholic in the sense that members of other nations might be incorporated into it (cf. Mt 23 [15]; Rom 15 [8-12]), and by our Lord's day had in great numbers been so. It was Apostolic in that Israel was God's appointed messenger and witness to the world, 'sent' to attract it to God by the glory and blessedness of its national life (Zech 8 [23]).

Now, if to the Hebrews belief in God was the first article of the Creed, belief in Israel His people was the second. Israel was the fruitful vine, which God had planted. It was God's Son, His firstborn, His wife, His house, His heritage; the language used of the Church in the New Testament being in all these cases anticipated in the Old Testament. To Israel, as St. Paul says, belonged the adoption, and the Shechinah of glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises (Rom 9 [4]: cf. 3 [1-3]). Here again, as with the doctrine of God, we should especially notice the teaching of the Second Isaiah. Nowhere is the greatness of Israel's destiny more glowingly depicted than in his prophecy. Israel is Jehovah's servant, chosen and called by Him to be His witness, and the means of manifesting His glory to the world. He is its King, its Redeemer, its unfailing Support and Guide. It is the object of God's love, precious in His sight; and its perpetuity is secured by the purpose which God has for it. If St. Paul's words, in speaking of the Church, sometimes stagger us, as we think of the Church as we know it, there is little that is new in them. The Second Isaiah recognizes to the full, not only the miserable condition of God's people from the standpoint of the world, but also their spiritual blindness and deafness; but he speaks of their calling

* For a different view cf. Commentary on Romans, p. 472*b*.

and destiny as boldly as St. Paul himself.

From all this it followed that to the Hebrews religion was a corporate rather than an individual matter. It was primarily the nation, not the individual, that was in covenant with God; and thus patriotism and churchmanship were one. On membership in Israel all the blessings of God's people depended, and they looked for nothing in the future but what their membership would give to them. This corporate view of religion was in no way inconsistent with the growth of a deep personal religion; even in the Second Isaiah we can see how within the corporate sonship of the nation the individual sonship is already recognized. But it is the corporate religion which comes first both in time and in importance, except in the case of the great instruments of God to whom He specially reveals Himself. As Ruth well knew (Ru 1 [16]), our relation to God is normally inseparable from our relation to the people of God; to be cut off from God's people is to lose all.

The Divine Vindication.—(*c*) Thirdly, St. Paul as a Pharisee believed in a coming 'day of Jehovah,' a divine intervention for the vindication of His people against all hostile powers, seen or unseen, and the establishment of His own reign of righteousness and peace. The Pharisees, unlike the Zealots, had no confidence in armed insurrection against the power of Rome. They believed that, when God's Law was rightly observed, God would make bare His 'holy arm in the eyes of all the nations,' and that all the ends of the earth would see His salvation (Is 52 [10]: cf. 2 Th 1 [5-10], which is full of Old Testament reminiscences). Here too the Second Isaiah was St. Paul's great teacher; and we must pay particular attention to his language. As we have just seen, Israel as a nation was in covenant with God; and covenant implies mutual obligation. Of course, Jehovah and His people were not contracting parties who met on equal terms; it had been for God alone to define the terms of their relationship. But, when once the bond had been formed, God was bound by it as well as His people; and it is here that we begin to understand the meaning of 'righteousness' as we find the word employed in the Second Isaiah and St. Paul. The righteousness of which they speak does not primarily rest upon the correspondence of conduct with any abstract law of right, but upon faithfulness to covenant obligations. God's people are righteous by the fulfilment of the claims which by the terms of the covenant God makes upon them; and God is righteous by the fulfilment of the claims, which by the terms of the covenant His people make upon Him. Indeed, so entirely does God's righteousness consist in His faithfulness to His promises, that, when He is charged with unrighteousness, it is enough to reply that He has but done what He said that He would do (Rom 9 [14, 15]). Thus in Isaiah, the Psalms, and elsewhere, God's righteousness, so far from being contrasted with His saving activity, is in fact identical with it (Is 51 [5, 8], etc.; Jer 23 [6]; Ps 31 [1], etc.); to be 'a just God and a Saviour' (Is 45 [21]) are not two things but one.

Justification Practical.—It is here again that we see the practical character of justification. To justify is to vindicate on the open stage of the world (Is 45 [24, 25], etc.). Alike in the Old Testament and in the New Testament its primary meaning is neither to 'make righteous' nor to 'account righteous.' It means to 'declare to be righteous,' and that generally 'not in word, but in power' (Is 54 [14-17]). Of course, we may regard God's public action on His people's behalf as having behind it a 'judgment' as to their righteousness delivered in His court; this forensic use of 'justify' is found in the Second Isaiah (Is 43 [9, 26], 54 [17]), and may appear in St. Paul himself. But the mind of God is only known to us through His action; and it is with His action that we are primarily concerned. Just as because of our human weakness human 'judgment' generally means human opinion, so because of the divine strength divine 'judgment' generally means divine action. The appeal so frequent in the Psalms (7 [8], 26 [1], etc.), 'Judge me, O Lord,' is an appeal for vindicating action; the Hebrew mind is not at all 'subjective,' and cares little for a vindication which is other than practical. When the Pharisees, and St. Paul himself (Gal 5 [5]), looked for vindication at the great day, they looked for a public vindication before the universe, which would declare both God's righteousness and their own (cf. Rom 3 [26]). Indeed, so completely is righteousness bound up with God's vindication of it that they hardly distinguished between the one and the other (cf. Dt 24 [13]; Ps 24 [5]).

The Expected Christ.—(*d*) Fourthly, and in close connexion with this threefold cord of faith in God, the Church and the coming justification, St. Paul as a Pharisee looked for the coming

of the Messiah or Christ. In the Old Testament the Messiah is a far less conspicuous figure than we usually suppose Him to be; it is Jehovah Himself who is the Redeemer of Israel, and not all the prophets expect Him to employ a human instrument. But the 'sure mercies' promised to David led many to expect an ideal king to arise from David's line (cf. Ac 13 [34]); and this hope, though long obscured, had again grown bright in the days before the coming of the Lord. Of the two chief conceptions of the Messiah current, that found in the Book of Enoch and that found in the Pharisaic Psalms of Solomon, the latter we should expect to be St. Paul's (cf. Rom 1 [3]). In the noble description of the conquering and righteous king, found in Ps. Sol. 17 [21-51], we are probably close to the original expectation of the Apostle. It is indeed not unlikely that St. Paul was acquainted with some form of the Book of Enoch, though the alleged parallels to its language in his epistles are not impressive. But if he was, he avoided the use of the titles which it gives to the Messiah. Not only does he never speak of the Messiah as the Son of Man—that title he may have regarded as unintelligible to the Gentile world. He never speaks of the Lord either as the 'Elect One' or as the 'Righteous One,' though both these titles were entirely accordant with his theology. When he says (1 Cor 15 [47]) that 'the second man is from heaven,' there is no reference to Enoch's heavenly son of man; St. Paul refers, as the context shows, to the exalted Christ, who will come from heaven to transform His members into His own likeness (1 Cor 15 [48, 49]; Phil 3 [20, 21]).

How then would St. Paul before his conversion, have thought of the expected Christ? (i) He would stand in a relation to God peculiarly His own as God's adopted Son, the destined sharer in His sovereignty (Ps 2, etc.; Ps. Sol. 17 [32] ff.: cf. Rom 10 [12]); 'the Lord' in St. Paul's writings seems always to mean the Lord Jesus Christ, except when he is quoting or referring to the Old Testament. (ii) He would stand in a relation peculiarly His own to the people of God. In the Old Testament the Christ and the Church are inseparable. The Christ is never the Saviour of the individual as such; He saves the individual by saving the people to which He belongs. Indeed, so inseparable is the Christ from the Church that it is sometimes hard to distinguish what is spoken of the one from what is spoken of the other. (iii) He would be the grand instrument of the divine vindication, and the Head and Centre of the Kingdom of God which would follow it (Ps 72, etc.: cf. 1 Cor 15 [25]). To these three elements in St. Paul's conception we must not add the Second Isaiah's picture of the Servant of the Lord, though here too it is hard to say whether we have always to do with Israel, or whether the divine purpose is primarily realized through an individual sufferer. The Jews do not seem to have regarded Is 53 as having any Messianic reference; and even in St. Paul's Christian days he refers but little to this chapter.

We need not go further in explaining those articles of St. Paul's belief which he carried with him into his new life as a Christian: very much which now belongs to the Creed of Christendom was already his. But we can now understand how 'exceedingly mad' against the Christians his Pharisaic outlook made him. They were the enemies of the people of God; the preaching of St. Stephen would have removed any doubt which he might have felt about that. They were insulting the hope of Israel by identifying the glorious Christ with a malefactor who had died under the curse of God; they were putting off the long-desired vindication by preaching faith in this malefactor instead of obedience to the Law as the means of obtaining it. Then came the vision on the Damascus road; and that at once taught St. Paul two things: (i) The Christ was Jesus of Nazareth, as the Church declared; the great vindication of God's people would come through Him. (ii) The true Church, which was one with the Messiah, was 'the sect of the Nazarenes'; for to persecute that, the Messiah said, was to persecute the Messiah Himself.

The New Truth. — (2) We pass now to the new truth which Christianity brought to St. Paul; and to the way in which it in part confirmed, and in part corrected, the faith which was already his. We shall not need, in explaining St. Paul's theology, to lay as much stress as is sometimes laid, either upon the peculiar experience involved in his conversion, or upon his supposed 'mysticism.' St. Paul well knew that his own experience was abnormal; he did not, like less wise teachers, expect it to be reproduced in other men; and, though the presence within him of the life of the risen Christ no doubt gave a new fulness of meaning to the doctrine which he taught, it by no means created it. In the discussion of religion to-day an exaggerated

stress is laid upon experience as the parent of doctrine. The former no doubt has its influence upon the latter; but the influence is reciprocal. It is largely truth accepted and made the basis of action, which both leads to religious experience and interprets it when gained. Moreover, before we speak of St. Paul as a mystic, we should make clear the sense in which we employ the word. Deissmann (*Paul*, new edition, 6) distinguishes between 'acting' and 'reacting' mysticism. The 'acting' mystic seeks for himself the revelation of truth and union with the divine by specially chosen methods of fasting, contemplation and prayer. But in 'reacting' mysticism the initiative lies with God, who reveals Himself to man, and awakens and transforms his inner life; man has but to respond to God and to yield himself to His grace. Now St. Paul, when his missionary work had once begun, was far too pressed by the demands made upon him (cf. 2 Cor 11 [23-29]) to have time for the 'acting' mystic's quest. Neoplatonism had not yet invaded the Church, and such language as that of 2 Cor 3 [18] refers simply to the transforming power of the divine grace. But a 'reacting' mystic he certainly was, as the saints of Israel had been before him, and all the greatest Christians have been after him (cf. Gal 2 [19, 20], 4 [19]; Phil 1 [21], etc.). It does not, however, follow from this that the theology of St. Paul was derived only from his personal experience of the divine grace. That grace was shown, as St. Paul himself assures us, by bringing him at once to the Church (Ac 22 [12-16]), and to the faith of the Church (Ac 15 [3] ff.); and from the first he became 'obedient from the heart, to 'the pattern of teaching' to which he was thus 'delivered' (Rom 6 [17]).

We shall then endeavour to show that St. Paul's theology as a Christian demands no recondite explanation. Its difference from his earlier theology is due to the facts that he became a disciple of the Lord, and that the Holy Spirit, in accordance with the Lord's promise, lit up both the teaching of the Lord Himself in His earthly life and that contained in His death and glorification. Just because, before St. Paul became a Christian, he was far more of a theologian than any of those who were Apostles before him, and had a far better acquaintance with the Old Testament, he saw the relation between the old truth and the new better than they did, and in theology became less their follower than their guide. But the Gospel which he proclaimed was identical with theirs, and the deeper theology which he worked out was such that they could accept it (Gal 2 [6-10]; 1 Cor 15 [11]).

St. Paul's Knowledge of the Historic Jesus.—But before proceeding to our principal task it may be well to justify the procedure which we propose to adopt, since it is not uncommonly supposed that St. Paul knew little about the earthly life and teaching of the Lord, and felt little interest in them. This paradox appears to rest upon two facts: the first being that St. Paul's mind is fixed upon the glorified Christ much more than upon the Jesus of history; and the second that he seldom directly quotes the words of the Lord, or refers to the details of His life (cf. 2 Cor 5 [16]).

Now, in the first place, St. Paul must surely have known much about the Lord's life and teaching before he became a Christian. The Pharisees had given much attention to the Lord's ministry; and, even if St. Paul was not in Palestine while that ministry was in progress, he would have learned about it from them before beginning his work as a persecutor (cf. Ac 22 [3-5], 26 [9-11]). In the second place, St. Paul became a member of the Church just as others did (Ac 9 [18, 19]: cf. 11 [25, 26], 13 [1]). He 'received' the faith of the Church as others received it (1 Cor 15 [3] ff.), and would have been instructed as others were in the life and teaching of the Lord (cf. Lk 1 [1, 4]). Indeed, had it been otherwise, his work as an Apostle would have been impossible (cf. Ac 28 [31]). How could he have answered the questions of his hearers or have given them the instruction which they required? St. Paul, moreover, set the highest value upon the traditions of the Church as to doctrine, morals and worship (1 Cor 11 [2]; 2 Th 2 [15], etc.); and these went back in many cases to the Lord Himself. It is inconceivable that St. Paul, in spite of all his opportunities for acquiring information about the Lord's life and teaching, failed to make use of them. To say nothing of his intercourse with the elder Apostles (Gal 1 and 2), he was the companion for long periods of St. Barnabas, and of St. Mark and St. Luke, the future evangelists. No doubt it is upon the glorified Lord that his gaze is fixed; but so is the gaze of St. Peter and St. John when they write their epistles; and it no more implies ignorance of the Lord's earthly life in St. Paul's case than in theirs. We generally think of the living as they are to-day; to be absorbed in a man's past means that he

is either dead, or so laid upon the shelf that he is as good as dead; and thus absorption in the Jesus of history always suggests an impoverished faith in the living Christ.

References to the Gospel Story.—How then, it will be asked, are we to explain the paucity of St. Paul's references to the earthly life and teaching of the Lord?

In the first place, we should notice that this paucity is much less marked than is often supposed. St. Paul's direct references to the Lord's teaching are less rare than those of St. Peter or St. John in their epistles (Ac 20 [35]; 1 Cor 7 [10], 9 [14], 11 [23] ff.: cf. Gal 3 [1]), and his indirect references are frequent (cf. e.g. Rom 12 [14, 19]; 1 Cor 7 [28, 33, 35], looking back to the words recorded in Lk 21 [23], 14 [20], and 10 [40-42]; 1 Cor 13 [2]; 2 Cor 10 [1]; 1 Th 5 [1-8], a passage full of reminiscences of the Lord's teaching). In all these cases St. Paul refers to that teaching which we find recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. But St. Paul's references do not seem to be confined to this. There is a close connexion between the teaching of St. Paul and that of the Fourth Gospel. Is this to be explained by supposing that the writer of the Fourth Gospel, in defiance of truth, puts St. Paul's teaching into the mouth of the Lord? On the contrary, the facts are far more easily explained, if we suppose that St. Paul was well acquainted with that tradition of the Lord's deeper teaching upon which the discourses of that Gospel were based, and that his mind was profoundly influenced by it. In the Fourth Gospel the teaching of the Lord may no doubt be expressed in the words of the evangelist himself, and adapted to the needs of the evangelist's contemporaries. But a true tradition of the deeper teaching of the Lord must lie behind the transcript which the evangelist gives; and that St. Paul knew it is the easiest explanation of much that he says. When St. Paul and the Fourth Gospel give substantially the same teaching, the form given to it by St. Paul, though much earlier in date, is often the fuller and more advanced. If e.g. we take the first piece of connected discourse ascribed to the Lord in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 3 [3-8]) we find that, while St. Paul reproduces it all (Rom 6 [3-11]; 2 Cor 5 [17]; Tit 3 [5]; Rom 8 [5-9]; 1 Cor 2 [14-16]), he does so with a significant addition: the new birth unto righteousness is seen to presuppose a previous death unto sin. Again, while in Jn 14-16 it is hard to disentangle what the Lord says about His return by the Resurrection, His return by the Spirit, and His final coming, in St. Paul's teaching all is clear, for the events of Easter and Pentecost have made it so (cf. also Jn 8 [34] with Rom 6 [16-20], and Jn 8 [35, 36] with Gal 4 [30]). The teaching of the Fourth Gospel, in spite of its adaptation to a later age, here faithfully reproduces the limitations natural during the Lord's earthly life, while St. Paul's is without these limitations. He does not, it is true, quote the Lord's teaching as freely as he quotes the Old Testament; the Jewish scribe has become a Christian prophet, and speaks 'the word of the Lord' with a living inspiration of his own. But to him, as to the elder Apostles, the teaching of the Spirit has largely been given by bringing to remembrance all that the Lord said, and lighting up its meaning (Jn 14 [26]).

Divisions of St. Paul's Theology.—How shall we divide St. Paul's theology? We shall keep his old theology in view throughout. But we shall not again speak of God, the Church, and the coming vindication apart from the Christ; for the Christ Himself profoundly affected St. Paul's thought of all three, and indeed of Christship itself. When the Christ came, He proved to be so much greater than the Christ who had been expected, that the old title proved too narrow to express all that He was found to be. St. Paul used it at first in dealing with the Jews (Ac 9 [22]), as St. Peter did; but it does not appear in his sermon at Pisidian Antioch. He prefers the confession of faith 'Jesus is the Lord' to the earlier confession 'Jesus is the Christ' (Rom 10 [9]; 1 Cor 12 [3]); and with him 'Christ' is on the way to become little more than a proper name, like 'Jesus' itself. No doubt it was possible to believe that the Christ was Jesus, and yet to maintain almost unchanged the old Pharisaic outlook. But St. Paul will not recognize this halfway house. We cannot put a Christian patch upon the old garment of Pharisaic Judaism; belief that Jesus is the Christ rends it past repair (Gal 2 [21]). Those who desired only the Christ of the Pharisees naturally found a stumbling-block in the Cross. It was because the Lord was so different a Christ from the Christ who had been expected that the Cross came.

St. Paul's Doctrine of God.—(*a*) We consider then first the doctrine of God. Here St. Paul had little or nothing to unlearn. He had found, as Deissmann says, 'a new position with regard to God, not a new doctrine of God.' Though unworthy conceptions of the divine activity and character are found

here and there in the Old Testament, they are inconsistent with its higher teaching; and St. Paul may never have held them. Thus apart from the Incarnation and the gift of the Spirit there is little to be added to what has been already said (cf. pp. 406, 407). Indeed, the new revelation itself is given as the old was given. Still the revelation comes through the facts of God's redeeming activity; and still it is for the prophet by the inspiration of the Spirit to recognize the revelation made and declare it to other men. But the purpose revealed is now a wider purpose (Rom 16 [25]; Eph 3 [18, 19]), and the facts which reveal it are greater facts than those upon which Paul the Pharisee had relied. The prophecy of Jeremiah that the old facts of divine redemption would no more be remembered is now fulfilled (Jer 23 [7, 8]). The love of God has now found a far more characteristic expression in the Cross (Rom 5 [8]), His power in the Resurrection (1 Cor 6 [14]; Eph 1 [19, 20]; Col 2 [12]), His wisdom in His dealings with His Church (Rom 11 [33]; Eph 3 [10]); and, when the Spirit lights up these facts and explains their meaning, the old revealing facts upon which Israel had relied are forgotten in the new. The God in whom St. Paul believes is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (2 Cor 1 [3], 11 [31] Eph 1 [17]), the God to whom the Lord had claimed a relationship all His own (Mt 11 [27]), the God upon whom the Lord had Himself relied and found His confidence justified. God who said, 'Out of darkness light shall shine, has shined in our hearts for the illumination of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ' (2 Cor 4 [6]). So to St. Paul the Fatherhood of God has acquired a tenderer and more personal meaning. St. Paul no more than the Lord, whose teaching he follows, speaks of God as the Father of all men (Rom 8 [14]). All indeed are by creation His 'offspring' (Ac 17 [28]); but not all are yet His 'children' by the new birth of the Spirit (Rom 8 [16] ff.), and His 'sons' (Gal 4 [6]) in their present freedom and glorious destiny. But all distinctions of race have now passed away (Gal 3 [26-28]); and within the Church itself sonship does not belong simply to the people of God as a whole, as generally in the Old Testament teaching (Ex 4 [22, 23]; Dt 32 [6], etc.), but to each and every member of God's Son Jesus Christ (Gal 4 [7]).

Now it is the eternal purpose of God and the manner of its fulfilment which are the great subjects of St. Paul's theology; and we shall never understand him if we allow his doctrine of God to be subordinated to any other doctrine whatsoever. It is the Father who has 'sent forth' both the Son and the Spirit (Gal 4 [4, 6]); they are His instruments, but not His delegates; and nothing is ever taken from Him to be given to them (cf. 1 Cor 8 [6] with Rom 11 [36]). Christ is God's (1 Cor 3 [23]); the Father is His God (2 Cor 1 [3]) and His Head (1 Cor 11 [3]); and, though He too is 'God blessed for ever' (Rom 9 [5]), it is only as one with the Father that He is so. Thus St. Paul always remains *pur sang* a monotheist; the activity of the Son or of the Spirit is always the Father's also. Indeed, there is nothing done for us which is not to be ascribed to the Father Himself. It is He who foreknows and selects the instruments of His purpose, who foreordains their adoption and attainment of the image of His Son, who calls and justifies and glorifies them (Rom 8 [29, 30]; Eph 1 [4-6]). So it is all through the Christian life. As the Father recreates (Eph 2 [10]) and quickens (Col 2 [13]), so He reveals (Gal 1 [16]) and teaches (1 Th 4 [9]), keeps (1 Th 5 [23]) and confirms till the end (1 Cor 1 [8]), works for His human instruments (Gal 2 [8]), bestows their office upon them (1 Cor 12 [28]), and gives the increase, as their work is done (1 Cor 3 [6, 7]). Much which St. Paul ascribes to the Father he also ascribes to the Son or to the Spirit. But the thought of Their activity must never lead us away from the thought of the Father's; every revelation and experience of Either is a revelation and experience of the Father Himself.

It is then against this monotheistic background that we must regard all that St. Paul says of the Son and of the Spirit. But we must not minimize what he does say. Though St. Paul is no systematic theologian, his thought is fundamentally Trinitarian (e.g. Rom 15 [15, 16]; 1 Cor 6 [11], 12 [4-6]; 2 Cor 1 [21, 22], 13 [14]; Tit 3 [4-6]), and the later doctrine of the Trinity very largely rests upon his teaching. It may be well to illustrate this before advancing further, though the Divinity of the Son and of the Spirit are not truths which we can profitably separate from that doctrine of salvation in which They are revealed.

The Lord's Divinity.—(i) How does the Divinity of the Lord appear in St. Paul's epistles? From the first he seems to have grasped it with a clearness peculiarly his own, though without thereby in any way weakening his sense of warm personal fellowship with his Master. The language of Ac 9 [20]—'he proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God'—has no parallel earlier in the book, and seems to mark a new

emphasis upon our Lord's position. The title 'Son of God' is never a mere synonym for the title 'Christ,' though the Christ was to receive the divine adoption (Ps 2 [7], 89 [26, 27]); and probably in St. Paul it has never a Messianic reference. Our Lord's Sonship, as St. Paul thinks of it, is one which is His alone. He is not only already God's Son (Gal 1 [16]) when sent forth to His incarnate life (Gal 4 [4]), but God's 'own Son' (Rom 8 [3, 32]), the Son of His peculiar love (Col 1 [13]: cf. Eph 1 [6]). Thus the title 'the Son of God' in St. Paul, and perhaps elsewhere, carries with it a reference to the Lord's life 'in the form of God' (Phil 2 [6]) before He was 'manifested in the flesh' (1 Tim 3 [16]). This pre-incarnate life is to St. Paul as to St. John something profoundly real, and not merely a speculative inference from what the Lord has been found to be (cf. Phil 2 [5] ff.; 2 Cor 8 [9]). Indeed, so real is it that it gives a new meaning to the Old Testament language. St. Paul sees the Lord in the mysterious 'Angel of Jehovah,' the companion of God's people in the wilderness (1 Cor 10 [4, 9]), and in that creative 'wisdom' of God whose position is described in Pr 8 [22-31] and the later Wisdom literature (cf. Wisd 7 [25, 26]; 1 Cor 8 [6]; 2 Cor 4 [4]; Col 1 [15-17]). This doctrine of God's creative Wisdom is more important for the understanding of St. Paul than is generally recognized. The language of Phil 2 [5] ff. and 2 Cor 8 [9] is generally interpreted as if the Son of God before His Incarnation lived only with the Father in some heavenly sphere, and 'came down from heaven.' A somewhat mythological conception of the Incarnation is thus suggested, and to some occasions difficulty. But it is God's creative 'Wisdom,' of whom St. Paul almost certainly thinks as being 'in the form of God,' and as emptying Himself of His glory within the sphere of the incarnate life. No doubt if we believe that Creation was 'in time,' the Son had a glory with the Father 'before the world was' (Jn 17 [5]). But St. Paul thinks of the Incarnation as it is thought of by St. John and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Jn 1 [1-3, 14]; Heb 1 [1] ff.); it is the divine Word or Wisdom who is incarnate, and not any Being remotely suggestive of the Heavenly Son of Man of the Book of Enoch (cf. Jn 5 [17, 19], 8 [58], where also the divine Wisdom is probably in view). Thus there is nothing peculiar to St. Paul in his doctrine of the Incarnation. What is new is his special emphasis upon the Lord's Divinity. He is, of course, entirely clear in his witness to the Lord's Humanity also (Rom 5 [15], 8 [3]; 1 Cor 15 [21, 47]; Gal 4 [4]; Phil 2 [8]; Col 2 [9]; 1 Tim 2 [5]), and in Rom 1 [3, 4] and Phil 2 [6, 7] comes nearer to formulating the doctrine of 'two natures' in the Lord than any other New Testament writer. But his emphasis is on the Divinity; and, when a line has to be drawn between the divine and the human, it is on the divine side that the Lord is found (Gal 1 [1]).

Direct Assertions.—How is this Divinity of the Lord asserted? First, St. Paul directly asserts it. He speaks of Him, as we have seen, as 'God, blessed for ever' (Rom 9 [5]), no other interpretation of the passage being surely possible; and the same definite ascription of Divinity is probably found in 2 Th 1 [12] and Tit 2 [13]. Equally clear is the language of Col 2 [9]—'in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' (cf. Col 1 [19]); and almost equally that of Phil 2 [6], since, whatever the exact shade of meaning which we give to the word 'form,' it either asserts our Lord's Divinity or implies it. So it is that, like other New Testament writers, St. Paul freely applies language spoken of Jehovah in the Old Testament to the Lord Himself (Rom 10 [12, 13]; 1 Cor 1 [2], 2 [16]; Phil 2 [10, 11]). He does not indeed assert that the Old Testament language applies to the Lord alone; the words quoted in Phil 2 [10, 11] are in Rom 14 [11] applied to the Father. But so fully is the Father found in Christ that such words may be applied to Either. Again, we may sin against Christ as we sin against God (1 Cor 8 [12]); and tempt Christ as we tempt God (1 Cor 10 [9]). The day of Jehovah becomes the day of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor 1 [8], etc.); the tribunal of God (Rom 14 [10]) the tribunal of Christ (2 Cor 5 [10]); the Kingdom of God (Rom 14 [17]) the Kingdom of Christ (Eph 5 [5]); the Church of God (1 Cor 10 [32]) the Church of Christ (Rom 16 [16]); and the Spirit of God (1 Cor 2 [11]) the Spirit of Christ (Rom 8 [9]). Indeed, as we shall presently see, it does not matter whether we speak of the faith which God asks of us as faith in God or as faith in Christ, if only we understand that faith in Christ is itself faith in God and nothing else. St. Paul prays to Christ (Rom 10 [13]; 2 Cor 12 [8, 9]), relies upon His providence (1 Th 3 [11]), offers to Him thanksgiving (1 Tim 1 [12]) and glory (2 Tim 4 [18]: cf. Rom 9 [5]), and thinks of hymns being sung in His honour (Eph 5 [19]).

His Place in Redemption.—Secondly, we must take account of the Lord's place in the scheme of redemption.

With this and with His present relation to the Church we shall deal later. It will be found that the character of the redemption involves the Divinity of Him by whom it is accomplished, and that the relation of Christ to the Church is one which no created being could possess; St. Paul's great phrase 'in Christ' will carry us far. But even the details of St. Paul's language are significant. The Lord is continually associated with the Father as the source of grace and peace and mercy (Gal 1 [3], etc.; 1 Tim 1 [2]); His love, just because it is divine, passes knowledge (Eph 3 [19]). He is the Head, not merely of the Church, but of every individual man (1 Cor 11 [3]), the supreme Law-giver (1 Cor 7 [10], 9 [14. 21]), the present Ruler (1 Cor 11 [32]), the future Judge (1 Cor 4 [5]; 2 Cor 5 [10. 11], etc.), the Giver of light (Eph 5 [14]), the Bestower of apostleship (Rom 1 [5]), the Transformer of character (1 Th 3 [12]), the Comforter and Stablisher (2 Th 2 [16. 17]: cf. 3 [3. 5]).

Doctrine of the Spirit.—(ii) The same is true, though less clearly, of St. Paul's doctrine of the Spirit. The Divinity of the Spirit of God there was no need to assert, for no Jew would have denied it. In the Old Testament the Spirit is simply God in action, and that specially in His inspiration of the prophets and vindicators of His people; and that the Spirit of the living God is Himself living goes without saying. But the conception of individual personality had in the Old Testament scarcely arisen, and was certainly not raised in relation to the Spirit of God. In the language of St. Paul, however, as in the Lord's teaching in the Fourth Gospel, there is a marked change. The Old Testament language is still in part maintained; there is much which St. Paul says of the Spirit which hardly suggests personality; it is the action of the Spirit and the result of His action which are prominent rather than His 'Person.' But it is not always so. Though the Spirit is not incarnate as the Lord is, and we lack the help towards grasping His distinctness from the Father which incarnation gives, He is sent by the Incarnate Christ (Rom 8 [9]; 2 Cor 3 [17]; Phil 1 [19]) as well as by the Father, and the thought of His distinctness from the Father thus inevitably arises. Here, as we have already seen, where the teaching of St. Paul runs parallel with that of the Fourth Gospel, and may find a part of its basis in the tradition which that Gospel embodies, it is the teaching of St. Paul which on the whole is the more advanced. There is hardly anything in the Fourth Gospel which so strongly suggests distinct personality as 1 Cor 2 [10] and 12 [11]; and, while in the 4th Gospel the work of the Spirit seems to be primarily a work of illumination, in St. Paul it is much wider. Not only does He reveal (1 Cor 2 [10. 12], 12 [3]; Eph 3 [5]), and bear witness (Rom 8 [16]), and bestow spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12 [4] ff.); He is also the source of the Christian character (Gal 5 [22. 23]); He converts (2 Cor 3 [3]) and transforms (2 Cor 3 [18]) and guides (Rom 8 [14]); He is the Inspirer of prayer (Rom 8 [26. 27]) and worship (Phil 3 [3]), the Creator of unity (Eph 4 [3]), and the Vindicator of moral freedom (Rom 8 [2. 13]); He consecrates and justifies (1 Cor 6 [11]; 2 Th 2 [13]), and strengthens with power in the inner man (Eph 3 [16]). So it is also when we think of our own response to His activity. We are to deal with Him as with a 'Person'; we are not to 'grieve' Him (Eph 4 [30]). Such language as this not only implies the Divinity of the Spirit, but a certain distinctness of personality also; and it implies both none the less, because it not only looks back to the Lord's teaching, but is the fruit of Christian experience. Moreover, this distinctness is not merely relative to the Father, but in some degree to the Lord also. It is true that the same work is often ascribed both to the Lord and to the Spirit, and that we may say either that Christ dwells in us by the Spirit, or that the Spirit comes to us from the ascended Lord. In Christian experience we cannot exactly distinguish between the work of the One and the work of the Other. But there is no example of any confusion between the two; in 2 Cor 3 [17] the words 'the Lord' should be placed between inverted commas, since St. Paul is interpreting the Old Testament language of the previous verse; and the very fact that St. Paul passes frequently backwards and forwards from the One to the Other implies their distinctness the One from the Other.

Doctrine of the Church.—(*b*) How did St. Paul's Christian faith affect his doctrine of the Church? Quite as profoundly as his doctrine of God. The old corporate outlook indeed remains unaltered. It is the Church which Christ loved and for which He gave Himself (Eph 5 [25]), and the Church of which He is the Saviour now (Eph 5 [23]). The individual, as we shall presently see, shares in the divine redemption and in all that it brings by his membership in the one Body (1 Cor 12 [12. 13]; Eph 4 [4-6]; Col 3 [15]). St. Paul's accounts of the blessings which Christians enjoy (Rom 8 [28] ff.; Eph 1 [3] ff.) all presuppose this membership

(cf. Eph 1 [14, 22, 23]). But God has now given His Christ to be Head over all things to the Church (Eph 1 [22]), and that makes all the difference to the character of its life.

Now in this corporate outlook St. Paul, as always, is a faithful follower of the Lord's teaching. Our Lord thought of the Church as the prophets had thought before Him. God in His parables is the King and Father of His people Israel. The parables of Lk 15 in their original meaning refer to Israel alone; as all the Lord's hearers knew, it is Israel that is God's flock, God's treasure, and God's family. It is thus to Israel, the Lord teaches, that the Kingdom of God at present belongs (Mt 21 [43]); its sons are 'the sons of the kingdom' (Mt 8 [12]); and Jerusalem is the city of the Great King (Mt 5 [35]). Thus again it is to Israel that the Lord's life is devoted (Mt 15 [24]); the sons and daughters of Abraham have a claim which is peculiarly their own (Lk 13 [16], 19 [9]); and His appeal is made city by city, and village by village, to every class, not even excepting the outcasts. If Israel was not gathered (Is 49 [5]), it was no fault of His (cf. Mt 23 [37]). But He warned the people of God, like the prophets before Him, that there could be no continuance of their position of privilege unless they responded by faith to the call of God (Mt 21 [43], etc.). Those who do not the works of Abraham are no children of Abraham (Jn 8 [39]); many will come 'from the east and the west, and sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the sons of the kingdom will be cast into the outer darkness' (Mt 8 [11, 12]). More than this, even in the Lord's earthly life we see a new Israel, the faithful remnant of the old, coming into being. Through the shifting sand of the impenitent and unbelieving, He digs down till His spade strikes the rock; and upon this, He says, He will build His Church anew (cf. Is 4 [3, 4], 10 [20-23], etc.). The test is belief in the Lord's Messiahship and attachment to His Person; 'they are not all Israel, which are of Israel' (Rom 9 [6] ff.); and, if Israel as a nation rejects its Messiah, its national life must pass away.

The New Israel.—Now it is this that we find St. Paul maintaining; the new Israel, the Israel of God, is the Church of Christ (Gal 6 [16]), upon which the Spirit has come. But it has no more lost continuity with the old than the restored Israel of Ezra and Nehemiah had lost continuity with the Israel of David and of Isaiah. There is but one good olive tree of the Church of God, holy by that root of the patriarchs from which it has sprung (Rom 11 [13,24]: cf. Jer 11 [16]). The Jews who have believed in Jesus as Christ and Lord were branches before the Christ came, and they are branches still. But the Jews who refused to believe have been broken off because of their unbelief, while believers from among the Gentiles have been grafted in, and partake of the root and fatness of the olive tree. What God is asking of His people is just that faith which He has always asked; and no one who refuses to believe in Him whom God has sent can have part or lot in the fulfilment of His purpose. In this, St. Paul urges, there is nothing new. Again and again in the history of God's people the many have fallen away, and only a 'remnant' have been saved to be the heirs of the promise (Rom 9 [27-29], 11 [4, 5]). So it is with the incoming of the Gentiles. God always intended it, and again and again foretold it (Rom 9 [25], 10 [19, 20], 15 [9-12]). The true seed of Abraham are those who share Abraham's faith (Gal 3 [6-9, 29]) and find their unity in the larger Christ—Christ as including His people (Gal 3 [16]: cf. for this use of 'Christ' 1 Cor 12 [12]). God from the first in the promises which He made relied upon Abraham's influence (Gen 18 [19]); it is only as Abraham is followed that God can 'bring upon' Abraham and his seed 'that which he hath spoken of him.'

Thus we find St. Paul, like St. Peter (1 P 2 [9]), claiming for the Church of Christ all the titles, the privileges, and the promises of the old Israel. It is the true circumcision (Eph 2 [11]; Phil 3 [3]), God's household (Gal 6 [10]; Eph 2 [19]: cf. 1 Tim 3 [15]), and people (Rom 9 [25]; Tit 2 [14]), and inheritance (Eph 1 [18]); its members are the true saints, or consecrated people (1 Cor 6 [1], 14 [33], etc.), the true sons and heirs of God (Gal 3 [26]; Rom 8 [14-17]), supernaturally born through faith in the divine promise (Gal 4 [23, 28]). So again the old fathers themselves are the fathers of all Christians (1 Cor 10 [1]); the Old Testament is written for us all (1 Cor 10 [11]), and only when we believe do we rightly understand it (2 Cor 3 [14-16]; 2 Tim 3 [15]). There is no harm in saying that Christ founded the Church or that the Church has taken the place of Israel, if we do not forget its continuity with the past. But no such language is found in the New Testament; the word 'build' (Mt 16 [18]), unlike the word 'found,' does not necessarily imply a fresh beginning (cf. Jer 1 [10], etc.; 1 Cor 8 [1], 14 [4]). Rather the Church is itself

Israel, inheriting Israel's unbroken life and unfailing promises (cf. carefully Ac 15 [15] ff.). What St. Paul holds about Gentile believers is not that it does not matter whether or no they belong to the commonwealth of Israel, or whether or no they are fellow-citizens with the old saints, but that, as baptized members of Christ, this position is already theirs (Eph 2 [12-22]).

Religion Corporate.—We see then that the true religion, as St. Paul understands it, is as definitely the religion of a people and a Church as it was before the Lord came. The Church, as St. Paul thinks of it, is just as much a visible body as the Jews or the Greeks (1 Cor 10 [32]); and the difference is clearly marked between those who are without and those who are within (1 Cor 5 [9-12], 14 [23]). Its preachers are the preachers of the society (1 Cor 12 [28]), and call their hearers into that society. The society itself has its visible sacraments of entrance and adherence, its organized ministry and regular discipline, its traditions, moral, doctrinal and liturgical, to which all should defer (1 Cor 11 [16], 14 [36]). No doubt St. Paul speaks not only of the Church but of the churches (Rom 16 [4]; 1 Cor 11 [16], etc.); this language was specially natural when the bodies of Christians in the great cities were separated one from another by tracts of unevangelized country. But 'the Church' is just as much prior in thought to 'the churches' as Israel had been to the organized societies of Jews scattered in the cities of the empire; and, when St. Paul speaks of 'the Church,' except when the context demands a more restricted meaning, it is the Church universal which he has in view (cf. e.g. 1 Cor 12 [28]; Eph 4 [4-12]; 1 Tim 3 [15]). But, though we should never employ such a phrase as 'the invisible Church,' St. Paul does not forget the truth for which it stands. Still, even after the Lord has come, 'they are not all Israel which are of Israel' and Christians may forfeit their position as Jews have done (1 Cor 10 [1-13]). It is the gift of the Spirit which makes the Church what it is; and 'if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his' (Rom 8 [9]: cf. also 1 Cor 15 [2]; 2 Cor 13 [5]; 2 Tim 2 [19]). It is not in accordance with St. Paul's teaching to distinguish between union with the visible Church and union with Christ. But it is quite in accordance with it to distinguish between a living and fruitful union with Christ and His Church and a union fruitless and only for a time because of the absence of a living faith (cf. Jn 15 [1-6]).

Relation of the Church to Christ.—But we cannot enter far into St. Paul's doctrine of the Church without considering more fully its relationship to Christ Himself. It is this which is the very centre of St. Paul's teaching. The Church is the body of Christ (Rom 12 [5]; 1 Cor 12 [27], etc.); the Christian is a man 'in Christ' (2 Cor 12 [2]); and the purpose of God is to create out of Jews and Gentiles 'one new man' (Eph 2 [15], 4 [24]). This unity of Christ and His people was, as we have seen, implied in the revelation which led St. Paul to faith (Ac 9 [5]), and came to possess for him an ever-deepening meaning through his own experience; the phrase 'in Christ' has a new frequency in the Epistles of the Captivity. But the roots of this conception lie far back in Hebrew thought, and we must understand what they are.

Corporate Unity.—We observe then first that in primitive thought the unity which belongs to a family or a tribe is more fully recognized than among ourselves. Such names as Israel, Esau, Jacob and Joseph are used indifferently of the individual and of the people which has sprung from him; and, in the Old Testament, stories told of individuals may in fact refer to the tribes which are regarded as their offspring. The father of the tribe contains within himself all who will spring from him (cf. Heb 7 [9, 10]), and his action affects them both for good and for evil. Such language as that of Ex 20 [5, 6], though it seems to do violence to the rights of personality, and needs the careful guarding which the great prophets give to it (Jer 31 [29]; Ezek 18), contains none the less a profound truth. Heredity and tradition are forces of immense power; and it is only by slow stages that the individual comes unto his own, and can be dealt with apart from the body to which he belongs. It is on these lines that St. Paul seeks to explain the reign of sin and death (Rom 5 [12] ff.; 1 Cor 15 [21, 22]); and, when he adds that Adam is 'a figure of him that was to come' (Rom 5 [14]), it is plain that he thinks of the unity of Christ and His people in a somewhat similar way. This unity is primarily a unity of life. By baptism we become animated by the same principle of life (Rom 6 [5]), that we may be conformed to the likeness of Him whose life we share (Rom 8 [29]). The Christian is not 'in Christ' as a bird is in the air, or a fish in the water; rather he is 'in Him,' as borne along in a stream of vital influence, to which more or less fully he yields himself, and through which the Lord is making him all that he is himself willing to become.

Nor is it Adam only whom St. Paul has in mind; we must take account of Abraham also. Abraham by his great acts of faith and self-surrender affected all his descendants, and won the promise for them all. As in Adam all died, even so in Abraham were all his children in a true sense made alive; and all who, yielding to his life flowing in their veins and his example calling them to a faith like his own, kept 'the way of the Lord' would inherit the promise. The 'merits of the fathers' were as real a ground of hope to St. Paul (Rom 11 [28]) as the merits of the saints to Catholics of later days; and, though the thought might be abused, and needed to be carefully guarded (Jer 15 [1]; Ezek 14 [14]; Mt 3 [9]), it was not one to be cast aside, for *noblesse oblige*. So it is with the Lord. The one great act of surpassing righteousness (Rom 5 [18]), by which the Lord yielded Himself up for all who should hereafter be His members, is an act that is ever living in the stream of life and influence which flows from Him through the Spirit; and, as in our baptism we die with Him to sin, we rise with and in Him to newness of life (Rom 6 [1-10]).

We observe, secondly, that it is this unity of Christ with His people which lies at the root of St. Paul's doctrine of the sacrifice of the Cross. St. Paul, like St. Peter, does not in his sermons in the Acts directly refer to the Cross as the means of forgiveness. The Lord had led the Apostles to faith in Himself as the Christ before He identified Himself with the Suffering Servant of Jehovah; and the Apostles follow His method. Forgiveness and the gift of the Spirit are offered as the reward of faith in Jesus as the Christ; and it is not necessary for their reception to know how they have been obtained. But 'that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures' is part of 'the Gospel' in the larger sense, and it was one of the truths of that primitive Creed which converts received (1 Cor 15 [1-3]).

The Atonement.—What then is St. Paul's view of the Atonement? Atonement through sacrifice was so familiar both to Jews and Gentiles that this part of the faith presented little difficulty to them. The Lord had identified Himself with the Suffering Servant, and had spoken clearly of the purpose of His death (Mk 10 [45], 14 [22-24]). St. Paul believed His word, and interpreted it by the sacrificial teaching of the Old Testament, without endeavouring fully to explain the *rationale* of what He had done. He regards the Lord's sacrifice as primarily an offering for sin, though other forms of Old Testament sacrifice are regarded as finding their fulfilment in it (1 Cor 5 [7]; Eph 5 [2]). But as a Pharisee he was not specially interested in the sacrificial system. His statements of the truth are for the most part simple and popular (Rom 5 [6-11], 8 [3]; 2 Cor 5 [18]; Gal 1 [4], 3 [13]; Eph 1 [7], 5 [2, 25]), and closely connected with their moral application (1 Cor 6 [20], 7 [23]; 2 Cor 5 [15]). Indeed, apart from his characteristic doctrine of union with Christ he makes only one statement peculiarly his own. He says that God sent forth His Son to be 'an expiation, through faith, by his blood because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime' (Rom 3 [25]), his meaning apparently being that, had there been no such public expiation, God's 'forbearance' with the world's sin might have been misinterpreted. St. Paul's great contribution to the doctrine of the Atonement lies in the way in which he connects it with the union of Christ with the Church. It was 'for the Church' that Christ 'gave Himself up' (Eph 5 [25]); and it is the union between Christ and His people which makes His Atonement available for them. The idea of substitution is not found in St. Paul's writings; his language is that Christ died 'for' us, not that He died 'instead of' us; and he always regards union with Christ as necessary to our profiting by what He has done (cf. Col 1 [13, 14]). 'One died for all,' therefore all died' (2 Cor 5 [14]); 'Him who knew no sin' God 'made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him' (2 Cor 5 [21]). The language here seems to be carefully chosen. The Lord died 'for' us as one separate from us, for we were not yet His members when He hung upon the Cross. But we become God's righteousness 'in' Him, for not until we become His members does His work take effect. God 'made' Christ 'to be sin' only in the sense that in giving Him up to death He treated Him as the sin which in His death was slain (cf. Rom 8 [3], and for this use of 'made to be' Jn 5 [18], etc.); but we 'become' God's righteousness, for the result of His work is a great reality. The acceptance with God which the Lord has won through His perfect fulfilment of the divine claim is ours as well as His.

Union with Christ.—We see then how true to Hebrew thought this great conception of union with Christ is. It appears dimly even in the Synoptic teaching (Mt 10 [40-42], 18 [20], 25 [35] ff.), and clearly in the Johannine (Jn 15 [1-7]), where the 'Vine' is the old symbol of

Israel; and St. Paul probably knew what the Lord's teaching had been. But he makes more of it than any other New Testament writer, and applies it in a greater variety of ways (cf. in this order: Gal 1 [22]; Eph 1 [1]; 1 Cor 4 [15]; Phil 1 [14]; Col 4 [17]; Phil 4 [2]; Rom 14 [14]; Phil 1 [8], 4 [13], 2 [24]; 1 Cor 4 [17]; Col 3 [18, 20], 1 [28]; 1 Cor 15 [18], all these uses being different one from another). Christ is sometimes regarded as the Head of the Church; while sometimes He and the Church are so identified that the Church itself bears the name of Christ (1 Cor 12 [12, 13]; Gal 3 [16]), and, as St. Augustine says, *Totus Christus caput et membra est.* There is here no confusion. The thoughts brought out by the one way of speaking are as important as those brought out by the other.

The first view of the Lord's relation to the Church is most fully expounded in the Epistles of the Captivity (cf. especially Eph 4 [15, 16]; Col 2 [19]). It is the Lord Himself from whom proceeds the whole life of the Church, and upon whom its growth depends. The individual member lives not so much by an individual gift of divine life as by sharing in the life of the whole. By the Hebrews life at all its levels is realistically conceived; and regarded as a gift from God, the fountain of life (Gen 2 [7]; Lev 17 [11]; Ps 36 [9], 104 [29]). Always it is the 'life' of the body which preserves its unity; when life departs, the body is dissolved into its elements. To this rule eternal life (Rom 6 [23]), the life that is life indeed (1 Tim 6 [19]), affords no exception; and St. Paul's language in Eph 4 [15, 16] is very seriously meant. In the Body of Christ a 'life' higher than any other life is flowing, the life of the Spirit, or of 'grace'; and it both is mediated by the Body to the individual member, and preserves the unity of the whole (Eph 4 [3]).

The Gift of Life.—Now the thought of this 'life,' regard it as we may, is of the first importance; and it is better like the Hebrews to think of it realistically than to explain it away because we cannot find any satisfactory way of conceiving it. It is often said to-day that grace means personal influence; and the statement is of value if rightly understood. The influence of the risen Lord is the influence of a Person upon persons, and proceeds from His conscious will. But the statement may be understood to mean that the Lord only influences from without by His teaching and example, and then it is not at all in accordance with St. Paul's mind. St. Paul sets in strong contrast law and grace, the external standard and the indwelling Spirit which renders possible its attainment; and it is the latter, not the former, which is the characteristic gift of the Lord (Rom 8 [2]; 2 Cor 3 [6]). St. Paul like St. John lays great stress upon the indwelling life of the Body of Christ. But he lays even greater stress than St. John upon its corporate character (though cf. 1 Jn 1 [3]); and that is one reason why he cares so passionately both for the holiness and for the unity of the Church. It is in the Church that we are united with Christ; and the inflow of His life cannot be unaffected either by the evil which the Church tolerates (1 Cor 5 [6], 15 [33]), or by the separation one from another of those who ought to be united. When St. Paul speaks of 'every contact with the supply, according to the working in due measure of each several part' (Eph 4 [16]), he probably thinks chiefly of those human gifts of Christ, of whom he has so recently spoken (4 [11]; cf. 2 Cor 4 [11, 12]). But all members of the Body ought in their measure to mediate the powers of the Spirit to the other members (cf. Rom 1 [11, 12]; Phil 1 [19]). It is just because in the Church as we know it to-day this mediation so largely fails that we come to regard the sacraments as channels of grace which may be employed without any thought of the corporate life. The truth is that, since the sacraments have for one of their purposes incorporation into the Church and continuance in it, they lose much of their value when the flow of the divine life in the Church is as terribly hindered as to-day it is. St. Paul's ideal is that the unity which the gift of the Spirit bestows should be jealously preserved by the humility and forbearance of our conduct one to another (Eph 4 [1-3]); that through the Spirit's influence Christians should have but one mind, heart, and will (1 Cor 1 [10, 11]; Phil 1 [27], 2 [1-4]); and finally that we should not only remain in one Body and possess a unity visible even to the world (Eph 4 [4])—that ought to go without saying—but all attain to a unity loftier still, the unity of the man full-grown, both in the number of his members and in the fulness of his life, 'the Christ that is to be' (Eph 4 [13]). Nor was this to him an ideal only; it was his ceaseless effort to forward its attainment. He knew that his insistence upon the Catholicity of the Church imperilled its unity; the line of least resistance was to allow the Jewish and Gentile Churches to drift apart. But he would no more tolerate this than tolerate divisions

within local churches (1 Cor 1 [11-13]); and it is the relation of the Church to Christ which is his great ground of appeal.

The second view of the Lord's relation to the Church is that of identification. The thought is difficult, and apart from the phrase 'in Christ' rarely appears; we are thus disposed to substitute some other for it. We speak of a new 'humanity,' meaning by that a multitude of individuals transformed by sharing in the perfect 'humanity' of the Lord. But the Hebrews knew nothing of Platonic universals, and the language of St. Paul suggests no such idea as this. His thought is concrete, and the well-known title-page of Hobbes's *Leviathan* may help us to grasp it. The body of 'the Christ that is to be' will be wholly composed of individuals; but they will not be, as in the old print, unrelated and unadapted one to another. Each will be so transformed by 'the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God' (Eph 4 [13]) that God's purpose for each will be realized (Phil 2 [12, 13], 3 [14]), and each have his own place in the vast organism, the 'one new man' (Eph 2 [15]) which will thus come into being. We shall not lose our individual personalities—for it is only as possessing these that we can contribute to the perfection of the whole—but we shall not be mere units. Personality lies even now largely in our characteristic relations to those about us; the fuller and the better these relations, the greater is the personality itself. *Dixit quidam; Quoties inter homines fui, minor homo redii* (*de Imitatione Christi*, i, 20). We know only too well what this *quidam* meant; but St. Paul's hope is the very opposite. It is that the full life of heavenly citizenship (Phil 1 [27], 3 [20]) which we live here, the life of mutual intercourse and mutual service, may render us not less but greater men, and so worthy members at last of the one full-grown man, in whom all are to be gathered up. Once the people of God were all in our father Abraham; at last they will all be in Christ, with their personalities fully developed through the perfecting of the whole.

Doctrine of the Sacraments.—In close connexion with St. Paul's doctrine of the Church is his doctrine of the sacraments; and here again his teaching should largely be interpreted by his pre-Christian faith. In regard to the sacraments a remarkable change has passed over critical opinion. Not long ago it was widely held that St. Paul's sacramental teaching was what for lack of a better term we may call 'Protestant'; and there are scholars who still maintain this view. But there are many to-day who, though themselves rejecting Catholic belief, recognize that St. Paul's sacramental teaching is far more like that traditional among Catholics than like that of the 16th-century Reformers (cf. for opinion in Germany, Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, v, vi). This teaching, however, seems to them out of harmony with the Lord's mind, and they think that St. Paul must have been here affected directly or indirectly by the teaching of the Greek and Oriental mystery-religions. Now the difficulties of this view are overwhelming. St. Paul was a Hebrew, and quite without that sympathy with ethnic faiths which the study of comparative religion has given to ourselves (cf. 1 Cor 10 [20]). He may occasionally make use of words which the mystery-religions had popularized (e.g. in Phil 4 [12]; Col 2 [18]; cf. Ramsay, *The Teaching of St. Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, xlvii), but this is all that we can say. His own use of the word 'mystery' and of other words associated with these cults is quite different from theirs; 'mystery' e.g. with him only means 'secret,' as in Daniel and Enoch. Parallels, no doubt, may be found between his teaching and that of the mystery-religions, especially if appeal is made to literature much later than St. Paul's day; but they are far from impressive (cf. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, appended note 6). There is, however, a simpler answer to be given; St. Paul's sacramental teaching requires no such explanation. Baptism, confirmation, penance, the Eucharist and ordination, to say nothing of lesser sacraments, find anticipations in Jewish rites far more like the Christian sacraments than anything to be found in the heathen 'mysteries' (cf. *Sacraments in the N.T. passim*). Here and there the history of the transition is obscure, but the main facts are clear.

Baptism and Confirmation.—We consider first Holy Baptism. Of all the sacraments it occupies—as we should expect with a missionary—the largest place in St. Paul's teaching. To regard 1 Cor 1 [14-17] as a depreciation of baptism is to ignore the whole of his teaching elsewhere. Baptism is the means of incorporation into Christ and His people (1 Cor 12 [13]); by baptism we put on Christ (Gal 3 [27]); and its blessings are those which union with Christ bestows. In baptism we die with Christ to sin and rise with Him to newness of life (Rom 6 [1-11]; Eph 5 [26]; Col 2 [12]; Tit 3 [5]). Our sins are washed away (Ac 22 [16]), and we are justified from sin (Rom 6 [7]). Thus baptism

is of the first importance (Eph 4 5); and apparently at Corinth, if catechumens died without baptism, other Christians sometimes underwent a vicarious baptism on their behalf (1 Cor 15 29). St. Paul in this teaching is of course mainly thinking of the baptism of adults, though, in view of previous Jewish practice, there is no reason to suppose that he did not authorize the baptism of infants (Ac 16 33, 34, 18 8; 1 Cor 1 16, 7 14; Eph 6 1; Col 3 20); and he always thinks of faith and baptism as closely united. He would not indeed have supposed that without 'faith in the working of God' (Col 2 12) baptism could work any spiritual change; the grace pledged to us in our infancy must wait for its practical efficacy till faith has been awakened. But, though baptism is no substitute for faith, just as little is faith a substitute for baptism; St. Paul would not have regarded as a believer one who refused to be baptized.

But what is the origin of the sacrament? Purification by water was a common ceremony of the Mosaic law, and a special purification of this kind may have been expected as a preparation for Israel's redemption (Jn 1 25: cf. Ezek 36 25 ff.; Zech 13 1). Moreover, even before the mission of the Baptist, baptism was in use as a rite for the admission of proselytes to Israel—in the case of women the only rite except a sacrifice which was necessary; and the Babylonian Talmud repeatedly speaks of the proselyte as being like a child new-born. Thus baptism had become a rite of admission to the Church before the Lord came, and it held its position afterwards. If Christian baptism brings far greater blessings than the old proselyte baptism, that is because the Church to which it now admits us is the Church glorified by the gift of the Spirit.

But how did the transition from the old baptism to Christian baptism come about? Probably in the following way. The Baptist treated the people of God as being no more ready for the Messianic judgment and kingdom than the heathen themselves, and so called them to a baptism of repentance in preparation for Messiah's coming (Mt 3 11);* and the Lord, in the days before He claimed publicly to be the Messiah, continued the Baptist's work (Jn 3 22, 4 1, 2). Those in whom the purpose of baptism found its fulfilment by their adherence to the Lord during His earthly life received no further baptism by water (Jn 1 31; Ac 19 4): their baptism was completed by the gift of the Spirit either at Pentecost, or subsequently by the laying on of the Apostles' hands. But if those baptized by John took part in the rejection of the Lord, the old baptism had not attained its purpose; and they received Christian baptism as well as the laying on of hands, if they were afterwards converted. St. Paul, like other writers of the early Church, seems to regard baptism and confirmation as two parts of one sacrament; and, when he speaks of baptism, to include both parts of the rite (Ac 19 1-6; 1 Cor 10 1, 2: cf. Gal 3 26, 27 with 4 4-6). The Old Testament teaching naturally led to this, since cleansing by water and anointing with oil were there closely associated (Ex 29 4-7; Lev 14 8, 9, 17, 18; cf. 1 Cor 6 11); and the language of the New Testament suggests that from the first, as later, unction was practised at confirmation (2 Cor 1 21, 22; 1 Jn 2 20, 27). Further than this we cannot confidently go. There are real critical difficulties in accepting Mt 28 19 as a word of the Lord, among them being the language of the Acts, which suggests that baptism was at first in the name of Jesus only (Ac 8 16; 19 5; cf. 1 Cor 1 13-15). But there is no reason to doubt that the continuance of baptism as the rite of admission to the Church had the Lord's authority, and its completion by the laying on of hands may have had it also. It is the characteristic teaching of the Lord that His own experience is to be reproduced in that of His followers; and in the experience of the Lord Himself the gift of the Spirit followed immediately upon His reception of baptism. Even if, as is perhaps most probable, the practice of the Church as to the laying on of hands rested rather upon the guidance of the Spirit than upon the direct command of the Lord, it was probably in the Lord's past experience that the Spirit taught the Church to see the revelation of His present will.*

The Eucharist.—We see then that neither Christian baptism nor the laying on of hands presents any serious difficulty. It is, however, about the Eucharist that controversy chiefly arises. St. Paul's language is here markedly realistic, and finds no parallel in the language used about other sacraments. The Eucharist, like the manna, is 'spiritual,' i.e. supernatural, food (1 Cor 10 3, 4: cf. Ps 78 24, 25; Jn 6 48-51). It brings participation in the Body and Blood of Christ, and so maintains the unity of the Church (1 Cor 10 16, 17). It is a feast upon the Lord's sacrifice analogous to the sacrificial feasts both of Jews and Gentiles

* But see on Mt 3 1-12.

* On confirmation cf. the footnote on Ac 8, p. 344b.

(1 Cor 10 18-22). Indeed, to partake unworthily is to be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord; and, if we discern not the Body, we eat and drink judgment unto ourselves (1 Cor 11 27-30). Moreover, St. Paul bases his warning upon the Lord's words of institution, thus showing that he attached to these words a meaning far deeper than that which would first occur to the mind in reading them. Familiarity with St. Paul's teaching, and experience of the power of the sacrament, may cause his words to appear simple enough to Catholic Christians. But we can understand that to others St. Paul's language suggests Oriental thaumaturgy rather than the authentic teaching of the Lord; and that the question may even be raised whether St. Paul and his converts have not somehow transformed into a new mystery-cult simple actions and words of the Lord which He never intended to be repeated. If we accept the shorter text of Lk 22 17-20, St. Paul is our only authority for the statement that the Lord said 'Do this in remembrance of me.' There is an apparent difficulty here which we are bound to meet.

We observe first that the transformation thus suggested is inconceivable in St. Paul's case. It is quite possible that some of his converts from heathenism may have been disposed to interpret the Eucharist by heathen ideas, and very likely that in later centuries a mutual influence was exercised by Christianity and the mystery religions. But St. Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and a large part even of his Gentile converts at Corinth had been closely associated with the Jews. It is not possible that but a few years after the first Eucharist, and before there was any separation between Jewish and Gentile Christanity, St. Paul of all people should have made himself responsible for such a corruption as this. We shall find as usual that, if we first understand the thought of the Jews, and then consider how St. Paul's new Christian faith would affect it, our difficulty passes away.

We turn then to St. Paul's account of the first Eucharist (1 Cor 11 23 ff.). When he says that he 'received' it of the Lord, he uses the same word as that which he employs in 1 Cor 15 1 and 3, and his meaning is that he received it from the Lord through those who were 'in Christ before' him. Indeed, his account of the institution of the Eucharist, except for the Lord's command to repeat it, is confirmed both by the Petrine Gospel of St. Mark and by the Palestinian Gospel of St. Matthew. Now the Lord's Supper (11 20), at which the Eucharist was instituted, was probably either a Passover meal or a quasi-Passover meal held a day in advance, because the Lord's approaching death rendered it impossible for Him to eat the Passover with His disciples (cf. Lk 22 15).* St. Paul thinks of the Lord as the true Paschal victim (1 Cor 5 7), and of the Eucharist as the Christian Passover; the 'cup of blessing' (1 Cor 10 16) is probably a Jewish phrase drawn from the Passover ritual. The Jews at their Passover commemorated the redemption from Egypt, which founded their corporate life as the people of God, and (with the redemption) their own escape from the judgment, which fell upon the firstborn of their oppressors. By taking part in the Passover festival they claimed their places among God's covenant people, and their share in its present blessings and undying hope. St. Paul would think of Christians as commemorating the far greater redemption upon which the corporate life of the Christian Church depends, and their own escape from the judgment impending over the heathen world (1 Cor 11 32). Christians too are in covenant with God; God has made with them a 'new covenant' whose terms Jeremiah had in advance declared (Jer 31 31 ff.), a covenant which brings the forgiveness of sin and the law written by the Spirit upon the heart. They too at every Eucharist claim their places among God's covenant people, with its present blessings and its confident anticipation of the Kingdom of God. Thus there would be nothing to cause surprise if no Gospel mentioned that the Eucharist was to be repeated; a Passover feast not to be repeated would be to Jews a contradiction in terms. The last judgment and the final Kingdom of God might come very soon, or might not; the Lord Himself did not know when the hour would strike (Mk 13 32). But till it struck the Lord's sacrifice had ever to be recalled and pleaded, and its blessings ever claimed anew. That the Lord did say 'Do this in remembrance of me' St. Paul tells us, and there is every reason to believe him. But it was not strictly necessary that the Lord should say this; the repetition of a Passover goes without saying.

But how do these considerations justify St. Paul's realistic language? Let us turn from the parallel between the Lord and the Paschal lambs to the immeasurable difference between them. The Paschal lambs were many, since like the priests who

* For a different view cf. *The New Testament Doctrine of the Sacraments*, pp. 397, 398.

offered them 'by death they' were 'hindered from continuing' (Heb 7 [23]); and, when they died, they had no resurrection. Sacred food they might offer, but not 'spiritual' or supernatural food; and the blessings of the people of God were not dependent upon union with them. With the true Paschal Lamb it is otherwise. He is One; and He is risen, that by His risen life we also may live; all our blessings, as we have seen, depend upon our growing up in all things into Him (Eph 4 [15]). It is a real identification with Him as sacrificed, and through sacrifice glorified, and not a merely symbolic identification, which we require for our preservation and growth as men recreated in Him; and there is no better way of saying that the Lord gives what we need than to say that 'the body' which was 'for us' on the Cross, and is 'for us' still (1 Cor 11 [24]), is given to be our food; and the blood, which has ratified the new covenant, to be our drink. In the physical world the fullest identification that we know is that of food and drink with the bodies which depend upon them for their support and growth. But there is not a word in St. Paul of that eating of 'the god' which some writers think that they find upon heathen ground (cf. Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, note A, iii). All his teaching grows out of the thoughts of the Passover and the covenant feast of Ex 24 [1-11], immeasurably deepened and spiritualized by that doctrine of the union of Christ with His people which St. Paul had received from Christ Himself. Our Lord at His first Eucharist 'gave Himself with His own hand' in all the fulness possible at this stage of His redeeming work. But all, we would suggest, was as yet anticipatory. He could not give His sacrificed Body to be our food before it was sacrificed, or communicate His outpoured life before it had been poured out; nor were the Apostles yet the new men who could assimilate such food and drink. At the institution the bread and wine were the symbols of the Lord's Body and Blood, and no more; there could not be a Passover commemoration of a redemption which had not yet taken place. The Lord looks forward to the fulfilment in the Kingdom of God of what is as yet but a picture of what will be (Lk 22 [16, 18]). And if we ask 'In what kingdom of God—in the Church, or in the heavenly country?'—the answer is, as in other cases, that the Lord does not—and perhaps cannot—yet fully distinguish. Certainly there is fulfilment here and now. The Lord's Humanity has been glorified; He has become 'life-giving spirit' (1 Cor 15 [45]); and now that He has ascended 'where he was before' (Jn 6 [62]), His Flesh and Blood can be eaten and drunk as they could not be before the great change had passed over them. The Eucharist now is a far greater thing than it could have been in the upper room at Jerusalem. And yet not even now have we all the fulfilment; for that we must wait 'till he come.'

We see then that, though in the Eucharist there is a communication of life, there is nothing magical about it. It rests upon the divine appointment, and it requires the co-operation of our own faith. St. Paul does not explain all that he means by 'worthy' reception; but 'faith in the working of God' must be as necessary here as in baptism (cf. Jn 6 *passim*). Not only must we have faith to 'discern the body,' but faith in God, who 'both raised the Lord, and will raise us up through his power' (1 Cor 6 [14]) by the redemption which is in Christ. Perhaps we may find in Phil 3 [10-14] the best description provided by St. Paul of the right dispositions. It would indeed be difficult to find any contrast more alien to St. Paul's mind than the contrast sometimes drawn between the use of sacraments and 'simple faith.' Faith is essentially practical, and only attains its full reality in the action to which it leads. Sacraments both at the beginning of the Christian life and throughout its course give to faith opportunities for its exercise, and so maintain both its reality and its simplicity. When the sacraments are neglected, faith too often remains 'in the air,' or loses itself in a maze of auto-suggestion.*

The Lesser Sacraments.—The other sacraments, except ordination, must be here only cursorily mentioned; for St. Paul never fully deals with them. The *locus classicus* for penance is 2 Cor 2 [5-11] (cf. 1 Cor 5; 2 Cor 12 [19]-13 [10]; 1 Tim 1 [20]). Under the old covenant members of the people of God separated from the life of the community could be restored to it; and a similar discipline continued under the new. In the *locus classicus* St. Paul forgives in the 'presence' or 'person' of Christ, and calls upon the local church to act with him. Whether the translation 'presence' or that of 'person' be adopted is a matter of indifference. St. Paul could not forgive consciously in the presence of Christ unless he believed that Christ speaking by him (2 Cor 13 [3]) Himself forgave. The forgiveness of the Apostle carried with it the forgiveness of the Lord.

* Cf. commentary on 1 Corinthians, pp. 503-505.

St. Paul's teaching on marriage is to be found in 1 Cor 7, 11 [3-12]; Eph 5 [22-33]; and all that the Church has ever intended to maintain in speaking of marriage as a sacrament is found there. Christian marriage differs from heathen and Jewish marriage in being in all cases indissoluble (1 Cor 7 [8-16]); in the case of a marriage contracted between the baptized, St. Paul refuses to contemplate divorce with freedom to marry again, though there may be separation. Indeed, he seems to regard Christian marriage as a symbol of the relation of Christ to the Church, and as deriving its special sacredness from this, though he bases his authoritative teaching on the Lord's word. On unction for the sick St. Paul never touches; but those possessed of 'gifts of healing' (1 Cor 12 [9], etc.) probably made use of it (cf. Mk 6 [13]; Jas 5 [14]).

The Ministry.—We pass now to the ministry. St. Paul's teaching is here not easy to grasp; he bases his own claim to apostleship upon no less than five grounds (Gal 1 [1]; 1 Cor 9 [1] and [2]; 2 Cor 11 [23] ff., 12 [12]), and each has its own importance. We shall find, however, not confusion but an admirable grasp of the complex teaching of the Old Testament, and a consistent application of it. The question of the authenticity of the Pastorals is here of special interest; but we do not require them in order to discover the mind of St. Paul; and they will be here used only to illustrate conclusions which may be reached without them.

We observe first that the constitution of the Church, alike under the old and under the new covenant, is always theocratic. The Lord our God is our King, both before the coming of His Christ (1 S 12 [12]) and after it; though after it God reigns in and through His Christ. Now according to Eastern ideas it belongs to the king's prerogative to appoint to all the offices which his kingdom requires. No man either 'taketh the honour unto himself' or can receive it from his fellow-subjects. God may call directly by voice or vision, or indirectly through a prophet, or through the order which He has established in His Church; but He must call and empower in some way, if a man is to be God's instrument in what he does.

We observe, secondly, that officers of the divine Kingdom are never delegates of God, receiving an authority which they can use as they please; rather men are to recognize God Himself as speaking or acting in them (cf. Mt 10 [40]; Gal 2 [8]; Eph 3 [7]; 2 Cor 13 [3]). Thus the constitution of the Church always remains strictly theocratic, and never becomes bureaucratic. No one has authority over God's people unless he represents God; and no one does represent God unless he truly represents Him. The calls of God are profoundly real; as long as His representatives rightly represent Him they can count upon His unfailing support. The 'gainsaying of Korah' (Jude [11]), his appeal to the holiness of all God's people and their supposed equality in His sight (Nu 16 [3]), has a tragic issue (cf. 2 Cor 13 [2-4]). But if God's representatives misrepresent Him, He is no longer to be found in them, and their authority ceases. All authority is given to the Lord in heaven and on earth; He has authority alike as Prophet, Priest and King. But He has it all because He is in the Father and the Father in Him; the reason why there can be no successful appeal against His claim to our loyalty, or against His teaching, or against His means of reconciliation, is His perfect representation of the Father who sends Him. So it is always with true spiritual authority. It does not need proof by intellectual arguments; it proves itself to those capable of recognizing it by the manifestation of God's presence in those who possess it. We shall find St. Paul perfectly faithful to both sides of the Old Testament teaching. 'Protestants' are often specially in need of the one, and 'Catholics' of the other.

How does St. Paul think of ministry? The thoughts of ministry to God and Christ and of ministry to men are closely connected (e.g. in Col 1 [7]), but the former is perhaps the more prominent (Rom 13 [4]; 1 Cor 12 [5]; 2 Cor 6 [4], 11 [23]). When to-day we speak of his Majesty's 'ministers,' we are at least as near to the Pauline sense of the word as when we speak of ministers of the Gospel. We must especially beware of using the term in too 'clerical' a way; the Lord requires ministers of many kinds. Just because He is Prophet, Priest and King, He requires, as God required under the old covenant, ministers to declare His will, ministers to reconcile, and ministers to rule in His Name. Thus 'he gave some to be apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers' (Eph 4 [7-11]; cf. 1 Cor 12 [28-31]). More offices than one may be combined in the same person, in St. Paul as in Moses or in Samuel; but it will not necessarily be so. Just as pastors and teachers will not always be prophets, so prophets will not necessarily exercise all the powers of the humbler but more regular ministry. The great thing is to do what

we have been sent to do, to 'take heed to the ministry received in the Lord' that we 'fulfil it' (Col 4 17).

Apostles.—This representation of Christ begins with the Apostles, and they represent Him in every aspect of His work; not only in His prophetic and reconciling offices, but in His ruling office also. Their rule is no more a rule of this world than was His own (Lk 22 24 ff.); they can 'do nothing against the truth but for the truth' (2 Cor 13 8). But the Lord has appointed unto them a sovereignty, even as the Father appointed unto Him. They eat and drink at His table as the members of His court, and sit on chairs of state to do justice in the new Israel (Lk 22 28-30).

Now it is this plenary apostolic authority which belongs to St. Paul; and in the powers which he claims and exercises he shows what he believes the position of an Apostle to be. He knows of no office higher than that of an Apostle; his attitude to St. Peter is one of complete independence (Gal 1 1, 16, 17, 2 6-14); and it would be hard to press apostolic authority further than he does. As a prophet he speaks by the word of the Lord (1 Th 4 15) in demonstration of the Spirit and of power (1 Cor 2 4). As an ambassador on behalf of Christ (2 Cor 5 20) he is the minister of reconciliation by the word and sacraments. But his commission does not end there. From the members of his churches he expects obedience; and where, as at Corinth, his authority is questioned, he not only himself strongly asserts it (1 Cor 4 21, 5 3-5, 7 17, 14 37, 38, 16 1; 2 Cor 2 9, 10 8, 13 1, 2, 10), but is confident that God Himself will vindicate his claims (2 Cor 10 2-6, 13 3, 4) if they are denied. The 'signs and wonders and mighty works' (2 Cor 12 12), which reveal the true Apostle, may be works of judgment as well as of mercy (1 Cor 5 5; cf. Ac 5 1-11, 8 18-24); and, when St. Paul says that the Corinthians are the seal of his apostleship (1 Cor 9 2), he probably thinks not simply of their evangelization—an evangelist like Epaphras at Colossæ might have affected that—but of all that his apostolic powers have made them (cf. Rom 1 11; 2 Cor 3 2, 3). But, though he is entirely confident about his authority, it is never as a delegated authority that he regards it, but as the authority of the Lord speaking and acting through him (1 Cor 14 37; 2 Cor 13 3). He would not even wish to be obeyed on any other ground; that would be to usurp the place of the one Lord instead of bringing Him near. (For a fuller account of the character of apostolic authority cf. the writer's Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Introduction, pp. xv-xxxii.)

We need not consider at length the position of the New Testament prophets, since it corresponds to that of the prophets under the old covenant. They were chiefly important as ministers to the Church of the Spirit's guidance (Ac 13 1, 2; Eph 2 20). Their call was no doubt directly from God, as it was in the Old Testament; probably it came chiefly through the self-evidencing power of the divine message with which they felt themselves charged, and it was for the Church to test the reality of their inspiration (1 Cor 14 29-33, 37; cf. 12 10). The position of 'evangelists' is more obscure. It is not unlikely that it rested upon a commission from some church, and that those thus sent out were called 'apostles' of these churches, though not Apostles of Christ. If so, we can understand how St. Luke speaks of St. Paul and St. Barnabas as apostles (Ac 14 14) in view of the mission described in Ac 13 1-3, though St. Paul only was an Apostle of Christ.

The Regular Ministry.—We turn now to the more permanent ministry, and our evidence is here scanty for several reasons. In the first place, St. Paul was expecting the immediate return of the Lord, and had no more thought of a ministry to last through the ages than he had of a New Testament. In the second place, St. Paul writes as a missionary; the preaching of the word and the moral problems presented by the young churches are thus far more prominent than questions of order or *cultus*. In the third place, these latter questions did not bulk large with either Jews or Christians in the 1st century. St. Paul was familiar with the sacrificial worship of Israel, and would not have regarded the offering of Ac 21 26 as valid, if it had not been made by a priest of the Aaronic succession. Not only prophets, however, but teachers of the Law, were far more important in Jewish eyes than priests; and even if St. Paul regarded the Eucharistic worship as taking the place of the sacrificial worship of the Temple, he would not necessarily have considered the commission to preside at it as a very important aspect of ordination. The Apostles probably did give this commission to the presbyters whom they appointed at Jerusalem (Ac 11 30) and elsewhere, but we should hardly expect to find it specially mentioned. It may be presbyters, whom we hear of as 'pastors and teachers' (Eph 4 11), and we may perhaps see the deacons and presbyters of Phil 1 1 in the

'helps and governments' of 1 Cor 12 [28]; but there is no reference to their position at the Eucharist, unless we find one in the presiding 'office-bearers of 1 Th 5 [12]. Needless to say that we never find St. Paul speaking of them as 'priests.' Such a title in the earliest days of the Church would have been most misleading, since a 'Christian priest' would have meant a Levitical priest who had become a Christian. St. Paul never uses the word either of the laity, or of the presbyters, or even of the Lord Himself. For all these reasons there will be much which is obscure. St. Paul in his undisputed epistles does not fully reveal to us his mind. But his companion St. Luke tells us how both St. Paul and his fellow-Apostles acted; the Old Testament explains the principles of their action; and the Pastorals, however we may regard them, confirm the results thus reached.

The Apostolic Succession.—Now what we find is just what we should have expected. The theocratic principle everywhere prevails; and the call to every kind of ministry comes directly or indirectly from God Himself. Apostles and prophets are called directly by the Lord; presbyters and lesser ministers by the Lord through the Apostles, or through apostolic representatives like Timothy and Titus. We find indeed one case of names being suggested by the laity (Ac 6 [3]), and it appears in the Pastorals that it is legitimate for the presbyteral office to be desired (1 Tim 3 [1]). But the authority lies always with the Apostles, and they or their representatives alone call and ordain (Ac 6 [6], 14 [23]; 1 Tim 5 [22] ?). In the case of the humbler ministries, we never hear of any inward call of the Spirit.* Those to be ordained are either designated by the word of the prophets (Ac 13 [2], 20 [28]; 1 Tim 1 [18], 4 [14]) or selected, no doubt in reliance upon the Spirit's guidance, by the Apostle or his representative. What the laying on of hands with prayer was understood to mean we may learn from the Old Testament precedents (Nu 11 [16, 17, 24-29], 27 [18-20]; Dt 34 [9]). God alone can bestow the Spirit; that is why prayer is necessary. But He 'takes of' the Spirit which rests upon those already His ministers, and puts it upon others, that they may either help to bear the ministerial burden (cf. 2 Tim 1 [6]), or succeed to those who are laying it down. Joshua, like Stephen, had the Spirit already; but Moses put of his own 'honour' upon him, that 'all the congregation of Israel' might 'obey.' Henceforward, as we read in Dt 34 [9], Joshua was 'full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him' (cf. also 1 S 16 [12, 13]; 1 K 19 [16]; 2 K 2 [9, 15]). Ordination in the New Testament is to be understood in the same way. All ministerial powers are at first concentrated in the Apostles; but, as the burden becomes too great to be borne, the Old Testament precedents are followed, and others associated with them in different parts of their work. A Christian can do in the power of the Spirit whatever he has been called and ordained to do in succession to the Apostles. The distinction sometimes drawn between apostolic succession as succession to office, and apostolic succession as involving the transmission of spiritual gifts, is a distinction without any practical difference, since God never gives the call without the gift of the Spirit for its fulfilment. In our modern controversies we should recognize the confusion into which the Church has fallen, and not expect recovery to be easy. But there are points about which no doubt should exist. First, St. Paul knows nothing of 'the democratic principle.' The Christian laity can create no ministry in any way empowered to represent the Lord. Secondly, the laying on of hands is meaningless, unless those who lay them on have themselves a divinely bestowed office to transmit. Thirdly, those who base their claims to be ministers of Christ on the ground that He Himself has called them, and that the reality of their call has been recognized by their fellow-Christians, take up a position which is entirely in accordance with St. Paul's teaching, if the ministry which they claim is prophetic only. What they claim is the call of the prophet; and, as has been seen, the prophet does not require ordination to establish his right to speak in God's name.

Justification.—(*c*) How was St. Paul's doctrine of the coming vindication affected by His Christian faith? In some ways very little; he pictures the 'Day of Jehovah' much as he would have pictured it before his conversion. But, taught by the Lord, he has come to see that the agelong purpose of God has stages in its fulfilment which as a Pharisee he had never recognized. On the Christ Himself God's judgment has already been passed, and to the Christ His vindication has already been given; the Christ Himself is already reigning. Believers in the Christ, also, have a present vindication by the gift of the Spirit, and as members of His Church are risen with

* Cf. footnote to Ac 6.

Him and sitting with Him in the heavenly sphere. But none the less there is a further judgment and vindication to be expected at the Lord's return; we do not enter into the full glory of the Kingdom till then. Here, once more, though St. Paul is the great exponent of the theology of the Church, he is far less original than we generally suppose. Everything that he says rests, as we shall see, upon the teaching of the Lord and the experience of His people.

We turn then to that teaching of the Lord which St. Paul reproduces. The Lord in His Gospel of the Kingdom repeats the agelong promise of the vindication of the people of God. It is with this that the Beatitudes are primarily concerned. The righteousness, e.g., for which God's people are hungering and thirsting is the manifestation of that redeeming righteousness of God of which Isaiah spoke and the Magnificat speaks (cf. also Mt 6 [33]). It is the Father's good pleasure to give the Kingdom to the Lord's little flock (Lk 12 [32]); speedily will He avenge His elect who cry to Him day and night (Lk 18 [7, 8]). He will vindicate them against the carnal Israel which is soon to go down to ruin (Mt 23 [34]-24 [2]), against all the tribes of the earth who have persecuted them (Mt 24 [30]), and against the personal power of evil himself (Jn 12 [31]). Neither the Christ nor His people will need to 'establish their own righteousness'; God will establish it for them. And, if we ask what is the condition for sharing in this vindication, the answer is that it is faith: faith at first in the Gospel that the Lord proclaims (Mk 1 [15]) and in Himself as its Messenger; and later, as He comes to be more fully revealed, faith in Him as the Christ, the Inaugurator and Head of the Kingdom and the universal Judge. When the great day comes God will vindicate the ungodly, vindicate even publicans and sinners, if they have 'confessed before men' the Christ whom He has sent (Mt 10 [32, 33]). Justification, or vindication, through faith—it is not left for St. Paul to establish that great principle; it is already established in the teaching of the Lord Himself. No doubt faith in the Lord involves obedience to Him; it is idle to call Him Lord without doing the things that He says (Lk 6 [46]); indeed, to answer to His call may involve the sacrifice of all that we possess (Lk 14 [33]). But even in the Synoptic record it is faith, and not obedience to the Law, which is the Lord's primary demand. The Law only binds till God's purpose finds its accomplishment (Mt 5 [18]); as men force their way into the Kingdom, the Law and the prophets pass away (Lk 16 [16]).

Now this brings us to a second point. Though the Lord generally speaks of the Kingdom as the future inheritance of God's people, he sometimes speaks of it in a different way. The Kingdom is already present in Himself and His little company (Lk 17 [21] RVm); the bridegroom's feast has begun, though it is doomed to be interrupted (Mk 2 [19, 20]); the miracles that He works are the first drops of the promised torrent of blessing (Lk 11 [20]; Mt 11 [2-5]), and His coming brings in the age of gold which the saints had longed to see (Mt 13 [16, 17]). Moreover, the Lord promises the gift of the Spirit, the great blessing of the Messianic age (Lk 24 [49]: cf. Is 32 [15]; Jl 2 [28]), and says that His generation will not pass away before the Kingdom of God comes with power (Mk 9 [1]). No doubt there is here much obscurity in the Lord's teaching; He does not reveal—perhaps He does not yet know—what the stages in the development of the divine purpose will be. But what was not revealed in the Lord's teaching was soon revealed by the Church's experience. First, the Lord rose; then the Spirit was sent; while the final coming is still awaited. What we shall find is that the teaching of St. Paul exactly reproduces the Lord's teaching, as the experience of the Church had interpreted it.

The Gospel.—We turn then to St. Paul's Gospel; and it is needless to say how profound is his belief in its power. It is a high honour to be entrusted with it (1 Th 2 [4]; 1 Tim 1 [11, 12]). It is a living thing, with an activity of its own, separable in thought from that of those who preach it (Rom 1 [16]; 1 Cor 1 [18]; Phil 1 [15-18]; Col 1 [6]; 1 Th 2 [13]). But what are its terms? They are identical with those of the Gospel preached by St. Peter. St. Paul's Gospel, like that of the Lord, is the Gospel of the Kingdom (Ac 19 [8], 20 [25], 28 [23, 31]); and, like the Lord, by the Kingdom he generally means the Kingdom of the future (1 Cor 6 [9, 10], 15 [50]; 1 Th 2 [12], etc.). All that he says in his epistles about the promises (Rom 4 [13] ff., 15 [8]; Gal 3 [16] ff.; Eph 2 [12], etc.) and the inheritance (Rom 8 [17]; Gal 3 [18]; Eph 1 [14], etc.) is in the closest connexion with this; and the joy of the future Kingdom evidently held a prominent place in his Gospel (Col 1 [5]). But the majority of his hearers were already familiar with the thought of the Kingdom; and the chief points that St. Paul seeks to establish are that Jesus is the Christ, at whose return the Kingdom will come, and that faith in Him and

incorporation into His people are necessary if the blessings of the Kingdom are to be ours.

How then did St. Paul preach the Gospel to normal audiences? We find the fullest answer in Ac 13 16-41. He begins with God as the God of Israel His people, with His election of the patriarchs, and His creation and preservation of Israel's national life. He then speaks of the choice of David to be the instrument of the divine purpose; and of the raising up, after the Baptist's mission to the whole nation, of the Lord, the Son of David, to be the Saviour of Israel. The Gospel which St. Paul preaches is 'the word of this salvation'; and it is the word of the Cross. For Jerusalem failed to recognize Him to whom the Baptist and the prophets had pointed; the Lord was crucified and was buried. But God raised Him from the dead, and He was repeatedly seen by His chosen witnesses. What the Apostles declare is the accomplishment of the promise of the Kingdom through the new birth of Jesus, the divine Son, by the Resurrection; through Him in His abiding life the 'sure mercies' promised to David are realized; He is, though St. Paul does not here employ the title, the expected Messiah. And what God asks of men is faith. Everyone who believes will have the burden of past sin rolled away, and be vindicated by deliverance from all those powers of evil from which the Law had failed to deliver him. St. Paul, unlike St. Peter (Ac 2 38), does not here mention either that acceptance of baptism by which faith must be expressed, or that gift of the Holy Ghost which will follow baptism; perhaps because his audience, unlike St. Peter's, did not immediately ask what practical steps they must take. But that St. Paul's mind was here altogether one with St. Peter's we know from his epistles. What St. Paul preaches, as he tells the Corinthians, is Jesus as the Christ, and Him a crucified man; there is no slurring over the fact of the crucifixion, in spite of the stumbling-block that it is to the Jews. But he does not yet explain the relation of the Cross to our salvation. 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved' (Rom 10 9).

Faith as Subjective.—It is at this point that we may consider what St. Paul means by faith. Faith with him seems almost always to be the faith by which we believe, not the objective body of truth to be accepted. There are possible exceptions (Gal 1 23; Eph 4 5; Phil 1 27, etc.); but outside the Pastorals, probably no one of them is real. St. Paul occasionally personifies faith as he personifies the Gospel (Gal 3 23, 25), and some of the apparent exceptions may be thus explained. But this in no way involves depreciation of the importance of objective truth. Faith to St. Paul is no indefinite trust or mystic self-surrender. It is primarily the acceptance of a definite message from God (cf. 1 Cor 1 21, 15 1 ff.; Rom 10 9), proclaiming facts and making promises for the future. Thus there is always in faith an intellectual element of the first importance. When St. Paul speaks of faith as proceeding from the heart, he has no thought of contrasting the heart with the head. In the psychology of the Hebrews the heart stands for the inner man as a whole, and includes the intellectual powers. The message of the Gospel appeals to our whole complex manhood—to the conscience, the emotions, and the will; it is the whole man who responds to it and believes. But faith none the less is primarily the acceptance of truth on the authority of God who declares it (1 Th 2 13).

This, however, is not all that it is. The very nature of the Gospel message as a proclamation of what God in Christ has done for us, and is ready to do, gives to the faith of Christians the character of personal trust. It is not only belief that the Gospel is true, but belief in God Himself as the Fulfiller of its promises, and in Christ through whom they will be fulfilled; and it thus not only 'gives glory to God,' but constitutes a personal bond between God and those who believe in Him, which should grow ever stronger. It will not always be easy to believe; for not only does faith ask much of us in the way of practical action, but the good news which God has sent all down the ages has brought a promise of life of which the fulfilment seems impossible. So it was when Abraham received the promise of a son (Rom 4 19-21), and later was called to sacrifice his son (Heb 11 17-19); and so it is with Christians who come forward for baptism, relying upon Him that 'raised Jesus our Lord from the dead' to raise them also (Rom 4 24). We, like Abraham, must look the facts in the face, 'consider' ourselves, in ourselves as good as dead: and yet, looking unto the promise of God, waver not through unbelief, but wax strong through faith, giving glory to God, and being fully assured that what He has promised He is also able to per-

form (Rom 4 [19-21]). That is the faith that is 'reckoned unto us for righteousness.' Righteousness, as we have seen already (cf. p. 409), is to the Hebrews a religious even more than an ethical term. It consists in the fulfilment of the claim that God actually makes; and, at the beginning of our Christian course, what God claims is faith and nothing else. It is not in the least St. Paul's meaning that what God really claims is a perfect fulfilment of His Law, but that He graciously allows faith to take its place. His meaning is that God accepts faith because faith is what He asks, and has asked from the beginning (cf. e.g. Ps 78 [19-22, 32-37]). Obedience to the best code in the world, even could we give it, would be of no avail while we refused to believe His word.

Faith as Objective.—Thus far for faith upon its subjective side. But the value of faith of course depends upon the value of the message which it accepts. What then is this? Briefly it is that 'Jesus is the Christ'; or, as St. Paul prefers to say in Gentile circles, that 'Jesus is Lord.' The Resurrection is so prominent in St. Paul's evangelistic message because by it the Father set His seal to the Lord's claim, and raised Him to the new life of glory and saving power necessary to its practical establishment. Now Christship, as we have seen, is bound up with saving power for the people of God and the fulfilment to them of the divine promise of the Kingdom; and thus faith in Jesus as the Christ leads at once to incorporation into God's people in order to share the salvation that the Christ has won for it—forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost in the present, and the Kingdom of God in the great days to come. But already the two aspects of the Kingdom that we have found in the Lord's teaching are appearing, and it is to the relations which exist between them that we now turn. 'How many soever be the promises of God in' Christ 'is the yea: wherefore also through Him is the Amen, unto the glory of God through us' (2 Cor 1 [20]). In the Lord—in His Word and experience—all the long roll of the Old Testament prophecies find their confirmation. But while some are fulfilled now, some must wait for their fulfilment; and we must give glory to God by the faith which says 'Amen' and claims a share in them all.

The Lord's Justification.—Let us turn for a moment to the experience of the Lord. For Him personally the Kingdom has already come. At His baptism, when He responded to God's claim that He should undergo it (Mt 3 [15]), God declared His righteousness; and that not only in word, but by the gift of the Holy Ghost. In His earthly life, directed as it was in every detail by the Spirit of God, the rule of God with all the blessings which belong to it was wonderfully manifested, though the outward conditions of His life did not correspond to its true character. The experience of the Lord was far from exhibiting that triumphant progress which the people of God had expected for the Christ. The predestined Head of God's people had to plumb the depths of their shame and suffering. He had to bear that death which is sin's characteristic penalty. As far as man could see, He died under the curse of God (Gal 3 [13]) to the complete obscuration both of His own righteousness and of the Father's. So the need arose for a new justification, and the Resurrection brought it. The Lord, whom the Father had foreknown and foreordained and called to be the instrument of His redeeming purpose, was thus justified (1 Tim 3 [16]) and glorified. Over His body a great spiritual change passed. God raised Him from the dead, and made Him to sit at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all (Eph 1 [20-23]: cf. 4 [10]). That was the Lord's justification; not just a forensic acquittal at some unseen bar, but a public vindication, such as God's people had ever desired, against all hostile powers seen and unseen. So God manifested at once His own righteousness and the righteousness of His Son; He was Himself 'just, and the justifier' of the Lord.

The Justification of Christians.—Now it is this twofold justification of the Lord, first by the gift of the Spirit, and secondly by His glorification, which we must keep in mind if we wish to understand St. Paul's doctrine of the justification of the members of Christ's body. As we have seen, the Lord in all that He did acted not for Himself alone, but as the predestined Head of His body the Church; and, when by faith and baptism we become identified with Him, His experience begins to be reproduced in us. For us as for Him the Kingdom comes in two stages; and each stage has a justification of its own. The Kingdom of God

begins for us here and now; the Father has 'delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us'—the word recalls the old transferences of population made by Assyria and Babylon—'into the kingdom of the Son of his love' (Col 1 [13]); wherever men are led by the Spirit of God, and there is 'righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' (Rom 14 [17]), there is the Kingdom. The instrument of this translation, as we have seen, is baptism, received with faith in the operation of God, who raised the Lord from the dead (Col 2 [12]). We are buried with Christ through baptism into death; we yield up to death the old carnal man that the body on which sin has laid so firm a grip may be deprived of its tyrannical power, and we ourselves be 'justified from sin'—vindicated against our greatest foe (Rom 6 [3-7]). When we have risen from the waters of baptism, cleansed and united with Christ and His people, we receive, as the Lord did, the gift of the Holy Ghost, raising us to new life in union with the risen and ascended Lord. We ourselves have been 'foreknown' and 'foreordained' to be conformed to Christ's image; we too have been 'called,' and have responded to the call; and so God justifies and glorifies us, as He justified and glorified Christ Himself (Rom 8 [29, 30]). We are 'raised up with him' and 'sit with him in the heavenly places' (Eph 2 [6]), where there is 'every spiritual blessing' (Eph 1 [3]). Just as the divine action on the Lord's behalf was His justification, so the divine action in the gift of the Spirit is ours; it is like His a justification not in word but in power. The Spirit which God bestows upon us is His own declaration of our righteousness, His own declaration that we have answered to His claim for faith, and so are righteous with the only righteousness which at this stage He demands. Justification no more with St. Paul than with the Second Isaiah is to be identified with forgiveness, though it implies forgiveness; we cannot receive the Holy Ghost while God reckons unto us our trespasses (2 Cor 5 [19]). Justification is a great act of that righteousness of God which is for His people one with His redeeming mercy; and by justifying us God vindicates His own righteousness as well as ours (Rom 3 [26]). So it was at the day of Pentecost. By the gift of the Holy Ghost God gave judgment in the controversy between those who had accepted Jesus as the Christ and those who had refused to accept Him; the Holy Ghost was the seal of His approval (2 Cor 1 [22]; Eph 1 [13]). So it was at the conversion of Cornelius. God gave His judgment on the position of believing Gentiles (cf. Ac 15 [8, 9]). God in their case gave the Spirit apart from the sacrament, which but for this declaration of the divine acceptance the Church would hardly have been ready to bestow. Where manifestly God bestows the spirit, He justifies; and there is no appeal against His justification (Rom 8 [33]: cf. Is 50 [8]).*

The Gift of the Spirit.—It is then to the gift of the Holy Ghost that we must chiefly attend if we wish to understand the full content of St. Paul's Gospel. It is the Spirit which is 'the earnest of our inheritance' (Eph 1 [14]: cf. 2 Cor 1 [22], 5 [5]), sealing us for the day of final redemption (Eph 4 [30]). It is the earnest not of a fuller gift of the Spirit in the future, but of the Kingdom of God and all that it will bring; and we should remember that in St. Paul's day earnest-money was larger in proportion to the whole sum due than it is among ourselves. St. Paul is distinguished from all other writers of the New Testament by the breadth of his conception of the Spirit's work. In the first days the gift of the Spirit, as we see in the Acts, was often followed by striking manifestations, such as that of speaking with tongues; and St. Paul recognizes their reality (1 Cor 12 [7-11]; Gal 3 [5]). But, as he himself urges (1 Cor 14 [1-25]), the most striking manifestations are not necessarily the most useful, nor have they been the most abiding: the grand result of the Spirit's presence is to be found in Christian insight, Christian love, Christian character and activity. At the beginning of our course we are washed, consecrated, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God (1 Cor 6 [11]); and all through it Christ through the Spirit continues to be to us wisdom from God, and righteousness, and consecration, and redemption (1 Cor 1 [30]). The Holy Spirit is first 'wisdom from God'—the 'God of the intellect,' as Gregory of Tours says. He is bestowed upon the Church 'that we may know the things that are freely given to us by God' (1 Cor 2 [12]: cf. the whole context). Secondly, He is the fountain of love (Rom 5 [5]). It is He who bestows the temper of sonship, giving freedom and confidence in our acesss to God (Rom 8 [15, 16]; Gal 4 [6, 7]). Thirdly, He is the source of the Christian character in all its unity and breadth (Gal 5 [22, 23]); St. Paul does not speak, as we sometimes do, of the fruits of the Spirit, but of its

* For another view of the meaning of justification cf. Romans, pp. 452, 453.

fruit. The works of the flesh (Gal 5 [19] ff.) have no unity; its impulses are at war one with another: but the fruit of the Spirit is one. Fourthly, He is the source of the manifold gifts which God bestows for Christian service (1 Cor 12 [4] ff.), the source of all Christian activity. So we analyze in our formal theological way. But indeed such analysis does violence to the unity of the Spirit's work; 'we do it wrong, being so majestical'; and St Paul speaks more wisely: 'That ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith; to the end that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God' (Eph 3 [16-19]).

We see then how the Spirit not only justifies and consecrates, but redeems also. He redeems by the communication of a divine 'life,' which enables us to master the impulses of the 'old man' and fulfil the will of God. If we walk after the Spirit, yield ourselves up to His guidance, and trust His upholding power, obedience to the 'requirement' of God is no longer impossible. St. Paul, in arguing with the Pharisees, speaks of the requirement of the Law (Rom 8 [4]); for the Pharisees, unlike the Lord, did not look beyond that. But St. Paul himself looks much further. As the perfect will of God by the Spirit's illumination is gradually revealed to us, the power of the Spirit enables us to accomplish it. St. Paul does not hold that the body with its disorderly impulses is affected by the gift of the Spirit. Though the spirit of man is 'life' through that vindication from sin which the Spirit of God has brought, the body is in its old deadness still (Rom 8 [10]); we must 'wait for' the redemption of the body (Rom 8 [23]). Indeed, so far from our flesh being already redeemed, the gift of the Spirit brings about a ceaseless conflict (Gal 5 [17]) between the old man and the new. But at our baptism the old man was nailed to the Cross, that the body of sin might lose its power; upon the Cross by the Spirit we must keep it (Rom 6 [6]); and, if we do so keep it, we are no longer under the dominion of sin, and no longer under the Law. In obeying the Spirit we not only fulfil the claims of the Law, but claims far higher, and need think of the Law no longer. It is here that we see the basis of two contentions of St. Paul which are of the first importance. The first is that the divine vindication can never be won by obedience to the Law; the second is that his own teaching, so far from sacrificing morality, reveals the one way to the only morality worth having. Here unavoidably we must pass to controversy, but we shall gain through doing so a clearer grasp of St. Paul's meaning. This particular controversy is alive still, nowhere more so than in our own country.

The Controversy with the Pharisees.—What then was the contention of the Pharisees? It was, as we have seen, that the divine justification could never be given until the Law was obeyed.* The coming of the Kingdom and of the life eternal which belonged to it depended upon obedience, and the purpose of the Law was to give life by showing how obedience was to be rendered. The Pharisees did not suppose that the Kingdom of God could be created by human effort. But, though God must bestow it, we must labour to deserve it (cf. Rom 4 [4]); and it was the grand privilege of the Jew to know as others did not exactly 'what he had to do.' Now St. Paul does not deny that the Law had life for its purpose (Rom 7 [10]); it is 'good,' or kind, designed to help, not hurt (Rom 7 [12]); indeed, had the Pharisees' way been practicable, God's vindication might have been won in the way that they expected (Gal 3 [21]). But we must look at facts. Human nature, as through sin it has come to be, cannot be controlled by this external code (Rom 8 [7, 8]); and thus the Law brings the curse and not the blessing (Gal 3 [10]). Indeed, if we regard Moses as the Pharisees regarded him, we can only say that he was a minister, not of righteousness and life, but of condemnation and death (2 Cor 3 [4-11]). But the Law was neither God's first way of dealing with men, nor His last. The fulfilment of the promise was from the first made dependent upon faith in the divine word; and if God for a time placed men under a legal system, that was merely an interlude whose purpose we can understand. There were four hundred and thirty years of promise before the Law was given (Gal 3 [17]); and for the believer Christ has brought it to an end (Rom 10 [4]).

The Place of the Law.—But then, if this be so, of what value was the Law? Its purpose was to awaken us to our real condition and prospects (Rom 3 [20], 7 [7], etc.). So far from delivering us from sin, it actually stimulates sin—*nitimur in vetitum*—and for

* For a fuller account cf. Romans, pp. 459 ff.

the moment makes us worse rather than better (Rom 5 [20], 7 [7] ff.; 1 Cor 15 [56]). But it brings us to recognize our failure, and worse than failure; it shows us that our condition is one of intolerable rebellion against God's declared will; and so leads us to cry out for deliverance (Rom 7 [24]). The Law, to put it in another way, is like a domestic slave, unable himself to control the children, but of use in conducting them to a better master (Gal 3 [24]). In all this St. Paul was unanswerable. Two things are clear about the Jews. The first is that in actual conduct there was far less difference between them and the Gentiles than they were disposed to claim (Rom 2 [17] ff.); the second is that the post-exilic Law had developed among them a sense of sin which the Gentiles did not possess, and that they thus provided the best field for the first proclamation of the Gospel. We may add that St. Paul is unanswerable still. No moral code, not even that of the Sermon on the Mount, can take the place of the Spirit as the Giver of life; and before the Spirit gives us life to any serious purpose, we generally require to be killed by the Law (2 Cor 3 [6]).

Morality and Law.—But it is not only Pelagians who find themselves ill at ease with St. Paul's teaching; very good Christians are sometimes in similar case. Morality and law appear to them correlative; and they find it hard to admit that the moral commandments of the Law, as well as the ceremonial and civil, have come to an end in Christ. St. Paul, however, never distinguishes between one part of the Law and another; he holds that it is all abolished. Thus the alarm that his teaching aroused, when he first gave it, is quite intelligible: and no doubt the moral failures of his converts at such places as Corinth and Ephesus gave point to the criticisms of the Pharisees. Thus it is always the tendency of cautious teachers to clip the wings of St. Paul's theology, and bring back a certain amount of legalism. Moreover, there is a strong tendency to-day to maintain that St. Paul's view is refuted by experience. No one doubts that he is deeply in earnest about Christian conduct (cf. 1 Cor 7 [19]), or that he urges his converts to it by every means at his disposal. Baptism itself involves a renunciation of the old life of sin (Rom 6 [1-4]; Eph 4 [17-24]); and he shows in detail how strong a foundation for particular Christian virtues is found in particular Christian truths (cf. e.g. 1 Cor 6 [13-20]; Eph 4 [25-32], 5 [22-24]). Moreover, the principle *Noblesse oblige* carries us far, and has many Christian applications (Rom 16 [2]; Eph 4 [1]; Phil 1 [27]; Col 1 [10]; 1 Th 2 [12]). But what are we to say of such threatenings as we find in 1 Cor 6 [9. 10], or of such a passage as Rom 2 [1-11], which might have been written by any pious Pharisee? Above all, when he says that he himself is under law to Christ (1 Cor 9 [21]), and finds in this Law not only general principles of action (Gal 5 [13. 14], 6 [2]) but definite commandments (1 Cor 7 [10. 11]) which no Christian may set aide, what becomes of justification by faith alone? According to his theory, the gift of the Spirit ought completely to deliver us from sin, but in fact it does not. If we want a decent moral standard, it may be urged, we must have rules to make our duties clear; and, if we want those duties performed, it must be plainly said that God's acceptance of us both now and at the day of the Lord depends upon their performance.

Now we observe first that to say that the gift of the Spirit ought wholly to deliver us from sin is to make an ambiguous statement. Is the word 'ought' here used in a moral or in a logical sense? If in a moral sense, the statement is in accordance with St. Paul's teaching (Rom 8 [9]). We must not indeed expect the Christian to attain perfection all at once; the Spirit's revelation of God's will grows from less to more, and no higher standard is required of him at the moment than that which at the moment he is able to discern (Phil 3 [15. 16]). But we 'ought' to do all that God asks of us moment by moment; we 'ought,' because by the Spirit we can (1 Cor 10 [13]; Phil 4 [13]). But, if the word 'ought' is used in a logical sense, the statement is not at all in accordance with St. Paul's teaching. It is true that it may seem to be so. But such language as that of Rom 6 [6. 7], 8 [2] (cf. Gal 5 [24], 6 [14]) does not really speak of any magical change in human nature, as the earnestness of the exhortations which follow sufficiently shows; it speaks rather of a deliverance from the tyranny of our lusts, which we have to turn to practical account by believing in it and acting upon it (cf. Rom 6 [11]). If at first we are startled, it is because Hebrew thought is dynamic, and does not distinguish (as we do) between an impulse indulged and an impulse kept under control. By 'passions and lusts' (Gal 5 [24]) St. Paul means the impulses of 'the flesh' as they are in the heathen who cannot control them; and so, when he teaches that the gift of the Spirit delivers us from their tyranny, he seems to say that it destroys the impulses them-

selves. That it does not do the latter, St. Paul's experience of his converts proved only too plainly.* The gift of the Spirit redeems us from our slavery; it gives us all necessary light to see God's will, and power to do it; but it in no way forces us to do it. Because at the moment the Spirit's divine life is within us—because in this sense 'we live by the Spirit'—it does not follow that we shall necessarily 'walk by the Spirit'; the latter is exactly what we must be exhorted to do (Gal 5 [25]). It is just because we can 'continue in sin' (Rom 6 [1]) in spite of all that has been done for us, that St. Paul has to urge us not to let sin reign in our mortal bodies (Rom 6 [12-14]). We must yield ourselves to the Spirit's guidance, and rely upon His power, and the lusts of the flesh will be unable to overcome us (Gal 5 [16]). That is always St. Paul's view of Christian activity: it is both God's and ours. It is God's, because from Him comes both the impulse to will it and the strength to carry it through; the power that we find at work in us is nothing less than God Himself, working for the fulfilment of His purpose. But it is also ours, because unless we respond to God, His grace will be in vain. Just because it is God who is dwelling in us by His Spirit, we must 'work out our own salvation with fear and trembling,' lest we fail after all (Phil 2 [12, 13]).

Faith and Works.—'But then St. Paul says that God declares us to be righteous if we believe that Jesus is the Lord, and not on the ground of anything that we have done.' Certainly he says this. But it is by the gift of the Spirit that God's declaration is made, and this declaration is only one aspect of the great gift. The gift of the Spirit bestows not justification alone, but wisdom and consecration and redemption also; it is impossible to claim one part of the gift and reject the rest. Suppose that we 'grieve the Holy Spirit of God' (Eph 4 [30])—St. Paul is probably here thinking of Is 63 [10]—the result will be as deplorable as the prophet declares it to have been of old. The Holy Spirit is not given once for all; He is a continual gift (1 Th 4 [8]); and, if He is grieved, He is taken from us, and the declaration of our righteousness with Him. 'If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his' (Rom 8 [9]); and Christ is no longer by the Spirit his 'wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption.' It is not that God now demands something other than faith as the means of justification; it is that in grieving the Spirit we show that we are ceasing to believe. Faith is a principle of practical action which so 'works through love' (Gal 5 [6]) that (in the language of the schoolmen) love is the 'form' which gives it its true character. The 'righteousness' which God bestows is 'from faith unto faith,' and the righteous 'live' by faith (Rom 1 [17]) as the condition upon which the divine life is continually bestowed. Faith is a mere abstraction apart from the action to which it leads (1 Th 1 [3]), and in which it attains its full reality; and, just as at the beginning of the Christian life it must express itself in responding at any cost to the call to baptism, so thereafter it must continually express itself in the response to every call to action and to suffering which the indwelling Spirit gives. To believe that Jesus is Lord, and yet to refuse to answer to His calls to fellowship and service is not possible, if we mean by faith a belief which belongs to the whole man, and not mere passive acquiescence in abstract truth; and one who refuses the practical response in life which the Gospel demands does not believe. In contending against the Reformers of the 16th century that 'to justify' means 'to make just,' the divines of the Council of Trent were wrong. But any doctrine of being accounted or declared righteous which separates it from consecration and practical redemption is contrary to St. Paul's mind and most dangerous; and the doctrine of Luther as generally understood undoubtedly does this.

The Spirit and the Authority of the Church.—But this is not the only error which this criticism of St. Paul involves. Those who misunderstand his doctrine of the Church misunderstand also his doctrine of the Spirit. They think of the Spirit as a purely individual gift, and suppose that obedience to the Spirit means obedience by every man to his own uninstructed conscience or 'inner light.' Whatever as individuals we 'feel to be right' is the guidance of the Spirit for us; and Christian liberty consists in following this, without consideration of anything else. A greater travesty of St. Paul's doctrine it would be difficult to imagine. The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, not only as the Spirit whom the Lord bestows, but also as the Spirit who ruled in all the words and deeds of His earthly life. Between the word of the Lord and the teaching of the Spirit there cannot be the smallest divergence; and it is the work of the Spirit to bring to our remembrance and to

* For a different view cf. commentary on Romans, p. 466.

apply to our circumstances what the Lord said. If then a so-called Christian declares that the indwelling Spirit leads him to do what the Law of Christ forbids, he is deceiving himself; that he 'feels' such a course to be right ought at once to show him how little of the Spirit he possesses.

The same is true in larger or smaller measure of the teaching of the New Testament and of the witnessing Church. It is true that to all but the Lord the Spirit is given 'in measure'; and that the sin, from which the Church has never been free, does not allow us to place the teaching of the Church on the same level as the Lord's. Insight varies with moral faithfulness in the Church corporately as in the individual Christian; and thus, though in the things of the Spirit the Church ought to be infallible, it is not infallible in fact. But to say this is not to encourage the individual to suppose that the promptings of his own heart are nearer to the mind of the Spirit than the teaching of the Church or of other Christians (1 Cor 14 [36]). The Spirit is the Spirit which belongs to the Church as the Body of Christ; and, though every member of the Church has his individual share in the gift which belongs to the whole, he has it just in so far as the divine life of the whole has free course within him, and lifts him above his old unregenerate self. It is only very slowly as a rule that he becomes the spiritual man, who can judge rightly of all things, and ignore the judgement of other men (1 Cor 2 [15]). Meanwhile, the best proof of his progress is that he is becoming more able to recognize that the instructions given to him by his holiest teachers are 'the commandments of the Lord' (1 Cor 14 [37]).

Consistency of St. Paul's Teaching.—We see then that in St. Paul's account of the Christian redemption, and of the life to be based upon it, there is no inconsistency of any kind. Just because the continual supply of the Spirit depends upon the continuance of the response of faith, the Christian life has faith for its fundamental principle from first to last. It is 'through the Spirit by faith' that we wait for God's final declaration of our righteousness (Gal 5 [5]). But, just because faith is a principle of practical action, and has no reality apart from the conduct to which it leads, there is at long last no difference between being justified through faith and being justified through the works in which it issues; as Bishop Wilson says: 'If we wish to ascertain the state of our hearts, we should impartially review our actions.' At the outset of the Christian life God justifies the ungodly (Rom 4 [5]), if they yield themselves in faith to become members of His Son. But at the final consummation God will not justify the ungodly; but every one will 'receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad' (2 Cor 5 [10]). Though the first three verses of 'Rock of Ages' are a noble expression of St. Paul's theology, the fourth cannot be accepted without careful explanation. When we stand before the 'judgment throne,' there will be no hiding ourselves anywhere. If by then we have not qualified for our places in the full-grown man of the redeemed (Eph 4 [13]), the divine purpose for us will have failed, and the divine Judge can but declare the fact. Many a failure and sin there may have been on the way, much stern discipline imposed upon the flesh 'that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus,' a discipline which, it may be, will not end at death (1 Cor 5 [5], 11 [30]). Repentance God will always accept, if it goes as deep as the sin; and we find a noble description of 'repentance unto salvation' in St. Paul's account of the repentance of the Christians towards himself (2 Cor 7 [10, 11]). But in one way or in another the divine end must be attained; and no teaching which obscures this is consistent with the mind of St. Paul.

The Final Justification and St. Paul's Eschatology.—There remains the final justification itself, and St. Paul never ceases to look for it with ardent longing, and to expect it soon (Rom 13 [11] ff.; Phil 3 [20]; 1 Th 5 [2, 3]); indeed, the one passage which might suggest postponement appears in one of his earliest epistles (2 Th 2 [1-4]). The change which we seem to see in his own expectation of living till the Lord's return (cf. 1 Cor 15 [51, 52] with Phil 1 [21-23]) is fully explained by the change in his own circumstances; a free man has a greater expectation of prolonged life than a prisoner awaiting his trial on a capital charge. But St. Paul's outlook upon 'the last things' is in two ways unlike our own; and we shall not understand it unless we remember both. In the first place, just because he expects the Lord's return so soon, he shows no interest in the 'intermediate state.' Into such questions as those of the present position of the blessed dead, of what they can do for us and we for them, he never enters; and both Catholics and Protestants will here appeal to him in vain. In the second place, the

Hebrews always expected the divine judgments to be manifested here in this world. They did not expect the servants of God to die, and go to the Kingdom; the Kingdom of God was to come for them here in a transformed society and environment. This Kingdom might be conceived as a restored Davidic monarchy, a reign of Christ and His saints in the world that we know; or it might be conceived in a wider and loftier way as involving a new heaven and a new earth (Is 65 [17]); or, once more, the two conceptions might be united, the realization of the first being expected soon, and the realization of the latter at a distant date. The third view, that known as Millenarianism, was a Jewish view which many Christians adopted. Both St. Paul and St. John recognize that the Kingdom comes in two stages, and that there are two resurrections (cf. Jn 5 [25-29]); they are Millenarians in that sense. But with them the Millenarian Kingdom is already in being through the glorification of the Lord and the spiritual resurrection and ascension of His people; there is now only the final consummation to be expected. It is quite inconsistent with the general teaching of St. Paul to find two stages in the development of the divine purpose, either in 1 Cor 15 [23, 24], or in 1 Th 4 [16, 17]; or to attempt to distinguish between the resurrection of the dead and the resurrection from among the dead (1 Cor 15 [12, 20]; Phil 3 [11]). But, however the Kingdom may be conceived, it is to come here; the Hebrews think, not like Neoplatonists, of a higher and of a lower 'world,' but of a present and of a future 'age' of the one world which we know. St. Paul is altogether a Hebrew in this. He believes that all things will be gathered under the feet of Christ (1 Cor 15 [25, 26]); and that, when the time comes for the manifestation of the sons of God and the redemption of their bodies, their whole environment will be transformed with them, and the travail of the old world pass away by the birth of the new (Rom 8 [18-25]).

Now from this there follows a second point. The Hebrews regard the coming of the Kingdom almost exclusively from the standpoint of the living. Belief in the Resurrection was a late arrival in Hebrew theology; and in St. Paul's day not all Hebrews accepted it. It was not that they were satisfied with belief in the immortality of the soul; it was that for long they had no belief in immortality of any kind; and, when better knowledge of the divine character and deeper spiritual experience made it impossible for them to believe that those who had 'died in faith, not having received the promises,' would lose their share in the Kingdom, the general character of the old outlook was not at first greatly affected. Thus in St. Paul's eschatology, as in that of the Gospels, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead has not the prominence which we may expect for it; it has rather the character of an appendix, dealing with an exceptional case. When St. Paul speaks of the redemption of the body (Rom 8 [11, 23]; Phil 3 [21]), he does not think primarily of the resurrection, but of the transformation of living Christians at the Lord's return. Indeed, it appears that his early teaching both at Thessalonica and at Corinth hardly dealt with the resurrection of the dead; for it was quite possible for his converts to feel the utmost distress when Christians died, and to suppose that they had lost their share in the coming glory (1 Th 4 [13]; 1 Cor 15 [12]: cf. 11 [30]). No doubt, as St. Paul urged, the Resurrection of the Lord contains within itself the promise of the resurrection of all His members; but it only establishes this when the profound relation of the Head to the members is understood, and this relation formed no part of St. Paul's first evangelistic preaching. No doubt the Lord Himself had risen from the dead, but His body never saw corruption; and thus its transformation on the Easter morning, though it renders easy the belief in the transformation of living Christians, does not in itself greatly help us to believe in the resurrection of those whose bodies have long mouldered away.

What then are St. Paul's expectations about the future? That there must be an end to the present order goes without saying. What he sees in history is the working out of a divine purpose; and a story which has no end can have no meaning, since it is only in relation to the end to be attained that the details can be understood. Moreover, since Christ is the Fulfiller of the divine purpose and the Heir of all things, the end must come through Him; and it is wholly in accordance with the principle of the Incarnation that His final manifestation should be one that all can see. St. Paul and the early Christians, who believed that all previous ages of the world's history were included in a few thousand years, naturally expected the final age to be short, while we as naturally may expect it to be long; but to expect the Parousia, the royal coming of the exalted Lord, is as reasonable for us as it was for them.

The Parousia.—Now St. Paul conceives this Parousia on the lines of the Old Testament theophanies (1 Th 4 16, 17; 2 Th 1 7-10). He speaks indeed of our standing before the judgment seat of Christ; but it is hard to find a place for this in the pictures which he draws. Probably in the Hebrew way he thinks of the manifestation of God in Christ as *ipso facto* bringing the judgment of all that is brought into contact with it (Is 33 14; 1 Cor 3 13-15, 4 5); all that cannot bear the divine fire shrivels away. What the manifestation of the glory of the Lord brings to Christians is the manifestation of their own glory (Col 3 4), the completion, by the transformation of their bodies to be like the body of the risen Lord, of that first vindication which the gift of the Spirit brought. St. Paul's description of the glorified bodies of Christians seems undoubtedly to be drawn from what he knows of the appearances of the Lord after His Resurrection (1 Cor 15 42 ff.), and there is no change to be found in the Apostle's teaching. The ascension of the saints (1 Th 4 17), which follows their resurrection, itself suggests this transformation; and 2 Cor 5 1-5 looks back to the fuller teaching given a few months earlier in 1 Cor 15, and is to be interpreted by it, the language used later in Phil 3 21 being decisive as to this.* There is no thought in St. Paul either of a spiritual body being gradually fashioned here and now within us, or of a spiritual body already prepared in heaven and to be assumed at death. How the bodies of living Christians are to be transformed St. Paul does not tell us. If we could understand the change, it would not be a change from one order to another, but a change within the present order. The language which speaks of what is mortal being swallowed up of life, and of the putting on of incorruption and immortality, does not describe any change like the changes which we know here; it tells us only that it will be with us as it was with the Lord on the Easter morning.

The Resurrection of the Dead.—But now what of the resurrection of the dead? The Hebrews had no belief in the necessary immortality of 'the soul'; eternal life depends upon union with God. But union with Christ is union with God, and death cannot sever it; those who have fallen asleep in Christ will have their full place in the coming glory (1 Th 4 13-15), and the dead as well as the living members of Christ be conformed to their Head. St. Paul knows no more than we do of the conditions of 'the intermediate state.' But a soul 'naked' or 'unclothed' (2 Cor 5 3, 4) is a soul largely deprived of its means of self-manifestation and action; it means a maimed personality, since it is largely in our relations with others that our personality lies. If death is to be 'abolished' (1 Cor 15 26) it can only be by the making good to us of the loss which death has brought. It is in this sense only that St. Paul believes in the resurrection of the body. So far from demanding that the old flesh and blood should be restored, he denies that they can inherit the Kingdom at all (1 Cor 6 13; 15 50). The resurrection body is the direct gift of God; and, though each will have his own body, St. Paul means by this, as his illustration of the seed proves, not that the elements of the old body will be reassembled, but that to each the instrument of his activity in the new world of the Kingdom will correspond to his individuality as the old instrument did (1 Cor 15 38). Of what lies beyond this St. Paul never clearly speaks. He believes (1 Th 4 17), as the Lord taught, that we shall share not only His Resurrection, but His Ascension (Jn 12 26, 14 2-6). His Ascension, like His Resurrection, is part of His redeeming work, and must be reproduced in ourselves. The Lord is the Forerunner (Heb 6 20), and we must follow where He is gone. But the conditions of the heavenly life we cannot yet know, and St. Paul never attempts to speak of them (cf. 1 Jn 3 2); enough that the Lord's Messianic activity will have ended; He will have abolished all other rule and authority and power (1 Cor 15 24), and subjected 'all things unto himself' (Phil 3 21); He will yield up Himself and all that He has won to the Father, that God Himself may be all things in us all (1 Cor 15 28). Then there will be direct union with the Father and the perfect knowledge given by the beatific vision (1 Cor 13 12). Of the future of the wicked St. Paul tells us nothing. Never in his epistles does he speak of their resurrection (though cf. Ac 24 15, reproducing Dan 12 2). He is not a universalist; 1 Cor 15 22 refers to Christians only, and Col 1 19, 20, etc., to the breadth of the divine purpose rather than to its necessary accomplishment. But, though St. Paul believes strongly in retribution to come (cf. Rom 2 8, 9), there is no word of everlasting torment; what his language rather suggests is complete destruction (1 Th 5 3; 2 Th 1 9; Phil 3 19), though it affords no basis for any positive assertion.

Jewish Beliefs Little Changed.—(3) The

* See note on 2 Cor 5 10.

third division of St. Paul's theology is of least importance, and may be dealt with briefly. St. Paul, it has been suggested, has, like other Christians, beliefs which, though fully compatible with Christian faith, are not necessary to it, and which we cannot base with confidence upon the teaching of the Lord; and it is surely no accident that it is precisely these beliefs of his which occasion most difficulty to ourselves. To many Christians, no doubt, any criticism of an Apostle of the Lord will appear irreverent and presumptuous. But if the great theology of St. Paul is to exercise its full influence in the modern world, we must make clear its compatibility with modern knowledge. The lapse of time, though it may not have increased our spiritual insight, has brought to us knowledge which St. Paul could not possess, and he would not have us set it aside. 'Brethren,' he says, 'be not children in mind; howbeit in malice be ye babes, but in mind be men' (1 Cor 14 [20]).

The Old Testament.—(*a*) The first question is St. Paul's view of the Old Testament. We do not certainly know what his canon of Scripture was, or whether the words of 2 Tim 3 [16] are his; and the alternative translations of the RV are here not identical in meaning. But St. Paul's use of Scripture makes two points clear: (i) He accepts as historical many narratives which modern knowledge renders it impossible for us so to accept. (ii) He sometimes either misinterprets the language which he quotes, or applies it, as the Fathers also do, in a way which seems to us fanciful. His use of the Old Testament, taken as a whole, is most illuminating; with the coming of Christian faith the veil has been taken away from many a passage which as a Pharisee he had failed to understand (2 Cor 3 [14]). But his incidental quotations of the Old Testament, as contrasted with those which deal with abiding principles, do not always seem to us happy in themselves, though they may have been useful with Jewish audiences (cf. 1 Cor 1 [19], 9 [9, 10], 14 [21]). There is surely a real contrast between St. Paul's use of Scripture and the Lord's. The Lord Himself appeals to the deeper sense of Scripture (cf. e.g. Lk 20 [37-44]); but He never interprets it unnaturally. He generally takes it in its obvious sense, while He criticizes it with remarkable freedom. St. Paul, we cannot but think, has like his Rabbinical teachers an exaggerated reverence for everything that 'is written,' and does not distinguish between the value of one part of Scripture and another (cf. Deissmann, *Paul*, new edition, iv, on St. Paul's relation to the LXX). At the same time, it is true of him, as of other noble Christians who have thought of Scripture as he did, that his error, if error it be, is to him quite innocuous. There is something here and there in the Old Testament not only of primitive savagery, but of the nationalism and legalism which it was St. Paul's task to combat. But his real guides are the Lord and the Spirit, and he goes on his way with no apparent recognition of these lower levels. With great numbers both of Catholics and of Protestants it has not been so. They have found the lower levels of Old Testament teaching much more congenial than the mind of Christ; and their view of inspiration has encouraged them to remain satisfied with them both in thought and in practice.

Angelology.—(*b*) The second question is St. Paul's angelology and demonology. It is again difficult to discover exactly what his belief is, and how far he asserts the reality of the angelic hierarchies to which he refers (Eph 1 [21], 3 [10], 6 [12]; Col 1 [16]). The Church itself, though in its less authoritative teaching often going beyond him in the volume of information offered about angels and demons, has not followed him at all closely. The contrast between the Lord and St. Paul is again a real one. In dealing with evil, both moral and physical, the Lord feels Himself in conflict with an unseen personal foe, the source both of temptation and of bodily suffering. There is no evil apart from evil will; and it is part of the horror of moral evil willingly accepted that through it we become Satan's children (Jn 8 [41] ff.: cf. Mt 13 [38]). St. Paul's teaching is here identical with that of the Lord (Ac 13 [10]; 1 Cor 7 [5]; 2 Cor 12 [7]; Eph 2 [2], 4 [27]; 1 Th 2 [18]; 2 Th 2 [9], etc.). But it is not clear that our Lord goes much beyond this, for the 'controls' of the demoniacs were perhaps regarded as discarnate spirits and not as 'devils' (cf. Josephus, *B.J.*, vii, 6, 3). So with the 'holy' angels. The Lord speaks of them frequently, but makes no reference to any hierarchies among them; indeed, the teaching of some parts of the Old Testament is here more definite than His own. Moreover, His language, like that of the Old Testament prophets, seems often to be symbolical (cf. e.g. Lk 10 [18]); we do not know how far He means us to accept it as it stands. St. Paul, on the other hand, instead of receding from the more advanced angelology of the Old Testament, goes beyond it, and seems

to reproduce some amount of extra-canonical teaching. His references to angels are on the whole unfriendly. Good angels undoubtedly there are (2 Cor 11 [14]; 1 Tim 5 [21]), but he is much more concerned with bad or indifferent ones (Rom 8 [38, 39]; 1 Cor 6 [3]; Eph 6 [12]; Col 2 [15]). The last quotation is especially striking, and may be connected with the Jewish belief in the function of the angels in the giving of the Law (Gal 3 [19]). If, as is possible, the 'elements' of which St. Paul speaks (Gal 4 [3, 9]; Col 2 [8, 20]) are elemental spirits, his language is again hostile; the elementals are now 'mean and beggarly' because of the Lord's victory over them. The cult of angels inculcated by Jewish teachers at Colossæ is in this case objectionable, not only because it obscures the way in which the fulness of the Godhead is concentrated in the Lord; but also because it is the cult of questionable powers, who may need reconciliation themselves (Col 1 [20]). Study of Jewish apocalyptic literature will convince us that St. Paul 'refuses' a vast number of 'old wives' fables' (1 Tim 4 [7]); but, in view of what we now know of the sources of the later Jewish angelology, we may not accept with confidence all that he accepts. Such an appeal as that of Eph 6 [12] is of high value; it turns to the best use fighting instincts which, if merely suppressed, may be harmful. Behind the evils which we see there may well be, as missionaries assure us, very macabre forces indeed. But we should not think that we know more of them than we can know; a little agnosticism will here do us no harm.

Original Sin.—(*c*) We reach more difficult ground when we turn to St. Paul's doctrine of original sin. Once again it is not altogether clear what his doctrine is. Does he e.g. agree with St. Augustine and the Reformers of the 16th century in taking a severe view of it, or with the milder view more widely current in the Church both in East and West? Do we find ourselves actually 'depraved,' or only 'deprived' of something which we were meant to enjoy? Does original sin expose us to God's 'wrath,' or does it not? The subtleties of this controversy are quite alien to the Hebrew mind. St. Paul is concerned with human character and conduct as they are revealed on the broad stage of history; when he speaks of our having been 'children of wrath' (Eph 2 [3]), he is not thinking of infants, but of responsible men and women in their wilful sins. The facts of our ingrained sinfulness and of its universality are plain for all to see; as Chesterton says, we have only to read our diaries, or look out of the window. Whether we were born with our nature already 'corrupt,' or whether we have become what we are because, being deprived of something that we ought to have had, we find ourselves unable to deal satisfactorily with the temptations which assail us, is not a matter of the first importance; and St. Paul hardly enters into it. It is clear that he thinks of God as taking a lenient view of human transgressions, as far as the time is concerned during which we know little of Him or of His requirements (Ac 14 [16], 17 [30]; Rom 3 [25], 5 [13]); 'original,' as contrasted with 'actual,' sin is an appeal to God's pity rather than to His wrath; and the mind of God towards mankind is to be learned by the action which He has taken for our redemption (Rom 5 [8]) and the wonderful patience which He has actually displayed (Rom 2 [4]), and not by considering what His attitude must be to original sin regarded in the abstract, and without consideration of the difficulties under which we labour. All this is entirely in accordance with the impression made upon us by the teaching and action of the Lord. The Lord shows a deep sense of the seriousness of our past sins (Mt 18 [24]), and of our present moral condition (Mt 7 [11]; Lk 13 [2, 3], 15 [19]); but, as far as the mass of men is concerned, He exhibits pity rather than anger (Mt 9 [36]; Lk 23 [34]).

But St. Paul, unlike the Lord, does not altogether confine himself to the facts of the moral situation; he offers an explanation of original sin which, chiefly through the exaggerations of St. Augustine, has had a great and not always a healthy influence upon Christian theology. His doctrine seems to be that original sin is due to the fall of Adam having affected all his posterity who are born in the ordinary way. There is no reason to suppose that St. Paul derived this teaching from the Lord, and it is doubtful whether any trace of it can be found in the Old Testament. The Jews seem to have possessed more than one theory of the origin of sin. In Jewish apocalyptic the story of Gen 6 [1-5] has immense prominence, and we should be grateful to St. Paul for passing on to us a view so immeasurably worthier of acceptance (cf. Ecclus 25 [24]; 2 Esd 3 [21, 22], 4 [30], 7 [46-48]). But the difficulties which his own view involves are to us serious; and, since he only twice refers to it (Rom 5 [12-19]; 1 Cor 15 [22]), we may question whether he himself would wish to press it to-day. We can go with him almost all the way. Sin in all men

and at all times means rebellion against God. It is never a step forward in any sense, but always and inevitably a fall, from which nothing but the grace of God can enable us to recover. To say, as has been said, that man by sinning lost Eden but gained a conscience, is to talk nonsense. Sin presupposes conscience, and is impossible without it. Indeed, we may perhaps go yet further. Even a child in mind may be in union with God; and it may be that when man first became man indeed, and recognized the difference between right and wrong, he found himself possessed of a union with God simultaneously bestowed, which made obedience far easier to him than it is to any but the saints to-day; and that thus his fall was the more heinous and the more disastrous to us all. But it is more than doubtful whether St. Paul held any such view (cf. 1 Cor 15 [46, 47]), and we must not assert as historical fact that for which there is no historical evidence. The third chapter of Genesis is by its moral and spiritual insight one of the greatest chapters of the Old Testament, but it is folklore turned into allegory, and cannot be made the basis for any statements of fact. We shall recognize, as this great chapter does, that the consequences of sin both for men and for women descend from generation to generation; the heritage of the past is ours both for weal and for woe. But the first man recedes for us ever further into the dim ages of the past; and the 'besetting' atmosphere of sin which we have ever to resist both within and without is due not to his 'fall' alone, but also to the multitudinous falls of all who have come after him. We shall think most of the falls nearest to ourselves, and—above all—of our own (on this subject cf. Romans, pp. 463 ff.).

Apocalyptic Symbolism.—(*d*) Finally we have to consider St. Paul's picturing of the last things. How largely his teaching here rests upon the Lord's word and the Church's experience we have already seen. But here too there are elements in St. Paul's teaching which go beyond the Lord's, and seem to belong to the furniture of his mind in his non-Christian days. We are, however, upon difficult ground. It is hard to say how far the Lord accepted the current Jewish eschatology, since the accounts of His teaching are here confused in the Synoptists, and there is reason to think, especially in St. Matthew's Gospel, that some interpolation has taken place. But, even if we accept the Gospels as they stand, we may feel that with St. Paul we are not quite in the Gospel atmosphere; and that like his Jewish teachers he sometimes fails to grasp the difference between symbols and facts. The noble symbolic language of the prophets of the Old Testament and of the Lord is a bridge by which there passes to us truth for heart and mind and will which cannot be expressed in ordinary language and forms of thought. This symbolism is ever changing; and the very impossibility of uniting its imagery in one self-consistent picture is invaluable in warning us that we are to lift up our hearts to receive spiritual truth rather than history written in advance. Who that has really heard the Lord's teaching in Mt 25 can ever forget it, or fail to be profoundly impressed by it? The picture of the judgment of the heathen nations with which it ends contains the grandest symbolism to be found in the literature of the world. We cannot picture the scene by any effort of the imagination, still less bring it into harmony with the symbolism of the two parables which have gone before it; and the very form which the Lord's teaching takes saves us from the folly of attempting to do this. But it is surely true that the events of 1 Th 4 [16, 17] can be pictured only too easily; and that St. Paul's words, though recalling those of the Old Testament prophets and of the Lord Himself (Mt 24 [30, 31]), make a different impression. So it is again in 2 Th 2 [1-12]. The belief in Antichrist has a long pre-Christian history, and there is nothing irrational about it. It is only too likely that the dark forces, which civil government hardly holds in check, may, after a great falling away of Christendom, break loose from all control, and consolidate themselves under some supposed saviour of society, to whose blasphemous claims there will be no limit. Indeed the Lord Himself may have some such incarnation of evil in His mind (Jn 5 [43]). But St. Paul goes far beyond the known teaching of the Lord (ctr. Mt 24 [5]); and history has not borne out his anticipations of the immediate future.

Conclusion.—Our task is finished. But we cannot end with words of criticism. *Sancte Paule, doctor gentium, ora pro nobis.* Of all the gifts of men which the ascended Lord has given to us we thank Him most for St. Paul. St. Paul has expounded the faith of Christ at the one moment when this could best be done. In his wonderful epistles we find that faith expressed in the forms of thought of the greatest of all peoples, the people whom above all others God had prepared to receive it and to understand it. But a

great disaster followed. The Jews as a nation rejected the Gospel; the breach between the Church and the Synagogue became complete; and the Church soon ceased rightly to understand the Hebrew outlook. The Church never lost the faith. But it did largely cease to understand Old Testament thought; and, in ceasing, ceased also fully to understand much of the language of the New Testament itself. Then came three great influences—Greek metaphysic, Roman imperialism and the moral and religious atmosphere of the Græco-Roman world; and the Church both in thought and in life was affected by them all. From all these influences the theology of St. Paul is free. Catholicism his religion certainly is, but primitive Catholicism; a religion far simpler, far less autocratic, far purer, than the later Catholicism either of the East or of the West. To-day the time is ripe for a better understanding of St. Paul. The Reformers of the 16th century failed to understand him just as their opponents failed, not only because they read him through the spectacles of St. Augustine, but because by no fault of their own they were out of touch with the Hebrew mind. With our new knowledge both of the Old Testament and of the Judaism of St. Paul's day we have an opportunity which was denied to them. It is likely that in the days to come the most marked division among religious men will be between those who, no doubt with some differences of interpretation, accept St. Paul's theology and those who as a whole repudiate it. It has been the purpose of this essay to show that, placed in its true historical context, it is not difficult to understand; and that a true understanding of it provides us with a clear historical account of the development of the Church's faith. It preserves for us most of what is valuable in the thought of the Old Testament; it is entirely faithful to the teaching of our Lord; it embodies the interpretation which the Spirit gave of His Person and work; and it includes them all in a self-consistent whole identical with the fundamental theology of the Catholic Church. There is no such thing as Paulinism as distinct from Christianity; Paulinism and Christianity are one.

Bibliography

For the Background of Jewish Thought: A. B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*; W. O. E. Oesterley and G. H. Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*; R. T. Herford, *The Pharisees*; H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*; A. S. Peake (edit. by), *The People and the Book*, article on *Hebrew Psychology*; also the article in this volume on Sacraments in the New Testament. **For the External Background:** W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, and other works; A. Deissmann, *St. Paul* (new edition); W. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*; T. R. Glover, *Conflict of Religions within the Roman Empire*. **For St. Paul's Theology:** O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinism* (Eng. trans., 1877); A. B. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*; A. Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters* (containing a complete Bibliography of the best German work up to its date); J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*; W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*; H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*; A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*; F. Prat, *La Théologie de St. Paul* (Eng. trans., 1927); W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *Romans* (*I.C.C.*); J. Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON PREDESTINATION

ST. PAUL'S doctrine of predestination has its roots in the Old Testament. All things derive their being from God, and must serve His purpose. He has a purpose for His people, chosen to manifest His glory (Is 41 [8] ff.); for the special instruments of His will whom He raises up (Is 45 [1]; Jer 1 [5] ff.); and even for those enemies of His people, whose 'fierceness turns to his praise' (Ex 9 [16]; Is 10 [5] ff.); and God's purpose must be at last fulfilled (Is 55 [10] ff.). But the theism of the Old Testament is an ethical theism, and the divine sovereignty is everywhere regarded as consistent with human responsibility. Though no one can create his own vocation, or should complain of the position in which God has placed him here, it is only too possible to forfeit the honour and blessing which high vocation brings (cf. 1 S 2 [30] ff., 16 [1]); and, if we will not forward God's purpose willingly, we must forward it unwillingly by becoming monuments of His just severity (cf. 1 K 9 [6] ff.). Thus in the Old Testament we hear of a divine 'hardening.' That fixity in evil which persistent disobedience brings, comes by a divine judgment, and serves a divine purpose; and though after punishment has fallen God may appeal again, the hardening is—at any rate for a time—

a profound reality (cf. Ex 8 [15, 32], 9 [34] with 9 [12], 10 [1]; Is 6 [9, 10] and the NT citations of this passage).

Now in the Old Testament this teaching hardly looks beyond this present world; but it stands unchanged when the hope of immortality has dawned. God's purpose is now seen as one of far horizons, and the Lord is the chosen instrument of its fulfilment. St. Paul thinks of God's predestination and election as resting upon the Lord Himself, and 'in him' upon those members of His Body, who are to be conformed to His likeness (cf. Rom 8 [23-30]; Eph 1 [9] ff.). But still vocation is from God alone, and still the high calling does not carry final salvation with it (2 Tim 2 [10]). The elect members of Christ may fall from Him; and, if their membership ceases, their election ceases with it, and others must take their places (Rom 11 [17] ff.). That this is St. Paul's general teaching few will doubt to-day. But it may be urged with great force that St. Paul is not always consistent with himself; and that in Rom 9—and, if there, perhaps elsewhere—he does, like St. Augustine and Calvin, make salvation dependent upon God's arbitrary will, and sacrifice human freedom to the divine sovereignty.* *A priori*, the charge seems unlikely to be true. Though St. Paul is 'rude in speech' (2 Cor 11 [6]), and so, easy to misunderstand, he is not 'rude in knowledge,' but an inspired Apostle of the Lord. If we consider the context in Rom 9, the difficulty will largely pass away.

We observe (i) that St. Paul is not there discussing the relation of the divine sovereignty to human freewill; that never seems to strike him as a difficulty. He is answering a Jewish objection to the doctrine that he preaches, and the objection is this. In maintaining that the Jewish people have forfeited their place in the divine purpose, St. Paul is charging God with unfaithfulness to His promise. God has pledged Himself to Israel His people, and He cannot go back from His word. St. Paul's answer covers Rom 9-11, and we must consider it as a whole. First, he shows that God has never thus sacrificed His freedom. Secondly, he shows that God's present rejection of Israel, so far as it exists, is morally justified. Thirdly, he shows that it is only for a time, and is being made the means to universal blessing. It is only in the first part of his argument that we find his teaching repellent, and there it is because we misunderstand it.

We observe (ii) that, when St. Paul insists upon the divine sovereignty, he in no way divorces the will of God from His wisdom, righteousness and love. Such a divorce would have been to St. Paul unthinkable (cf. *supra*, pp. 406, 407). It is one thing to say that 'the gifts and calling of God' cannot be created by us, and are not due to any merits of our own; it would be quite another to say that they are bestowed arbitrarily. When St. Paul says that God 'hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardeneth,' he is not claiming that the divine will is enthroned 'beyond good and evil'; rather he is insisting that God has never by His promises to Israel sacrificed His freedom to act as His righteousness and love demand. No doubt, had St. Paul been acquainted with Calvinism, he would have used more guarded language; but so horrible a doctrine never entered his mind.

We may now turn to St. Paul's argument in Rom 9; and he begins it with admirable tact and sympathy. In burning words he speaks of his passionate love for his nation, and recognizes most fully the abiding glory of their position ([1-5]). He then denies that God's promise to Israel has come to nothing ([6]: cf. 11 [1-5]). God never pledged Himself to the whole nation. From the first He chose some, and not others, for the fulfilment of His eternal purpose; and that in a way that emphasized His freedom to choose when He would, apart from all self-righteous human claims ([7-13]). Is there then injustice if He does the same now? So far from having broken His word by the calling of the Gentiles, He has kept it; He has done just what He said that He would do ([14, 15]: cf. [24-26], 10 [19, 20], 15 [8-12]). The place of all alike in God's purpose is of His free grace; it does not spring from any will or activity of their own ([16]). Indeed, it is the fulfilment of God's purpose which is in view even when God hardens men; whether in mercy or in judgement, we must bow before His will ([17, 18]). That the purpose and the will alike are just and righteous St. Paul will soon prove triumphantly (9 [30]-10 [4, 16-24]); but the first need is to vindicate God's freedom.

But now a baseless cavil is heard: 'if it is God who hardens us, why are we to be blamed for it?' St. Paul does not give a full answer at once, though he will give it shortly: the Jews are to be blamed for the disobedience and gainsaying which have made their hardening necessary ([32, 33], 10 [21]). But for the moment, as in 3 [5] ff., his indignation leads him to another answer. God being what God is, and man being what man is, it is infamous

* Cf. commentary on Romans, pp. 474, 475.

that man should thus reply against God (19, 20). No doubt the thought in the foreground is that man is the created, and God the Creator. But that contrast surely does not stand alone; there is another behind (cf. Ecclus 15 11-20; Jas 1 13-15). Man is sinful and God is holy (cf. Ezek 18 25); how should the one lay the burden of his sin upon the Other? Jeremiah's simile of the potter and the wheel (Jer 18 6), to which St. Paul refers (21) brings out both contrasts (Jer 18 6). It is Israel, 'marred in the hand of the potter' by its own persistent wickedness, that is in view, and what God claims is His right to make of it 'another vessel,' and use it for another purpose than that first intended. When St. Paul speaks of 'vessels of wrath fitted for destruction' (22), he means just what Jeremiah means. God Himself 'afore prepared unto glory' the 'vessels of his mercy' (23); if those once intended to be vessels of His mercy are now only fitted for destruction, they have but themselves to blame for it. Meanwhile St. Paul calls us to observe the long-suffering with which God has borne with them, and will soon call us to observe the way in which even their wickedness has been made to serve His purpose of universal blessing (22-25).

We need not carry further the exposition of St. Paul's argument; the rest suggests no serious difficulties. Here, as elsewhere in the Bible, if we have rightly interpreted St. Paul's meaning, divine predestination does not come even into apparent conflict with human freewill.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

By N. P. Williams

(A) Introduction

(I) Genuineness, Date, and Place of Composition.—The genuineness of this, perhaps the greatest of St. Paul's letters, has never been seriously challenged, being admitted even by Baur and the radical critics of Tübingen; and its fresh, vigorous, and rugged style is the surest guarantee that it is no pseudepigraphic figment. There is equally little dispute as to its approximate date; the account given by the Apostle in 15 of his past movements and future plans makes it certain that the epistle was despatched to Rome towards the close of the Third Missionary Journey (for the relation of 15 to the rest of the epistle see below, § IV). It must thus have been written during the winter of A.D. 55-56, according to C. H. Turner's chronology (Hastings' *D.B.*, i, 423, article 'Chronology of the New Testament'), or of A.D. 53-54, according to Harnack's *Chronologie der altchristl. Literatur*, 1897, i, 233-244. If 16 belongs to the epistle as originally composed, the commendation of Phœbe, deaconess of the Church of Cenchreæ (one of the ports of Corinth) in 1, 2, and the mention of Gaius and Erastus (23), names associated elsewhere in the Pauline *corpus* with Corinth (see the commentary *in loc.*), strongly suggest that the place of composition was Corinth. And if the epistle was written at Corinth, we could then assign it with certainty to the period of St. Paul's visit to 'Greece' mentioned in Ac 20 2, and to a time just before the discovery of the plot mentioned in the following verse, a discovery which caused the Apostle to abandon his design of returning to Palestine by the direct sea route and to retrace his steps by land through Macedonia. This hypothesis is tempting, and even probable: but the present uncertainty with regard to the original destination of 16 makes it impossible to be dogmatic on the point.

(II) Occasion and Purpose of Writing.—More important, however, than the question of an accurate and absolute date is the question of the epistle's relative date, that is of the position which it occupies in St. Paul's life and intellectual development, and of the religious situation which it presupposes. This will need a little explanation.

When Saul of Tarsus was converted to Christianity, the followers of Jesus constituted a group, or school of thought, within the ancient Jewish Ecclesia. They were bound together, and distinguished from other Jews, (1) by their belief that the Messiah for whom Israel was looking had already come, and was in point of fact none other than the crucified Jesus of Nazareth, who had risen from the dead, had been exalted to God's right hand, and would soon come again with glory to inaugurate the Messianic age; (2) by their consciousness of the indwelling of 'Holy Spirit,' to an unprecedented degree, in themselves both individually and cor-

porately; (3) by their use of what we now call the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; (4) by the general presidency and leadership of the 'Twelve.' But these convictions in no way prevented them from regarding themselves as good Jews; and they must have conceived their function to be that of gradually converting the Jewish Church, *from within*, to a belief in the Messiahship and Lordship of Jesus. They had no idea of going out from it, or of setting up a new and rival Church; they assumed that the Law and the Temple would go on until the Parousia, and that there could be no question of evangelizing Gentiles, except in so far as these were willing previously to become members of the one and only (which to them at that time would simply mean the Jewish) Church.

The first steps towards a wider view of the significance of Christianity were taken by the Hellenist Stephen, who proclaimed the transitoriness and non-essentiality of the Temple and the Law. The persecution which followed his murder showed that the Jewish nation in its main mass would have none of the new teaching, and was the incidental cause of a new and all-important departure being taken in the conversion of certain 'Greeks' at Antioch, that is, persons who had no connexion whatever with the Jewish Church, being neither proselytes nor even 'God-fearers.' Though the fact was probably not realized at the time, this action logically involved the following positions: (1) that the Jewish Church had ceased to be *the* Ecclesia in an exclusive sense, and that its privileges and functions in this regard had now devolved upon the Christian group, which henceforward was the sole lawful representative of the ancient Church of God, the Church of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; (2) that, whilst the Mosaic Law might still be binding on those Christians who were of Jewish birth, it was not binding on Gentile Christians, and therefore not in principle binding on Christians as such; (3) that the Law was therefore not a means or vehicle of salvation, and that acceptance of Jesus as Risen, Messiah, and Lord was the crucial and all-important matter which differentiated Christians from non-Christians, and would ultimately assure them a safe passage through the terrors attending the 'consummation of the age' into the harbour of the Messianic Kingdom.

Christianity was thus tending to become conscious of itself as a definite, substantive religion, not a mere appendage of or an addition to Judaism, and this development received a notable impulse from the conversion of St. Paul, who may be presumed to have thought out the positions just formulated during his retirement in Arabia (Gal 1 [17]) and at Tarsus (Ac 9 [30]), translating them into practice on a large scale by his First Missionary Journey, which had the effect of enormously increasing the numbers of the purely Gentile wing of the Christian Church. These Stephanic and Pauline developments were, however, not at all to the taste of the majority of the members of the Mother-Church of Jerusalem, who adhered rigidly to the earliest view of Christianity as being simply Judaism *plus* the belief in the Resurrection and Lordship of Jesus, and the use of the Sacraments: and they consequently despatched missionaries to Asia Minor, for the purpose (as they would have said) of regularizing the results of St. Paul's labours by incorporating his converts, not merely into Christianity, but into the full profession of Judaism and membership of the Jewish Church. It was obvious that this action on the part of the Jerusalem Christians challenged the whole Pauline and Gentile-Christian conception of Christianity as a substantive Faith and Church (rather than as an addition to the Jewish Faith and a school of thought within the Jewish Church); and St. Paul resolved to force the whole question to an issue, once and for all, by demanding from Peter and the original Apostles, in the name of the Gentile and pro-Gentile section of the Church, an unequivocal answer to the question, whether the action of the Jerusalem Christians was carried out with their approval. Before, however, leaving Antioch for Jerusalem, he wrote a vehement letter to his converts in Asia Minor, imploring them not to accept circumcision or become Jews, and stating, in an unsystematic form, his general conception of Christianity as a self-subsistent religion, in which Faith in Christ and not the observance of the antiquated law is the central point. This letter is the 'Epistle to the Galatians.'

The Council of Jerusalem resulted in a sweeping victory for the Pauline point of view. (I assume without argument that the 'Western' omission of 'things strangled' from the Apostolic Decree, Ac 15 [29], is correct: see Kirsopp Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 48-60.) It became the official theory of the Christian Church that the only part of the Mosaic Law which obliged non-Jewish Christians was the moral part. St. Paul was, there-

fore, free to proceed with his work of indefinitely expanding the Gentile section of the Christian society, which he carried out, so far as Asia Minor and the Balkan Peninsula were concerned, in the Second and Third Missionary Journeys, which planted communities of free Gentile-Christians in the principal towns, along the great Roman roads, 'in a circle from Jerusalem as far as Illyricum' (Rom 15 [19]).

All was not yet, however, plain sailing. It usually happens that, when a Council of the Church has come to a doctrinal decision, there is a dissentient minority which repudiates the authority of the Council and continues to be 'of the same opinion still.' Sometimes this recalcitrant minority breaks into open schism, as after Ephesus and Chalcedon: sometimes, as after Nicæa, it remains within the Church and endeavours to make the decrees of the Council nugatory in practice. In the same way, it would appear that the old-fashioned Jewish-Christians retained their own opinions even after the Council of Jerusalem, and, moreover, were probably smarting with resentment over their defeat at the Council—a state of things which, unless tactfully handled by the leaders of the Church, might well have resulted in a 1st-century Great Schism between the Jewish and Gentile sections of the Church. It is for this reason that St. Paul assigns so much importance to the collection made by his Greek and Macedonian converts for the benefit of 'the poor Christians of Jerusalem,' as likely to smooth down the ruffled feelings of the latter. When the Christian world was in this state, it was natural that St. Paul, the champion of the tendencies which had officially triumphed, should attempt again, in a calmer spirit, to do what he had already attempted, under the stress of controversial excitement, in the Epistle to the Galatians—namely, to set down on paper a constructive statement of the essence of the Christian religion as he conceived it, in contrast with the (officially) defeated Judaizing view. This statement is the 'Epistle to the Romans.' We misconceive the epistle if we regard it as a monograph on some one point of Christian thought—Atonement, Grace, or Justification; its scope is much wider. If St. Paul had been in the habit of giving titles to his letters, he might well have chosen for this one a title analogous to Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums*. 'What Christianity is and is meant to do'—'Christianity considered as the only way of Salvation'—may be suggested as roughly expressing the aim and purport of the letter.

The immediate occasion of its writing is described in 1 [10-13] and 15 [22-23]. The Apostle's plan of campaign is not so much to convert whole districts, as to plant centres of Christian life from which the truth may spread. This, by the end of the Third Missionary Journey, he feels that he has done pretty effectively so far as the Levant is concerned: the time has therefore now come for him to leave his Eastern Churches to leaven their own neighbourhoods, and transfer his pioneer activities to the West. For this purpose he needs a base of operations in the West, as Antioch and Ephesus had been in the East—a place to which he can retire for rest and spiritual recuperation between his missionary tours. The obvious place was Rome, the centre of the great Roman system of roads. But it was necessary that the Roman Church should be an appropriate and congenial spiritual *milieu* for his purposes: he would not be able to find much refreshment for a tired body and soul in a bitterly Judaizing Church, or even in one which had not thoroughly grasped the essentials of Pauline Christianity—and still less in one which was, like the Corinthian Church, morally relaxed. The Roman Church, whether founded by St. Peter or not, cannot indeed have been predominantly Jewish-Christian in character; but 9-11 presuppose the existence of a Jewish-Christian element in it (for the grounds of these statements see § III below); and 6-7 seem to suggest that the Apostle is not altogether easy in his own mind as to the moral level at which the life of the community was maintained. The immediate purpose, therefore, of the epistle is to announce St. Paul's forthcoming visit to the imperial city, to consolidate and fortify the Roman Church in the true interpretation of the Gospel, to answer difficulties arising out of this interpretation, and to insist upon absolute moral correctness amongst the members of the Church in which he hopes in the future to spend so much of his time. It is one of the many proofs of the genuineness of the epistle, that the writer is obviously ignorant of the circumstances under which St. Paul did in fact reach Rome (Ac 28); a pseudepigraphist would undoubtedly have made the Apostle prophesy his own arrival in chains.

The main doctrinal portion of the epistle (1-8) is thus to be regarded as an attempt to capture a Church, which was predominantly Gentile in composi-

tion, and already Pauline in general sympathies without having set eyes on St. Paul in the flesh, for full, conscious, and explicit Paulinism. It would seem, however, that there was a strong minority of Jewish-Christians at Rome; hence the Apostle feels it necessary to add a discussion of one of the crucial difficulties which the Pauline presentation of Christianity would present to a Jewish-Christian, namely, its implied extrusion of all non-Christian Jews, that is, the great majority of the Jewish race, from the Ecclesia of God—and a vindication of the justice of God in having allowed this paradoxical consequence of the appearance of the Messiah to come about. 9-11 thus form a Theodicy *ad Judæos*, which stands apart so distinctly from 1-8 that it might almost have been written as a separate treatise—though there is no reason to suppose that it was. Five chapters devoted to practical and personal matters conclude the letter.

(III) **Origins and Composition of the Roman Church.**—The traditional Roman theory is that St. Peter, after his release from prison (Ac 12), went to Rome (the 'other place' of Ac 12 [17]) and there established a Christian community, over which he presided, as a monarchical bishop, for twenty-five years (A.D. 42-67), the period which a newly elected Pope is warned on the morning of his coronation that he is not likely to surpass ('annos Petri non superabis'). This theory is indeed of considerable antiquity, having been traced back with great probability to Hippolytus (see Sanday and Headlam, *I.C.C.* [1905], xxx); but it is sufficiently refuted by the fact that the Epistle to the Romans, which must have reached Rome in the middle of St. Peter's alleged Roman episcopate, contains no greeting to or even mention of him. *A priori*, it would seem a sufficient explanation of the genesis of the Roman Church to suppose that it came into existence by the fortuitous confluence to the capital of persons who had already been converted to Christianity in other parts of the empire, much as the Mohammedan community at Liverpool has been created by the natural collection of individual Mohammedans in a great seaport. 'Sojourners of Rome' (that is, Jews and proselytes domiciled in Rome) are said to have witnessed the outpouring of the Spirit on the nucleus of the Christian brotherhood (Ac 2 [10]); some of them may well have been amongst the three thousand who were converted on the Day of Pentecost, and may have carried the Christian faith with them back to the imperial city. The early and presumably reliable tradition which asserts that St. Peter preached the Gospel at Rome and perished there as a martyr under Nero does not require us to suppose more than that he visited Rome for some period, short or long, *after* the date of the composition of this epistle.

So far, then, there seems no ground for believing that St. Peter was the 'founder' of the Roman Church in the sense of having been the first to introduce Christianity into Rome, though it is quite likely that he and St. Paul were its 'founders' in the sense that they subsequently visited a community which had grown up as it were spontaneously, and helped it to organize and regularize its life. It has, however, been recently suggested that the terms of Rom 15 [20, 22] 'making it my aim so to preach the Gospel . . . that I might not build upon *another man's* foundation; . . . *wherefore* also I was hindered these many times from coming to you' imply that the Roman Church *was* the foundation of an Apostle other than St. Paul: and Kirsopp Lake affirms 'the question will always remain, why not [of] St. Peter?' (*Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 379; cf. also G. Edmundson, *The Church in Rome in the First Century* [1913], 28, 29, etc.). For a detailed discussion of this verse see the commentary *in loc.*; it must suffice here to summarize the present state of scholarly opinion in the following sentence: It is clearly impossible to deny that St. Peter *may* have paid an early visit to Rome, and made some converts there, at some time within the decade A.D. 40-50, and we may be fairly confident that he died there, probably in A.D. 64; but what is certain is that he did not reign there as a local bishop between these two dates, and that he had no special connexion or touch with the Roman Church at the moment when St. Paul wrote to it.

The origins of the Roman Church are thus involved in obscurity; but its composition, when St. Paul addressed it, can be gathered with much greater certitude from the words of this epistle. The Apostle directly implies that his readers are in the main Gentiles in 1 [5, 6, 13], 11 [13]. On the other hand, the discussion of Abraham's justification in 4, the references to the Law in 6 and 7, and the 'theodicy' of 9-11 are passages which could hardly have been of primary interest to others than Jews. We may therefore conclude that the Roman community was predominantly Gentile-Christian in character, but included a strong Jewish ele-

ment; a hypothesis which adequately explains the attitude assumed by the Apostle in this letter, in which authoritative instruction, conciliatory argument, and mordant polemic are uniquely mingled.

(IV) **Integrity.**—If a few relatively unimportant points of reading be disregarded, we may take it as beyond doubt that 1-14 of the epistle have come down to us exactly as St. Paul dictated them for transmission to the Church of Rome. But the problem of the exact *provenance* of 15 and 16 is involved in some difficulty. This difficulty is occasioned by three facts: (1) that a short recension of the epistle, omitting 15 and 16 [1-23] but ending with the doxology (16 [25-27]), was almost certainly current in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D.; (2) that a fairly strong case, based upon internal evidence, can be made out for the supposition that 16 [1-23], which consists entirely of personal messages, originally formed no part of the Roman letter, but is a brief note written to commend the deaconess Phœbe to the Church of *Ephesus*, not of Rome, and attached by a copyist's error to the end of our epistle; (3) that the doxology itself (16 [25-27]) has been thought late Pauline or non-Pauline in style, and un-Pauline or even Marcionite in contents. The questions thus raised shall be dealt with *seriatim*.

(1) The reasons for supposing that a short recension of the epistle once existed are as follows: (*a*) A doxology so elaborate and solemn as 16 [25-27] can hardly have been written at any point of an epistle other than the end. Now, though all existing Greek MSS. contain the epistle in its long form, including 15 and 16, yet codex Angelicus (*sæc.* ix), more than 200 minuscules, the texts used by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and John of Damascus, some MSS. known to Origen, and the Harkleian Syriac version place this doxology at the close of 14, and omit it after 16; these authorities, therefore, must be taken as witnesses to the existence of a widespread textual tradition that the epistle once ended with 14. Note also that A (codex Alexandrinus), like the Armenian version, has the doxology in *both* places; a fact which is most easily explicable by the supposition that the epistle in the 5th century was simultaneously current in two recensions, a short and a long, and that the scribe of A produced his text by mechanically conflating both. (*b*) Cyprian nowhere quotes from 15 and 16, though in *Test.*, iii, 68, 78, 95, where he is amassing scriptural proofs of the duty of avoiding heretics, it would have been natural for him to cite Rom 16 [17]; Tertullian also ignores these two chapters, and, in *adv. Marcion*, v, 13, quotes from 14 [10] the phrase *tribunal Christi* as standing *in clausula*—that is, at the conclusion of the epistle. (*c*) The system of *breves*, or chapter headings, given in codex Amiatinus and many other Vulgate MSS., but evidently taken over from an Old Latin version, implies that the doxology follows immediately upon 14, and that the epistle then ends (for details see Sanday and Headlam, *I.C.C.* [1905], xc, or Kirsopp Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 335 ff.). (*d*) Origen, or his translator Rufinus, assures us (*Comment. in Rom.*, 16 [25-27]) that Marcion cut off (*dissecuit*) the whole of the epistle after 14 [23]: 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' The cumulative effect of these reasons has appeared to most scholars irresistible.

Side by side with this conclusion, however, must be set the fact that 15 and 16, whether they were originally addressed to Rome or not, are evidently Pauline, and contain various minute touches (for which see this commentary *in loc.*) which would have been beyond the power of a forger to imagine. In particular it must be noted that the argument of 14 flows on with complete continuity into 15. Three possible hypotheses, therefore, lie open to us: we may suppose, either (*a*) that St. Paul wrote the long recension first to Rome, and then made the short recension for more general use, by cutting off the last two chapters (or the last chapter, if 16 does not really belong to this epistle), as being too local and restricted in interest (Lightfoot); (*b*) that St. Paul wrote the short recension first, possibly to his converts in Asia, and then produced the long recension, which he sent to Rome, by adding 15 (? and 16) as a 'covering letter' (Kirsopp Lake); (*c*) that St. Paul originally wrote the long recension, and that someone else (? Marcion—so Sanday and Headlam, Von Soden, Corssen) produced the short recension by cutting off the last two chapters, possibly because 15 was too Jewish in tone for the abbreviator's taste.

The first of these hypotheses seems to be excluded by the fact of the complete continuity between 14 and 15; Sanday and Headlam pertinently observe: 'It is to us inconceivable that St. Paul should have himself mutilated his own argument by cutting off the conclusion of it' (*op. cit.*, xcv). The same fact militates powerfully against the second: it is hard to believe that an author so careless of literary effect as St. Paul could by mere accident have

produced so convincing an appearance of logical and stylistic homogeneity between two documents written at different dates (as, on this hypothesis, the body of the epistle and the 'covering letter' are). Kirsopp Lake's case for this theory rests largely on the supposition that the short recension did not contain the words 'in Rome' in 1 [7] and [15]: but the arguments for this supposition seem very precarious (see below, commentary *in loc.*). No real difficulties, however, seem to attach to the third hypothesis, that the epistle was mutilated by Marcion for dogmatic reasons. We have the witness of Origen (or of his translator Rufinus), that Marcion did actually cut off from the epistle everything that follows 14 [23] (see above): and the commendation of the Law and the Jewish scriptures which occur in 15 furnish ample reasons for his action. Marcion could not possibly have allowed such a sentence as 15 [8], 'Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of circumcision,' to stand in his text of St. Paul's epistles. If it be objected that a recension made by the heresiarch Marcion would not have been likely to find its way to acceptance in orthodox circles, it may be replied that there are other notable instances of influence exercised upon the thought and practice of the 'Great Church' by those who were sundered from its visible communion; Tertullian, most of whose Christian life was spent in the Montanist schism, was the father of Latin theology, and the Catholic custom of singing the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed in the Eucharistic Liturgy on Sundays and holy days was borrowed from the adherents of the Monophysite Peter the Fuller (d. A.D. 488). We therefore conclude that the hypothesis favoured by Sanday and Headlam still holds its ground, and that 1-15, at least, are to be taken as a continuous work of the Apostle, the short recension being the work of Marcion, adopted by some Catholic Churchmen possibly because of its convenience for public reading in church.

(2) **The Personal Messages** (16 [1-23]).—There is no MS. evidence whatever for detaching this passage from the Roman epistle (apart from the evidence summarized above for the existence of a short recension), and whatever its original destination may have been it is certainly Pauline. The arguments for an Ephesian destination are as follows: (*a*) it is unlikely that St. Paul would have known so many members of the Roman Church which he had never visited, whereas it is self-evident that he would have had hosts of Christian friends at Ephesus, where he had resided continuously for more than two years (Ac 19 [8-10]); (*b*) the warning against false teachers contained in [17, 18] does not seem specially appropriate to the Judaizers whose influence the Apostle seems to have dreaded at Rome, and would be much more applicable to Asian semi-Gnostics such as are denounced in Col 2 [8] ff.; (*c*) in [5] Epænetus is described as the 'firstfruits of Asia,' an epithet which would have much more complimentary force in a letter addressed to Ephesus than in one destined for Rome; (*d*) Prisca and Aquila, who are greeted in [3] f., were expelled from Rome by Claudius, and were found by St. Paul at Corinth (Ac 18 [2]): they accompanied St. Paul to Ephesus (Ac 18 [18]), and their house is a meeting-place of a congregation (1 Cor 16 [19], which cannot have been written more than a year or two before the Epistle to the Romans). It is singular that Prisca and Aquila should have returned to Rome so soon after their expulsion, and perhaps even more singular that a year or so after their house had become the centre of a church at Ephesus they should be found occupying a similar position at Rome. If Rom 16 [1-23] was originally addressed to Ephesus, 'the church that is in their house' of [5] is identical with the body as described in 1 Cor 16 [19], and the difficulty as to their movements does not arise.

None of these arguments appears to be specially cogent except the last. To (*a*) it might be replied that it is impossible to decide *a priori* how many friends the Apostle may have had in a given place, and that in addressing, somewhat diffidently (see commentary on 1 [8-12], 15 [14]), a church to which, in its corporate capacity, he was personally unknown, he may well have desired to emphasize the individual friendships which bound him to many of its members; to (*b*), that we do not know enough about the personal characters of the Judaizers to be confident on the point; to (*c*) that in view of the cosmopolitan composition of the Roman Church, suggested in the last paragraph, the description of Epænetus as the earliest Christian of Asia may, for all we know, have had a special point for Roman Christians which we cannot now rediscover. But the difficulty about the movements of Prisca and Aquila remains: and it becomes even more acute if the full Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles be admitted, for according to 2 Tim 4 [19] they are (? again) residing at Ephesus during St. Paul's (presumed) second Roman cap-

tivity. It is tempting to suppose that they were continuously at Ephesus between the points of time marked by Ac 18 [18] and 2 Tim 4 [19], and to eliminate their hypothetical visit to Rome, which the 'Ephesian' theory of the original destination of Rom 16 [1-23] would allow us to do.

The arguments in favour of the supposition that this passage formed part of the original Roman letter are based on (*a*) the unanimity of the MS. testimony, and (*b*) the fact, pointed out by Lightfoot (*Ep. to the Philippians*, 174 ff.), that many of the names mentioned in it can be paralleled from Roman sepulchral inscriptions. (*a*) could, however, be explained by the supposition that the agglutination of the Ephesian note to the end of the Roman letter took place at a very early date, so early as to determine the text of the archetypes of all existing MSS.: and the increase of epigraphic knowledge has very much diminished the cogency of Lightfoot's argument, as the same names are found in inscriptions from many parts of the Roman Empire outside the capital (see Kirsopp Lake, *op. cit.*, 330). The attempt of the archæologist De Rossi to connect the names of Prisca (3) and Nereus (15) with the ancient Roman basilicas of Sta Prisca on the Aventine and SS. Nereo ed Achilleo must remain purely speculative, until scholars have arrived at a final verdict regarding the value of the topographical traditions of the early Roman Church.

Where the arguments on either side are so evenly balanced, an attitude of suspended judgement appears to be inevitable; though the student cannot be blamed who, having regard to the difficulty of arriving at a solution of the problem either on archæological or critical grounds, prefers to pin his faith to the unanimous testimony of the MSS., and to take the existing text of the epistle, including 16 [1-23], as identical with the letter originally addressed by St. Paul to Rome. It is perhaps worth while to re-emphasize the fact that in any case this passage comes from the lips of St. Paul; and to add that, in view of their purely personal character, the hypothesis of an original Ephesian destination of these verses, if accepted, would not have any *doctrinal* import or bearing whatsoever: it would only disable us from affirming with confidence that the body of the Epistle to the Romans was written at *Corinth*, rather than at any other place touched by the Apostle on his return from the Third Missionary Journey.

(3) The Doxology (16 [25-27]).—Corssen impugns the Pauline authorship of this passage, and assigns it to a Marcionite redactor, on the ground that in [25] the 'mystery' (i.e. of the Incarnation and of Redemption) is said to have been 'kept in silence through times eternal.' He contends that St. Paul's authentic mind is that the future Incarnation was not 'kept in silence,' but proclaimed to the men of the Old Dispensation, only not recognized or comprehended by them (cf. 2 Cor 3 [12] ff.): and that only a Marcionite could have affirmed that the Incarnation was *concealed* from those under the Law. This seems hypercritical: St. Paul was not a pedant, and it is unreasonable to expect minute and unvarying verbal consistency from him. The contention that the style of these verses is more reminiscent of the epistles of the Captivity than of the epistles of St. Paul's earlier period, and that this doxology may therefore be a fragment of some later Pauline letter which has accidentally become attached to the end of Romans, is less arbitrary. But, again, it appears unjustifiably subjective and dogmatic to cut up St. Paul's literary career into 'periods,' and to deny him in one period the power of expressing himself in terms characteristic of the next. There seems no adequate reason for rejecting either the Pauline authorship or the Roman destination of this short passage, both of which are vouched for by the fact that it terminated both the long and the short recensions of the epistle.

We may sum up this discussion by reaching the judgement that 1-15 and 16 [25-27] were certainly sent by St. Paul to Rome; the question of 16 [1-23] is more doubtful, but even here there is no absolutely overwhelming reason for departing from the existing MS. tradition.

(B) Commentaries

R. M. Benson, *Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans*, 1892; H. P. Liddon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, 1899; W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *I.C.C.*, last edition, 1905; C. Gore, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., 1907; A. E. Garvie, *Cent. Bible*, n.d.; Th. Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, 1910; E. Kühl, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, 1913; H. Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum N.T.*, iii, 1 (2nd edition, 1919); Th. Haering, *Der Römerbrief des Apostels Paulus*, 1926. See also Hort, *Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians*, 1895; Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, ix, 1983; C. Gore (on 9-11) in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, iii, 37 ff.

(C) **Detailed Analysis of the Epistle**

I. 1-7. Opening Salutation.

8-17. Self-introduction to the Roman Church, ending in a statement of the main topic of the epistle, viz. 'The Gospel as divine power setting forward man's salvation,' and the necessity of 'righteousness,' i.e. the *de jure* status of acquittal (to be carefully distinguished from *de facto* holiness) as the prerequisite condition of 'salvation.'

(I) **'Justification,' or 'Acquittal'—the Entrance to the Christian Life** (I.-IV.).

(1) I., II. **Demonstration of the universal need for righteousness—in other words, of man's universal sinfulness.**

(*a*) I. The Gentile world is involved in sin of the gravest kind, having neglected the light of natural religion which it had.

(*b*) II. The Jews are in no better state: they are as sinful as the Gentiles, and are possessed by the additional vice of hypocrisy. (2[1-16] are a digression, asserting that racial privilege will be non-existent on the Day of Judgement.)

[Excursus rebutting some Jewish objections to the foregoing (3[1-8]).]

III. 9-20. Summing up of (*a*) and (*b*). All men are equally under the dominion of sin.

(2) III. 21-26. **The remedy stated—'Acquittal' is bestowed by God in consideration of 'Faith,' appropriating the benefits of Christ's atoning death.**

[III. 27-31. Digression: Jews and Gentiles alike must make use of the new method of 'Faith.']

[IV. **Scholastic excursus on the case of Abraham.**

Abraham admittedly was 'justified,' or 'acquitted.' How? By Faith or Works? St. Paul makes use of Rabbinical methods of exegesis to show that he was justified by Faith.]

(II) **The Christian Life itself—Sanctification** (V.-VIII.).

(1) V. 1-11. Exhortation to cultivate interior peace, based on the certitude of redemption.

[12-21. The thought of redemption suggests a digression on the parallelism between Adam and Christ, which involves a brief discussion of the Fall (5[12-14])—the *locus classicus* for the subject in the New Testament.]

(2) VI. 1-VII. 7. Exhortation to cultivate absolute moral spotlessness, based upon the complete break with the old life involved in the fact of Baptism. This is described in four metaphors:

(*a*) Baptism as a mystical death and resurrection (6[1-11]).

(*b*) Baptism as desertion from one monarch, Sin, and enlistment in the service of another monarch, God (6[12-14]).

(*c*) Baptism as manumission from the ownership of Sin and acceptance of the ownership of God (6[15-23]).

(*d*) Baptism as the dissolution by death of our marriage with Sin, and entering into wedlock with God (7[1-7]).

[VII. 8-25. Digression on the relations between Law and Sin. The impotence of mere Law and the terrible power of inbred Sin.]

(3) VIII. Renewed exhortation to confidence and interior tranquillity, based upon (*a*) experience of the Spirit's indwelling (8[1-17] and [26, 27]); (*b*) the apocalyptic hope of the regeneration of the material universe ([18-25]); (*c*) the consciousness of predestination ([28-30]).

(III) **St. Paul's Theodicy 'ad Judæos,' or Vindication of God's Dealings with the Jews.**

IX. 1-5. The problem: How is the present condition of the Jews, outcast as they are from the true Israel and Church, to be reconciled with God's faithfulness and justice?

Three complementary answers are given, viz.:

(*a*) IX. 6-29. God is absolute Sovereign of all men, and can do what He wills with His own.

(*b*) IX. 30-X. 21. Israel's rejection is due to Israel's own deliberate faithlessness.

(*c*) XI. As a matter of fact, there is a faithful remnant (the small body of Christian Jews), and the whole nation will be converted before the Parousia.

(IV) **Various Practical Exhortations, Statement of Plans, and Personal Messages** (XII.-XVI.).

XII. General moral and religious exhortations.

XIII. 1-7. Loyalty to the State.

8-10. The universal duty of love.

11-14. The approach of the Parousia.

XIV. The controversy between the 'strong' (? convinced Pauline Christians) and the 'weak' (? Essenizers) to be settled on lines of mutual toleration.

XV. 1-13. General exhortations to harmony and concord between the Gentile and Jewish elements in the community.

14-33. Personal matters. The writer's plans for the immediate future.

XVI. Greetings and messages to individuals.

One warning should be added to this analysis—namely, that in this epistle we have a document which on its human side is a product of Hebrew and not of Greek

thought. And the Hebrew genius at its highest is prophetic rather than scientific in character. We must consequently expect to find that some of St. Paul's arguments, when tested by the standards of accurate reasoning to which the modern, Western-European mind is accustomed, fall short of formal cogency. But logical precision is an infinitesimally small matter in comparison with religious truth, and the faultiness of an occasional chain of reasoning does not disparage the sublimity of the intuition or the reality of the divine inspiration from which the main Pauline positions are ultimately derived. Whatever there may be of merely temporary validity in some of his *obiter dicta*, it remains true to say that his was the mind which determined the main lines on which Christian theology was to develop, and that the ideas enunciated by him—such as the universal dominion of sin, the purely divine origin of redemption and the undeserved, gratuitous character of God's 'favour,' the absolving power of 'faith' or self-committal to Christ, the unsatisfactoriness of a merely legal relation to God, and the replacement in Christianity of the external constraints of Law by the interior transforming operation of the Holy Spirit—still hold their ground in undiminished strength. It is in his clear vision and his unfaltering proclamation of these Gospel truths that the Apostle's unique and incommunicable glory resides, a glory which is not dimmed by the recognition of the human elements inhering in the external form of his exposition. We may well believe that, in this connexion as in others, he would himself have been willing to confess 'We have this treasure in earthen vesels, that the exceeding greatness of the power may be of God, and not from ourselves' (2 Cor 4 [7]).

(D) The Commentary

I. **1-7. Opening Salutation.** — The Apostle expands the customary greeting, with which ancient letters began, into a statement (*a*) of his own apostolic authority, and (*b*) of the fundamental ideas of his Faith. (*a*) In [1] he claims to be a 'called Apostle' (that is, not a pseudo-Apostle), 'separated' from other men by his missionary vocation (the word may be a reminiscence of Gal 1 [15], and may also contain an allusion to the etymological meaning of the word 'Pharisee'—*perishaya*', one set apart); and in [5] the scope of this apostolate is defined as being 'among all the Gentiles,' a fact which justifies him in addressing the Roman Christians, though personally unknown to them. (*b*) In [2] he emphatically, though indirectly, asserts his belief in the inspiration of the OT (the 'good news' was proclaimed beforehand by God through His prophets in scriptures that are *holy*—the order of the Greek words is meant to bring this out); in [3, 4] he asserts Christ to be the Son of David on His physical, and the Son of God on His spiritual side—a sentence which contains the germ of the Chalcedonian doctrine of the Two Natures—and adduces the admitted fact of the Resurrection as the proof of His divine Sonship.

3, 4. The contrast between the human and the divine elements in Christ is expressed in the form of a triple antithesis, 'born' in [3] being set over against 'declared' in [4], 'of the seed of David' against 'Son of God,' and 'according to flesh' corresponding to 'according to a' (not 'the,' as RV) 'spirit of holiness.' The difficult phrases are 'declared' and 'according to a spirit of holiness.' The Greek word translated 'declared' means, literally, 'separated' or 'marked off' (a derivative of it is used in [1]): hence it may signify either 'declared to be, designated as already being' or '*appointed* to be,' with the implication that the person appointed to a given office or status had not previously enjoyed it. If the former meaning is correct here, the Christology contained in this verse is in line with subsequent Catholic theology, and implies that our Lord always was Son of God, but was marked out as such before the eyes of men by the Resurrection. If the latter be accepted, the passage becomes 'Adoptianist' in sense, implying that our Lord previously to the Resurrection was mere man, but was exalted through that event to the position of (adopted) Son of God. Both meanings are linguistically possible, and the question must be decided by considerations of probability drawn from St. Paul's general theological position. 2 Cor 8 [9], written only a year or so previously, clearly implies the pre-existence of Christ; and the description of Him in 9 [5] of this epistle as '[he] who is over all, God blessed for ever' (see below) would have been almost impossible for an Adoptianist. We conclude, therefore, that RV is right in translating 'declared.'

The exact significance of 'according to a spirit of holiness' is more elusive. 'Of holiness' is evidently a Hebraism, and = 'holy.' But the antithesis of 'flesh' and 'spirit' clearly cannot here be under-

stood in its usual Pauline sense, which assumes that 'flesh' has in us come to be a principle of evil; and it seems unlikely that the reference to a 'holy spirit' is meant to indicate Him whom we call the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. It appears best to understand 'according to flesh' as meaning 'on the physical side of His being' and 'according to a spirit of holiness' as meaning 'on the spiritual and superhuman side of His being.' 'Spirit' is in the OT thought the characteristic nature of God (cf. Is 31 [3]; Jn 4 [24]).

7. The words 'in Rome' are omitted here by codex G (*sæc.* ix), Origen, and Ambrosiaster; they are also omitted in [15] by the first two of these authorities (Ambstr. has them). If these words be excised, nothing remains in the body of the epistle which necessarily connects it with Rome. On the other hand, 16 was evidently written to a particular Church; and even if this chapter does not properly belong to the epistle, 13 clearly envisages a special, and probably a local, controversy concerning diets and calendars (see below). It is therefore unlikely that the epistle was originally written as a general or encyclical letter, and probable that the omission of the words 'in Rome' was made deliberately, in some varieties of the short recension, in order to fit the text of 1 to the purposes of a lectionary. There does not, however, seem to be any reason for supposing that this omission was characteristic of the short recension as such: Kirsopp Lake's attempt to establish this conclusion (*op. cit.*, 348) is based upon arbitrary and subjective grounds.

8-17. Self-introduction to the Roman Church, culminating in a statement of the main thesis of the epistle, 'The righteous shall live by faith.' The primary object of this section is to announce St. Paul's proposed visit to Rome, and it is only in its last sentence that the doctrinal purpose of the letter begins to develop itself. As the Apostle was personally unknown to the Roman Church, and as it was not a foundation of his own (but possibly of some other Apostle—see below on 15 [20-22]), the task of self-introduction has to be managed with great delicacy and tact. He therefore begins ([8]) by a complimentary acknowledgement of the renown enjoyed by the Roman Church throughout the Christian world, and follows this up ([9, 10]) by a statement of his long-standing interest in his readers, and of his desire to visit them. In [11] the purpose of the visit is described as that of imparting 'some spiritual gift' (*charisma*), the nature of which is not defined; it may have belonged either to the 'ordinary' or to the 'extraordinary' category of *charismata*, but as its effect will be to 'establish' the Roman Christians, it most probably belonged to the former (ecstatic gifts, such as *glossolalia* or prophecy, would not naturally be described as 'establishing' or confirming the community). We may suppose that he intends to remedy some defect of order or organization ('ruling' or 'presiding' is enumerated as a *charisma* in 12 [8]). Here he speaks with conscious apostolic authority; but any impression of brusqueness which this early assertion of his own position may have produced is softened by the immediately expressed thought of the spiritual consolation which he will himself gain from association with his readers.

14. 'Greeks' and 'barbarians' mean respectively 'members of the civilized' and 'of the uncivilized races.' Presumably the majority of St. Paul's readers consisted of 'Greeks' in this sense. 'Wise' and 'foolish' are semi-ironical adjectives denoting what we should call the 'cultured' and the 'uncultured' classes: cf. 1 Cor 1 [20] ff.

16. The unexpressed thought which must be supplied between [15] and [16] is as follows: '[15] . . . I long to preach the Gospel at Rome.] Yes, at Rome, the capital of the world. Some of you may think that I, a Roman citizen by birth, feel some diffidence in approaching the imperial city as the missionary of a despised Syrian cult; [16] but I feel none: for the Gospel is divine power, etc.].'

unto salvation. The word 'salvation,' Greek *soteria*, would be pregnant with somewhat different associations for Jewish and Gentile Christians. For those of Pharisaic Jewish antecedents, it would mean primarily a safe passage through the terrors of the end of the world into the 'Kingdom of God' (cf. *Psalms of Solomon*, x, 9, xii, 7; *Test. Twelve Patr.*: Sym. 7, Jud. 22, Benj. 9, 10; and see Sanday and Headlam *in loc.*). Those, however, who had been converted from paganism would understand it rather in the light of its use in 'mystery religion' terminology, in which *soteria* meant the attainment of a blessed (individual) immortality through sacramental rites or magical lore (cf. S. Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, 138). Presumably St. Paul used the word as a Jew, and with its Jewish associations. Both classes of his readers, however, would understand the 'salvation' promoted by the Gospel as in a

primary sense other-worldly, as something to be completely attained in the next life and not in this; though Christians can, in virtue of their progressive sanctification, be proleptically described as already 'being saved' (as in 1 Cor 1 [18]; 2 Cor 2 [15]) or 'having been saved' (cf. Eph 2 [5, 8]).

to every one that believeth: we might paraphrase this as 'to every Christian' (see Note A, 'Justification by Faith,' below).

to the Jew first. 'First' is omitted by the great 4th-century codex Vaticanus (B); its excision, however, is probably due to some early scribe who disliked the attribution of religious privilege to the Jew. St. Paul's own convictions regarding the prior right of the Jews to hear the Gospel are unequivocally expressed in 11 [13-32].

17. revealed: the Greek word is that from which 'revelation' in the technical sense, *apocalypse*, is derived: a fact which brings out the eschatological tone and background of St. Paul's thought. At this date the Apostle still held to the common Christian belief in the nearness of the Parousia (cf. 13 [11]), though in 11 [25, 26] it is implied that sufficient time will be left before the end for all the predestined, Gentile and Jew, to be converted.

a righteousness of God: this would appear to mean 'a technical *status* of "righteousness," i.e. freedom from guilt, bestowed by God'—*not* 'God's own righteousness or moral character.' In other words, 'righteousness, in the forensic sense just indicated, for all practical purposes means the state of pardon, or forgiveness of past sins, which is the preliminary condition of entrance upon the Christian life; it is not the same thing as sanctity or Christian perfection, which is the goal of the Christian life. It must be carefully remembered that in 1-4 St. Paul is discussing the means of attaining 'righteousness' in this technical, forensic, and almost artificial sense of 'preliminary acquittal'; it is not until 5 that he begins to describe sanctity, the settled moral and religious character which is formed under the influences of the Holy Spirit's indwelling. For a slightly different exposition of the phrase see Sanday and Headlam *in loc.*

by faith unto faith: the means of attaining this preliminary pardon are declared to consist in Faith ('by faith'); and the experience of pardon imparts a yet deeper Faith to the absolved sinner ('unto faith').

as it is written: the quotation is from Hab 2 [4], where it probably has reference to the coming invasion of Nebuchadnezzar.

Note A—'Justification by Faith.'—The Greek word which both AV and RV render as 'justify' in many passages of this epistle is cognate with the words translated 'righteous' and 'righteousness,' and means 'to *account, deem*, or *pronounce* to be righteous'—in brief, 'to acquit' (of the charge of sinfulness). Its use is attributed to our Lord Himself by St. Luke in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican ('this man went down to his house justified rather than the other,' 18 [14]). This conception of 'acquittal,' bestowed by God upon man, is nothing other than the idea of the divine forgiveness expressed in terms of forensic metaphor. In St. Paul's thought, God's pardon for sins committed during pre-Christian life is the necessary preliminary to the life of the redeemed Christian: God cannot bestow the full riches of His grace on those whom He has not yet absolved of past sin. 'Acquittal,' then, may be compared to the wicket-gate seen by the hero of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, which admitted him into the path leading to the heavenly city. But the wicket-gate is not the same thing as the path: the preliminary forgiveness which admits to the Christian life is not to be identified with the Christian life itself; or, in other words, 'Acquittal' is to be clearly distinguished from 'Sanctification.' Hence the Latin term 'justification,' which inevitably suggests the idea of 'making righteous' (*iustum facere*) and not merely of 'accounting righteous,' is seriously misleading, and has obscured the true Pauline doctrine (apparently paradoxical, yet borne out by modern psychology), which is that the sinner must first be considered and treated as 'righteous' before he can actually become so.

This divine forgiveness, or cancellation of the guilt of past sin, is affirmed by St. Paul to be bestowed upon the sinner in consideration of 'faith.' The meaning of this substantive (in Greek) must be determined by the meaning of the cognate Greek verb which is translated 'to believe.' But this verb has two shades of meaning: it may mean to believe a proposition (that is, to accept it intellectually), or to believe *in* a person, that is, to have complete trust and confidence in him. A study of St. Paul's language seems to show that for him the latter is the fundamental sense, on which the more developed theological significance which he attributes to

the word is built. 'Faith' is for the Apostle a mental and emotional attitude of unreserved confidence in and self-surrender to Jesus as Messiah, Lord, and Son of God. This attitude does indeed involve the intellectual acceptance of certain statements about Him, as that He truly rose from the dead, and is at the right hand of God; St. Paul's conception of 'Faith' includes St. James's (see below on 4). But it goes far beyond the mere mental assent to certain propositions, being indissociable both from love and also from certain external actions which form its necessary expression, such as self-separation from sin and idolatry, and the acceptance of initiation into the Christian fellowship through an oral confession of faith (cf. Rom 10 [9, 10]), baptism, and the laying on of hands. Hence for St. Paul 'Faith' usually means the total fact of being or becoming a Christian, both as regards interior conviction and feeling, and also as regards external conversation and manner of life: 'believers' are simply Christians, and 'to believe' (used absolutely, in the aorist tense), or, 'to make the act of Faith,' seems to have been a synonym for 'to become a Christian' (cf. Rom 13 [11], where RV obscures the idiom by gratuitously inserting 'first'; and many passages in Acts, presumably reflecting Pauline usage). Very occasionally, indeed, the meaning of 'Faith' appears to be confined to denoting the interior act of accepting Christ, in distinction from its external expression, as in Rom 10 [10], 'with the heart man believeth unto righteousness'; but normally Faith in St. Paul is 'Faith working by love' (Gal 5 [6]), and by all that love of God and man implies. Lightfoot (*Comm. on Gal.*, 205) well observes: 'These words [working by love] bridge over the gulf which seems to separate the language of St. Paul and St. James.'*

The idea of 'justification by faith,' as taught by St. Paul, is therefore a perfectly simple and untechnical idea: it means neither more nor less than pardon for past sins, bestowed by God upon the individual man on the occasion, and in consideration, of his embracing Christianity and giving his whole-hearted allegiance to Christ. It will now be seen in what sense the Apostle means to deny the possibility of 'justification by legal works' (Rom 3 [20]). His Judaizing opponents maintained that man could earn forgiveness by scrupulous observance of the Law, ceremonial and moral—a position from which it followed that allegiance to the personal glorified Christ was in the last resort a matter of secondary importance, a desirable addition, indeed, to Mosaic orthodoxy, but not the central fact of religion. St. Paul's Christocentric devotion cannot endure this: for him, Christ is all, the hope of glory, the only ground of salvation, and mere 'legal works' (for the precise meaning of this phrase see below on 3 [20]) are valueless. Hence the Pauline doctrine of 'justification' by faith is, in the last analysis, only another way of affirming that (in modern phrase) 'Christianity is Christ.'

I. 18-II. 29. **Demonstration of the universal need for righteousness.**

(*a*) I. 18-32. **Amongst Gentiles.**—Before the nature of the divinely provided means for obtaining 'righteousness' (that is, the status of having been forgiven) can be expounded, it is logically necessary to show that all men do actually stand in need of forgiveness. This St. Paul proceeds to demonstrate inductively by a survey of the moral condition of the human race, which, as a Jew, he naturally dichotomizes into Gentiles and Jews. 1 [18-32] is devoted to proving (or rather asserting) the universal sinfulness of Gentiles, and 2 (with the exception of the digression [6-16]) to establishing that of Jews. Though the wicked of 1 [18-32] are not explicitly described as Gentiles, that they are follows from [19, 20], which designate 'natural religion'—not the Mosaic revelation—as the source of their knowledge of God. Being perfectly clear in his own mind that the subject-matter of his denunciation in these verses is the Gentile world, the Apostle omits to say so. We shall often have occasion to notice his habit of leaving important points unexpressed: a habit which is natural in one dictating to a stenographer, not writing, but which gives rise to some obscurity in the resulting text.

The following history of the moral 'Decline and Fall' of the Gentiles contains many reminiscences of Wisd 12, 13, 14, which are minutely catalogued by Sanday and Headlam (p. 51). St. Paul may well have drawn from this book the main theses of this section, namely, that neglect of natural religion leads to idolatry, and this in turn to immorality. It is noteworthy that neither in 1 [18-32] nor in 2 does St. Paul mention the Fall of Adam as the source of human sinfulness.

18. the wrath of God: as usually in the NT, this phrase refers to that divine wrath which will break forth at the Last Judgement.

* For a different view of 'justification' see *The Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 409, 426-430.

who hold down the truth: in Plato's phrase, the Gentile sinners have 'the lie in the soul'; they deliberately stifle the voice of conscience, and hide themselves from the light of God's revelation through Nature.

21. The first stage in the Gentile apostasy consists in neglect of God's worship, and absorption in philosophical speculations which corrode the moral sense and cloud the intellect ('their senseless heart was darkened'). For St. Paul's contempt for Hellenic philosophy cf. 1 Cor 1 [20] ff.; Col 2 [8].

23-27. The result of the mental confusion engendered by sophistical dialectic is idolatry, in gross and fetichistic forms. This is punished by God with 'judicial abandonment' to sexual impurity, of a monstrous and unnatural kind. The justice of St. Paul's indictment in regard to this latter point will be admitted by all who are familiar with Greek and Roman history and literature.

28. And even as they refused . . . God gave them up unto a reprobate mind. The idea of 'judicial abandonment' is again emphasized: impurity undermines the character, so rendering it an easy prey to sins of every kind, of pride and malice no less than of sensuality. The original Greek contains a play upon words, which may be clumsily represented as follows: 'Even as they did not *approve* the keeping of God in clear knowledge, God gave them up unto a habit of mind which by no reasonable standard could be *approved*.'

31. The Greek is energetic, and might be rendered 'wretches, who knowing the ordinance of God,' etc.

32. consent with: better 'give their hearty sympathy and approval to.' The pagan world not merely is *de facto* steeped in wickedness, but glorifies wickedness, and has erected it into a law of life.

II. The universal need of 'righteousness.'

(*b*) **Amongst Jews.**

1. St. Paul turns swiftly upon a typical Jew, whom he imagines as listening with self-righteous complacency to the foregoing denunciation of the Gentile world, and accuses him of being infected by an equally deep moral corruption, which will be visited with equal vengeance at the rapidly approaching Day of Judgement.

2. the judgement of God is according to truth: that is, operates in accordance with moral realities, not with fancied racial privilege.

3. that thou shalt escape: the 'thou' in the Greek is scornfully emphatic: 'Do you suppose that you, of all people, will somehow manage to evade the just punishment of your sins?'

6. who will render to every man according to his works: this verse makes it clear that, when St. Paul disparages 'legal works' as a means of earning forgivenesss, he does not mean to deny the importance of good works as such; see below on 3 [20].

9, 10. 'Greek' here means Gentile, as opposed to Jew. For the phrase 'the Jew first, and also . . . the Greek' cf. 1 [16]; here, however, it is employed with severe irony—the Jew's primacy will on the Day of Doom only increase his punishment.

11. no respect of persons, i.e. no racial favouritism.

12-16. At this point St. Paul is drawn off into a digression on the principles which will determine the divine judgement of Gentiles, that is, pagans (he is not thinking of Gentile-*Christians*) on the Last Day. The passage comes in rather awkwardly from the point of view of logical and orderly exposition, because the object of 2 is to establish the sinfulness of Jews, not the possible virtue of some Gentiles; a hypercritical reader might also object that the admission of the fact of Gentile virtue in [14] detracts from the impressiveness of the unqualified denunciation of the Gentile world contained in 1. St. Paul, however, is dictating freely, and does not care to be bound too closely to the straight path of his argument, whilst it is quite in his manner (as we shall see in 9-11) to present first one and then another side of a subject, without making any effort to explain how they cohere.

12. as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law. From the rigidly Jewish standpoint which St. Paul here takes up, all Gentiles as such were 'without law,' i.e. ignorant of the precepts of morality, because they were not acquainted with the Law of Moses, 'the Law' *par excellence*, which is assumed here to be identical with 'law in the abstract.' The gist of what follows is that although the Gentiles do not enjoy the exterior guidance of the *Torah*, yet they have the interior light of conscience. And each man will be judged at the Last Day by the law which he knows—the Jew by the Law of Moses, the Gentile by the law of conscience. 'Shall perish without law' therefore means 'will be doomed to death, after full weight has been allowed by the Divine Judge to the fact that they had not the guidance of the written code of Moses.'

13-16. The obscurity of these verses

will be removed if [14] and [15] are enclosed in brackets, so as to form a parenthesis interpolated into a principal sentence which consists of [13] and [16]. This sentence may be paraphrased as follows: '[13] It is not mere listeners to Law who enjoy the status of "not guilty" in God's eyes: it is the doers of Law who will be pronounced "not guilty" ("justified"), [16] on that great Day when God will judge the secrets of men,' etc.

14. are a law unto themselves. The phrase 'to be a law unto one's self' has been vulgarized into meaning 'to be self-willed or rebellious, to be an anarchist.' This is almost diametrically opposed to the significance which the Apostle meant it to bear; his intention merely is to assert that the inner nature of the Gentiles, on which the precepts of morality have been stamped by their Creator, is for them as truly a law as the Law of Moses.

15. the work of the law: that is, the essence, the practical upshot, of the Mosaic code.

conscience: a Stoic word, occurring first in Biblical Greek in Wisd 17 [11]. In the NT its use is mainly Pauline. 'It is one of the few technical terms in St. Paul which seem to have Greek rather than Jewish affinities' (Sanday and Headlam).

their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them: better 'their thoughts reciprocally accusing or else excusing *each other*.' The interior functioning of conscience is metaphorically depicted as a *forum* in which debates are continually proceeding: a thought (of some proposed or desired action) appears in the mind, then a second thought appears, either approving or reprobating the first thought, then a third thought which takes sides either with the first or the second (if the second is hostile to the first), and so on.

17. After the digression of [12-16], St. Paul returns to his task of convicting the Jew, as such, of deep-seated sinfulness, aggravated by the additional vice of hypocrisy. His indictment now takes a more detailed form, and is expressed as a conditional sentence, ending with [23]. The biting sarcasm of the Greek would be best rendered by converting the protases of this conditional sentence into a series of principal sentences, somewhat as follows: '[17] Now, I understand, you style yourself a Jew; you take your stand upon Law; you boast of your unique relationship to God, and claim to have an exact knowledge of His Will. . . . [21] And yet, may I ask, is it the case that you, who are so ready to instruct others, do not devote equal pains to your own instruction? that whilst you denounce theft, you habitually practise it,' etc.

18. approvest the things that are excellent: that is, 'you plume yourself on having in your mind a lofty standard of moral attainment.'

19, 20 describe the spirit in which the orthodox Jew regarded himself in relation to his Gentile proselytes, of whom there were not a few at this period.

22. thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou rob temples? A peculiarly satirical touch: we may imaginatively expand—'You who affect such horror of paganism that you gather your skirts about you when you pass heathen temples, for fear of contracting ceremonial pollution—is it the case that, after dark, you are not above helping yourself to any votive offerings and ornaments that you may find in them?' The remark of the Ephesian town clerk (Ac 19 [37]), that Paul and his companions were *not* robbers of temples, seems to imply that many Jews were.

25-29. A denunciation of the superstitious idea that physical circumcision was an adequate substitute for a moral life: we shall meet the notion of an *ex opere operato* efficacy inherent in circumcision again in 4.

27. the uncircumcision which is by nature: i.e. persons who remain uncircumcised as they were born.

judge: that is by force of contrast; cf. Mt 12 [41] f. = Lk 11 [31] f. 'The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it,' etc.

with the letter and circumcision: that is 'whilst in full possession of the written Law and the seal of circumcision.'

whose praise: there is a play on the word 'Jew' (Judah='praise'; cf. Gen 29 [35], 49 [8]).

III. 1-8. Short Digression, rebutting some casuistical Jewish objections to the thesis maintained in 2, namely, that the Jews are just as sinful and as much in need of 'acquittal' as the Gentiles.

This digression is couched in a form very usual with St. Paul and specially characteristic of this epistle, that of a compressed dialogue with an imaginary Jewish objector. Its obscurity is due to the fact that there are no distinguishing marks in the text to show which sentences are meant to be Jewish objections and which St. Paul's replies. Such marks are supplied in the following paraphrase:

OBJECTOR: '[1] If what you say is true—if the Chosen People are in God's sight as

worthy of condemnation as the Gentiles—what point is there in being a Jew at all? and what is the use of circumcision?'

ST. PAUL: '[2] There is a great deal of point. First of all, the Jews were the depositaries of the pre-Christian revelation, and therefore it is no small privilege to belong to their number; then . . .'

OBJECTOR—(the following objection is not actually expressed in the text, but must be supplied in order to give sense to [3])—'But if the Jews are, as you maintain, in a lost and fallen condition, it follows that God, by allowing them to drift into this condition, has been false to the covenant which He made with our fathers.'

ST. PAUL: 'It does not follow in the least. [3] Even if *some* Jews' (notice the way in which St. Paul at this point minimizes the extent to which sin infects Israel, in order to parry the objector's argument—the 'some' are the non-Christian majority of the Jews) 'have been false to their side of the covenant, that in no way prejudices God's faithfulness to *His* side. [4] On the contrary, we must maintain as axiomatic God's eternal truthfulness, even though this may involve the consequence that all men are liars.'

OBJECTOR: '[5] Well—let us grant, for the sake of argument, that the Jews are as bad as you assert. But if our badness brings into clearer relief' (Greek 'establishes'; RV 'commendeth' is vague and unsatisfactory) 'the goodness of God, are we not thereby rendering a service to God? and, if we are rendering God a service by our sins, must it not be unjust in Him to visit us with His wrath at the Last Day?' (The Apostle apologizes in a parenthesis for the anthropomorphic language in which controversial exigencies compel him to speak of the Divine Being.)

ST. PAUL: '[6] God is the Judge of the world, and therefore cannot be unjust.'

OBJECTOR: '[7] You have not really answered my point. If, as you assert, my unfaithfulness to my promise (the promise of fidelity to God implied in the covenant between Him and Israel) really brings out into clearer light His faithfulness to His promise, my sin must be deemed to minister to His glory: and the obvious conclusion is, Go on sinning.' ([8] The Apostle interjects an indignant parenthesis into the middle of the objection, to the effect that this is precisely the doctrine of doing evil that good may come, which he has been slanderously accused of maintaining.)

ST. PAUL: 'Men who employ arguments of this kind thoroughly deserve the condemnation which they will undoubtedly receive at the Day of Doom.'

It will be observed that in this brief excursus St. Paul raises points ([3], only 'some' Jews are apostates; [5, 7], possible antinomian distortions of the doctrine of grace) which will be more fully dealt with in subsequent chapters (cf. especially 6 and 11).

9-20. Summing up the foregoing. Jew and Gentile alike are under the dominion of sin.

9. A Parthian shot from the Jewish objector. We may paraphrase: 'Well, if what you say is true, we Jews are actually worse off than the Gentiles (instead of being, in a spiritual sense, incomparably superior to them, as we had always thought).' St. Paul replies ([10]): 'Not in the least; you are neither superior nor inferior to the Gentiles, you are, spiritually, on precisely the same level with them; for you and they are equally sinners.' He reinforces this conclusion, in Rabbinical manner, with a cento of quotations from the OT ([10-12]=roughly Ps 14 [1-3] and 53 [1-3]; [13a]=Ps 5 [9b]; [13b]=Ps 140 [3b]; [14]=Ps 10 [7] LXX; [15-17]=Is 59 [7-8]; [18]=Ps 36 [1b]).

19. Here again a Jewish objection must be supplied, in order to give the verse a logical connexion with what precedes it. The objection may be phrased as follows: 'Well, you have undoubtedly produced an imposing catena of scriptural denunciations of the wicked; but in Scripture the "wicked" are usually the Gentile oppressors of Israel, and therefore you cannot use these quotations as proof of the sinfulness of Jews.' St. Paul replies (in this verse): 'Not at all; the Old Testament' (this seems to be roughly the meaning of 'the law') 'was admittedly addressed to persons living under the Old Testament dispensation, and therefore it is a self-evident principle of exegesis that the denunciations which it contains must be applicable to Jews.' The argument here seems to be somewhat arbitrary, and not borne out by a critical study of the OT; however, the Jewish objector is silenced; or at any rate not allowed to reappear; and St. Paul draws the triumphant conclusion (at the end of the verse) that the whole world is judicially guilty in the sight of God.

20. A postscript to the foregoing demonstration of human sinfulness, asserting (what remains to be proved in 4) that no man can obtain 'acquittal' solely by virtue of 'works of law' (RV's insertion of the definite article before

'works' and 'law' is gratuitous). Notice that St. Paul does not disparage good works as such (in 2^6 he asserts their meritoriousness), but only 'legal works,' i.e. ceremonial observances, and acts of conformity to the moral law in so far as such acts are carried out in a legalistic and servile spirit (cf. 6^{15}, 7^6, 10^4). He adds that the function of law is (only) to impart clear knowledge as to what actions constitute sin: law cannot save us from committing these actions, or win us pardon for them after we have committed them (for a further discussion of this point see 7^{7-25}).

21-26. The Remedy for man's universal sinfulness described; 'Acquittal' is bestowed by God in consideration of Faith, appropriating the benefits of Christ's atoning Death.

This is one of the key-passages of this epistle, and indeed of the whole Pauline *corpus*: for it contains one of the Apostle's few approximations to a theological statement of the idea of the Atonement. Its importance is largely obscured in the RV by the unfortunate fact that the revisers have printed $^{19-31}$ as one paragraph, instead of beginning a new paragraph with ^{21}, and another with ^{27}. It is noteworthy that St. Paul's statement of the remedy is much briefer and less precise and systematic than his description of the disease.

21. 'With the advent of the Gospel God has revealed His own method of bestowing acquittal, a method which does not bring in the principle of law at all' (as before, RV has gratuitously inserted 'the' before 'law' at the beginning of the sentence), 'though the Mosaic Law and the prophets contain many predictions of this method.'

22-24. '—a *status* of acquittal bestowed by God upon all who believe in Jesus as Messiah in consideration of their faith—' (^{22b} and ^{23} are a parenthesis: 'I say upon *all* who believe: for there is no distinction [between Jew and Gentile, in this regard]: for all, Jew and Gentile alike, have sinned, and feel themselves equally far from the glories of the promised Kingdom'). ^{24} resumes the sentence contained in ^{22a}—'being acquitted gratuitously' (this phrase really qualifies the 'all who believe' of ^{22a}, though there is a grammatical anacoluthon in the Greek) 'by God's free favour, through the ransoming that is in Messiah Jesus.' Notice (1) the emergence of the thought of the spiritual equality of Jew and Gentile, a thought which is so dominant in St. Paul's mind that he cannot help re-emphasizing it here, though it might be deemed to have been sufficiently enforced in the preceding chapters; (2) the stress which he lays upon the free, undeserved, gratuitous character of God's forgiveness of sin.

24-26. In these verses St. Paul sketches, rather than defines, the outlines of the idea of the Atonement under three main aspects: (*a*) as a 'ransom'; (*b*) as 'propitiatory'; (*c*) as an object-lesson of God's own righteous character. He makes no effort, however, to construct anything like a dogmatic theory of the Atonement, or to explain the *modus operandi* of the saving efficacy of Christ's Death, and his whole treatment of the subject is brief and vague.

24. redemption: literally 'ransoming.' St. Paul may have known the saying of the Lord recorded in Mk 10^{45}: 'The Son of Man came . . . to give his life a ransom for many.' It is useless to enquire to whom the 'ransom' was paid: the nemesis of all attempts to extract more information from scriptural metaphors than they were meant to contain is seen in the theory of the Atonement popular amongst the Greek Fathers, which regarded the offering of Christ's life as a ransom, or bribe, paid to the devil—a theory which developed various shocking and immoral corollaries (for which see H. Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology* (1919), 243 ff., 259, 303 ff., 311, 313, 332).

25. to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood. The words 'propitiation' and 'by his blood' are to be taken closely together ('through faith' being a parenthesis), and they clearly affirm that the Death of Christ was in some sense an atoning sacrifice, analogous to the piacular sacrifices of the OT, and fraught with an objective efficacy. This doctrine, in its most general form, is diffused throughout the NT writings (cf. especially Rom 5^9; Eph 1^7, 2^{13}; Col 1^{20}; 1 P $1^{2, 19}$; Heb 9, 10, 13; 1 Jn 1^7, $5^{6, 8}$; Rev 1^5, 5^9, 7^{14}, etc.); and doubtless derives from our Lord's own words, in which, borrowing a phrase from Ex 24^8, He attributed a sacrificial significance to His coming Passion—'This is my covenant-blood which is poured out for many' (Mk 14^{24}=Mt 26^{28}; ? Lk 22^{20}; 1 Cor 11^{25}). But nothing is here said as to the *modus operandi* of the Atonement, in its Godward aspect. As a matter of fact, the term 'propitiation' is a somewhat misleading translation of the original Greek word (*hilasterion*), inasmuch as it seems to imply that the Death of Christ produced a change in God's character or disposition, making

Him more benevolent towards man than He otherwise would have been—an idea which (as Westcott has shown, *Epistles of St. John*, 83 ff.) is completely unscriptural. A better rendering would be 'expiation'; the thought in the Apostle's mind is not so much that God is 'propitiated' or 'appeased,' as that sin is 'expiated,' that is, neutralized or cancelled. God is always the same, always loving and compassionate towards His creatures; but sin interposes a barrier which prevents man from receiving the full benefits of God's love, a barrier which the perfect self-dedication of Christ, expressed through the shedding of His Blood, has now swept away.

through faith: though the Godward aspect of the Atonement remains shrouded in mystery, its manward aspect is to a certain extent elucidated by these words. By 'faith' (i.e. as explained above, Note A, by the total act, interior and exterior, of self-surrender to Christ, expressed in conversion and baptism) man can so identify himself with and incorporate himself into the glorified Messiah as to be able to make his own the Messiah's attitude of perfect obedience to God. But faith is indispensable: the Atonement only avails for the individual in so far as its fruits are consciously appropriated by him.

to show his righteousness: literally 'for a demonstration of His righteousness,' that is, for an object-lesson to bring home to men's minds the fact that God's moral character forbids Him simply to overlook or ignore sin. The ultimate necessity of things, which is nothing other than the nature of God, requires that sin be paid for, sooner or later, and the Crucifixion was a proclamation, in the most vivid terms conceivable, of this fact: which is not less a fact because we cannot understand it.

This proclamation, the Apostle adds, was specially necessary, because men might have drawn from the fact that God had borne with sin hitherto the conclusion that He was prepared to bear with it indefinitely.

26. Viewed in this light, the Passion has the double effect of revealing God both as Himself eternally righteous and as the bestower of (forensic) 'righteousness' upon the Christian believer.

27-31. Digression: Jews and Gentiles alike must make use of the new method of 'Faith.'

As though feeling that he has too rashly attempted to explain a mystery which transcends human comprehension, St. Paul abandons his exposition of the Atonement, which should have been the crowning point of his argument, after only six verses ($^{21-26}$); and reverts to a topic of a somewhat more earthly order, which is never for long absent from his mind, namely, the abolition by Christianity of the special racial privileges of the Jew.

27. the glorying: i.e. the Jew's characteristic habit of boasting about his favoured position in relation to God. This is 'excluded'—that is, permanently rendered absurd.

by what manner of law? 'Law' here must be taken in its most general sense, as equivalent to 'system.' Christianity is a system or scheme of things based, not on the principle of conformity to a legal code, but on the principle of self-surrender to a Person.

28. The main thesis of the first four chapters is once more enunciated—as an inference from ^{27}, if the text of RV is correct ('therefore'), or as a ground for the statements contained in ^{27} ('for,' RVm). The latter seems to be logically the better; but the textual evidence is almost equally divided between 'therefore' and 'for.'

29, 30. Religious universalism is an inevitable inference from monotheism: it is absurd to suppose that the One Sovereign of the universe limits His affection and interest to a small minority amongst His human creatures.

30*b*. and he shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith: better 'who will accept the Circumcision (i.e. the Jews) as the result of faith, and the Uncircumcision (i.e. the Gentiles) in an atmosphere of faith' (the Greek preposition which RV translates 'through' expresses 'attendant circumstances'). Various attempts have been made to discover a subtle meaning in the distinction between faith as the instrumental cause, and faith as an attendant circumstance, of 'acquittal'; it may be doubted, however, if the antithesis is meant to be more than verbal and rhetorical.

31. 'Are we annulling Law by this principle of Faith? God forbid: on the contrary, we are establishing Law on a surer basis' (RV gratuitously inserts 'the' before 'Law,' and omits it before 'Faith'). St. Paul's characteristic position, that 'legal works' (i.e. as explained above, the fulfilment of ceremonial ordinances, and even the fulfilment of moral precepts, in so far as this springs from the mere will to conform to an exterior code in order to avoid punishment)

do not avail to procure God's forgiveness, appears to have been misunderstood—whether wilfully or not, we cannot tell—by his Judaizing adversaries, as a repudiation of all moral restraints whatsoever. Doubtless his blunt and unqualified way of stating his thesis lent itself to such a misapprehension. He interjects here a hasty parenthesis to assure his readers that, though he denies the quasi-sacramental efficacy which Rabbinism attributed to Law and its observance, yet he desires to conserve and exalt the ethical ideals which Law was meant to enforce.

IV. Scholastic excursus on the case of Abraham.

Having established (by forcible enunciation rather than by logical proof) the great thesis that 'Justification,' or the state of being free from guilt in the eyes of God, can only be won by Faith, and not by 'legal works,' St. Paul feels himself compelled to examine the crucial instance of Abraham, which Lightfoot (*Galatians*, eighth edition, 158 ff.) has shown to have been a common subject of discussion in the Jewish schools, and which at first sight seemed to militate strongly against his whole position. For Abraham, by the confession of all believers in the OT revelation, non-Christian Jews, Christian Jews, and Christian Gentiles, actually *was* 'justified'; he, if anyone, indubitably was 'right with God'; and the only question was, how did he attain to this state? Two theories divided the allegiance of orthodox Judaism: (1) that he was 'justified,' 'acquitted,' or absolved, by and through his circumcision—in other words, that circumcision was a sacrament invested with an objective and *ex opere operato* efficacy; (2) that he was 'acquitted' in virtue of his exact observance of the Mosaic Law, which by a special privilege had been revealed to him a thousand years before its promulgation on Mount Sinai. Both these theories are doubtless absurd to us, but they were real, and simple enough in the eyes of 1st-century Jews. St. Paul has to refute them both, and to explain Abraham's 'justification' as in some sense the outcome of 'Faith.' This chapter accordingly contains three lines of argument, two devoted to destroying the two rival Jewish theories, and one designed to establish St. Paul's own theory. The obscurity of the section is due to the fact that these three lines cross and recross one another in baffling intricacy, though it is not beyond the power of a patient exegesis to comb them out and exhibit each in isolation from the others: and it will be noticed that St. Paul is only able to show that Abraham was justified by 'Faith' through a dialectical *tour de force* which abstracts Faith as an activity of the soul from its normal object, namely, Christ (see below on ^{18} ff.).

1, 2. These verses really constitute a brief dialogue, which may be paraphrased as follows:

JEWISH OBJECTOR ($^{1, 2a}$): 'What then, if you are right, are we to make of the great spiritual achievements of Abraham, our physical ancestor? For if (as the *consensus* of Rabbinical theologians hold) Abraham earned "acquittal" by means of "works," he at least must be allowed some merit, some ground for boasting'—(an allusion to the 'boasting' which in 3 ^{27} is said to be 'excluded').

ST. PAUL (^{2b}): 'Not at all. Not even Abraham can claim any ground for boasting in respect to his relations with *God* (whatever may be the case in regard to his relations with men).'

3. The proof-text is now produced, Gen 15 ^{6} (LXX): 'Abraham made an act of Faith' (this is the force of the Greek aorist) 'in God, and it was reckoned unto him for (that is, in the place of, or as equivalent to) Righteousness.' The metaphor of 'reckoning' seems to be derived from the books in which Oriental monarchs caused to be entered the merits or demerits of their subjects (cf. Est 6 ^{1} ff.).

4. A distinction is now drawn between a gift, which is paid to the recipient as a matter of favour, and wages, which the recipient has *ex hypothesi* earned by work done. One of the Jewish theories which St. Paul desires to destroy maintained that Abraham's 'righteousness' was to be regarded in the light of 'wages,' earned by his anticipatory observance of the Law; the sense of ^{5}, which can be discerned behind a somewhat confused form, is that Scripture is entirely silent about 'work' done by Abraham, basing his justification entirely on his act of Faith, and that consequently the state of righteousness so bestowed on him by God must be regarded as a gift or present, not as wages.

6. Ps 32 $^{1, 2}$ is quoted to show that God actually does bestow forgiveness apart from any antecedent merits ('apart from works') of the forgiven sinner. It is the paradox of the divine forgiveness that it seems to us to involve an element of fiction, in so far as it treats one who is in point of fact a sinner as though he were not a sinner: but it is a paradox which inheres in the divinest form of human forgiveness as well.

9. St. Paul now turns his attention to the other Rabbinical theory, that Abraham was forgiven by virtue of his circumcision. He easily disposes of this by pointing out (10) that Abraham's 'justification' preceded his circumcision, and could not therefore have been caused by it.

11*a* gives the true explanation of Abraham's circumcision, namely, that it was not a sacrament producing justification *ex opere operato*, but merely an external sign or symbol, superadded as a kind of legal authentication of the 'righteous' condition which he had already attained by virtue of his Faith. Thus there is no parallel to be drawn between the position of circumcision under the Old Covenant and that of baptism under the New. In 11*b* and 12 the thought of the spiritual equality of Christian Jews and Christian Gentiles, which is never far long out of St. Paul's mind, reappears; and Abraham is declared in virtue of his Faith to be the spiritual Father of Gentile Christians, and in virtue of his Faith and of his circumcision the spiritual Father of Jewish Christians.

13. The first of the rival Jewish theories, that of Abraham's supposed anticipatory observance of the Law as the ground of his 'acquittal,' emerges once more. The argument which St. Paul directs against it in 13-17 may be paraphrased as follows:

'The promise that Abraham and his descendants should possess the Messianic kingdom ("that he should be heir of the world") cannot have had attached to it the condition that he and they should always conform exactly to the Law:

14. 'For, if there had been such a condition—if only those who depended on law, i.e. whose religion was cast in a legalistic mould, could enter the kingdom—Abraham's faith' (RV wrongly gives 'faith' without the definite article which exists in the Greek) 'would have been futile, and the Messianic promise would have been illusory. *Because, owing to the weakness of human nature, no one ever can obey the Law perfectly; and the Law cannot in itself help a man to fulfil its precepts.*'

15. 'All it can do is to reveal to him the wrongfulness of his actual conduct, thus exposing him to the divine wrath which will visit deliberate sinners at the Last Day. Of course, before a man knows the Law, he can hardly be said to sin at all'—a parenthetic remark which is not strictly relevant to this section of the argument, and represents the premature emergence of a point which will be dealt with more fully in 13, 7 7 ff.

16. 'It follows from all this that Abraham's "justification," or "acquittal," or attainment of the status of "being right with God," had necessarily to be grounded on an act of Faith on his part, in order that it might be exhibited as due to God's pure, undeserved favour. So, and so only, could the Messianic promise, belief in which procured Abraham's acquittal, be transmitted to his descendants in a form on which they could rely absolutely: for if the fulfilment of the promise had been made conditional upon human merit, no one could ever have felt certain that he had merited it, whereas now that it has been shown to flow from God's pure undeserved favour, evoked by Faith, everyone can feel certain that his Faith will meet with the same response of favour or kindness on God's part. And when I speak of Abraham's descendants, I mean not merely those physical descendants who put their trust in the Mosaic Law, but also those (Jew and Gentile) who imitate his Faith; for indeed Abraham is the spiritual Father of all of as Christians—

17. 'in the sight of God, who quickens the dead, and, in His sovereign sway over the whole realm of being, actual and possible, can deal with non-existent things as though they were existent.' Compare with this passage the brief discussion of Abraham's 'justification' contained in Gal 3 6-9, where the same ideas are put forward in a rougher and less thought out form.

18-24 constitute the climax of St. Paul's *midrash* or scholastic commentary on the Case of Abraham, containing as they do his constructive suggestion, namely, that the 'Faith' which according to Scripture procured Abraham's 'acquittal' was, *considered solely in itself as a mode of psychical activity*, identical with the 'Faith' which, in St. Paul's view, procures 'acquittal' now for the convert from heathenism or mere Judaism to Christianity. The argument underlying these verses may be drawn out as follows:

'Abraham, who as Patriarch of the Jewish (and therefore of the Christian) Church is the type of all the "acquitted," was himself acquitted in virtue of an "act of Faith."

'This "act of Faith" consisted in an interior act of self-committal to God, based upon belief in His power to bring life out of death (in this particular instance, to bring the new supernatural life embodied in Isaac, the heir of the Mes-

sianic promise, out of the dead and withered bodies of his parents).

'Now the Christian's "Faith," considered psychologically, is the very same thing: it is an act of self-committal to God, based upon belief in His power to bring life out of death (as shown by His bringing the divine life manifested in Jesus our Lord out of the darkness of the tomb).

'[*Conclusion*, implied but not expressed. *Therefore*, Abraham was "justified" in virtue of a "Faith" which was substantially the same thing as Christian "Faith": so that his case, far from militating against the idea of "justification by Faith only," becomes confirmatory evidence for it.]'

It will be observed that this contention is only made possible by (1) the intense emphasis here laid upon the interior side of 'Faith': (2) the substitution for the normal object of 'Faith'—namely, Jesus as the risen Lord—of a rather more abstract object, namely, the idea of God's power to bring life out of (real or apparent) death; and (3) the tacit telescoping of the narratives contained in Gen 15 [1-6] and 21 [1-7]. (In Gen 15 Abraham is still capable of paternity, for Ishmael is born in 16; but in 17 [17], when the specific promise of a son from Sarah is made to the Patriarch 'now as good as dead,' so far from making an 'act of Faith' he laughs incredulously, and urges the claims of Ishmael to God's special protection. The Apostle's argument ignores this *prima facie* difficulty.) However, its main thought is one of permanent validity. All the great Acts of Faith described in Scripture are based, in one way or another, upon confidence in God's power to produce life when the conditions of life seem to be absent. The faith of Abraham here alluded to, the faith of the prophets in Israel's national resurrection (Ezek 37), the faith of Mary (Lk 1 [45]), the faith of the Lord going to His Passion (Heb 5 [7]), the faith of the convert to Christianity coming forward for baptism, are identical in principle.

It is noteworthy that Heb 11 [11, 12] alludes to the birth of Isaac as an instance of the power of faith, and applies to Abraham precisely the same description as is used here ('as good as dead')—but assigns the whole merit of this faith to *Sarah*.

19. he considered: that is, he contemplated, faced the facts of, his own physical condition. The 'not' occurring in AV is not vouched for by the best MS. authorities, and spoils the sense. True faith never refuses to consider facts.

20. waxed strong through faith: better 'was endowed with strength by his faith.' The idea seems to be that Abraham's faith had a reflex effect upon his body, rejuvenating him in such a way that he became able to beget Isaac.

25. The antithesis 'delivered up on account of our trespasses,' 'raised on account of our acquittal,' seems to belong to the same category as the antithesis of 3 [30] ('who will acquit circumcision by faith and uncircumcision under the attendant circumstances of faith'), i.e. it is rhetorical and sonorous only, and does not contain any specific logical or doctrinal point. Obviously, our Lord's Passion and Resurrection constitute one single redemptive act, the whole of which was designed, and was necessary, in order to make possible our 'acquittal' from the guilt of past 'trespasses.'

Note B—St. Paul and St. James on the Case of Abraham.—It is a remarkable fact that the author of the Epistle of St. James also discusses the 'justification' of Abraham (Jas 2 [14-26]) with special reference to Gen 15 [6], and arrives at a conclusion which at first sight seems to be in direct contradiction to St. Paul's. The Apostle's contention is 'that a man is justified by faith apart from legal works' (Rom 3 [28]): the author of James asserts 'that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith' (2 [24]). If we have regard to the essential meanings which these writers respectively were endeavouring to express, we shall see that the contradiction does not really exist. In the Epistle of James, 'Faith' means the mere intellectual assent to a proposition (as, 'that God is one'): in this sense, the demons 'believe' (Jas 2 [19]). But for St. Paul 'Faith' means the whole act, or attitude, of surrender to Christ, intellectual, moral, and emotional: he could not have understood a Faith which did not express itself in moral action, and he would have been as ready as St. James to proclaim the uselessness of a barren assent to a formal orthodoxy. Actually, the apparent contradiction is merely one of terminology. It is a further question, however, whether one of the two writers may not (mistakenly) have believed himself to be in opposition to the other, and have been consciously endeavouring to controvert him. If this is so, we must suppose that the author of James is attacking St. Paul, and not *vice versa*, inasmuch as his discussion, with its contemptuous address to 'you empty-headed fellow' (2 [20]), seems to be the work of an aggressor. This, however,

would imply a comparatively late date for James, which seems to be incompatible with its primitive and Judaistic character. We cannot here discuss the date and authorship of the epistle attributed to the Lord's brother;* it must suffice to say that the apparent connexion between the two passages is amply explained if we suppose, with Sanday and Headlam, that the two writers are independently dealing with a subject which was a commonplace of the Jewish schools, and that the author of James intends to direct his polemic against perverted versions of the Pauline teaching which had reached him by hearsay.

(II) **The Christian Life itself—Sanctification** (V.-VIII.).

This, the second main section of the epistle, seems to have been projected as an exposition of the qualities which belong to the character and temperament of the converted, baptized, 'acquitted' or absolved, and Spirit-filled Christian. These qualities may be briefly described as serenity and sinlessness. The section begins (1^{1-11}) and ends (8^{31-39}) by inculcating the idea of interior tranquillity; its intermediate portions, especially 6 and 7, are mainly devoted to impressing upon the Romans the necessity of spotless moral purity in the baptized. But the Apostle's restless intellect, playing this way and that with lightning-like swiftness, finds it difficult to touch upon the idea of sinlessness without exploring further the way in which sinlessness is attained: hence these chapters contain many returns to the subject of 'acquittal,' which, formally at any rate, might be deemed to have been finished with.

(1) V. 1-11. **Exhortation to cultivate interior peace, based on the certitude of redemption.**

1. **Being therefore justified by faith:** better 'Seeing, then, that we were once and for all (this is the sense of the aorist participle) acquitted as the result of faith.' The phrase is clearly meant to indicate that the discussion of 'justification,' the entrance to the Christian life, is over, and that a new exposition—presumably of the Christian life itself—is beginning.

let us have peace, i.e. let us possess, enjoy, intensify our feeling of peace with God.

2. **grace:** this word in St. Paul's usage stands for a disposition or attitude of God towards man, or towards some men, namely, 'kindness,' 'favour,' or 'goodwill,' and it is usually employed with the implication that such divine 'favour' is gratuitous or unmerited. It does not exactly correspond to 'grace,' *gratia sanctificans*, in the later theological terminology which derives from St. Augustine; for *gratia* in this context means not so much a kindly disposition of God as that which is the external expression of such a disposition, namely, some kind of objective assistance and influence towards good infused by Him into the soul. As in the case of 'justification,' so also in that of 'grace.' St. Augustine has, through lack of a thorough knowledge of Greek, attached to a Pauline term an idea which, though true and important in itself, is not what St. Paul meant to convey by the term.

in hope of the glory of God: that is, of the Messianic kingdom, which will be established in a universe rejuvenated and invested with, or transformed into, 'glory' (cf. 3^{23}, 8^{18} ff.).

4. **probation:** a somewhat misleading rendering of the Greek word, which means 'the state of having been tested and approved,' the 'temper of the veteran.' Endurance strengthens character, and therewith the confidence with which the Christian confronts the future.

5. **and hope putteth not to shame:** better 'and *our* hope' (i.e. specifically Christian hope—this is implied by the definite article, which RV, as often, ignores) 'is not likely to put us to shame, i.e. disappoint us.'

the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts (the Greek implies, 'and still fills them'). St. Paul appeals to his readers' love for God as a fact of everyday experience—an eloquent testimony to the level at which Christian devotion was habitually maintained. The phrase, with what follows, has become classical through its frequent citation by St. Augustine in the beautiful treatise *de Spiritu et Litera*.

through the Holy Ghost: better *through Holy Spirit* (or *Breath*). Here RV has gratuitously inserted 'the.' 'Holy Spirit' without the definite article seems to imply that, *for the moment*, St. Paul is thinking or writing in terms of the OT conception of God's Breath or Spirit as an impersonal effluence which streams forth from Him—though in view of $8^{26, 27}$ in this epistle it is impossible to maintain that the Apostle did not intellectually accept the Personality of the Spirit.

which was given unto us: the original uses the aorist, which implies that the gift of the Spirit was bestowed upon Christians at definite moments of time, on

* See G. H. Rendall's *Ep. of St. James and Judaic Christianity* (Cambridge Press), vii.—C. G.

particular occasions. These occasions can hardly be other than those of the 'laying on of hands' which formed the concluding part of Christian Initiation, and which, detached as it now is in Western Christendom from baptism, we call 'Confirmation.' We shall have occasion again to call attention to 'significant aorists' which seem to refer to the experience of Initiation or to the moment of baptism which was its climax.

6. A further ground for confidence—Christ died for us before we had made a single sign that we were likely to appreciate His self-sacrifice, or had any desire to be reconciled to God. This thought of the utterly unmerited and spontaneous character of the love of God exhibited in the Atonement is re-emphasized in [8].

In what sense did Christ die 'for' the ungodly? St. Paul does not tell us: we can only say that the preposition which he uses can naturally be translated 'on behalf of,' but cannot be pressed so as to imply the idea of 'penal substitution.'

7. St. Paul for a moment seems to soliloquize: 'Yes—wonderful thought—Christ died for *sinners*, not for those already righteous. It is very rarely that a man will lay down his life for a virtuous neighbour—though I suppose someone might be willing to sacrifice himself for a neighbour who was both virtuous and personally attractive' (this is the meaning of the contrast between the two Greek adjectives translated in RV as 'righteous' and 'good'). 'However, *we* were neither virtuous nor attractive: and yet,' etc.

9. Notice that here 'acquittal' is connected specifically with the Passion of Christ, rather than (as is more usual) with Faith in His Divine Sonship and Resurrection. Notice also the eschatological tone of the concept of 'salvation.'

10, 11 contain three 'significant aorists,' which are obscured in the English versions—'we were reconciled,' 'having been reconciled,' 'through whom, as it is, we received our reconciliation.' It is probable that these refer to Initiation, which crowned and consummated 'justification': see on [5].

12-21. The thought of redemption suggests a digression on the parallelism between Adam and Christ, which involves a brief discussion of the Fall of Adam ([12-14], the *locus classicus* for this subject in the NT).

12-14 are confused in form, owing to the fact that St. Paul here yields to his habit of 'thinking aloud,' half-forgetting, perhaps, that his soliloquy is being taken down by his amanuensis and so stereotyped as a permanent part of his epistle. When he begins this section, it would seem that his intention merely is to illustrate the glories of Redemption by contrasting them with the disasters which flowed from the sin of Adam. If he had adhered to this intention, [12] would have run somewhat as follows: 'As through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, *so through one man (Christ) redemption came into the world, and through redemption life.*' The idea of the inseparable connexion between death and sin, however, raises various difficulties in his mind, difficulties which he impulsively expresses in speech, with the result that the sentence is never completed. As before, the best form of commentary will be an extended paraphrase (missing logical connexions which we have restored are printed in italics):

12. 'And so, as through one man (Adam) sin entered into the world, and death as sin's inevitable concomitant—so that death became diffused amongst all men, inasmuch as all men sinned . . .

13. '*This, however, raises a difficulty.* Until the giving of the *Mosaic* Law *on Sinai*, sin must have existed in the world, *because death shows the presence of sin as smoke shows the presence of fire, and the pre-Mosaic generations of humanity did actually die, and must therefore have been sinners in some sense.* But *it is difficult to see in what sense, because* "sin" implies the knowledge of a law to sin against, *and* ex hypothesi *the pre-Mosaic generations knew nothing of the Law.*

14. 'Nevertheless, the broad fact remains that those who lived between Adam and Moses were all subject to death, even though they did not, and in the nature of the case could not, sin in the way in which Adam sinned, i.e. *by wilfully transgressing a known law.*'

It will be noted with regard to the above (*a*) that St. Paul is not giving a theological exposition of the idea of the Fall, but merely expressing, with the utmost simplicity, certain puzzles which arise in his mind as the result of a passing allusion to the Fall; (*b*) that these puzzles are based upon an assumption which we have already met in 2 [12] ff., namely, that the moral law is exclusively embodied in the Mosaic Law, so that those who are ignorant of the actual Decalogue are incapable of moral merit or demerit. It will be further noticed that St. Paul raises these perplexities in [13, 14], and then drops them again, without producing any solution of them; what approximates to a solution eventually appears at the end

of the chapter, in [20, 21] (see commentary *infra*).

Verse [12], therefore, which expresses St. Paul's mind with regard to the Fall of Adam, is to be regarded as an *obiter dictum*, and not as a formal dogmatic utterance. Nevertheless, we can collect from it what he really believed on the subject, namely, (1) that man was originally sinless and immortal; and (2) that sin and death found an entrance into the world through Adam's sin, so that all men became sinful in some sense and by consequence mortal (cf. Wisd 2 [23, 24]). This is all that can be reasonably extracted from the Apostle's words, and the simplicity and indefiniteness of his doctrine contrasts forcibly with the elaborate developments later imposed upon it by St. Augustine. St. Paul knows nothing of 'original righteousness' in the sense of an exalted degree of positive sanctity supposed to have been possessed by our first parents; he does not use the word 'Fall' (which as a technical term is patristic, not scriptural); he does not speak of 'original sin' (a phrase coined by St. Augustine), nor does he imply that all Adam's descendants are in virtue of their birth implicated in his guilt; he says nothing as to the mode whereby the disastrous consequences of Adam's sin are transmitted, though his language is, perhaps, most easily intelligible if we suppose that physical heredity was in his mind. That the doctrine did not play as important a part in his intellectual scheme as in later Western theology may be inferred from the fact that in 1 and 2 of this epistle he explains the universal wickedness of humanity, Gentile and Jew, as the result of free choice, without making any allusion to the sin of Adam or its effects.

The teaching of our Lord, as recorded in the Gospels, contains no allusion to the doctrine of the Fall, and the question naturally arises, Whence, then, did St. Paul obtain it? The answer must be that the Fall-conception was brought over into Christianity from Judaism by our Lord's earliest disciples, and that St. Paul had probably believed in it long before he became a Christian, and saw no reason for dropping it, but on the contrary every reason for retaining and emphasizing it, after he had passed through the unique experience of conversion and 'acquittal' through faith in Christ. The idea that the ills of mankind, physical and moral, flow from some primordial sin (first identified with the Fall of the angels in Gen 6, then with the transgression of Adam in Gen 3) arose amongst the post-exilic Jews as the result of reflection on the observed universality of sin and unhappiness, and appears in many passages of the pseudepigrapha (for references, and a full discussion of the origins of the Fall-doctrine, see the present writer's Bampton Lectures, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, 1927). Its authority for Christians, therefore, rests not so much on any word of Christ as on the spiritual experience of St. Paul and the earliest disciples.

These considerations go far towards removing the difficulties which are sometimes felt with regard to the Fall-doctrine as popularly understood. It must always be remembered that the gloomy doctrine of St. Augustine is not to be found in Scripture, and has never secured the explicit allegiance of the Church as a whole; the only conception of the Fall to which historical Christianity as such can be deemed to be committed is the very general and undefined one set forth in this passage. Moreover, if this elastic Pauline doctrine of some kind of inherited moral infirmity be based upon the universal or practically universal consciousness of sin—and if the further doctrine that the moral infirmity must have had a primal revolt against God as its cause be based upon the faith that God cannot be the author of evil—then the foundations of the Fall-doctrine rest upon the bed-rock of spiritual experience, and are unaffected by the verdict of historical criticism upon the story of Gen 3.

12. for that all sinned: 'for that' is the correct translation of the Greek conjunction, which, however, the Old Latin versions, followed by Vulgate, render as *in quo*. This was misunderstood by 'Ambrosiaster' as meaning 'in whom,' *sc.* Adam: and was used by him to support the theory of the 'seminal identity' of the human race with Adam, and its corollary, the idea of 'original guilt.' In less technical language, the unknown 4th-century author of a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles usually printed at the end of the works of St. Ambrose read this sentence as 'in whom all sinned,' and used it as a proof-text to show that all men, having been physically contained in Adam's loins at the moment when he sinned, are deemed by God to have sinned 'in' him, and so are, antecedently to any personal demerits of their own, born in a condition of 'guilt' and consequent liability to eternal damnation. St. Augustine all too eagerly borrowed this mistake from 'Ambrosiaster,' and used

it to rivet the idea of 'original guilt' on Western theology (see *Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, 127, 308 f., 379).

14. who is a figure of him that was to come. The Apostle finds the puzzle raised in [13] too much for him, and utilizes this phrase as a means of returning to the idea with which he began in [12], that of the parallelism between Adam and Christ (for which cf. 1 Cor 15 [22, 45] ff.).

15-19. Contrasts and likenesses between the work of Adam and the work of Christ, designed to enhance the splendour of the latter. [15, 16] contain formal contrasts, [16-19] likenesses. In the last resort, all are variations on the same set of themes: the correspondence of Adam and Christ and of their characteristic acts, the contrast between the unity of Adam and the multiplicity of his descendants, the contrast between the unity of the Christ and the multiplicity of His redeemed. St. Paul here gives full rein to his love of highly compressed, two- or three-membered antitheses.

15. The first sentence may be paraphrased: 'But God's free gift (of redemption) is not in all respects parallel to the (primal) transgression.'

16*a*. Paraphrase: 'The boon bestowed by God is not in all respects correspondent to the ill effects of one man's sinning.' Sanday and Headlam luminously comment on [16*b*]: 'In the one case there is expansion outwards, from one to many: in the other case there is contraction inwards: the movement originates with many sins which are all embraced in a single sentence of absolution.'

18. through one act of righteousness: better 'through one sentence of acquittal.'

19. through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners (or, 'established in a sinful condition'): presumably by heredity, though this is not stated. At any rate, the expression 'were made sinners' is strong enough to make it clear that St. Paul was not a Pelagian.

20. Paraphrase: 'And the (Mosaic) Law came into the course of human history as a kind of divine afterthought, to meet an emergency (i.e. the Fall and its consequences) which, so to speak, had not been allowed for in God's original plan—in order that the sin of man might be multiplied, i.e. in order that the vague hereditary sinfulness which had existed in a suppressed form in the pre-Mosaic generations might be stimulated to break forth into a multiplicity of actual sins.' The two concluding verses of the chapter indicate the solution of the puzzle raised in [13], with regard to the moral status of pre-Mosaic men. We may express the Apostle's thought as follows:

PROBLEM ([13, 14]): 'Death and sin are inseparably connected: all Adam's descendants who lived before Moses died, and therefore must have sinned, or been sinful. *But* sin implies a Law to sin against, and before Moses there was no Law: how, then, can the pre-Mosaic men have sinned?'

ANSWER ([20, 21]): 'It is true that the pre-Mosaic men cannot have sinned in the strict sense of the term, owing to the absence of a Law: but, none the less, owing to the sin of their father Adam they were infected with a kind of "suppressed sinfulness," or tendency to sin. And the Law was promulgated on Sinai (paradoxically enough) in order that men might be stimulated to break it: that is to say, in order that this congenital poison of "suppressed sinfulness" might be brought to the surface of men's souls—might be externalized, so to speak—in the shape of particular sinful acts, which God's unbounded love and kindness could then deal with by way of judicial absolution.'

Note (1) the fact that St. Paul's description of the Law as an afterthought, a stopgap, a *pis-aller*, entirely contradicts the dominant tendency of Rabbinism, which was to maintain that the Law existed in the mind of God from all eternity, and that the earth and man were created mainly in order that there might be sentient beings to observe the Law; (2) the apparent assumption that God's 'favour' can only deal with sinful *acts*, and not with the disordered *state* of personality from which these acts arise.

(2) VI. 1-VII. 7. Exhortation to cultivate absolute moral spotlessness, based upon the complete break with the old life involved in the fact of baptism.

For the understanding of this section three points must be kept in mind:

First, there is no contrast or disparateness in St. Paul's mind between 'Faith' and 'Baptism.' As previously pointed out, the acceptance of Christian Initiation, which culminates in the ceremony of the mystical laver, is for him the necessary expression and the crowning point of the 'Act of Faith'; Faith and Baptism are related as the inner and outer aspects of the one indivisible act of conversion from sin and idols to the service of the true God.*

Secondly, the Baptism of which he is thinking is Baptism as administered to adults. All, or nearly all, of his readers

* For a fuller statement of this relation see *The Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 420, 421, 433.

must have been adult converts, whose baptisms would be events not more than a few years old, events which they could vividly remember. Consequently, the Apostle can appeal to their experiences in Baptism as a modern preacher cannot —for the modern preacher's hearers were baptized as unconscious infants, and accordingly have no memories of the sacrament capable of being stirred by fervent addresses. It must be admitted that St. Paul, like the other NT writers, does not mention infant baptism, which may have been practised during the lifetimes of the Apostles, but required five centuries in which to win universal acceptance by the Church. (This consideration will not be regarded as a disparagement of infant baptism by those who believe in the Spirit's guidance of the Church. It should be recognized that to welcome infant baptism where there is real security for Christian education is not the same thing as to acquiesce in the practice of indiscriminate baptism which has actually grown up, though never formally approved by the Church.)

Thirdly—a point to be remembered especially with regard to the exegesis of 6 1-11—the argument of this section is blended of two or three somewhat different and, it may be deemed, hardly compatible strains of thought. (*a*) There is the argument from *symbolism*—'The whole ceremonial of Baptism is clearly meant to typify death to an old life and resurrection into a new: therefore by going through this symbolic action you bound yourselves to renounce the sins of your pre-conversion life.' But (*b*) there is also the argument from what Matthew Arnold has called 'the doctrine of the *necrosis*' (*St. Paul and Protestantism*, 75), i.e. the doctrine founded upon the Apostle's own overwhelming experience, that the man who has attained to mystical union with Christ has *ipso facto* attained to the 'sublimation' of all disorderly impulses, has been freed from old temptations, and has become a 'new creature.' And (*c*) parallel to this, and apparently leading to the same conclusion, there is the line of thought arising from the exalted conception held by St. Paul of the inherent efficacy of Baptism. Baptism was from the first conceived as effecting the 'washing away' of sin (cf. Ac 22 16), and it is no wonder that in the Church's enthusiastic youth, before there had been time to work out a systematic theology of the sacraments, this should have been taken to include the washing away of all tendency to sin. (*a*) naturally leads to an exhortation: 'You are now Christians, and therefore I urge you to abstain from the sins of the heathen'; (*b*) to a statement of what is at least ideal fact: 'You are Christians, and Christians cannot, or at least do not, practise the sins of the heathen.' It is no argument against the possibility of St. Paul's having occasionally used words which seem to presuppose the latter view to urge that he had already been confronted with grave post-baptismal sins at Corinth (1 Cor 5, etc.) and Ephesus (Ac 19 18): for it is quite in his manner to forget in one context facts which he recognizes in another (cf. the practical denial of pagan virtue in 1 18-32 and its recognition in 2 14, 15).* But, though (*b*) seems to be presupposed by such utterances as 6 6, 7 6, 8 2, if they are taken at their face value, there can be no doubt that (*a*) represents St. Paul's dominating thought: and an accurate estimate of his teaching on a given subject must take account of all his words written in different connexions, with due regard to the proportion which they bear one to another. The essential truth of (*b*) seems to lie in the thought that what St. Augustine called the *beata necessitas non peccandi* is the ultimate reward of the Christian's striving after perfection.

The suggestion that the high sacramental view of Baptism expressed or assumed in this section was unconsciously borrowed from the cathartic lustral rites of the pagan 'Mystery-cults,' does not require more than a mention: it may be deemed to have been sufficiently dealt with in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, 407 ff. Cf. in this volume *The Gentile Background of Early Christianity*, p. 30; *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 420; *Sacraments in the N.T.*, *passim*.

The breach with sin involved in the fact of accepting Christianity is described by means of four metaphors, of which the first is:

(*a*) **Baptism as a mystical Death and Resurrection, by which the baptized person participates in the Death and Resurrection of Christ (VI. 1-11).**

VI. 1. This verse carries on the thought of 5 20, 'where sin was multiplied, God's favour abounded more exceedingly,' contains an allusion to the reproach of antinomianism levelled at St. Paul by his Jewish adversaries, and at the same time constitutes a tactful device whereby he is enabled to insist upon the necessity of moral correctitude, without seeming to exhort his Roman readers in too pointed a manner.

* For a different view see *The Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 432, 433.

2. we who died to sin (Greek aorist): that is, at the moment of Initiation. The aorists in this section ('died,' 'were baptized,' 'were buried') give the clue to the meaning of the 'significant aorists' already pointed out in 5.

3, 4. These verses sum up what some German writers have called St. Paul's 'Passion-mysticism' (*Passionsmystik*). For the Apostle, the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ are facts, not merely of the historical order, but of the eternal and transcendental world: they are timeless realities, and the believer, by being incorporated through Baptism into the eternal Christ, becomes in some sense a partaker in these acts and experiences: he dies in Christ's Death, is buried in His Burial, and rises again in His Resurrection. The argument is—'Baptism is a *dramatic* death, burial, and resurrection: but, as Baptism is not merely a symbol, but a hyper-symbol or sacrament, which actually effects what it portrays, this dramatic death and resurrection involve a *real*, though *spiritual* and *transcendent*, death and resurrection, i.e. Christ's Death and Resurrection as shared in by the person who is being made a member of Him; and this *spiritual* resurrection must further involve yet a third kind of resurrection, namely, an *ethical* one.' Notice (*a*) that the conception of the 'mystical Body' of Christ, as it will be developed in the Epistle to the Ephesians, clearly underlies the thought of this paragraph; (*b*) that the symbolic interpretation of Baptism as a descent into a mystical grave presupposes the custom of immersion.

6. Here the freedom of the baptized Christian from temptations, especially physical temptations, seems to be stated absolutely, as a fact of experience. 'Our old man' means 'our old unregenerate human nature': this is said to have been 'crucified with' Christ, i.e. put to death or abolished (*qua* unregenerate) in the mystical death of Baptism, in order that the 'body of sin' (i.e. the 'sinful body,' or, in other words, the sinful impulses of the body—St. Paul does not stay to distinguish between innocent appetite and its illicit gratification) might be 'annulled,' that is, made inoperative and powerless to determine our actions.

7. A fanciful development of the metaphor of slavery hinted at in 6^b. 'When a slave dies, he ceases to be his master's property: so, when we 'died' (in Baptism), we 'stood acquitted' from the claims of our old owner Sin.'

8, 9 contain, together with the idea of ethical resurrection, the thought of yet a fourth kind of resurrection, viz. the eschatological resurrection of the body, which we shall also share with Christ in virtue of our inherence in Him.

10. the death that he died, he died unto sin once. Christ 'died unto sin,' not for Himself—for He was without sin—but in His capacity as the representative (though not necessarily vicarious or substitutionary) bearer of the sins of humanity.

(*b*) **Baptism as desertion from the service of one monarch, Sin, and enlistment in the service of another monarch, God** (VI. 12-14).

12, 13. Notice the emphasis which St. Paul lays upon the duty of sanctifying the body, with its implication that man's physical nature is the main theatre in which moral weakness is displayed.

14. ye are not under law, but under grace. This is one of those Pauline epigrams which contain a whole world of thought packed up into a brief verbal form, and were in consequence peculiarly liable to misunderstanding. As is often the case with such pithy sayings, it appears unexpectedly and without explanation. Its meaning may be drawn out as follows: 'Before Christ came, under the old system, the Jew had to be kept in the straight path by means of Law, i.e. by means of an external code of regulations, with pains and penalties attached to their transgression. His relations with God were on a thoroughly unsatisfactory basis: with his disorderly, unregenerate nature, always tending to defy God, he had to be treated like a rebellious slave, who requires a set of rules and a whip to make him do his duty. But, with the coming of Christ, all this is changed. The Christian's nature has been completely transformed, so that he no longer even wants to diverge from the will of God; hence Law has ceased to exist for him *as* Law, that is, as an *external* code reluctantly submitted to, because what the Law commands has become what he instinctively desires to do. This being so, God can deal with him as with a son, not as with a slave: God's attitude towards him is no longer one of watchful severity, keen to detect any divergence from the written code, but one of pure, trustful affection and loving-kindness ("favour")'. For this train of ideas cf. Gal 4^{5-7}; Rom 8^{2} ff., $15^{}$ ff., 10^{4}.

(*c*) **Baptism as manumission from the ownership of Sin and acceptance of the ownership of God** (VI. 15-23).

15. The utterance of this epigram, embodying one of St. Paul's watchwords,

'Not Law, but Favour,' calls up at once, as well it might, the thought of a possible misunderstanding. Doubtless some of St. Paul's opponents had taken his blunt, unexplained assertion 'We Christians are not under Law' to mean 'We Christians are not subject to any moral restraints, and can behave as we like.' Characteristically, it does not occur to the fiery Apostle to explain what he does mean by his proclamation of the obsoleteness of Law: he prefers to insist yet further, in vehement language, upon the utter incompatibility of Christianity and sin.

16 means in effect 'Ye cannot—not merely ought not to, but cannot—serve two masters,' though the form of the sentence is slightly confused.

17. **form of teaching**: the word translated 'form' would be better rendered 'pattern' or 'standard,' and the whole phrase means 'the standard of Christian conduct which was set before you in your pre-baptismal course of instruction.' It would be anachronistic to take the phrase as referring to a 'Pauline type' (opposed to Judaizing or other 'types') of 'doctrine.'

18*a* is a parenthetic apology for the use of anthropomorphic language, necessitated by 'the infirmity of your flesh' (presumably='your liability to fleshly sins,' a meaning which is supported by the contents of the second half of the verse). 'I know that your special danger is that of a relapse into the pagan immorality by which you are surrounded, and therefore I have to use forcible and even crude metaphor in order to drive home the seriousness of what I say.' Here the idea of the impeccability of the baptized is explicitly denied.

19*b*, 20, 21 assume, very candidly, that St. Paul's readers (or the Gentile majority of them) had been stained by pagan vice in their pre-Christian lives: cf. a similar frank address to the Corinthian Christians: 'And such were some of you' (1 Cor 6 [11]).

23. 'wages' and 'free gift' are in all probability technical military terms, the former standing for the soldier's regular 'pay,' the latter for the 'donative' or 'largesse' distributed by an emperor on his accession amongst the Prætorian Guards.

(*d*) **Baptism as the dissolution by a (mystical) death of our marriage with sin, and as an entering into wedlock with God (VII. 1-7).**

VII. 1. **men that know the law**: better 'men who know law,' i.e. are conversant with legal theory and practice. 'Law' in the Greek has no article, and must therefore mean 'law in the abstract': we must suppose that when St. Paul describes his Roman readers as 'acquainted with law' he is thinking of the daily opportunities which they had of becoming acquainted with *Roman* law by witnessing the administration of justice in the basilicas which lined the Forum. Similarly 'the law' (in the phrase 'the law hath dominion') must mean 'the Law in general,' which is embodied alike in the Roman and the Mosaic laws.

2, 3. Death puts a term to all legal rights, including the rights of a husband over his wife.

4. The application of the metaphor. The 'wife' is ourselves, baptized Christians: the 'old husband' is—not Sin, as we should expect, but 'the law' (now, presumably, the principle of Law as such, abstracted from its particular Roman or Mosaic embodiments): the 'death' is, of course, the mystical death of Baptism, and the 'new husband' is, first Christ ('he who was raised from the dead'), and then, almost in the same breath, God. As the metaphor works out, it makes the 'wife' first die and then marry again: but logical consistency is with St. Paul a consideration secondary to lucidity of exposition. The sense in which Christians have been 'made dead to the law' (i.e. in which the Law has been made dead, or annulled, in regard to them) has been explained above on 6 [14].

through the body of Christ, i.e., probably, 'through the physical crucifixion of Christ, considered as the temporal expression of that eternal act of self-sacrifice in which the Christian has been made to share in and through his baptism' (see above on 6 [3, 4]).

5. **For when we were in the flesh**: that is, when the focus of our interests, the centre of gravity of our personality, was in our animal, as opposed to our higher, nature.

the sinful passions: no doubt what St. Paul means is 'the bodily appetites, the illicit indulgence whereof constitutes sin': but the phrase is obviously open to misconstruction, seeming as it does to imply that the bodily appetites as such are sinful.

which were through the law: that is, which were stimulated, roused into life, by the threatenings of the Law. This point will be elucidated further in [7-14] of this chapter.

6. **having died to that wherein we were holden**: The Greek phrase is highly compressed, but a more natural translation seems to be 'inasmuch as we died (aorist)

in respect of that whereby we were held.' The Law had hold of us by our animal nature, as a man-trap may grip a man by the leg. If the leg is severed from the body, so that it is left in the trap, it dies indeed, but the man is freed: he can win liberty by 'dying in respect of that whereby he was held.' So, by the mystical death of Baptism, our physical nature is 'killed' ('the body of sin' is 'annulled,' 6^{6}), that is, rendered impotent to plague us with sinful solicitations: and there is consequently no part of our personality on which the Law can lay hold.

8-25. Digression on the relations of Law and Sin: the impotence of Law as such and the terrible power of the inbred sinful tendency.

In this section St. Paul states his view of the Law, thus explaining isolated and enigmatic *obiter dicta* such as 3^{20}, 'through the law cometh the knowledge of sin'; 4^{15}, 'the law worketh wrath.' He also illustrates the power of the sinful tendency, which the argument of 5 seems to presuppose as existing in all men, by what appears to be a chapter from his own life.

8. The Jewish objector takes up St. Paul's conception of Baptism as 'freeing us from the Law,' and suggests that this involves equating 'the Law' and 'Sin,' inasmuch as Baptism admittedly frees us, in some sense, from sin. St. Paul explains his real meaning in—

7*b*-13, which may be paraphrased as follows:

7*b*. 'It would be both absurd and impious to say that the Law *is* sin. The truth is, that it is knowledge of the Law which makes (actual) sin, in the strict sense of the term, possible. For instance, I should never have experienced illicit desire, if I had never known of the Law which says, "Thou shalt not desire . . . illicitly."

8. 'What I mean is this. Apart from the explicit knowledge of the Law, Sin (in the sense of the inherited sinful tendency) is dead, that is, impotent to do me any harm; for (as explained above, 13^{b}) a man cannot "sin" if he knows no Law to sin against. But this connatural power of Sin within me "found its occasion through the commandment," that is, utilized the circumstance of my becoming acquainted with the Tenth Commandment, "Thou shalt not desire . . .," to produce in me all kinds of illicit desire.

9. 'There was a time when I lived a happy, careless life, as a child, knowing nothing of Law. But all the time there was this demon of Sin dormant within me; and when I reached the age of moral responsibility, and learnt God's commandments, this slumbering demon suddenly woke into life, and I died—that is, committed some evil deed which cut me off from God.

10. 'So that I am faced with this paradoxical situation: the Decalogue, which *ex hypothesi* was designed to promote my spiritual good, seems in fact to have promoted the exact opposite.

11. 'For this mysterious inbred power of Sin has used the Decalogue as a kind of fulcrum whereby to push me into the abyss of sin.

12. '(The paradox is a striking one): for admittedly the Law is in itself an essentially good thing.

13. 'Am I then to conclude that this essentially good thing, the Law, has *in virtue of its intrinsic properties* done me immeasurable harm? No, to think that would be impiety. The blame for the fact, that my becoming acquainted with the Law was immediately followed by a transgression of Law, rests not upon the Law but upon this congenital Sin, or sinful tendency, which exists within me. And this sequence of events—learning the Law in childhood, immediately followed by conscious transgression of it—was tolerated by God, in order to bring out the full hideousness of connatural sinfulness, as shown by the fact that it was able to utilize so essentially holy a thing as the Decalogue as an instrument of its fell designs' (cf. the argument of Jn 19^{11}).

A modern psychologist would supplement this account of the onset of temptation by pointing out that the idea of a suggested action naturally tends to realize itself, unless the impulse which it begets is inhibited by conscious will-power. Now the Law, by forbidding (e.g.) stealing, necessarily suggests the idea of stealing to the mind: consequently, as the physiological machinery of ideation is so closely interlocked with that of volition, that the immediate result of learning the Eighth Commandment is an almost imperceptible, but real, impulse to steal: if this minute impulse produced by acquaintance with the Law be reinforced by a flood-wave of animal appetite, man's will, weakened by the Fall, is unable to resist it, and the result is an act of theft. It is this weakness of will, or congenital inordination of appetite, which St. Paul hypostatizes as a substantive power of 'Sin,' and which, using the not altogether happy expression coined by St. Augustine, theologians call 'Original Sin.'

14. carnal: better *a being of flesh*; the Greek adjective does not contain the

disparaging implication of 'carnal.' For the contrast cf. 1 Cor 3 [1-3]

15-23 describe, with the poignancy born of personal experience, the state of divided personality ensuing upon the temptation and fall sketched in [8-11]. These verses are a series of variations upon the theme *video meliora proboque Deteriora sequor*. The condition of the 'recidivist,' the man who both knows and approves of what is right, yet cannot extricate himself from the coils of some overmastering vicious habit, was described by Aristotle as *akrasia*, 'incontinence': yet the Greek philosopher cannot suggest any means of deliverance from congenital 'incontinence,' whereas the Apostle knows that the remedy is union with Christ ([25]). Notice the frequent allusions to man's physical nature in this passage—[14], 'a being of flesh'; [18], 'in my flesh'; [23], 'my members'; [24], 'the body of this death'; [25], 'the flesh.' There can be no doubt that St. Paul considers our physical nature to be the home and seat of transmitted sinfulness, though this must not be pressed to the point of attributing a Manichean dualism between flesh and spirit to him.

VIII. Renewed exhortation to confidence and interior tranquillity, based upon (*a*) experience of the Spirit's indwelling ([1-17] and [26, 27]); (*b*) the apocalyptic hope of the regeneration of the material universe ([18-25]); the consciousness of predestination ([28-30]).

1. With this verse we return to the first characteristic of the Christian life, interior tranquillity, as expounded in [1-11]. Whatever their pre-conversion lives may have been, however agonizing their moral struggles prior to Baptism, they are now acquitted, absolved, forgiven, and therefore should be free from all disquietude. Notice the great phrase 'in Christ Jesus,' which contains in three words the whole doctrine of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.

2. For an explanation of the thesis that Faith and Baptism produce 'freedom from the Law,' see above on 7 [6]. Here this idea is further elucidated by the statement that it is 'the Spirit of the life in Christ Jesus'—that is, the Holy Spirit, identified with the life-force or energy pervading the Mystical Body of Christ—who operates the interior transformation which causes the Christian spontaneously to desire to do what the Law commands, so that the Law ceases for him to be a 'Law,' in the sense of an externally repressive and constraining code.

3. Paraphrase: 'For that task which was impossible to the Law—a task which was impossible to it owing to the congenital infirmity of human nature described in our last section—that task God has actually performed: having sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and in the capacity of a sin-offering, He "condemned" Sin, that is, caused it to be judicially defeated, to lose its suit, within that very sphere of the "flesh," over which it had claimed exclusive authority.' Man, as the Apostle has so often insisted, could not win forgiveness through 'works of Law,' because, owing to the inherited flaw of his nature, he could never keep the Law: but God has now put forgiveness within his reach through the Incarnation and the Atonement.

Notice (1) the phrase 'His *own* Son'—the Greek is emphatic, implying that Christ is the Son of God in a way that no other has been or can be: a similar phrase occurs below in [32]: (2) the strongly objective view of the Atonement implied in the description of Christ as a 'sin offering' (the Greek phrase employed is the regular LXX term for the 'sin offering' of Leviticus); (3) the absence of any explanation as to *how* Christ's sacrifice avails to 'condemn sin' in respect of the individual believer; (4) the implied designation of 'the flesh' as the sphere of sin.

4. who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. RV is probably right in spelling 'spirit' without the initial capital, so as to indicate that it is the human spirit, man's higher moral and religious self, that is meant. St. Paul easily passes from the thought of God's Spirit to that of man's spirit; and, as Tertius' autograph contained no capitals, the use of this device in modern texts to show when the Divine Spirit is meant rests upon conjecture. However, the sense of the following passage seems to show that RV has used this device correctly throughout the following verses, in which a contrast is set up between life 'in' or 'after flesh' and life 'in spirit'—that is, between a life centred in the animal nature, and a life centred in the higher, God-apprehending side of man's personality.

6, 7. The opposition between 'the mind of the flesh' and the 'mind of the spirit'—that is, between the totality of instincts belonging respectively to the higher and lower sides of human personality—is suggestive of the Rabbinical doctrine of the two *Yeçārim*, the *yēçer ha-rà'*, or 'evil impulse,' and the *yēçer hattōbh*, or 'good impulse,' and may very possibly be a

translation of it (as modified by St. Paul's belief in the Fall of Adam) into Greek terms. In the official Jewish theology the idea of the *yēçer ha-ra'*, or 'evil imagination' (a term derived from Gen 6 [5]), was the explanation of man's proneness to sin: it was supposed to have been implanted by God in each individual at birth, in order to provide him with the occasion of self-discipline and self-conquest. We have no evidence that the companion conception, that of the *yēçer hattōbh*, or 'good impulse,' had been developed as early as the time of St. Paul: but it may well have been. The Rabbis conceived the evil *yēçer* and the Law as mutually hostile powers: and this conception seems to be hinted at in [7]. On the whole subject, with special reference to the interpretation of this passage, see *Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, 150 ff.

9. The Apostle returns from the thought of man's spirit to that of the Spirit of God.

9*b*. 'if any man hath not the Spirit of God' seems to allow for the possibility of post-baptismal sin, though not giving any explanation of it.

10. if Christ is in you. Notice the way in which this clause occurs as a parallel to three clauses alluding to the indwelling of the *Spirit*. It would, however, be unjustifiable to assert that St. Paul identifies the glorified Christ with the Spirit: the truth rather is that the form of his sentences is shaped by a fundamental Christian experience, that of the mutual interpenetration of the activities of the Son and the Spirit—an experience which finds its appropriate logical articulation in the doctrine of the coinherence (*perichorêsis, circuminsessio*) of the Three Persons of the Trinity, as formulated by subsequent Church theology.

the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness: a characteristic triple antithesis. The Christian's body is still liable to physical death because of the sin with which it was infected (before Faith and Baptism): but his higher self already is, or possesses, eternal life in view of the status of 'righteous' imparted to him at the great change in his life.

12, 13 repeat once more the exhortation to moral purity, which in [14-17] passes again into an exhortation to cultivate interior peace. These two *motifs* form the twofold thread which binds together the whole section 5-8.

14, 15 are repeated, almost verbally, from Gal 4 [5, 6]. The present commentator is inclined to think that 'spirit,' in the phrase 'spirit of adoption,' means the Divine Spirit, and should therefore be printed with a capital initial. The reference would then be to the reception of the Divine Spirit through the laying on of hands at the time of Initiation. (It is evidently the Spirit of God who is meant in the parallel passage in Galatians.) The reference to Initiation becomes more vivid and explicit if we accept a brilliant conjecture of Th. Zahn (*Brief. des P. an die Römer* [1910], 395) that the phrase 'whereby we cry, Abba, Father' refers to the solemn corporate recitation of the Lord's Prayer (presumably in its Lucan form—see Lk 11 [2]) by the newly baptized, as the first exercise of their Christian privileges. The bilingual phrase (Aramaic and Greek) may be a reminiscence of our Lord's words in Gethsemane (Mk 14 [36]): we may surmise that on that solemn occasion the opening invocation of His own Prayer rose naturally to His lips.

18-22 sets forth the hope of the apocalyptic Kingdom of God as a ground for interior tranquillity, and affirms that the subhuman creation will share in the glories of the new age (cf. Is 11 [1-9]).

20. The 'vanity,' that is, the waste and futility which marks subhuman Nature is affirmed in enigmatic language to be a consequence of the Fall. 'He who subjected it' is probably Adam. The idea was not uncommon amongst the Jewish apocalyptists: cf. *Jubilees*, iii, 28. Modern science, which has shown that death and presumably pain existed amongst the animals millions of years before man was born, makes it impossible to accept this naive view literally; but the general ideas underlying the passage, the conviction that the evil which exists in Nature must be contrary to the will of God and will one day be done away, and the half-mystical, half-poetical conception of Nature as groaning with desire for her own redemption, have become a permanent possession of the modern religious mind.

23. the firstfruits: better 'the first instalment.' The measure of the Spirit which Christians possess now is only a preliminary instalment of that overflowing gift of the Spirit which will be bestowed upon them in the Messianic Kingdom; it is an 'earnest' of that which is to come (2 Cor 1 [22], 5 [5]). One effect of this fuller endowment with the Spirit will be the 'redemption of our body,' that is, its transformation into a 'spiritual body' or 'body of glory' (1 Cor 15 [44] ff.).

24, 25. The argument is: 'The virtue

of hope,' which is admittedly a part of the true Christian's character, implies that there is much more in store for him than he already possesses.'

26-27. Another ground for complete confidence in God—the almost sensible presence of the Spirit felt when the Christian congregation is met for prayer, and manifested audibly in the 'inarticulate groanings,' or strange ecstatic utterances, elsewhere described as 'speaking with a tongue.' There is some probability that Romans was written at Corinth (see Introduction, § 1): and we know that the Corinthian Church was specially rich in supernormal endowments such as the power of producing these utterances. Compare with this passage 1 Cor 14, and note that there (*a*) in [2], the 'charismatic' who 'speaks with a tongue' is said to be acting through 'spirit' (in the Corinthian letter, presumably the human 'spirit' as contrasted with 'mind,' [14] ff.; but St. Paul, as has been pointed out, very easily passes from the thought of man's spirit to that of God's, and *vice versa*); (*b*) he is said to be addressing God, not man ([2]); (*c*) an interpreter of his utterances is affirmed to be desirable, in order that the congregation may be edified ([27] f.). Here it is implied that the meaning of these 'inarticulate moanings' is not understood by the 'charismatic' himself: he only knows that they are a means of relief for obscure and tumultuous emotions which are surging in his subconsciousness. But God knows what they mean: He needs no 'interpreter'; for these emotions are nothing other than the workings of His indwelling Spirit, expressing through human organs His intercessions for the whole community of Christians, and so coming to the help of individuals, who owing to the inadequacy of human thought and language cannot word their prayers in a manner befitting the infinite majesty of God. On the physiological explanation of *glossolalia* (a phenomenon common at times of religious revival) as due to temporary paralysis of the 'speech-centre' of the brain, induced by strong emotion, see Kirsopp Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, 247 ff.; it need only be observed here that the scientific explanation of the mechanical causes of this phenomenon does not exclude the religious explanation, that the emotion itself is due to the influx of the Spirit.

28-30. Yet a further ground for mental tranquillity—the thought of our predestination to enter the Messianic Kingdom, and of the providential way in which all the circumstances of our lives are ordered by God so as to bear us onward to that final goal.

28. 'Calling' and 'purpose'—two technical terms which will be further elucidated in 9-11, to which this brief section points forward like a finger-post.

29, 30. The history of the individual Christian is here conceived as a line (so to speak) stretching from eternity through time to eternity. In this line five crucial points stand out: (1) God's *prevision*, or fixing His regard upon the yet unborn soul whom He purposes to create; (2) His *predestination* of it to glory (doubtless in reality these two points coincide, but they are distinguishable in thought); (3) His *call*, presumably conveyed by bringing the predestined soul within hearing of the Gospel; (4) His *acquittal*, or absolution of the soul, bestowed in consideration of its acceptance of the Gospel; (5) His *glorification* of it in the Messianic Kingdom.* Observe that though St. Paul mentions God's prevision separately from His predestination, he is silent with regard to the question whether the predestination is absolute or dependent upon 'foreseen merits.'

31-39 conclude the chapter with a magnificent pæan in praise of the redeeming love of God manifested in Christ.

31*b*-34 repeat in impassioned language the thought with which the chapter began ([1]): 'there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.' Notice in [32] (*a*) the expression 'his *own* Son' (see above on [3]); (*b*) the implicit affirmation of a strongly objective view of the Atonement, without any attempt to describe its *modus operandi*.

38. 'principalities' and 'powers' are angelic or superhuman spirits (cf. 1 Cor 15 [24]; Eph 1 [21]; Col 2 [10]); it is possible that 'height' and 'depth' may be the names of Gnostic 'emanations' or 'æons,' though Sanday and Headlam prefer to take them in a general sense as personified abstractions.

(III) St. Paul's Theodicy 'ad Judæos,' or Vindication of God's dealings with the Jews (IX.-XI.).

These chapters stand apart, as a self-contained whole, from the great exposition of Justification and Sanctification contained in 1-8, and might almost have been written as an independent treatise, though there is no reason to suppose that they were. They, especially 9, constitute the classical NT discussion of the problem of predestination and freewill, and on them

* For a different view see *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 408.

St. Augustine and Calvin built a great part of their characteristic doctrines. The exact interpretation of these chapters has for centuries been a matter of dispute: but two points are now generally agreed upon, viz. (*a*) that St. Paul's subject is not primarily the destiny of the individual, but that of the Jewish nation; and (*b*) that the problem which he sets himself to solve presupposes the idea that there is and can be only one Church, the Church of Abraham and the patriarchs, from which the greater part of Israel, in the ethnological sense of the term, has apostatized in virtue of its rejection of the Messiah. The question necessarily arises, How can God's toleration of this state of things be reconciled with His promises to Abraham (a question which has already been cursorily touched upon in 3^{3} ff.)? And these three chapters supply three distinct, and apparently incompatible, answers to it.

The only outstanding point upon which commentators are still divided is that of the *nature of the consequences* which St. Paul believed that their apostasy would entail upon the Jews. Some high authorities have maintained that the Apostle is not thinking of their eternal ruin in the next life, but merely of their loss of the privilege of evangelizing the Gentiles in this. It appears to the present writer that such a view does not do justice to the gravity of St. Paul's words, especially to the almost appalling strength of the phrase in 9^{3} ('I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ'—which is surely a wild exaggeration unless St. Paul thought that his Jewish 'brethren' were themselves 'anathema'). Moreover, the Jews were *ex hypothesi* outside the Church: and for St. Paul those outside the Church were subject to the wrath of God which would break upon them at the Last Judgement. This, indeed, is elsewhere explicitly affirmed of the Jews ('the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost,' $1\ Th\ 2^{16}$). The commentary which follows will, therefore, assume that in the following section, or least at the beginning of it, St. Paul is writing on the supposition that most of his countrymen are likely at the *Parousia* to meet the same fate as 'sinners of the Gentiles,' however he may have conceived this fate: it would at least involve exclusion from the Kingdom, whether or not its further consequences included annihilation or eternal condemnation to Gehenna.

It is not a cogent argument against this hypothesis that at the end of the section, 11^{36}, St. Paul comes to the reassuring conclusion 'and so all Israel shall be saved.' For St. Paul in this section, as elsewhere, is clearly 'thinking aloud'; he is clarifying his ideas in the process of expressing them, or, in the common phrase, 'working them out as he goes along.' Consequently it is not surprising that he should begin with a note of the deepest pessimism, should gradually come to the conclusion that the situation of the Jews is not so bad after all, and should end with an expression of radiant optimism. The permanent essence of his teaching must, accordingly, be gathered not so much from this or that *obiter dictum* as from a comprehensive survey of the section as a whole, a survey which appreciates the various and superficially irreconcilable aspects of truth set forth in it.*

IX. 1-5. **The Problem of Israel's Rejection stated.**

1, 2. Notice the abruptness of the Apostle's transition from the heights of spiritual exaltation reached at the close of the last chapter to a mood of the deepest depression—highly strung temperaments are liable to such sudden emotional changes—and the deep solemnity with which he introduces his new theme.

3. **I could wish**: lit. 'I was praying'—that is, as we should put it, 'I have almost caught myself praying.' The terrible prayer which the Apostle might have uttered is reminiscent of Moses' petition ($Ex\ 32^{32}$): 'Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written.'

4. **Israelites**: the most dignified name for the chosen people, suggesting all the theocratic privileges which are now enumerated.

the glory: i.e. the *Shekhînah*, or visible radiance which was believed to dwell above the Ark of the Covenant as a token of the Divine Presence.

the service: that is, the solemn liturgical and sacrificial worship of the Temple.

5. **whose are the fathers**: the 'fathers' are the patriarchs, and other saints of the Old Covenant. The idea that the merits of the patriarchs constituted one of Israel's chief spiritual assets is assumed in the argument of $11^{16\text{-}24}$, on which see below.

who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. If RV's punctuation of this verse is correct, the sentence represents the highest point to which St. Paul's Christology had hitherto risen, inasmuch as these

* For a different view of the meaning of Rom 9 see *The Theology of St. Paul*, Additional Note, pp. 440-442.

words describe Christ simply as 'God' without any reservation or qualification—a *usus loquendi* which cannot be paralleled elsewhere in the Pauline *corpus*, though the great Christological passage, Phil 2^{5} ff., uses an equivalent expression, 'pre-existing in the form of God.' It is, however, a question (first raised by Erasmus) whether this, the traditional, punctuation is correct: it rests in any case upon conjecture, as the autograph of a 1st-century letter would contain no punctuation, the divisions of words and sentences being left to the reader to gather from the sense. The footnote in RV gives various alternative punctuations, which place a full-stop respectively after 'flesh' or 'all,' and make the rest of the sentence an ascription of praise to the *Father*, as follows: (1) 'of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh. He who is God over all be blessed for ever. Amen'; (2) 'of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all. May God be blessed for ever. Amen.' It is in the nature of the case impossible to decide with absolute certainty between these rival punctuations: but the present writer's opinion is (*a*) that the rhythm of the sentence is more easy and natural if it be allowed to flow continuously on down to 'Amen'; (*b*) that the two last-mentioned punctuations make the doxology a rather rough asyndeton; (*c*) that, whilst a phrase expressive of adoring reverence for Christ is in place in a sombre context, a joyful doxology addressed to the Father is not; (*d*) that, as St. Paul had certainly attained to the conviction that Christ possessed the fulness of the divine attributes by the time that he wrote Phil 2^{5} and Col 2^{9}, there is no reason why he should not have attained it a few years earlier: cf. on 10^{13}.

(*a*) **The first answer to the problem of Israel's rejection: God is absolute Sovereign of all men, and can do what He wills with His own (IX. 6-29).**

6-13. The argument may be paraphrased as follows:

6. 'In any case it is certain that God has not broken His word to "Israel." For the word "Israel" may be used in two senses, physical and spiritual: and the "Israel" or "progeny of Abraham" to which the Promise was made must be understood to be the "spiritual Israel." And to this "spiritual Israel" not all the members of the "physical Israel" necessarily belong: God has a perfect right, if He so wills, to choose only a certain number of Abraham's descendants for membership of Israel, in the sense of the Church.

7. 'That He has exercised this right in the past is shown by the selection of Isaac to carry on the favoured line, and the rejection of Ishmael (who, from a merely physical point of view, was just as much "Abraham's seed" as Isaac).

8, 9. 'This incident clearly shows that the "children" of Abraham who are the beneficiaries of the Promise are not identical with the totality of Abraham's physical descendants.

10. 'The same exercise by God of the right to select some of Abraham's physical descendants and reject others is seen in the next generation, in the case of Isaac's sons: Jacob is chosen, and Esau rejected. [This refutes the suggestion that Ishmael had been previously rejected as being the son of a slave concubine, not of Abraham's wife: for] Jacob and Esau were the sons of the same father and the same mother.

11. '[Nor can it be suggested that Esau's rejection was due to his ferocious character: for] his rejection was supernaturally foretold to his mother *before* the birth of the twins, and, therefore, before Jacob could have earned any merit or Esau any demerit—a fact which brings out the majestic continuity of God's selective purpose working through the generations, and guided, not by any merits of those whom He selects for membership of His *Ecclesia*, but solely by His sovereign good pleasure expressed in His calling of them.' Cf. $^{9:8}$ with the somewhat vaguer attempt to express substantially the same ideas in 4^{11b} ff.

14. The Jewish objector reappears. 'By this exclusive emphasis on God's call, God's action in making men members of the Church, God's apparently unmotived and arbitrary selection of some and rejection of others, are you not abolishing God's attribute of justice?' St. Paul does not meet this objection on its merits, but contents himself with an appeal to authority. 'You may say what you like: but that what I say *is* so is proved by Scripture.'

16. Paraphrase: 'So then membership of the true Israel, and its corollary, a safe passage through the terrors of the End into the Messianic Kingdom, depend not on man's will or on his active exertions, but solely on God's mercy.'

18. A terrific affirmation, which comes very near to making God responsible for human sin, or at least for human failure to fulfil His purpose. St. Paul is for the moment following the predestinarian line of thought whithersoever it may lead, regardless of the consequences. But, to obtain a just estimate of the Apostle's

point of view, we must set this statement side by side with others in [10] and [11] which assume no less clearly human freedom and responsibility.

19. The Jewish objector produces a very pertinent criticism of the absolute determinism to which St. Paul appears to be committing himself. 'If men are what they are because God has "hardened" them, how can God with reason claim the right to pass moral censure upon them? If I sin because God made me a sinner, clearly I have not defied His will—on the contrary, I have conformed to it.' As before, the Apostle makes no attempt to meet this argument directly, for it is, indeed, unanswerable: he endeavours instead (in [20, 21]) to overwhelm his opponent by appealing to the incomprehensible greatness of God and the limitations of man's intellect.

20*b* embodies the appeal to scriptural authority in a composite quotation from Is 29 [16] and 45 [9]; the simile of the potter and the clay, as expressing God's moulding control of human character and destiny, is also used in Is 64 [8] and Jer 18 [6], and the idea of the potter's absolute power to make whatever kind of pots he likes out of his clay may have been suggested by Wisd 15 [7]. St. Paul's contention, stripped of its polemical and metaphorical form, appears in effect to assume the hypothesis of what was later described by St. Augustine as God's 'occult justice,' i.e. of a mysterious quality of 'justice' in God which partakes to such a degree in His own incomprehensibility that it may well issue in acts which, if they had been done by man, would be deemed unjust.

22. St. Paul is still writing (like St. Augustine in some moods, Calvin, and Spinoza) under an overwhelming sense of the all-embracing, ineluctable universality of the divine causality, and in this verse he begins—though he draws back in time—to press his argument to a lurid extreme. 'If God, desiring to make a terrifying exhibition of His wrath [at the Last Day] and to reveal the plenitude of His avenging power, has patiently endured men who are vessels of wrath, manufactured for' (this seems to be the natural sense of the Greek words rendered by RV as 'fitted unto') 'destruction'—if, that is, He has constituted certain souls in such way that they inevitably defy His law, but has chosen, instead of avenging Himself on them now, to save them up to be object-lessons of His wrath at the Day of Doom:—the apodosis was apparently meant to be 'why should He not?' They are His creatures, His workmanship: and He, being absolute and sovereign, has a perfect right to do what He wills with His own.' If the potter chooses to mould some of his clay into ugly pots, which he proposes to dash into shivers at some future date in order to demonstrate his dislike of ugliness, he is fully entitled to do so. But this appalling hypothesis, when he has fully realized it, is too gruesome even for St. Paul's sternest mood, and consequently the apodosis of the sentence is never formulated. Instead, he begins a clause which is meant to lead into another, co-ordinate, protasis—

23. 'and [if], in order to make known the riches of his glory towards "vessels of mercy" which he prepared beforehand unto glory'—apparently wishing to mitigate the gloom which the thought of reprobation would naturally induce in his readers' minds by the contrasted thought of the predestination of some to glory: but at this point the thought of the wonder of Gentile vocation occurs to him, and drives all else out of his mind, so that not merely does the apodosis never appear, but the supplementary protasis is never completed, and the whole sentence is left as a hopeless anacoluthon. Grammatical inconcinnities, however, are matters of no consequence to St. Paul: the main point is that the thought of the admission of Gentiles to the Church (a source of ever fresh wonder and joy to him) enables him to extricate himself from the very dangerous *terrain* on to which he has strayed, and to return to more familiar ground.

25, 26 accordingly give two proof-texts from Hosea (2 [23], 1 [10] LXX) to show that the call of Gentiles was predicted in the OT; and [27-29] quote Is 10 [22], 1 [9] (LXX), applying the Isaianic conception of the 'Remnant' of the chosen seed to the small body of Christian Jews. The idea of the 'Remnant' is developed further in 11 [2-7].

(*b*) **The second answer to the problem of Israel's rejection: It is due to Israel's own deliberate faithlessness (IX. 30-X. 21).**

30-33 purport to sum up the preceding discussion, but in reality introduce a new point of view, that of libertarianism or the belief in human freewill, a point of view from which the problem is envisaged all through 10; we therefore group 9 [30-33] and 10 together as constituting a logical unity, though rhetorically a fresh start is made with the 'Brethren' of 10 [1].

30. 'The situation is this: Gentiles, who *ex hypothesi* have made no effort to "get right with God," have attained to this *status* as it were unconsciously or without premeditation, as the result of an

act of Faith: whereas Israel, endeavouring to satisfy the precepts of a Law, observance of which was supposed to impart this *status*, has not even succeeded in keeping that Law.'

33. The 'stone of stumbling' is the Messiah. The quotation which follows is taken from Is 28 [16], interpolated with words from Is 8 [14]. The first of these passages is quoted in 1 P 2 [6], and the words taken from Is 8 [14] in 1 P 2 [8]: a fact which suggests that the two Isaiah-passages may have formed part of a primitive Christian *catena* of Messianic proof-texts. Both Romans and 1 Peter have the otherwise unknown variant 'shall not be ashamed,' instead of 'shall not make haste.'

X. 1, 2. St. Paul explains that he is far from exulting in the spiritual misfortunes of his countrymen, and that he genuinely longs for them to be 'saved' (as before, at the Parousia).

3. **God's righteousness**: this does not mean God's own moral character, but is a compendious expression for 'the method of attaining to the *status* of acquittal which God Himself has revealed.'

4. **For Christ is the end of the law** (better 'of law') **unto righteousness to every one that believeth.** Paraphrase: 'For the appearance of Christ has brought all legal systems as such to an end, so that the *status* of "acquittal," "absolution," or "forgiveness," which is only to be obtained by Faith, may be open to every one (whether Jew or Gentile).' The sense in which Christ has 'abolished Law' has been explained above, on 6 [14]: this is one of those blunt and paradoxical apophthegms which doubtless furnished St. Paul's adversaries with *prima facie* evidence for the accusations of antinomianism which were apparently made against him (cf. 3 [8], 6 [1]).

5, 6. Notice the contrast between 'Moses' (in [5]) and the personified 'righteousness which is of faith' (at the beginning of [6]). It would seem almost as though the statement of [5] is ironical: 'Moses indeed promises forgiveness and life to those who observe the Law: [a singularly helpful promise, in view of the fact that no one (as we have often insisted) ever can observe the whole Law!].

6-8 contain a very free quotation of Dt 30 [12-14] (LXX), with two Midrashic comments of St. Paul's own inserted in parentheses. (Some eminent critics prefer not to speak of a 'quotation' at all, but to describe St. Paul as 'borrowing one or two words and phrases' from the Deuteronomic passage.) The original is meant to insist upon the easiness and simplicity of the Deuteronomic Law: St. Paul characteristically utilizes it to enforce the easiness of the Gospel way of salvation.

6. **Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven?** The original means, 'In order to bring down the Law from some supernatural plane, and make it accessible to men.' St. Paul glosses it 'in order to bring Messiah down from heaven': there is no need to do this, for He has already come, and the way of salvation is prepared.

7. **or, Who shall descend into the abyss?** The original has 'Who shall go over to the further side of the sea for us?' St. Paul substitutes for 'sea' the 'abyss,' a word which in LXX Greek originally meant the 'depths of the sea,' and which he therefore feels to be near enough to the verbal form of his text, in order to apply the phrase figuratively to the *descensus ad inferos*: this is shown by the gloss 'that is, to bring Messiah up from the dead: [this is needless, for He has already risen].'

9, 10 develop out of the Deuteronomic phrase 'in thy mouth and in thy heart' a distinction between Faith, which is said to be in activity of the 'heart' (a word which, in the usage of Hebrew psychology, designates the inner self, with special reference to the intellect: see article 'Heart,' in Hastings' *D.B.*) and confession of Jesus as Lord (presumably the simple pre-baptismal *exomologesis*, out of which all our baptismal creeds have grown), which is said to be made with the mouth. Note that the meaning of 'Faith' is here narrowed down to denote the *interior* side of the act of 'becoming a Christian'—as it is distinguished from the Confession which formed the introductory part of Initiation, and so distinguished from Initiation itself (which included Baptism and the laying on of hands). Here St. Paul seems to approach St. James' use of the word 'Faith.'

12. Observe the readiness with which the thought of the universality of the Church, including Jew and Gentile on equal terms, rises to the surface of St. Paul's mind: cf. 3 [22, 29].

13. **Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord.** In this quotation from Joel (2 [32]) 'the Lord' represents the LXX equivalent for the divine name Yahweh. But for St. Paul Christ was 'the Lord' *par excellence*, whose uniqueness stood in sharp contrast to the multiplicity of pagan 'lords' or mystery-gods (1 Cor 8 [5]). The unconscious ease with which he applies

an OT text, alluding to 'the Lord' and meaning thereby the supreme God, to the glorified Messiah who is 'the Lord' of Christians, suggests very strongly that he believed in some essential community of nature between the Father and the Son: cf. $8^{3.32}$, 9^{5}.

14-21. The first thirteen verses of this chapter have exhibited Israel's rejection as due to Israel's own fault, in ignoring God's revealed way of salvation and insisting on pursuing its own way. The last eight verses are a piece of highly compressed dialogue with the Jewish objector, who endeavours to find excuses for his nation. As before, an extended paraphrase will be the best commentary (missing logical connexions are supplied in italics):

14. 'JEWISH OBJECTOR: "Calling upon the name of" (that is, offering worship and prayer to) Jesus implies Faith in Him: Faith implies having heard a message about Him: the hearing of a message implies the existence of an authoritative body of preachers,

15*a*. 'enjoying a divine mission. *And no such divinely commissioned body exists: therefore the Jews have not had a fair chance of hearing about the Messiahship and Resurrection of Jesus, and cannot reasonably be censured for not "calling upon his name."*

'ST. PAUL: *Your last statement is quite divorced from fact. There is a divinely commissioned body of preachers (namely, the Christian Apostles, prophets, and teachers),*

15*b*. 'as Isaiah foretold, in the words "How beautiful are the feet," etc. (Is 52^{7}).'

[RV mistakenly begins a new paragraph with ^{16}: but there is no break in the sense.]

16*a*. 'JEWISH OBJECTOR: Well, after all, it is the case that not all Israelites have yielded allegiance to the message of salvation: *and this suggests that there must have been some flaw in the arrangements for conveying the message to them.*

'ST. PAUL: *It suggests nothing of the kind. Israel is quite perverse enough to reject a divine message which has been clearly laid before it.*

16*b*. 'Witness, again, the words of Isaiah, *who complains of a similar perversity in his own day*: "Lord, who hath had faith in the hearing of us?" (Is 53^{1}); ["report," RV, obscures the point of what follows].

17. '*I quite admit that this quotation supports your preliminary contention, that* "Faith," implies "hearing," and "hearing" presupposes the existence of an authoritative message about the Messiah.

18. 'But when you go on to suggest, Perhaps Israel has not heard, *you are saying what is patently absurd: for the divine message and the authoritative body of preachers actually exist, and the preachers have by this time carried the message all over the world,* as the Psalmist predicted: "Their sound went out into all the earth," etc.

19. 'I understand you to suggest again, Perhaps, *owing to some defect in the presentation of the message,* Israel did not properly understand it. *But that is even more absurd—the idea that Israel, the chosen people, which for centuries had enjoyed the benefits of divine revelation, could not have "understood" a further revelation! At any rate, thousands of Gentiles understood well enough. And this, too—the wilful blindness of the Jews and the spiritual receptivity of Gentiles, who might have been expected to be "void of understanding" in the things of God—was predicted in the Scriptures:* at the very beginning of the nation's history (RV "first") Moses warns it, "I will provoke you to jealousy . . ." etc. (Dt 32^{21}):

20. 'and, at a later date, Isaiah puts the same point in even more daring language, saying with regard to the Gentiles, "I was found of them that sought me not . . ." etc. (65^{1}), and with regard to Israel, "All the day long . . ." etc. (65^{2}).'

Conclusion, implied but not expressed: 'All your shifts are useless; Israel's rejection is due to its own inexcusable perversity.'

(*c*) **The problem of Israel's rejection finally solved: the rejection is only (*a*) partial, and (*b*) temporary: and all Israel will ultimately be saved (XI).**

XI. 1. The problem stated again, more explicitly than heretofore. But now the idea that God can have permanently rejected His chosen people is repudiated with horror, as inconceivable to a writer of Jewish descent and sympathies.

2-5. After all, a partial apostasy of Israel is no new thing: it occurred in the days of Elijah, who was just as much downcast by it as the Apostle when he began 9. But even then there was a faithful remnant, who carried on the worship of the true God in secret: and there is a faithful remnant now, namely, the small body of Christian Jews. This is 'a remnant (constituted) in accordance with (the principle of) selection based upon favour.' Here, and in $^{6-10}$, St. Paul reverts to the absolutely predestinarian

standpoint of 9. The members of this (spiritually) fortunate minority owe their position simply to the fact that God has selected them, and He has selected them solely because He has chosen to extend favour towards them: and no further account of the matter need or can be given.

6 insists on this: the Christian Jews must not claim to have merited their position in the Church by 'works,' because that would be to disparage the absoluteness of God's dominion and the uncontrolled nature of His 'favour.'

7. the election: that is, the elected, or selected, 'remnant.'

and the rest were hardened: a reminiscence of 9 [18], though a different word is employed here. It will be explained, however, in [25], that the 'hardening' of the Jews is only partial.

8. The quotation here is conflate, being a fusion of Dt 29 [4] with words from Is 29 [10] and 6 [9, 10].

9. Quoted from Ps 69 [22, 23] (LXX). 'Their table' means 'their feast,' metaphorically applied to the imagined feast of spiritual good things which the non-Christian Jews believed themselves to be enjoying in the Mosaic Law and *cultus*.

11. A new and short paragraph ([11, 12]) begins here, though RV does not indicate the fact. 'Let me sum up the discussion by asking, Have the Jews stumbled so badly that they are now fallen and lie prostrate? (In other words, Is their fall irremediable?) God forbid! No, the truth is that they have fallen (temporarily) in order that salvation might be bestowed upon the Gentiles; and this (the salvation of Gentiles) was divinely ordered for the purpose of "provoking the Jews to jealousy."' In the question, RV's translation 'that they *might* fall' ignores the usage of Pauline Greek (see Sanday and Headlam *in loc.*). The idea that the conversion of the Gentiles was purposed by God to stimulate the ultimate conversion of the Jews, by inspiring them with a feeling of 'jealousy' that Gentiles should be nearer to God than themselves, seems to have been suggested to St. Paul's mind by the quotation given in 10 [19]. And the suggestion that the salvation of Gentiles is really a means to a further end, namely, the salvation of the chosen people—a suggestion which is developed with some emphasis in [13] ff.—shows that at the moment the Apostle is writing and thinking as a thorough Jew: cf. [1] of this chapter.

12. An argument *a fortiori*, rhetorically effective rather than logically cogent. 'If the apostasy of the Jews has brought such great blessings to the Gentiles, how much greater blessings will be brought to the world by their reconversion!' However, in his contention that the rejection of Christianity by the Jews caused its acceptance by Gentiles, St. Paul lays bare the factors which underlay the great expansion of the Christian body during his own lifetime. The persecution which arose upon the death of Stephen occasioned the first preaching to Gentiles (Ac 11 [20]): and the hostility which greeted the Apostle's own evangelization in the synagogues caused him to turn his efforts towards the Gentiles (cf. Ac 13 [46], 18 [6]). It is probable (humanly speaking) that if the Jewish nation as a whole had immediately accepted Christ, Christianity would never have shaken itself free of the swaddling-clothes of the Law, and might never have spread outside the borders of Israel.

13. 'A word to my readers, who are Gentiles. Do not, in the first flush of your convert enthusiasm, despise the Jews for not having accepted Christ. After all, they were members of the Church for centuries, and still have the best right to be in it: whereas you are late comers, allowed in, so to speak, on sufferance.'

inasmuch then as I am an apostle of Gentiles, I glorify my ministry. 'Inasmuch as' (RV) appears to be a mistranslation: the literal rendering of the Greek is *in so far as*, and this gives a much better sense. 'In so far as I am an apostle of Gentiles' is meant to remind St. Paul's readers that he has other functions than that of evangelizing non-Jews, other interests than those connected with his Asian and European missions. He is a patriotic Jew as well, and they must not be surprised at his speaking in this latter character.

'I glorify my ministry' means I value this function and attribute great dignity to it: cf. Gal 2 [7] ff.

14. 'But all this is really an indirect means of converting my own countrymen'—a remark meant to have a chastening effect upon his Gentile readers.

15 repeats the argument of [12], but defines the blessings which the conversion of Israel will produce as 'life from the dead': this seems to mean the resurrection of the dead which will accompany the Parousia.

16 is parallel in form to [15], but introduces, almost unconsciously as it were, an entirely fresh idea. This is the idea of the hereditary, ingrained 'holiness' of the Jewish national stock, treated as a guarantee of the ultimate restoration of all Jews to the *Ecclesia*. The argument

of the following verses assumes this idea, and for that reason may perhaps be reckoned as belonging to those elements in the Apostle's thought which were derived not so much from his Christian experience as from his Rabbinical upbringing, and which have no better authority than that of his early teachers. For the idea of 'holiness,' as a quality derived from far-off ancestors by physical heredity, and indelible by apostasy from God or moral corruption such as that described in 2, seems to be conceived on physical rather than on ethical lines: it represents a reversion to the mode of thought characteristic of Leviticus, in which things and places are 'holy,' in the sense of being instinct with what the Polynesians call 'good *mana*,' and goes behind the work of the prophets, who made ethical uprightness an essential element in holiness. Nevertheless, though the basis of the Apostle's argument, formally considered, is a non-ethical concept which has remained embedded in his thought as a fossil relic of a much earlier stage in his intellectual and religious development, the argument itself is clothed with an ethical atmosphere by the references to 'faithlessness' as the cause of Israel's downfall in [20, 23].

if the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump: the allusion is to the cake offered as a 'heave offering,' taken from the 'first of the dough': see Nu 15 [19, 20]. In this metaphor the cake stands for the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve sons of Jacob: these are the 'firstfruit' which was consecrated to God, and their dedication has the effect of making the whole 'lump,' that is, the whole nation to which they belong, 'holy,' in the sense indicated above. The clue to the idea of the Patriarchs as the source of Israel's 'holiness' is given by the phases in [28], 'beloved for the fathers' (i.e. the Patriarchs') sake.'

16*b*-24 expound the history of the *Ecclesia*, as continuous through both its phases, Jewish-nationalist and Catholic, under the figure of an olive-tree (perhaps derived from Zech 4). The following scheme will give the key to the interpretation of the passage:

The 'good,' that is cultivated, olive-tree = the One Church of God, continuously existing through the centuries.
The root = the Jewish Patriarchs.
The 'fatness,' or sap which wells up from the root = the accumulated merits of the Patriarchs, and the quasi-physical 'holiness' derived from them by their descendants.
The branches broken off = those Jews who apostatized from the *Ecclesia*.
The wild olive-branches which have been grafted in = those Gentiles who have been incorporated into the *Ecclesia*.

It is remarkable that St. Paul should, even momentarily, write as though the Jewish Fathers were the sole source of the spiritual vitality of the *Ecclesia*, with no mention of Christ or of the Holy Spirit: but we must take this as one more instance of his tendency to isolate one aspect of a subject and treat it as though it exhausted the subject. For a note on 'The Merits of the Fathers' see Sanday and Headlam (1905), 330.

It has often been pointed out that the figure reverses the usual procedure of arboriculture by making the unnamed owner of the tree graft *wild* branches into a cultivated tree: but St. Paul himself describes the process as 'contrary to nature' ([24]).

25-32. 'All has been foreseen—the apostasy of the Jews leading to the conversion of the Gentiles, and this again destined to bring about the reconversion of the Jews: and all will be well in the end.'

28. A characteristic triple antithesis the terseness of which is inevitably lost in a paraphrase. 'If we confine our attention to the question of the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Christian message, we must admit that the Jewish nation is in a condition of feud with God, though this has been providentially tolerated for the spiritual advantage of you Gentiles. But if we think of the "election" (i.e. as in [7], the divinely selected minority of Christian Jews), we shall see that the nation as a whole is still dear to God, for the sake of the merits of the Patriarchs.'

29. '(The Jews can never lose their *status* of the Chosen People): for God never takes back a vocation and dignity which He has once bestowed.'

32 repeats, in a different connexion, the verdict of [3 9, 23] on humanity as a whole.

33-36. The theodicy concludes with a doxology, ascribing praise to God as the all-wise Governor of human history and the ineffable Source and ground of all being. It is a mistake to attempt to read the doctrine of the Trinity into [36*a*].

(IV) **Various practical exhortations, statement of plans, and personal messages (XII.-XVI.).**

XII. **General moral and religious exhortations.**

1 contains an exhortation to purity, or at least to the avoidance of fleshly sins

in a broad sense: a life free from such sins is described as 'rational worship,' that is, 'an act of (liturgical) worship carried out with the intelligence.'

2. This requires the renewal of the intelligence itself: Christians must not merely abstain from such sins, but must be genuinely convinced that they are irrational and horrible. The Christian point of view is the exact opposite of that attributed to pagans in 1 [32].

3-8 inculcate humility in the exercise of individual gifts, endowments, and powers. This exhortation is based (*a*) upon the necessity inherent in an organic body, such as the Church is, for keeping its various functions in due proportion and balance ([4]: cf. 1 Cor 12 [4] ff.); (*b*) upon the duty of the individual not to usurp functions to which he has not been called, or to strain after effects, in the way of prophecy and the like, which are beyond his powers.

9-21 are exhortations of the most general kind, forming a practical commentary on the Sermon on the Mount.

19. wrath: the Greek has 'the wrath,' that is, of God, which will be revealed at the Last Day. The warning is almost satirical, if the term can be used in such a connexion: 'leave something for the Almighty Judge to do at the Last Day.'

XIII. 1-7. The duty of loyalty to the State.

1. the powers that be: as we should say, 'the *de facto* Government.' It must always be remembered that St. Paul is writing under the conviction that the *Parousia* was near at hand: consequently, it was not likely, from his point of view, that the Roman Empire would be replaced by any other form of political organization during the few remaining years of the present age. The only alternative to the Roman Empire which he could have envisaged would have been anarchy. It follows, therefore, that when he exhorts his readers to be loyal to the existing Government he is really meaning to inculcate good citizenship and loyalty to law and order as such: his words cannot be interpreted as insisting on a monarchical as opposed to any other form of government, and the difficult question whether or when insurrection is justifiable has not risen above his intellectual horizon.

4*b*, 5. 'wrath' and 'the wrath' seem to have the same eschatological implications as elsewhere. Here, however, the eschatology is, so to speak, proleptic: the vengeance which the civil magistrate takes upon evildoers is a preliminary instalment of God's own vengeance which will break forth at the Day of Doom, and in this sense the magistrate is God's minister or servant.

6. Apparently it was an admitted principle of Christianity that taxes had to be paid (doubtless the Lord's own saying, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that be Cæsar's,' Lk 20 [25], had put this beyond dispute). St. Paul points out that this admission carries with it the admission of the duty of general loyalty to the State. Perhaps the effect of the Gospel, with its message of the spiritual equality of all men, had been to stimulate revolutionary tendencies in the oppressed classes which furnished the majority of its earliest converts; a parallel phenomenon may be seen in China to-day.

attending continually upon this very thing: this translation imposes a construction, unparalleled elsewhere in Greek literature, upon the word translated 'attending continually.' The sentence should be rendered 'For they are God's sacred ministers, constituted in order to promote ("unto") this very end (i.e. the true good of the individual, as in [4]), *if they devote themselves faithfully to their office*': we may suppose that St. Paul desires to safeguard himself against being thought to describe a Verres or a Pilate in unqualified terms as 'God's minister.'

8-10 may well have been suggested by the Lord's answer to the question, Which is the great commandment in the Law? (Mt 20 [37] ff. =Mk 12 [29] ff.=Lk 10 [27] ff.).

11-14. The approach of the Parousia.

11. RV obscures the vigour of the idiom by inserting 'first' before 'believed,' in the last half of the verse: it should run 'for now is our salvation nearer to us *than when we believed*' (aorist); that is, 'our deliverance from this evil age and our entry into the Messianic Kingdom are by so many years nearer than when we made the Act of Faith, i.e. than when we became Christians.'

13*b*-14. The famous text upon which St. Augustine's eyes fell, when he opened the NT at random in the garden at Milan, on hearing the words *tolle lege* chanted in a school next door, and which was the external occasion of his conversion (*Conf.*, viii, 12).

XIV. The controversy between the 'strong' and the 'weak' to be settled on lines of mutual toleration.

Though Sanday and Headlam think that the Apostle merely means to inculcate tolerance in general, and is using questions regarding food and the calendar merely as typical examples of matters in regard to which tolerance might be needed,

it appears to the present writer that the vigour and point of St. Paul's words are most easily explicable on the supposition that he had in mind a definite controversy, or at least instances of friction, actually occurring in the Roman Church at the time. The 'weak' party are those who are scrupulous about legally 'unclean' articles of diet (14), so scrupulous that they have to be vegetarians (2), and who feel obliged to observe certain days (5: we are reminded of Gal 4 10—'Ye observe days, and months,' etc., and both characteristics of the 'weak' party, taken together, are reminiscent of the Judaizing Colossians, who needed the exhortation, 'Let no man therefore judge you in [respect of] meat, or drink, or in respect of a new moon or a sabbath day,' Col 2 16). It is difficult to resist the impression that St. Paul is here thinking of a mild and unaggressive type of Judaistic Christianity, which may well have admitted in theory the principle of 'acquittal only through Faith in Christ,' but had not been able to shake itself free of a nervous feeling that exact observance of the ceremonial Law was still an essential part of true religion: the reference to vegetarianism suggests that it may have been influenced by Essenism. The 'strong' are presumably convinced Pauline or ultra-Pauline Christians, who have grasped the idea of the obsoleteness of the Law with such thoroughness that they find the scruples of their 'weak' brethren ridiculous and contemptible. It is easy to imagine the opportunities for friction between the two parties, especially in regard to the question of dietary *tabus*, which would be afforded by the Agape, or common meal which at that date seems to have preceded the Eucharist. St. Paul's own sympathies are clearly shown by his use of the terms 'strong' and 'weak': but in this passage he endeavours to solve the difficulty rather on the lines of statesmanlike accommodation than on those of a ruthlessly logical application of doctrinal principle.

1. weak in faith: this does not imply that the Judaizer is uncertain intellectually about the truth of Christianity, but merely that he has not taken the plunge of self-committal to Christ with sufficient emotional enthusiasm to free him from his old anxieties about the Law.

receive ye: that is, welcome, treat as a brother.

not to doubtful disputations: better, *not unto criticisms of (his) speculations.* If you receive a man into the Christian fellowship, do so heartily, and do not afterwards make him unhappy by criticizing his private opinions (about forbidden foods and the like).

3*b*. The Judaizer must not show contempt for the Gentile Christian who ignores the Jewish food *tabus*: for the Gentile's position in the Church is manifestly the act of God.

6. giveth God thanks: the reference may be to the Eucharist which concluded the common meal. Judaizer and Gentile may be guided by different principles in partaking of the Agape, but both alike participate on equal terms in the sacrament to which it leads up.

13 and the following verses develop a further point: the 'strong,' Pauline Christians must refrain, not merely from unkind criticism of their Judaizing brethren, but also from scandalizing them by ostentatiously transgressing the food *tabus* in public (13, 15, 21). Apparently some of the 'strong' went even further than this, and, doubtless by ridicule, coerced some of the 'weak' into violating their own consciences by themselves partaking of food which to them was forbidden (20, 23). All this is utterly inconsistent with the spirit of brotherly love (15). After all, the whole food question is a matter of trifling importance: there will be no dietary *tabus*, for there will be no material diet (in opposition to the gross imaginations of some Jewish apocalyptists) in the Kingdom of God (17). It is perfectly true that food *tabus* do not correspond to anything objective; but subjectively, from the point of view of the man who believes in them, they are real enough (14). If you flaunt your liberty in regard to this matter before him, you may shock and horrify him so much that he may leave the Christian Church: and so you will, spiritually speaking, have 'destroyed' him (15). It is worse still to put pressure upon him to eat the same food as yourself if he is uneasy in conscience about it: for the man who acts with an uneasy conscience is committing what is, *subjectively and for him*, sin (even though his conscience may be ill-informed, and the action in question may be objectively right or indifferent) (20).

23. Paraphrase: 'If a man is not certain whether the Mosaic rules about food are still binding upon him or not, and nevertheless defies those rules, he is committing (what is subjectively) a sin, because he is not acting on the basis of Faith, that is, of a whole-hearted allegiance to Christ which involves the clear recognition that Christ has put an end to the

obligation of Mosaic ceremonial ordinances: any contravention of the Old Law which is not based on Faith, in this sense, is, subjectively and for the individual, sin (even though it may be objectively right).' It will be observed that many checks and qualifications have been inserted into this paraphrase in order to bring out the exact shade of meaning which the context compels us to assign to the verse. St. Augustine, however (not allowing for St. Paul's habits of 'thinking aloud' and of expressing himself with what, if he had realized that his words were destined to be ranked as 'Scripture,' would have been incautious bluntness), interprets the last half of the verse to mean 'everything which does not proceed from Christian Faith is sin,' i.e. all the actions of non-Christians are sins. On this he founds his doctrine of the impossibility of real virtue or merit outside the Church: see *Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, 374 ff.

For a discussion of the origin of the short recension of the epistle which appears to have ended with 14, see the Introduction, pp. 446, 447.

XV. 1-13. **General exhortations to harmony and concord between the Gentile and Jewish elements in the community.**

These verses do not contain any sustained argument, but are rather a series of desultory exhortations of a soothing character, designed to smooth down any ruffled feelings which may still survive after the exposition of 14.

4. The connexion of thought between this verse and the preceding is: 'I make no apology for this quotation ("The reproaches of them that reproached thee . . ."' Ps 69 [9]) from the Jewish Scriptures, for the Jewish Scriptures have a permanent value for the spiritual edification and comfort of Christians.' That is to say (if a paradoxical but convenient anachronism may be allowed), 'I make no apology for quoting the Jewish Scriptures, for (in spite of the liberal attitude towards the Law implied in 14) I am anything but a Marcionite born before my time': cf. on 1 [2].

8. This anxiety to disclaim an iconoclastic attitude towards the Jewish past of the one *Ecclesia* expresses itself in the affirmation that 'Christ hath been made a minister of circumcision' (RV has gratuitously inserted 'the' before 'circumcision'). 'A minister of circumcision' must mean 'a minister of that covenant of which the initial and distinctive rite was circumcision'; in other words, 'a minister of the Jewish Dispensation.' Even the Son of God condescended to become, so to speak, an office-bearer of the Old Covenant: and hence contempt for the Old Covenant is utterly out of place in Christians, especially as one of the purposes of the Incarnation was to fulfil the promises made by God to the Jewish Patriarchs.

14-33. **Personal matters. The writer's plans for the immediate future.**

14, 15. A delicate apology for the candour which has marked some passages of the epistle, especially 14—a candour which, however, is justified by the writer's position as 'Apostle of Gentiles' (cf. 11 [13]).

16. **ministering the Gospel of God**: a more exact rendering would be 'discharging those sacrificial functions which belong to the Gospel.' The phrase is, however, metaphorical, and there is no reference to the 'Eucharistic sacrifice.' The 'sacrifice' which St. Paul imagines himself as offering is 'the oblation of the Gentiles,' i.e. an oblation consisting of the Gentile Churches, which he, as being their Apostle and in most cases founder, solemnly presents to God: the costliness of this oblation is briefly indicated in [18, 19], which describe the extent of St. Paul's missionary labours in Syria, Asia Minor, and the Balkan Peninsula.

20-22. St. Paul here enunciates a principle which has always guided his choice of areas to be evangelized, namely, that of not trespassing upon ground already occupied by another Apostle or teacher (cf. 2 Cor 10 [13, 15, 16]). He goes on: 'And *for this reason* I have often been prevented from visiting you.' The *prima facie* inference from this is that Rome had been another Apostle's sphere of work, but was so no longer. It is a permissible speculation that the other Apostle may have been St. Peter (see Introduction, p. 445). Against this, it may be argued that, if St. Peter had already visited Rome, he would doubtless have addressed his appeal mainly to the Roman Jews as a body: but Ac 28 [21, 22] seem to imply that the latter, at a date subsequent to the writing of this letter, had heard no more of Christianity than the facts of its existence and of its universal unpopularity. It would also be possible to take [20, 21] as a parenthesis, and the 'Wherefore' of [22] as referring to the extent of St. Paul's Levantine missions, described in [19]. The question, therefore, of St. Peter's foundation of the Roman Church must remain open.

23. **place**: i.e. 'scope for work.' St. Paul's mission was not to evangelize the population of a whole area, but to plant

centres from which the Gospel might spread: this he considers that he has done effectively, so far as the Levant is concerned.

24. whensoever I go into Spain. Was this journey ever carried out? It is possible that it may have been, if the Apostle's imprisonment at Rome (Ac 28 [30]) ended in an acquittal; and Lightfoot argues powerfully for interpreting the Roman Clement's statement that St. Paul reached 'the limit of the West' (*Ep. Clem.*, 5) as evidence for a Spanish visit (note *in loc.*).*

25, 26. For this collection for the benefit of the poor Christians at Jerusalem cf. 1 Cor 16 [1-4]; 2 Cor 8 [1-15], 9, and see Introduction, p. 444.

27. Notice once more the unconscious assumption that the Jews enjoy the privileges of revelation as a matter of right, and Gentiles only as a matter of favour.

31. disobedient, i.e. to the Christian message. The prayer was fulfilled in an unexpected manner: for St. Paul, after being nearly lynched by the fanatical Jews, was only preserved from assassination at their hands through his arrest by Claudius Lysias (Ac 21 [27] ff.).

XVI. Greetings and messages to individuals.

(For the question whether this chapter was originally addressed to Rome or to Ephesus, see Introduction, pp. 447, 448. It will be assumed in the following that it forms part of the text of this epistle, as sent to Rome.)

1. servant: Greek 'deaconess.'

Cenchreæ: the port of Corinth, on the Saronic Gulf, which would be St. Paul's natural point of embarkation for the voyage to Palestine contemplated in 15 [25].

3. Prisca and Aquila: see Ac 18 [2] f.; 1 Cor 16 [19]; 2 Tim 4 [19], and, for a discussion of the difficulty raised by these passages with regard to the movements of the couple, Introduction, p. 447. The statement that 'all the churches of the Gentiles' had reason to be grateful to them suggests that their habits were in any case somewhat nomadic. See Sanday and Headlam, 418 ff., for De Rossi's attempt to identify the site of the Church of Sta Prisca on the Aventine with that of their house.

5-15. Nothing is certainly known of any of the persons greeted in these verses. The following points may, however, be noted:

(*a*) Their names can all be paralleled in Roman funerary inscriptions: see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 174 ff., and Sanday and Headlam's notes on this chapter. It would, however, be rash to affirm that they are peculiar to Rome (see Introduction, p. 448).

(*b*) **Junias** may be really Junia (the Greek gives the accusative case, which might be derived from either form). If so, Andronicus and Junia are presumably husband and wife; but the application of the term 'apostle' to a woman would be unique in existing Christian literature: 'kinsmen' means 'fellow-countrymen,' as in 9 [3].

(*c*) The name **Ampliatus** is inscribed over a cell in the cemetery of Domitilla at Rome, one of the earliest of Christian catacombs.

(*d*) **them which are of the household of Aristobulus . . . them of the household of Narcissus.** Lightfoot plausibly conjectures that these terms stand for *Aristobuliani* and *Narcissiani*, i.e. bodies of slaves belonging to the Emperor, but formerly the properties of Aristobulus and Narcissus respectively. The Aristobulus in question would be a Jewish prince, grandson of Herod the Great, who had lived at Rome as a private citizen: he was a friend of the Emperor Claudius, and might well have bequeathed his slaves to him. 'Narcissus' would probably be the well-known freedman of that name, who had acted as the minister of Claudius, but had been put to death by Agrippina shortly after Nero's accession: his slaves would doubtless then escheat to the imperial household. This hypothesis, however, though attractive, cannot be said to be proven.

13. Rufus: perhaps the son of Simon of Cyrene (Mk 15 [21]).

16. This apostolic custom still survives in a conventionalized form as the liturgical 'kiss of peace': cf. 1 Cor 16 [20]; 2 Cor 13 [12]; 1 Th 5 [26]; 1 P 5 [14]; and St. Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i, 65.

17-20. A warning against false teachers, presumably Judaizers.

18*a* implies not so much that their personal conduct is lax as that their main motive is material self-interest: a similar expression is used in Phil 3 [19].

19, with its implied commendation of the Roman Christians' 'obedience,' suggests that the false teachers had not yet arrived, and that these verses are meant to be a warning in advance: they presumably had arrived, and caused much trouble, by the time that Phil 1 [15-17], 3 [2. 18] f. were written.

21-23. The benediction of [20] was apparently meant to conclude the epistle: but St. Paul has hardly dictated it before

* Cf. Pastoral Epistles, Introduction, p. 574.

it occurs to him to add a postscript containing greetings from his companions.

Lucius may be the Antiochene prophet of Ac 13 [1]. Jason is probably St. Paul's host at Thessalonica (Ac 17 [5-7]); Sosipater may be the Sopater of Ac 20 [4]. Gaius may be one of the Corinthians baptized by St. Paul (1 Cor 1 [14]). Erastus must have been a man of considerable position if he was treasurer of 'the city' (? Corinth): he is referred to, in connexion with Corinth, in 2 Tim 4 [20]. It seems reasonably certain that 16 was at least written *from* Corinth, whether it was written *to* Rome or not.

25-27. The epistle now finally concludes with a solemn and elaborate doxology in which the Apostle's thoughts crowd so rapidly one upon the other that the structure of the sentence is overpowered, and it ends in a grammatical anacoluthon. The thought of the mysterious purpose which, unknown to men, God has been working out in human history occurs in 1 Cor 2 [6, 7, 10] and in Eph 3 [3, 5, 6]: the expression of it in this doxology constitutes a bridge between the thought of the epistles of the Missionary Journeys and that of the Epistles of the Captivity

I. CORINTHIANS

By J. K. Mozley

With the simple words 'after these things he departed from Athens and came to Corinth,' St. Luke in Acts (18 [1]) introduces us to an event of such great importance in connexion with St. Paul's missionary activity and the propagation of the Gospel. For Corinth was the most important city in Greece, even if it could not rival Athens in the appeal of its ancient history, of its artistic and philosophical culture. The old city had been destroyed by Mummius in 146 B.C., and the new city had been founded by Julius Cæsar in 46 B.C. It was the capital of the Roman province of Achaia, a centre of commercial activity, a cosmopolitan city. Situated as it was between the Corinthian and Saronic gulfs, and on the main route between Rome and the East, it was singularly well placed for the development of a busy life of its own, and for the attraction of travellers. To the latter, unfortunately, the licentiousness for which Corinth was notorious contributed, especially in connexion with the worship of Aphrodite. The mass of the population was Greek, but there were Romans living there, and a colony of Jews, while its proximity to Asia would lead to the presence in the city of 'barbarians' of one kind or another. Here St. Paul worked for 18 months. He found immediately a link with two interesting persons, who were most probably, though not quite certainly, already Christians—Aquila and his wife Priscilla. In company with them St. Paul pursued his craft; one may wonder how much time he had had in the preceding years for making tents, and whether the pressure of evangelistic work in Corinth must not have made it difficult for him to continue his craft on any but a small scale; still, with whatever support from Philippi and perhaps from other churches, he was able to maintain himself without accepting any financial help from his Corinthian converts. His labours bore much fruit; the Jews indeed showed their hostility after a month or two had passed, a hostility which passed into more active measures after the success of St. Paul's preaching to the Gentiles. An attempt to arraign the Apostle before the Proconsul Gallio on a charge of disloyalty to the law in his religious teaching was a complete failure, and may have brought the Jews into great disrepute (cf. Bezan text of Ac 18 [17] 'all the Greeks'). So to the end of his time at Corinth St. Paul was able to preach freely and build up the Church. His converts as a whole were not important or distinguished people, which is not to say that they were of the lowest social strata (cf. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 147); as to their previous religious history there must have been much variety; what was often lacking was any background of realized unity between the religious and the ethical. This, with an intellectual pretentiousness and a typically Greek aptitude for factiousness, was to give St. Paul much trouble.

Our 1 Corinthians was not the beginning of correspondence between St. Paul and the Corinthian Church. From 1 Cor 5 [9] we know that he had written an earlier letter, which had given rise to misunderstanding. This is lost, though it is possible that a fragment survives in

2 Cor 6[14]-7[1]. And from 1 Cor 7[1], with which other sections beginning with the word 'concerning' may be compared, we learn of a letter addressed by the Church to St. Paul and raising a number of important questions.

As to our 1 Corinthians it may be said that no other document in the New Testament throws equal light upon the character of Christianity within a Gentile Church. It is full of the interest of religious life and thought in the concrete. We can see how at point after point the Gospel brought both inspiration and problems. Great questions of belief and practice involving permanent issues, as to God's way of salvation in Christ, as to the relation of the Church with the world, as to the Eucharist, and spiritual inspiration, and the Resurrection, come before us in the form under which they were presented in those early days: and with them questions such as those connected with the veiling of women, or the regulation of 'tongues,' deriving their importance from temporal and local customs which affect the character of the injunctions given. We find a remarkably developed Christian theology, and can see what difficulties still remained for more precise dogmatic solution. On the other hand, 1 Corinthians has practically nothing to tell us as to the organization of the Church. We never hear of presbyters; and 1 Cor 12[28] has no mention of them; and the name may not have been in use in the Corinthian Church (but cf. the *Epistle* of Clement, 44).

If the Epistle throws much light on an early Christian Church, it is illuminative with regard to St. Paul. In the very forefront stands his personal devotion to Christ, his Lord. It is this which explains and resolves what may seem to be a profound tension within the personality of the Apostle, expressing itself now in self-depreciation, now in self-assertion. He would abate nothing of what it meant in the way of authority to be an Apostle of Christ; he would never let it be supposed that he, Paul, had any standing, power, or value, except through and in Christ. And then the Epistle reveals St. Paul's deep love for his converts; he had not a little to say in the way of admonition and, even, stern rebuke; yet through it all one feels how truly he is the father as well as the founder of the Church. And of his practical sagacity, of his power of differentiation between the essential and the comparatively unimportant, there are instances enough. St. Paul understood life and men—and both the better for his knowledge of Christ. One may add that with all its defects the Corinthian Church gives the impression of being an attractive as well as an interesting community.

Space need not be taken up in discussing the authenticity of the Epistle. Only a scepticism which would result in the impossibility of any security as to their history of the past can deny it as St. Paul's work. It is referred to as 'the Epistle of Paul' in Clement's *Epistle*, 47. Nor does the art of dissection, as practised with extraordinary minuteness by J. Weiss, necessitate any hesitation in affirming the integrity of the Epistle. One is reminded of Windisch's humorous remark in his great commentary on 2 Corinthians, with regard to a particular point: 'but then Paul had not read Karl Barth.' So one may say that had he read J. Weiss he might have been more careful to allow not the least appearance of inner discrepancy ever to manifest itself. The settlement of the date depends on two considerations—first, the general scheme of Pauline Chronology; secondly, the relation of the Epistle to St. Paul's departure from Ephesus. If we date the foundation of the Corinthian Church in the eighteen months autumn 50 to spring 52, which is consistent with the date of Gallio's proconsulship, St. Paul was at Ephesus from the autumn of 52 to the summer or autumn of 55. If we accept the usual view that he left Ephesus in the same year as he wrote 1 Corinthians, we shall date the Epistle in the spring of 55. But much depends on the relation between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians, and on the character of, and time required for, the intervening events. If we adopt J. H. Kennedy's argument in his book *The Second and Third Epistles to the Corinthians*, we shall allow for one and a half years between the writing of 1 Corinthians and 2 Cor 1-9, and therefore, in connexion with the general scheme, date 1 Corinthians in the spring of 54. It was written from Ephesus.

I. 1-3. **Greeting.**—St. Paul has the same conviction as an Old Testament prophet, Amos or Jeremiah, of his office as something which he owes wholly to God. For a yet stronger statement cf. Gal 1[1], 6[15]. This is the doctrine of election and predestination viewed from the standpoint of faith and experience. It is, primarily, positive religious certainty. It is impossible to solve the question of the identification of this Sosthenes with the Sosthenes of Ac 18[17] (itself a difficult pas-

sage). Weiss suggests that the Sosthenes of Acts, being attracted to Christianity, presented the Jewish case in a feeble way, and that his maltreatment by the Jews drove him 'into the arms of the new religion.' **the church of God which is at Corinth.** Bengel, *lætum et ingens paradoxon.* In the words **sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints** we see the double thought involved in the idea of holiness, that of religious status and that of moral demand. In language of free association St. Paul joins the Corinthians in their Christian standing with all their brethren. **that call upon,** etc. W. Morgan points out that this is indistinguishable from prayer (cf. Ac 2 [21]); AV, **both theirs and ours** refers to the Lord, and RV inserts the word. In the Greek 'theirs and ours' goes closely with **place,** and some commentators so take the words. But there is a lack of force in this rendering, and 'ours' seems to look back to 'our Lord Jesus Christ,' who is the Lord of all Christians, and a joint-source with God the Father of supreme spiritual blessings.

4-9. Thanksgiving.—Its general character, of which Bousset well says that it is 'finely weighed,' is inconsistent with Zahn's statement that nowhere in 1 Corinthians is there any real commendation of 'any feature of the moral or religious life of the Church,' a view which makes it easy for Zahn to identify the 'painful letter' of 2 Cor 2 [4] with 1 Cor 1 [8] in particular implies that, as regards the Church, St. Paul can look forward confidently to the future. [5] shows that the Corinthian powers of speech and of intellect were in themselves matter for rejoicing. His experience at Athens may have convinced St. Paul of the inadequacies of an intellectualistic presentation of the Gospel, but he is no forerunner of those timid Christians, whose disparagement of the intellect was a trial to Clement of Alexandria. In [6] the RV **testimony of Christ** obscures the fact that the genitive is objective, 'the witness borne to Christ.' This witness, given by St. Paul, was confirmed in the Corinthians by their own experiences after conversion. [7] and [8] indicate the expectant attitude of the Church and what the Church could look for at the Lord's coming. Its title or standing would be guaranteed. The subject of 'who' in [8] is most naturally taken as Christ. In [9] final assurance is given by the reference to the trustworthiness of God.

10-17. Warning against Parties and Party-Spirit.—The state of things at Corinth as revealed in these much-discussed verses is up to a point clear enough. The Corinthians, while maintaining their unity as a Church (the divisions were within the society), were inclining to a distinctive, and to some extent exclusive, group-life, and each group defined itself by the use of one name. The situation was serious, but rather, perhaps, for what might develop than for what had already occurred. At the same time, G. H. Rendall's view that the parties had not labelled themselves, and that what is said here is 'St. Paul's vivid way of describing the tendencies at work,' unduly minimizes what had actually happened. But when we try to go into detail, difficulties arise. How did the parties start? Perhaps a spell cast by the cultured preaching of Apollos first led some members of the Church to disparage what seemed to them the less 'gifted' ministry of Paul. In that case Bousset would probably be right in thinking that the Paul-party arose by way of reaction against the Apollos-party. However, no special problem confronts us With the mention of the Cephas-party the mists deepen. Had St. Peter ever been in Corinth? Dionysius of Corinth definitely ascribed to him a share in the planting of the Corinthian Church (Eusebius, *H.E.*, ii, 25), and Lake thinks he was probably one of the founders of the Church. As against this view of Lake, Acts certainly does not suggest that the Gospel had reached Corinth, or that a Church existed there before St. Paul's arrival, which is the most natural time if we are to allow for evangelistic labours of St. Peter in Corinth. On the whole, any considerable activity of St. Peter in Corinth is improbable. What, then, of the party which used his name? Was it in any sense a Judaizing party? 1 Corinthians does not suggest the existence of such a party, and the evidence from 2 Corinthians is not conclusive. Probably Zahn and Bousset are right in seeing in the Cephas-party a personal following of Peter rather than a doctrinal variation. Some members of the Church may have been impressed by the closeness of Peter's connexion with the Lord during the earthly ministry. But far the most difficult problem is presented by the party which claimed for itself the name of Christ. Some scholars, for instance Goudge, Robertson and Plummer, and Massie, see in it a definite, even extreme, Judaizing party, and find references to it in 2 Cor 10 [7, 10, 11]. But then we should expect a more definite condemna-

tion of the Judaizing position. No such condemnation appears in 1 Corinthians, and even in 2 Corinthians the controversial passages are not closely related to the Galatian letter. But was there such a party? Weiss argues that no further reference is made to it, that 1 [13] is inconsistent with its existence, since the question 'Is Christ divided?' is logically impossible, 'if one party claimed the whole Christ for itself,' while the succeeding questions 'contain the thought—you seem in your cry, "I of Paul," etc., to have forgotten that you are Christ's. Therefore it follows, that a saying "I of Christ" cannot have preceded.' Weiss is inclined to regard the words as a later addition, perhaps of a pious reader offended by the party cries. Parry favours the same solution. Another interpretation ascribes to St. Paul himself, in sharp repudiation of the party cries, the words 'but I of Christ.' Textually this is extremely harsh, as there is no sign that St. Paul suddenly stops quoting the party cries, and makes in his own person his own profession of loyalty to the Supreme Head. Still, its abruptness is not beyond St. Paul's powers, and C. H. Turner has quite recently (*Theology*, xiii, 76) favoured it. If we keep the text as it stands, it is probably best to conceive of a group at Corinth which in a rather ostentatious way asserted its own direct allegiance to Christ, and argued that the other groups showed by their choice of names that they were not equally with itself 'Christ's people.'

10. St. Paul begins with an appeal for unity in word and thought, with reference, by anticipation, to the different party cries; he obviously knew nothing of the divisions until Chloe's people told him. This makes a visit to Corinth between the founding of the Church and the writing of 1 Corinthians rather improbable. The way in which Chloe is mentioned suggests that she lived at Corinth. There follows ([13]) three indignant questions. The first words may be a statement, but are more forcible as a question, and **divided** is better than 'apportioned to one section,' as Robertson and Plummer render the Greek. In that case the reference would be simply to the claim of the Christ-party. Lightfoot, who refers to St. Paul's positive conceptions in 12 [12] f., [27], interprets as a protest against the rending of Christ's body. The second question contains the conviction, which St. Paul knows that his readers share with him, of the claim which Christ as crucified has upon them. By the third question he shows that baptism involves no relation of personal dependence upon himself.

14-17. There is no disparagement of baptism in these verses. Rather do they suggest the efficacy of the baptismal act; only the important thing was not who baptized but into whom they were baptized. St. Paul is glad that in only a very few cases could the idea of a personal relationship between himself and a baptized Corinthian occur. For Crispus, cf. Ac 18 [8]. Weiss thinks St. Paul baptized him because of his importance as former head of the synagogue. Gaius is probably to be identified with the Gaius of Rom 16 [23]. Stephanas is mentioned as one of the Corinthian representatives in 16 [17]. The final verse of the passage with its emphasis on the Cross serves as an introduction to the next section.

18-31. The Paradox of God's Way of Salvation.—St. Paul shows the contrast between God's way of saving men through Christ crucified and what Jews or Greeks would have looked for. He appeals to the experience of the Church itself. It was not a society of notable persons. St. Paul seems to have moved some distance away from the subject of the party divisions: the connexion is to be found in the fact that the divisions may naturally be supposed to have gone along with a claim on the part of some members of the Church to possess a superior knowledge and wisdom.

the word of the cross ([18]) Parry interprets as 'our exposition of the Cross.' This limits overmuch. Moffatt well translates 'the story of the Cross.' It is the power of God, in that through the Cross God works upon man. St. Paul supports the paradox of the Cross with Old Testament quotations; first, from Is 29 [14], with slight variations at the end, and then with loose quotations from Is 19 [11] f., 33 [18]. Massie takes the scribe as the Jewish wise man, the disputer as the Greek wise man. So definite a distinction is not probable. Earthly wisdom as a whole cannot reveal God's way of salvation. In the next words ([21]), it is much best with Lightfoot to understand 'in the wisdom' of God's purpose. This agrees both with 'hath made foolish' and with 'it was God's good pleasure.' 'The foolishness of the preaching' is St. Paul's own way of putting it: he is not speaking according to the view of the 'perishing.' He is thinking of the substance of the preaching, not of the manner of delivery.

22-25. The mention of the Jews' demand for signs reminds us of the Gospels

(Mk 8 [11] f.; Jn 2 [18]). In [23] **Christ crucified,** where Christ is a proper name, is preferable to 'a crucified Messiah.' The idea of the Messiahship of Jesus is not to the fore in the whole passage. In [24] the emphasis falls on the repeated **of God.** The supreme power and wisdom are to be found in Christ. The absoluteness of the Christian religion is the absoluteness of Christ. The paradox of the whole section since [18] is rounded off in one of St. Paul's triumphant climaxes.

26-29. What St. Paul has said is borne out by the way the Gospel came to the Corinthians. **calling** does not mean vocation or state of life, but God's calling of them, the manner or process by which it came. Intellect, as men account it, power, high birth, were not characteristic of the community. God's choice had lighted on persons lacking such distinctions. The impressiveness of the verses gains by the use of the neuter. It is not quite easy to define exactly the meaning of **the things that are not, that he might bring to nought the things that are.** Parry interprets of the new creation in Christ, whereby the things of the world are shown 'not yet to have attained any real existence.' Rom 4 [17] is a parallel. In [29] boasting is excluded by the method of God's action; so in Rom 3 [27] by man's proper response to God's action.

30-31. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus. Lightfoot interprets as 'Ye are His children in Christ'; that the Corinthians may be classed among the things that truly are is due to God. 'In Christ Jesus' is also emphatic; the real existence of the Corinthians is an existence in union with Christ, and all that they need of wisdom is present in Him. **righteousness** and **sanctification** and **redemption** fill out the meaning of **wisdom.** 'Righteousness' refers primarily to forgiveness and justification (cf. Rom 3 [21] ff.). In sanctification the notion is of the new life of holiness as brought about in us by Christ. 'Redemption' is an inclusive word describing the freeing of the Christian; and if one asks from whom or from what, the best answer is from the slavery of the old sinful life (cf. 2 Cor 5 [17]). Since this is so the only occasion for boasting is to be found in the Lord Jesus. So St. Paul applies Jer 9 [22] f.: for similar transferences of Old Testament language concerning Jehovah to Christ cf. 10 [22]; 2 Cor 3 [16]. Its significance in a monotheistic religion is noteworthy. We should observe how in [30] the content of wisdom is given in terms which apply to the religious and moral, not to the definitely intellectual side of life. Christianity is not an esoteric theosophy. For a great commentary on the verse see Hort's Hulsean Lectures, *The Way, the Truth, the Life.*

II. **1-5. The Character of the Apostle's Preaching Explained.**—This connects naturally with all the latter part of the first chapter. If God saves man not in ways which man would expect, but through the 'stumbling block' and 'foolishness' of Christ crucified, then it is in accordance with the fitness of things that the Apostle's preaching should not make a show through brilliance of form or oratory.

proclaiming to you the mystery of God. The MSS. evidence for 'testimony' is rather stronger than for 'mystery,' and it is easier to imagine the former word being changed into the latter. But 'mystery' fits the context better, and 'my testimony to God' lacks force. In the next verse the negative goes naturally with the verb **determined.** Possibly before St. Paul came to Corinth, as a result of his experience at Athens, in any case from the moment he began his ministry in Corinth, he decided against any exposition of his Gospel which should obscure the open proclamation of 'Jesus Christ and Him crucified.' He refused to abate anything of the paradox 'a crucified Messiah.'

3-5. Ac 18 [9] f. throws only partial light on [3], for there St. Paul's fear is of interference from without; here he thinks of the hesitation and profound sense of personal inadequacy with which he preached. He had not given them 'the plausible argument of "wisdom"' (Moffatt), but his preaching was not ineffectual; it had a convincing note, supplied by the Spirit and the power of God. Thereby the faith came to rest not on the intellectual brilliance of a human teacher, but on the power of God.

6-16. The Wisdom of God and its Revelation through the Spirit.—St. Paul now turns to explain that what he has been saying in depreciation of human wisdom and of its competence to judge in advance God's method of salvation does not imply that there is no possibility for man to speak of the secrets of the wisdom of God. The foundation of St. Paul's Gospel was Christ crucified, and he could preach Him with the conviction that that was all that was necessary, though that was not the whole content of what he could say. But for the further wisdom, the more hidden mysteries of the divine purpose, a spiritual maturity was necessary beyond what the Church as a whole possessed. That ideally

the whole Church should have been able to listen to him when he spoke of this wisdom and purpose, resulted from the gift of the Spirit which it had received. The chapter is very important for the light it throws on the Pauline and early Christian idea of the work of the Spirit in illuminating the Christian.

6-9. The word **perfect**, especially when taken with what St. Paul says later in 3^1, suggests the full-grown as compared with the immature Christian. This is one of the cases in which St. Paul uses a word which belongs to the circle of mystery-terminology. But we need not assume dependence upon mystery-conceptions. Two further questions arise; first, what is God's wisdom **in a mystery** which St. Paul will speak of to the mature? We cannot say precisely. Parry, who refers to such passages as Rom 16^{25}; Col 1^{26}, interprets of 'the redemption of mankind through Christ,' which is something more than 'the fact of Christ crucified with its immediate consequences.' This makes good sense, and in so far as, in Parry's words, it 'involves far-reaching consequences' as to the 'nature and destiny of man' suits the prospect opened up by 9. The two contrasted types of teaching are illustrated by the contrast between the evangel in the sermon in Ac $13^{16\text{-}41}$ (the typical example which Luke gives us), and the teaching of Ephesians. The former shows what St. Paul understood by knowing nothing 'save Jesus Christ and him crucified.' No more than St. Peter in Ac 1-5, 10 does St. Paul here draw out the meaning and power of the Lord's atonement; but he proves that Jesus is the Christ without in any way slurring over the reality and the fact of suffering and humiliation by which the glory was attained. The latter gives the deeper teaching only suitable for mature Christians. The second question concerns **the rulers of this world.** Are they earthly rulers, Jews and Romans, as Parry and Robertson and Plummer hold, or the demonic powers who exercise control over the unregenerate world-order: so Bousset, Weiss, and W. Morgan? A decision is not easy, and depends to some extent on the interpretation of such passages as Gal $4^{1\text{-}3}$; Col $2^{8\text{-}23}$. The phrase 'rulers of this age' on the whole points to demonic powers, and the words **which are coming to nought** seem more full of meaning on this interpretation, but one may doubt whether St. Paul would have said that they crucified Christ, and the partitive **none** is more consonant with earthly rulers. Of the very striking expression **the Lord of glory** Weiss says: 'it is perhaps the most highly arresting description of him, which we find in Paul.' Despite the considerable variations in [9] from Is 64^4, taken with Is 65^{17}, there is no difficulty in supposing a loose quotation by the Apostle. We know too little about the 'Apocalypse of Elijah' and its date to know what significance to attach to Origen's statement that the words occur in that document. For the leading thought of these verses that God turns evil plans and events to good account cf. Ac 2^{17} f., and in Old Testament Gen 50^{20}.

10-16. The main lines of the thought are plain. Christians are given access to the wisdom of God by the Spirit. The Spirit, which is God's Spirit, in God, conceived of here, as Bousset says, as a 'self-existent being (person, hypostasis),' knows the counsels of God. And as Christians have received that Spirit, the Spirit's knowledge becomes their knowledge, while the unspiritual man cannot possess that knowledge, and, therefore, any examination he makes of, or judgement he passes upon, the spiritual man is of no value. He can no more instruct the latter than he can instruct the Lord. Garvie truly says that St. Paul is concerned with no question about the divine self-consciousness. If one presses the language of [10] one must discriminate between the consciousness of God and that of the Spirit. The meaning of [12] and [13] is that in order that Christians may know the content of God's wisdom and purpose, which takes shape in positive blessings, they have been given the Spirit and also the power of adequate expression. What is needed is speech inspired not by mere human wisdom, but by the Spirit. Spiritual subjects must be treated of and expressed in a corresponding spiritual way. It is certainly better to take both the words translated **spiritual** as neuter. The renderings of Parry and Peake 'combining spiritual subjects (or "truths") with spiritual expression' keep close to the Greek. In [12] the aorist tense **we received** points to a definite occurrence, and, in view of 12^{13}, most naturally to baptism. In [14] **the natural man** is the unregenerate man whose wisdom is only that to which he is able to attain by the use of his natural faculties. He has no power of examining truth which is revealed and interpreted only through the Spirit. The claim made for the spiritual man in [15] is of the highest order. It is ideally true, but its actual

truth in any case must depend on how far the spiritual man is following the guidance of the Spirit. St. Paul asserts the freedom from examination of the spiritual man in the most absolute way. The effect of his words is seriously weakened if one supplies as an explanation 'by the natural man.' In [16] the quotation is from Is 40[13] abbreviated. The word 'mind' is used rather of the content than of the organ of thought.

III. 1-23. The Evils of the Party-Divisions Expounded in the Light of the Truth as to the Building up of the Church.

1-9. St. Paul turns to the sad fact of the failure of the Corinthian Church to reach the level on which he could have taught them the full substance and meaning of the divine wisdom. He had neither been able to speak in that way when he had been among them, nor would it be possible now. They were not mere 'natural men,' but he had to adapt his instruction to their condition of great immaturity. Though properly they were spiritual, he could not treat them as such, but as carnal. In [2] *sarkinois* has the sense of 'composed of flesh'; in [3] *sarkikois* has a wholly ethical sense. But, by its suggestion of complete fleshly condition, and with the context to guide us, the former word represents a state more completely opposed to a spiritual one. At the same time, there is more implication of Corinthian responsibilities for their condition in *sarkikois*. With [2] cf. Heb 5[12-14]. The proof which St. Paul gives in [3] of the carnal-mindedness of the Church is significant. Some, if not all, of the parties would regard their particular claims as a mark of superior wisdom. The Apostle goes on to show the absurdity of these party-cries, for Paul and Apollos were not at all what those cries suggested. They were only ministers, of Christ rather than of the Corinthians. St. Paul wishes to turn the thoughts of the Church away from Paul and Apollos to Him whose ministers they are. The Lord had appointed them to different tasks. Paul had planted the Church; afterwards Apollos watered, but the fact of the Church's growth was due to God. They did not 'count' (Moffatt) at all, only God counted: perhaps at the end of [7] in the Greek we should supply with Parry 'is everything.' Further, to show the impossibility in the real nature of things of setting up Paul and Apollos against one another, they are essentially one; the only difference would lie in the character of the rewards corresponding to the difference in their work. In [9] the truth of the matter is briefly summed up. Paul and Apollos are fellow-labourers in the service of God; despite the linguistic argument this rendering is to be preferred to fellow-labourers with God. The Corinthians are a field or a building, the possession of God, and, so it is implied, to be cultivated or raised up for Him.

10-17. St. Paul now develops the idea of the building, and, with an eye on what had been going on, or was going on, in the community, points out that the fact that the foundation has been once for all well and truly laid does not imply that everything which is raised upon the foundation is of equal and lasting worth. St. Paul, in the character of a **wise master builder**, had laid the foundation, the only possible foundation, Jesus Christ. To others falls the task of building thereupon; St. Paul does not suggest that anyone had made the attempt to lay a different foundation. St. Paul in imagery which we must not press too closely conceives of different kinds of buildings rising on the one foundation; their respective values will one day, on the great and final Day, be determined. The Day will break in with the accompaniment of fire, and the fire will test the superstructures. Then two possibilities arise. One man's superstructure will stand the test, and he will be rewarded; another man's superstructure will perish, and he will have to pay, yet he will not fail of salvation, though he will only just escape the fire which has burnt up his work. As to the **reward** and the **loss**; Bousset thinks St. Paul means that the preservation or destruction of the work is itself the reward or punishment. Weiss holds that St. Paul certainly conceives of a special reward, but that the loss consists in the ruin of the work, his possession. It is natural to interpret the two cases in a similar way, and to think of the one as receiving some definite reward corresponding to the labour he has expended ([8]); Beet's suggestion of 'a higher degree of blessedness' is adequate if we wish to characterize it in any way; while the other, having remained true to the foundation, but raised no valuable building on it, is just saved, and loses all reward with the loss of his work. The fire-imagery obviously applies to the Last Day, not to a preceding purgatorial period. It is not quite easy to understand the meaning of the **work** itself. St. Paul has in mind teachers and leaders in the Church; is the work their teaching, or the Church itself regarded as an institution rising on the foundation? Goudge's interpre-

tation, 'the members of the Church as formed by the teaching they have received,' links teaching and institution ideas together; only we must not press it to mean that St. Paul conceives of the members who have been given this worthless teaching as themselves lost. In [17] the idea of the community and its sacred character emerges very definitely. The factiousness which rends asunder to the point of destruction the Temple of God will meet with the punishment which befits it.

18-23. The danger of intellectual pretentiousness and the danger of party-divisions were not disconnected. One who imagined himself to be wise, while his wisdom was really only the wisdom of the passing age or world, needed to become a fool that he might attain to the true wisdom which could meet with God's approval, whereas the wisdom of the world was mere foolishness in God's eyes. St. Paul quotes Job 5^{13} and Ps 94^{11} in support of this contempt of worldly wisdom. And all this boasting of one man or another was a reversal of the true order of things. The Corinthians were not owned, they were owners. Their only subjection was to Christ, and through Him they had the final bond of unity with God. For the triumphant strain of [22] cf. Rom 8^{38} f. The whole world-order and all that falls within it belongs to the Christian, and is not lord over him. But on this note St. Paul cannot end. The Christian belongs to Christ, and there is yet one further movement upwards; Christ belongs to God. With this we may compare 11^{3} and 15^{28}, verses which in themselves express the subordination of Christ to God. But while we recognize this, we do not therefore attribute to St. Paul an Arianizing Christology. As W. Morgan, who emphasizes the presence of this subordination-element, says, 'unquestionably for Paul Christ belongs to the side of reality we call divine. And His pre-existence would seem to him an inseparable concomitant of His divinity. His divinity is the primary fact to which every further determination or limitation attaches itself.'

IV. **1-21. St. Paul and the Church in Corinth.**—This chapter is of a more personal nature than the ones which have preceded it. The Apostle wants the Church to think of him and of others in the right way; that does not mean that he submits himself to any examination by them. By a sharp turn of thought he goes on to point out that what he has been saying about himself and Apollos is to be taken as a general warning against pride and party-rivalry. Every kind of boastfulness is absurd, since whatever anyone has he has of God. The thought of the community's self-satisfaction causes St. Paul to break forth into a passage of powerful and concentrated irony in which he contrasts the perilous life of apostles, exposed to every kind of suffering and contempt, with the serene self-complacency, as of men who have already entered into their kingdom, of those whom he is addressing. Once again the tone changes; he is a father not a superintendent; let them take him as their example. Timothy, who is coming to them, will tell them all they need to know. But (with yet another change of thought), those who think that he is sending Timothy because he dare not come himself will find themselves very much mistaken. He proposes to come, and soon; in what spirit he comes depends not on himself but on them.

1-5. Let a man so account of us, as of ministers of Christ, etc. This may mean 'let a man regard us in the category of ministers of Christ,' or 'let a man judge of us as he is accustomed to judge of ministers of Christ.' The former is best. The descriptive words point to the subordinate functions of the teachers. What a steward must show is fidelity to his charge. But St. Paul does not allow that this gives the Corinthians or any human court the right to sit in examination of him. The use in [3] of the Greek word for day, translated judgement, involves a contrast with the one true judgement-day which is God's. He does not even sit in judgement on himself: the reason why he does not is not perfectly clear. The words **for I know nothing against myself** may give the reason: then, in order to show that he has no power to pass a verdict of acquittal in his own case, he continues **yet am I not hereby justified,** etc. But it is possible that the words at the beginning of [4] should be taken as a hypothesis 'for though I know nothing against myself, yet,' etc.; so Weiss, and Robertson and Plummer. In that case the reason why he does not sit in judgement on himself is that only Christ can deliver sentence of acquittal. In any case, the conclusion drawn is that the Corinthians must not try to anticipate the judgement which the Lord will pass when He comes. Where there is hidden evil He will bring it to light, where praise is due He will apportion it.

6-14. There are two difficulties in [6]. First, as to the words **these things I have in a figure transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes.** What are 'these things?' Presumably what he has been saying as to ministry and stewardship. And the 'transference in a figure' will mean that he and Apollos did not need to be reminded of their true position, but that others did. Lake takes the words as a warning against exaggeration by the Corinthians of their own personal importance. The language tells against a more restricted reference to particular persons in Corinth. The other difficulty concerns the words **not to go beyond the things which are written.** If this is taken to refer to the Old Testament, it can only be, as Edwards says, of the general spirit and point of view of the Old Testament: but the phrase in the Greek is difficult, and the lack of any definite point of attachment makes it obscure. Weiss and Moffatt give up the traditional text. At the end of [6] **against the other** is best taken of 'the other teacher.' In [7] St. Paul singles out a hypothetical individual in order to prove the absurdity of any self-importance. Whatever such an one possesses he has received; it is no credit to him:—the last two questions were dear to Augustine for their strong anti-Pelagian ring. St. Paul now leaves the hypothetical individual and comes to the actual Church. Whether in [8] we have three questions, or, as Robertson and Plummer prefer, satirical affirmations, the effect is the same. The point of the end of [8] is that if the Corinthians had come into their kingdom it would be a good thing for the Apostles who would be able to share in it. For the true state of things was very different; the Apostles had to be content to be fighting down below like doomed gladiators in the arena, with men and angels as spectators of their agony, while the Corinthians sat on high in royal complacency 'without' them. They were despised as foolish, weak, inglorious, while the Corinthians had exactly the reverse impression of themselves. The Corinthians were confident that their position 'in Christ' gave them the reputation of wisdom; St. Paul and his companions only knew that **for Christ's sake** they must bear the reproach of fools. Bodily sufferings and men's contempt were their lot. In the midst of their missionary labours they even supported themselves by their own manual toil. We meet with this emphasis elsewhere (9 [6]; 2 Cor 11 [7]). St. Paul attached considerable importance to it (cf. 1 Th 2 [9]; 2 Th 3 [8]; Ac 20 [34]). In the end of [12] and beginning of [13] St. Paul shows how the sufferings he and others endured had not embittered them. The force of **intreat** is made clearer in Moffatt's translation 'we try to conciliate.' The words **filth** and **offscouring** in [13] may refer to the custom whereby in certain Greek cities individuals of a degraded condition offered themselves as scapegoats, or criminals were chosen to be sacrificial victims: so Edwards and Bousset. But it is better with Weiss, Parry, and Goudge to understand the words more generally. St. Paul wishes to express in the strongest way the view which the world took of the utter worthlessness of the Apostles.

14-17. If anything could shame the Church out of its self-complacency these contrasted pictures would. Yet he had not intended to rebuke them, but to give them a warning, in the spirit not of their thousands of superintending guardians, but of their one earthly father. In [15] the repeated **in Christ** refers to their state as Christians. The expressions here tell against a rigorous application of Deissmann's semi-local interpretation of the phrase 'in Christ,' of Christ as the element within which the Christian life moves. It is the parental relationship which explains St. Paul's purpose in sending Timothy. He will remind the Church of the Apostle's **ways.** The context suggests that the reference is to St. Paul's general way of life, which, as Weiss says, is 'only the expression of the view of life which he preaches.' It is not certain that in [17] the Greek implies that Timothy had already started, though 16 [10] shows that he was not taking the letter.

18-21. St. Paul thinks it necessary to insist that any self-complacency on the part of any members of the community, due to a belief that St. Paul would shrink from coming himself, was likely to be short-lived. For their attitude cf. 2 Cor 10 [9] f., though the latter passage points to far greater disaffection. He knows they can talk, but can they do more? It is power, not talk, which witnesses to the presence of the Kingdom. It is for the Corinthians to show by their attitude, particularly, perhaps, by the way they respond to his warnings against party spirit and self-complacency, whether love and gentleness, or the exercise of stern discipline, shall be the characteristics of his visit. The alternative is not, as Massie says, 'Shall he come as a father or as a pædagogus?'

V. 1-13. The Case of Gross Immorality and the Lax Attitude of the Church.—The news of the party divisions was not the worst news which had come to St. Paul. Far more notorious was a case of scandalous moral behaviour, at which even the Corinthians' heathen neighbours would look askance. A member of the Church was living, whether in a relation of marriage or of concubinage, with his father's wife. The Church had done nothing, and so St. Paul tells them of his decision already made, a decision of severe excommunication which he clearly expects the Church to enforce. At the same time he wishes to correct a wrong impression, drawn from a former letter, that he expects the members of the Church never to meet any heathen guilty of one of the characteristic vices of heathendom.

1-5. The abruptness of the opening witnesses to St. Paul's indignation. We do not know how the news first reached him. On the whole, it is probable that the father was dead, and the woman almost certainly was not a Christian. In [2] the meaning is that the grief which they should have shown ought to have led them to decide on the removal of the offender. In [3-5] the piling up of the consentient agents is very impressive. The Apostle has already decided on what must be done; the fact that he is not in Corinth makes no difference. He has the authority of the Lord Jesus for his decision, and as he thinks of his own spirit as present at the meeting of the Church, so he knows that the power of the Lord will be with them. What is intended is clear enough in the main lines. The sinner is to be excluded from the Church, excommunicated. But more than that, he is to be solemnly handed over to Satan, who is regarded as having power outside the Church which he does not possess within it, with a view to his death. This is the natural interpretation of **destruction of the flesh**, and is generally adopted. The destruction of the flesh by Satan's hostile action is not, however, the purpose of the whole procedure. In some way or other physical death serves the end of the salvation of the spirit. There is no definite suggestion of repentance after death, and it is not clear what is supposed to be the spiritual disposition of the offender at the moment of death. Parry thinks that the man is supposed to die in alienation from God, after which his spirit is redeemed. But how does physical death in itself help towards spiritual salvation? Bousset's notion that St. Paul thought of liberation from the flesh as liberation from sin working in the flesh suggests too mechanical an idea of salvation. Perhaps St. Paul had no precise conception of the method whereby after all the sinner would be saved, but was simply confident that the tremendous sentence would have saving as well as destructive power: cf. [11 30-32]. One may note how more than one view of the purpose of punishment appears in these verses. The punishment is in the strictest sense the sinner's desert; and yet there is more in it than sheer retribution. For the whole passage cf. for the work of Satan the beginning of the book of Job, and for the exercise of discipline [Ac 5 1] ff.

6-8. The Church seems to have held that this gross sin was an entirely individual matter and was no affair of the society or blot upon it. By the parable of leaven St. Paul shows that this cannot be true. The corrupting influence must be purged away **that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened**, a parallel, says Holtzmann, in Jewish form to the old proverb 'become what thou art.' Leaven has suggested to St. Paul the paschal ritual, and so he passes on to the thought of Christ as the true paschal lamb, whose sacrifice necessitates a new moral life of complete sincerity and correspondence with the nature of things. The words **let us keep the feast** refer to the whole Christian life, not to a particular occasion; but the imagery gains in significance if the letter was written near the time of the Passover season.

9-13. The letter to which St. Paul now refers is wholly lost unless [2 Cor 6 14-7 1] is a fragment which has found its way into 2 Corinthians; for Weiss's elaborate attempts to break up the unity of 1 Corinthians and to assign to the earlier letter [6 12-20], [9 24-10 22], [11 2-34], [16 7b-9, 15-20], though supported by much ingenious argument, are an example of the oversubtlety of his methods, and are adequately answered by Parry. St. Paul had said **have no dealings with fornicators.** The Church had been puzzled, and may have expressed its feeling in the Church-letter. In [10] **not altogether** is obscure: 'assuredly I did not mean' (Lightfoot), or 'not that I meant literally' (Lake), attaching the negative to a verb understood gives the sense. [11] **but now I write**, epistolary aorist, puts the matter beyond the possibility of misunderstanding. The catalogue of vices in [11] shows how far some who were baptized members of the Church were from realizing the moral character of the Christian life.

The word **idolater** is especially remarkable. It suggests that some tried to combine Christianity with other forms of worship. The meaning involved in the first question of [12] is that neither the Apostle nor the Church can exercise any judgement or discipline except over members of the Christian society. God commits to the Church no judicial power over others; He alone deals with them. With a quotation from one of a number of passages in Deuteronomy St. Paul ends with a brief decisive injunction. Gross sinners must be separated from the new holy people, as formerly from the old.

VI. **1-11. The Unseemliness of the Litigious Spirit in the Church, and, in particular, of Lawsuits before Heathen Judges.**—The thought of the exercise of judgement leads St. Paul on to speak of another matter which was revealing further moral weakness in the Church. The members of the Church were much too ready to indulge in a quarrelsome spirit, an old Greek failing, and to take their grievances before a heathen court. This custom was destructive of the new life of brotherhood in Christ and obscured the distinction between the Church and the world. The passage illustrates the never-absent difficulty of consolidating Christian ethical practice on a higher level than that of the non-Christian world, while the last verses imply that Christian ethic is not the crown of the natural man's efforts, but the fruit of regeneration.

2-3. the saints shall judge the world . . . we shall judge angels (cf. Dan 7 [22]; Mt 19 [28]). Weiss points out that the ideas of sharing in God's Kingdom and sharing in God's judgement lay close together. The expression in [3] is more difficult, and stands by itself in the New Testament, but that there were evil spiritual beings was certainly St. Paul's conviction. Such a passage as Col 1 [15] is clear evidence. Cf. also Ju [6]. The destiny of man, in the Old Testament so notably stated in Ps 8, was lofty enough to include the power of sitting in judgement on all evil forces. In [2] the RVm **of the smallest tribunals** gives the exact meaning; there is an easy transition of thought from the court to the matter which comes before the court for judgement. In [4] it is not certain whether we should interpret **them who are of no account in the church** as heathen or unimportant Christians, and take **set to judge** as an imperative or a question. Weiss argues that not till [5] does the thought of Christian judges appear. On the other hand, the force of 'set to judge' suggests Christian judges. With considerable hesitation we interpret of heathen judges, and take the verse as a question. In [5] **decide** suggests action outside a court. St. Paul would prefer no courts at all. On the whole section Dods rightly points out that St. Paul has no idea of transferring into the Church the whole paraphernalia of civil courts. [7] shows that St. Paul favours abstention from lawsuits even to the point of suffering wrong, whereas ([8]) the Corinthians went to the courts to obtain that to which they had no right. So doing they wronged their brethren and came within the scope of the law which excluded wrongdoers from the Kingdom of God, a law to which they would blind themselves at their peril. St. Paul impresses this on them by pointing out that some of the members of the Church had been wrongdoers of one kind or another, and that the religious blessings which they had received after their conversion from heathendom had meant a sharp decisive break with the old life. At the beginning of [11] the meaning is: 'You had yourselves washed free from all these things' (Parry). **ye were sanctified,** that is brought into the position of consecrated people, and so, by inference, pledged to a life of moral holiness. **ye were justified,** accounted righteous before God. The three verbs refer to the same point of time determined by the reference to baptism and the words at the end of the verse. St. Paul does not teach justification by baptism, but he does, as Bousset says, here regard baptism and justification as synchronizing, and baptism as 'a sacrament in the essential sense of the word.' Goudge would see a reference to the gift of the Spirit, whereby men were consecrated and their righteousness publicly declared by act, the washing being by the baptismal immersion, the consecration by the gift of the Spirit through the laying on of hands.

12-20. The Special Evil of Fornication.—**All things are lawful,** etc. It is possible, as Zahn suggests and Moffatt approves by his method of translation, that St. Paul is quoting phrases used in the Church's letter, and showing how the claim made for complete spiritual freedom in the use of material things must be limited. The second limitation is particularly significant; a person who claims absolute liberty must beware lest his real position be that of servile subjection. In [23] Weiss finds another catch-phrase of the Corinthian 'Gnostics.' In any case, St. Paul has no objection to the phrase **meats for the belly, and the belly for**

meats, but goes on to refute deductions which might be drawn from it. Meats and the belly which received them belonged to the passing order of things; not so the body; between it and the Lord there was a high and abiding relationship. It is noteworthy how in [14] both the bodily resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of our bodies is implied. Accordingly ([15]) the body, as organically related to Christ, must not be taken away from Him and put to a perverted use, the true relation being horribly counterfeited in sexual impurity. In this context the word **flesh** ([16]) quoted from Gen 2 [24] takes on a higher significance than that of the fleshly organism. At the same time, we may note how the word **spirit** is reserved for the union between the Christian and Christ, a union 'mystical, not merely ethical' (Peake): in sexual immorality the relation does not rise above one of bodies. [18] is quite intelligible if we do not pedantically press the letter of the verse; the binding relation into which the man enters through fornication affects the body in a way no other sin does. Profane use of the body is ([19]) profane use of what the Corinthians surely know very well to be a shrine of the Holy Spirit; that the body is that as well as a member of Christ reveals the close connexion between St. Paul's doctrine of Christ and his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. At the same time, it points away from the idea that St. Paul identifies the exalted Lord with the Spirit, **which we have** (cf. 12 [4] f.). In [20] the price is, as Weiss says, Christ's death. It is needless to ask to whom the price is paid. These last verses and the whole section seem quite inconsistent with the notion that St. Paul thought of the body, even if regarded simply in the light of its fleshly composition, as essentially evil. W. Morgan does not allow that these verses disprove St. Paul's conception of the fleshly body as possessing an essentially evil moral quality, but if, as Morgan insists, the doctrine 'that in matter lies the principle of evil is not to be found in Paul,' who teaches that 'all things were created by Christ and for Christ,' so that nothing is unclean of itself, the flesh as 'the material living substance of the human body' must, in itself, be clean also.

VII. **1-40. Reply to the Church-Letter concerning (i) Marriage and Kindred Questions.**—The Corinthian Church had referred a number of questions dealing largely with the application of Christian ethical principle to St. Paul. The questions themselves and the way in which St. Paul deals with them throw much light on the difficulties confronting a Christian Church in a heathen environment. St. Paul had, in many matters, no authoritative decision to which he could appeal. The level which his answers reach, if regarded simply from the standpoint of human tact and common sense, is an exceedingly high one. There is no confusion between principle and expediency, and no attempt to make his own preferences obligatory. The position at Corinth was one of diverse opinions in which there was real danger, if the opinions were pushed to an extreme.

1-7. The Question of Marriage in General.—**It is good.** The Greek word so often repeated in this chapter strikes the note of what Parry well calls 'the higher expediency.' Only in [38] is it used as of good but inferior value in comparison with another course of action. In [2] the meaning is, if a man desires to marry let him do so without any sense of wrong-doing. [3] and [4] express the mutual rights involved in the marriage-relationship. In [5] the conditions governing any break in the physical side of that relationship are clearly set forth. It is to be by agreement, for a particular length of time, with a view to opportunity for prayer, and have the resumption of the relationship in view—the second 'that' depends on the general sense of the preceding words, with a closer connexion with what is said as to resumption: if the gift of continence is lacking there is danger through temptations of Satan. In [6] **this I say** is best, with Lightfoot, Parry, and others, explained as referring to the question of marriage; [7] then follows quite naturally.

8-9. Unmarried men, with a possible inclusion of widowers, who are otherwise not mentioned, and widows, to whom there is a further reference in [39-40], are advised to be content with that condition of life in which the Apostle himself is; though if, through lack of his gift, the strain is too great, they should marry. This is special advice; it should not be taken as giving us the whole of St. Paul's mind on the reasons for marriage. Of 'virgins' he will have something to say later.

10-11. The married must not seek divorce. This is the Lord's command. The force of the parenthesis is not quite clear. Weiss argues that St. Paul has in mind a possible *fait accompli*. In any case St. Paul is emphasizing the fact that another union must not be contracted.

The two alternatives are a state of life in which the conditions of marriage are not present, or reconciliation with the husband. The different words used in the cases of the husband and of the wife probably point to the fact that the husband could, according to Jewish law, divorce or put away (AV) his wife, while the wife could not 'put away,' but only leave her husband.

12-16. St. Paul now uses his own judgement as to cases where one of the parties has become a Christian. Some members of the Church would certainly think that in such a case the marriage-bond ought to be broken. The advice of the Apostle is conspicuous for its wisdom and charity. If the heathen partner is willing to continue as before, no change should be made. So far from it being true that the Christian was defiled by the heathen, the heathen was sanctified in the Christian. As a proof of this he points to the fact that the children of such a marriage would have to be regarded as unholy if the Christian partner had necessarily become unholy through being joined to a heathen. This unholiness of the children is an intolerable idea, which will, he knows, be rejected: the logical sequence of thought is clear in the Greek. The end of [14] does not raise the question of infant baptism. The character of the argument is excellently brought out by Edwards: 'If children partake of the consecration of a believing parent, much more will the husband partake of the consecration of the believing wife.'* In [15-16] St. Paul turns to a case where the heathen chooses to make a separation; in such a case the Christian should not try to prevent the other's action. God's call to be a Christian means peace, not slavery, and slavery it would be to try to retain the marriage-bond with a heathen, when the heathen wished to break it. That seems far the most natural way of taking [15], and, if so, [16] becomes an argument in favour of separation, the likelihood of the salvation of the heathen partner being regarded as remote. The objection to it is that it is unlike St. Paul to give up all hope, or to advise an action which would mean the abandoning of whatever hope there was. If we feel this strongly, as Lightfoot does, a way out of the difficulty of [15] is, with Moffatt, to bracket the first part of [15], down to in such cases, and carry back the rest of [15] and [16] into close connexion with [12-14]. As to whether by what he says in [15] St. Paul would justify re-marriage there is much disagreement. It is a matter of inference and feeling. The present writer is not convinced that St. Paul intended the state of peace to involve the right of re-marriage.

17-24. St. Paul's advice against changes in the marriage-state broadens out to cover other cases. Should a converted man try to change conditions under which he was called? St. Paul's regular rule ([17]) is to command acquiescence in what represented the divine choice for the individual. As to circumcision and uncircumcision, they do not matter one way or the other; what does matter is that men should keep God's commandments—a remark to be noted by those who think that, as his opponents affirmed, St. Paul was something of an antinomian. For the irrelevance of the circumcision-question in itself cf. Gal 5 [6], 6 [15]. There is perhaps no verse in the epistles in which it is harder to be sure of St. Paul's meaning than in [21]. Does St. Paul parenthetically suggest that if a chance of freedom presents itself, the Christian should take it? Or does he say, 'Do not trouble about slavery; even if you can be free, stop as you are'? The English commentators are, on the whole, decidedly in favour of the supposition that St. Paul advises freedom, when the opportunity is there;

* Personal consecration can hardly be communicated by one to another. St. Paul probably means that the heathen partner is consecrated so far as the marriage relation is concerned; its fruit is 'holy' children (cf. Ps 112 [2]). That he means by the words 'is not under bondage' that the Christian partner may marry again appears to be certain. For (i) the heathen partner *ex hypothesi* has left the Christian; an endeavour to re-establish the old relations could not be described as bondage. Bondage must stand in contrast to freedom, and freedom to marry is the kind of freedom which the context suggests (cf. [39]). Moreover, [15] seems to refer back to [10, 11]; 'such cases' are an exception to the general rule. (ii) St. Paul's decision thus understood is the reasonable one. Normally, the marriage of Christians with non-Christians is inadmissible ([39]), since non-Christians will not accept the obligations which Christian marriage brings with it. In the heathen world marriage in the Christian sense hardly exists, the difference between a wife and a concubine, where there is freedom of divorce, being social rather than moral. Such unions cannot be in themselves regarded as indissoluble, though they become Christian marriages, if the man and the woman are converted and accept for their union the Christian law. St. Paul rules that in the case before us the Christian may retain the heathen partner, accepting no doubt the obligations of Christian marriage for himself or herself, whatever the heathen may do. But the Christian indissoluble marriage has still to be created; and, if it is not, the Christian is free. (iii) The evidence of the Fathers and Councils is strongly in favour of this view. For a full discussion of the subject, cf. O. Watkins, *Holy Matrimony*, viii. The matter is of great importance in the mission field, and may become so in England.—Ed.

it is urged that the natural object to supply with use is 'freedom,' not 'slavery,' that the aorist of the verb and the verb itself suggest a change to a new state of life, while one or two would emphasize the improbability of St. Paul recommending a slave not to avail himself of the freedom which would mean the power of unrestricted observance of his religion. On the other hand, Bousset and Weiss, with two of the older English commentators in Edwards and Ellicott, argue that the whole context suggests the unimportance of earthly situation and the undesirability of change, and lay stress on the implications of 'even if' and 'rather.' [22] seems to weigh the balance down on this side, though it can still be fairly argued that, the latter part of [21] being a parenthesis, [22] refers only to what lies outside the parenthesis and its hypothesis. In any case, the religious emphasis of the passage is to be found in the conviction that the Christian need not be, and, therefore, ought not to be, in any slavish manner the servant of men.

25-35. Concerning Virgins and the Desirability of the Unmarried State.—St. Paul has to use his own judgement, yet if he has no word of the Lord to guide him, he is not without confidence; the trustworthiness of the Apostle may be inferred from the mercy of the Lord shown to him. In [26] **to be as he is** naturally means, pointing forward to [27], 'not to seek for any change in position'; let him be content to be married or single as the case may be; but the Greek means literally 'so to be,' and that could be interpreted as 'to be unmarried.' Despite the curious advice, if the letter be pressed, not to seek freedom from a marriage ([27]), it is very unnatural to follow Weiss's interpretation at this point of a spiritual betrothal. Confident as St. Paul is in his judgement, he knows ([28]) that it will be no sin to act against it; but he desires to spare his converts the anxiety and suffering which will come to them in the near future (cf. [26] 'present,' or 'imminent distress') if they marry. He may be thinking of persecution, or—and along with that—of the woes before the Parousia. What he says about marriage applies more generally to detachment from the world, its pursuits and its emotions; to use the world to the full ([31] RVm) would suggest a real value in it inconsistent with its vanishing character. The succession of paradoxes in [30, 31] implies the conviction 'the believer's treasure and heart are not bound up with the order of this world' (cf. Mt 6 [21]; Lk 12 [20] f.). In [33-34] the text is uncertain. The phrase **there is a difference** may belong to the end of [33]; in which case we should translate 'and is divided,' i.e. is distracted in his interests. In [34] the mention of the **virgin** after the **unmarried woman**, if that is the true text, may be explained, as by Peake, in reference to one dedicated to the celibate life, but it may mean simply a young woman, whose age would naturally fit her for marriage; if she does not marry her whole attention will be given to the Lord; and she will have more opportunity for increase in actual holiness. At the same time, St. Paul wishes to make it quite clear ([35]) that he is thinking wholly of what is most advantageous for the Corinthians.

36-38. On the Marriage of Virgins.—The usual interpretation of this passage is that St. Paul here gives advice as to the conduct which a father or perhaps a guardian should pursue with regard to an unmarried daughter or ward. The Apostle thinks it best that, if circumstances allow, the father should not give her in marriage. But if she has come to marriageable age, and it is clear that marriage is desirable, he commits no sin if he allows a marriage to take place. This in itself makes good sense, and is quite reconcilable with the extensive legal rights which a father or guardian possessed. Yet St. Paul's language is decidedly puzzling. In [36] the **any man** and the **virgin** seem to be the two persons concerned, who are to marry; the words **he sinneth not** sound strange when the case is supposed to refer simply to the father's decision. (Yet cf. [28]: and we must allow for the presence of ascetic tendencies.) In [37] the emphatic **his own virgin** is not the natural way of referring to a daughter or ward; further, the words 'father,' 'daughter' are not used. So another interpretation is favoured by Weiss and Peake. At Corinth cases had already arisen of those 'spiritual marriages' (*subintroductas mulieres*) which are found in later Church history, gave rise to scandals, and were condemned by Councils (first at Elvira, early 4th century). But it might happen that the strain was found too great; the man or perhaps the woman was of a passionate nature. So the question arose as to the right course to pursue. St. Paul answers (for the problem may have been mentioned in the Church-letter) that a physical marriage in such a case is no sin, though if the man can control his inclinations, it is well that he should do so. The conclusion is that to marry is good, but not

to marry is better. Again, the difficulties are considerable. There is no clear hint of such spiritual betrothals till the end of the 2nd century; the word in [36] which Weiss would explain as meaning 'passionate' (RV 'past the flower of her age') is wrested to that sense against its normal usage and implication. In [37] the Greek does not suggest the power of self-control which enables the man to keep the virgin in her unmarried state, but 'the right to give effect to his own purpose' (Parry), while in [38] the natural sense of the Greek word *gamizon* is not 'marry' but 'give in marriage.' The balance of probability is, on the whole, in favour of the usual interpretation. (For the translation when the idea of a 'spiritual bride' is accepted, cf. Moffatt.)

39-40. The Remarriage of Widows Allowed but not Recommended.—Despite the adverse opinion of Lightfoot, **in the Lord** probably implies that she may only marry a Christian. With such a restriction cf. 2 Cor 6 [14] ff. The end of [40] gives St. Paul's justification for stating clearly his own opinion, and may glance at members of the Church who doubted whether he was really 'spiritual.'

VIII. 1-XI. 1. The Reply to the Church-Letter concerning (ii) Participation in Heathen Feasts and the Eating of Meals Offered in Sacrifice to Idols.—This section naturally divides into three parts. In 8 St. Paul deals directly with the question submitted to him in the letter from Corinth as to the extent of Christian freedom in the matter of participation in festal meals definitely connected with some heathen divinity and taking place in a temple. In 9 St. Paul seems to have passed to another subject—the reality of his apostleship and his right, even though he had not availed himself of it, to maintenance at the expense of the Church. Yet in the word **free** of 9 [1] we have the keyword in which the connexion of thought is implicit and the end of the chapter draws it out. Freedom brings responsibilities, and is not incompatible with limitations. So in 10 he shows, by pointing to examples in the history of Israel, the danger of imagining that a privileged position in relation to God is in itself a safeguard against the dangers which may lie in associations really incompatible with the Christian profession. As to the eating of sacrificial food, a question different from that of sharing in a heathen feast in a heathen temple, the Apostle recommends a course of sanctified common sense. It is to be noted that St. Paul makes no reference to the decree of the 'Council of Jerusalem' that Gentile Christians should abstain from things offered to idols. Why this is so is uncertain; perhaps he did not regard the decree as permanently binding, or thought of it as applying only to churches founded at the time. 8 begins with what is probably a reference to a claim made in the Corinthian letter to the existence of a knowledge which is the peculiar property of Christians and justifies courses of action which otherwise would be unseemly. St. Paul agrees ([1]) that there is such knowledge: the way he writes **we know that we all have knowledge** suggests that it is not so wonderful a thing as the Corinthians supposed. Moreover, ([2]) knowledge by itself—for that is the implication—only makes a man conceited; that which really builds up is love. Here we have already a hint of the manner in which St. Paul is going to handle the subject. We need not supply either 'himself' or 'others' after **edifieth.** The statement is quite general. The contrast between knowledge and love is now carried further. [3], a claim to some special knowledge, means that the true path to knowledge is not yet being trod; the love of God, on the other hand, leads —we expect St. Paul to say—to the knowledge of Him; but, with an entirely characteristic turn of expression, in which his deep theological sense of the prevenience of God is revealed, he goes on: **the same is known of him** (cf. Gal 4 [9]). He now comes closer to his subject. Most of [4] may be quotation from the Church-letter. St. Paul agrees on the the main point—as to the one God with whom Christians are concerned, but in [5] allows the existence of many spiritual beings to whom the names of 'God' or 'Lord' is given. To this extent he modifies the position adopted by the Corinthians. They were well aware of the names, and the first part of [5], **there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth,** may still be, as Parry takes it, part of the Corinthian statement. But they admitted no reality behind the names, whereas St. Paul, as is clear from 10 [20] ff., saw behind the name and behind the idol an evil spirit, a demon. However, these gods and lords stood in no comparison with the 'one God, the Father,' and the 'one Lord, Jesus Christ.' In [6] St. Paul is not giving utterance to a formal Christology in which Christ as the Lord was contrasted with the Father as God. It is indeed not certain that St. Paul did ever speak directly of Christ as God, but if the question be asked, 'Does St. Paul's attitude to Christ and to what Christ does

place Him on the side of God or on the side of creation?' we shall answer, with a liberal critic like Bousset, 'On the side of God.' Of this verse Bousset says 'the remarkably quick development of the doctrine of Christ in the original period of the Christian community lies here clearly before the eyes.' God the Father is the Creator and the End of man's existence, the Lord Jesus the Agent in creation (cf. Jn 1 [3]), and the Medium whereby 'we Christians' occupy the position we do. This knowledge is common to St. Paul and the Corinthians, yet not effective in all ([7]). Owing to the associations of idol-worship some, when they eat sacrificial food, could not treat it as unaffected by its relation to the idol; so their weak, that is over-scrupulous, consciences suffered harm. St. Paul points out ([8-9]) that the act of eating has in itself no religious value; while those who can eat without suffering in their own consciences must be careful not to become by that very act a cause of stumbling to the weak. The consequences of such action are very powerfully drawn in [10-11]. A weak Christian, sitting at a feast in an idol's temple with a strong brother, follows his example, and is builded up (RVm) to eat. The word may, as Weiss suggests, come from the Corinthian letter. But what a 'building up' St. Paul replies: it is destructive, not constructive; in the way you use your knowledge is contained the ruin of that weak man, and he is the brother for whose sake Christ died. Such action is equivalent to a wounding of the weak conscience, since the brother eats, and yet, despite the other's example, feels that he is doing wrong. So there is a sin against the weak brethren, and, therefore, against Christ. In [13] St. Paul, who is himself one of the strong, asserts in the most positive way, that he will give up the use of meat altogether rather than take action which causes a brother to stumble. Goudge sees in [10] a definite prohibition of participation in a heathen feast in a temple. It would be safer to say that the consequences might be such as would make abstention altogether desirable, while, in principle, it was a matter of indifference whether a Christian went or stayed away.

IX. 1-18. Except for the implication of the one word free the connexion with 8 is, as we have seen, not clearly indicated. And in its main theme the larger part of the chapter has the character of a parenthesis. In it we catch the first notes of that 'defence' by St. Paul of his own position and rights of which 2 Cor 10-13 is full. The style of the Apostle's reply is marked by great vivacity; the number of pointed questions is specially noteworthy, but there is hardly a touch of that sombreness, or sign of those deeply wounded feelings, whereby the end of the second epistle is distinguished.

St. Paul begins with four questions demanding in each case the answer 'yes.' The fact that he has seen Jesus, i.e. at his conversion, is equivalent, in the context, to evidence for the reality of his apostleship. The connexion is less close than in Gal 1 [12, 15], but it exists. And whatever others may think about it to the Corinthians reality of his apostleship is indubitable; as the Church owed itself to him in the Lord, so it was the seal upon the apostolic office which he had exercised in Corinth. In 2 Cor 3 [2] the genuineness of the apostolic work is witnessed to by the Church which is his letter. If people want to subject him to an examination on the point he has his answer ready. this at the end of [3] is best taken with Ellicott as 'this that I have specified.' W.-H. by their spacing after [2] suggest a connexion of 'this' with [4] ff., and the Greek runs more easily on that interpretation, but [1-2] give a more effective defence than the later verses. In [4-6] St. Paul argues by inference that rights of marriage and of sustentation by Christian communities were possessed by himself and Barnabas equally with others. the rest of the apostles may include others besides the Twelve. the brethren of the Lord were held in honour for their relationship to Christ, whatever that relationship may have been. The mention of Barnabas is interesting. The way in which St. Paul couples him with himself, though he was presumably personally unknown to the Corinthians, suggests that any bitterness of feeling which followed the incident of Ac 15 [37] ff. had disappeared. The customs of men in ordinary life point to the right of maintenance through whatever may be a man's avocation ([7]). Besides purely human arguments an appeal to the Law is possible ([8-10]). When in Dt 25 [4] it is said: Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn, not the letter of the precept, but its inner meaning is to be noted. It suggests the hope which the ploughman and sower ought to have of partaking of the fruits of their labours. There is no difficulty in the appeal to the Law. St. Paul had the highest regard for the Law as an authority in which the divine will was expressed. W. Morgan is guilty of something very

like pedantry when he says of this appeal that it stands 'in glaring contradiction with his principle that the Law has been abolished.' For the allegorical interpretation of Scripture cf. 10 [5]; Gal 4 [21] ff. That method, except in the interests of homiletics, is not ours, and we can see a real significance and value in the care for animals exemplified in this letter of the Deuteronomic legislation. In [11-14] St. Paul returns to the question of the support of himself and his colleagues. The sowers of the word of the Gospel have a right to material sustenance ([11]). Others ([12]) availed themselves of this right. St. Paul claims a higher right, but has not used it lest any obstacle should have been presented to the progress of the Gospel. In [13-14] there is a further appeal, this time to the religious customs of Jews and heathen (possibly of the one or of the other alone), while the last word on the matter is that of the Lord (Mt 10 [10])—one of the few places where we can be sure of a reference by St. Paul to a saying of Christ which has a place in the Gospels. In [15-18] St. Paul explains that he has neither accepted support nor is now writing with a view to it in the future; he will not have his pride in not accepting maintenance made null and void. With the best reading there is a break of construction at the end of [15]. St. Paul does not say what it is which is less endurable than death, and abruptly ends with **no one shall make my glorying void.** The main thoughts of the next verses ([16-18]) are clear enough: St. Paul as a preacher of the Gospel has no cause for boastfulness; for he is a man under compulsion; nevertheless he has something whereof to boast, now referred to as his **reward,** in that he preaches the Gospel without letting others support him. But the connexion of thought in [17] is difficult. **For if I do this of mine own will, I have a reward: but if not of mine own will, I have a stewardship intrusted to me.** Does St. Paul mean that he preaches of his own will, or the reverse? Commentators on the whole regard the second part of the verse as stating St. Paul's own position. The 'not of my own will' then corresponds to 'necessity is laid upon me' of [16]. St. Paul is only a steward to whom a piece of work is assigned (cf. 4 [1]). The difficulty about this, on which Weiss insists, is that if this is the case St. Paul has no reason to expect any reward, yet in [18] he speaks as though some reward must be his. There is a good deal to be said for Parry's view that the alternatives of [17] represent the two possible attitudes of the slave on whom the 'necessity' of work is laid. As St. Paul does his work willingly, he has a reward. As to the 'reward' of [18], it is best to find it in the paradoxical fact that the Apostle preaches the Gospel without expense to others; so the latter part of [18] is not the reason why he may look for a reward, but the reward itself. The Greek strongly favours this interpretation.

19-23. In this section St. Paul shows how he has used his freedom. Though he stood in no relation of slavery to men he made himself the slave of all men, 'to win over as many as I could' (Moffatt). He conciliated the Jews and those who regarded the law as binding by observing their scruples. Bousset points to such incidents as those recorded in Ac 16 [3], 18 [18], 21 [23] f. He approached the Gentiles with a Gospel from which emphasis on law was absent, though so far from being free from God's Law he was bound to the Law revealed by Christ. This must be interpreted of the moral obligations involved in the acceptance of the Gospel. He shared the scruples of the scrupulous—a clear reference back to the theme of 8. He adapted himself to the needs of all to give himself the best chance of winning over some of them, and all that he did he did because of the Gospel that he might be **a joint partaker thereof.** These last words are most naturally interpreted as suggesting a desire on St. Paul's part that he with others may share in the blessings of the Gospels.

24-27. With the appeal for self-discipline with which the chapter closes the question of 'freedom' is approached from another point of view. The Christian must remember that the prize set before him is not one which he can gain by any kind of behaviour. All indeed, and not only one, as in the games, could win that prize. But the Christian must run his course as keenly as the man who wished to reach the goal first. The runner while training could not afford to be self-indulgent; the Christian with his eye on no perishing crown of pine-leaves, but on one that should never fade (cf. 1 P 5 [4]), could afford it still less. Of his own practice St. Paul speaks in imagery drawn first from the running, then from the boxing, contest. He does not run vaguely like a man uncertain of the goal, nor does he deal his blows like a futile boxer who only hits the air, but he subjects his body to a course of treatment which ensures it being his slave, not his master: only by such conduct can he escape the disgrace of having pointed others the way to the prize

and yet losing it himself. Strong as the word for buffet in 27 is, it implies in the context strong self-control rather than any special asceticism.

With 10, and in close connexion with what he has said as to the need for self-discipline, St. Paul approaches the general question of the relation of Christians to heathen idol-feasts from the point of view of the spiritual safety of the Christian participant. With this he associates the argument from spiritual consistency, while at the end he returns to the need for charitable regard for 'weak' consciences.

X. 1-5. To show the need for self-discipline St. Paul now speaks of the experiences of the Israelites, the spiritual fathers of all Christians, whether Jew or Gentile. These were types of the Christian sacraments in the wilderness-wanderings. The cloud which covered the host and the Red Sea through which it passed with Moses as its leader was equivalent to a baptism uniting it to Moses. So, it is implied, Christian baptism unites to Christ, while 10 1- and 12 13 make it clear, as Holtzmann points out, that this union with Christ involves also incorporation into the community. Nor was the Lord's Supper untypified in the wilderness. There was supernatural food, the manna, and supernatural drink, the water from the rock. The word translated spiritual may refer to source or to content. It should be noticed that to Hebrew thought 'spiritual' is the proper equivalent of 'supernatural'; it is that which is directly bestowed by God who is Spirit (cf. 15 38, 44), and is to be contrasted with the 'natural,' not with the 'material,' as the present passage shows. In 4, the rock was Christ, we have an allegorical or mystical interpretation. But it is unnecessary to follow Bousset in attributing to St. Paul literal belief in the Rabbinic legend, based on Ex 17 6; Nu 20 2-13, of the miraculous rock which accompanied the Israelites in their wanderings, and to suppose that he identified the rock with the pre-existent Christ. The point is that despite the blessings they received the majority of the people fell under God's displeasure, and the wilderness through which, with God's help, they should have passed became their grave.

6-11. In these verses we have St. Paul's expression of the great truth of that continuity of history, in virtue of which the Christian Church is the successor to Israel after the flesh. By reference to various incidents in Exodus and Numbers he exhorts the Corinthians to avoid the example which the Israelites gave in their evil desires, their idolatry, their gluttony, their fornication, their tempting of the Lord, their rebellous murmurings, and so not to suffer their fate. The events were types, and in their written record there was a warning for Christians who were the heirs of former ages. St. Paul appears to say that the hand of God is to be seen, not only in the provision of the types, but in the provision of the record of them—an important principle for the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament.

12-13. St. Paul gives both a warning and a promise. A proud confidence in a position of religious privilege is no guarantee against a fall. On the other hand, they must not imagine that any trial can be so overwhelming as to make a fall inevitable: none can reach them except such as falls within the limits of what a man may rightly be called upon to endure. Moreover, they can rely on God to save them from any trial beyond their strength; whatever trial comes they may be sure He will enable them to escape from it by enabling them to bear it. In 18 it is over-subtle to see an implied reference to demonic assaults upon those who by sharing in idol-feasts have brought themselves within the scope of demonic activity, and the assurance that if they have run into this danger God will save them. In 13 St. Paul does not mean that the trial can be borne because God will provide a means of release from the trial, but that the way of release is contained in the successful endurance of the trial.

14-22. St. Paul now develops an argument which implies that for the avoidance of idolatry the safe course is to abstain from attendance at idol-feasts. These he contrasts with the Christian sacred meals, and appeals in support of his conclusion to the spiritual wisdom of the Corinthians. In it the blessing of the cup (the phrase itself may derive from the Passover ritual in which the third cup was known as the cup of blessing) and the breaking of the bread meant fellowship in the blood and the body of Christ. The idea, or, rather, complex of ideas, present in the word *koinonia* dominates this section. St. Paul does not say that the cup is the blood of Christ or the bread His body, but still less does he move within the field of merely representative or didactic symbolism. As Bousset says, the idea of the bread and cup as symbols is 'artificial and remote.' But a fuller discussion of what is implied by St. Paul's language must wait till after 11 23-34. The

social significance of the Eucharist is emphasized in [17]. If RV translation **seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body, for we all partake of the one bread,** be adopted, the verse explains the fact of 'communion' emphasized in [16]; the communion is witnessed to by the fact that the many Christians form one loaf, one body, and that unity is seen in the participation in the one loaf. But the connexions of the thought are not free from difficulties, and some commentators favour RVm **seeing that there is one bread, we, who are many, are one body.** On this translation, [17] introduces a further thought and is not directly connected with [16]. The end of [17] helps this way of taking the verse, which, however, is not easy in the Greek. St. Paul goes on to show that participation in a sacrificial feast cannot be regarded as religiously indifferent. In the historic sacrifices of Israel those who partook of the offering entered into fellowship with the altar on which the offering was laid, and so, by implication, with God. He now expounds the significance of idol-feasts. He quite agrees that the idol in itself has no proper reality; but, with a reference to Dt 32 [17], he points to the demons behind the sacrifices and the idols. Participation in idol-feasts means fellowship with them. That is what he desires the Corinthians to avoid; moreover, they must realize that there is an absolute incompatibility between taking part in feasts in which demons are present, and sharing in the Lord's Supper. If they sit at the table which belongs to the Lord, perhaps with the notion of Him as the president or host, they must keep away from the table which belongs to the demons. The contrary action means a provocation of the Lord; surely they do not think that they are strong enough to bear the consequences.

23-24. St. Paul returns to the argument of 8 [7-13]. A Christian must not press his own liberty to the hurt of others. The truth of the unity of the Christian fellowship as stated in 10 [17] gives point to the command to seek one's neighbour's good.

25-30. A further question now appears. What was the right attitude of the Christian to meat exposed for sale, or put before him when he went to a meal with an unbeliever? Such meat might have been used in connexion with heathen sacrifice. As to purchase in the 'public market, St. Paul says 'eat such freely and do not let your conscience stir you up to ask scrupulous questions.' [26] is an implicit condemnation of every kind of Manichæan dualism. The problem at the dinner-table might be more difficult. The Christian who cared to accept an invitation (**if ye are disposed to go** throws the responsibility on the man invited, but is hardly a dissuasion from accepting) should eat freely unless someone should call attention to the fact that the meat had been used in sacrifices. The informant is regarded by most commentators as another Christian guest, in that case a 'weaker brother,' and this agrees best with **for his sake that shewed it.** In such a case, says St. Paul, **eat not.** The latter part of [29] and [30] present difficulties owing to the condensed form of expression. Probably the two questions represent St. Paul's claim, or that of a hypothetical strong Christian (so Parry) to his own rights, even while he makes his concession. Another man has no authority to judge his conscience, and he ought not to be regarded as a wrongdoer when he eats that for which he has thanked God. In [30] **by grace** is more naturally referred to the Christian's dependence upon God than to an introductory prayer over the food (Moffatt 'after saying a blessing over it').

X. 31-XI. 1. In all things the glory of God and the good of man is to be sought. The scruples of Jews and Greeks must be charitably considered. With them St. Paul couples **the church of God,** clearly the whole society of Christians. In his closing appeal St. Paul points the Corinthians through himself to the example of Christ in the self-sacrifice either of His earthly life or of the Incarnation itself.

XI. 2-16. On the Veiling of Women in Public Worship.—St. Paul begins by praising the Corinthians for keeping him in remembrance and holding fast the traditions he had delivered to them. These **traditions** will be those of the Christian Churches as a whole. He then goes on to explain why women should veil themselves in the Church assemblies. This is associated first ([3]) with the principle of subordination which works in an ascending scale from women to man, from man to Christ, from Christ to God. [4] and [5], following [3], involve this difficulty that in them the word **head** refers to the man's or woman's own head, which he or she dishonours by appearing veiled or unveiled, while the metaphorical sense of the word in [3] vanishes, though [3] seems to be the introduction to [4] and [5]. How the veiled man dishonours his head is not clear, unless [4] is taken closely with [3], and the suggestion is that the veil would

imply a subordination to some mere earthly authority. A woman who discards the veil might as well cut her hair off. If she will not do what is admittedly a disgraceful thing to do, associated only with women of indifferent character, she ought to wear a veil. St. Paul supports his demand by an allusion to Genesis. Man was made in the image of God; in him the supreme transcendence (Moffatt 'supremacy') of God has its reflexion; veiling, therefore, would be out of place as simply a mark of subordination. The woman, on the other hand, is in an inferior position since she reflects the glory of the man. Priority in creation distinguishes the man, while the woman, taken out of the man, was created for his sake, not he for hers. The next verse is one of the most disputed as to its meaning of any that St. Paul has written. The word in the Greek translated **a sign of authority** signifies properly simply 'authority.' To suppose that the reference is to the veil as a sign of man's authority is unjustified by the Greek, while the view of Bousset and others that St. Paul, with Gen 6 as proof, alludes to the temptation which the sight of unveiled women might occasion to the angels, is not probable enough in itself to weigh against the obscurity, on this hypothesis, of the Apostle's language. Parry's interpretation is best: he takes 'authority' as meaning 'authority.' The woman exercises authority over her head by veiling it; thereby she does, inferentially, acknowledge her husband's authority (in [9] there is a transition of thought from 'man' to 'husband'): and this does not pass unnoticed by the angels, regarded as present in Christian worship and interested in the due order of earthly relations. St. Paul now proceeds to lessen the apparent implications of what he has said. Though woman is subordinate, man needs her, as she needs man, in the sphere of their relationship **in the Lord.** If she was created out of man, he is now born through her, and they both, like all things, belong to God's creation. St. Paul then closes his discussion of the subject with an appeal first to the teaching of **nature,** which shows that long hair is as fitting in a woman, as unfitting in a man, and so suggests the appropriateness of a veil, and then to the authority resident in the Apostle and in the Christian Churches. Neither he nor they have any other custom. In face of that no one ought to be obstinate in raising contentious points.

17-34. On Disorders in Connexion with the Lord's Supper.—This passage, besides the importance which it possesses in connexion with St. Paul's eucharistic theology, throws light on the associations of the Lord's Supper in the primitive Gentile communities; for though Corinth may have exhibited particular features, we must suppose that a common standard prevailed in these communities. The situation as implied by this passage, and its relation to later development, is thus summed up by Dr. Srawley (*The Early History of the Liturgy*, 16): 'The whole meal in St. Paul's thought has the character of a sacred meal. It is a "supper of the Lord." It was only when the social side of the meal came to be distinguished from the more solemn liturgical acts connected with it, that the Agape was conceived of as separate from the Eucharist, and came to be finally dissociated from it.'

St. Paul begins by declaring that he has now, in a new subject, to blame the Church, because its assemblies so far from benefiting the Church had the reverse effect. He had heard, possibly from Chloe's people, that in the Church-meetings divisions had revealed themselves; even if there were exaggeration he did not doubt that the story contained truth. Parties had the value of showing who were the real Christians. So St. Paul can speak of them as necessary, and there is no reason, with Bousset, to conceive of an ironical repetition of the defence offered by the Church. Now he turns to the actual offence. The way the members of the Church behaved made a **Lord's supper** impossible. At the meal each consumed what he had brought with him, and did not share it with others. The result was that some poor man had to go hungry, while, conversely, there were cases of intoxication. Indignantly, St. Paul asks whether if it is just an affair of eating and drinking there are not private houses available, or whether they really have that contempt for the Church and indifference to the feelings of the poor which their conduct implies. Praise of the Church in respect of such conduct was impossible. He now reminds the Church of the true character of the Supper. What he had received from the Lord he had handed on to them. The Lord was the final source; it is unnecessary to suppose a special revelation. The account of the actions and words of the Lord Jesus at the Last Supper is the earliest written record we possess. We may note the following points which emerge from St. Paul's statement: (1) The significance of what was done at the Last

Supper took its place at an early date (Acts suggests from the first) among the traditions of the Church, and a short formal narrative embodying what was essential came into existence. (2) St. Paul's narrative implies that the command to repeat came to him as part of what he was told. (3) The whole scene is steeped in the thought of an approaching sacrifice, which by the language of anticipation is regarded as actually taking place. The symbolism employed in connexion with the bread, and, by inference, with the cup, accords with the language. At the same time, the natural sense of the words in [24] in the command to repeat is against the view that in them there is an injunction to offer a memorial sacrifice to God. The notes in Gore's *The Body of Christ* may be consulted in this connexion. The idea of Eucharistic sacrifice was not built up round a sacrificial construction of the words *poieite* and *anamnesin*. (4) There is no reason to assume any influence from the side of Mystery-Religions. One may go further and say that as St. Paul's own comments follow closely upon the words used by the Lord, the idea that St. Paul brought Mystery-Religion conceptions to the interpretation of the meaning of the Supper starts with a legitimate *præjudicium* against it. In [25], where there is a reference to the covenant of Ex 24 [8] and the new covenant promised in Jer 31 [31], the definite connexion with Old Testament conceptions is clear. The Marcan form 'this is my blood of the covenant' may represent the Lord's words more exactly. As to the interpretation of the words in the form in which St. Paul gives them, it is most natural to take **in my blood** with **the new covenant**. St. Paul now goes on to emphasize the close connexion between the Eucharist and the Cross, and the consequences which flow from that. The Eucharist is, in the words of the Catechism, 'a perpetual memory of the sacrifice of the death of Christ.' It is itself a proclamation of the Gospel, the reference being not to any particular words, but to the whole solemn action; and it looks forward to the time when the Lord shall come again. Because the meaning of the Supper is such as is implied in the words of the Lord Jesus and in the Apostle's interpretation, 'unworthy' reception—he thinks of the careless, self-pleasing attitude of the Corinthians—means guiltiness, liability to punishment, because it is sin in reference to the Lord's body and blood. To avoid this, a man should examine himself to see if his attitude towards the Supper justifies his coming to it. For it is not a common meal; it is one in which the Lord's body is present to be discerned, that is distinguished from ordinary food. If he does not so distinguish, then his eating and drinking involves the calling down of judgement upon himself. That in [29] **the body** has any reference to the Church is very improbable in view of the context. St. Paul now points out that judgement has taken effect in sickness and some deaths at Corinth. This could be avoided by the use of self-examination—the verb in the Greek is the same as that used as to discerning the body. At the same time, the judgements are disciplinary rather than, or as well as, penal. We may compare 5 [5]. They make for salvation not for that condemnation to which the world, as alien from the Gospel, must at last be subjected. Finally, St. Paul enjoins that the members of the Church shall make the meal a common meal by waiting till all are assembled, and that hunger should be satisfied at home. All other points which need regulation he will see to on his next visit.

Two great questions arise concerning the Eucharistic teaching of St. Paul—How are we to explain its origin? and What does it mean? With the first question we enter the field of enquiry as to the relation between his sacramental teaching, though not that alone, and conceptions current in the Mystery-Religions. The progress of careful investigation does not tend to support views which imply real dependence of St. Paul upon Mystery-Religion conceptions. As to the improbability that St. Paul was responsible for what would amount to a serious pagan infection of Christianity, reference may be made to N. P. Williams's contribution to *Essays Catholic and Critical*. One may put the matter like this: if, in connexion with St. Paul's teaching and, more especially, his sacramental and eucharistic conceptions, there were no possibility of explaining his thought by reference to his Jewish antecedents and his own religious experience, the case for a real influence upon him of Mystery-Religion ideas would be strengthened in advance; but if these two factors together are adequate for the explanation of the substance of what he says, the hypothesis of a real debt by St. Paul to ideas current in the Mysteries starts with nothing in its favour. The Mystery-Religions and the Christian Religion were in various respects undoubtedly very different, and St. Paul had not advanced so far as to be able to adopt the point of view that differences in religions

represent only minor variations on a common theme. As to his eucharistic teaching we must be on our guard against reading back into St. Paul our modern controversies and distinctions. For instance, H. T. Andrews's suggestion, in his valuable chapter in Forsyth's *The Church and the Sacraments*, that it is doubtful if any theory short of consubstantiation adequately explains St. Paul's language, is misleading if it conveys the notion that the sort of problem which the Lutheran doctrine was intended as a solution to meet was present in St. Paul's mind. St. Paul does not express himself in quite the sort of way that a modern theologian, whatever view he might hold, would do. But to this one must add that the modernizing of the Pauline doctrine in terms of a symbolic (in the modern sense), simply memorialistic, or receptionistic interpretation of it, is to go to the farthest remove from what St. Paul says or means. W. Morgan, who attributes to the Apostle a memorialistic view and denies that he thought of the Supper as a means of union with Christ, is only able to defend these positions by the argument that in 10, as contrasted with 11, St. Paul is working less with his own categories than with those of his readers, in itself a very surprising notion, when one notes how St. Paul puts the questions of 10^{16}. Nor, with regard to 11, do the words in ^{29} 'most naturally mean' that the recipient fails to recognize in the Supper a memorial of Christ's sacrificial death. H. A. A. Kennedy interprets 10^{14-21} as meaning communion with the Lord as crucified, and all that that involves, and denies that there is any realistic idea in 11^{23-30}. But both in 10 and 11 the participation is of the bread and the cup, that is, by direct statement in 10, by implication in 11, of the body and blood of the Lord. Such language as Bousset and Weiss use as to St. Paul's belief in the presence of the body and blood of Christ, or of Christ, in the elements suggests a greater precision of thought than St. Paul's own language demands. But the language he does use and the comparisons he makes with Israel in the wilderness and with the heathens in their feasts point away from symbolic and merely memorialistic views. The Eucharist was for St. Paul a Sacrament in the sense of a *visibile verbum*, but it was also a Sacrament in the sense of an *opus operatum*: so we may say of it, what it signified it was. And in St. Paul, as in our Lord's own words, we find that emphasis upon the connexion between the Eucharist and the Cross which has been at the centre of the liturgical tradition of the Church, and has such deep expression given to it in the Church's theology.

XII.-XIV. **On Spiritual Gifts.**—In what way and to what extent the question of spiritual gifts found a place in the Corinthian letter we do not know. But if we compare 12^{1} with its quasi-formula **now concerning** with 7^{1} and 8^{1} we shall think it most probable that the letter did give the Apostle an opportunity to speak at length on a subject which was of great practical importance in connexion with the life and worship of the Corinthian Church. There were remarkable manifestations of spiritual power in the Church. Its 'richness' in this respect St. Paul had recognized in his original thanksgiving (1^{4-7}). But the situation was not free from dangers, and the elimination of these gives the purpose and forms the substance of St. Paul's instructions. As in his handling of marriage-questions, so in this later section, the balance, judgement, and spiritual tact of the Apostle are most noteworthy. His instruction is given in the spirit of a true father of the community.

XII. 1-30. **Spiritual Gifts and the Unity of the Body**

1-3. While it is most natural to take **spiritual gifts** as an inclusive expression, the context makes it possible to limit the word with Zahn and Weiss, to the gift of tongues. Weiss takes the adjective as masculine. In ^{2} the implication is that on certain occasions of an ecstatic character the Corinthians, while still pagans, were subjected to the control of demonic powers which led them astray to the worship of idols. The idols then will be called dumb in half-ironical contrast with the ecstatic utterances of the worshippers. Building on this experience St. Paul goes on to show how it is possible to distinguish between the spirits (cf. 1 Jn 4^{1} ff.). If anyone calls out **accursed be Jesus**, he is not speaking in the power of God's Spirit. On the other hand, it is a proof of the possession of **Holy Spirit** to be able to make the confession **Jesus is Lord** (cf. Rom 10^{9}). The main thought seems to be of ecstatic utterance which gives the opportunity of supplying tests, so that, as Bousset says, 'everything must come out which is within the man.' But it is difficult to conceive of a professing Christian, even in ecstasy, uttering such an anathema, and Massie's idea of an unbeliever present at Christian worship is not impossible: or the statement may be quite general.

4-11. St. Paul now points out that differences in the gifts do not imply more than one Spirit, any more than differences in the services which Christians render imply that they are rendered to more Lords than one, or the variety of the effects of Christian activity more than one God as their real cause. **in all** is best taken as meaning 'in all things.' These verses, with which 2 Cor 13 [14] may be compared, give us a definite if unformulated expression of Trinitarian doctrine. God, Christ, and the Spirit appear over against men and the world. The variety of the Spirit's gifts is now shown in detail. Each Christian manifests the presence of the Spirit in a particular way for the benefit of the Church. This is the probable meaning of [7], but **of the Spirit** may be a subjective genitive, 'caused by the Spirit,' which gains support from the verses that follow, while **to profit withal** may refer to the individual's own advantage. With the list that follows may be compared 12 [28]. On the whole it is best to see in **knowledge** the conception of a more wholly intellectualistic, or mystical, apprehension of truth, and to associate with **wisdom** the idea of practical judgement. **faith** is more than belief in the Gospel. It is, perhaps, best explained by 13 [2]. The **workings of miracles**, literally 'the effects of (divine) powers' relate to events other than cures. Weiss may be right in thinking of exorcisms, but it is improbable that one particular class of 'miracles' is exclusively meant. That **discernings of spirits** appears as a special gift shows that it was not always as easy as in the case described in [3] to be certain of the value and authority of a spiritual utterance.

12-30. What St. Paul has said concerning diversity is now shown to be consistent not only with the unity of the Spirit, but with the unity of the body, the Church. At the end of [12], where we should have expected 'so also is the Church,' St. Paul writes **so also is Christ**, thus introducing the mystical thought of the corporate personality of the Church, which is Christ. This identification of Christ with the body, the Church, is carried on in [13], where we have something like the reverse of [12]: **we were baptized**, St. Paul might have said 'into Christ' (cf. Gal 3 [28]); he does say 'into one body.' And now comes the close association of the body, the Spirit, and the water of baptism. The preposition **in** has the significance partly of instrumentality, partly of local element. **made to drink of one Spirit** indicates the effects of baptism, and the language of [13], especially of the last words, points to the notion of the communication of the Spirit through baptism, though Goudge would see a reference to the laying on of hands. But the present writer agrees with Weiss in seeing in 'were made to drink' an allusion to, or a picture drawn from, the water surrounding the person who is being baptized. In the verses which follow down to [27], St. Paul is concerned to show two things, first, that since the body is **not one member, but many**, every member of the body has a necessary function to fulfil. A member of the Church, conscious of his lack of some unmistakable spiritual gift, and so inclined to infer that he was in no real sense a member of the Church, might reassure himself from the analogy of the physical body. At the same time, those endowed with more striking talents should see the absurdity of ignoring the contributions made by their less gifted Christian brethren. This leads on to the second point which St. Paul wishes to make, the necessity that the Church should have a place for those members who seemed lacking in spiritual power, and treat them with special respect. Again, he finds support in his analogy of the human body. A weak member is not, therefore, an unnecessary member; and such parts as lack natural dignity and seemliness have their needs supplied—St. Paul means by clothing. So God has moulded the body together; the lack which any member feels He supplies through the **more abundant honour** which comes to it as a result of the care bestowed upon its proper clothing. This seems to be the best meaning, and to allude to 'the instincts of decency and self-respect . . . implanted by God' (Parry). Thus the body is a unity, there is no schism, all the members share in the suffering or the honour which comes to any one member. And all this can be applied to Christ's body, the Church. As St. Paul is thinking particularly of the Church at Corinth he can say, without risk of misunderstanding, **ye are the body of Christ.** Of that body the individual Corinthians are **severally members.** St. Paul now applies the conception of the members of the body and their various usages to different classes of persons exercising different functions in the Church, and by the Church here he definitely means the Church Catholic and not the local Church. We may compare Eph 4 [11]. In the case of each **class named** St. Paul

implies the presence of a distinct *charisma*, which by no means implies the existence of a 'charismatic ministry' in contrast with some other kind of ministry. The mention of helps and governments is specially interesting, as whatever may be implied by the word, it is natural to think of persons engaged in conducting the affairs and seeing to the needs of local churches. We must not deny to the power to administer Church finance a place among spiritual gifts.

XII. 31-XIII. 13. **The Supreme Value of Love.**—With the exception of the end of Rom 8, this is the most beautiful and moving passage in St. Paul's letters. Its beauty is the more remarkable since the chapter is not just a panegyric, in the abstract, on the supremacy of love. As Stanley well says in his valuable note on 'The Apostolical Doctrine of Love,' 'every word of the description tells with double force, because it is aimed against a real enemy.' It is entirely apposite to the situation at Corinth. In the same note Stanley brings out the significance of the New Testament conception and use of *agape* as the 'crown and completion' of ideas of love to be found in earlier Hebrew and Greek thought.

XII. 31-XIII. 4. St. Paul begins by promising to show to those who are recommended to set their hearts on the greatest of the gifts a way of still more surpassing excellence, of which he goes on immediately to speak. In [1] **tongues** comes very near to the meaning of 'languages,' while the addition of **and angels** suggests a heavenly speech which transcends all earthly language (cf. 2 Cor 12 [4]), but the idea of ecstatic speech must be included. The comparison with **sounding brass** and **clanging cymbal** suggests ostentatious but spiritually empty utterance. The gift of prophecy which, as 14 makes clear, St. Paul valued so highly, with which he here associates that knowledge of spiritual mysteries which he had spoken of earlier (2) as the mark of Christian maturity, leaves its possessor nothing worth unless he has love. For what he says of faith cf. Mt 17 [20], which probably stood in Q. We cannot, however, be certain that St. Paul has this word of the Lord in mind. And there is a very remarkable difference. St. Paul thinks of an act of faith of pre-eminent quality; our Lord says all that is needed to cause the removal of the mountain is faith 'as a grain of mustard-seed.' Unsparing philanthropy, heroic self-devotion, bring no profit apart from love. The true reading at the end of [3] is uncertain. MSS. authority favours 'that I may boast,' but the mention of 'boasting' as implying an unworthy intention or result imparts what seems to be an alien thought into the passage. Deissmann refers to the space accorded to martyrdom by fire in 4 Maccabees.

XIII. 4-7. St. Paul now turns to the positive excellencies of love. It is free from envy, does not give itself airs, is not full of a sense of its own importance, does not behave in any unseemly way, does not make its own interests its concern, is not provoked to hostility by the conduct of others, does not reckon up the evil done to it as an account to be paid off, feels no pleasure when it views wrongdoing, but finds its joy in association with the truth. The paragraph ends with the celebration of love's universal forbearance, faith, hope, and endurance. The mention of forbearance (lit. 'endures' or 'hides') may refer to love's readiness to keep itself in the background; in what he says of faith and hope St. Paul means that the fullness of faith and hope is within the power of love; faith is not presented as credulity, nor hope as irrational optimism.

8-13. Love is imperishable. It seems unnatural to confine **never faileth**, as Bousset does, to this life; the spiritual gifts which St. Paul goes on to mention might continue throughout this life; but they pass away or are transcended in the life beyond. How true this is of knowledge St. Paul shows by two comparisons; the knowledge which he had as a child no longer answered to his needs when he came to man's estate; so it was **put away**; and his present knowledge is as though he were seeing things reflected in a mirror with uncertainty as to the significance of what he saw; in the future state there will be direct vision. We may note how here, as in 8 [3] and Gal 4 [9], the foundation religious fact is the knowledge which God has of man. In [13] **now** is logical rather than temporal, but in what sense St. Paul conceives of faith and hope as abiding in the future life cannot be determined. There is an attraction in Weiss's view that faith and hope formed with love a well-known triad, and so come to be mentioned here. Each has an abiding quality, but among the three there is a distinction: love is greatest.

XIV. St. Paul now returns to a consideration of the spiritual gifts possessed by certain members of the Church, and gives careful instructions as to the exercise of the gift of Tongues. From this chapter

it is quite plain that the gift of tongues or of a tongue meant the facility for ecstatic utterance, which, in itself, conveyed no intelligible message to those who listened. That the speaker himself understood to some extent the significance of his speech is implied by 14 [2, 4, 5]; at the same time, he was not necessarily able to expound that meaning, 14 [13 f., 27 f.]. With regard to the Glossolalia, the narrative of the Day of Pentecost in Acts, and the reference there to Joel's prophecy, attach the phenomenon in its beginnings to Jewish piety. Bousset and Weiss connect it with Hellenistic religion. But how far it was common in the Gentile Christian churches we do not know. Ecstatic utterance at times of religious revival is a persistent phenomenon, and has had a place in Irvingism and occurred in the Welsh Revival of 1904-1906.

1-19. The last chapter echoes in the command to **follow after love.** Spiritual gifts can only be desired, and of them prophecy is the most desirable. The restricted value of tongues arises from their character as utterances from which the community can gain no such profit as is immediately available in prophecy. The speaker addresses himself exclusively to God and the meaning of his words is hidden from men. By **mysteries,** secrets of the divine purpose are signified. It is the whole phrase which suggests that the speaker alone understands the meaning of the utterance: if the speaker did not understand, it is difficult to see how he could edify even himself. To edify oneself is a good thing, but to edify the Church is better; so St. Paul would desire that they should all have the one gift, but still more the other, though if the speaker with tongues has the gift of interpretation he is on a level with the prophet. He puts the matter personally; his gift of tongues could be of no help to the Corinthians unless the utterances contained some definite piece of intelligible revelation or religious knowledge or prophecy or teaching. St. Paul now shows by analogy that there can be no value to the Church in an uninterpreted tongue. If musical instruments are to mean anything they must observe distinctions. Again, the trumpet for battle is useless, unless the meaning of the blast is immediately clear. In [9] we have the application to speaking with tongues; when that lacks clear significance the speaker is talking **into the air**—St. Paul passes over what he has said in [2] of speech **to God.** Similarly in respect of all the many **voices** (here practically equivalent to 'languages') in the world; if the language is not understood, a gulf separates speaker from listener. The use of the term **barbarian** gives point to what he says, as he is writing to a Greek community. All this shows that in their desire for spiritual gifts they should keep the good of the Church before them. In [13] the natural sense is that the speaker with tongues should pray to be given the power of interpretation. In [14] the thought is of the content of the tongue-speech being a prayer. The difficulty is lessened if we explain [13] as meaning that while he is in a state of ecstasy the person in question should pray to be given the power of interpretation. The distinction between **spirit** and **mind** is to be noted. 'Spirit' suggests the element in man akin to the divine Spirit, 'mind' the rational faculty in itself. Prayer in a tongue does not, apart from interpretation, bring profit to the latter. So St. Paul's purpose and ideal is to pray and offer praise with 'spirit' and 'understanding' in harmony. The mind must do its work, expressing the utterance of the spirit in rational conceptions for the benefit of those present who would desire, when praise or thanksgiving was offered, to reply with an Amen, but would not be able to do so if they did not understand what was being said. As to the phrase **the place of the unlearned** it is best, with Weiss and Parry, to take the word *idiotes* as referring to one who was on his way to becoming a member of the Church, parallel to a catechumen of later date, one not yet baptized and possessing the Spirit. This view agrees well with the use of the word in [23]. We may then take **place** literally; such persons occupied a definite place at meetings of the Church. The paragraph ends with words which show us St. Paul summing the whole question up from the standpoint of the pastor and teacher of a congregation.

20-25. St. Paul now shows the superiority of the gift of prophecy. He begins by telling them that where intellectual judgements are concerned they must not remain in a state of childhood—he implies by valuing gifts according to their character of marvel—though as to moral evil the less experience they have of it the better. Then, by a reference to Is 28 [11], where Isaiah warns the drunken scoffers that as they will not listen to God speaking to them through His prophet, He will speak to them by invaders (the Assyrians whose speech they will not understand), St. Paul declares that the significance of **tongues** is for unbelievers.

The words 'they will not hear' are taken out of their context. According to Origen, the passage, as St. Paul quotes it, stood in Aquila's translation. As to the sign, Swete's explanation (*The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*), 'tongues . . . were in heathen lands a warning to non-Christians that the Church possessed an unexplained power which might be divine,' makes excellent sense in itself. The difficulty in regard to it comes in [23] f., where 'tongues' are said to have no edifying effect upon unbelievers or 'catechumens,' whereas prophecy, which in [22] is brought into relation with believers only, is shown to have a great power in leading those others to worship God. The fact is that the use St. Paul makes of the quotation from Isaiah does not accord with the actual experience of the diverse effects of the two gifts of 'tongues' and of 'prophecy.'

26-34. A Church-meeting is now pictured. The members assemble each with a contribution to make—a hymn of praise, some instruction to give or revelation to declare, a tongue-utterance or power of interpretation. The edification of the Church must determine the character of the meeting. Of those who spoke with tongues only two or at the most three should speak at one meeting, and they in turn. Also, an interpreter was necessary; if none was present (St. Paul is not referring to the possibility of the speaker being also an interpreter), the would-be speaker must be content with silent self-edification and praise or prayer. Not more than two or three prophets should speak, and the value of their words was for the rest of those present to determine. A speaker must give way if some seated brother felt moved to communicate a revelation which he had just received; such provision for individual prophesyings was in the interests of the Church as a whole. That such self-control was possible was due to the fact that the prophet was not in subjection to the spiritual power within him; were that the case no safeguard against disorder would be possible, and God, whose gift the prophetic power is, would be the author of confusion, instead of peace. St. Paul is far removed from ethnic ideas of inspiration. If the words **as in all the churches of the saints** go with what precedes and not with the following injunctions as to women, they may signify that in all churches God is a God of peace, or that the results of orderly prophesying will be found in Corinth as in other churches.

34-36. A particular injunction is given. In the Church-assemblies women must be silent. It was not for them to take the lead. The Law (Gen 3 [16]) asserted the principle of their subjection. At home they could refer questions to their husbands, and so not offend against the canons of good behaviour. If the Corinthians were inclined to dissent they must remember that they were neither the original nor the only Christian Church. Though the proper place of [34-35] is not quite certain, since some MSS. put them after [40], their removal from the chapter by Bousset and Weiss is not justified. In 11 [1-16] St. Paul is deciding another question; what is really the major question he defers till he discusses the whole matter of Church-meetings.

37-40. St. Paul now claims the Lord's authority for the orders he has given; he refers, as in 2 Cor 13 [3], to Christ as speaking through him. And he expects anyone who thinks himself to be a prophet or a possessor of spiritual gifts to recognize the truth of this claim. A person taking no account of this is himself not accounted of. This is as well vouched for by MS. evidence as the subjunctive **let him be ignorant**, and has more point. 'He is not known by God' is the most natural meaning. The concluding words sum up the teaching of the chapter.

XV. **The Question of the Resurrection.**—St. Paul had come to know, probably not through the Church-letter, that by some members of the Corinthian Church man's resurrection was being denied. This must not be taken to imply a total denial of an existence after death. That they denied the whole idea of an existence after death is very improbable; the latter stage of the argument from 15 [33] seems to imply that it was the notion of a bodily resurrection which was proving a difficulty, and that because of a materialistic conception of the future state which was supposed to be involved in it. As against this St. Paul shows that the body of this earthly life is not to be thought of as, in an unchanged condition, the body of the resurrection-life, but that in an altered form it will be fitted for the new state into which it will enter. We may recall the way in which our Lord showed that the absolute denial of immortality by the Sadducees—though in their case too the question is raised in connexion with the idea of resurrection—was invalidated by the supposition that the conditions of the future age must precisely resemble those of this world's life. Apparently, the Corinthian disbelievers in man's resurrection did not

deny the resurrection of Christ; only, they had failed to face its implications. The question of the relation of St. Paul's belief in the resurrection-body as expressed here to what he says in 2 Cor 5 may wait till we come to that passage. As to the teaching on the resurrection of the body which has been given in the Christian Church, both in its unity and in its variety, reference may be made to Dr. Darragh's book, *The Resurrection of the Flesh*. He claims, with regard to the ascription to 'the general current of Christian teaching about the resurrection' of 'a gross and "materialistic" tendency,' that 'the evidence shows this too common assertion to be, if not totally unfounded, at least grossly exaggerated.' Cf. also W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, *The Resurrection and Modern Thought*. A very clear and useful interpretation of St. Paul's conception of the spiritual body is to be found in a small, posthumous work of Dr. Swete's, *The Life of the World to Come*.

1-11. The Tradition of the Resurrection of Christ a Fundamental Element in the Gospel.—St. Paul begins by pointing out that the Gospel as he is now going to put it before them is neither something new nor something of small importance. He had preached it to them, they had accepted it, they were standing firm in it, and it was the means of their salvation. The next words are best taken closely with **by which also ye are saved**, and rendered 'under the conditions of that record of the Gospel which I gave to you.' **if ye hold it fast** is a parenthesis, and the further condition points back to the beginnings of the Corinthians' belief. The Apostle hopes that theirs had been no random, purposeless faith. At the first he had handed on to them the tradition he had received—Christ's death for sin according to the Scriptures (Is 53, cf. Ac 8 [32-35]), His burial, and His being raised up on the third day according to the Scriptures. The mention of burial and resurrection close together implies belief in the empty tomb. The second reference to the Scriptures may, as Weiss is inclined to think, apply only to the resurrection. In that case, Ps 16 [10] is a relevant passage. If **on the third day** is included, St. Paul must be thinking of Hos 6 [2].* Cyprian refers to this text in his 'Testimonies' *ad Quirinum*. As to the appearances of the risen Christ here given, we cannot identify them all from the Gospel records. An appearance to Peter is found in Lk 24 [34]; the one to the Twelve (i.e. Eleven) may naturally be identified with that of Lk 24 [36] ff. As to the **above five hundred brethren at once**, Mt 28 [16] is the nearest parallel. Of an appearance to James there is a beautiful story in the Gospel according to the Hebrews; cf. Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, 2. The appearance to **all the apostles** cannot be identified. If the phrase means the Eleven, we might refer to Jn 20 [26-29], in which case 'the Twelve' of [5] may be reduced to 'the Ten,' with Thomas omitted, as in Jn 20 [19-24]. Or 'all the apostles' may, as Parry argues, imply others besides the original apostles. Mt 28 [16] is not an impossible reference in this connexion. Finally, there was the appearance to St. Paul himself: the word 'abortion' is probably a word of his own, not of his enemies' choice. 'The suggestion here is of the strangeness of the birth, the imperfect development, and of the child being the last born' (Parry). The verses which follow bear striking witness to St. Paul's humility: his labours were due not to himself but to the grace of God, and any distinctions between the labours of himself and the others left their agreement in the Gospel which they preached unaffected; and what they had preached the Corinthians, to whom St. Paul had proclaimed this common Gospel, had believed. We may further note, first, that it is not certain that the tradition stops with the end of [5], despite the change in construction; secondly, that St. Paul's silence as to any appearances to women does not justify the rejection of what the Gospels tell us of the part played by the women on Easter-day. The evidence for that is very strong, and reads convincingly. St. Paul had probably not been told of appearances to women, which may have been regarded as of less importance than appearances to Peter, James, and the Apostles. And, thirdly, nothing can be made of the word **appeared** as an argument against Christ's bodily resurrection. Weiss, who holds that it was St. Paul's belief that Christ 'with an already glorified body' had left the grave, well says 'that "appeared" with him does not signify a subjective "vision" in the modern psychological sense, but a real seeing of the glorified One, is obvious in itself, even if at the same time this seeing can always occur only "in spirit," as in the case of all heavenly sights.'*

12-19. The Inconsistency of Disbelief in the Resurrection of Man with Belief in the Resurrection of Christ.—It is irrational,

* But see note on Mt 16 [21]; and *The New Testament and the Catholic Creeds*, p. 381.

* Cf. footnote on Ac 9.

St. Paul argues, to deny the possibility of the resurrection of men and yet to maintain the fact of the resurrection of Christ. The latter seems not to have been denied at Corinth, and St. Paul shows how its denial would mean the overthrow of the Gospel. In such a case preaching and faith alike would be void of reality. Moreover, the apostles would have spoken falsely of God—the forensic picture adds to the effect—since, if the dead never rise, God had not, as the apostles asserted, raised up Christ. The faith of Christians would then be useless, and Christians still in their sins, since to His death no saving significance could then be attached. Further, those who had already fallen asleep (cf. 1 Th 4 [13]—the typical Christian word with its atmosphere of peace and hope) in Christ would have perished. The Corinthians might not have accepted this conclusion: it was still open to them to assert immortality: but the Christian Gospel for man was bound up with a Christ who had died for man's sins and risen again. In [19] **only** covers the whole sentence which means 'if we are persons who in this life have set our hopes on Christ, and for whom there is no fruition of our hopes'; in that case, because our hope has neither basis nor fruition, we should be of all men the most to be pitied.

20-28. The Resurrection of Christ and the Events of the Last Times.—Triumphantly the Apostle turns from suppositions to facts. Christ is risen and His resurrection is the beginning of the harvesting of those that have fallen asleep. Death came through man, and all men die in Adam; resurrection comes through man, and all will be made alive in Christ. There is a lengthier comparison between Christ and Adam in Rom 5 [12-21]. We cannot exclude here the thought of Adam's sin, but Adam may be conceived of as in himself 'a weak and earthly creature' (G. B. Stevens). The idea of representation approaches the idea of mystical inclusion. In [22] St. Paul does not assert universal salvation, but the dependence of life upon a relation to Christ. He now pictures the coming of the end. Each has his appointed place: the phrase is a difficult one; the word translated **order** has a military significance equivalent to 'division'; but the only definite distinction made is between **Christ the first-fruits** and **they that are Christ's.** That **the end** in [24] means 'the rest,' and so another class, is improbable. The Kingdom, and the destruction of opposing powers, demonic or human, in [24] and [25] can be quite naturally assigned to the present activity of the risen Christ. The final enemy to be abolished is death, whereby the universal subjection spoken of in Ps 8 is accomplished. One exception there must be, for from the things subjected God, the Speaker, is obviously excluded. That God is the subject of **says** is the most natural view. But Findlay, with whom Parry agrees, takes the subject to be Christ, who gives the verdict 'upon His finished work.' This is, as Parry says, a 'dramatic conception,' but it is too dramatic, Miltonic rather than Pauline. The final stage before the consummation is that of the subjection of the Son **to him that did subject all things unto him.** What the 'subjection' means St. Paul does not say. This is not the only statement of a subordinationistic character in 1 Corinthians (cf. 11 [3]), and such statements represent one side, but not the whole, of St. Paul's thought. The end comes and God is **all in all,** an expression of unlimited comprehensiveness: it is best to take both adjectives as neuter. St. Paul speaks of an end of all active rebellion against God and of a harmony which means God's closest association with creation. How this can be, apart from a doctrine of universal salvation or, at least, of the complete passing away of all evil, it is not in our power to say, and neither universalism nor conditional immortality is a doctrine which can confidently be ascribed to St. Paul. But that he conceives of a real unity at the end is clearly the effect of this passage.

29-34. The Resurrection and Christian Life.—St. Paul now shows how much is bound up with the fact of, and belief in, the resurrection of the dead. Such a practice as vicarious baptism for the dead would obviously be without value if there were no resurrection. This is certainly a very surprising verse, but its meaning is not disputed by recent commentators. The most that can be done to break its force appears in H. A. A. Kennedy's notion of an *argumentum ad hominem*, and his denial that St. Paul gave the practice his approval. But St. Paul shows no sign of thinking it an illegitimate practice. Andrews, in the chapter he contributes to Forsyth's *Lectures on the Church and the Sacraments*, speaks of thirty-six interpretations, thirty-five of which evade the clear sense, which is that baptism conveyed some spiritual endowment, otherwise unobtainable. St. Paul thinks next of the uselessness of his life of peril if there were no resurrection. Every day he was in danger of death; he swears it by the pride they take in him, which he possesses in

Christ. Again, if, 'humanly speaking' (Moffatt), he had fought with wild beasts at Ephesus, what was to be gained, if there were no hope of resurrection? This can hardly be taken literally, unless, as by Weiss, hypothetically, 'as men intended'; Roman citizens did not fight in the arena. Nor can there be a reference to the riot of Ac 19 [23-40] which resulted in an immediate departure from Ephesus, whereas (16 [8]) St. Paul proposes to stay there some time longer. We must take the words as a very strong metaphor in allusion to the opposition the Apostle had to encounter. **at Ephesus** suggests to Weiss that this chapter does not belong to the letter written from Ephesus; the difficulty of the words in a letter from Ephesus is over-emphasized by him. The quotation from Is 22 [13] in [32] is not to be taken as a considered judgement by St. Paul, but as expressing the futility of life if no hope for the future is possible. The next words, with the quotation from Menander, show the connexion between intellectual error and moral laxity, and so glance back at the Isaianic passage. The command **awake up righteously** refers to the need for moral soundness, which was imperilled among some members of the Church; and the cause was an ignorance of God, as shown by the denial of the resurrection. His words are intended to arouse a sense of shame in the community.

35-58. The Nature of the Resurrection-Body.—A Christian questioner puzzled as to the nature of the resurrection-body, and perhaps, therefore, in danger of denying the resurrection, is referred, with a word of rebuke for his superficiality, to a field of experience in which 'death' involves the reverse of extinction. A seed is sown, bearing no resemblance to the body which will afterwards appear; it is just a grain and no more: and in that original form it has to die before it can be made alive. After death comes the new life active in the body which God, in accordance with His original purpose, now gives the seed. As against Bousset's idea that St. Paul thinks only of a temporal, not of a causal, link between the two bodies, we may note that St. Paul does not speak first of a seed, then of a body, but of a body which is to be, and which God purposes to be, the body for the seed. The description of the body as God's gift is entirely harmonious with the Jewish tendency which St. Paul had inherited to trace everything to a direct act of God. But that does not mean that for St. Paul there is no inner or organic process in the transition from seed to body. So, St. Paul continues, each seed is given its own body. And, further, men, beasts, birds, fishes, all differ in respect of the flesh which they possess, moreover, there are **heavenly bodies** and **earthly bodies**, different in the **glory** which they respectively possess. Are the heavenly bodies those of heavenly beings or (in our modern sense) sun, moon, and stars? Since the word 'glory' seems to bind together [40] and [41] in such a way as to suggest that the glory of the heavenly bodies in [40] is spoken of more precisely in [41]; the second explanation is to be preferred. St. Paul now comes to the application of his original metaphor. There is a sowing in corruption, and in dishonour, and in weakness, a raising in incorruption, in glory and in power; what is sown is a 'natural' body, what is raised is a 'spiritual' body. On the whole, it is best to interpret sowing not of burial, but of the body under the conditions of its first existence in this present life. In [36] the sowing is markedly precedent to death, while in [44] the natural or psychic body suggests a body animated by the principle of a merely natural life; the adjective fits better the state before death. And the end of [44] suggests the natural body of earthly life. St. Paul now extends the contrast he is drawing to the cases of the first and last Adam. The first Adam, as Genesis says (2 [7]), became **a living soul**; that is, the principle of natural life, and nothing more, was in him; the last Adam became—but St. Paul does not repeat the verb—**a life-giving spirit**; so we have the true order, first the natural, then the spiritual, and to this order a diversity of nature corresponds. The first Adam comes from the earth and possesses an **earthy** nature; the second Adam comes from heaven, and, it is implied, is a heavenly or spiritual being; similarly, there are 'earthy' men resembling in their nature the earthy first man; above the level of natural life they never rise; there are others who resemble the heavenly second man; in them as in Him the higher principle of spirit is alive. There is, indeed, no escape from the bearing the image of the first earthy Adam in the form of the natural body, but Christians can look forward (despite inferior textual support the future is to be preferred to the subjunctive) to bearing the image of the last heavenly Adam in the form of a spiritual body. Such is the general sense of the passage. In the forefront of the particular problems it raises stands the question, Does St. Paul here identify the pre-existent Christ with

the heavenly man of the Book of Enoch? For a very recent discussion, in which the relation between St. Paul's doctrine and Jewish speculation is drawn close, Rawlinson's Bampton Lectures, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, may be consulted, while a note hostile to the whole idea of Enochian influence on the New Testament appears in Bp. Gore's *Can We Then Believe?* If in this passage St. Paul has the idea of a primal man in mind, he transforms it by his use of the adjectives **last** and **second**. What, then, is the meaning of **became a life-giving spirit** and **from heaven**? The former can hardly refer to anything but the resurrection and its consequences, but the latter must refer either to the Incarnation or to the parousia: the second interpretation follows naturally on the thought of the resurrection in ^{45}; on the other hand, not till ^{51} is there a definite idea of the parousia, though ^{49} implies it. A further question arises in what St. Paul says of the first Adam. It seems as though his nature in itself, and apart from sin, were regarded as devoid of the spiritual element. The explanation must be, that St. Paul, without regard to an unfallen Adam, is thinking of humanity in its merely natural condition as contrasted with humanity raised to the level of spiritual life as seen first in Christ and then in Christians. And when St. Paul contrasts the **natural** and the **spiritual** bodies, he is thinking of the body which is the organ of the natural life and the body which will be the organ of that life which is altogether spiritual. At the close of his exposition, St. Paul denies in set terms any materialistic notion of the resurrection. Flesh and blood, the perishable element in man, will have no place in the final Kingdom; and so a secret of the divine purpose is declared; not all will die, but all, living and dead, will be changed with instantaneous suddenness at the sound of the last trumpet. The change involves the putting on of incorruption by the perishable element and of immortality by the mortal element (cf. 2 Cor 5 ^{4}). Here the metaphor of 'putting on' must be controlled by the fundamental conception of change. With two quotations from the Old Testament, from Is 25 ^{8} and from Hos 13 ^{14}, he triumphantly acclaims the victory over death; its triumph and its sting are at an end. It was sin that gave death its sting, while sin gained its strength from the Law—St. Paul is thinking as in Rom 7 $^{7-11}$ of Law's condemnatory and yet provocative character. In contrast with that old deadly chain stands the victory which God gives in Christ. The burst of thankfulness is similar to that at the end of Rom 7. With an appeal for moral steadfastness and unwearied energy in the Lord's work, based on the certainty which the Corinthians possess, through faith in the resurrection, that their labours cannot be without effect, the great chapter closes. The words **in the Lord** may qualify **labour** as well as **in vain**. Finally, in illustration of what St. Paul has said as to the pre- and post-resurrection body, and as showing its value for Christian dogmatics and apologetics, a passage in Origen's reply to Celsus may be quoted: 'We do not maintain,' he says, 'that the body which has undergone corruption resumes its original nature, any more than the grain of wheat which has decayed returns to its former condition. But we do maintain that, as above the grain of wheat there arises a stalk, so a certain power is implanted in the body, which is not destroyed, and from which the body is raised up in incorruption.'

XVI. From the great theme of the Resurrection St. Paul passes to certain matters which need immediate attention. Instructions as to the collection for the Church in Jerusalem, information as to his own plans, and as to Timothy and Apollos, are given. Moral exhortation, salutation, and a brief, sharp anathema follow. Round the word 'love' the epistle ends, the word which inspires its passage of purest religious feeling.

1-5. The question of the collection for the saints at Jerusalem may have been touched on in the Church-letter. It was a considerable charge on St. Paul's thought at this time: cf. 2 Cor 8-9 and Rom 15 $^{25-28}$; we may compare further Ac 24 ^{17}, and, for the names of those who took part in the journey to Jerusalem Ac 20 ^{4}. St. Paul now orders the Corinthians to put by on **the first day of the week** savings for the purpose of the collection according to the capacity which each individual might have; then, when he came, there would be no need for special collections. With the mention of the first day of the week we are not far from the description of it as 'the Lord's day' (Rev 1 ^{10}). When he came he would send men chosen by the Corinthians themselves to take the offering to Jerusalem, and he would go too if the size of the collection was sufficient to favour such action on his part. The order in the Greek favours the association of **by letters** with **ye shall approve**, and St. Paul would feel that no charge of

constraint upon the Church could lie against him as to the selection of the representatives, if before he came their names had been communicated to him in writing. No Corinthians are mentioned in Ac 21 [4]: perhaps in the end St. Paul acted as the Corinthian representative.

5-9. He now speaks of his own plans. He intends to come to Corinth, but by the long route through Macedonia. This is a journey which he did ultimately take: cf. Ac 19 [21] and 20 [1-3]. But it does not follow that he carried it out exactly as he had intended, and that there can have been no intervening visit to Corinth. What he thinks may happen is that when he comes he will stay some time at Corinth, perhaps even winter there; then, when his plans after that visit are fixed, the Corinthians can send him on his way; a mere passing visit is not to his mind. It is interesting to note how completely unsettled St. Paul's movements for the future are ([4, 6]). Acts (19 [21]) shows that when the time at Ephesus was near its end, just before the riot, St. Paul's mind was fully made up: first Jerusalem, then Rome. It is not certain that the journey of Timothy referred to here and in 4 [17] is equivalent with that of Ac 19 [22]. St. Paul's intention is to stay in Ephesus till Pentecost; there was a great opportunity and much opposition. If we remember these two excellent reasons for his presence at Ephesus, we shall not assume that St. Paul must have left Ephesus in the same year in which 1 Corinthians was written.

10-12. The way in which St. Paul mentions Timothy's probable arrival shows that Timothy was not the bearer of 1 Corinthians, and suggests that he may have gone round by Macedonia. The threefold comment as to the behaviour of the Church to Timothy is remarkable. As one who was doing **the work of the Lord**, he was entitled to respect. It seems as though St. Paul knew that Timothy was of a diffident disposition, and feared lest the Church should be inclined to treat him somewhat contemptuously. For similar indications of Timothy's character cf. 1 Tim 4 [12], and, perhaps, 2 Tim 1 [2-8]. St. Paul will be awaiting the return of Timothy and that of **the brethren**. These are mentioned again in [12]; the language is against Ellicott's view of two sets of brethren. They are probably not Corinthians, but persons sent by St. Paul to Corinth, probably the bearers of the letter. St. Paul had pressed Apollos to return to Corinth at the same time, and Apollos had answered with a decided 'no.' Both the request and the refusal bear witness to a generous and high-minded spirit in him who 'planted' and in him who 'watered.' Apollos would come at a favourable opportunity.

13-14. These exhortations to watchfulness, to a firm stand in the Christian faith, to a life of moral power and to the constant exhibition of love, connect up with earlier portions of the letter, but St. Paul may not have had that precisely in mind.

15-18. St. Paul now gives a special injunction in respect of the household of Stephanas. It was the first Christian household in Achæa, and had devoted itself to a work of ministry to the saints—work on behalf of the poor seems indicated; to such persons and to everyone who worked and toiled along with them the Church must look up. It is difficult to say exactly what is involved in **be in subjection**; what is meant, in general, is that the labours of Stephanas and others gave them an authority which ought to be recognized. There had been converts at Athens; but perhaps, as has been suggested, that of Stephanas was the first converted and baptized *household* in Greece. Stephanas and two other Corinthians were now with St. Paul: a Fortunatus is mentioned in Clement's *Epistle*, 65, but identification is very doubtful. St. Paul rejoiced in their presence; they filled the gap in his life caused by his present separation from the Corinthians, and **refreshed** his spirit. **and yours**, he adds. Goudge thinks there may be a reference back to [15]; this would make good sense, and reads less into the words than Parry's view that as they relieved St. Paul's mind of anxieties, so they relieved 'the Corinthians from the fear of being misrepresented to St. Paul'; where this interpretation is strong is in its making the refreshment of St. Paul and the Corinthians to synchronize, as seems to be implied.

19-20. Greetings are sent from the Churches of the provinces of Asia, and with special cordiality from Aquila and Priscilla, who are now, though apparently not for long (Rom 16 [3-5]), settled in Ephesus, and salute their old friends. With them is associated **the church that is in their house**, that is, the Ephesians who worshipped there. And the whole Ephesian Church joins in the greetings. By the members of the Corinthian Church the Christian salutation of the **holy kiss** is to be exchanged (cf. 1 Th 5 [26]; 1 P 5 [14]; Justin, *Ap.*, I, 65). With his own hand, as on other occasions (2 Th 3 [17]; Col 4 [18]), St. Paul sends his own greeting and finishes the letter. The stern warning

contained in the anathema is equivalent to a final admonition to be on the Lord's side, and He is coming (or 'Come, O Lord'). Then comes the familiar grace, and finally, in a unique and touching way, the Apostle sends his love to them all in Christ Jesus. So his last words are the name of Him whom he had preached in this letter, as he had preached Him in Corinth.

Bibliography

The Epistle is rich in English commentaries. Of comparatively recent date are Parry (*C.G.T.*: also *C.B.*), Robertson and Plummer (*I.C.C.*), Goudge (*W.C.*), Massie (*Cent. B.*). Of the older works Ellicott's is perhaps the most generally useful. Reference may also be made to Stanley, Edwards, and Beet, to Peake in Peake's Commentary and Findlay in *E.G.T.* On the more strictly expository and homiletic side there are F. W. Robertson's *Lectures*, and Dods (*E.B.*). Readers of German will gain much, even while they often disagree, from J. Weiss, the commentator in the 10th edition of H. A. W. Meyer's *Kommentar*, and from W. Bousset in *Die Schriften der Neuen Testaments*, edited by J. Weiss. Many of the questions which arise in 1 Corinthians are the subject of detailed discussion in books on Pauline or New Testament Theology. A suggestive, if often disputable, book is W. Morgan's *The Religion and Theology of Paul*. Different points of view on St. Paul's sacramental doctrine will be found in K. Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, in which the Corinthian situation and the Epistles to Corinth are considered at length; A. Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, and H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*. For a good brief account of the Epistles a recent book by H. N. Bate, *A Guide to the Epistles of St. Paul*, may be recommended.

II. CORINTHIANS

By J. K. Mozley

The old view of the relation of 2 to 1 Corinthians was, in itself, simple and satisfying. In his first Epistle St. Paul had occasion to find much fault with the Church, especially as to its indifference to a case of gross morality. He wrote with grief and tears (2 Cor 2 [4]), and afterwards was inclined to regret having written (2 Cor 7 [8]). His anxiety continued after he left Ephesus in the summer, and till in the autumn he met Titus, who may have taken 1 Corinthians to Corinth, in Macedonia. Learning from Titus that the Church had put itself right about the scandal, he wrote and sent by Titus another letter, 2 Corinthians, in which he expressed the greatest satisfaction at the news of the Church's loyalty to his instructions, and urged that forgiveness should follow punishment. He further exhorted the Church to complete the collection for the Jerusalem poor, and, finally, denounced in scathing terms false teachers, Judaizers, who were trying to ruin his authority at Corinth by open and veiled attacks on his person. No letter to Corinth was written between 1 and 2 Corinthians, nor did St. Paul visit Corinth in the interval.

To this scheme there are three important objections. First, the language of 2 Cor 2 [3-11], 7 [8-12] is difficult to reconcile with the view that St. Paul has in mind the case of 1 Cor 5 (contrast 2 Cor 2 [6] with 1 Cor 5 [3-5]), while 2 Cor 7 [12] would imply that the solemn injunctions of 1 Cor 5, inspired by profound moral indignation, were written to inspire the Church to show its zeal for the Apostle. Secondly, the description of the former letter in 2 Cor 2 [4], as written, 'out of much affliction and anguish of heart, with many tears,' is not such as we should expect to be given of the writing of 1 Corinthians. Thirdly, 2 Cor 13 [1] implies two visits in the past. So, with a little less certainty, does 12 [14]; while far the most natural interpretation of 2 [1] is that St. Paul had paid one sorrowful visit (which cannot refer to the time when he founded the Church), and had resolved to avoid another. That this visit preceded the writing of 1 Corinthians, and indeed of the letter of 1 Cor 5 [9] (so Sanday and Bernard), is most improbable.

Accordingly, there is a strong tendency to hold that after 1 Corinthians was dispatched, and before St. Paul left Ephesus (Ac 20 [1]), unfavourable news concerning the Corinthian Church led him to pay his second visit to Corinth. It was a brief and unhappy one. The Apostle may

have been personally insulted (yet it is difficult in the context to interpret the wronged person [7 12] of St. Paul). Anyhow, on the visit, or possibly before the visit as 2 1 may suggest, a member of the Church committed a grave wrong against someone, and when St. Paul was at Corinth the Church would not compel redress. He returned to Ephesus and wrote a letter which caused him much pain. But it did its work, and Titus, who took it to Corinth, could inform St. Paul, when they met, that the loyalty of the Church was completely restored (7 11, 14, 16). St. Paul then wrote the letter which we call 2 Corinthians.

There was, then, a painful letter, written after 1 Corinthians. Is it wholly lost? Most modern scholars who have given up the old view would say so, and hold our 2 Corinthians to be a unity, with the possible exception of the fragment 6 14-7 1, which is sometimes regarded as a piece out of the letter of 1 Cor 5 9. But there has been, especially in England, a growing regard for A. Hausrath's *Four Chapters' Hypothesis*, according to which 2 Cor 10-13 belongs to the painful letter, and so was written before 2 Cor 1-9. This theory has been worked out with great thoroughness and ability by J. H. Kennedy, and Dr. Plummer has adopted it in his commentary in *I.C.C.* But it is not the only theory which detaches 10-13 from 1-9. Taking up an earlier suggestion, H. Windisch in his edition of Meyer's *Kommentar* has referred 10-13 to a letter later than 1-9, written after fresh bad news had come from Corinth, and only some 4 to 6 weeks after 1-9, which had celebrated St. Paul's reconciliation with the Church. Windisch's commentary is most impressive, and a view adopted by him needs far fuller consideration than can be given to it here.

The severance of 10-13 from 1-9 is due to the sense of the extraordinary change which comes over the Epistle after 9. It is held to be inconceivable that after the Apostle had so thankfully and joyfully welcomed Titus's report and ended 7 on a note of complete harmony, and after he had handled with so much tact and restraint in 8 and 9 the question of the collection, he should burst out into the tremendous attack, the 'great invective' of 10-13, in which he not only denounces the false teachers, but shows himself distressed, doubtful and indignant as to the attitude of the Church (10 6, 11 3 f., 7-10 19-21, 12 11, 14, 19-21, 13 2-6). That St. Paul could have sent a letter of which the last part was calculated to destroy the effect of the earlier part, that he should speak of his coming visit as one which was likely to lead to mutual dissatisfaction (12 20), after he had spoken (7 13-15) of his joy in discovering that the 'boasting' concerning the Church which he had made to Titus had been justified, is regarded as psychologically inconceivable. And it is argued, and rightly, that in 10-13 a dissentient minority of the Church cannot be distinguished from the Church as a whole. In defence of the unity of the Epistle it is urged, with force, that when MS. tradition shows no sign of dislocation, there is a very strong preliminary objection to the theory that part of another letter was somehow tacked on to 1-9. Moreover, it is claimed—and the argument is developed very persuasively by Dr. Goudge in his introduction to 2 Corinthians in *W.C.*—that the satisfaction of St. Paul with the Church in 1-9 has been much exaggerated; appeal is made to the implication of such passages as 1 12, 2 17, 3 1, 4 2, 5 11, 8 20 f. The first part of the Epistle, with its recollection of the particular incident in which the Church had put itself right and with its exhortation to common service in the collection, prepares the way for the definite attack on the Jewish counter-mission, in which, while there is some blame of the Church, there is much tenderness and appeal.

If this interpretation is not accepted we must fall back on one of the other two theories. It is argued for the priority of 10-13 to 1-9 that 10-13 might well be part of a painful letter, that if we compare 13 10 with 2 3, 12 2 with 1 26, 10 3 with 2 9, in each case the passage in 1-9 seems later than the one in 10-13 and seems to look back to it. And, as to the journey of Titus, 12 18 compared with 8 6 makes excellent sense if we suppose that Titus's first visit to Corinth was concerned with the collection-business, his second wholly with the painful letter, while 8 16-18, 22-24 shows that he was being sent back on a third visit, when he would complete the work of the collection. As to the way in which 1-9 and 10-13 may have been conflated Kennedy has interesting suggestions. He makes much of Clement's silence as to 2 Corinthians in *Ep.* 47. The upholders of unity do not allow that the cross-passages prove the priority of 10-13. Menzies claims that in 10 1 the coming visit is taken up just where it was left in 9 4. Sanday and Bernard refer to words which appear both in 1-9 and 10-13, and suggest the Epistle's unity. Thus in 7 16 and 10 1 there appears, and in no other place in St. Paul's letters, the word

translated 'am of good courage.' And Windisch points to the dissimilarity of subject-matter between 1-9 and 10-13. 10-13 is concerned with the work of false teachers in Corinth. If this was part of the painful letter we should expect the reconciliation with the Church, celebrated in 7, after the painful letter had done its work, to touch upon the collapse of the hostile propaganda. But of this there is nothing; only a reference to a particular case of wrong-doing of which not a word is said in 10-13. This argument seems to the present writer to have great, if not absolutely decisive, weight.

With regard to Windisch's solution the special difficulty is that it forces us to hold that St. Paul's reconciliation with the Church was so short-lived. Titus must have gone to Corinth with 1-9, found new and very serious trouble on foot (unless it developed after his departure), and then, in not more than six weeks after the sending of 1-9, St. Paul wrote and sent a letter which might be described as even more painful than the original (and lost) painful letter. It is not impossible, but it does not seem likely.

A full discussion would have to treat of the complicated question of the relevance of what St. Paul says of his travel-intentions in 1 $^{15\text{-}17}$. But there is no interpretation sufficiently certain to make the passage decisive for any one theory. And with regard to every theory the present writer does not feel able to give any other verdict than 'Non-Proven.'

As to the false teachers in 10-13 the view that they were Judaizers is most probable, even though we hear of no demand for circumcision. Lake's theory that they were Jews by birth who claimed to be 'spiritual' Christians and were imbued with antinomian views is consistent with the force of certain passages, e.g. 10 ^{2}, 12 $^{1\text{-}10}$ (Lake finds traces also in 1 Cor 1-4), but is less plausible as a whole.

Whatever view we take of the problem of 2 Corinthians the letter is of exceptional value for the light it throws on St. Paul. It is the most personal of all his letters, and the one which enables us to see most clearly what his ministry meant to him. Even more than 1 Corinthians it is the letter of a pastor. He might have said of himself in relation to the Church, even in moments of deepest amazement, indignation and bitterness of soul, 'Love never fails.'

As to the date, the reconstruction of events which we may adopt makes a difference. But it is not necessary to assume more than eight or nine months between 1 Corinthians and 2 Cor 1-9, and if 1 Corinthians belongs to the spring of the year St. Paul left Ephesus (55), 2 Cor 1-9 and possibly 1-13 will have been written in the late autumn.

I. 1-11. Salutation and Thanksgiving.—Two points in the salutation call for special attention; first, the association of Timothy with St. Paul. Of Timothy's movements since the mission referred to in 1 Cor 4 ^{17} we cannot be certain. As Windisch says, we must not assume that a grave failure at Corinth is to be imputed to him. Secondly, the mention of the whole of Achaia shows that St. Paul or his associates had evangelized beyond Corinth (cf. 11 ^{10}). The thanksgiving which follows is expressed in language of high dignity and strikes the note of relief from suffering and tension which often sounds in $^{1\text{-}9}$. Affliction and comfort link St. Paul and his associates with other sufferers, and both with Christ. In ^{3} it is natural to take the word **God** as well as the word **Father** as governing the genitive **of our Lord Jesus Christ**, which is not equivalent to saying that the relation of God to Christ is that of Creator to creature (cf. Jn 20 ^{17} and 1 Cor 15 ^{28}). There is MS. confusion as to the true order of the words in ^{6} and the first part of ^{7}, but the difference in sense is only slight. If we take the W.-H. text, St. Paul shows first that the sufferings of the preachers of the Gospel have as their object the consolation and spiritual profit of their converts, and then that the consolations which the preachers themselves receive reproduce in the converts a similar state which is seen to be efficacious through the converts' ability to endure the same sufferings as those of their evangelists. On this fact of solidarity in suffering and comfort rest the Apostle's sure hope for the future of his converts; he knows that as there is a joint-sharing in the sufferings which discipleship to Christ entails, so there is a joint-sharing in the consolations which come from Him. With what St. Paul here says of **the sufferings of Christ** cf. Col 1 ^{24}. St. Paul now gives more precise meaning to the idea of his sufferings by referring to the great affliction which he had passed through in Asia: so unbearably severe had it been that he had given up hope of life. So far as he was concerned he had felt that sentence of death had been passed; but, really, the purpose of God working through that human conviction had been to constrain the Apostle to trust

wholly in God who restores the dead to life. This should be taken quite literally as meaning that death itself is no reason for despair. Of the nature of this occasion we cannot be certain. If it is to be identified with the Ephesian riot of Ac 19 [23] ff., St. Paul must have been in greater danger than St. Luke suggests (yet cf. Ac 19 [31]). The deliverance which St. Paul then experienced gives him assurance of future deliverance: to this the Corinthians contribute by their intercessions in which they are fellow-workers with the Apostle and his associates; and as there has been intercession, so there will be thanksgiving.

12-14. The Apostle's Sincerity as his Ground of Boasting.—He has a ground of 'boasting'—one of the characteristic words of 2 Corinthians—in the witness of his conscience to the fact that both in his general behaviour and especially in his conduct towards the Corinthians he had shown a purity and sincerity which reflected those divine attributes, and had employed no mere natural shrewdness but the grace which God supplied. There is no sophistry in his letters; what he writes they read and, further, consent to: he hopes that will always be the case, and finds confidence in the fact that they do, anyhow in some measure, acknowledge him, that is, find a ground for glorying in him, even as he finds a ground for glorying in them, a fact which will be revealed when the Lord comes. It is unnecessary to limit the **we write** in [13] to the present letter. The phrase **read or even acknowledge** is certainly difficult, but there is not sufficient ground for following J. H. Kennedy in translating the first word 'acknowledge' and the second 'maintain.'

15-22. St. Paul's Travel-Plans and the Charge of Vacillation.—The difficulty of this passage is due partly to our lack of certainty as to the character of the events which had intervened between the writing of 1 Cor 16 [7] and 2 Cor 1 [15-17], and partly to the elusiveness of St. Paul's language. The Corinthians would possess a key which is denied to us. What is clear is that St. Paul, relying on the good relations obtaining between himself and the Church, had wished at some point of time in the past so to arrange his plans as to pay two visits to Corinth instead of only one. That would mean two favours shown to the Corinthians—the most probable explanation of **a second grace** (or 'joy'). He had hoped to come first to Corinth, which in the context would mean by the short sea-route, then to pass to Macedonia, to return to Corinth, and, finally, to be sent forward from Corinth to Judæa. In [15] we should probably translate *to come first* rather than 'I formerly wished.' St. Paul does not say that he had communicated this plan to the Corinthians, nor does he imply that this was the original plan which had been altered by the plan of 1 Cor 16 [5-7], the plan which at the moment of writing 2 Cor 1 [15-17] he was carrying out. In view of possible intervening events the relevance of any reference to 1 Cor 16 [5-7] at this point is very doubtful. St. Paul repudiates, in the form of a question, light-mindedness in his wishes, or that kind of worldly-mindedness in the formation of plans which makes it possible to say 'yes' and 'no' in the same breath. That he is defending himself against a charge of fickleness is not certain. J. H. Kennedy argues that *elaphria* means not change of mind, but lightness of character. For testimony to his reliability St. Paul points with a word of solemn adjuration to the preaching of which the Corinthians had had experience. He, Silvanus, and Timothy had preached Christ Jesus the Son of God (the full title is given for the sake of impressiveness), in whom there was no alternation of 'yes' and 'no.' In His case only the word 'yes' was in place, since all the promises found their fulfilment in Him, while through Him the Church replied with its 'So be it' to the glory of God, on the basis of the apostolic teaching. As a final witness to his trustworthiness St. Paul refers to God's work in giving the Gospel-preachers along with the Corinthians a firm position in Christ, and then, with three words reminiscent of baptism, speaks of the anointing, the sealing, and the pledge of the Spirit in their hearts. The thought is not of a promise of a future donation of the Spirit, but of the gift of the Spirit as 'the first instalment of eternal life' (Plummer).

I. 23-II. The Apostle's Absence from Corinth and his Grievous Letter Explained.

I. 23-II. 4. With a strong appeal to God in respect of his truthfulness, St. Paul now explains that to **spare** the Corinthians he had not come again. This verse, when taken with 2 [1], where **again** and **with sorrow** go naturally together, strongly suggests that a painful visit, subsequent to the original founding of the Church, had already been paid. In [24] St. Paul repudiates any idea that he wishes to tyrannize over them in respect of their faith: in it they stood firm; his wish is so to co-operate with them that their life may be one of joy. With this,

2 1-3 is closely associated in thought. The joy that should bind the Apostle and his converts would have been shattered by another painful visit. It was right that they should cause him joy, whereas, had he come, it would have been necessary for him to cause them sorrow. In 2 **who** does not refer to any particular member of the community, but to the community regarded as an individual. So he wrote a letter as a substitute for his coming. **I wrote** could be taken as the epistolary aorist, but the context here and in 7 8 is against this interpretation: **this very thing** may be equivalent to 'for this purpose,' or may be taken literally, meaning 'I told you in my letter that I was going to spare you another painful visit.' He explains that even under the painful circumstances of the past he was confident that the Church would find its joy in what gave joy to its Apostle. So the object of his letter which caused him such deep distress was not to grieve the Church, but to enable it to understand the greatness of his love for it; the character of the letter would make that plain.

II. 5-11. St. Paul now comes to closer quarters with the painful affair of the past and the person who was responsible. Pain has been caused, but St. Paul's concern is for that which the Church had experienced. **in part** seems to limit the scope of the words **to you all**, while the general sense of the words in brackets in RV is that St. Paul wishes not to 'overstate the case' (Moffatt). Now, by the action of the majority of the Church, the offender had been punished, in a manner which St. Paul judged to be **sufficient**. Thereby the pain had been transferred to the offender, and, that he might not be overwhelmed by it, he was to be forgiven and comforted. In 6 and 7 the meaning may be either that the most active supporters of St. Paul wished for a severer punishment than that which had been inflicted, but are informed by St. Paul that he is satisfied with what has been done and are urged to adopt a forgiving attitude, or that the minority consisted of those who desired no punishment, or at least a milder one, to be inflicted. In this case there is no opposition between **the many** and **you**. On the whole, there is no clear evidence here of the existence of an 'ultra-Pauline' party, while 'you' most naturally refers to the Church and not to a section of it. The word **contrariwise** points a contrast simply between punishment and forgiveness. But that St. Paul was in any way dissatisfied with the punishment need not be assumed. He now returns again to his past letter; he had written it to test the obedience of the Corinthians, and now, it is implied, being assured of that, he forgives the offender his wrong-doing even as they do; he has the good of the Church in view, and acts **in the person of Christ**. This may mean simply 'in the presence of Christ,' but it is possible that there is the notion of the Apostle acting with Christ's authority: RV text implies this, but it is doubtful whether *prosopon* means 'person' in our sense of the word. But a comparison with 'in the name' and 'with the power' of the Lord Jesus in 1 Cor 5 4 suggests a relation between the Apostle and the Lord in the action of excommunication or forgiveness which points towards the idea that the Apostle in his action is the representative of the Lord. Any other conduct, says St. Paul, would merely bring profit to Satan, whose destructive purposes would be furthered if the offender were not forgiven and restored. Of this passage (2 5-11) we may say with confidence that it does not refer to 1 Cor 5 1-13. The passage, especially when taken with 7 8-12, suggests something quite other than a sexual enormity. St. Paul could hardly have said in 2 9 and 7 12 that he wrote to test the obedience or zeal of the community in such a case: nor does 2 6 at all agree with St. Paul's own solemn pronouncement of sentence in 1 Cor 5 5. The passage, especially in the way it begins, is quite compatible with the view that some insult had been offered to St. Paul.

12-17. St. Paul now returns, somewhat abruptly, to the former historical situation. He had left Ephesus (Ac 20 1) and had reached Troas. He had intended to preach the Gospel there, and found conditions favourable (cf. 1 Cor 16 9, of Ephesus). But he had also hoped that Titus would meet him there with, as we learn from 2 Cor 7, news from Corinth. In this he was disappointed, and the inner tension was so great that he felt it impossible to evangelize. He crossed to Macedonia to intercept Titus, perhaps at Philippi. And when Titus arrived, so it is implied, all the Apostle's fears passed away and a profound thankfulness for the victorious progress of the Gospel filled his heart. What that meant to him St. Paul now presents in terms of present and continuous fact. God is always leading the Gospel preachers in triumph in Christ. The verb is of doubtful interpretation. It is used in Col 2 15 of God triumphing over the principalities and powers in the

Cross. That God should here be spoken of as leading the Apostles in triumph almost as His captives in a triumphal procession is not too difficult a notion for St. Paul with his sense of men's dependence upon God; while the characteristic addition **in Christ** is a safeguard against the idea of a merely external relationship. Through the Apostles the fragrance of the knowledge of God is everywhere manifested. Then, with a change in the metaphor, the Apostles themselves appear as the fragrance, though it is Christ's, not their own. This **savour** works differently, according as it is diffused among those who are being saved or among those who are perishing. Among the latter it becomes deadly, and so by 'conclusion from the effect to the operative power' (Windisch) can be spoken of as proceeding **from death.** The former class finds that the savour of the Gospel which proceeds from life tends to life. It might well be asked whether, if the preaching of the Gospel was of such a character and had such effects, anyone could be **sufficient** as an evangelist. But St. Paul is convinced that such sufficiency does belong to the true preachers, to him and his colleagues. Whereas many teachers (he says *the majority*) were treating the Gospel in the spirit of hucksterers adulterating an article for sale, he spoke as a man does who possesses inner sincerity and depends on God for his message, a message delivered in the presence of God, with the speaker himself one who is 'in Christ.'

III. 1-VI. 10. **The Apostolic Office and Mission.**—There is nothing in 1 Corinthians quite equal to the impression of the greatness of Christian theology which is given in this section, with its conception of the apostolic ministry, in all its preaching, its labours, and its hopes, as centred in the revelation and work of Christ.

III. 1-3. What he has just said as to the character of his preaching reminds the Apostle of the charge of 'self-commendation' which had been brought against him. Here is another instance of it, some will say. This matter of **commendation** reappears in $10^{12, 18}$, 12^{11}. If these passages are earlier than 3^{1} they throw a definite light on 3^{1}, but the question of priority can only be decided in accordance with the probabilities of the whole situation. St. Paul's rejoinder to the charge is that whereas **some** needed letters of **commendation** to introduce them to Corinth, or from Corinth to introduce them to other communities, he had all the commendation he needed in the Corinthian Church itself, which was a letter both inscribed in his heart and open to the world's inspection. Then in ^{3} the metaphor changes; the Church is viewed as a letter dictated by Christ, with the Apostle as the pen-man, and the means with which it is written is the Spirit: and, by a final turn of the picture, the letter which is the Corinthian Church is written on the hearts of the Corinthians. The phrase **in tables that are hearts of flesh** goes back to Pr 3^{3} and Jer 31^{33}. RV gives the most probable text and construction, and the meaning is clear.

4-11. In this truth concerning the Corinthian Church St. Paul finds confidence. Christ is the mediator of it, and it is directed towards God. Then, possibly with an allusion to charges of arrogance made against him, he repudiates any self-sufficiency. The source of his **sufficiency** is God, who has made him **sufficient** as the minister of a new covenant, of which the characteristic is not written law but spiritual inspiration; written law kills (cf. Rom 7^{7-25}), but the Spirit makes alive. The antithesis **of letter, of spirit,** probably goes, as Windisch says, with the words 'new covenant,' and not simply with the word 'covenant.' The idea of covenant, taken with the mention of the letter, leads on to St. Paul's statement of the inferiority of the covenant of Sinai to the new dispensation. At Sinai what came into existence was the **ministration of death,** consisting in written commandments and engraven upon stones. The meaning of 'ministration of death' is the same as that of 'the letter killeth'; in each case the thought, fully developed, implies the close relation between written law, disobedience, sin, and death. This dispensation had a glorious inauguration, physically reflected in the face of Moses, and of such brightness that the Israelites could not look upon his face; and yet that glory was a fading one. In two respects St. Paul goes beyond the narrative in Ex 34^{29} ff.: he substitutes for 'they were afraid to come nigh him' a reference to the inability of the people to look upon Moses' face, and with the words **which glory was passing away** he introduces a new idea. Much more, then, would the dispensation marked by the presence of the Spirit be glorious; **shall not in** ^{8} is best taken as a logical future. The contrast is expressed in ^{9} in terms of the results of the two dispensations; that of the former was condemnation, of the latter **righteousness,** that is justification, viewed in the context as 'acquittal.' In this case the 'glory' could not but be far greater.

So much indeed is this the case that in comparison with the greater glory the glory of the old dispensation may be regarded as no glory at all. The words **in this respect** are best taken with **hath not been made glorious** and in close connexion with **by reason of the glory that surpasseth.** In [11], to the contrasts between death and life, condemnation and justification, is added that between abolition and continuance: the contrast is helped out with the use first of the preposition *dia*, implying no more than accompaniment, then of the preposition *en*, implying a settled state.

12-18. The hopes which the character of the new dispensation inspire lead to **great boldness of speech.** There is no need for the Gospel-preachers to follow Moses' example. He put a veil on his face to prevent the Israelites seeing the glory fade from his face, **its end.** Of the text of Ex 34[33] Plummer says the true translation is not, as AV, 'till Moses had done speaking with them,' but 'when Moses had done speaking with them.' Windisch may be right in seeing in the end of [13] the idea of the blindness of the Jews to the transitoriness of the old dispensation. This makes the connexion with **but their minds were hardened** (Plummer 'dulled') easier. They did not understand the significance of Moses' action. Now comes the application: the state of blindness remains; the Jews no more understand the character of the old covenant when they hear it read than they did when it was first given; **the same veil** (the metaphor is easily intelligible) **remaineth unlifted.** Bousset's reference to the Torah-rolls as covered in linen clothes is probably not to the point; the words at the end of [14], **which veil is done away in Christ,** are better rendered *because it is done away in Christ*; this is the explanation of the uplifting of the veil; that is possible only when Christ is confessed. Now, when Moses is dead, even as when he was seen, there is the veil, spoken of, with a further development of the thought, **as upon their hearts.** With a further echoing of words in Ex 34 St. Paul adds that when Israel turns to the Lord the veil is removed. **Now the Lord is the Spirit.** That by these words St. Paul intends to identify, in the strict sense of that word, Christ and the Holy Spirit is a view tenable only if we suppose that St. Paul was so careless a thinker as to be unaware of the fact that again and again he speaks in a way which rules out such identification. St. Paul is thinking here of the sphere of divine and creative revelation; he is not expressing a metaphysic of Deity. In Windisch's words there is 'a dynamic identification of two known magnitudes,' since where the Lord is and works, there is also the Spirit. We may note also Goudge's view that in [17] 'the Lord' would in modern printing be in inverted commas, as referring simply to the language of the Exodus passage. Then the meaning will be that the Lord to whom Israel must turn is that Spirit, whose presence in the Church is the mark of the new dispensation. In that case Hort's minute emendation of *Kuriou* into *Kurion* at the end of [17] has much in its favour, and we should translate 'where the Spirit is Lord.' Where the Spirit of the Lord is (the turn of language is itself significant), there is liberty, a gift and blessing, it is implied, impossible under the old covenant. And, in contrast with the Jews, all we Christians reflect in our unveiled faces the glory of the Lord, and are being transformed into the very image of Christ, so that in us there is an advance from stage to stage of glory, as naturally results since the cause of the whole progress is the Lord who in his nature is Spirit. The AV 'beholding as in a glass' is possible, and Windisch prefers this rendering, but the RV suits what seems to be the Apostle's thought better. Of the many possible renderings of the last words of [18] the one adopted has the advantage of keeping the order. So does 'from the Lord of the Spirit,' but such a statement of relationship hardly accords with St. Paul's mind.

IV. **1-6.** St. Paul now shows, possibly with a side-glance at attacks on himself, but with a more probable allusion to the behaviour of such false teachers as those of 2 [17], that the character of the apostolic preaching corresponds to the character of the apostolic Gospel. Entrusted with it, his life is in a line with the mercy he has received. He does not grow weary, he repudiates all secret and disgraceful conduct (this does not imply that he had once lived in moral laxity); there is nothing insincere in his behaviour nor deceitful in his treatment of the Gospel which he preaches. His appeal is to the conscience of men in the sight of God: this he does by plainly proclaiming the truth—and that is the only way in which he cares to commend himself. There could be no question of a 'veiled Gospel' except in the case of those who were perishing in unbelief, men whose minds had been darkened by Satan to prevent them beholding the illumination produced by the

Gospel of the glory of Christ, the image of God. He is the subject of the Gospel-preaching; the preachers preach themselves only as slaves of the Church for the sake of Jesus. For all the light in the preachers' hearts has its source in God, even as the light which in creation penetrated the darkness, and its object is so to illuminate men that in the person of Christ (the word 'face' keeps the connexion with the last chapter) they may apprehend the glory of God. The mention of the **god of this world** implies no theoretical dualism. For Christ the **image of God** cf. Col 1 [15]. Here the thought is of the divine glory as reflected in Christ. The genitives after **light** in [4] and [6] may both be subjective, but in [6] an objective genitive after 'light' used in the active sense of enlightening is, perhaps, more probable. Windisch seems right in doubting in [6] any close reference to St. Paul's conversion-experience.

7-18. A further thought shows yet more clearly the subordinate position of the Gospel-preachers. The treasure—that is, probably, the Gospel itself which they possess—is contained within the frail vessels of their human personalities, here regarded in close relation to their bodies. So it is made clear that the more than normal power which was theirs came from God. Their sufferings never reached their final point, but as the putting to death of Jesus was continually being repeated in their bodily experiences, so that served the end of revealing in those bodies the life of Jesus. In [10] Bousset sees the Christ-mysticism of St. Paul at its highest point, involving bodily, and not only spiritual, fellowship. The identity of 'the Christ of history' and 'the Christ of experience' is made specially clear by the use of the name 'Jesus.' With a sudden turn of thought St. Paul contrasts the **death** which the activities of himself and others involve with the **life** which (so he implies) those activities produce in their converts. He returns to the experiences of the preachers. They possess **the same spirit of faith**—probably as the Psalmist (Ps 116 [10]), possibly as their converts; so they believe and speak, in the knowledge that God who had raised Jesus would raise them with Jesus, and, at the last, unite evangelists and converts. It was for their converts that the preachers were ready to undergo all things, that the grace of God, abounding more and more in the increasing number of converts, might give rise to more and more thanksgiving to the glory of God. So there could be no slackening in the work: with a daily wearing out of the bodily frame went a daily renewal of the inner personality; the light affliction of the passing moment was building up an immeasurable and eternal reality of glory in the case of those who fastened their eyes not on what was visible and transient, but on what was invisible and everlasting. These last verses form an introduction to the first verses of 5. The mention of the **outward** and **inner man** brings to mind later language in Eph 3 [16]; Col 3 [9-10]. There the contrast more definitely belongs to the ethico-religious sphere; here it is more metaphysical. The contrast is not quite the same as in 1 Cor 15 [42-45].

V. 1-10. St. Paul now elaborates the thought of 4 [18], and takes up the general idea of the decay of the body. This is now spoken of as a tent and its destruction pictured. But that does not matter, since the Christian can look forward with absolute certainty to the possession of a dwelling which God provides, an eternal house in heaven. So our groaning, while we live in our earthly tent, springs from the desire to put on as a further covering (here the metaphor of a house changes to the metaphor of a garment) the heavenly dwelling, since such clothing will save us from a state of 'nakedness.' The earthly body—the 'tent'—is indeed a burden, but our groanings do not imply a desire to put it off, but to put something else on, that what is subject to the laws of mortality may be 'absorbed' (Moffatt) by life. This is God's purpose for us, and we have the pledge of its realization in our present possession of the Spirit. This expectation gives us continual confidence, and in our knowledge that our present life in the earthly body means absence from the Lord—that is, a life of faith and not of open vision—our confident preference is for a departure from the body which will mean a life at home with the Lord; and with this in view our eager desire is to please Him, whether in the body or out of the body. For, according as we have done good or bad with our bodies, we shall receive our due at the judgement-seat of Christ, where we must all stand and be revealed in our true natures.

Two main questions arise out of this passage: first, what precisely St. Paul means to teach as to the state after death; secondly, what is the relation of his doctrine in this chapter to that in 1 Cor 15. In connexion with the first question several problems arise. Does it imply that the tent or garment, used as symbolic of the

new body, already exists in heaven? Bousset confidently affirms that this is the meaning, and it is the most natural, if not absolutely necessary, interpretation of [1-2]. Is then the new body put on at the moment of death? [2-3] taken by themselves—and whether in [3] we read *endusamenoi*, being clothed with AV and RV, or *ekdusamenoi*, 'having unclothed ourselves,' i.e. of the earthly body, with Bousset—point that way. On the other hand, [8] and [9] suggest simply the absence, after death, from the earthly body, without any implication of the assumption of the heavenly body. Windisch rejects as an idea intolerable to St. Paul the notion of a presence in a naked condition with the Lord, and argues that St. Paul conceives of a 'body of glory' as put on immediately at death. But Bousset distinguishes between two periods after death: the first, before the general judgement, when the righteous are with the Lord but possess no bodies, and the final one, introduced by the judgement, at which believers receive the new bodies which have been prepared for them. This, on the whole, fits St. Paul's language better. That St. Paul supposes an interval of suspended consciousness after death in a bodiless condition is regarded by C. A. A. Scott as not irreconcilable with this passage; but the force of the Apostle's words is opposed to this view. As to the relation between the new body and the old, [2] and [4] point not to an abolition of the old, but to its conservation and transmutation to fit the new conditions. The second main question concerns the relation of 2 Cor 5 to 1 Cor 15. That in so short a time St. Paul had really changed his doctrine is improbable. In both chapters he is dealing, though much more obviously in the earlier one, with the implied query, 'What happens to Christians who die before the Parousia?' In both cases he teaches by metaphor, first of the seed, then of the tent or garment. As these metaphors are quite different, the doctrine exhibited by means of them possesses a different appearance. The thought of the new body laid up in heaven is certainly new (Bousset gives parallel passages in Slavonic Enoch and the Ascension of Isaiah), and could not, as it stands, be united with the notion of the body as raised in glory, but the passages are at one in their repudiation of materialistic conceptions of the resuscitation of an earthly body, and of any doctrine which affirms simply the immortality of the soul. They are at one in presenting the conception of a spiritual or heavenly body in which the earthly body undergoes a change or absorption.

11-21. It is in the light of these truths that St. Paul turns to speak of his ministry, and possibly with a glance at charges of insinuating appeals, of self-commendation, and of being mentally unbalanced. His appeals to men are, he says, based on his fear of the Lord. What he is is manifest to God, and he hopes that no verdict of insincerity will be passed upon him by the consciences of the Corinthians. This is no further self-commendation, but he wishes them to have some cause of pride in him, and an answer to give to those who boast of external characteristics and are not concerned with inner worth. This is a reference to Judaizing teachers, who may, as Bousset says, have boasted of their external relation to the original Apostles and perhaps to Jesus. As to his being beside himself, that, he says, is a matter between God and himself; when he is of sober mind his thought is for the Corinthians. The controlling power in his life is the love of Christ, and of the death in which that love was revealed he finds the meaning to be the death of all when one died for all, and the purpose to be an incentive to men to find the centre of their lives no longer in themselves, but in Him who died and was raised on their behalf. Knowledge of others based on merely external characteristics is now a thing of the past; if the Apostle's knowledge of Christ was once of that kind, it is so no longer. There is a new internal relation to Christ, and he who possesses it is a new creation: the old has passed away, has been transformed into the new. The whole process has its source in God. He took the initiative and reconciled men to Himself through Christ, and entrusted them with the Gospel message of reconciliation (St. Paul has the apostolic ministry especially in mind), which is that God was in Christ, bringing the world to a state of reconciliation with Himself, not making a reckoning of men's sins, and giving the proclamation of this reconciliation into the keeping of His ministers. And so, says St. Paul, I am an ambassador in the affairs of Christ; it is as though in my voice you listened to the appeal of God; as an ambassador for Christ my message is **Be reconciled to God.** For God went so far as to effect in Christ's Cross so close a relation between Christ and sin that Christ could be said to have been **made sin,** and God's purpose was that in Christ we might be justified and made righteous. This pas-

sage should be compared with Rom 3 [21] ff. for its doctrine of Christ's death. There the central thought is of propitiation; here representative and substitutionary views, with an extension in the direction of mystical union, are dominant. That St. Paul thinks of Christ as not only acting on men's behalf, but also as standing in their place, is apparent from [14] and [21]. Since God takes the initiative, all dualistic distinctions between the attitude of God and that of Christ are ruled out. On the other hand, as Holtzmann rightly argues, the passage does not imply that there is only a one-sided reconciliation of man to God. There is a tendency to explain the first part of [21] as though 'made sin' were equivalent to 'treated Him as a sinner.' This is not wrong, but is not quite adequate to the greatness of St. Paul's thought. This implies, as Windisch says, that Christ 'has in some way taken sin in its whole reality into Himself, like the Scapegoat.' (That 'made sin' means 'made to be a sin-offering' is certainly possible. Passages in Leviticus, e.g. 4 [21], 6 [25], show that in the LXX *hamartia* was used as 'sin-offering.' So the RV in Rom 8 [3] has '*as an offering* for sin.' But the force of the paradox is greater if in each case we take *hamartia* as meaning 'sin.') The end of [16] has given rise to much discussion. It is very improbable that it implies that St. Paul had seen Christ before the crucifixion. But he does depreciate the kind of knowledge which is based on the external associations which some might claim. Any knowledge he may ever have had which rose no higher than that he puts aside: 'It was not the earthly life, as such, but the *effects* of the earthly life as followed by death and risen glory which were everything to him' (McNeile).

VI. 1-10. St. Paul goes on to show how what God has done is brought before men in the preaching and life of God's ministers. They are fellow-workers with God, and appeal to their converts to see that the grace which they have received bears fruit in their lives; for that, the present is the right time, since to the present belongs the fulfilment of the prophet's words (Is 49 [8]) concerning God's readiness to help. That the preachers may present no stumbling-block in their lives to the acceptance of their message, no occasion for complaint, they commend themselves in such ways as befit God's ministers. They endure every kind of suffering (in fastings the reference is probably to involuntary not to voluntary abstentions from food); they exhibit qualities of character which help to win attention to their message and show a power which is of God. Everywhere, in their campaigns, their 'weapons' are those of righteousness (genitive of quality rather than of source). Whether men speak well or ill of them makes no difference. Finally, in a series of arresting paradoxes, St. Paul shows how beneath the appearances of failure and incompetence which the Gospel-preachers presented, and which in some respects were facts of their lives, there worked a greater and contrary reality. One may note how in his exposition of 6 [1-10] F. W. Robertson combines the idea of an apostolical succession of order, 'authority delegated by those who have authority,' with that of a succession of spiritual likeness.*

VI. 11-VII. 16. St. Paul's Joy in the Harmony Restored between Himself and the Church.

VI. 11-13. The Apostle now returns directly to the subject of his relations with the Corinthian Church. He is able to speak so freely of the ministry, because there is no contraction of his love where the Corinthians are concerned. If such a change had been made (it seems as though it had been), it applied to them, not him. The only recompense he wants from them for what he has given is a love like his own; that he may expect from his spiritual children. (Moffatt's tr., 'a fair exchange now, as the children say,' is interesting, but loses the point of St. Paul's tender use of the term 'children.')

VI. 14-VII. 1. This warning against association with unbelievers comes surprisingly in the context, and some scholars hold that it is an 'erratic boulder' which belongs elsewhere, perhaps to the lost letter of 1 Cor 5 [9]. Zahn and Plummer defend its position here. The former thinks that St. Paul has long been leading up to this exhortation, the latter that he may have remembered the stumbling-block to full unity with himself in Corinthian compromises with the heathen. The abruptness is not too great for St. Paul. By a series of sharp contrasts he shows the impossibility of close association (like different animals under the same yoke) with unbelievers. Christ and the devil (Bousset makes the word mean anti-Christ here, and compares 2 Th 2 [3]) cannot agree. There can be no dealings with idols on the part of those who are themselves God's Temple (cf. 1 Cor 3 [16] f.). St. Paul establishes the true relation with God and the consequent necessity for 'separation' by a number of Old Testament quotations.

* Cf. *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 424.

Accordingly, with a word of emphasis on his love for them, he appeals for the purging away of whatever may defile the spirit and for a holy life lived in the fear of God. This verse is a powerful obstacle to the view that St. Paul regarded the flesh as essentially evil. Bousset's translation, 'pollution of our outer and inner man,' does not do justice to the words.

VII. 2-4. The appeal of 6 [13] is taken up again. Let the Corinthians open their hearts. In no action of his had the Apostle harmed any member of the Church. Nor in what he says is there any thought of condemnation; a bond of heart-felt affection unites him with them for death and life. In the open expression of his confidence, in the pride he has in them, there is no limitation of his comfort and joy in the midst of his afflictions.

5-16. Now we have the resumption of the historical narrative which was broken off after 2 [13]. In Macedonia he had been as restless as at Troas. 'Battles' probably refers not to persecutions, but to dissensions—we cannot say of what kind, yet cf. Phil 3. But then in the coming of Titus and the news he brought, which had been so great a relief to Titus himself, of the Corinthians' loyal zeal, St. Paul experienced the divine comfort; there had been joy in Titus's arrival, more joy in his news. Now the Apostle feels that he need not repent of having sent the painful letter as he was once inclined to do; the grief it caused them for a short time was worth while (the construction is broken at the end of [8]). So he can be glad not for the Corinthians' sorrow, but for its character and results. It was sorrow such as God willed, thereby relieving the Apostle of all fear of having done harm; for such sorrow induces a repentance issuing in a state of salvation which excludes all regrets, whereas mere remorse issues in death. St. Paul now in a quickly moving passage portrays the effect of their repentance on the Corinthians' feelings. Their fear was probably not of St. Paul's anger, but may be identified with the uneasiness of conscience aroused to the realization of past sin. So they manifested their integrity. And now the Apostle can say that it was for this purpose that he wrote, and not because of either the wrong-doer or the wronged. He returns to the thought of the joy he had in Titus's joy: 'You have all set his mind at rest' (Moffatt), and the confidence in the Church of which St. Paul had spoken to Titus had proved well-founded. Titus's affection was all the greater for the obedience and humility the Church had shown, and St. Paul's own confidence in the Church was complete. [12] can hardly be reasonably related to the case of 1 Cor 5. Yet the confidence of Bousset and others that the wronged person is St. Paul is open to question. One of St. Paul's companions may be meant. 2 [1] may imply that the incident took place before St. Paul's second visit to Corinth.

VIII.-IX. 15. We now come to the second main section of the Epistle, which deals with that collection for the poor Christians at Jerusalem to which reference is made in 1 Cor 16 [1-4]. The tactful handling of the matter by St. Paul is very noticeable. Clearly there was need for greater keenness in the work of collecting, but St. Paul enforces this without blaming the Church. The prominence given to Titus links this section with 7, while the sense of completely restored harmony is the presupposition of the Apostle's injunctions. There is considerable difficulty as to the visits of Titus to Corinth. Rendall's idea of four missions is unacceptable. It is unnecessary to follow Windisch in his separation of 9 from 8.

VIII. 1-15. St. Paul leads up to his subject by a reference to a particular instance of divine grace in the generosity of the Macedonian Churches. From the midst of affliction (the Acts narrative in 16 and 17 may help us to understand this) their abundant joy and their great poverty together issued in a noble offering. Their contribution surpassed their power; they begged of their own accord to be allowed to make the contribution; and the character of their action was beyond all expectation, for it was an offering of self, first to the Lord, and then, in accordance with God's will, to the Apostle. The construction in [3-5] is broken, but the sense is quite clear. Accordingly, St. Paul has exhorted Titus, who had started the work of the collection, to bring it to a conclusion: this grace is most probably governed by both verbs. Titus *may* have started the work soon after the arrival of 1 Corinthians. And now, says St. Paul, let the Church's keenness in this matter equal its qualities in other respects. Moffatt justifies by textual authorities the RV your love to us, but 'our love to you' is a possible turn of thought. He had referred to the enthusiasm of others in order to supply a test for their love, and now he points them to the supreme example of Christ, whose incarnation had meant a change from riches to poverty accepted in the spiritual interests of the Church. The impressiveness

of this Christology is the greater for its almost casual appearance. Appealing to their last year's willingness to give as something more than the gift, he asks for a completion of the collection in proportion to their powers; what matters is the spirit of willingness, and that (or possibly the actual gift) is acceptable in so far as it represents a man's ability to give. He does not want to impoverish them for the good of others, but to establish equal conditions; now they can spare something for the needs of others; some day the position will be reversed. Thus is shown the truth of the Exodus passage about the collectors of manna. The phrasing of [10] is difficult, but the meaning seems to be as Plummer says, that the Corinthians were first in the field not only in work, but in intending to set to work. That **a year ago** implies before the last January 1 is probable. It is quite compatible with, but does not necessitate, the assigning of 1 and 2 Corinthians to different years. In [14] the **equality** can hardly be thought of as realized in the present.

16-24. St. Paul goes on to speak of the arrangements he has made for the receiving of the Corinthian contribution. Titus was setting off, even more at his own keen desire than as a result of the Apostle's request. His companions would be two 'brothers'; the first was held in high esteem as an evangelist in all the Churches, and had been chosen by the Churches (perhaps of Macedonia) to travel with St. Paul and help in the administration of the charity to the glory of the Lord and the great satisfaction of the Apostle. By such wise provision all suspicion of the Apostle's management of the fund would be removed. The second brother had often proved a zealous helper of St. Paul, and on this occasion was the more zealous because of his great confidence in the Corinthians. In the relation of Titus to St. Paul and of the brethren to the Churches an enquirer should be satisfied. The highest recommendation of all was that in the brethren 'the (spiritual) glory of Christ mirrored itself' (Windisch). Let the Corinthians, therefore, give to these envoys and to the Churches they represented clear proof of their love and of the good ground the Apostle had for his pride in the Corinthian Church. In [24] it is difficult to choose between RV text and RVm. The question of the identification of the brethren has been variously and inconclusively answered.

IX. 1-5. The connexion with the preceding chapter is not really difficult, despite Windisch's criticisms. St. Paul explains that while the collection in itself is not a necessary subject in a letter, since the Corinthian preparations dating from the previous year were a source of pride to him and an incentive to most of the Macedonians, he is sending the brethren to ensure the completion of the preparations, and to save him from the shame which would be his on his approaching visit with the Macedonian envoys, were he to discover that his confidence in the Corinthians had been excessive. He wants the promised contribution to be ready as a freewill gift, and not as the money with which avaricious people reluctantly part.

6-15. St. Paul brings the subject to a close with an exposition of the religious value of generosity. Grudging or liberal giving brings its appropriate fruit to the giver. A man must make up his mind and give without regret or compulsion. Pr 11[24] and 22[9] (LXX) are passages loosely quoted in support. There is an abundant source of every grace in God, sufficient for an activity in every good work, and, as the Psalmist says, the good actions of the generous man never fail. God, who, as Isaiah says, provides seed and bread, will furnish them with what they need for works of charity which cause men to give thanks to God; indeed, the value of the service they render is to be seen in such thankfulness as well as in its material benefits. Through the test which this service supplies men give glory to God for the obedience involved in the Corinthians' faith in the Gospel and for their generous contributions, and express their feelings of affection in earnest prayers for the Corinthians, recognizing the grace of God richly given to them. The section ends on a deep note of thankfulness to God for His **unspeakable gift**, referring probably to the abundant graces given to the Corinthians. [13] is a difficult verse, though the central thought is clearly that in the charitable activities of the Corinthians men recognize the sincerity of their allegiance to the Gospel. The words **unto the Gospel** are perhaps best taken both with **obedience** and with **your confession.**

X. 1-XIII. 10. The Self-Vindication of the Apostle in the Face of Attacks upon his Person and Authority.

The sharply controversial character of this section forms a great contrast to the subject-matter and the spirit of the Epistle up to this point. For a statement of different views offered in explanation,

reference should be made to the Introduction. One may note that whereas in Galatia the attack had been directed rather against the Gospel as preached by St. Paul, with emphasis on the necessity of circumcision, in Corinth St. Paul himself was the principal object of attack. In whatever way his opponents were Judaizers, they appear to have made no demand for circumcision. This may have been, though we must not assume it, only a tactical reticence.

X. 1-6. The section begins with an impressive assertion of the reality of St. Paul's power. Laying stress on his own person, possibly, as Bousset says, taking the pen in hand, he appeals to the example of **the meekness and gentleness of Christ**, meaning either that he speaks in that spirit, or that they should exhibit similar qualities. A general picture of our Lord's character seems to be in the Apostle's mind. With an allusion to the criticism that his courage was shown only when he was away from the Church, he asks that he may be spared the necessity, when he comes, of the courageous behaviour which, nevertheless, he is determined to adopt towards those who assume that his conduct is such as is consonant only with the 'fleshly' level of existence. That, he replies, is not true, though, of course, his life (like that of others) is **in the flesh**. But his **warfare** is another matter; his weapons are powerful for God (and, it may be implied, come from Him). They are adequate when any work of destruction and subjugation of human pride is necessary. So when the obedience of the Church is an accomplished fact he is prepared to deal drastically with any cases of disobedience.

7-18. St. Paul now deals more closely with claims of his opponents and attacks upon himself. Look, he says, at what lies before you. Suppose someone claims to belong to Christ, he ought to recognize that that is equally true of the Apostle. As to his authority, the original purpose of which was edification, not destruction, his claims for it will be found valid. It is not just a case of frightening them by letters (before [9] Windisch would supply something like 'this I emphasize'). That is what is said: 'Paul's letters are powerful, but he has no presence, and his speaking is contemptible'; in fact, his actions when he comes will be no less effective than his letters. Comparisons with others he avoids; they would be wiser not to make themselves the standard of their comparisons. As to 'boasting,' that is not unlimited, but keeps within the limits of the sphere of work assigned by God; that certainly includes Corinth, where St. Paul was the first to preach the Gospel. He claims no merit for work done by others outside his sphere, but hopes, when the faith of the Corinthians increases and he is more highly prized among them, to extend his province to regions beyond them, without intruding on another man's sphere and making any claim in respect of work already done. Finally, as Jeremiah (9 [23]) says, boasting should be **in the Lord**. To be approved means to have not one's own but the Lord's commendation. [7], if it refers to a special 'Christ-party,' gives us St. Paul's exposure of the absurdity of such a group. [10] does not exclude the possibility of 2 Cor 10-13 being part of the 'painful letter.' In [12-13] Bousset and Moffatt follow the shorter text of D. The reference to lack of wisdom disappears, and St. Paul says that measuring himself by his own standard he avoids unmeasured boasting. **the parts beyond you**, referring to the west (cf. Rom 15 [24, 28]), is regarded by J. H. Kennedy and Plummer as a phrase more natural in a letter from Ephesus than from Macedonia.

XI. 1-15. **Contrast between St. Paul and the False Teachers in Relation to the Church.**—A new and ironical strain now appears. St. Paul asks the Corinthians to bear with a little folly from him. The object of this zeal for the Church had been to betroth it as a pure virgin to Christ. But he fears lest Eve's fall before the tempter's wiles should be repeated in the history of the Church. It was a fine thing they were doing in tolerating newcomers with their preaching of another Jesus and their offering of a different spirit and gospel. That [4] is ironical praise of an actual situation is the natural interpretation. The view taken by Zahn, and regarded by Lake as possible, that an unreal hypothesis is presented, and that, given the situation suggested, the Church would be free from blame, is out of keeping with the context. Moffatt's 'why not put up with me' may give the introduction to [5]. St. Paul denies any inferiority to those superlative Apostles (that there is any, even indirect, reference to the original Apostles is very unlikely). He may be untrained as an orator, but he is properly equipped with knowledge and has never failed to communicate it. An explanation of the Church's attitude occurs to him. Had he done something wrong in refusing the right of maintenance at Corinth? His purpose had been to enhance the dignity of the Church. He

had forced other churches to contribute to his Corinthian ministry; at Corinth he had been a burden to nobody even when in want; Macedonian Christians brought him what he needed. He had never been and never would be burdensome to them. As Christ's truth was in him, to this particular boast there should be no let or hindrance. God knew it meant no lack of love of them. No, his steadfast purpose was to give no opportunity to his adversaries of claiming that in their preaching of the Gospel, of which they made so much, they were on the same footing as he. Really they were false apostles, wearing the appearance of Apostles of Christ, as Satan their master could assume the form of an angel of light. They were not ministers of righteousness at all, and their conduct would bring its appropriate punishment. In [12] the second 'that,' of the two conjunctions of purpose, is best taken as referring to the desire of the adversaries that St. Paul, like themselves, should accept maintenance, though we should have expected 'we as they' rather than 'they as we.' It is possible, with Massie, to take the **that** as referring to St. Paul's own desire to force his opponents to refuse support. On [14] Bousset and Windisch quote apocryphal traditions, e.g. *Apoc. Mos.*, 17, 'Satan took the form of an angel and sang praise to God like the angels.'

16-33. The Contrast between St. Paul and his Adversaries in Relation to Missionary Work.—From impassioned denunciation St. Paul returns to repudiate another contemptuous description possibly used of him. But with a quick turn of thought he decides to come before them in the rôle of fool ascribed to him. His confident boasting shall be that of a fool, on the level of the natural man, not of an inspired Apostle of Christ. The Corinthians in their wisdom know how to tolerate folly:—they have tolerated every kind of insulting behaviour in others. St. Paul admits that if not to be able to behave in such a way is a sign of weakness, the shame is his. Yet he has the same grounds for boastfulness as those others. In nationality, in membership of the holy people, in descent from Abraham, he is their equal; as a minister of Christ he is far their superior, mad though it is to make such claims in such a matter. (One may note that here, in contrast with [13-15], there is no repudiation of the reality of their Christian ministry.) St. Paul now gives, without reference to the occasions, a list of dangers and sufferings in which he was continually immersed. As a picture of a Christian Apostle's life we may compare it with 1 Cor 4 [9-13] and 2 Cor 6 [4-10], but as an objective statement of what that life contained it stands by itself. The Acts helps us very little in the way of direct identification. Yet these things were incidental (the exact significance of the beginning of [28] is doubtful); but anxious concern for all his Churches was a daily responsibility. A brother's weakness caused sympathetic weakness; in a brother caused to stumble the Apostle found reason for wrath. So true was it that only in his weaknesses would he boast, and the blessed God knew he was no liar—probably as to the ground of his boasting, possibly as to the record of his experiences. For [32-33] cf. Ac 9 [25]. Aretas IV must have been given control of Damascus for a time, and presumably desired to gain favour with the Jews. The date of the incident will be later than Gal 1 [17]. The isolation of the incident here is not easy to explain. Bousset suggests that his adversaries had attributed St. Paul's departure from Damascus to cowardice, and denied that he had been in real danger.

XII. 1-10. St. Paul's 'Rapture' and the Thorn in the Flesh.—There is remarkable confusion in the MSS. at 12 [1], but it would seem that St. Paul declares that he has a special ground of boasting, of which he feels compelled to say something, in visions and revelations from the Lord. Referring to himself as a third person, a Christian of fourteen years earlier, that is before the First Missionary Journey, he tells how he was caught up into the third heaven or paradise—the expressions are probably synonymous—where he heard words which he may not repeat. Only God, he says, knows whether the 'rapture' was of body as well as of spirit. St. Paul speaks of a number of heavens according to ideas of the time. Of this Paul he can boast, but of the normal Paul only in respect of his weaknesses. Yet he refrains from using his right, as he wishes to be judged only from men's observation of his life and words. Moreover, he had had a warning against undue pride in his revelations in a painful malady described as a thorn or, possibly, stake in the flesh and a messenger of Satan. Thrice he had asked for its removal, but had learnt that the grace the Lord supplied was sufficient for all his needs, since in human weakness divine strength was shown to be perfect. This assurance of Christ's power with him makes him boast of weaknesses rather than ask for their removal, and in all his afflictions he re-

joices because of Christ's relation to him, which means that in his weakness he is strong. The text of 7 is difficult: if **wherefore** is kept, **the greatness of the revelations** should grammatically go with the former clause, but the **and** is exceedingly harsh in that case and the sense not as effective. As to the 'thorn,' some kind of nervous complaint is possible. Bousset is sure it was epilepsy which threw St. Paul to the ground like a blow from an invisible foe. Ramsay is equally sure that it was not epilepsy. And the idea of acute pain gives some support to Ramsay's suggestion of malaria.

11-18. The Refusal of Support and Integrity of the Apostle.—Looking back upon his self-commendation St. Paul feels that it was indeed foolish, but as the Church had not stood up for him he could not help himself. However insignificant he was (Windisch seems wrong in taking this as 'pure irony') the superlative Apostles were not his superiors. He had proved his apostolate by mighty works of supernatural power at Corinth. And as for the Church, its only inferiority to the other Pauline Churches was that it had not been called on to support its Apostle. **forgive me**, he says, perhaps not altogether ironically, **this wrong.** St. Paul now asserts that on his approaching third visit he will continue to make no demands on them: that he has already paid two visits is the natural meaning of the words. As a parent he does not look for the support of his children, and as to expenditure he will gladly offer his resources and let himself be made an offering for them. Can it be that less love from them is to be his reward for his more abundant love? But the accusation against him can take another form; granted that he was not a burden to them when at Corinth, that was only because he was clever enough to trick them, i.e. into supporting him. That must have been through one of those he had sent, Titus or the brother. But can anyone pretend, St. Paul asks, that Titus made anything out of the Church? Or that there was any difference between Titus's spirit and behaviour and the Apostle's own? 18 is a verse on which Menzies confidently relies as proving that 8 6 ff., 23 was written before 12. But the fact that 12 17 f. clearly refers to a past visit of Titus, when he may have started the collection before acute trouble broke out, shows that Menzies' view is not unchallengeable.

XII. 18-XIII. 10. The Moral Condition of the Church and the Possibility of a Painful Visit.—A warning is given against any idea that the Apostle feels it necessary to make a defence of himself to the Church. It is to God that he is responsible as he speaks **in Christ.** And what he says he says not in his own interests but in those of the Corinthians. He wishes to build them up, since he fears lest their approaching meeting may be satisfactory neither to him nor to the Church. There is a danger of his finding the Church seething with quarrels, jealousies, and disloyalties; he is not sure that those who have formerly been guilty of grave sexual offences have repented, and the grief which such a state of things would occasion him would be felt as a humiliation for the Apostle of such a community. In 21 the former time to which these sins belong refers to some period in the Christian life of these members of the Church, perhaps to a period before St. Paul's second visit; not, as Bousset takes it, to their pre-Christian state. Once more St. Paul announces an approaching third visit. What he has said will then be fully established, for his third visit will, with the two former, make up the number of witnesses required in a Jewish trial (Dt 19 15). Difficult as this application of the text seems, it best suits the connexion between the beginning and end of the verse (so Windisch). 2 is not to be connected with 1. St. Paul now repeats in his absence the warning he gave in Corinth on his second visit. RV **as when** is right; AV 'as if' wrong. On a future visit he will act drastically. Those who ask for proof that he speaks with Christ's authority shall have it—proof of Christ's strength. As in Christ weakness and death were followed by life, so is it with His Apostle. It is difficult to exclude the idea of the resurrection-life of the Apostle from 4, but the context demands the thought also of a present life of power. But St. Paul would gladly be spared the necessity for such a proof of his power. He asks the Church to test its own standing in the faith. That can be done since Christ is among them; if He were not, they would already have been tried and found wanting. He hopes they will recognize that he has not been found wanting. But his real concern is for their conduct, not for an opportunity of showing that he can pass a test; if they do right he is content to be regarded as one who has failed to pass a test. He can work only as truth demands, and, it is implied, what truth now demands is the good conduct of the

Church. So he is glad to be weak if they are strong; his one desire is for their sound moral state. And he writes as he does that when he comes he may not have to exercise his authority severely. That authority he has from the Lord, but its purpose is primarily constructive, not destructive.

XIII. 11-13. **Concluding Greetings.**—Whatever our views of 10^1-13^{10} in relation to 1-9 may be, there is no reason to detach these final verses from the rest of 10-13. They contain a kindly appeal for the practice of the moral conduct of which he has been speaking. In the final verse, with which we may cf. 1 Cor 12^{4-6}, we have a religious benediction, very suggestive as it stands, which will be given its full and legitimate theological expression in the later formulated doctrine. The first two genitives are subjective; the third may be so—'the fellowship which the Holy Spirit creates'—but is more probably objective, 'fellowship in (i.e. "participation of") the Holy Spirit.'

Bibliography

This is less extensive than in the case of 1 Corinthians. Of comparatively recent date are Plummer (*I.C.C.* and *C.B.*), Massie (*Cent.B.*), J. H. Bernard (*E.G.T.*), Denney (*E.B.*), Menzies, and now Goudge (*W.C.*). J. H. Kennedy, *The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, and G. H. Rendall, *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians* should be consulted for the priority of 10-13 to 1-9; also Lake in *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*; cf. also G. H. Clayton in *D.A.C.*, I, 252 ff. W. Sanday in *E.G.T.* maintains the unity. (Bishop) A. Robertson's article on 2 Corinthians in *H.D.B.* is well-balanced and judicious. F. W. Robertson's *Expository Lectures* include 2 as well as 1 Corinthians. To Windisch's commentary (1924) reference has been made. Bousset edits the Epistle in J. Weiss's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. He, and Jülicher in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (Eng. tr.), argue for the unity of the Epistle.

GALATIANS

By Wilfred L. Knox

The epistle is written to the 'Southern Galatians,' the group of churches founded by St. Paul and St. Barnabas at Antioch in Pisidia, Lystra, Derbe, and Iconium. There is no evidence that St. Paul ever preached in any other part of the province. His readers are addressed as Galatians for the reason that there is no other single name which would apply to them all. Antioch lay in Pisidia, Iconium in Phrygia, Lystra and Derbe in Lycaonia. The importance of these places was due to their situation; St. Paul had already evangelized Cilicia during his ministry at Tarsus: his work in these cities was an extension of the Church along the road to Ephesus and Asia Minor, one of the most populous regions of the Empire, and a centre of the Jewish Dispersion. The old view that the epistle was written to the Northern Galatians implies that at some unspecified period St. Paul paid a visit to the thinly populated and only half-civilized region in the neighbourhood of Ancyra, a region in which the native Celtic language survived as late as the days of St. Jerome. Ac 16^6 does not describe a mission in Galatia, but a journey, during which no preaching is said to have taken place, along the frontier of Phrygia and Galatia in a northerly direction from the Pisidian Antioch to Dorylæum on the frontier of Bithynia, while Ac 18^{23} describes a journey through the cities of Southern Galatia and Phrygia, in a westerly direction from Derbe through the Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus. There is thus no evidence that the supposed churches of Northern Galatia ever existed.

This view is confirmed by a consideration of the date. Any identification of the visit of 2^1 with that of Ac 15 implies that one of the two accounts is a hopeless falsification; one describes a strictly private meeting of the leaders of the Church, the other a public meeting of the whole. Lightfoot's view that there was a private consultation followed by a public meeting, which had only to accept a prearranged decision, gives no explanation of St. Paul's motive for mentioning the private agreement and ignoring the formal vote of the Church in his favour. Nor does it explain why St. Paul's opponents after their defeat at the Council should reopen the question in Galatia. Consequently it seems that the epistle is

to be dated in the year A.D. 49, shortly after the end of the first missionary journey (cf. 1 [6]); it is a move in the controversy described in Ac 15 [2]. The supposed objection to such an early date, the resemblance of this epistle to Romans, is quite unconvincing. For (1) the whole tone of the letters is different. Romans is a calm survey of a controversy that is over, while this epistle is written in the heat of controversy. (2) The resemblance consists largely in the use of 'proof-texts' from the Old Testament; but these texts are common 'proof-texts' of the Judaism of the Dispersion in their attempts to convert the Gentiles. In using them St. Paul is making use of the normal armoury of the Hellenistic Jew.

The authorship is undisputed. The only peculiarity is that (on the date suggested above) St. Barnabas does not appear to have taken any part in writing it. This, however, is not surprising, since the letter was manifestly written in the heat of the controversy over circumcision, when the Jewish Christians were carrying on a campaign throughout Syria, Cilicia, and Galatia. St. Barnabas may very probably have been occupied in combating their influence in some other part of the region in which he and St. Paul were the leading apostolic figures; St. Paul writes without waiting to consult him on a matter on which they have been agreed since the opening of their work at Antioch.

I., II. 1-14 (probably). **St. Paul's Authority.**

I. 1-5. St. Paul opens with a vigorous claim to an Apostleship of directly divine origin, based on the fact that he has seen our Lord. He has, indeed, to admit elsewhere that there was a difference between his vision of our Lord after the resurrection and those of the other disciples (1 Cor 15 [8]),* but this does not lessen his apostolic authority, which comes to him not from men nor through any particular man, such as one of the older Apostles, but through the risen Christ Himself. It is noticeable that authority which comes through Him is definitely contrasted with authority which comes through a man; His right to confer authority is nothing less than the power of God, who raised Him from the dead.

4. **who gave himself for our sins.** This is the simplest statement of the doctrine of the Atonement, and reminds us of our Lord's words in Mk 10 [45]. The belief that Jesus gave Himself 'for our sins' is a vital part of the Christian faith, however difficult it may be to formulate the doctrine of the Atonement. In this passage St. Paul regards His death as liberating us from 'the present evil age,' i.e. the order of time, which, like the 'world,' i.e. the order of space, in 1 Jn 5 [19], lies in the power of the evil one. This deliverance has been accomplished **according to the will of our God and Father**; man had in the past been subject on account of his sins to the power of darkness (Col 1 [12]), but by the death of Jesus he is liberated and restored to his true position as the son of God.

6-10. The abrupt opening, which omits the usual note of praise and thanksgiving, reveals the burning indignation with which St. Paul writes. The obscure language of [7] is best rendered, **I marvel that ye are so quickly removing . . .,** except for the fact that they who trouble you are somebodies,' i.e. are people of importance. For this sense of the words cf. 2 [6] and Ac 5 [36]. He admits that the Galatians have some excuse in so far as the teachers of circumcision are men of high standing in the Church. But it is God who has called them **in the grace of Christ** without imposing the duty of observing the Law; those who impose that duty are preaching not a more correct conception of the Gospel, but a totally different message. Anyone who preaches a message contrary to that which he has given, even if it be himself or an angel of God, is to be rejected as perverting the Gospel of Christ. The firmness with which he makes this pronouncement may suffice to demolish another charge brought against him, that he tries to please men by abolishing the Law and so omitting an essential part of the Gospel. His action in doing so could easily be represented in this light; his boldness in opposing influential Christians in this matter disproves the charge. Elsewhere (1 Cor 9 [19-22]) he shows himself perfectly ready to please men, if by doing so he can gain them to Christ; he will not do so where the result of his action would be to lose them.

11-17. The authority of St. Paul's Gospel is proved by the fact that it came to him by direct revelation. It is entirely contrary to any personal predilections of his own, since he was before his conversion prominent for his zeal for the Law. After his conversion he retired from Damascus to Arabia; it was there that he worked out what was implied in the revelation of the risen Lord given to him on the road to Damascus. By Arabia is

* But cf. footnote on Ac 9 [1-19], p. 346.

meant the desert lying east and south of Palestine, the country of the Nabatæan Arabs. The region included Mount Sinai, the scene of God's original revelation of Himself to the Jewish nation. St. Paul's journey to this region was not a missionary journey, but a retirement into solitude comparable to that of Elijah. Its purpose was to enable him to adjust his life and teaching to the new truth revealed to him that Jesus was in fact the Messiah and not an impostor. In this sense he had learnt his Gospel not from flesh and blood, i.e. from human teachers, but by the revelation which caused his conversion and his subsequent meditations on what that revelation implied.

At the same time it must be remembered that the main facts of the Gospel as taught by the Church, the Death and Resurrection of our Lord and His presence in the Church which preached Him as the Messiah, were already known to St. Paul. The distinctive feature of his Gospel, that the Gentiles need not observe the Law, is here by a characteristic exaggeration referred to as if it were the whole of the Gospel; but without that the Gospel for St. Paul becomes something entirely different. It is important to recognize this in view of the attempts sometimes made to use this passage as evidence that St. Paul's teaching was mainly based on his own visions and had little connexion with Christianity as it existed before.*

18-24. Only after three years (one whole year and parts of two others) did he visit Jerusalem, where he spent a fortnight with St. Peter. The object of his visit was to have an interview with the recognized head of the apostolic band; the passage clearly implies that his primacy was in some sense recognized, though it gives no clue to its nature or extent. He saw no other Apostle but James the Lord's brother, who already enjoyed in Jerusalem a position practically equal to that of the original Twelve, although it is not certain whether he would have been described as an Apostle in the full sense. Thence he went to Syria and Cilicia, and was unknown except by reputation to the churches of Judæa. The inconsistency of this passage with Ac 9 [26-30] may easily be exaggerated. St. Luke is certainly mistaken in supposing that St. Paul was introduced by St. Barnabas to the whole body of the Apostles. He assumes that the Twelve were all in Jerusalem, whereas this passage shows that they were not. It would seem that, except for St. Peter and St. James the Lord's brother, they were occupied in supervising the new communities of Judæa and Galilee which had sprung up in consequence of the flight of the followers of St. Stephen. There is, on the other hand, no evidence that St. Paul's whole stay in the city only lasted a fortnight, as apart from his stay with St. Peter. It is quite possible that St. Peter left Jerusalem at the end of a fortnight, leaving St. Paul there.

The reference to the churches in Judæa is remarkable. Most of the converts in them could have told St. Paul little or nothing of the Gospel, which they had only just learnt. But since they are in Christ they possess a corporate existence, which makes them witnesses to the Gospel, although in fact they depend for their knowledge on the Apostles who are engaged in instructing them. In virtue of this corporate unity the distinction between the Apostle who instructs and the Church which he teaches can be ignored. The use of the word **faith** is remarkable; usually in St. Paul it means the individual's assent to the truth of the Gospel; here it means a system of belief which can be preached and persecuted.

II. **1-10.** The story of the crisis at Jerusalem is one of the unsolved mysteries of the New Testament. The visit referred to can only be that of Ac 11 [30]. The revelation which caused it may have been the prophecy of Agabus; more probably it was a revelation which informed St. Paul that the earlier command to leave the city (Ac 22 [18]) had been withdrawn. The fourteen years date from the time of his conversion (A.D. 35-36) to A.D. 48, the actual time of the famine. It cannot be supposed that St. Paul has ignored this visit in view of the solemn assertion of 1 [20]. Nor is it possible to say that St. Paul might ignore this visit, since he only met the presbyters, in the absence of the Apostles; the presbyters of Jerusalem could have given him plenty of information about the Gospel, while the object of the whole passage is to show his independence of those who were his elders in the faith.* It would seem that a controversy had already arisen over the relation of the Law to the Gospel at Antioch, though it did not reach the acuteness of that described in Ac 15. At a private discussion the three older Apostles agreed with St. Paul; but some

* Cf. *The Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 411, 412.

* The meaning of the last words of [2] probably is that, had the observance of the Law been imposed upon the Gentile converts, St. Paul's whole work would have been wrecked.—ED.

of the Jewish Christians discovered that Titus was uncircumcised, and raised an outcry. What followed is uncertain. The *prima facie* explanation of 3-5 is that Titus was not circumcised; but the confused language and the absence of a definite statement as to the exact course of events suggest that the true meaning is that Titus was not *compelled* to be circumcised, but owing to the action of certain false brethren he was circumcised in fact, though St. Paul's concession was not for a moment to be regarded as a yielding to superior authority or to compulsion, only as an act of conciliation. This interpretation has in its favour the fact that the language is obscure in itself, which indicates that the matter did not go entirely in St. Paul's favour, and also the absence of any allusion to Titus in the Acts, although he appears in 2 Corinthians as one of St. Paul's most trusted lieutenants. It is at least possible that St. Luke, who writes with the controversies of this period in his mind, avoids the mention of a name connected with St. Paul's one serious defeat. But it must be admitted that the opposite interpretation is possible and more in accordance with the natural meaning of the words. In 6 the obvious irritation with which St. Paul writes of the older Apostles is instructive when compared with the courtesy with which he treats St. Peter in 1 Corinthians; it suggests that at the moment he is uncertain whether they will not decide against him. St. Peter's primacy noted above is so vague that he does not feel entitled to claim any jurisdiction over the Pauline Churches.

The exact scope of the agreement made on this occasion should be noticed. It gives the younger Apostles a free hand in dealing with the Gentiles, and reserves the Jews for the older ones, but makes no provision for mixed communities. the poor are the Christians of Jerusalem, whose strict observance of the evangelical precept of poverty entitles them to the veneration and support of the Gentile Churches, whose members cannot imitate them in this respect. (Cf. 2 Cor 8, 9, and the name 'Ebionites' [the poor], which seems to have been applied to the Jewish Church before it was transferred to the early sects of Jewish heretics.)

11-14. St. Peter went to Antioch at some unspecified date, and accepted at first the equality of Jews and Gentiles which he found there. The arrival of some messengers from St. James caused him to change his attitude. (It is not necessary to suppose that they had been sent for the purpose of urging him to do so; they would naturally be influential members of the Church at Jerusalem, who acted on their own initiative in the matter.) St. Peter endeavoured to arrange a compromise by which Jews and Gentiles separated for the common meals of the Church and the Eucharist. Since this was the centre of Christian life, St. Paul rightly saw that this separation was in principle an assertion of the superiority of Jews to Gentiles, and protested vigorously; his most telling argument was that St. Peter, being a Jew, lived like a Gentile; St. Peter only observed the popular standard of Judaism current among the nation as a whole; to St. Paul, as a Pharisee, such a measure of Judaism was no better than living like a Gentile; it was ridiculous to impose on Gentiles a standard of Judaism which was totally inadequate even as Judaism.

II. 15-V. 13. The Superiority of the Gospel.

II. 15-21. St. Paul's indignation carries him away so rapidly that it is impossible to say where his reproof of St. Peter breaks off. The point given here for the transition is a probable one, but no more. The argument is that the only value of belief in Christ is that it confers on the sinner a righteousness which the Law cannot give. But the claim made for the Law by the judaizing Christians is that it is a necessary safeguard against their relapsing into the vices of the heathen. (This was the ground on which the Jews of the Dispersion defended the Law to the heathen proselytes and adherents of their synagogues.) If this claim were true, it would follow that those who were 'found in Christ' were still sinners. But Christ had abolished the Law; if, having done so, He then proceeded to impose it afresh, He convicted Himself of being a servant of sin, who built up again what He had first destroyed. Through the Law, i.e. through the revelation of sin which the Law gave, St. Paul has died to the Law in order that he may live to God; having been crucified with Christ, he no longer lives himself, but Christ lives in him. (This experience of mystical union with Christ and a resulting freedom from the old slavery to sin is the basis of all Pauline theology.) He does indeed still live in the flesh; from this point of view his life, though his own, is completely dominated by faith in the Son of God, who died for him. If the righteousness which he experiences in himself had been

attainable by the Law, the death of Christ and the power of grace which it introduced into human life would have been unnecessary. **grace** is another way of expressing the new power of righteousness of which St. Paul has been conscious since his conversion; his whole theology rests on this claim that the death of Christ has brought into the world a new power, of which he is personally conscious, which renders possible the attainment of that righteousness which the Law (and all human systems of religion and ethics) set up as man's end, but gives him no power to accomplish.

III. **1-6. An Appeal to the Experience of the Galatians.**—'Who has bewitched you? You had Christ crucified proclaimed to you, and the proclamation produced a marvellous effect. But this effect was due not to the fact that you had been observing the Law in the past, but to the fact that you heard the proclamation with faith; you cannot be so foolish as to suppose that the outpouring of the Spirit was the lower stage of development, and that it was only intended to lead you up to a system of external rules. If so, all you have suffered for the Gospel was unnecessary.' St. Paul describes his preaching of the Gospel as a 'placarding of Christ crucified' before the eyes of the Galatians. As in the Acts, enormous emphasis is laid on the evidential value of the visible manifestation of the Spirit in the form of speaking with tongues and healing of diseases which accompanied St. Paul's first mission. His hearers had received this outpouring of the Spirit, not as a reward for their previous observance of the Law, but because they listened with faith; some no doubt, probably the majority, had been Jews or proselytes, but the Spirit had not been confined to them. Had their conversion been merely a preliminary stage leading up to the observance of the Law, it would have been an absurdity. For they had suffered for their faith as Christians; but no one need suffer for the sake of Judaism, which was not liable to persecution. God had given them this outpouring of the Spirit through the faith with which they listened. The repetition of the phrase **hearing of faith**, i.e. hearing accompanied by faith, leads up to the argument from one of St. Paul's great proof-texts (Gen 15^6), which is also used on several occasions by Philo.

In ^{5} **he that supplieth** is most naturally interpreted as referring to God, not to the apostolic agent through whom He works this outpouring of the Spirit.

7-22. To the modern reader the purely rabbinical arguments which St. Paul uses to prove the necessity of faith and the claim of our Lord to be the fulfilment of the promises made to Abraham are startling. God promised to Abraham that all the nations of the earth should be blessed in him. The promise was made to him in virtue of his faith; it follows that the blessing will be given to those who share his faith. The Law cannot be the condition of the fulfilment of the promise; for the Law brings not the promised blessing, but only a curse on all those who fail to keep it. Righteousness can only be obtained by faith (the just shall live by faith), whereas the Law does not demand faith, but only the impossible task of fulfilling all its prescriptions (he that doeth them shall live in them). (It is implied, as St. Paul always assumes, that in fact it is impossible to observe the Law rightly, and that therefore every man is under the curse imposed by the Law on those who fail to keep it.) From this curse, however, Christ has freed us, by being Himself made a curse (cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree). Here the Deuteronomic command which forbade the leaving of the corpse of an executed criminal to hang all night is applied to the crucifixion; the curse attached to hanging on a tree is the curse pronounced on all who fail to keep the Law; Christ has borne the curse, and so abolished it. Henceforth the blessing promised to Abraham comes into force in Christ, and is available for the Gentiles who through faith obtain the promised blessing, the gift of the Spirit.

Even if the covenant made with Abraham had been a purely human one, it could not be set aside. By that covenant a promise was made not to his seeds but to his seed, in other words, not to all his descendants but to one. (The collective word **seed** is here forced into meaning one person.) St. Paul would no doubt have defended his argument by alleging the unity of all Christians in Christ, but a Jewish opponent would have replied that all Jews were a collective unity in Abraham in virtue of descent, just as St. Paul's argument in Rom 5^{15} depends for its force on the conception that the whole human race is collectively one with its first parent (cf. Heb 7^9).

Now the covenant made with Abraham was not a purely human one; it was made by God. The Law could not abolish it. Nor was the Law the means for bringing about the fulfilment of the promise; for

it offered not a free gift, as did the original promise made to Abraham, but a curse. The Law therefore was merely a temporary measure to reveal the full nature of sin and the powerlessness of man to overcome it (Rom 5 [20]), until the time came for the fulfilment of the promise in Christ, the seed of Abraham. The promise to Abraham was made by God alone; the inferiority of the Law is shown by the fact that it was given through angels and a human mediator. Had it been given direct by God, the mediation of Moses would have been unnecessary; God could have pronounced it Himself. The mediation of angels proves that the givers of the Law were angels—a number of givers on the one side and a number of recipients on the other, so that a mediator was needed. But, of course, the Law was not contrary to the promises; it was merely unable to give true life. So as the Scriptures tell us all were subjected to sin, in order that the promise might be fulfilled through faith in Christ when He came.*

23-IV. 7. Before He came we were prisoners waiting for the revelation of faith by which we were to be delivered. Or, by a change of metaphor, the Law was a guardian appointed to lead us to Christ, in order that we might be justified by faith. For through faith in Christ we are mystically made one with Him, so that we all become the sons of God. In virtue of our union with Him all the old distinctions are abolished; being one with Him we are also one with each other. If, then, we are Christ's, we are the seed of Abraham and heirs of God in accordance with the promise. Before we were like children subject to the rule of servants, the servants in this case being the powers that rule the material world. Man's sin had made him subject to them, and the Law was the 'bond written in ordinances' (Col 2 [14]), which testified to that subjection; when, however, the appointed time had come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman and made subject to the Law, in order that He might bear the curse which the Law imposed (3 [13]), and thereby make it possible for us to return to our true position as adopted sons of God. (Another interpretation of this difficult passage may be obtained by understanding the word 'elements' in the sense of elementary teaching: we were like children in an elementary stage of development, comparable to slavery; God sent His Son to be subject to the Law in order that He might redeem us from our subjection to the Law. In this case the exact nature of the means by which redemption from the bondage of the Law was obtained for man by the subjection of Christ to the Law is left unexplained.) We now have the freedom of sons, as is proved by the fact that He has sent into our hearts the Holy Ghost, which enables us to cry 'Abba, Father,' i.e. to approach God with freedom and love, instead of fear and subjection.

It is important to observe that in 3 [27] the act of faith and the receiving of baptism are regarded as inseparable: it is assumed that conversion is accompanied by the sacrament; St. Paul does not stay to consider whether it is the ratification of the inward change of heart or the means by which the first movement of faith in the soul is brought to its completion. The idea that faith is possible without formal admission to the Church by baptism is entirely foreign to his whole conception of Christianity, which involves as its essential character unity in Christ with the whole body of Christians.

In 4 [6] the presence of the Holy Spirit in our hearts represents an entirely new attitude towards God as against the old servile fear and subjection, which was all that the Law allowed. We come to Him as children to a father. This is the fact which guarantees our belief that we are sons of God through Christ, not as formerly slaves of the Law or of other spiritual powers.

IV. 8-11. In those days you did not know God, but served those who by nature are not gods but creatures of an inferior order. Now you know Him, or rather are known by Him. Here, as in 1 Cor 8 [3]

* The immense strength of St. Paul's appeal to the Old Testament is sometimes obscured by its Rabbinical form. In the Old Testament there is to be found some amount both of legalism and of nationalism, but its highest teaching rises above both. (i) In the Old Testament story God's primary claim is always for faith. All its heroes are heroes of faith. They are men who believe and act upon a divine message given to them, and it is upon their faith that their acceptance with God rests (cf. Hos 6 [6]). (ii) The prophets are with St. Paul in denying that descendants of Abraham, who refuse to believe the divine message sent to them, will inherit the promise; while some of them recognize that faithful Gentiles will do so. God has in no way pledged Himself to the physical descendants of Abraham (cf. *The Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 416-418). (iii) St. Paul's view that the legal system was merely a temporary measure, intended to develop its sense of sin, is strongly supported by modern historical criticism. It did not come into being till after the Exile, and so was far later than even St. Paul supposed. When it arose, prophecy ceased; and with it in large measure God's appeal for faith. With the coming of the Lord and His Gospel of the Kingdom the old appeal revived.—ED.

and 13 [12], man's knowledge of God is only made possible by an act of divine recognition, by which God takes cognizance of him. The same idea appears in Rom 8 [29], where predestination is due to the fact that God has 'foreknown' us. We cannot know God unless He gives us the power to do so by taking knowledge of us. The Galatians are now seeking to return to the old state of slavery to inferior beings by their observance of the Law, as though St. Paul had not brought them a higher knowledge.

12-20. An appeal to the affection of the Galatians and their first enthusiasm for him in his weakness as against their present enthusiasm for teachers who are leading them astray. They are not zealous for your salvation, but jealous of your freedom. They seek to exclude you from the privileges of the Jew in order that you may be jealous of them and look up to them as possessing something which you have not got. St. Paul rightly ascribes the demand that the Gentiles should observe the Law to the desire of the Jewish Christians to assert their racial superiority. The desire was no doubt often not consciously felt, but it was always present below the surface.

21-V. 1. A further rabbinical argument for the superiority of the freedom conferred by the Gospel to the bondage of the Law.* The two sons of Abraham represent the two covenants. Ishmael, the son of Hagar, represents Mount Sinai, the home of his descendants. Now Sinai corresponds to the earthly Jerusalem (an allusion to the legend that the three holy places of the world, the Garden of Eden, Mount Sinai, and Jerusalem were created 'facing one another' in some supernatural correspondence), which, as all the world can see, is in bondage. Sarah represents the heavenly Jerusalem, conceived as existing in heaven and waiting to be revealed in due time (cf. Rev 21 [2]); this city is free and not in bondage. If at the moment the Jewish nation persecutes the Church, this was foreshadowed in the persecution of Isaac by Ishmael.

Thus the mere fact of physical descent cannot be claimed as a privilege by the Jews. The true sonship is spiritual, and is given to those who accept by faith the liberty which Christ has won for us. Although St. Paul's allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament may not mean much to modern readers, his conclusion is of vital significance. The Christian covenant is a gift of spiritual freedom, based on the acceptance by faith of the Person of Christ, not a system of external observances. St. Paul leaves no room for any necessity of a limited element of regulation in the Christian life as a means to the expression and preservation of this personal union with Christ. In practice it is almost inevitable that this element should be retained; but it is essential that it should be regarded as being merely a means which possesses no value in itself.

V. **2-6. A double argument against circumcision.** In itself it binds those who accept it to obey the whole Law. By this St. Paul means to observe the whole legal system as elaborated by the Pharisees (cf. 2 [14] and 6 [13]). The popular standard of Judaism is not obeying the Law; it is no better than living like a Gentile. Further obedience to the Law cuts the observer off from Christ, in whom we obtain righteousness by means of the Spirit, partially in this life, perfectly in the life to come through faith that realizes itself in love. The phrases here are variations of language, all intended to describe that mystical union with our Lord through love and faith on the part of the believer, as a result of the gift of the Holy Ghost on the part of God, which is the essence of Pauline Christianity.

7-13. A further appeal to the Galatians to abandon their false teachers. In [11] there seems to be an allusion to some statement by St. Paul's opponents that St. Paul himself still preaches circumcision. Possibly this claim was made on the strength of the fact that he still observed the Law and regarded it as the duty of Jewish Christians to do so (1 Cor 7 [18]; Ac 16 [3], 21 [26], 23 [6]). In this respect he was in fact inconsistent. **the stumblingblock of the cross** refers to the peculiar objection felt by the Jews to the idea that One who had died by a death so repulsive to Jewish sentiment as the Cross could be the Messiah. If, St. Paul argues, I allow that circumcision is necessary, I am in fact denying that the death of Christ has any value, and there is no reason to be offended by the Cross: for if the Law provides all that is necessary, the Cross and the Person and work of Christ are of no importance in the scheme of salvation.

* The story of Hagar has probably a Midrashic character, its purpose being to contrast the place of Israel, the nation supernaturally born, with that of the Ishmael tribes of the desert, whose kinship as children of Abraham was admitted. The children of nature are contrasted with the children of grace (cf. Jn 8 [31-40]). Thus the story which St. Paul treats as an allegory is in fact an allegory; and he reinterprets in accordance with his previous teaching about the true seed of Abraham.—H. L. G.

V. 13-VI. 10. Practical Conclusions.

V. 13-26. St. Paul is faced with the difficulty that having established the liberty of the Christian from the Law, he has none the less to insist on the necessity of leading the Christian life. He does so in terms of a dualistic theology, the language of which, if taken strictly, implies that the flesh, or human nature in itself, is at any rate in man's fallen condition the necessary source of all evil, while the spirit, as the element in man which enables him to enter into communion with God, is the channel by which he receives a divine power enabling him to live rightly. St. Paul's use of this language cannot be taken to prove that he would have committed himself to the view that the material world in itself is evil; in Rom 1 [20] he takes a diametrically opposite view. In any case the fact that human nature is the source of evil is due to the fact of man's fall, not to God.

Those who walk by the Spirit will not follow the desires of the flesh. In those who are not yet perfect there is a conflict between the two elements which prevents them from acting as they would; but if we allow ourselves to be led by the Spirit we are free from the conflict between the two, which the Law reveals but does not solve, and therefore are free from the Law. (For the conflict in man so long as he is under the Law and unregenerate, cf. Rom 7.) The works of the flesh are the sins natural to man; in contrast to these stands the fruit of the Spirit, the different Christian virtues, which are the various manifestations of the one indwelling Spirit and form a single whole. The Law has nothing to say with regard to these virtues;* they can only be manifested by those who are Christ's in virtue of the fact that they have crucified the flesh. For the last conception cf. Col 2 [11] ff. The Christian at baptism dies to the old life of the flesh, and rises to a new life in the Spirit in virtue of the fact that Christ by His death has conquered the powers to which man had become subject by reason of his sins, and acquired for Himself His new body, the Church.

Once again St. Paul's opponents could urge that all they claim for the Law is that it is the appointed means for enabling the imperfect Christian to realize in this life the standard of conduct in which the Spirit will be able to manifest itself. St. Paul cannot allow this, since the effect of accepting the obligation of observing the Law would have been to make it the centre of the Christian life. He is in some difficulty since he cannot express the duty of 'walking in the Spirit' in terms of obedience to a moral code. On the other hand, his argument is truer than any which accepts the idea of a moral law as an ultimate element in the Christian ideal of life. Although the idea of a moral code may be necessary at certain stages of Christian development, yet the true Christian ideal, is never one of obedience to a code; it is a life in which the Spirit of God is allowed to work freely and express itself in the spirit of man.

VI. 1-13. Practical exhortations to charity, mutual forbearance, and liberality. Those who are spiritual must prove the fact by revealing the spirit of gentleness towards their weaker brethren. It was naturally easy for those who had received the gifts of the Holy Ghost in an exceptional degree to suppose themselves superior to those who were less favoured; we see such a situation in 1 Cor 12. Here, as there, St. Paul points out that humility and love are the true proof of possession of the gifts of the Spirit. We must bear one another's burdens, if we would follow the Law of Christ, recognizing that we have our own failing, which prevent us from judging others. All of us have to bear our own burden of responsibility for our own actions; an appreciation of this fact will make us ready to help others to bear the burden of their own failures instead of adding to their burden by judging them harshly.

them that are of the household of faith. The Christian is bound to show kindness to all men, especially to those who, as his fellow-Christians, are members of the same household as himself, namely the household which is united by the sharing of a common faith, just as in Phil 4 [22] some of the Roman Christians are united as members of the household of Cæsar. Naturally the duty of a Christian is not limited to his fellow-Christians; but where they are in need they have a claim on him which ranks before the claim of others.

11 to end. Autograph postscript by St. Paul. His opponents wish to reserve for themselves the natural gratification of being able to claim as Jews to be superior to other Christians, as those who were Jews by birth claimed to be superior to proselytes. They have the further desire to avoid persecution as Christians. Yet they do not really keep the Law themselves; they only keep it in details, and they wish to make the Galatians do the same in order to gratify their own vanity.

* Perhaps rather 'has nothing to say against them' (cf. 1 Tim 1 [9]).—H. L. G.

But the Christian has no ground for boasting but the Cross, through which he has been crucified to the world. It does not matter whether a man has been circumcised or not; all that matters is that through his death to the world he should have been created afresh and raised to a new supernatural state of life (cf. 2 Cor 5 [17]).

16. the Israel of God. The Church is for St. Paul primarily the new chosen people to which the privileges forfeited by the unbelief of the Jews have descended.

17. The marks of the persecutions which he bears on his body are the proof that he is the servant of the Lord Jesus, and ought to be sufficient to defend him from attack or criticism by those who profess themselves servants of the same Master. Probably the reference is to the practice of branding slaves, especially those of heathen temples, as a mark of ownership.

Literature

Commentaries: Lightfoot, Ramsay, Emmet. **Other literature:** Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*; Askwith, *The Epistle to the Galatians*; and Ramsay *passim* for the South Galatian theory. For the North Galatian theory see Schmiedel in *Enc. Bibl.*

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

By Eric Graham

Authorship.—The Epistle to Philemon 'is virtually Paul's own signature appended as their guarantee' to Ephesians and Colossians (Sabatier). This close connexion between the three epistles was acknowledged from the radical side by Baur, who felt compelled to reject Philemon in rejecting the other two. But attempts have been made to drive a wedge between Colossians and Ephesians, most forcibly by Moffatt (*I.L.N.T.*), who regards Ephesians as 'a set of variations played by a master hand upon one or two themes suggested by Colossians.' This view, however, hardly does justice to the extremely intricate and deep-rooted connexion between the two epistles, which cannot be satisfactorily explained except on the supposition that they were composed at roughly the same time by one writer in whose mind the ideas and phrases characteristic of both epistles were living and adaptable. If Ephesians is the work of a later writer assuming the name of St. Paul, we have to suppose that he was a person of amazing ingenuity who imitated Pauline mannerisms, yet quite inconspicuously, while rashly using a new phrase like 'in the heavenly *places*' no less than five times; that he minutely dissected Colossians and redistributed the fragments throughout his own work in all sorts of different contexts on no particular plan; that while claiming St. Paul's name, he only used it twice, and that in the most natural way possible (1 [1] and 3 [1]); and that in spite of this elaborate and meticulous artificiality he yet produced a work which gives the impression of entire spontaneity, admirable, moreover, alike for the loftiness of its style and the magnificence of its thought. We assume therefore that Ephesians, which is in any case the crown of the Pauline writings, is the work of St. Paul himself.

Destination.—Ephesians can hardly be a letter written by St. Paul himself to the Ephesian Church. His relations with that church were of the most tender and intimate kind (Ac 20 [17-38]); but in this epistle there is no trace of personal feeling and no allusion to his work at Ephesus; on the contrary, he has only 'heard' of the faith of those to whom he is writing (1 [15]), and they have 'heard' of his commission to the Gentiles (3 [2]). Moreover, the true reading of 1 [1] omits the words 'at Ephesus' on decisive manuscript and patristic testimony. But there is no alternative reading which suggests any other Church, and the Ephesian destination was not disputed in ancient times except by Marcion (before *c.* 150), who calls it the Epistle 'to the Laodiceans.'

Probably St. Paul took advantage of Tychicus's journey to Colossæ to write this letter to a group of churches in that neighbourhood, including e.g. Laodicea and Hierapolis; and as it was not addressed to one particular church, he left a gap in 1 [1] for the oral insertion of the name of each place in turn. (This 'circular letter' hypothesis has been criticized by Moffatt as 'not true to ancient methods of epistolography'; but so simple and

common sense a plan does not require to be justified by precedents.) The letter, having finished its rounds, found its final home at Ephesus, the chief city of Asia Minor and the one most intimately connected with St. Paul. In this way both the omission of 'at Ephesus' in the oldest MSS., and the tradition which associates the letter with Ephesus, are reasonably explained. We may go one step further: Ephesians was sent at the same time as Colossians and by the same messenger, Tychicus (cf. Eph 6 [21] with Col 4 [7]). Presumably also the letter which was to come to Colossæ from Laodicea (Col 4 [16]) was sent at the same time as Colossians. Therefore, unless we are to postulate yet another letter which was written at the same time, but has perished without leaving a trace behind, we must identify Ephesians with 'the epistle from Laodicea'—a phrase which does not necessarily imply an epistle written specially to the Laodicean Church, but is equally applicable to a 'circular' letter which was to be handed on to Colossæ after it had been read at Laodicea. The two cities were only thirteen miles apart. Whether Marcion was following some tradition which connected Ephesians with the Laodicean Church, or whether he was merely putting forward a conjecture based on Col 4 [16], remains an open and not very important question.

Occasion and Purpose.—The imprisonment during which St. Paul wrote Ephesians is thrice referred to in the epistle; and the view that it was the two years' imprisonment at Rome mentioned in Ac 28 [30] (*c.* 59-61 A.D.)—on all grounds the most probable view—is confirmed by the phrase 'I am an ambassador in chains' (6 [20]); i.e. he is present in the imperial city, though without honour, as the representative of Christ the King. So far as there is any special 'occasion' to be assigned to the epistle, it is in this fact that we must find it. The wide and detached outlook which characterizes the great epistle written *to* Rome appears even more conspicuously in this letter *from* Rome. Philemon shows us that St. Paul had private matters to deal with, and Colossians that the care of the various churches still pressed upon him; but in Ephesians he rises above all particular or local needs, and treats of the glorious life in Christ with a new breadth and freedom, and in language of a new force and grandeur, with an almost lyrical strain making itself felt from time to time.

His aim may be expressed in his own words: it is to expound the eternal purpose of God which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord (3 [11]), in order that all to whom he writes may know what is the hope of His calling, what the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints, and what the exceeding greatness of His power to us-ward who believe (1 [18] f.); and thus may walk worthy of the calling wherewith they were called (4 [1]), as members one of another in the mystical and Spirit-bearing Body of Christ: the universal Church (1 [23], 2 [18-22], 4 [4, 25]).

Doctrine.—The special thoughts about God which St. Paul emphasizes in Ephesians are His Fatherhood (eight times) and His eternal purpose manifested in Christ; and in close connexion with these he lays great stress on the work of the Holy Spirit, 'by whom the whole Body of the Church is governed and sanctified.'

The Christology is that of Colossians, but assumed rather than expounded. Christ—crucified, risen, ascended—is the Beloved of God, His only Son (1 [6], 4 [13]), the manifestation of the divine purpose and power; and for us—who were chosen in Him before the foundation of the world—He is the One Lord (4 [5]), the source of redemption, forgiveness, reconciliation, access to the Father, and of all spiritual blessings; for His riches are unsearchable (1 [3, 7], 2 [5, 13, 14, 18], 3 [8], etc.).

Moreover, He is the Head of the Church which is His Body; and this relationship is the most characteristic theme of the epistle. The essential place of the Church in the divine scheme of redemption—as the Israel of God continuous in its life with the old Israel—is never absent from the mind of St. Paul (cf. Rom 12 [5]; 1 Cor 12 [12] ff.; Col 1 [18-24]); but nowhere else does he treat the theme so fully as in Ephesians, or make it so abundantly clear that redemption implies not merely a personal and individual reconciliation with God, but also membership in a corporate society of divine origin—the Church of Christ.

What, then, is the Church? It is a visible society consisting of all those, whether Jews or Gentiles, who through Christ have access in one Spirit unto the Father (2 [13-18], 4 [5, 25]). But it is more than a mere society, just as its origin is more than human. It is an organic unity, answering to and manifesting the unity of God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (4 [3-6]). It is a building 'fitly framed together,' of which Jesus Christ Himself is the chief corner stone; it is a habitation of God in the Spirit (2 [20-22]); it is the sphere of God's glorious working (3 [20] f.), wherein His wisdom is proclaimed

to the angelic powers (3 10); it is the training-ground of all the elect (4 11-16); it is the Bride of Christ which He loved and cleansed that it might be glorious and holy and without blemish (5 24-27). But the most frequent and characteristic of St. Paul's metaphors in this connexion is that which represents the Church as the Body of Christ (1 22 f., 4 4, 16, 5 23, 28-33); i.e. it is His outward and visible manifestation; the organ of His self-expression; the instrument whereby He works. Moreover, it is an essential part of Himself, just as His 'natural' body was in the days of His flesh; without it He would be incomplete, not, of course, in His perfect Deity, but as the Incarnate Saviour of mankind. This is the force of the daring expression in 1 23, where St. Paul calls the Church the fulness of Him (Christ) who all in all is being 'fulfilled'; i.e. it is that which gives completeness to Him. As the Church grows in completeness, St. Paul conceives of Christ Himself being progressively fulfilled thereby.

The following analysis of the epistle may help to show how large a place is held in it by the idea of the Church:

1 1 f. **Salutation.**

(1) 1 3-3 21 **God's Eternal Purpose for Man: Now Working and Manifested in the Church.**

(i) 1 3-14. Thanksgiving for the privileges of membership in Christ.

(ii) 1 15-23. Prayer that the 'Ephesians' may understand the glories of membership in the Church.

(iii) 2 1-22. Contrast between their present privileges in the Church and their former heathen life.

(iv) 3 1-19. Renewed prayer for the same object as in (ii); interrupted by a parenthesis (2-13) on St. Paul's share in preaching the 'mystery' of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.

(v) 3 20 f. Doxology concluding Part I.: Glory to God 'in the Church and in Christ Jesus.'

(2) 4 1-6 20. **The Significance of Church Membership for Daily Life.**

(i) 4 1-16. Diversity of gifts and functions within the unity of the Church.

(ii) 4 17-24. Contrast between the old life and the new.

(iii) 4 25-5 21. General social virtues required of members of the Church.

(iv) 5 22-6 9. Special duties of special classes in the Church.

(v) 6 10-20. The Church's warfare and the armour of God.

6 21 f. Personal matters.

6 23 f. Benediction.

1. 1 f. **Salutation.**—**saints:** the root-meaning of the word is not personal holiness, but membership in the chosen people, the Israel of God (Gal 6 16). The privileges once limited to the Jewish nation now belong to the whole fellowship of the baptized. **faithful:** believing and loyal. **at Ephesus:** see Introduction.

Part I. (1. 3-III. 21).—**God's Eternal Purpose for Man: Now Working and Manifested in the Church.**

(1) 1. 3-14. **Thanksgiving for the Privileges of Membership in Christ.**—The section is hardly patient of an analysis; it is an exuberant lyric inspired by meditation on the will of God as disclosed to us and blessing us in Christ. In Him God has bestowed upon us all spiritual blessing (3), election to holiness (4), predestination to sonship (5), bounteous grace (6), redemption and remission of sins (7), and knowledge of His will (9)—which is, to sum up all things in Christ (10). In Christ we have been made God's own portion (11); in Christ the 'Ephesians' also have heard the word of truth, the Gospel of their salvation (13); in Him they have been baptized, and 'sealed'—confirmed—by the Holy Spirit whose bestowal fulfils the hopes of the Old Testament dispensation, and is the first instalment of our full privilege as the redeemed people of God (13 f.).

The Trinitarian implications of St. Paul's language here are worth noting. The work of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in accomplishing man's salvation is mentioned in order; and each paragraph, or rather strophe, ends with substantially the same refrain: 'to the praise of His glory' (6, 12, 14).

3. **spiritual blessing:** in contrast to the temporal rewards which figure so largely in the Old Testament (e.g. Dt 28 1-13 and *passim*).

in the heavenly places. This remarkable phrase occurs five times in Ephesians, but nowhere else (cf. 1 20, 2 6, 3 10, 6 12). 'In the heavenly sphere' is perhaps the best available rendering: the unseen spiritual region which lies behind and above the world of sense. Our share in this is not only future but present, as the verse makes plain (cf. Col 3 1; Phil 3 20).

4. **he chose us.** God's eternal purpose of love for mankind is one of the main themes of the epistle. St. Paul is here meditating on the wonder of this love and all that it means for us; he is not using the precise terms of a theological handbook, as the Calvinistic interpretation of his words implies. In this epistle,

as in Romans, he both asserts divine predestination and assumes man's free-will (e.g. in the practical exhortations: 4^{17}-6^{9}).*

in him before the foundation of the world. The Incarnation took place in time, but its purpose and significance are eternal.

in love: love is to be our response to the goodness of God. The phrase occurs six times in the epistle (cf. 3^{17}, $4^{2, 15, 16}$, 5^{2}) in this sense.

5. adoption as sons: in one sense God is the Father of all men, but the true sonship to Him is a specifically Christian privilege, bestowed by the Holy Spirit in the Church (Gal 4^{5-7}). It is in baptism that we are made '*the* children of God.'

6. in the Beloved. The usual New Testament word which is translated 'beloved' means more properly 'only,' and as applied to our Lord has a Messianic significance. St. Paul here uses the past participle of the verb, and the translation of AV and RV is right. In Col 1^{13} St. Paul gets the same sense in a different way. Cf. note on Mk 1^{11}.

7. redemption through his blood. The redemption of Israel by God is a familiar theme in the Old Testament; the deliverance from Egypt is perhaps the most typical instance, and the sprinkled blood of the paschal lamb—typical of Jewish sacrifices in general, throws light on St. Paul's meaning here. Our redemption has been wrought by the blood of Christ—i.e. His voluntary offering of His life on our behalf—and includes the forgiveness of our trespasses (cf. Heb 9^{22}).

9. the mystery of his will, i.e. the purpose of God which once was concealed but now has been declared (through the Incarnation). In contrast with our modern use of the word 'mystery' as = something unintelligible, the chief stress in the New Testament is not on the past concealment of God's purpose, but on its present revelation. There is no need to detect an allusion here to the 'Mystery Religions'; Jewish sources, open to St. Paul, make free use of the word 'mystery' in essentially the same sense as his (e.g. Dan 2 LXX; En 8^{3}, 9^{6}).

10. unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times = 'that the divine purpose might be carried out when all things were ready' (cf. Mk 1^{15}; Gal 4^{4}; Heb 1^{1} f.). (In later Christian language 'the Dispensation' = the Incarnation and all that God has done for mankind therein.)

to sum up = to gather up into one. In

* Cf. *The Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 440-442.

Christ alone can we make sense of the universe; all things, seen and unseen, find in Him their principle of unity. The thought is expanded in Col 1^{16-20}.

11 practically repeats the thought of ^{4} and ^{5}.

12. we who had before hoped in Christ = either the Jewish nation as a whole, with their Messianic expectations, or Christian Jews: as distinct, in either case, from the Gentiles ('ye also,' ^{13}), whose faith came later in time.

13. ye were sealed, i.e. by Baptism and Confirmation, which were and are essentially one rite. The gift of the Spirit follows the immersion as God's seal, declaring His acceptance of those who receive it (cf. Rev 7^{3} ff.). In the Eastern Orthodox Church the formula of Confirmation is 'The Seal of the Gift of the Holy Spirit. Amen.'

the Holy Spirit of promise: lit. 'the Spirit of (the) promise, the Holy (Spirit)' = the Holy Spirit who is Himself 'the promise of the Father' (Lk 24^{49}; Ac 1^{4} f.).

14. an earnest of our inheritance: the gift of the Holy Spirit is the *first instalment*, not simply a sign or pledge, of the promised kingdom of God, which shall be inherited in its fulness in the 'day of redemption' (4^{30})—**the redemption of God's own possession,** i.e. the full and final emancipation of His people. For the use of 'seal' and 'earnest' together in connexion with the ministry of the Holy Spirit cf. 2 Cor 1^{22}; and for 'earnest,' see M.M., *Vocab.* The ancient 'earnest' seems to have been relatively much larger than the modern 'first instalment.'

(2) I. 15-23. **A Prayer that the 'Ephesians' may Understand the Glories of Membership in the Church.**—St. Paul begins with thanksgiving for the faith and love which already characterize the 'Ephesians' (^{15} f.), and goes on to pray that a further outpouring of the Spirit may give them such spiritual knowledge and illumination as may reveal to them the glories which God has in store for His people (^{17} f.), and the greatness of His power exerted for our benefit (^{19}), and pre-eminently manifested in the resurrection of Christ (^{20}), whom He has made Lord of the universe (^{21} f.) and Head of the Church, which is His Body (^{22} f.).

15. I also: St. Paul makes his own contribution to 'the praise of God's glory,' by his ceaseless thanksgiving on behalf of Christ's people.

having heard: St. Paul could hardly have written thus to the Church of Ephesus (see Introduction). The reading

of AV is to be preferred to RV here, *sc.* 'and love unto all the saints.'

16. I . . . give thanks . . . making mention. The evidence of Egyptian papyri shows that phrases of this type were in normal use as epistolary salutations in pre-Christian times. St. Paul gives them a new and deeper meaning, like a man saying a deliberate 'God be with you' instead of the conventional 'good-bye.'

17-19. These three verses give the substance of St. Paul's prayer.

the Father of glory: rather perhaps 'the Father of the Glory,' the true Shekinah (=the manifestation of God to man: cf. *H.D.B.*, iv, 487 ff.), a proper title of Jesus Christ. So probably Jas 2^1: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ who is the Glory,' i.e. the Shekinah.

a spirit of wisdom: rather 'the Spirit.' 'It is a teaching Spirit rather than a teachable spirit which the Apostle asks that they may have' (Robinson).

revelation: the Christian 'mystery' can only be understood by those to whom it is revealed by the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 2^{10} ff.).

the hope of his calling: there are always further blessings in store for the people of God.

power . . . working . . . strength . . . might. St. Paul piles up these emphatic words to insist on the power of God at work within us.

20. The act of God by which Christ was raised from the dead is the most signal example and proof of this power (cf. Rom 1^4; Phil 3^{10}).

in the heavenly places (cf. [3] note).

21. rule . . . dominion. St. Paul's point is to emphasize the pre-eminence of the risen and ascended Christ over all other powers and existences whatsoever, not to give a catalogue of actual grades of being (cf. Col 1^{16-18}; 1 P 3^{22}).

every name that is named = every conceivable rank or dignity (cf. Phil 2^{9-11}).

22 f. he put all things . . . under his feet. The Psalmist (Ps 8^6) uses these words in exhibiting mankind as the crown of God's creation; Christ in His own Person has fulfilled this true human destiny. The thought that we share His exaltation lies near at hand (cf. Heb 2^{6-11}).

head over all things to the church, which is his body (see Introduction). Christ and the Church form one unity; He as Head guides and controls the Body by His Spirit. (So Eph and Col. In Rom 12 and 1 Cor 12 St. Paul's emphasis is rather on the unity of many members in one society, the head being then included as one member of the body: 1 Cor 12^{21}.)

the fulness of him that filleth all in all. The word here timidly translated 'filleth' is a passive; read therefore, *him who all in all is being fulfilled.* **the fulness** = 'that which gives completion'; Christ, God Incarnate and Brother of man, is in a profound sense incomplete without the Church, as a head necessarily is without a body; and the growth of the Church in holiness and inclusiveness involves the progressive fulfilment of Christ Himself. Cf. Col 3^{11}, and Tennyson's phrase (Robinson), 'the Christ that is to be.' See Introduction.

(3) II. 1-22. **The Contrast between the Gentiles' Present Privileges in the Church and their Former Heathen Life.**—The two leading ideas of this chapter are (*a*) that the Gentiles have been raised from the death of sin to the life of righteousness and glory by the gift of God bestowed upon them in Jesus Christ ($^{1-10}$), and (*b*) that their old status of aliens, with no share in the blessings of God's covenant-people, has been exchanged, through the death of Christ, for complete enfranchisement: full membership in the household of God, and a secure place as stones in His spiritual temple ($^{11-22}$). It is the same contrast regarded from two different points of view; the key verses are respectively (*a*) 'God quickened us together with Christ . . .' (^{5} f.), and (*b*) 'he is our peace' (^{14}), 'for through him we both (Gentile and Jew alike) have our access in one Spirit unto the Father' (^{18}).

(*a*) 1-10.

1. And you . . . when ye were dead through (rather in) **your trespasses and sins:** St. Paul is referring back to the death of Christ just mentioned (1 ^{20}), and is going on to show that the quickening power of God which raised Him from the dead has raised the 'Ephesians' also from the death of sin.

2. the prince of the power of the air = the ruler whose sphere of authority is the air, the air being popularly regarded as the abode of evil spirits. St. Paul adopts, without either criticizing or confirming, the popular conception.

of the spirit: the genitive case seems to be a grammatical slip, as the sense requires 'the spirit' to be in apposition to 'the ruler.'

the sons of disobedience: a Hebraism = 'the disobedient' (cf. [3], 5 [6]).

3. St. Paul inserts this verse to make it plain that Jews not less than Gentiles were once dead in sin (cf. Rom $3^{9, 23}$).

the lusts of our flesh: not only what we call carnal and sensual lusts, but all

desires appealing to our lower selves (cf. Gal 5 [19-21]).

by nature children of wrath: St. Paul refers here to actual 'trespasses and sins' (cf. [1]), not to 'original sin,' or to children, as the Catechism wrongly suggests. 'Children of wrath' is a Hebraism = deserving of punishment: cf. 'sons of disobedience' ([2]) and Ps 102 [20] 'appointed unto death' (Heb. 'children of death'). 'By nature' = in ourselves, apart from the grace of God, whose rich and loving mercy has altogether changed our condition (4 f.). Cf. Rom 1 [18-32].

5-7. The Resurrection, Ascension, and heavenly Enthronement of Christ are mystically reproduced in the experience of the Christian. By baptism we were raised from the death of sin to the new life of righteousness and glory, that life which is truly lived even now in the heavenly sphere where Christ is (cf. 1 [3] note). This is the salvation bestowed upon us in Christ by the grace, the free gift, of God.

8 f. emphasize the truth, stated parenthetically in [5], that no merit of our own has earned these spiritual privileges; we receive them by faith, but they are the gift of God, bestowed by His free grace on recipients altogether undeserving. (Even our faith itself is a gift from God, though St. Paul does not make this point here, unless the reference of 'and that . . .' in [8] is to be restricted to the preceding phrase 'through faith.' But the wider interpretation, followed above, is preferable.)

10. his workmanship = His making; a new creation in Christ (cf. Gal 6 [15]; 2 Cor 5 [17] margin), in whom mankind is given a fresh start.

for good works: lit. 'on condition of,' and so = 'with the object of.' Salvation is not earned by good works, but our vocation cannot be fulfilled nor the Kingdom of God come unless we perform them. So they are 'afore prepared' for us by the divine plan, ready to hand for us to do.

(*b*) **11-22** (see introductory note to 2 [1-22]).

11 f. St. Paul reminds his readers of their sorry condition in former times, before, through the death of Christ, they were brought into full membership in 'the Israel of God.'

in the flesh . . . called . . . called . . . in the flesh. The old titles of Jew and Gentile, circumcision and uncircumcision, were based on the external distinctions of physical descent and a physical mark artificially made. These distinctions are now obsolete, in Christ; but 'aforetime' the physical disqualification of the Gentiles was associated only too closely with real spiritual disabilities. Not all the circumcised were 'Jews inwardly' (Rom 2 [29]), but certainly the Gentiles as a whole were spiritually as well as physically uncircumcised. They were 'alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise' just because they were 'separate from Christ' and 'without God' (ctr. Phil 3 [3]).

in the world = under conditions where God is nothing accounted of; the phrase sums up the former spiritual state of the Gentiles.

13-18. The reconciling work of Christ.

13. But now in Christ Jesus: in strong contrast with the immediately preceding 'in the world.' In Him 'the distance between the unprivileged and the privileged is annihilated' (Robinson).

in the blood of Christ: *sc.* by a new covenant sacrifice—and that the only perfect sacrifice ever offered to God—which includes all mankind in its scope, irrespective of external distinctions.

14. he (emphatic) **is our peace**, even He who, etc. **our peace**: the peace of Jews and Gentiles alike.

the middle wall of partition: Josephus describes a stone fence which separated 'the court of the Gentiles' from the inner precincts of the Temple. Notices engraved on the stone (one of which has been discovered) made it clear that any Gentile trespassing beyond this 'wall of partition' incurred the death penalty (this would be vividly in St. Paul's memory: cf. Ac 21 [29]). The separation between Jew and Gentile thus symbolized has been broken down by Christ.

15. in his flesh, i.e. by His death (cf. Col 1 [21] f.). The whole clause repeats in other words the sense of the preceding; the existence of the partition wall meant a state of enmity between the two classes whom it divided.

even the law . . . ordinances. It was the settled policy of later Judaism to 'make a fence round the Law' in order to keep it pure and inviolate. This was effected by a multiplicity of ceremonial enactments; it is these, and the rigid exclusion based on merely external things, which Christ has abolished, not the moral and spiritual kernel of the Law, which is 'holy and righteous and good' (Rom 7 [12]), and which the Jews of this time were quite anxious that Gentiles should keep (cf. Col 2 [14, 20-22]).

one new man: the 'new creation' in Christ, by abolishing the distinction be-

tween privileged and unprivileged, unites both classes in that peace which He Himself is.

16. in one body, i.e. the Church, the one true 'Israel of God.'

unto God: Christ has reconciled, by His atoning death upon the Cross, not only Jews and Gentiles with each other, but both—i.e. mankind as one whole—unto God.

thereby, or perhaps, 'in Himself.'

17. St. Paul combines here two passages from the Book of Isaiah (52 [7] and 57 [19]). The preaching is the preaching of the Exalted Christ, now present on earth through the Spirit in the Church. Pentecost may be regarded—as apparently in the 4th Gospel—as the fulfilment of the Church's Advent hope; at the very least it is the earnest, the first great instalment, of that fulfilment.

18. A brief summary of the difference made to us by the reconciling work of Christ: Jew and Gentile united to each other and enjoying together the new benefit of direct access to the Father.

in one Spirit: the phrase corresponds with the 'in one body' of [16]. Cf. 4 [4], 'one body, and one Spirit,' and the juxtaposition in the Apostles' Creed of 'the Holy Ghost' and 'the Holy Catholic Church.'

19-22. The full enfranchisement of the Gentiles, and their place as stones in the spiritual Temple of God.

19. sojourners: the metaphor is political, and the word = aliens who have been given certain privileges but possess no citizen rights. It is this lack of status which St. Paul stresses here. Christians, conversely, are not full citizens of 'the world' (1 P 2 [11]; cf. Jn 17 [14b]).

fellow-citizens with the saints: fully enfranchised members of the chosen people of God (cf. note on 1 [1] f.)

of the household of God = members of *God's family*; it is not merely to a divinely patronized society that their baptism into Christ has admitted them (cf. Gal 6 [10]).

20-22. St. Paul introduces a new metaphor to emphasize the unity and solidarity of the 'saints'; the Church is a Temple of God; Jesus Christ Himself is spoken of as the chief corner stone on which the whole building depends (a Messianic designation: Is 28 [16]; Ps 118 [22]; cf. Mt 21 [42]; Mk 12 [10]); the apostles and prophets form the first foundation course, and all other believers find a place as stones in the building. For the whole metaphor cf. 1 P 2 [4-8].

prophets, i.e. of the Christian Church, not the Old Testament prophets (cf. 3 [5], 4 [11]).

each several building. This rendering ruins the figure, but that of AV 'all the building' is based on a false reading in the Greek. The picture before St. Paul's mind is a temple *in process* of being built, and he refers here to 'every part of the building process,' though an exact translation is difficult. Perhaps *whatever is included in the building* may serve.

fitly framed together, groweth . . . The participle is present, as the process, or growth, is still continuing. For the combination of the metaphors of growth and building cf. 4 [16].

an holy temple: the Greek word denotes the shrine or sanctuary (*naos*) as distinct from the precincts (*hieron*). The latter word is used in such contexts as 'going up into the Temple to pray,' e.g. Lk 18 [10]; but it is the shrine which is looked upon as the habitation or dwelling-place of God. This purpose the Church is now to fulfil.

in the Spirit: as it is 'in (the) one Spirit' that we have our access to the Father, so it is 'in the Spirit' that He comes to dwell in His shrine, the Church.

(4) III. **1-19. A renewed prayer for the same object as in** (2) **above**—that the 'Ephesians' may understand and enjoy the glories of membership in the Church; especially spiritual strength and knowledge. The prayer is **interrupted by a parenthesis** ([2-13]) **on St. Paul's share in preaching the 'mystery' of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.**

St. Paul's prayer begins with [1], but his description of himself as 'the prisoner of Christ Jesus in behalf of you, the Gentiles,' leads him on at once into a digression expounding his relationship with them. So the prayer does not have free course until [14] is reached, when he takes up again his opening words, 'For this cause. . . .' The substance of the prayer is that God, out of His abundance, may give the 'Ephesians' spiritual strength ([16]); the indwelling of Christ in their hearts through faith, in love ([17]); and once again strength—to know the divine love which passes knowledge ([18] f.).

The digression ([2-13]) speaks of the mission entrusted to St. Paul for the Gentiles ([2-4, 7-9]) in connexion with the 'mystery,' long hidden but now revealed ([5]), of God's eternal purpose to admit them to full privileges, in Christ ([6, 11]); in whom we come to the Father ([12]). St. Paul draws special attention to the significance of the Church for the whole

universe, as the chosen sphere of God's working (10). Finally, there is no need for his readers to be discouraged by the afflictions to which he has been brought by his efforts on their behalf (13).

1 f. I Paul: there is very little stress throughout the epistle on the Apostle's person; this is a mark of authenticity. But now St. Paul has reached a point when his theme requires some mention of his own work. He assumes that his readers know of it, though the words in which he expresses this ('if so be that ye have heard') tell strongly against an exclusively Ephesian destination for the epistle (see Introduction).

dispensation (cf. 9: see the note on 1 10): *the purpose of God in action* is the main thought, not merely St. Paul's share in its accomplishment.

3. by revelation: without which the 'mystery' would have remained concealed (see 1 9 note).

as I wrote afore = as I have just written; i.e. the first two chapters of this letter are enough to show its readers St. Paul's 'understanding in the mystery of Christ' (4). There is no reference to any earlier epistle.

4. the mystery, i.e. the world-purpose of God revealed in the Incarnation; the special part of it treated here is the incorporation of the Gentiles with the chosen people.

5. as . . . now: God has never left Himself without witness, and His dealings with Israel especially show His progressive self-revelation to mankind. But only in the Incarnation and the Church is the revelation fully given (cf. Heb 1 1 f.).

holy: the same word as 'saints' in 1 1, where see note. 'Set apart' is the force of the word, not personal sanctity (cf. our 'Reverend'). So its use here provides no argument against the apostolic authorship of Ephesians.

prophets: in the Spirit (see notes on 2 20. 22).

6. St. Paul states the content of the 'mystery' so far as it concerns the Gentiles.

fellow-heirs, etc., i.e. with the originally chosen people.

the promise, i.e. the Messianic hope, now realized in Christ.

7. the gift of that (the) grace of God which was given me. The phrase is verbally identical with that in 2, excepting the change of 'dispensation' for 'gift.'

8. The first clause is parenthetical, and the second explains the 'gift' of 7. There should be no stop at the end of 7, and 'Unto me, . . . given' should be between dashes.

less than the least: this is but one word in the Greek, apparently coined by St. Paul; lit. 'leaster than . . .' For this magnifying his office coupled with depreciation of himself cf. 1 Cor 15 9 f.

9. to make all men see. The more probable reading = to bring to light.

dispensation: see note on 1 10.

who created all things: the creation is part of the eternal purpose of God.

10. 'The sublime thought . . . that God's wisdom in the scheme of redemption is an object of contemplation to heavenly intelligences' (Abbott).

through the church. The Church is the covenanted sphere in which the 'dispensation' of God is at work; angels and men may see focussed and localized there, so to speak, the wisdom of God which is infinite and past tracing out, and so may have a key to His character and His purpose.

manifold: lit. richly variegated.

11. eternal purpose: lit. 'purpose of the ages.' Cf. Rock of ages = eternal rock (Robinson).

purposed: lit. 'made,' 'framed.'

12. Cf. 2 18. In Christ the gulf between the Eternal and Uncreate God and frail man is bridged.

13. Wherefore, i.e. since the eternal purpose of God is such, the Ephesians are not to be disheartened by St. Paul's present sufferings; 'it was in order that they should obtain so great blessings that Paul was imprisoned' (St. Chrysostom).

14-19. St. Paul's prayer for the Gentiles.

14. Here at last St. Paul's prayer finds utterance; the verse takes up 1 after the parenthesis of 2-13.

I bow my knees: standing was the usual attitude of prayer (cf. Mk 11 25). St. Paul's words here denote prostration in worship and emotion (cf. Mk 14 35).

15. The English versions lose the verbal connexion of the Greek between 'family' (*patria*) and 'Father' (*Patēr*). In Greek the family is literally *named* from the father. St. Paul's point is that God is the Author of all imaginable fatherhood; His Fatherhood is no mere metaphor, but the divine reality of which the human relationship of a father to his children is but a reflection. (Or perhaps we should stress the present tense—'is coming to be named,' i.e. every family, and not only the Jewish nation, is now, *by adoption*, coming to find its Father in God.)

17 f. Translate: 'that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith *in love*; being rooted and grounded *that ye may have strength* . . .'

Cf. 1 [4], 4 [2, 16] for clauses ending with the emphatic phrase 'in love.' The grammar of 'being rooted and grounded' is irregular but characteristic of St. Paul, and the participles should precede the 'that' in English as they do in the Greek.

18. the breadth and length and height and depth: *sc.* of the love of Christ. The four dimensions suggest what St. Paul states in the next verse, that this love passes human knowledge.

with all the saints (see 1 [1] note). The Church as a whole comprehends the deep things of God in a way and to an extent impossible for the isolated individual. And the individual's fellowship with the other believers in the one Body increases his own powers of comprehension.

19. But still the love of Christ 'passeth knowledge'; hope is one of the three 'theological virtues' which abide eternally (1 Cor 13 [13]); there is always more to be expected from God, more to be known of the love of Christ.

filled unto all the fulness of God: 'attainment of purpose and realization of ideal' (Robinson) (cf. 1 [10]; Col 2 [9] f.). Later on St. Paul speaks of spiritual growth as being 'unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' (4 [13]).

(5) 20 f. Doxology concluding Part I. of the Epistle: Glory to God 'in the Church and in Christ Jesus.'

20. The boldness of the prayer which St. Paul has uttered is justified by the inconceivable greatness of God's power, and the fact that it is actually at work in human lives.

21. in the Church and in Christ Jesus: so the true reading; contrast the tame and corrupt text followed by AV. In the Church, as in Christ (Jn 1 [14]), in the Body as in the Head, the glory of God is focussed and shown forth. The Church is 'the extension of the Incarnation,' and no long treatise could emphasize its dignity half so powerfully as this short sentence of St. Paul's.

Part II. (IV. 1-VI. 20). The Significance of Church Membership for Daily Life.

(1) IV. 1-16. Diversity of Gifts and Functions within the Unity of the Church.

—[1-6] stress the unity of the Church; [7-16] the diversity of the gifts and functions of its members.

1-6. Christians must 'walk worthy' of their calling by humility and loving forbearance, and a careful guarding of their Spirit-given unity. The Church is one even as the Spirit is one; all its members acknowledge one and the same hope, one and the same Lord Jesus, one and the same faith in Him, one and the same sacrament of new birth into Him, one and the same divine Father.

1. therefore: belief in the theological truths of Christianity must show itself in the practice of Christian virtues (cf. Rom 12 [1]).

the calling: *sc.* into membership of the one Body.

2. lowliness (of mind): it was only in Christianity that this quality took rank as a virtue; in St. Paul's time it was commonly regarded as equivalent to 'meanness of spirit.' The reason for its elevation is clearly given in Phil 2 [3, 5-8]: cf. also the first Beatitude (Mt 5 [3]).

All the qualities which St. Paul commends to his readers in this verse are destructive of man's natural self-assertion; and without them the injunction of [3] cannot be carried out. It is self-assertion, in various forms, which has broken the visible unity of the one Body of Christ.

3. the unity of the Spirit=the unity which the one Spirit bestows on the one Body. This is very different from a mere 'unity of spirit' in the modern sense of similarity of outlook and temper; the removal of this weaker expression in favour of the true Pauline conception in the prayer 'for all sorts and conditions of men' is most desirable. Still the unity though given by the Spirit, has to be guarded by human effort, and very diligent effort; hence the exhortation in [2].

4-6. There is no main verb in the Greek, St. Paul gives us not a sentence, but a battle-cry or charter, or the inscription on the Church's banner. See the first note of this section.

6. God is supreme over all His people. He works through them all, and is present in them all. The AV 'in *you* all,' though incorrect as a reading, is right as an interpretation; St. Paul is still speaking of the Church. The point of this verse is that *all* the baptized belong *altogether* to God, though *each* one ([7]) has a *special* gift entrusted to him.

7-16. The diversity of gifts and functions within the one Church. St. Paul here emphasizes (1) the variety of gifts bestowed upon us ([7] f., [11]); (2) the one Source of them all—the Ascended Christ ([8-10]); (3) the purpose of them all—the spiritual growth of Christians into the full corporate unity which the Church exists to express ([12-16]). For the whole thought of the passage cf. 1 Cor 12.

7. the grace: it is the one grace of God, but the gifts bestowed are different in kind and degree according to His purpose for each individual (cf. 1 Cor 12 [11]; and for the idea of 'measure,' Jn 3 [34]).

8. he saith: rather, *it saith, sc.* the Scripture, in Ps 68 [18]. St. Paul is following here not the Hebrew or the LXX, but apparently some old Jewish interpretation, which gave the desired connexion between 'ascending' and 'bestowing gifts.' The figure in the psalm is that of 'a victor, taking possession of the enemy's citadel, with his train of captives and spoil following him in the triumph' (Driver).

captivity = company of captives; a Hebraic use of abstract for concrete.

9. With the false reading followed by AV, 'descended *first*,' and perhaps even without it, the descent is previous to the ascent, and refers either to the Incarnation or, more probably, to the descent into Hades. But the context is much more favourable to another interpretation—that the descent is subsequent to the ascent, and refers to the gifts bestowed upon the Church by the Ascended Christ descending in the Spirit at Pentecost (cf. 2 [17] note and Ac 2 [33]; Jn 14 [18]). In this case certainly, in the former possibly, the phrase **the lower parts of the earth** = simply 'this world below' (cf. Is 44 [23]).

10. It is the Ascended Christ Himself, and none other, who, in spite of the unimaginable heights to which He has ascended, yet deigns to dwell in His Church.

fill (fulfil) all things: cf. 3 [19] note, 1 [10] note (on 'to sum up'), and Jn 1 [16].

11. Translate: *He it is who gave . . .* The terms which follow are descriptive rather than technical (cf. 1 Cor 12 [28] and ctr. Phil 1 [1]; Ac 14 [23]).

12. Remove the comma after 'saints.' 'Ministering' is not used here in the technical sense = the work of ordained 'ministers,' but simply of the service which each Christian must render to the Body.

13. The unity of the Church, though perfect when viewed as a divine gift (like the 'new man,' [24]), has yet to be striven for by redeemed mankind. True unity depends on corporate faith in and knowledge of the Son of God.

a perfect man (sing.): in contrast with the helpless and disorganized crowd of 'children' (plural) described in [14] (cf. [24]).

fulness: cf. 1 [23], last note.

14. sleight = trickery, lit. with dice.

15. speaking the truth: the sense is wider = dealing truly, or maintaining the truth.

16. through that which every joint supplieth: a preferable translation is, *through every contact with the supply*, i.e. with the bounty of Christ.

(2) IV. 17-24. **Contrast between the Old Life and the New.**

17. the Gentiles: *sc.* those Gentiles who are yet unconverted and so in the condition described in 2 [12]. With this verse and [18] ctr. 1 [18] f.

18. hardening: probably rather *blindness*.

19. greediness: the Greek word (*pleonexia*) and its cognates are used several times in the New Testament in contexts which suggest the special sense of undue sexual appetite. So it is here. Cf. 1 Th 4 [6], where the RV translation, 'wrong' conceals the verb *pleonektein*.

21. if so be that ye heard: see note on 3 [2]. The whole verse amplifies the condensed phrase 'learned Christ' in [20]. St. Paul is thinking of catechetical instruction.

in Jesus: this is the only reference in the epistle to our Lord by His human name alone. The point is that truth has been revealed to us in the historic person and mission of Christ.

22-24 summarize the lessons learned in learning Christ.

the old man . . . the new man, i.e. the old Christless self and the new Spirit-guided self, which reflects and reproduces Christ.

of truth: *of the truth*; it is from the truth that both the righteousness and the holiness spring, in contrast with 'the lusts of deceit' ([22]).

(3) IV. 25-V. 21. **General Social Virtues required of Members of the Church.**

IV. 25-32. 'Six sins are struck at: lying, resentment, stealing, bad language, bad temper, lust' (Robinson); and the 'contrary virtues' are enjoined. The fact that 'we are members one of another' ([25]) calls for this discipline.

25. Speak . . . neighbour: a quotation from Zech 8 [16].

26. Be ye angry, and sin not: from Ps 4 [4], LXX. Christians are to know only *righteous* anger.

28. The vice of stealing (taking for oneself what belongs to others) is to be replaced by the contrary virtue of liberality (giving to others what belongs to oneself). This provides a noble motive for industry.

29. corrupt: lit. rotten. The phrase = 'foul talk.'

for edifying as the need may be: speech, like all other gifts, is to be used for the 'building up,' the spiritual help, of our fellow-Christians.

30. Cf. 1 [13] f. note.

32. Cf. [1] note. St. Paul deduces Christian conduct as a corollary from Christian doctrine; here from the doctrine of the Atonement (cf. Phil 2 [5] ff.; Col 3 [1] ff.).

forgave: probably a 'baptismal aorist,' referring, like [30], to the crisis of initiation into the Church. But the AV rendering 'hath forgiven' is quite permissible.

V. 1-14. The thought of imitating God, implicit in 4 [30], is emphasized in [1] f., and leads on a further series of practical warnings to be observed by Christians.

2. Cf. Gen 8 [21]; Phil 4 [18].

3. **covetousness**: the same word as 'greediness' (4 [19]), where see note.

4. **jesting**: *sc.* of a licentious nature, as the context indicates.

giving of thanks: Christian speech should always be with *charis* (grace or charm) (4 [29]; Col 4 [6]). The word for 'thanksgiving' (*eucharistia*) is derived from *charis*; and thanksgiving itself adds a distinctive *charis* to the Christian life, and banishes delight in uncleanness of word or deed. Cf. Rom 6 [21] (no fruit=nothing to give thanks for).

5. **covetous man** (cf. [3] and 4 [19] note). 'Covetousness' is described as idolatry in Col 3 [5]; in its wider sense it=the worship of Mammon, and in the narrower sexual contexts it=the worship of the flesh. The main idols from which Christians are to guard themselves (1 Jn 5 [21]) are the world, the flesh, and the devil; these are God's rivals for our devotion (cf. 1 Jn 2 [15] f.).

For the general sense of the verse cf. Rev 22 [15].

6. **sons of disobedience**: see 2 [3] note (on 'children of wrath').

8. **light in the Lord**: Christians are the light of the world (Mt 5 [14]) because they are in Christ who is the light of the world (Jn 1 [4, 9], 9 [5], etc.).

9. **of the light**: the false reading (AV) 'of the Spirit' has been brought in from Gal 5 [22].

10. **proving**=discern by testing. The same word is translated 'approve' in Phil 1 [10].

11. **unfruitful works**: in contrast with the fruit of the light ([9]), so in Gal 5 [19, 22] the (dead) *works* of the flesh are contrasted with the (living) *fruit* of the Spirit.

reprove=expose.

12 f. 'Expose them—for the things done by them in secret it is a shame even to speak of, but all things if exposed by the light are made manifest—for whatever is in process of being made manifest is itself light.' The active influence of Christians, who once were darkness but now are light ([8]), causes even the sons of disobedience, who as yet are darkness, to become light in their turn (cf. Jn 3 [20] f.). Conviction of sin is the first stage in this transformation. (The verb here translated 'expose' is the same as in Jn 16 [8]—RV 'convict.')

14. **he saith**: it saith (cf. 4 [8]). St. Paul seems to be quoting some early Christian hymn, possibly baptismal, possibly commemorative of the descent into Hades.

15-21. The contrast between light and darkness, just emphasized, leads St. Paul back again to the theme of practical conduct, and the need for careful heed therein; for wisdom and understanding; for spiritual elevation; for joy and thanksgiving to God; and finally for the mutual subjection of Christians to one another.

16. Christians by their wise conduct may redeem the evil time in which they live from its bondage and use it for the highest good.

18. Cf. Rom 14 [17]: the precept here is from Pr 23 [31] LXX.

with the Spirit: lit. in (i.e. through) the Spirit. Or translate as RVm. It is often difficult to be sure whether St. Paul is referring to the Holy Spirit or the spiritual element in man which is the special sphere of His activity.

19. Cf. Col 3 [16]. The Christian alternative to 'the fun of getting drunk' is not solemn dulness, but spiritual exhilaration.

21. The exalted enthusiasm of [19] f. is to be decent and in order.

fear: not slavish fear, but reverential awe.

(4) V. 22-VI. 9. **Special Duties of Special Classes in the Church.**—There is no break in thought between this section and the preceding; indeed, the verb in [22] has to be supplied from [21]. The duty of husbands and wives to each other is illumined and elevated by a comparison of the marriage bond with the union between Christ and the Church ([21-33]); children and fathers (6 [1-4]), slaves and masters ([5-9]) are exhorted to fulfil their various duties as in the sight of God.

23. **being himself the saviour of the body.** These words give the content of the idea of 'head' as St. Paul here uses it: guardian and protector of the body. Husbands are to remember that there is no right to rule apart from the responsibility to protect; so [25, 28, 33]. Difference of functions as between husband and wife does not, of course, imply any inequality in spiritual status.

25. Cf. 5 [2].

26. The reference is to baptism: the washing, distinguished from all other washings by some solemn formula which accompanied it and defined its intention.

Both 'matter' and 'form' are necessary for the completeness of the Sacrament. (In the Greek world the bath of the bride before marriage was an established custom, and may be in St. Paul's mind here.)

27. Translate 'a glorious bride (cf. Rev 21 2. 9 ff.). The Church herself is the indefectible Bride of Christ, joined to Him in an indissoluble union. To see all that mars her outward manifestation on earth, in various periods and places, in the true light, we must look upon her, so far as may be, with the eyes of Christ. So St. Paul sees her here.

28-33. St. Paul passes from the thought of headship to that of complete union. 30 (where RV rightly omits 'of his flesh and of his bones') gives us essentially the same picture as Jn 15 1 ff. (vine and branches): Christ the whole of which Christians are parts; the Church is part of Christ's very self, inseparable from Him (29, cf. 1 23 note). In this amazing fact St. Paul finds the *rationale* of indissoluble marriage; the union of husband and wife corresponds to the union of Christ and His Bride, and is to share its character.

31. The familiar words from Gen 2 24 continue the thought of 28 f. (29 f., from 'even as,' are strictly parenthetical, like the similar passage in 25, from 'even as,' to 27; but the theme of it overflows into the practical exhortations.) **For this cause** = because of the essential oneness of a man and his wife ('his own flesh'), as the context in Genesis makes plain.

32. The AV 'great mystery' gives a wrong sense (1 9 note, and cf. 1 Tim 3 16). The meaning seems to be—'The revelation of God's purpose here declared is of great importance; and I (emphatic) am citing it now with reference to Christ and the Church'; i.e. I am applying it to husbands and wives in the light of the perfect union between the heavenly Bridegroom and His Bride.

33. Nevertheless: *sc.* 'not to dwell further on this mystical thought, the practical upshot is . . .'

fear: see on 21.

VI. **1-4.** Children and fathers.

1. in the Lord. The children of Christian parents were themselves, it seems, baptized members of the Church.

2 f. first commandment. The strikingly similar context in Mk 12 28 indicates that 'first'=of greatest importance, not first in order on some list. A comma after 'commandment' renders unnecessary the unprofitable discussion about 'commandments with a promise.' Translate: 'Honour thy father and mother—for this is a (the) commandment of highest importance for you, and has a promise attached to it, as you may see from the words which follow—that it may be,' etc. St. Paul is talking to children.

5-9. Slaves and masters. Christianity supplied the impulse which abolished slavery, but St. Paul was much less concerned with the 'rights of man' than with the duty of each man to serve God in whatever station he might be.

5. Servants: slaves; so in 6, and it is the same word which is translated 'bond' in 8.

masters: here and in 9 (twice) the word is the same as 'Lord' in 7, 8.

9. Slaves and masters alike can only do their duty aright if they are slaves of Christ, the one Lord and Master of all, who judges all men by the quality of their service, and pays no regard to social status.

(5) VI. **10-20. The Church's Warfare, and the Armour of God.**—St. Paul has concluded his exhortation on particular duties, and returns here to the universal need for strength—the theme of 1 19 ff. He has been thinking so far mainly of the Church as it is, or is to be, within; now he reminds his readers of the warfare which it has to wage against spiritual foes without. Each member of the Church is to be a spiritual warrior, fully equipped with the weapons of the Divine Warrior Himself.

10 f. The emphatic words are 'in the Lord and in the strength of his might' and 'of God.' Delete the word 'whole' before armour, which suggests a false emphasis. The wiles of the devil have to be met by the armour of God.

12. Cf. 1 21, and note on 2 2; Rev 12 7-9. The supernatural 'principalities and powers,' etc., are partly good, as in 3 10, partly evil, as here.*

in the heavenly places: in contrast with the solid and palpable battlefields of earthly warfare (see 1 3 note).

14-17. The main features of St. Paul's picture are taken from two passages in the Book of Isaiah: 59 17, where God Himself does battle, and 11 4 f., where the warrior is the Messianic King. The significance of the various parts of the equipment is not to be pressed (cf. 1 Th 5 8, where the breastplate is faith and love).

15. Cf. Is 52 7 **preparation:** lit. preparedness=readiness, in the sense of freedom of movement, bestowed by the Gospel of peace.

16. Flaming missiles were often used in ancient warfare.

* Cf. *The Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 437, 438.

17. In Is 11 [4] LXX it is 'with the Spirit through his lips' that the Divine Warrior slays the wicked, and 'with the word of his mouth' that He smites the earth. Here 'the sword of the Spirit'=rather the sword supplied by the Spirit, and it is then further described as the utterance of God (spoken through His servants; cf. Hos 6 [5]). Cf. Heb 4 [12].

18. The thought of Spirit-given utterance leads on to the thought of another kind of utterance in the Spirit, viz. intercessory prayer.

19. mystery: see 1 [9] note.

20. an ambassador in chains. St. Paul, though a prisoner, is the representative of Christ the King in the imperial city of Rome. See Introduction.

21 f. Personal matters

ye also: as well as the Colossians (Col 4 [7-9]) and others.

23 f. Benediction.

uncorruptness: incorruptibility. 'Imperishableness is the characteristic of our new life in Christ and of our love to Him' (Robinson).

Bibliography

Commentaries: Robinson; Abbott (*I.C.C.*); Martin (*Cent. B.*); Moule (*C.B.*); Salmond (*E.G.T.*); Alford. **Expositions:** Gore; Findlay (*Exp. B.*); Robinson. **Other Literature:** Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays* (x); Hort, *Proleg. to Romans and Ephesians*; Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul*, 225 ff.; Moffatt (*I.L.N.T.*); Lock (*H.D.B.*); Grensted (*D.A.C.*); Barry, *A Philosophy from Prison*.

PHILIPPIANS

By J. C. Du Buisson

Introduction

Philippi, in eastern Macedonia, was situated on a steep hill some eight miles north-west of Neapolis, its seaport. Originally known as Crenides, or Little Fountains, from the springs which fed a great marsh south of the city, it received its later name from Philip of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great, who refounded it in the 4th cent. B.C. Two hundred years later it fell into the hands of the Romans, and in the next century was the scene of the defeat of Julius Cæsar's murderers, Brutus and Cassius, by Antony and Octavian, afterwards Augustus, when Brutus died by his own hand. It was given the status of a colony, or settlement of disbanded soldiers, with special privileges and a constitution modelled on that of Rome. Thus it became a centre of Roman influence. Strictly speaking, it was not in St. Paul's time the first city of the district, as St. Luke calls it in Ac 16 [12]. This honour belonged to Amphipolis, some thirty miles to the south-west. The two cities were keen rivals. 'Amphipolis ranked first by the general consent, Philippi first by its own consent' (Ramsay).

The story of St. Paul's first visit to Philippi, during his 2nd journey, probably in A.D. 50, is given in detail in Ac 16. St. Luke, as his use of the first person plural shows, was with St. Paul and probably remained there for some time after the Apostle had left. About five years later, in his 3rd journey, St. Paul passed through Macedonia on his way to Greece (Ac 20 [1, 2]) and may have visited Philippi, although this is not mentioned. On his return from Corinth the next spring he arrived there just in time to keep the Passover (Ac 20 [6]). No later visit is recorded, but if he was released from his Roman prison and included Macedonia in his later travels (cf. 1 Tim 1 [3]), we may reasonably suppose that he would not omit the church to which he was bound by ties of special affection.

It is probable that only a small proportion of St. Paul's letters have survived. If we are to take literally a statement of St. Polycarp in the 2nd century, more than one Epistle to the Philippians was known in his day. At any rate it is certain that from the first the Apostle was in constant communication with them. Twice they had sent money to him in Thessalonica (4 [16]), and this epistle is the acknowledgement of a later gift which he had received from them.

St. Paul, when he wrote, was a prisoner (1 [7], etc.). Where? An unrecorded imprisonment at Ephesus in connection with the riot (Ac 19) has been suggested, and also the two years' captivity at Cæsarea (Ac 24 [27]), but the ordinary view that he was in Rome has most to be said for it and is supported by the mention of Cæsar's household (4 [22]). The letter, then, was written during the two years men-

tioned in Ac 28 [30], probably 59-61; and belongs with Eph, Col, and Phm to the 3rd group of the Pauline epistles, known as the Epistles of the Captivity. In the Bible it is placed between Eph and Col, but while these two and Phm are closely connected, Phil stands somewhat by itself, and is either the earliest or the latest of the four, the arguments on each side being very equally balanced. The Apostle's hope of being shortly released (2 [24]) favours the later date, early in 61. Epaphroditus, who had brought from Philippi the gift mentioned above, had remained on in Rome to help St. Paul. Probably from overwork, he had a severe illness, which left him on his recovery anxious to return to his home. St. Paul readily consented to this and, as it seems, made him the bearer of this letter.

The genuineness of Phil is generally admitted except by those who reject as spurious all the Pauline epistles. Whether the letter as we have it preserves the original form is more doubtful. At 3 [2] the exhortation to rejoice is suddenly interrupted by a stern warning in the style of Gal against Jews or Judaizing Christians. Hence it has been conjectured that 3 [2]-4 [1] is a fragment of an earlier letter, a stray sheet, perhaps addressed to the Roman church and found there by Epaphroditus, who carried it back to Philippi with the letter entrusted to him by St. Paul. Another explanation is that the Apostle had just begun to dictate the closing paragraph of his letter (note 'finally,' 3 [1]) when news arrived of some fresh attack on him by his Judaizing opponents. This led him to sound the alarm at Philippi and to enter on a vigorous self-defence, but as he proceeds his wrath dies down and he speaks in a gentler strain of what he had gained by his conversion, a gain completely outweighing the loss of Jewish privileges. Then other topics suggest themselves and the original train of thought is not resumed till 4 [2]. There were signs of dissension in the Philippian church which caused him anxiety (e.g. 2 [3, 14], 4 [2]), and the gift of money, to which perhaps the donors attached undue importance, made it necessary for him in thanking them to explain that he valued it not for itself, but as a token of their love for him (4 [10-20]). Nothing else, however, apart from the outburst in 3, disturbs the impression of calm and trustful happiness conveyed by the epistle. 'I rejoice; rejoice with me,' is its message. It combats no errors of doctrine or of practice and is a spontaneous expression of love, joy, and peace.

I. 1, 2. **Salutation.**

1. **Timothy**: St. Paul's young and trusted companion. For his early history see Ac 16 [1-2]. The last mention of him in Ac is at Troas, 20 [4, 5]. Later he must have joined the Apostle in Rome (see 2 [19-23]). **saints**: a common term for Christians in the NT, implying consecration rather than personal holiness. It is the old Jewish title for the people of God (Dt 33 [3]; Ps 30 [4], etc.), passed on to the new Israel, the church of Christ. So they are now **in Christ Jesus**. **bishops**: i.e. the presbyters, to whom in Gentile churches the Greek title *episkopoi* (overseers) was applied. They and the deacons were the two local orders of ministers. The Apostles exercised a general supervision, with plenary authority over the churches and their individual members.

2. **Grace . . . peace**: St. Paul's ordinary greeting, combining the Greek and Hebrew forms.

3-11. **Thanksgiving and Prayer.**

St. Paul nearly always begins his letters with thanksgiving. Here it is especially fervent and prolonged because he has no occasion for rebuke.

4. **all**: the recurrence of this word when the Philippians are mentioned (1 [1, 7, 8, 25], 2 [17], 4 [21]) is connected with the exhortations to unity ([27], etc). **joy**: one of the notes of this epistle (1 [25], 2 [2, 29], 3 [1], 4 [1]). See Introduction.

5. **fellowship**: co-operation with himself, not confined to their gifts of money (4 [15, 16]), although these, as a proof of their readiness to help, were doubtless in his mind. **the first day**: the day when they had received the Gospel, more than ten years before.

6. **the day of Jesus Christ**: the day of the Lord, frequently mentioned in the OT prophets (Is 2 [12], etc.), becomes in the NT the day of Christ, when He will return in judgement. This was looked for as immediate by the first Christians, but in view of his trial at Rome St. Paul now thought that he might not live to see it ([23]).

7. **in my bonds**: their sympathy with him in his imprisonment and in his work of defending and establishing the Gospel was a sign that God's blessing was upon them as upon himself.

8. **tender mercies**: rather *heart*, as the seat of the affections. The union between the Master and the disciple is so close that their hearts beat in common. Cf. Gal 2 [20]. 'In Paul Paul lives not, but Jesus Christ. Wherefore Paul is moved, not in the heart of Paul but of Jesus Christ' (Bengel).

9-11. **love, if it is to bear its proper fruit, must be combined with knowledge and all discernment,** that sensitiveness to moral and spiritual distinctions which leads both to a sound judgement and to a pure and blameless life. Heart and head must grow together.

10. **approve the things that are excellent:** or, as RVm, **prove the things that differ.** The first rendering is preferable, but both bring out the truth that moral choice is always between higher and lower courses of action, between the relatively good and the less good.

12-30. **Progress of the Gospel in Rome** (12-18). **St. Paul's Present Condition and Prospects** (19-26). **Exhortation to Live worthily of the Gospel** (27-30).

12-18. Another cause of thanksgiving. Even his imprisonment has furthered the spread of the Gospel.

13. **throughout the whole prætorian guard:** lit., as RVm, **in the whole Prætorium.** There are three possible interpretations of the word *prætorium*: (1) The imperial palace. So AV. This is unlikely, although the mention of Cæsar's household in 4 22 seems to favour it. (2) The imperial guard, who had charge of St. Paul as a prisoner. But they were a very large body of men, whom he could hardly have influenced to the extent implied. (3) The supreme court, by which he was being tried. In this case the trial must have already begun when he wrote. The third explanation is the most probable.

14. **being confident through my bonds:** they had gained increased trust in God through the unexpected results of his imprisonment.

15. **Some:** probably the Judaizers who everywhere opposed him.

16. **set:** i.e. appointed.

17. **affliction:** the distress of being a prisoner and so unable to counteract their teaching.

18. **Christ is proclaimed:** an imperfect Gospel preached from wrong motives is better than no Gospel at all. The centre of the primitive Gospel was that 'the Christ is Jesus.' This the Judaizers and St. Paul held in common.

19-26. St. Paul now speaks of his own prospects. All will turn out for good whether he is released or not. For himself he wishes to die, for the Philippians' sake to live. The latter is what he expects.

19. **salvation:** i.e., as often in the NT (e.g. 2 Cor 1 6), spiritual welfare, present and future.

21. **to live is Christ:** see on 8. For St. Paul Christ gives meaning to life.

> 'Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
> Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.'
> F. W. H. Myers.

gain: its nature is stated in 23.

22. The construction in this verse is broken and the exact rendering uncertain, but the general sense is clear. If his earthly life is to be prolonged, he still doubts whether this is desirable.

23. **very far better:** in the Greek this is a double comparative, 'much more better,' which brings out St. Paul's strong preference for the future life. It is one of the few passages in the NT which throw light on the future state, and is marked by great reserve. All it says is that to the Christian death brings a closer union with Christ than can be obtained on earth. Cf. 2 Cor 5 6-8.

26. **your glorying:** they will have fresh cause for Christian exultation when he is among them once more. His expectation of release seems to grow as he proceeds. Cf. 2 24.

27-30. An exhortation to live worthily of the Gospel and to show courage.

27. **let your manner of life be worthy:** lit. *exercise your citizenship worthily.* See on 3 20. **one spirit . . . one soul:** an undercurrent of anxiety about disunion in the Philippian church runs through the epistle. Cf. 2 2, 3, 14; 4 2.

28. **adversaries:** we do not know who these were. Possibly Jewish emissaries had stirred up the Roman authorities against the Christians and they were being persecuted (29). **which:** i.e. their fearlessness.

an evident token of . . . salvation: cf. 2 Th 1 5, where suffering endured with patience and confidence is regarded as a pledge of final victory.

29. **the same conflict:** they had witnessed his sufferings at Philippi (Ac 16 19 f.; 1 Th 2 2) and knew what he was now going through in Rome.

II. 1-11. **Exhortation to Unity and Humility** (1-4). **Christ the Supreme Example of Self-Humiliation** (5-8). **His Subsequent Exaltation to Supreme Lordship** (9-11).

1. **comfort:** rather *encouragement.* **fellowship of the Spirit:** joint participation in the Holy Spirit, who unites believers to Christ and to one another. 'The Apostle here appeals to the Philippians, by all their deepest experiences as Christians and all their noblest impulses as men, to preserve peace and concord' (Lightfoot).

2. that ye be: by being.

3. faction: the special danger of Greek communities. Cf. 1 Cor 1 [10-12].

5-8. Humility, the characteristic virtue of Christianity as contrasted with paganism, is here traced to its source in the voluntary self-humiliation of Christ. As so often with St. Paul, a profound statement of doctrine emerges out of a piece of practical exhortation.

6. being: the Greek word may imply being from the beginning (RVm. Cf. Jn 1 [1]). It denotes prior existence, but not necessarily eternal existence (Lightfoot). **in the form of God:** the word translated **form** (*morphē*) means not mere appearance, but the manifestation of a reality. Here it is practically equivalent to 'nature.' Thus the whole phrase **being in the form of God** asserts the Godhead of the Son before the Incarnation, just as in [7] **taking the form of a servant** asserts His true manhood after it. Both before and after He is the image or expression of the unseen God. Cf. Col 1 [15]; 2 Cor 4 [4]; Jn 1 [18]. **counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God:** note the important difference between AV and RV here. The word translated 'robbery' in the one and 'prize' in the other means strictly an act of seizing or robbery, then a thing to be grasped at. **on an equality with:** the original is the neuter plural of the adjective meaning 'equal,' used adverbially. There are two ways of interpreting the clause: (1) Christ did not use His position of equality with God as a means of securing earthly honour; (2) He set no store by that equality, but willingly surrendered it. The second is to be preferred.

7. emptied himself: on this word (*ĕkĕnōsĕn*) has been built the doctrine of the *kenosis* or self-emptying, i.e. the abandonment of divine prerogatives by the Son of God when He became incarnate. Cf. 2 Cor 8 [9], and on the connexion between the two passages see Gore, *Belief in Christ*, 225 ff. But it is not safe to lay much stress on the use of the verb. St. Paul may well mean, not that the Son emptied Himself of anything, but simply that He poured Himself out, like water from a vessel, in order to enrich others. **taking:** better *by taking*. The self-emptying was not a preparation for the Incarnation, but was necessarily involved in it. We may notice that St. Paul does not speak of Christ's laying aside the form of God. If form means reality manifested, that would be out of the question. **being made in the likeness of men:** He took not only the nature of a servant, but also the outward appearance of a man.

8. being found in fashion as a man: this clause means practically the same as the preceding. Christ was like other men to look at. **obedient:** i.e. to His Father's will, even when it involved death, and that no ordinary death, but one of horror and shame. **the death of the cross:** to us the cross is a sacred object. In ancient times the word suggested only degradation, much as gibbet does now.

This passage ([5-8]) is one of the chief scriptural foundations of the doctrine of the Incarnation. It brings out the deity and the humanity of our Lord, but throws little light on the problems connected with the co-existence of the two natures in the one Person. It is best understood when studied devotionally, and is fittingly chosen as the Epistle for Palm Sunday.

9-11. The exaltation following on the humiliation.

9. the name: i.e. Lord ([11]), the supreme name which claims and secures universal homage.

10. in the name of Jesus: this does not, as is commonly thought, refer to the utterance of the name Jesus, but to the revealed majesty of Him who was so called. In the OT the name of Jehovah often means His glorious presence, e.g. Dt 12 [11]. So here all created things, wherever they are, as soon as the glory of Jesus, the incarnate Son, is revealed to them, do reverence to Him on bended knee. It may be remarked in passing that the custom of bowing at the sacred name in the creed and elsewhere should not be based on a supposed injunction in this passage. St. Paul's meaning is quite different.

11. Lord: there may be an implied protest here against the 'gods many and lords many' of paganism (1 Cor 8 [5]), also possibly against the application of the title to the Roman emperors, which was connected with the growing tendency to deify them, so that Christians were obliged to refuse it. But this question can hardly have become acute when Phil was written. **God the Father:** the ultimate object of all worship and adoration.

12-18. Exhortation to Continued Obedience. His Willingness to Die on their Behalf.

12, 13. in my absence, work out your own salvation . . . for it is God which worketh in you: they need not depend on him, the Apostle, for they have a much higher support. Religious progress is always a matter of co-operation between God, the

source of all that is good in us both as regards will and action, and ourselves, when we respond to His promptings. Cf. 1 Cor 3 [9] and the Collect for Easter Day. In the language of theology, grace is (1) prevenient, or going before, and (2) co-operating. **for his good pleasure**: in fulfilment of His good purposes for mankind. The words probably refer back to God's working in us and give its reason.

15. lights: rather *luminaries*, like stars in a dark sky.

16. holding forth: more probably, *holding fast*. The reference is to their own adhesion to the Gospel, not to their proclamation of it to others. **the day of Christ**: when St. Paul will have to render an account of his work among them. See on 1 [6].

17. if I am offered: for the literal meaning see RVm. He is ready to die for them, if necessary, and rejoices at the thought. The metaphor of sacrifice is general, with no special allusion to Jewish sacrifices. The Philippians are pictured as offering up their faith, and he gives his life-blood as the accompanying libation.

19-30. Plans for sending Timothy and Epaphroditus.

He is sending Epaphroditus at once, probably as the bearer of the letter. Timothy is to follow soon, and he hopes shortly after to come himself.

19. Timothy: cf. 1 [1]. Timothy had helped in the foundation of the Philippian church (Ac 16 [3] f.), and had probably been sent there more than once since, as his missions to Macedonia (1 Th 3 [2]; Ac 19 [22]) would naturally include visits to Philippi.

20. likeminded: with Timothy, not with himself, or he would have said 'no one else.'

21. all seek their own: possibly a somewhat hasty judgement. Some of his companions may have refused to go to Philippi for reasons which seemed to him selfish, and he gives vent to his disappointment. Cf. the condemnation of Demas (2 Tim 4 [10]).

22. proof: i.e. proved character. This implies that Timothy was already well known at Philippi.

24. For St. Paul's hopes of a speedy release cf. 1 [26].

25. Epaphroditus: apparently a native of Philippi, only mentioned in this epistle. (It is almost certain that he is not the Epaphras of Col and Phm, although that name is but a shortened form of this.) He had brought a contribution from the Philippian church and had remained in Rome to help St. Paul. Then he had a severe illness, news of which had reached his friends at home, so that he was now anxious to return and allay their distress.

27. sorrow upon sorrow: the additional weight of sorrow that would have come to him if his friend's illness had ended fatally.

28. diligently: or *eagerly*. [28-30] convey the impression that the stay of Epaphroditus at Rome had caused some dissatisfaction at Philippi, which St. Paul is anxious to remove: but this must remain a conjecture.

29. such: him and men like him.

30. hazarding his life: he had overworked himself in making up for what was necessarily lacking in the help given to St. Paul by the Philippians—namely personal service.

III. 1-16. Warning against Judaizers. His own Career. Loss and Gain.

1. Finally: St. Paul apparently intended to close at this point. **rejoice**: cf. 2 [18], 4 [4], and the note on 1 [4]. The possibility of the alternative rendering **farewell** (RVm) is rejected by some, but on insufficient grounds. It probably means this in 2 Cor 13 [11]. Here there is perhaps an intentional ambiguity. **the same things**: what things? Probably the duty of rejoicing. **safe**: we should have expected the addition of 'to read' or 'to hear.'

2. On the different explanations of the marked change in tone here see Introduction. If the passage is a fragment of an earlier letter accidentally inserted at this point, the foes denounced may be unconverted Jews: if, as is more probable, St. Paul had just received news of some fresh attack on his work, they are Judaizing Christians. **dogs**: the pariah dog of the East is regarded as a type of all that is filthy and contemptible. Cur is the nearest English equivalent. **concision**: i.e. mutilation, a scornful reference to circumcision. Our translators, following the Vulgate, have used the term in order to preserve the play on words, which is evident in the Greek.

3. the circumcision: i.e. the true Israelites. The best commentary on this verse is Rom 2 [28, 29]. Cf. Col 2 [11]. The Catholic Church continues the life of Israel, not the unbelieving Jews, who have been cut off for rejecting their Messiah. This is the general teaching of the NT. Cf. Rom 11 [17-24]; Gal 6 [16]; 1 P 2 [9, 10]; Rev 2 [9]. **by the Spirit of God**: the Holy Spirit is the power, which enables us to

worship 'in spirit and in truth' (Jn 4 [23, 24]). **glory in Christ Jesus:** the idea of glorying in God runs back to Jer 9 [23, 24], which is twice quoted by St. Paul in a condensed form (1 Cor 1 [31]; 2 Cor 10 [17]). What is said in the OT of Jehovah is here, as frequently in the NT, transferred to Christ. **in the flesh:** in external or racial privileges. Their nature is set forth in [5, 6].

5. **Benjamin:** the tribe which gave the Jews their first king, St. Paul's namesake. For the Apostle's pride in his descent cf. Rom 11 [1]. **a Hebrew of Hebrews:** i.e. a Hebrew of Hebrew descent. In the NT the term Hebrew is applied to Aramaic-speaking Jews who adhered to their national customs. **a Pharisee:** and therefore a strict observer of the law.

6. **persecuting the church:** St. Paul never forgot that he had once been a persecutor. Cf. Ac 22 [4]; Gal 1 [13]. Here he mentions the fact ironically as a proof of his zeal. **the righteousness which is in the law:** to the Jew righteousness meant before all things strict conformity to the law. St. Paul had broken entirely with this conception (Rom 9 [31, 32]).

7-10 tell what he had gained by renouncing his privileges. They illustrate the parables of the hidden treasure and the pearl of great price (Mt 13 [44-46]).

8. **the excellency of the knowledge:** 'strictly the excellency is Christ's; when He is known the knowledge gains excellency too' (Bengel).

9. **a righteousness of mine own:** earned by meritorious works, as contrasted with **the righteousness which is of God,** His gift appropriated by us through our **faith in Christ** and so resting upon that as its basis. There are two elements in this righteousness, separable in thought but not in fact—namely, acquittal of the guilt of sin, and the communication of a new moral life. Both are ours through a continual surrender of the self to Christ. This is the special theme of Gal and Rom, e.g. Rom 10 [3, 4]; Gal 2 [16]. See Liddon, *Analysis of Romans*, 17, 18.

10. **that I may know him:** to know Christ is to be in conscious union with Him as crucified and as risen. Cf. 2 Cor 4 [10, 11]; 13 [4, 5]. **the power of his resurrection:** the resurrection is placed first because it was the risen Christ that St. Paul had come to know. But its power is only revealed to the disciple who shares the sufferings which preceded it, and who may therefore hope for his own resurrection ([11]).

12-14. Consciousness of his present imperfection leads St. Paul to compare himself to a long-distance runner, but the metaphor is only partially developed.

12. **if so be:** the exact rendering of this clause is uncertain, but the general sense must be that he hopes to attain the end for which Christ had laid hold on him.

15, 16. A brief exhortation, developed more clearly in [17], to follow his aims.

15. **perfect:** rather *mature*, in faith and life, as opposed to children. Cf. 1 Cor 14 [20]. The word is said by some to have been used of persons fully initiated into the Greek mysteries, but that thought probably does not come in here. **otherwise minded:** mistaken.

16. Faithfulness to the standard we have reached is the condition of receiving more help and light from God.

17-21. **Warning against Licence.**

Besides Judaism, there was a danger to the Philippians in the opposite direction, from Gentile self-indulgence and worldliness.

17. **mark them which so walk:** fix your eyes on those who follow the example which we have set you.

20. **citizenship:** the Philippians, who were proud of their Roman citizenship, are reminded that their real citizenship already exists in heaven, whence their Lord will return. According to Eph 2 [6] we are even now enthroned with Christ 'in the heavenlies' or heavenly sphere, a vague expression which shows that St. Paul did not conceive of heaven merely as a place. Cf. also Heb 12 [22-24].

21. **humiliation:** better *low estate*, as the word is rendered in the Magnificat (Lk 1 [48]). Our earthly body is subject to decay and death, but in the exercise of His universal sovereignty Christ will make it like the glorious body which He now wears. For another description of the change cf. 1 Cor 15 [35-58]. The transformation of our Lord's body on the first Easter Day is the first stage in a process which will transform our bodies and even the whole creation (Rom 8 [19-21]).

IV. 1. **Exhortation to Steadfastness.**

1. **crown:** the victor's wreath, which, if his beloved converts will remain faithful, he will at last be able to wear as the sign that he has not run in vain (2 [16]).

At this point the break which began at 3 [2] comes to an end.

2, 3. **Personal Appeals.**

2. **Euodia and Syntyche:** apparently two Christian women at Philippi who had quarrelled. They are not mentioned elsewhere.

3. yokefellow: it is just possible that the word so translated may be a proper name, Syzygus, but more probably it refers to some unnamed friend, perhaps Epaphroditus, the bearer of the letter. **Clement:** a Philippian Christian, otherwise unknown. The name is common, and there is little ground for identifying this man with the Clement of Rome whose letter to the church of Corinth is almost, if not quite, the earliest extant Christian writing outside the NT. **the book of life:** in the OT the book of the living is the register of God's people, Israel; e.g. Ps 69 [28]. In Dan 12 [1] the book is connected with the idea of immortality. In the NT it is the roll of the citizens of the heavenly commonwealth (cf. 3 [20]). The actual phrase **book of life** is only found here and in the Apocalypse (3 [5], etc.). Cf., however, Lk 10 [20].

4-7. Joy, Forbearance, Confident Prayer, Peace.

4. Rejoice: see on 3 [1].

5. forbearance: or *reasonableness*, the temper which will not always insist on having its own way, especially valuable as a safeguard of unity. **The Lord is at hand:** a kind of watchword in the primitive church, expecting as it did the speedy return of Christ. In 1 Cor 16 [22] it appears in the Aramaic form, **Maran atha**, which shows that the title Lord was given to Christ by Jewish Christians and was not, as some have maintained, due to the influence of the pagan mystery religions. See Gore, *Belief in Christ*, 102-105.

6. be anxious: the same word as is used in Mt 6 [25]. The antidote to anxiety is prayer combined with thanksgiving, the grateful remembrance of what God has done for us in the past. For the combination cf. 1 [3, 4].

7. all understanding: literally, *every mind*. This is sometimes taken to mean every human contrivance, but the ordinary rendering is quite as probable. God gives a peace which transcends our powers of thought. **guard:** the Greek word is a strong one, meaning to watch over like a sentinel. Cf. Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, cxxvi.

8, 9. Subjects of Thought.

8. Finally: a second attempt to conclude. Cf. 3 [1]. In this verse St. Paul passes into the region of natural ethics, and uses terms common in Greek philosophy. **virtue**, the ordinary Greek word for moral excellence, is found here only in his letters. It is as though he said, Take account of goodness, wherever you find it. Lightfoot paraphrases, 'Whatever value may reside in your old heathen conception of virtue, whatever consideration is due to the praise of men.' Modern psychology stresses the value of the apostle's advice. The breeding-place of good habits is within the mind.

9. the God of peace: not only the peace of God ([7]), but God Himself (Bengel).

10-20. Acknowledgement of the Gift sent through Epaphroditus.

On the Philippians' gifts to St. Paul see Introduction. They seem to have been intermitted for some time, but this was due to lack of opportunity, not of thought ([10]). Probably because he had been charged elsewhere with making money out of the Gospel, he is careful in sending his thanks for their recent contribution to assert his independence ([11, 12]), while he shows his appreciation of their continued generosity ([15-17]).

12. to be abased . . . to abound: i.e. to live in a humble way, and to live in plenty. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, c. xiii) maintains on rather slender evidence that St. Paul was a man of means during his later years.

15. in the beginning of the gospel: see on 1 [5]. **giving and receiving:** a financial phrase meaning a credit and debit account. We learn from 2 Cor 11 [8, 9] that he had refused pecuniary aid from Corinth, although he accepted it from Macedonia.

16. even in Thessalonica: before he left Macedonia. After his departure from Philippi St. Paul went to Thessalonica and Berœa; thence to Athens and Corinth (Ac 17, 18).

17. the fruit: 'the recompense which is placed to your account and increases with each fresh demonstration of your love' (Lightfoot). Cf. 2 Cor 9 [6].

18. I have: the verb used is a technical term for giving a receipt. Their debt to him was more than paid. **I am filled:** his wants are fully satisfied. **an odour of a sweet smell:** an OT phrase (e.g. Gen 8 [21]), explained by the words which follow. In Eph 5 [2] it is used in connexion with the sacrifice of Christ.

19. my God: 'my' is expressive. God will regard the generosity shown to His servant. **according to his riches:** God considers what it is suitable to His riches to give, not what is suitable for our merits to receive. **in glory in Christ Jesus:** their recompense will be spiritual, the satisfaction of every need through their union with Christ, which will bring them to glory. Cf. Eph 1 [18].

21-23. Salutation and Grace.

21. saint: see on 1 [1]. **brethren:** his

personal companions, as distinct from the Roman Christians generally.

22. Cæsar's household: a vast body, including all persons engaged in the emperor's service, whether in Rome itself or in the provinces. The Christian members of it at this time were probably drawn from its lower ranks, freedmen or slaves.

Literature

Commentaries: Lightfoot, Vincent (*I.C.C.*), Moule (*C.G.T.* and *C.B.S.*), Maurice Jones (*West. C.*). Also Moule, *Philippian Studies*. E. H. Gifford's study of $2^{5\text{-}11}$, entitled *The Incarnation*. Arts. on 'Philippi' and 'Ep. to Philippians' in *H.D.B.*, iii.

COLOSSIANS AND PHILEMON

By T. W. Crafer

Colossæ was situated in the heart of the province of Asia, on the road inland from Ephesus, in the valley of the Lycus, a tributary of the Mæander. As St. Paul had travelled by the 'higher parts' on his third missionary journey (Ac 19^{1}), he had never passed along this valley road. Colossæ was the least important of the three towns on the banks of the Lycus. A few miles higher up lay Hierapolis, where the Stoic philosopher Epictetus was then in his youth; and about ten miles lower down was Laodicea, a proud city of some importance. The inhabitants of the district were Phrygian by descent, which does not suggest that they were marked by either steadiness or constancy. There were certainly Jews among them; but though the epistle shows that Jewish thought and practice had much influence at Colossæ, the Church seems to have consisted mainly of Gentile Christians.

There seems little doubt that the letter was written when St. Paul was in prison at Rome. He is in confinement, but is not prevented from seeing his friends or preaching the Gospel (4^{3}). His many companions are mostly Gentiles, and one of them is Onesimus, a runaway slave from Colossæ. All this makes it improbable that he wrote during his earlier imprisonment at Cæsarea. Though he had not personally founded or even visited the Church at Colossæ (2^{1}), his representatives, during his long stay at Ephesus, had evidently penetrated into other parts of the province of Asia (Ac 19^{10}). One of them, by name Epaphras, was himself a Colossian (4^{12}), and seems to have been the founder of the Church there (1^{7}). He is now with St. Paul, and is still actively interesting himself on behalf of his converts, though not immediately returning to them (4^{12}). He has recently come from Colossæ, bringing St. Paul a report of the Church (1^{8}). But there was much to tell about them besides their faith and love (1^{4}). For they had been infected by a form of false teaching which induced them to put their trust in other spiritual mediators between God and man besides the Son of God ($2^{18, 19}$), and turned them to a false asceticism based on the assumption that matter is evil ($2^{20\text{-}23}$). Alike in their belief and their practice there was a strong Jewish colouring, for the mediators were connected with the angels, and the asceticism consisted in the observance of the ordinances of the Law. The result was a system which seemed to those who accepted it to be an advance on the Christianity taught them by Epaphras. It was therefore necessary for St. Paul to write at once and call them back to the truth, setting forth the absolute headship of God the Son, and showing them that His Person was the true centre and satisfaction of their thought and life. This epistle is the result; and is sent by the hand of Tychicus, a tried companion who came from their own province (Ac 20^{4}), and could add to St. Paul's words when he arrived ($4^{8, 9}$). But St. Paul took the opportunity of sending with him the runaway slave Onesimus (4^{9}), who had escaped from his master Philemon, and probably had stolen some of his property (Phm $^{11, 12, 18}$). St. Paul therefore writes a second letter to his 'fellow-worker', Philemon, to be presented to him by the poor runaway, for whose conduct crucifixion was the natural punishment. He had doubtless sought safety in the underworld of Rome, but had come into touch with St. Paul, who had made him a Christian (Phm ^{10}). He now sends him back, tactfully giving him the support of Tychicus on his terrifying mission, with such a letter of commendation as it would have been hard for Philemon to ignore. The latter is not mentioned in the public epistle; but Archippus, who is referred to in both, seems to have been Philemon's son

(Phm [2]), and to have occupied a ministerial position (4 [17]).

Three problems must be briefly dealt with: (1) The nature of the Colossian heresy; (2) the Christology which St. Paul's answer to it draws from him; (3) the relation of the epistle to Ephesians.

(1) **The Colossian heresy** has so much in common with Gnosticism, that some have argued that the epistle must therefore be later than the time of St. Paul. But it is now recognized that it suggests no more than those earlier elements of which undeveloped Gnosticism consisted. It seems probable that the new faith which was trying to oust the Gospel was composite in character. Judaism was one ingredient; another may be described as Oriental speculation; and there was an admixture of the mystery religions current in Phrygia. The chief problem is with regard to the Jewish elements. Lightfoot argued from the likeness of the heresy to Essenism, that Essene Judaism had spread as far as the Lycus valley, just as Pharisaic Judaism had reached Galatia and threatened to overthrow St. Paul's work there. But there seems no necessity to insist on the presence of this particular form of Judaism, for the non-Jewish elements in the heresy are enough to explain its unusual features. Hort, in his *Judaistic Christianity* (120 ff.) argued that, although there was no need to postulate the presence of Essenism, the elements of the heresy were all of Jewish origin, and it only received the courtesy title of 'the philosophy' (2 [8]), its real nature being practical rather than speculative. Some modification of this view seems necessary, and more allowance must be made for Greek and Oriental influences. If the heresy be regarded as a theosophy of a syncretistic character, the answer to it cannot be without significance for the kind of theosophy current to-day.

(2) **The Christology of St. Paul's Answer.**—The epistle is wisely devoted mostly to positive teaching of the truth, only 2 [8-23] containing direct refutation of the heresy. It had suggested the cult of angelic mediators as a humble form of worship (2 [18]), and apparently laid stress on their share in the giving of the Law as setting them at least on a level with the Author of the Gospel. St. Paul shows, without accepting or rejecting the work of spiritual beings, that their era ended with the atoning death of our Lord, who is the one Saviour from sin and Author of new life (2 [15], 3 [10]). But it is also His absolute priority that sets Him above the angels, for He is the eternal image of the Father, and the agent of all creation (1 [15-17]). His headship is complete alike in the universe and in the Church (1 [18-19]), and He contains in Himself a fulness, both divine and human, to which nothing can be added. At His Second Coming those who have shared His life here will share His glory. It is the risen and ascended Christ who is uplifted as the centre of their faith and worship; His resurrection is a call to the baptized to nail their lower nature to the Cross and rise with Him to higher life. Such a Christology is undoubtedly in advance of that of St. Paul's earlier epistles, and has therefore caused some to doubt St. Paul's authorship of it. But it would be strange if by this period of his captivity there had been no development in his thought.*

(3) **The Relation of the Epistle to Ephesians.**—Much depends on the view taken of Ephesians. If both epistles were conveyed at the same time by Tychicus, it is easy to understand that St. Paul would wish to express the same thoughts to some of the other converts in Asia, and would omit only the negative and controversial part called forth by the heresy at Colossæ. If the more general letter were a circular one, he might well refer to it in Col 4 [16] as 'the epistle from Laodicea' (see note on the passage). Those who assign to Ephesians a date later than St. Paul assume either that the writer has utilized the best of the Apostle's thought, and added more to it of an equally high standard, or that the Colossian epistle itself only contains a Pauline nucleus (a still more difficult supposition), the rest being the work of a later editor, who was also responsible for the whole of Ephesians (see Introduction to Ephesians).

COLOSSIANS

I. 1-8. After the usual form of salutation ([1-2]), St. Paul assures the Colossians of his thankful prayers ([3]), in the thought of the three Christian virtues manifested among them: faith, centred in the Person of Christ; love, exhibited towards one another ([4]); and hope, arising from the glad tidings preached to them ([5]). The message is world-wide, and, since they

* The development in Christology found here is a development rather in fulness of expression than in substance. Thus the relation of the Christ to the universe before His Incarnation appears already in 1 Cor 8 [6], His relation to the Church in 1 Cor 12 [12] ff., and His absolute divinity almost certainly in Rom 9 [5]. Cf. note *ad loc.*—Ed.

were given their first sacramental share in the divine grace, there has been seen among them, as elsewhere, the fruit of Christian lives and the consequent increase in the number of believers (6). In their case, it is the result of the teaching of Epaphras, who has done St. Paul's own work among them (7), and has now brought him a report of their Christian love (8).

1. and Timothy. But the message was St. Paul's own, as in 1 Thessalonians, and the 'we' of 3, etc., probably only refers to himself.

2. faithful brethren: i.e. those who are loyal. It hardly can include those who had accepted the false teaching; but these he regards as a minority to be ignored till later in his letter.

5. the hope. Hope of the future, identified with its object, the ascended Christ, leads to present faith and love.

7. Epaphras. He seems to have been the founder of the Colossian Church, but was now at Rome (4 12). His glad report of their 'love' must have been supplemented by a sad account of their heresy, but this the Apostle tactfully omits. As a 'Vicar Apostolic,' like Timothy and Titus in the Pastoral Epistles, he could confirm and ordain.

9-14. This report has shown the writer how to direct his prayers for them. They need a fuller grasp of the working out of God's eternal purpose (9), and an effort to live in accordance with it. The more this knowledge deepens, the more will they manifest it in their lives (10). The strength for this will come from God Himself, which will enable them to bear with gladness any trial (11). For those who have become God's children share with all faithful people the light that is the Christian's inheritance (12); and from the darkness which once dominated their lives God has now transferred them into that new sphere of light in which His Beloved Son is King (13). It is through Him that we win redemption and forgiveness (14).

9. knowledge of his will: not only as applied to their own lives, but involving a general grasp of what God's will is for man.

10. in the knowledge: prefer *by*, as RVm. Doctrine and practice cannot be dissociated; the continued effort to know more of God is a way of help towards Christian living.

12. made us meet to be partakers: lit. 'made us competent for the portion that consists in the lot,' i.e. qualified us to take possession of our allotted part. For God's grace makes the Christian 'an inheritor of the Kingdom of heaven.' The use of the word 'kingdom' in the next verse, as referring to the present Kingdom of Christ, is unique in the writings of St. Paul.

the saints in light. To the Church in later days these words only suggest those within the veil; to St. Paul it included the whole body of the 'illuminated.' Perhaps 'in the light' follows grammatically the word 'inheritance.'

13. translated us. As the Assyrian and Babylonian kings had removed whole populations (such as Israel) into another country, so does the King of kings treat the baptized.

Son of his love. These words lead the writer to unfold the Christology which is his answer to the false teaching. To realize that Jesus is Redeemer in time leads to the thought of His Person in eternity.

15-17. Though God is invisible, yet the Son is His eternal image who reproduces Him, and in both position and time stands before all created beings (15). For everything created, whether earthly or heavenly, is founded in Him; He is alike the agent and the goal of all (16). He stands as absolute Head, He binds and sustains all that is (17).

St. Paul here gives his fullest statement concerning Christ's Person before the Incarnation (but cf. 1 Cor 8 6). The passage stands beside Jn 1 1-18 and Heb 1 1-4, as proclaiming the pre-eminent Son of God, alike in His eternal relation to the Father through all eternity, and His relation in time to all created things. In earlier epistles the centre of the Apostle's teaching is Redemption; now, owing to the heresy he is combating, it is Headship. The picture of Christ upon the cross is succeeded by that of Christ upon the throne. In Ephesians the same thought appears, but is applied to the relation of Christians to their Lord and Head (1 22, 2 4); here we find, in answer to Colossian errors, a doctrinal statement which perhaps contains the special message of the epistle for the 20th century. For the emphasis of to-day falls in undue proportion upon the human life and death of the 'Jesus of history.'

15. image. Before the Incarnation as well as after, though it was when the Word was made flesh that He could fully reveal God to man (cf. Jn 1 18).

the firstborn of all creation: a difficult phrase, and one which has proved so in the history of the Church. For it might be taken to imply that He was

Himself part of creation, the first of all things that were created. This was the view of Arianism in the 4th century; and this is why the words, which had been in the creed presented to the Council of Nicæa, were omitted because of their ambiguity, and the great affirmation was put in their place that He was 'of one substance with the Father.' But the word 'firstborn' is to be connected with the Old Testament meaning of the word, and suggests the heir by virtue of primogeniture. The Son is first in *position* in His relation to the universe. He is also first in *time* by virtue of His eternal existence. St. Paul's words may therefore be linked with those of the creed 'begotten before all worlds.' In Rabbinical literature we find God Himself called the Firstborn.

thrones, etc. (cf. 2 [18] and Eph 1 [21]). St. Paul appears to be giving a list of the powers in the spiritual world, beginning with the highest, such as formed the chain of angelic mediators in the false teaching at Colossæ. But he himself seems to have more or less accepted the later Jewish teaching about angelic hierarchies (cf. 2 [15]).

17. he is before all things: not merely a statement of His priority, but of His eternal existence; He *exists* as the 'I am.'

18-20. The headship of the universe has been claimed for the Son. St. Paul proceeds to show His headship in a narrower sphere. For He is also the Head of *redeemed* creation, from the moment that His victory over death made His redemptive work complete. He stands to the Church as its beginning and its Head, and it is therefore rightly regarded as His body. He became in a deeper and more intimate sense 'firstborn' by that return from the dead which established Him in a new pre-eminence over all ([18]). It was all part of God's plan, which provided, first, that He should possess a 'fulness' which enabled Him to deal with all things in heaven and earth ([19]), and, secondly, that when the universe both material and spiritual needed bringing back to God, His atoning death should be the means of accomplishing this, thus restoring the broken harmony of the world ([20]).

18. the church. To St. Paul the Church is always prior in thought to the churches, just as to the Jews Israel was prior in thought to the local communities of Jews. Its essential oneness is necessitated by its being Christ's 'body' upon earth (cf. 2 [19]; Eph 4 [4, 16], 5 [27] and 1 Cor 12 [28]).

19. fulness. The plenitude of Deity abides in the Son, who is 'very God of very God.' The word 'fulness' here is expanded in 2 [9] into 'all the fulness of the Godhead.' It is important to distinguish between the word for Godhead or Deity (*theotes*), and the other Pauline word *theiotes*, 'divinity,' which occurs in Rom 1 [20]. The two words are frequently confused to-day. Abbott defines the latter as meaning 'not the essence but the quality' of Godhead.

20. There is an ambiguity (as in 2 [14]) as to whether 'God' or 'Christ' is the subject of the sentence. It seems better to regard the work as the Father's throughout. It is important that the Father's part in the Atonement should sometimes thus be stressed.

all things. St. Paul had already suggested in Rom 8 [22, 23] that the effects of the Atonement extend through man to the lower creation; here he includes the higher creation too. The angels, so far from being means of reconciliation, may themselves need reconciliation (2 [15]).

21-23. These great doctrinal truths must be applied to the case of those to whom he writes. Blind in thought and base in deed, they had once in their heathen days been ranged on the opposite side to God's reconciling grace ([21]); but now their share in the incarnate and crucified Christ has brought them within its sphere. The goal of their redemption is no less than His presenting of them without the stain of sin before the throne of God ([22]). The only means to attain this is to hold firmly and definitely to the Faith which they have already received, not allowing anything to move them from that good news on which their hope rests, and which was the substance of the Apostle's own message ([23]).

22. the body of his flesh: in distinction from His other body the Church in [18].

through death: as in all sacrifice, the death is a preliminary to the presentation of the sacrifice thereafter.

23. the faith. If 'the churches' are replaced in St. Paul's later thought by 'the Church,' the same is perhaps true of 'the faith,' as representing not only the subjective feeling of belief, but the objective creed which could be summed up as 'the pattern of sound words,' as in 2 Tim 1 [13].

preached in all creation (cf. 1 [6]). Already the good news had gone forth to every quarter.

24-29. The share in Christ to which the Colossians are called makes him speak of his own share, and illustrate therefrom the glory of the Christian message and calling. The first effect upon himself is

a new sense of joy. This is caused by realizing that his very sufferings, as identified with the Cross, help to advance the Church, and thus strengthen the earthly body of Christ (24). His relation to his readers is part of God's plan for the dispensing of His new means of grace to men. He has thus become an instrument in imparting God's bounty to His household (25). This was a mystery which remained unrevealed in earlier generations; but now it is open to all those initiated into the Christian faith (26). This new illumination extends even to those outside the Jewish covenant, to whom the divine bounty is now displayed. Stated in brief, the mystery consists in their present union with Christ, the guarantee of something yet more glorious to come (27). His own message is to proclaim Christ thus, not limiting it (as the mystery religions or the new cult introduced at Colossæ would do) by only imparting a share to a privileged few, as if it were an occult form of knowledge, but with the express object of granting full initiation to every living soul (28). The goal of all his labours is thus to set all men before his Lord. It is hard work, but its real force lies in the divine power working within him (29).

24. fill up . . . that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ. It is not that the sufferings of Christ's followers possess any atoning merit. Lightfoot explains thus: 'The Church is built up by repeated acts of self-denial in successive individuals and successive generations.' But we may add that though suffering in itself never has any atoning value, it leads to the setting free of life to be imparted to others. For the thought cf. Ps 69 9, and also Ro 15 3; He 11 26; 2 Co 1 5, and (above all) 2 Co 4 11, 12. The manifestation of the Risen Life, which brings life to others, comes through suffering (cf. Jn 12 24).

for his body's sake. There is no separation between helping Christ and helping the Church. Union with Him means union with all those who are in Him; salvation is not individualistic.

25. dispensation, RVm *stewardship.* In any case the thought is of each 'steward of the Lord' as what the Ordinal calls 'A faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments.'

the word of God, even the mystery. Thus are the sacramental and the teaching sides of the ministry combined. The sacraments must teach, and the teaching must be sacramental.

26. mystery. The word suggests the secret cults which were the most living part of religion in the heathen world of that day. The language of this whole passage seems to be suggested by them, and intended to show how different the Christian faith is from them, and from the exclusive cult which the false teachers at Colossæ were propagating. (But some would see in St. Paul's use of the word 'mystery' an echo of the language of Daniel and Enoch, in which the word simply means 'secret.')

27. Christ in you. Christ is the centre, but it is Christ in relation to man (cf. 2 3). The next verse gives the correlative, 'every man . . . in Christ.' This double relation is fostered and deepened by each act of sacramental union, 'that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us.'

the hope of glory. The glory of the Christian is at present hidden from the world. At the Second Coming, when Christ's glory is manifested, the Christian's will be manifested with it (cf. 3 3, 4).

29. This verse finely expresses St. Paul's view of the relation of freedom to grace.

II. 1-3. The Apostle writes thus of his labours to show them why he should 'agonize' for people like themselves whom he has never seen (1). His struggle means prayer that each heart may have assurance, and that as a body they may grow in Christian love. But his prayer is likewise that their minds may be fully illuminated, so as to grasp that in Christ was revealed all that men could know of God's bounty (2, 3).

1. Laodicea. This was the next town to Colossæ, lower down the valley of the river Lycus (see 4 16). His work round Ephesus had evidently not taken him so far inland.

2. He does not hesitate to connect the essence of the faith with what must be grasped by the enlightened intellect. His teaching only differs from his opponents' in making it a religion of the whole man, and not of his intellect only. His 'gospel' involves far more than the Jesus of history. Doctrinal teaching is of its essence. The message of the epistle up to this point might be summarized as 'This is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ' (Jn 17 3).

4-7. He now reveals why he is so anxious about them. He is afraid of their being turned from such truths. It is not error in itself that he fears, so much as the specious way it is put forward (4). Let them therefore remember first of all

that he is spiritually present with them, and that it adds to his joy to know that Christ's army at Colossæ is in order of battle, and that their faith presents a solid front (5). They have learnt the truth that in the Person of Christ is both the humanity of Jesus and the reality of eternal Godhead. Let them therefore continue to advance in their union with Him, firmly fixed in the faith which they have been taught, and more and more thankful for it (6, 7).

5. Westcott points out that the metaphors are military.

7. Up to this point St. Paul has sought to banish error by proclaiming the truth. Only when it becomes absolutely necessary does he turn to the negative task of exposing the false teaching. And he here appeals to what is soundest in them, by first dwelling thankfully and affectionately on all that is best and most hopeful among them.

in your faith. It is uncertain whether he means the contents of their faith, or whether their faith is to be the means whereby they remain 'stablished' in the truth.

8-15. The time has come to warn them definitely against the false teaching among them. There is a danger of their being captivated by systems which call themselves philosophy, but are wholly of this world (8). They must not forget that Christ *must* take the first place in all. Their first danger is of theological error, which would replace the Divine Head, the centre of all divine fulness, by other mediators (9, 10). Their second danger is of the practical error of building their moral teaching on ritual or ascetic observances (11-15). Those who have the full inward circumcision of the heart do not need the partial and outward circumcision of the body (11). Once for all, in the waters of baptism, they sank to all that was of the old man, and rose regenerate, quickened with a new life in Christ (12). It is the blotting out of sins that brings this about, which applies to Jews and Gentiles alike (13). Their burdensome obligation to external rules (which for the Jew was represented by the Law) is now cancelled, being removed by the death of Christ (14). In His humanity He tore off the robe of evil from around our human nature, and, by means of His cross, led in triumph the powers that opposed Him, like a general leading his enemies behind his triumphal car (15).

8. spoil you. The influences that draw men from Christ are thought of as bandits who 'kidnap,' whereas the Lord's own victories are those of a leader in open war (15).

philosophy. There is no thought of belittling true philosophy. But systems which claim to be philosophic, and to expand the Christian faith by a wider theosophy, are a real menace, both then and now. The usage of the term 'philosophy' had already come to be wide and loose.

rudiments (cf. Gal 4 3, 9). The words may suggest mere abc, in contrast with the fuller truths of the faith; but the reference may be to those 'elemental spirits' which St. Paul later identifies with angelic powers (15 and 18).

9. fulness: see note on 1 19.

bodily. Either 'assuming a bodily form' (Lightfoot), a reference to the Incarnation, or in the colloquial sense in which we use the word 'bodily,' i.e. 'utterly' (Westcott).

11. The spiritual circumcision, like the fleshly, is to deprive the 'body of the flesh' of its power.

12. buried with him in baptism. St. Paul's references to the Sacraments are the more valuable because incidental. The same aspect of baptism is given in Rom 6 4. The primitive form of immersion suggested a burial under the water, and the baptized then rose above it in a rebirth to life in Christ. The one means of union with Christ crucified and ascended is thus seen to be regarded in the first age as sacramental.

through faith. If the Sacrament is to be effectual there must be faith in the vivifying power of God. Cf. Rom 4 19 ff. for acts of faith as made towards God who gives life to the dead.

14. the bond. The bond is the debt which was cancelled on Calvary. It is described either as 'consisting in' ordinances, i.e. contained in the Jewish Law, or at least as illustrated by it. The debt was unpaid, because of the impossibility of keeping the whole Law. The 'bond' was therefore hostile to those against whom it was valid.

15. The subject of 13 was 'God'; it is difficult in 15 to think of it as anything else than 'Christ,' though Peake declares 'the subject of the verbs throughout the passage is God.' Lightfoot thinks the change comes at 'took it out of the way.' Perhaps the very ambiguity teaches us not to dissociate the work of the Father and of the Son.

put off from himself. The Latin Fathers supplied the word 'body' after 'put off,' His death being the means of exposing the hostile powers. But to the

Greek Fathers it was the powers themselves that He stripped off and thrust away, and Lightfoot is led to say that 'in His cross we too are divested of the poisonous clinging garments of temptation and sin and death.' But the context does not suggest that the powers are evil (see [10]). The angelic powers had played a part in the giving of the Law (cf. Gal 3 [19] and Ac 7 [53]). Christ endured the curse of the Law upon the Cross, and so brought the Law to an end. With its ending there ceased to be any need of angelic mediators. As a further point in favour of this last view (for which see Abbott, 260), it must be remembered that the false teachers at Colossæ had connected the use of Jewish ordinances with the worship of angels ([16-18]). So St. Paul argues that, whatever share the angelic powers may have had once, it ended on Calvary.

16-19. The doctrinal error is significantly followed by a practical one. The answer has been found in baptism as the means of becoming united to Christ, such baptism involving a belief in the reality both of sin, and of forgiveness through the triumph of the Cross. Material questions of outward Jewish observance are now shown to be a mere shadow; the substance lies with Christ ([16, 17]). He warns them thus: Do not let anyone rob you of your prize, however much he may wish to do so, by setting the example of a seemingly humble subservience to angels. Such a man lays the stress upon his visions, and is made conceited by thoughts which God has not inspired ([18]). His error is manifest; he has not kept Christ as the Head of all, and does not realize that it is through Him alone that the Body—the Church of the baptized—grows with God's own increase, through the medium of its joints and ligatures ([19]).

16. judge you. Such outward things are not the standard by which reality is to be tested.

17. The Law was but a shadow. The 'substance' is Christ's. ('The substance lies with Christ,' Westcott.) It is only here that St. Paul anticipates the teaching of Hebrews (cf. Heb 10 [1]).

18. by a voluntary humility: lit. 'willing in humility.' This may either mean 'taking delight in humility' (Lightfoot) or 'willing' may stand alone, as meaning 'wilfully.'

angels. These are the intermediaries between God and man which appear in the system of Gnosticism. The Colossians, who had received Jewish teaching, would naturally call them 'angels.'

dwelling in . . . seen. Probably the true text has not been preserved. Of many meanings suggested, the three most probable are (1) that he is obsessed with the visions which he claims to have seen through the secret cult to which he belongs; (2) that a 'not' has dropped out before 'seen.' His speculations have no real basis; (3) that the Greek words must be emended (perhaps to *aera kenembateuon*), giving the meaning 'idly treading upon air.' In any case, the point is that his faith, like that of theosophy and other modern cults, has no substantial basis in fact and history. Cf. Ramsay, *The Teaching of St. Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, xlvii.

19. the Head (cf. 1 [18]). Here again it is plain that Christ is not the Head regarded as one member of the body, but the Head in its relation to the whole body of Christians. It is the Church that binds all together, for though there is a brotherhood of man, the Church is *the* brotherhood.

joints and ligatures. These seem to be the human means of union, perhaps the 'ministers and stewards'; but *growth* (which is the secret of the life of the body) comes from the Divine Source.

20-23. If union with Christ's death means that the elemental things of the world no longer touch the believer, why should he be ruled by the kind of material prohibitions that regulate the life of the Jew ([20-22])? Such self-imposed austerities and self-chosen humiliations may seem to be a wise course, but really they are not a remedy against sensual indulgence ([23]).

20. rudiments . . . ordinances. The elementals had been concerned with the promulgation of the Law. Note the double reference to our Lord's teaching (Mt 15 [9, 17]).

23. will-worship. This is an unsuccessful attempt to express in English the strange word *ethelothreskeia*, which St. Paul seems to have coined for the occasion. Lightfoot comes nearer to it with '*volunteered service.*' It looks like a further condensation of the phrase in 2 [18], 'voluntary humility and worshipping of the angels.' But probably there has been primitive corruption in the text of both passages. Hort speaks of this chapter as 'ill preserved in ancient times.'

not of any value against the indulgence. Another difficult phrase. The preposition rendered 'against' may also mean '*towards*,' i.e. they are not of any value, but, on the contrary, tend to gratify the carnal mind. The Law, as St. Paul

always contends, is powerless to prevent the flesh from having its way with us (cf. Rom 7 [9] ff.).

III. **1-4.** St. Paul proceeds to give an antidote to the error by a return to his positive teaching, resuming the thought of 2 [6, 7]. Those who become Christians enter on a share in the risen life of Christ, and their own life must now take a different direction, and be ruled by their relation to their ascended Lord ([1, 2]). For baptism involves death to the lower things, and a new life, hidden indeed from the world, but centred, like Christ's own life, in God above ([3]). When Christ is manifested hereafter, then it will be seen that His followers share in the life that is life indeed ([4]).

2. Set your mind, etc. This advice is fully in accord with what modern psychology would suggest (cf. Phil 4 [8]). 'It is not ascetic rigour that will master fleshly temptation. It is the expulsive power of a new and grand idea which will best achieve it' (Westcott). But more than this: for the power that sets free is the Spirit (cf. Rom 8 [1] ff.), bestowing the risen 'life' of Christ.

3. hid with Christ in God. This thought is expressed more plainly in Eph 2 [4] ff. Our union with the risen and ascended Christ is a present possibility, for which we pray in the Ascension Day collect, 'that we may in heart and mind thither ascend, and with Him continually dwell.'

4. then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory. At the Second Coming Christians will be revealed to the world as sharing His glory, the very bodies of the living being transformed (1 Cor 15 [51] ff.).

5-11. This change of attitude involves a change of living to match it. They must treat the sins of the flesh as now dead within them, by virtue of the death which every Christian has died ([5]). Once they were alive to such things, and thus were among those disobedient children who incur their Father's displeasure ([6, 7]). But now all base conduct must be set aside ([8]), just because they have exchanged their old nature for a new ([9]). This new man is growing more and more into Christ's likeness ([10]), into a state where there can be no invidious distinctions of nationality or class, for Christ is supreme throughout them all ([11]).

5. Mortify therefore. This translation comes through the Latin *mortificate*. But it properly means (as the Greek) '*make dead*' (as RVm). It is not a course of self-mortification that he recommends; that was the unsuccessful remedy suggested by his rivals at Colossæ (2 [23]). If they had died to the world when buried in the waters of baptism, they must go on 'reckoning as already dead' within them all that is base (cf. Rom 6 [11]). If the lower self was nailed to the Cross, it must be kept there, and each vice regarded as a thing renounced and crucified.

9, 10. the old man . . . the new man. Some have suggested that the old man is Adam, whose image men bear (1 Cor 15 [49]), while the new man is Christ. But it is better taken as the regenerate man formed after Christ, in contrast with his unregenerate state.

9. ye have put off the old man. The tense is perfect, implying that Christians are not doing it now, for it has already been done. The baptized have already died to what is base. So far from vices being natural, they are to them an unnatural perversion.

10. have put on the new man. Negative teaching is not enough. 'Thou shalt not' is Jewish rather than Christian. It is psychologically true that the secret of advance consists not only in weeding out vices, but in planting in virtues.

the image of him that created him. The Son seems to be the image; but the Father He 'that created.' Man was first created in God's image, and the new birth recreates him thus; 'the subsequent life must be a deepening of this image thus stamped upon the man' (Lightfoot).

11. barbarian, Scythian. These two are not in contrast like the other pairs; 'barbarian' is a contemptuous word opposed to the idea of a brotherhood of man, and 'Scythians' were regarded as the lowest of barbarians.

all, and in all. Cf. 1 Cor 15 [28].

12-17. The 'new man' includes the gentler virtues, and specially the forgiveness which they learn from Christ's example ([12, 13]). But the closest link between them is love, and that spirit of unity which must reign supreme in a society which is Christ's own body ([14, 15]). Christ's message must abide with them, and they must stir up within each other melodies of heart as well as voice ([16]). All they say and do must be consciously in the Master's name, who will inspire them to continual thankfulness to the Father ([17]).

16. the word of Christ. Perhaps the word that Christ speaks, either through the Gospel, or through the voice within. But the word is generally spoken of as coming from God (cf. 1 Th 2 [13]), so that it may be the message from God of which

Christ is the subject, the phrase being like 'the word of the cross' in 1 Cor 1 [18].

psalms and hymns: already dear to the Jews and a feature of their worship, and now taken over by the apostolic Church. For the use of psalms, see Ac 4 [24], and for fragments of Christian hymns quoted by St. Paul himself, see Eph 5 [14], and 1 Tim 3 [16].

18-IV. 1. Advice is given for each relationship in life: to wives, submission; to husbands, tender love ([18, 19]); to children, obedience; to fathers, tactfulness ([20, 21]); to slaves, honest service and hard work, as in the one Master's sight, and for the recompense which will be given by the impartial Judge of all human action ([22-25]). Masters must act in the thought of their Master above (4 [1]).

22. **Servants.** The case of Onesimus may be the cause of the fuller reference made to this relationship (cf. 3 [11]).

IV. 2-6. General precepts follow addressed to all the faithful, concerning prayer and thanksgiving, including intercession that the writer may make bold use of his present opportunities ([2-4]). They must show tactfulness towards outsiders, and a readiness to seize every opportunity ([5]). Their words must be gracious and winning, as each occasion demands ([6]).

3. **a door** (cf. 1 Cor 16 [9]).

the mystery of Christ. In Eph 6 [19] it is the whole Gospel; here it seems to be the admission of the Gentiles, which had been the cause of his imprisonment.

5. **redeeming the time.** More fully expressed in Eph 5 [16]. Prefer, as RVm, '*buying up the opportunity*.'

7-9. He passes to personal matters. Tychicus may be trusted to do more than deliver the epistle; he, and their fellow-townsman Onesimus, who is now a Christian, will give them all the news from Rome.

7. **Tychicus** appears chiefly as the Apostle's messenger (Tit 3 [12]; 2 Tim 4 [12]).

9. **Onesimus.** It would be impossible to guess from these kindly words that this was the runaway slave who was returning as Tychicus's companion to give himself up to his master Philemon (see Introduction).

10-14. Salutations from brethren at Rome; first from the three companions who were of his own race, Aristarchus, Mark, and Justus ([10, 11]). Next, from three Gentile helpers, Epaphras (who was still full of zeal for his native Colossæ and the neighbouring churches), Luke, and Demas ([12-14]).

10. **Aristarchus.** He had accompanied St. Paul to Rome (Ac 27 [2]). **Mark.** St. Paul has plainly forgiven him for his conduct in Ac 15 [38] (cf. 2 Tim 4 [11]).

11. **Jesus.** The reason for giving him another name is obvious. **these only**: i.e. they were his only fellow-workers who were Jews.

12. **Epaphras** (cf. 1 [7]). He may have been the founder not only of the Colossian Church, but also of the other two churches in the Lycus valley.

14. **Luke.** It is from this passage that we know that the evangelist was a doctor. His narrative in Acts shows that he had travelled to Rome with St. Paul. **Demas** is stated in 2 Tim 4 [10] to have deserted later on.

15. **Nymphas**: or perhaps 'Nympha,' in whose house at Laodicea the Christians met.

16. **the epistle from Laodicea.** This certainly seems to suggest a letter which the Apostle had himself written to the Laodiceans. If Ephesians was a circular letter, taken from one town to another, Laodicea would be the nearest point to Colossæ that it would reach. Hence the ingenious theory that that epistle is here referred to.

17. **Archippus** (cf. Phm [2]). Possibly there is a hint that he needed more zeal.

18. The amanuensis gives the pen to St. Paul himself for his signature and final message.

(For Bibliography see end of Philemon.)

PHILEMON

IN the 4th century this little personal epistle was regarded as unworthy of the great Apostle. But there has been a growing appreciation of it, as 'a pearl of the most exquisite purity in the rich treasure of the New Testament' (Sabatier). It is more than a tender pleading with a friend on behalf of a runaway slave, for it shows some of the great social principles underlying the Christian faith. Slavery is not condemned as wrong, but Christian principles are suggested which, if acted on, must ultimately mean the righting of social abuses. Renan calls it a 'chef d'œuvre of the art of letter-writing,' and it is certain that its gentle tact must have been of avail with Philemon, or he would not have allowed it to be placed in the collection of St. Paul's letters.

1-7. St. Paul addresses the epistle from his Roman prison to Philemon, a Christian of position at Colossæ. The names coupled with his are probably those of his wife and son. The Apostle thanks God for his faith and for his goodness towards other

Christians, and prays that these things may deepen his spiritual insight.

1. **Timothy.** He was with St. Paul during his long stay at Ephesus, and may have become acquainted with Philemon there. **Apphia:** a Phrygian name.

8-21. He then prefers his request on behalf of a slave who had escaped from his master and fled to Rome. There he had come in contact with St. Paul, who made him a Christian, and thus begot him in his bonds. To return to his master meant to invite torture and crucifixion as an example to the other slaves, but he has been persuaded that it is his Christian duty to do so. St. Paul seizes the opportunity of sending him in the company of Tychicus, the bearer of the letter to the Church at Colossæ, and relies on what he writes to the master to preserve the slave from harm. Instead of claiming a right, he asks a favour. This poor slave no longer belies his name of Onesimus (profitable), for he has become very precious to the worn-out prisoner (8-12). He would fain have kept him as his minister, but wants Philemon's permission first (13-14). He returns now in a permanent relationship in Christ, which is far more than that of servant (15-16). Let Philemon receive him as though he were the Apostle himself, who will be responsible for any loss through this thief and runaway, even though the real debt is on the other side, for Philemon owes to him his Christianity (17-19). So he asks in all confidence, and hopes soon to be able to leave his prison and come himself (20-22).*

9. **Paul the aged.** If this be the meaning, he is pleading respect for an old man's request. But it is quite likely that the word 'presbutes' is used as an equivalent for the kindred 'presbeutes' (ambassador). In this case he uses the words as enforcing 'his right to command' (Lightfoot), and they must be translated as *'Paul an ambassador'* (RVm). Cf. Eph 6 20.

10. **Onesimus.** There is a gentle playfulness in suggesting that poor misnamed 'Helpful' has at last become true to his name. There seems a further play of words in 'let me have joy (RVm *help*) of thee in the Lord' (20), where the word is the same. In Col 4 9 he is mentioned as accompanying Tychicus.

16. **both in the flesh and in the Lord.** In the one he had the brother for a slave, in the other he had the slave for a brother (Meyer).

21. **even beyond what I say:** a gentle hint that he should release him from slavery. But it is conscience, and not compulsion, that must rule the Christian's conduct.

22. **prepare me a lodging.** He leaves it to Philemon to suggest his own hospitality (cf. 7). This verse indicates his hopefulness of a speedy and successful result of his appeal to Cæsar. But he might well lay stress on the likelihood of his coming in person, as a final word to make more sure the granting of his request.

23-25. He sends salutations from some of those mentioned in the public letter to Colossæ, naturally putting Epaphras first, who probably founded the Colossian Church (Col 1 7, 4 12). It is only here that he is called 'fellow-prisoner,' doubtless in a voluntary sense.

* St. Paul's claim in 8 is remarkable. 'In Christ'—speaking as His Apostle in His name to a member of His body—St. Paul has the right to command, though he does not wish to use it.—ED.

Bibliography

J. B. Lightfoot (Macmillan), 1890; T. K. Abbott (*I.C.C.*), 1897; F. B. Westcott, *A Letter to Asia* (Macmillan), 1914; J. Rutherford (T. and T. Clark), 1908; A. Lukyn Williams (Cambridge), 1907; H. J. C. Knight (*The Churchman's Bible*), 1907; G. W. Garrod (Macmillan), 1898; M. R. Vincent, *Philippians and Philemon* (*I.C.C.*), 1897.

I. AND II. THESSALONIANS

By MAURICE JONES

Thessalonica and the Founding of its Church.—Thessalonica, the modern Salonica, was the most populous city in Macedonia. Its original name was Thermæ, from the hot springs in the neighbourhood. It owed its new name, given to it in 315 B.C., to Thessalonica, the sister of Alexander the Great. Situated on the Via Egnatia and at the end of the Thermaic Gulf, it was admirably placed for trade purposes. Under the Romans it became the capital of one of the four districts of Macedonia, and ultimately the virtual capital of the province.

As a reward for its loyalty to Octavian, it was made a free city of the Empire; and, in spite of its being the residence of the Provincial Governor, it enjoyed a large measure of internal autonomy, being ruled by its own politarchs (Ac 17 [6]). Jews in large numbers had made their home in the city; and their influence is manifest in Ac 17 [4], where we read of 'devout Greeks, a great multitude,' who were attracted by St. Paul's preaching. The Apostle arrived there during his second missionary journey, towards the end of A.D. 50. The narrative in Ac 17 seems to imply that he only spent three weeks in the city and confined his attention to the synagogues, but our epistles make it clear that his stay was considerably longer than this and that his mission had a much wider scope.

Gentiles in considerable numbers had embraced the faith, and an important Church had been founded; and this would involve a mission covering several months, during which the Philippian Church had sent the Apostle assistance more than once (Phil 4 [16]). He also in 1 Th 2 [11] speaks of his ministry in terms which imply both private and public intercourse with his converts, and this rules out a stay in the city of a few short weeks only. He was finally driven out by the intrigues of the Jews, who stirred up the rabble to charge him and Silas with high treason because they proclaimed a King who was not Cæsar. The Apostle himself not being at hand, certain Christians, with Jason at their head, were haled before the magistrates, who, fearing a riot, bound them to keep the peace. This obviously could only be achieved if the man who was at the root of the disturbance left the city; and this St. Paul did without delay, leaving Thessalonica by night and proceeding to the neighbouring city of Berœa (Ac 17 [1-10]).

The Occasions and Dates of the Epistles—1 *Thessalonians*.—This was written at Corinth, and apparently fairly early during St. Paul's stay in that city on his second missionary journey, and therefore sometime in A.D. 51. It is possibly the earliest of the Pauline epistles (but see *Galatians*). The Apostle, after a brief ministry at Berœa, proceeded to Athens, leaving Silas and Timothy in the former city, but was apparently joined at Athens by Timothy, who was then sent back on a special mission to Thessalonica (1 Th 3 [2]). When St. Paul had arrived at Corinth from Athens, Timothy again joined him, bringing with him a report of the situation in Thessalonica, and perhaps also a letter from the Thessalonian Church.

The report was on the whole favourable. The Thessalonians had proved themselves worthy of their 'election,' and were an 'example' to the brethren in Macedonia and Achaia (1 [4] ff.); but there were certain weaknesses which required immediate attention. Doubts were being cast, probably by Jews, on the Apostles' authority and upon St. Paul's status in particular, and the methods of their ministry were being attacked (2 [1-12]). There had also been some persecution after the Apostles' departure (3 [3] ff.), and a certain amount of moral laxity had manifested itself among the converts, due to the influence of the paganism out of which they had so recently emerged, as well as a good deal of unrest and idleness arising out of the belief that the Parousia of the Lord was close at hand (4 [1-12]). The Church was also troubled concerning those of its members who had already died, and their fate when the Parousia duly arrived; and to some the event itself seemed to be unaccountably delayed (4 [13]-5 [11]). The discipline of the Church was not quite satisfactory, and the authority of those placed in charge of it needed strengthening (5 [12, 13]). This was, briefly, the situation with which St. Paul had to deal, according to Timothy's report, and 1 Thessalonians was written to comfort, strengthen, warn, and quiet the young Church in its many difficulties and dangers.

2 *Thessalonians*.—Soon after the dispatch of 1 Thessalonians further news, brought back perhaps by the bearer of that epistle, arrived at Corinth from Thessalonica. The faith of the Church was growing and love was abounding, and the community remained steadfast in the face of persecution (1 [3-5]); but the thought of the imminence of the Parousia was still a disturbing influence, and the excitement had been increased rather than diminished by the receipt of 1 Thessalonians. Certain statements, purporting to be based on utterances or a letter of St. Paul, that the Day of the Lord had already arrived, were being circulated (2 [1-2]). 2 Thessalonians was therefore written to correct the impression left on the Church by this perversion, and to define more carefully the conditions which must precede the Parousia (2 [2-12]). The opportunity was also utilized to encourage the Church to continue in steadfastness (2 [13-15]), and to lead a quiet and orderly life, abandoning the unruly and idle behaviour which was now so rife

in the community. That no great interval of time separated the two epistles seems clear from the slight change in the situation of the Church which the letters presuppose, and we may safely place the writing of 2 Thessalonians a little later than that of 1 Thessalonians in the year A.D. 51.

The Authenticity of the Epistles—1 *Thessalonians*.—There is very little ground for questioning its authenticity. The internal evidence is not quite as strong perhaps as in the case of some other Pauline epistles, but it is good enough for the purpose. It cannot be proved that Ignatius and Hermas were acquainted with it, although there are passages in both writers which remind us strongly of it. On the other hand, it is included both in the Canon of Muratori and in that of Marcion, and is contained in the Syriac Vulgate and the Old Latin version, and is quoted by name by Irenæus. Two objections to the Pauline authorship have been put forward, both of them based on internal evidence. (1) It is maintained that 2 [16] contains a clear reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. But it is much more probable that what is in view here is the certainty of God's vengeance upon the Jews for their blindness and unbelief, and that the statement is prophetic and not historical. (2) Some scholars hold that 2 Th 2 [2] refers to a forged letter which must be 1 Thessalonians. But this is a forced interpretation of the expression 'as from us,' which seems to belong not to 'epistle,' but to 'greatly disturbed' in the same verse. Little weight need be attached to either objection, and certainly not sufficient to justify any doubt concerning the authenticity of a letter which is thoroughly Pauline in tone and character.

2 *Thessalonians*.—The objections are much more serious here, and have reference mainly to the difficulty which arises from the marked similarity that exists in general between the two epistles, combined with a striking difference between the eschatological teaching which they respectively contain. It has been suggested that 2 Thessalonians is the work of an author who, desiring to gain authority for certain ideas that he held concerning the Man of Sin, circulated these in a letter composed after the Pauline model. But there is no real inconsistency between the eschatological teaching of 1 Thessalonians and that of 2 Thessalonians. The expectation of the Parousia contained in the one is not abandoned in the other, but is only more clearly defined in 2 Thessalonians by the statement that certain events must precede the coming of the Day of the Lord. There is doubtless an advance in the teaching, but no real inconsistency can be found.

Some scholars also maintain that 2 Thessalonians is the earlier of the two epistles. (1) It contains the emphasis on the Apostle's autograph (2 Th 3 [17]), which one hardly expects to find in a second letter to the same Church. But the same emphasis is found in 1 Cor 16 [21], which was not St. Paul's first letter to Corinth, a point which substantially discounts this contention. (2) The phrase 'as we charged you' in 1 Th 4 [11] seems to refer to a command in a letter, and this command is actually found in 2 Th 3 [10]. But there seems to be no reason why the reference should not be to a charge delivered by word of mouth. (3) The tone of 2 Thessalonians is much more Jewish than that of 1 Thessalonians, and this is more easily explained if 2 Thessalonians was written first, when the Thessalonian Church was more predominantly Jewish than it became later. Harnack explains this difference between the epistles by suggesting that 1 Thessalonians was written more expressly for the Gentile section and 2 Thessalonians for the Jewish section of the Church. All the evidence that we have seems however to point to the conclusion that the Thessalonian Church was from the beginning a predominantly Gentile community. While allowing some weight to these objections, it is probable that the true relationship between the epistles is best explained by the supposition that both were written by St. Paul, and both addressed to the same Christian community.

The Eschatological Teaching in the Epistles.—Two main points in this connexion are discussed in the epistles. (1) What share in the Parousia will they have who are already at rest in Christ? and (2) What will be the signs of the end?

(1) is discussed in 1 Th 4 [13]-5 [10], where it is stated that those who are at rest will suffer no disadvantage, but will rise first, and, accompanied by those who are still alive, will meet their Lord in the air and be united with Him for ever. The picture of the Parousia given in this passage is coloured by the imagery of Jewish apocalyptic literature, but it is permeated through and through with the strong conviction that Christ is risen from the dead, and that His resurrection is the sure pledge of the resurrection of the saints.

(2) The signs of the end (2 Th 2 [1-12]),

The Parousia is certain but not yet at the very door, and certain events must first precede it. These are a great apostasy and the revelation of the 'Man of Sin,' who will make war on all that is sacred and holy, and will sit in the Temple claiming to be divine. Deceived by his powers and lying wonders many will follow him, bringing upon themselves ruin and destruction. This 'mystery of lawlessness' is already at work, but some influence or power is at present restraining its full development, and when this is removed the 'lawless one' will be revealed and for a time accomplish his dread purpose, but only finally to be destroyed by the Lord Jesus at His glorious coming.

The chief elements in this descriptive passage are taken from Jewish sources. In the earlier Jewish eschatological writings the idea of a great conflict between good and evil is generally present, and the period immediately preceding the Messianic coming is invariably described as a time of upheaval among the nations and of a wide outbreak of evil leading to the Golden Age, when the oppressors of God's people shall be finally destroyed. In later apocalyptic documents such as Daniel, 4 Ezra, and the Sibylline Oracles, etc., the issue is widened; and the conflict is now between the powers of the world and the Kingdom of the saints, when the world-powers are led by a shadowy figure, half-human, half-demonic, the forerunner of the anti-Christ, who is undoubtedly what St. Paul has in mind when he speaks of the 'Man of Sin.' The only new feature in the prophecy in our epistle is the introduction of the restraining power. It has been suggested, with much plausibility, that what the Apostle is thinking of throughout the passage is the Roman Emperor in a twofold capacity, now as the servant of the Church restraining the existing powers of disorder and persecution, but soon to be revealed as its implacable foe, when the worship of the Emperor—now sitting in the Temple of God and claiming divine honours—shall have reached its full development. But the reference is probably of a more general character, and is primarily to be traced to the uncompromising hostility of his own countrymen, restrained for the present by Roman rule and justice. Ultimately the 'Man of Sin' is any power which actively and of set purpose opposes the spread of Christ's Kingdom.*

* On antichrist cf. notes on Mt 24^{15}, Rev 11^{1-13}, and *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 439*b*. A wider conception of antichrist is found in 1 Jn 2^{18}.—Ed.

The Church in the Epistles.—Both epistles are addressed to 'The Church of the Thessalonians,' a form which is peculiar to these letters: but St. Paul's teaching elsewhere shows that he had in mind more than the local community of saints in Thessalonica, and that he saw in that assembly of Christians the representative of the whole Church, of the people of God, of the universal Society. The addition of the words 'in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' (1 Th 1^{1}; 2 Th 1^{1}) brings out the truly divine origin and character of the Church. There is no explicit reference to the Sacraments in the epistles, but the emphasis on 'sanctification' in 1 Th 4^{7} and 2 Th 2^{13}, when compared with 1 Cor 6^{11}, seems to indicate that the references in these two passages is to Holy Baptism completed by the laying on of hands.

There are traces in 1 Th $5^{12,13}$ of the existence of a definite Ministry, which exercises government and discipline, although no particular office is designated, and behind this Ministry there stands the final authority of the Apostles (1 Th 5^{27}; 2 Th 3^{14}). The note of catholicity is sounded in 1 Th 1^{8}, 2^{14}.

I. THESSALONIANS

I. 1. Address and Greeting; Paul and Silvanus and Timothy. The use of 'we' throughout the epistles, a use peculiar to them, shows that St. Paul associates his brother Apostles with him in all that he says here. **In God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.** Note the emphasis on the essential equality between Father and Son, as the source of salvation, so characteristic of these epistles.

I. 2-III. 13. Historical and Personal.

I. 2-10. Thanksgiving for the good estate of the Thessalonian Church.

3. faith, love, hope. The earliest occurrence of this triplet. This order is also found in 5^{8} and Col 1^{4}. They are thought of here in their practical manifestation—in work, labour, and patience.

4. election, as proved by their historical call into the Church and by the eagerness with which they had received the Gospel, although this involved persecution.

8. in Macedonia and in Achaia. The Churches of Philippi and Corinth in particular, although the additional phrase 'in every place' may point to a wider dissemination of the Gospel from Thessalonica owing to its position as a centre of sea and land traffic.

9. ye turned unto God from idols to

serve a living and true God. A brief résumé of the Apostle's missionary preaching (cf. Ac 14 [14-15]).

10. his Son. Only found here in these epistles. Note the equation of the Son with the historical Jesus. **raised from the dead.** The necessary prelude to the Second Coming. **the wrath to come.** The Divine Judgement from which the Son alone can save. With [9, 10] cf. Ac 17 [31]. It is important to note how every chapter in the epistle, except the last, closes with the advent hope.

II. 1-12. The general character of the Apostles' ministry in Thessalonica is a defence against certain charges brought against them. St. Paul recalls (1) their courage in the face of persecution ([1-2]); (2) their freedom from self-interest ([3-6]); and (3) their personal tenderness in instructing their converts ([7-12]).

3. error, uncleanness, guile. A contrast to heathen worship, so often associated with wild emotionalism and impurity.

4. approved. A reference to Athenian practice, in which candidates for office were tested as to antecedents and character.

5. flattery. Only found here in the New Testament. The word involves the idea of flattery used from selfish motives and to aid self-interest.

7. gentle. A better attested reading is 'babes'; and the inversion of the metaphor by the use of 'nursing mother' later in the verse presents no real difficulty in view of St. Paul's frequent recourse to such inversions (cf. 5 [2, 4]; 2 Cor 3 [13-16]).

8. to impart our own souls, explained in [9] as the self-sacrificing labour which consisted in their working night and day to maintain themselves.

10. holily and righteously. *holily* the positive side, *unblamably* the negative.

11. each one of you. The individual and personal aspect of the ministry.

12. his own kingdom and glory. The future and not the present Kingdom. There are two stages in the final consummation, Christ's rule and Christ's glory.

13-16. Renewed thanksgiving for the success attending the mission to Thessalonica.

13. word of God, perhaps correcting an insinuation that the Gospel was a mere human invention.

14. which are in Judæa. Mentioned because they were the earliest founded and had been subject to persecution all through their history. **own countrymen:** their fellow-tribesmen and, therefore, the pagan population of the city.

15. killed the Lord Jesus, better *killed the Lord in slaying Jesus.*

16. the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost. See authenticity of 1 Thessalonians in Introduction.

II. 17-III. 10. The Apostles' anxiety about the Thessalonians until reassured by Timothy.

17-20. St. Paul's desire to revisit Thessalonica, its cause, and why he was prevented.

18. hindered. The Greek word suggests the cutting up of a road to render it impassable.

Satan, representing the personal force, 'the adversary,' in whom all evil centres. Possibly 'the messenger of Satan' of 2 Cor 12 [7].

19. coming. The first use of Parousia in the New Testament. The Greek word is used of the coming visit of a King.

III. 1. This verse indicates that Timothy had joined St. Paul at Athens, a fact not mentioned in Acts.

2. comfort, preferably *inspire with confidence.*

3. be moved = be allured by flattery as by a dog wagging his tail.

4. Cf. Ac 14 [22].

5. tempter. Satan (cf. 1 Cor 7 [5]).

6. brought the glad tidings. The same word as is used for preaching the Gospel.

11-13. A prayer that the Apostle may be able to return to Thessalonica, and that the Church there may develop in spiritual capacity.

11. Note the association of the Lord with the Father in *providence*—a thought not very common.

12. The Lord. Christ.

13. saints may mean 'just men made perfect,' or 'angels,' or both. The first is the Pauline usage, but the reference here may be to both as in the Old Testament and Jewish apocalyptic literature.

IV. 1-V. 24. Hortatory and Doctrinal.

IV. 1-12. Shortcomings among the Thessalonian Christians corrected, with exhortations to purity, love of the brethren, and honest work.

3-8. Warning against impurity, needed in view of their pagan environment.

4. his own vessel. This may mean (1) 'body,' or (2) 'wife.' Most modern commentators are in favour of (2), but (1) is the more natural meaning, and the word is used in this sense in 2 Cor 4 [7].

5. know not God. A quotation from Jer 10 [25].

6. transgress and wrong. 'Transgress' is absolute, 'wrong' is sin against society.

the Lord is an avenger. Cf. Dt 32 [35].

9-10*a*. Encouragement to progress in brotherly love.

10. in all Macedonia. The position of

Thessalonica on the Via Egnatia would provide the opportunity.

10*a*-12. A call to quiet work.

12. An exhortation to preserve their reputation as Christians among heathen and to maintain an honourable independence.

13-18. Concerning them that fall asleep before the coming of the Lord. Would those who had died either from persecution or natural causes lose all hope of sharing in the Parousia?

14. The death and resurrection of Christ guarantee the resurrection of Christians.

15. **the word of the Lord.** Not necessarily a direct revelation; probably a reference to the saying recorded in Mt 24[31]. **precede:** will have no advantage in point of time.

16. **the dead in Christ:** the antithesis to 'we that are alive, that are left.'

17. **the air,** the space between heaven and earth. There is no interval between [16] and [17], and no room here for a Millennium. **ever be with the Lord.** The final consummation, uninterrupted communion with the risen and glorified Lord.

V. 1-11. **The uncertainty of the time of the Advent and the need of watchfulness.**

2. **know perfectly,** from the Apostle's own teaching, based on Christ's authority.

3. There are possible references to Ezek 13[10] and the Lord's words in Mt 24[8].

4. **thief**—caught by the approach of daylight. The metaphor of [2] is here reversed.

6. **watch and be sober.** The mental and moral attitudes.

8. **breastplate, helmet.** Terms derived from Is 59[17]; Wisd 5[17] ff., and from the Jewish conception of the struggle against anti-Christ found in the apocalypses.

10. **wake or sleep.** The reference is literal and not ethical, and sleep means death. See J. A. Robinson, *Ephesians*, 133 ff.

12-15. Exhortations to orderly living and the due performance of social duties.

12, 13. See on 'The Church in the Epistles' in the Introduction.

13. Respect for those in authority leads to peace in the Church.

14. Probably addressed to the leaders.

16-22. Injunctions relating to prayer and spiritual matters generally.

19, 20. Protest against a tendency to despise special spiritual gifts, and prophecy in particular. At Corinth the opposite tendency was at work (1 Cor 14).

22. **every form of evil.** (1) Every kind of evil; (2) any visible form of evil.

23-24. Prayer for the Thessalonians.

23. **spirit, soul, and body.** Placed here in the order of their importance: 'spirit' and 'soul' are often synonymous in the New Testament, but here St. Paul distinguishes between them.

25-28. **Personal injunctions and benediction.**

26. **a holy kiss.** Cf. Rom 16[16]; 1 Cor 16[20]. A century later this custom had become liturgical. Cf. Just. Mart., *Ap.*, i, 65. It is possible, however, that the kiss was liturgical in Judaism before St. Paul's time.

27. The letter was probably addressed to the leaders, but was to be read to all the brethren assembled together. This injunction may be the origin of the later practice of regarding St. Paul's epistles as Scripture.

II. THESSALONIANS

I. 1-2. **Address and Greeting.**—The only difference between this and the corresponding passage in 1 Thessalonians is the addition of 'from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ' in [2], where the gifts of 'grace and peace' are traced back to their Divine source.

I. 3-II. 17. **Historical and Doctrinal.**

I. 3-4. Thanksgiving and prayer, in which special stress is laid on the progress of the Thessalonians in faith and love, and on their patient endurance of persecutions, which lead the Apostles to boast of them in the Churches of Corinth and neighbourhood.

3. **bound,** conveying the sense of personal obligation.

5-10. The remembrance of their patience and constancy leads to the thought of what awaits them at the Final Judgement, when they, the persecuted, shall be recompensed, while their persecutors shall receive eternal destruction. The Judgement is described in a rhythmical passage based on the language and imagery of the Old Testament, the style of which suggests that it may be an adaptation of a primitive Christian hymn.

5. **the righteous judgement of God:** 'righteous' because of the character of the Judge. **the Kingdom of God:** the new order established by Christ, but with a special reference to its final development in His future Kingdom.

7. **rest,** always the opposite of 'affliction' in St. Paul.

8. **in flaming fire.** In the apocalyptic literature the 'fire' is always material, but here it is spiritualized. **know not God and obey not the gospel.** Not two separate classes, Gentiles and Jews, but unbelievers generally.

9. **suffer punishment.** Preferably *pay the penalty.* **from the face of the Lord.** Cf. Is 2 [10, 19, 21] (in the LXX) = exclusion from the presence of the Lord.

10. **to be glorified in his saints.** The saints are the mirror in which His glory shines.

11-12. The prayer is continued, and the Apostle prays that his converts may be deemed worthy to be called to the Kingdom of Christ's glory, and that they may be perfected morally and spiritually, so that the full glory of the Lord may be displayed in them and that they may derive their glory from Him.

11. **our God,** the God of us all. **worthy of your calling.** The combination of the Greek words for 'worthy' and 'calling' shows that it is their final acceptance that is in view here. **desire of goodness:** delight in well-doing.

12. **the name of the Lord:** a periphrasis for 'the Lord,' following the usage frequently found in the Old Testament. **our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.** Note again the equality of Father and Son as the source of grace.

II. 1-12. **Teaching concerning the events preceding the Parousia** (see Introduction).

2. **shaken from your mind:** drift away like a ship from its moorings. **spirit:** spiritual revelation. **word:** oral communication. **as from us.** This may refer (1) to 'spirit, word, and epistle,' in which case the Thessalonians are exhorted not to be disturbed as if the Apostles were in reality in any way responsible; or (2) to 'epistle' only, and in that case the allusion is either to 1 Thessalonians or possibly to some forged letter; or (3) the phrase should read 'as by us,' and is to be connected with 'shaken' and 'troubled.'

3. **the falling away.** Cf. 1 Mac 2 [15]. A religious apostasy on the part of either Jews or Christians, or of both, and not a political revolt. **the man of sin, the son of perdition.** The one term expresses the intrinsic character, the other the ultimate destination of the person or thing described (cf. Belial, 2 Cor 6 [15]).

4. **opposeth and exalteth himself.** This is not Satan himself (see [9]), but some tool or emissary of Satan. **all that is called God or that is worshipped.** A comprehensive phrase covering everything that is held in religious reverence (cf. Ac 17 [23]). **temple.** This passage is reminiscent of Dan 11 [36] ff., where the reference is to Antiochus Epiphanes, and 'temple' here must, therefore, refer to the Temple at Jerusalem and not to the Church of Christ.

6. **that which restraineth:** the restraining power of law and order, especially as these were embodied in the Roman Emperor or Empire. **may be revealed in his own season.** The Man of Sin, like Christ Himself, will be revealed at the time appointed by God.

7. **the mystery of lawlessness.** The principle of lawlessness is already at work, but in secret, hence 'the mystery' (cf. 1 Tim 3 [9]).

8, 9. These verses describe in inverse order the lawless one's method of working, by false miracles, signs, and wonders, and by every unrighteous device, and the means by which he will be swept away (cf. Is 11 [4]).

10. **because they received not the love of the truth.** They not only reject the truth, but they have no desire to possess it (cf. Rom 1 [32]).

11. With the three stages in the downward career of the wicked described in [10, 11, 12], cf. Rom 1 [18-32].

13-15. The thanksgiving and exhortation are repeated.

13. **from the beginning.** Another reading 'as first-fruits' has very considerable support, and suits the context well, because the Thessalonians might well be described as 'the first-fruits of Macedonia' (cf. Rom 16 [5]; 1 Cor 16 [15]). **sanctification of the Spirit.** Sanctification by the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 P 1 [2]).

14. **to the obtaining of the glory** (1) 'In order that we might obtain the glory,' or (2) 'in order that He might invest us with the glory.'

15. **the traditions:** both oral and written teaching on the part of the Apostles. They would be doctrinal, moral, and liturgical, as 1 Corinthians shows.

16-17. A prayer for their strengthening in the faith. The invocation here is closely parallel to that in 1 Th 3 [11], except that 'the Lord Jesus Christ' precedes 'God our Father' here, illustrating once again the equal honour ascribed to the Son with the Father throughout these epistles.

III. 1-16. **Consolatory and Hortatory.**

1-2. A request for their prayers.

1. **the Lord,** the Lord Jesus as generally in these epistles. **may run and be glorified:** may have a triumphant career.

2. **unreasonable**—perverse, outrageous, the Greek noun being often used to express 'an outrage.' The reference is to hostile Jews. **faith,** probably the Gospel because of the presence of the Greek article.

3-5. **Confidence in their spiritual progress.**

3. guard you from the evil one. A reminiscence of the Lord's Prayer.

5. patience of Christ—the constant endurance of Christ as the suffering servant of Jehovah. It is to be noted that **the love of God** and **the patience of Christ** are here not only attributes of the Deity, but are also ruling principles in the hearts of the saints.

6-12. Charges concerning the disorderly, especially those who were idle, supported by an appeal to the example of the Apostles themselves, who laboured for their daily bread although they had the right to be maintained by the Church. The situation in this respect had become worse since the dispatch of 1 Thessalonians, and what was then only a vague suspicion had now become an ascertained fact, and the disorderly conduct of certain members is openly rebuked.

6. disorderly: a metaphor borrowed from military discipline, implying insubordination.

8. With this verse cf. 1 Th 2 [9]. There, however, St. Paul dwells on his labour as a sign of disinterestedness, here as an example to be followed.

9. the right. This word originally meant 'liberty to act,' but in the New Testament it implies a positive and acknowledged right (cf. Lk 23 [7]).

10. In the last part of the verse a popular Rabbinic maxim is utilized.

13-15. Exhortation to the loyal members of the Church to persevere in an honourable course, to mark the man who disregards the injunction, and to avoid intercourse with such, so that he may be brought to shame. Yet the treatment must be gentle, because administered to a brother.

14. by this epistle. His written commands have equal authority with those delivered by him when actually present among them.

16. the Lord of peace, probably God the Father, on the analogy of 1 Th 5 [23].

17-18. Salutation and Benediction.

17. The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand. A better translation is *The salutation by the hand of me, Paul.* He appeals to the fact of the salutation being written by himself as the token by which his own genuine letters may be recognized (cf. 1 Cor 16 [21]; Col 4 [18]). **so I write:** this is my handwriting.

18. The grace is as in 1 Th 5 [28], with the addition of the word 'all,' inserted here lest he should seem to exclude those members of the Church whose conduct he had impugned.

Literature

Commentaries: (*a*) Denney (*E.B.*), Findlay (*C.G.T.*), Plummer (*1 Thessalonians*), Adeney (*Cent. B.*); (*b*) Lightfoot (*Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*), Milligan, Moffatt (*E.G.T.*), Frame (*I.C.C.*).

Other Literature: Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul;* Askwith, *Introduction;* Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things;* Bousset and Keane, *The Antichrist Legend;* Harnack, *Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs.*

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

By A. E. Burn and H. L. Goudge *

The Pastoral Epistles received their distinctive name from P. Anton in 1726, but the word 'Pastoral' had been used earlier by St. Thomas Aquinas of the letters to Timothy. Before 1726 the title 'Pontifical' had been suggested (Cosmas Magalianus, Lugduni, 1609). In early days, e.g. in the Muratorian Canon and in all MSS., they were classed as a group of private letters with the Epistle to Philemon. Their main purpose is to set up a high standard of Christian character, and to inculcate loyalty to apostolic teaching. But a great part of their value lies in the light which they throw upon the position and duties of the Christian ministry, as they were understood in the last forty years of the 1st century, and upon the organization and discipline of the Christian Church. To the clergy these books are some of the most valuable which the NT contains; they form part of that Bible within the Bible which belongs especially to them. In carrying out the Lord's commission the preaching of the Gospel necessarily comes first. But when the Gospel has been accepted, and a great body of converts gathered in, insistence on standards of faith

* The deeply lamented death of the late Dean of Salisbury took place before the Commentary reached its present form. The Introduction is for the most part not his, though I have made use of some of the material which he collected. The notes in the main are his, though I have made additions to them. Where my own view differed from his, my practice has been to leave his without expressing dissent from it.—H. L. G.

and morality becomes most important. So it is that in St. Paul's earlier Epistles the Gospel occupies the foreground; while Church organization and discipline, though by no means forgotten, are left in the background. In the Pastoral Epistles it is otherwise. We hear less of the Gospel, and more of organization and discipline. Still the old evangelical fire breaks out (cf. 1 Tim 2 [3-7]; 2 Tim 4 [5]; Tit 3 [4-7]); but the 'herald' is giving place to the 'teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth' (1 Tim 2 [7]).

But who is it that is speaking to us? Is it St. Paul himself, or some other who writes in his name and spirit, or sometimes the one and sometimes the other? The scribes of the centuries before the Lord came, who collected the words of the prophets, often blended their own teaching with that of those who had gone before them. Like St. Paul (Ac 20 [20]), they would keep back nothing that was profitable; if the one Spirit spoke, what did it matter by whom He spoke? Something similar may have taken place in the Pastoral Epistles. Their authorship is one of the most difficult problems of the NT, and this Introduction will be mainly occupied in dealing with it. But other problems will come into view, and we shall not think of them only for the light which their solution may throw upon the question of authorship.

(i) First, then, as to the external evidence. This is as strong as we can expect it to be. Coincidences with the language of the Pastoral Epistles are found in Barnabas 7; in Clement of Rome (1 *Cor.* 29); in Ignatius (*Magn.* vi, 2; viii, 1); while that Polycarp knew them there seems to be no doubt (*Phil.* 4 [1, 2], 5 [2], 9 [2]). They are accepted by Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and St. Irenæus, and incorporated under St. Paul's name in Latin and Syriac versions of the 2nd century. Nowhere in the great writers of the Church is any doubt thrown upon the Pauline authorship. Such evidence is of high value, and the rejection of these letters by writers so arbitrary in their methods as Marcion and Basilides does little to shake it.

(ii) Secondly, there is the historical background. Can these epistles be fitted into the story of St. Paul's life? If we must assume that St. Paul's first Roman imprisonment (Ac 28 [30, 31]) ended with his death, few will follow Dr. Bartlet in his belief that they can. Had e.g. St. Paul founded a Church in Crete (Tit 1 [5]) either during his long stay at Ephesus or on his voyage to Rome, would not St. Luke have told us so? But there is no reason to assume that the first imprisonment ended fatally. We cannot build upon St. Paul's words in Ac 20 [25], for not even a prophet's anticipations are always fulfilled; and there is some evidence, though not much, for the attainment of St. Paul's desire to go to Spain (Rom 15 [28]). Clement of Rome (1 *Cor.* 5) says that 'Paul, having taught the whole world righteousness, came to the boundary of the west'; and, though Harrison suggests that the word translated 'boundary' means rather the 'winning-post' of a race, and that Rome is meant, a reference to Spain is more probable, since a journey to Spain finds support both in the Muratorian fragment and in a tradition recorded in Eus., *H.E.* ii, 22. Be this as it may, probability is strongly in favour of St. Paul's release. He would not have appealed to Cæsar, if he had not expected to be acquitted (Phm [22]); and the Jews had no case against him (Ac 26 [31, 32]). Indeed, had not the necessary documents been lost in the shipwreck, he would probably have been tried and released much earlier. Thus St. Paul was probably set free in February 61, and may well have revisited Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, and spent some time in Crete. If he was martyred at Rome soon after August 64, when the great persecution began, this would leave three or more years for his later journeys; and his martyrdom may not have taken place so soon.

There is, however, a difficulty urged. It is said that, though the epistles as we have them must, if authentic, be later than the first imprisonment, the *personalia* which they contain are earlier, and are really fragments of St. Paul's correspondence somehow preserved and worked into unauthentic epistles. These fragments, according to Harrison, are the following:

(1) Tit 3 [12-15]: St. Paul writes from West Macedonia some months after 2 Cor 10-13 and before 2 Cor 1-10, bidding Titus, who is at Corinth, join him at Ephesus.

(2) 2 Tim 4 [13-15, 20, 21a]: St. Paul writes from Macedonia after the visit to Troas (2 Cor 2 [12] f.), bidding Timothy, who has returned to Ephesus, join him before the winter.

(3) 2 Tim 4 [16-18a] (? [18b]): St. Paul writes from Cæsarea soon after his arrival under escort from Jerusalem. The 'first defence' refers to the events described in Ac 22 [1] ff.

(4) 2 Tim 4 [9-12, 22b]: Timothy recalled to Rome.

(5) 2 Tim 1 16-18, 3 10 f., 4 1, 2a, 5b, 6-8, 18b, 19, 21b, 22a: the last farewell.

There is, Harrison argues, 'an amazing set of similarities between the two captivities. Erastus remains again at Corinth. Again St. Paul visits Troas with Timothy and Trophimus as his companions, and they touch at Miletus. Mischief is made by Jews from Asia led by the same Jew Alexander, who has dogged his steps even in Rome. A second time he has had as companions in prison Luke, Mark, Tychicus (Timothy?), and Demas. Again he has sent Tychicus to Ephesus. Mark, whom the Colossians were told to expect (Col 4 10), is recalled from the same neighbourhood.'

But, ingenious as is all this, it has not much force. Not only is the reconstruction of these fragments highly speculative, and their preservation without more valuable material attached to them most improbable, but there is nothing 'amazing' in the similarities alleged. St. Paul's chief disciples were very frequently with him. Erastus was a Corinthian (Rom 16 23). Alexander, as far as we know, never stirred from Ephesus, or withstood St. Paul's words anywhere else (cf. 1 Tim 1 20). If he has come to Rome, why is Timothy at Ephesus bidden to beware of him? Just as baseless is the suggestion that 2 Tim 4 11 is inconsistent with 2 Tim 4 21. In the former verse St. Paul is obviously speaking of his own personal following, and in the latter of members of the local Church of Rome. Indeed, there seem to be only two real historical difficulties, and neither of them is serious. The first is that, in view of Timothy's close acquaintance with St. Paul's mind and practice (2 Tim 3 10, 11), such directions as those of 1 Tim 2 and 3 appear unnecessary; the second is that the stay of Titus in Crete seems to have been curiously short (2 Tim 4 10). But, in writing to both Timothy and Titus, St. Paul may well have wished to supply a permanent record of the principles upon which he acted, the language of 2 Tim 2 2 being very noticeable; while, not only are we ignorant of the interval of time which separated Titus and 2 Timothy, but we know that St. Paul did move his lieutenants from one place to another with great frequency. Our conclusion then is that the historical background of the epistles is fully compatible with Pauline authorship.

(iii) We turn now to the substance of the epistles; and, putting aside for the moment all questions of vocabulary and style, and the special problems of the ministry and of the false teaching attacked, we ask whether we find here the spirit and mind of St. Paul himself. Here opinions differ, but a broad answer may at once be given. The teaching is throughout wholly in accordance with St. Paul's mind, though (as already noted) there is a difference of emphasis, and the deeper thought of the earlier epistles appears less frequently than we should expect. There is e.g. strangely little reference to the Holy Spirit. The Pastorals exhibit in the most natural way St. Paul's characteristic combination of apostolic authority with personal humility, his warm affections, and his fierceness in dealing with false teaching when bound up with moral obliquity (cf. Parry, *Introd.* xxii-xxx). There is nothing which St. Paul could not have said, and very much which could hardly have been said by anyone else. Is it, e.g., conceivable that he did not write 1 Tim 1 12-16, or 2 Tim 1 3-5, or 2 3-9? A disciple writing in St. Paul's name might well make him refer to the fact that he was once a persecutor, but would he have added the beautiful thoughts of 1 Tim 1 16? Still more, is it conceivable that he would have gone out of his way to criticize Timothy, and do it with the subtle tact of 2 Tim 2 3-7? The words are entirely appropriate on the lips of Timothy's spiritual father, but in an imitator they would be the very reverse. If Timothy were still alive, they would be impertinent; if he were dead, they would be out of place. If then we are to accept the view of a divided authorship, we must ascribe to St. Paul far more than Harrison does. That there are echoes in the Pastorals of the Apostle's earlier language is natural enough; we all tend to repeat ourselves as we grow older. The noticeable fact is that we find characteristically Pauline teaching which is no mere echo, but given with the addition of new thoughts and in language of remarkable originality and force (cf. 1 Tim 2 3-6; 2 Tim 1 9, 10; Tit 3 4-7). It is equally natural that St. Paul should speak of Timothy's 'youth' (1 Tim 4 12). 'Youth' in the language of the Bible is a more extended period than in our own; and no lapse of time really convinces us that our children and pupils are not still young. There is, however, something to be said on the other side. If from the epistles of St. Paul we were asked to select passages in which he may seem to fall below his own highest level, we should probably draw almost all of them from the Pastorals. But these passages would be fragmentary, and we should be sure to disagree about their selection.

But what are the difficulties alleged ?

(*a*) There is the question of the doctrinal background. The great controversies of St. Paul's life are now over, and we do not expect detailed instruction in Christian doctrine in letters written to Timothy and Titus. But there is no change of view. As Lock says: 'The goodness of all creation (1 Tim 4 [4]; Tit 1 [15]), the universalism of salvation (1 Tim 2 [1-7]), the divine initiative in it (2 Tim 1 [9]; Tit 3 [5]), the divine overruling of the world and its history (1 Tim 1 [17]; 6 [15], Tit 1 [3]), the conception of Christ's nature and work as the risen Lord (1 Tim 3 [16]; 2 Tim 2 [8]), the thought of the Church as a family (1 Tim 3 [1-15], 5 [1]) and as the inheritor of the promises made to the Jewish nation (Tit 2 [14]), are no longer discussed, but are all implied as the basis of Christian life.' Specially noticeable are the great verse 1 Tim 2 [5], linking (like Col 2 [17]) St. Paul's thought with that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in relation to baptism the Trinitarian passage Tit 3 [4-5]. It is no doubt true, as is urged by McNeile (*Introduction to the N.T.*, p. 101), that there is a new stress upon orthodox belief; but, as has already been pointed out, that is entirely natural at the stage now reached in the development of the Church's life. Nor can we agree with McNeile (*op. cit.*, p. 183) that the reference to the Lord's appearing (2 Tim 4 [1]) is inconsistent with the teaching of Colossians and Ephesians: though in these epistles of the first captivity the Parousia is not prominent, St. Paul still expects it (cf. Eph 4 [30]; Col 3 [4]).

(*b*) Much the same is true of the moral teaching of the Pastorals. Here again there is no change except that which the new circumstances demand. St. Paul has always strongly insisted upon Christian morality. What we observe is that, as Brown makes clear in his Commentary, St. Paul is dealing with the same difficulties which Christian missionaries have to meet in the East to-day. 'It was,' he says, 'with a delighted surprise that we came back to the Pastoral Epistles, and realized that the Apostle's difficulties had been much the same as ours. Such phrases as "not given to much wine," "not purloining," "not slanderers, tattlers and busybodies," rang in our ears with comfort and encouragement, and we felt thankful that the Apostle had not thought it beneath his dignity to mention such matters. . . . He did not write for histrionic effect, and when we have got over our own disappointment at not finding in these epistles a theme of theological grandeur equal to that of the first chapters of Ephesians—a sort of swansong of the concentrated sublimity of apostolic doctrine—we begin to realize that they are exactly what the circumstances demanded. . . . Timothy and Titus found, as we find in India, that in Ephesus and Crete even the natural virtues had been to a great extent lost, and the conscience perverted by a false system of religion, and it was necessary to make people men before they could be made Christians.'

Equally remarkable is the teaching which is given in the Epistles to Timothy on the life and duties of the Christian ministry. It is no doubt largely new, since St. Paul's earlier epistles are addressed to all members of his churches alike; but who but St. Paul could have given it ? It is precisely this spiritual versatility, this power to speak in a new way to new people under new circumstances, which is so especially Pauline.

(iv) We turn now to two questions which may throw light upon the date of the Pastorals, that of the false teaching attacked, and that of the doctrine of the Christian ministry

(*a*) The first may be dealt with briefly. If it were clear that the writer had in mind a developed Gnosticism, we could hardly identify him with St. Paul. But Hort (*Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 130-146) has shown that this is not the case. Some amount of incipient Gnosticism there may well have been. The Gnostic depreciation of matter as the source of evil seems to be in view in 1 Tim 4 [1-5]; and both the denial of bodily resurrection (2 Tim 2 [17, 18]) and the magic of which the writer speaks (2 Tim 3 [8, 13]) were characteristic of the Gnostics. But this is all that can be said. Though the language of 1 Tim 1 [4] and 6 [20] may at first suggest Gnostic teaching, it can be otherwise better explained. The false teaching was evidently Jewish (1 Tim 1 [7]; Tit 1 [14], 3 [9]), though Gentiles also may have accepted it (Tit 1 [10]); and the old wives' fables denounced (1 Tim 4 [7]; 2 Tim 4 [4]) were probably derived from Jewish Midrash or apocryphal books. The Halachic Midrash dealt with the Law and the Haggadic with the narratives of the Pentateuch, the latter Midrash being replete with senseless 'fables,' while the *Book of Jubilees*, to take but one example, contains mythical 'genealogies.' But we should notice that the Greek word for 'genealogy' had a wider meaning than its English equivalent, the historian Polybius using it of the legendary narratives found in Greek historians. Thus, when the writer speaks of the vain talking of teachers of the Law (1 Tim 1 [6, 7]) and of

the oppositions of the knowledge falsely so called (1 Tim 6 [20]), he probably has Halachic Midrash in mind; the 'oppositions,' if not contradictions of Christian teaching, being what Hort describes as 'the endless contrasts of decisions founded on endless distinctions which played so large a part in the casuistry of the scribes.' The genealogies, on the other hand, will belong to Haggadic Midrash. Now the writer deals with all this just as we should expect St. Paul to deal with it. The depreciation of matter is regarded seriously, and rejected upon fundamental Christian principles. But to take the old wives' fables seriously would have been to do them too much honour; and they are contemptuously dismissed as silly, aimless, and morally noxious (1 Tim 1 [6], 6 [20]; 2 Tim 2 [14]). Thus there is here no evidence to support a later date for the Pastorals; similar teaching seems to have been prevalent a little earlier at Colossæ (Col 2 [4, 8, 16, 23]), and at the date of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 13 [4, 9]).

(*b*) We cannot so briefly dismiss the doctrine of the Christian ministry. We have here a question of abiding importance; and, if it could be shown that the teaching of the Pastorals was contrary to St. Paul's mind, we could not regard him as the author. But nothing surely is further from the fact. In the earlier Epistles he has little occasion for dealing with the ministry; but both his practice, as St. Luke describes it, and his earlier language are entirely in accordance with what we find here. The situation disclosed is neither precisely the same as that of earlier days, nor that found in the Ignatian Epistles; but it is far nearer to the former than to the latter. St. Paul's apostolic authority is as clear as ever. No more than in his earlier epistles does he recognize any right in his converts to set aside his commands; and he exercises discipline (1 Tim 1 [20]), when it is necessary, as strenuously as in earlier days (1 Cor 5 [3-5]). But though there is nothing new in the sending of others to represent him (1 Cor 4 [17], 16 [10, 11]; 2 Cor 8 [6]), his representatives are apparently in a somewhat new position. They stand indeed in no permanent relation to the churches which they oversee (1 Tim 1 [3], 3 [14]; 2 Tim 4 [10]), and may be recalled at any moment (Tit 3 [12]). But St. Paul's course will now soon be finished, and the direction of his churches pass into other hands; and so we find powers committed to Timothy and Titus which (as far as we know) had not before been theirs. Titus (Tit 1 [5]) and probably Timothy (1 Tim 5 [22]) are to ordain; both are to exercise discipline over the teaching and conduct of others (1 Tim 5 [17-25]; 2 Tim 2 [14], 4 [2]; Tit 2 [15], 3 [10]), and generally to regulate the life and organization of the churches under their care (cf. e.g. 1 Tim 5 [9]): and, though St. Paul does not say that these powers will still be theirs after his death, that goes without saying. Timothy (1 Tim 1 [18], 4 [14]) had been designated by some Christian prophet or prophets for ordination, and had been by St. Paul ordained for the work committed to him (1 Tim 4 [14]; 2 Tim 1 [6]); doubtless the same was the case with Titus; and there is nothing new in the view of ordination which St. Paul's words presuppose. It is derived from the OT (Nu 11 [16, 17, 24-29], 27 [18-20]; Dt 34 [9]). God alone can bestow the Spirit; that is why the laying on of hands is accompanied by prayer. But as the task committed to a man of God becomes too great, others are associated with him, God 'taking of' the Spirit resting upon him and bestowing it upon them; and when the life of the man of God is over, those thus associated carry on his work (for a fuller explanation cf. *Sacraments in the N.T.*, pp. 399, 400, and *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 426). There is complete agreement between the Pastorals and the teaching of St. Clement of Rome. 'The Apostles,' says the latter, 'appointed the firstfruits of their ministry, having proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who would believe'; and 'afterwards gave an additional injunction'—the reading is here uncertain—'that other proved men should succeed to their ministry' (1 Clem. 42, 44). The commission bestowed upon Timothy and Titus, and no doubt upon others, makes exactly the provision required; and the careful directions given about the character necessary for the bishops and deacons show how careful St. Paul was that the office-bearers of the future should be as carefully tested as had been those already ordained.

We see then that in Timothy and Titus we have not only representatives of the Apostle, but his destined successors in his powers of ordination and discipline. These powers resemble those of bishops to-day; and we need not doubt that, like St. Paul himself, they would not only have themselves ordained, but in time have associated others in the power to do so. What then are the powers of the 'bishops,' of whom we hear in Phil 1 [1] and again in the Pastorals? Cf. 1 Tim 3 [1, 2]; Tit 1 [7]; and Ac 20 [28]. Are we to distinguish them from the elders (1 Tim 5 [1, 17, 19]; Tit 1 [5]), or to identify the two classes? Though

the bishop is in both cases mentioned in the singular, and with the definite article prefixed, the second view is almost certainly the true one. The language both of Ac 20 [17, 28] and of Tit 1 [5, 7] suggests this strongly; in both cases we first find 'elders' mentioned, while the subsequent language presupposes that the 'elders' are 'bishops.' Moreover, their identity is clear from all that is said about them. If it were a question of different offices, we should expect them to be carefully distinguished. If bishops and presbyters belonged to different classes, there would be candidates to consider in each case, and in each case questions would arise as to their performance of their duties and the discipline to be exercised over them. Against this argument it should not be argued that it is merely an argument from silence. If there was in Ephesus or in other churches in which Timothy was to act a separate class of bishops, it is unnatural to suppose that he would have received no instructions as to his relation to them. Indeed, if we assume such a distinct office (as Bernard does) with the special functions of internal administration, of dealing with heretics, and of representation of the society to the outside world, Timothy's commission would necessarily bring him into direct contact, and even into conflict of authority, with such officers; and instructions would be even more necessary than in regard to the presbyters, who are assumed to have more strictly personal relations limited to their own community. Again, special instructions as to the character fit for an elder would surely be not less required than those for the character of a bishop. If, in addition to these considerations, we notice that the special functions indicated are to a large extent the same, the conclusion that we have here but one office is strengthened. These functions are in both cases described comprehensively by the word 'rule.' In both cases teaching is mentioned as a special duty. There is indeed in the second passage no reference to hospitality or financial responsibilities. But there is obviously no occasion in the second passage to describe in detail what the office involved. The exact relation of the one title to the other is uncertain. But the Church continued the life of Israel, and the Christian presbyters are probably the successors of the presbyters of the Jewish synagogues, endowed, not without remembrance of the story of Nu 11, with new gifts of the Spirit for a wider and more spiritual activity. They are not a body marked off from the laity in the same degree as in later days: the 'religious' and the 'secular' officers of the Church are not yet clearly distinguished. All must be done in the name of the Lord Jesus; and the leaders of the Church have to deal with all alike. But in the Church, which is governed by the word of the Lord, teaching and ruling are the highest functions of the presbyters; and, though all may not teach, all have their share in ruling (cf. 1 Tim 5 [17]). So it probably was that 'bishops' or overseers came to be a sub-title of the presbyters, descriptive of their main function in early days, but never became, like 'presbyters,' a distinctive title for their office. Naturally therefore, when the Apostles were dead, and the chief rule in the churches had passed to men like Timothy and Titus, or to individual rulers chosen from the local churches to share their special authority, the name of bishop was easily detachable from the presbyters, and acquired its later sense. But in the Pastorals, as in Clement, this stage has not been reached; and we have thus a clear indication of their comparatively early date. About the deacons little need be said. It is just possible that in the Pastorals both 'bishops' and 'deacons' are also 'presbyters'; Phil 1 [1] is consistent with this. But the language used does not naturally suggest it, and probably from the first they were as distinct from the presbyters as they have been in later days.

(v) We see then that, though difficulties may be suggested here and there, there is nothing in the Pastorals to lead a reader unacquainted with Greek to doubt the traditional authorship. That the three epistles have the same *provenance* is almost universally recognized; and to suppose that 2 Timothy, with its touching references to Eunice and Lois, and its combination of deep affection with gentle criticism, does not proceed from St. Paul seems little short of an absurdity. But now comes a great difficulty which the English reader does not see, the difficulty of the style and vocabulary. Its reality has long been recognized; but the work of Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, has afresh brought it into the foreground and given to it a greatly increased strength. His argument must be read in its entirety if justice is to be done to it, though it should be compared with the discussion of the vocabulary of the Pastorals in Parry's Commentary. All that can be here attempted is to give a brief account of its character; and to show how, though at first it may appear conclusive, further thought leads

us to doubt whether it is strong enough to outweigh the case for the authenticity of the Epistles.

The question of style may be briefly dismissed; for it is the vocabulary, and not the style, which constitutes the great difficulty. Bishop Lightfoot notices that the syntax 'is stiffer and more regular than in the earlier Epistles, more jointed and less flowing. The clauses are marshalled together, and there is a tendency to parallelism.' Also, 'there is a greater sententiousness, an abruptness and positiveness of form. Imperative clauses are frequent.' But these differences, considered with other distinguishing features of these Epistles, only lead him to 'the obvious and almost irresistible conclusion (1) that they must all three have been written at or near the same time; (2) that some considerable period must be interposed between them and the remaining Epistles of St. Paul.'

There is, moreover, something to be said on the other side. Lock finds the style of all three Epistles more like that of St. Paul in the practical sections of his earlier Epistles than that of any other NT writer; and it is with these sections, and not with those which are argumentative and theological, that the Pastorals should be compared. There is, e.g., the old playing upon words (1 Tim 1 [8], 6 [17, 18]), and the old love of oxymoron (1 Tim 5 [6, 13]). We need not then be much concerned about this aspect of the problem, St. Paul's style varies greatly in one Epistle and another and even in the same Epistle; and the Pastorals are very different from the rest both in destination and in character.

We turn then to the question of vocabulary; and here the evidence which Harrison has marshalled is very striking. St. Paul's vocabulary varies considerably even in his earlier Epistles; but they maintain among themselves, he thinks, a close family likeness. The case is wholly different when we come to the Pastorals. 'Their vocabulary consists of some 902 words, of which fifty-four are proper names. Of the remaining 848, 306, or over 36 per cent., are not to be found in any one of the ten Paulines.' There are indeed fifty words found both in the Pastorals and in one or more of the earlier Epistles which are not found elsewhere in the NT. But when they can be called characteristically Pauline, they are largely due in Harrison's opinion to deliberate copying, while an old word is often used in a different sense. Of course the change of language is in part explained by the new subjects with which the writer is dealing. Parry finds that in 1 Timothy eight out of every nine peculiar words are found in connexion with these new subjects. But it is not only important words in which the change appears; the little words—the particles, enclitics, prepositions, and pronouns—are changed also. For such a change within the works of one author there is no known parallel in literature. Nor is even this all. 'A large percentage of the words and expressions in the Pastorals which are foreign to the vocabulary of Paul, in so far as this is known to us by his genuine epistles, is found to belong to the vocabulary of the Apostolic Fathers'; and 'of those comparatively few remaining words in the vocabulary which do not occur in Christian writers between A.D. 95 and 170, practically the whole number . . . are actually used by non-Christian writers of that period.' Not only then was the writer not St. Paul, but he was apparently a much later writer. Can any answer be made to this indictment?

Now in the first place we should notice that the last point is of little force. The vocabulary of a language never changes rapidly. The language, e.g., of William Law is perhaps nearer to the language of to-day than that of many writers of the 19th century. Words that live at all have generally a long life; and no one makes frequent use of more than a moiety of the words that he knows. Moreover, the later the date to which the Pastorals are assigned, the more difficult it becomes to understand how they came to be accepted as St. Paul's.

But the earlier points are much stronger. St. Paul, as Lock says, 'shows always a great change of vocabulary and fondness for different groups of words at different times,' and many of the new phrases and 'faithful sayings' may have been drawn from the popular Christian language of the time; but the great change in the vocabulary of the Pastorals cannot be adequately explained in this way. Nor is much help to be gained from the suggestion that the letters were actually written, wholly or in part, by one of St. Paul's companions, St. Paul himself supplying the thoughts which they express. Though he often associates others with what he writes (1 Cor 1 [1]; 2 Cor 1 [1], etc.), his individuality was far too strong for such collaboration; and, when as in 2 Timothy censure has to be delicately given, the personal touch, or the particular turn of a phrase, may make all the difference between failure and success. But there is a further consideration which seems

not to have received attention, and with this the Introduction shall end.

We observe then that the force of an argument from style and vocabulary varies greatly in different cases. We will take first the case of a scholar living a somewhat secluded life, and engaged in literary work with little variety of subject. His style and vocabulary will be formed early. In this case 'the style is the man,' and the one will alter as little as the other. If we heard that a new book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* had been discovered, or a new sermon by Isaac Barrow, we should be prepared to judge of its authenticity by its style and vocabulary alone. How different it is with such a writer as Shakespeare! Little as we know about his life, we can see that there was nothing of the recluse about him. He had a wide and ever-changing experience of human action and passion; his moods varied greatly; and his thought touched all things in heaven and earth. Moreover, though very conscious of his poetic power, he cared little about style for its own sake. Very often he writes most carelessly; and, when he takes no trouble, he can sink to a depth of banality of which no other great poet is capable. Not only do we find great differences of style and vocabulary as we pass from one play or poem to another; but he would be a bold man who would say of any fine lyric of the 16th century that Shakespeare could not have written it. Thus the parallel between the variety of Shakespeare and the variety of St. Paul has naturally been urged in the discussion of the problem of the Pastorals; and though, as Harrison has shown, it does not solve the problem, it carries us a considerable distance towards its solution. All the sources of Shakespeare's variety, except his poetic and imaginative genius, are also sources of St. Paul's; and St. Paul thinks even less about his style than Shakespeare. There are places where the beauty of his thought lifts his language to a corresponding beauty (Rom 8 [18-39]; 1 Cor 13). But his sentences can be almost intolerably heavy (Eph 1 [3-14]); the expression of his thought is often far too compressed (2 Cor 3 [12-18]); while sometimes we shall best understand him if we trust the general impression which his words convey, without filling the gaps or attempting to unravel the syntax (2 Cor 8). In a word, St. Paul is wholly absorbed in what he wishes to say, and hardly observes how he is saying it.

But now comes the new point which requires attention. Shakespeare, like Hooker and Barrow, writes in his own national tongue, while St. Paul does not; and that makes a great difference. St. Paul in his own family spoke not Greek but Aramaic (Phil 3 [5]), and probably he always thought in it. Just because we think largely by means of words, we fix our style by our thought as well as by our speech and writings; but it is only when we write in our own tongue that our style is thus affected. St. Paul no doubt spoke Greek fluently, for he had heard it spoken from his earliest days. But he used it simply to convey his ideas to others; and since he had learned his Greek chiefly by the ear, it would change rapidly with the company which he kept. Let us consider a similar case, that of a Frenchman who teaches at an English public school. The English that he speaks, however fluent and correct, is the English which he hears being spoken around him; and, unless he is a student of English literature, he will have little sense of English style and little preference for one word rather than for another. Suppose then that he migrates from England to the United States; in a short time his vocabulary will have changed greatly. He will use a number of words which he never used in England, and old words in new senses. What, e.g., he once called a shop he will now call a store, and what he once called a station he will now call a depot. And how will it fare with the little unimportant words, on which Harrison lays such stress? They will offer even less resistance to the forces of change. They vary greatly even in different parts of England, and their use is continually varying. 'Quite' (for some unknown reason) suddenly takes the place of 'Yes'; 'What of it?' disappears, and 'What about it?' is heard on every hand. But when our Frenchman goes to America, the change in his little words will be much more rapid. He will pick up by ear American turns of speech as once he picked up English, and to a large extent unconsciously. What then would happen when St. Paul went to Rome? Thus far he had chiefly heard the Greek of the Orient, and read it in the Semitic Greek of the LXX. But now he hears the kind of Greek spoken in Rome, a Greek affected by Latin idiom, and probably differing considerably from the Greek that he has known. At first he will write as before—there is no reason for putting any Epistle of the first captivity late in the two years' imprisonment—but not for long. Is it then strange that Latinisms appear in the Pastorals—that, whereas he once said *eucharisto*, he now says *charin echo* (*gratiam habeo*), and whereas he once said

dio, he now says *di'hēn aitian* (*quam ob causam*)? This, however, is but a detail. Harrison points out, as we have seen, how many of the new words found in the Pastorals are found in the earliest Fathers. 'Clement of Rome uses in common with the Pastorals 63 words never so far as we know employed by Paul; 2 Clem. 23 . . ., Ignatius 39, Polycarp 20 . . ., Hermas 75 . . .; while Aristides has 7, Tatian 61, Justin 116, Athenagoras 59, and the fragments from Melito 5.' But why are Clement, Hermas, Justin and his disciple Tatian so far ahead? The Ignatian Epistles, e.g., taken together are nearly as long as Clement ad Cor., and nearer to the Pastorals in their subject-matter. Is not the answer obvious? Clement, Hermas, and Justin are Christians of Rome, though they write in Greek; and they are affected by the same influences as St. Paul was in his latest years. We have not of course sufficient evidence to draw up the vocabulary of specially Roman Greek; but the facts speak for themselves.

Nor is even this all. As Nägeli has shown, many of the new words in the Pastorals belong to the more literary vocabulary of the Greek of the time; and Falconer has argued (*D.A.C.*, 'Timothy and Titus' Epistles') that the remarkable similarities in language and ideas between the Pastorals and the writings of St. Luke suggest that St. Luke had a large share in their composition. Reasons have been given above for rejecting the view that St. Luke was much more than an amanuensis. But St. Luke went with St. Paul to Rome, and we do not know that he ever again left him. When 2 Timothy was written, St. Luke was the only one of St. Paul's company who was with him still. Have we not here the explanation of the fact which Nägeli has noticed? If these two spent so long a time together, St. Luke's vocabulary, as well as that of Rome, would have influenced St. Paul greatly. St. Luke was probably a Greek, and certainly a man of letters; and St. Paul would have learned from him both consciously and unconsciously. We cannot say that all these considerations taken together prove that the Pastorals in their entirety are the work of St. Paul. If they were intended, as they probably were, to leave to the Church a permanent record of his mind, other injunctions known to possess his approval may well have been incorporated in them. But St. Paul, even on Harrison's view, had his share in their production, and there is nothing definitely to prove that he did not write them as we have them to-day.

I. TIMOTHY

Historical Situation.—St. Paul, on his way to Macedonia, has left Timothy at Ephesus to oppose false teachers. But Timothy is still young for so responsible a task; his health is far from strong (5 [23]); and he has the timidity which the language of 1 Cor 16 [10] may suggest. Thus St. Paul, though hoping shortly to rejoin him (3 [14]), feels that there is cause for anxiety in case he is delayed. He writes to repeat his warning against false teaching, and give directions about public worship and the character of Church officers, and draws an attractive picture of the true teacher and of true teaching.

I. 1-20. Introduction.

1-2. God our Saviour. A Jewish phrase (Ps 24 [5]; Lk 1 [47]); there is probably no allusion to any use by the heathen of this title for their deities. **our hope**, i.e. on whom we place our hope. **true child**: the relationship is proved by similarity of character (cf. Tit 1 [4]). **in faith**, i.e. in the matter of faith; St. Paul speaks of faith as a quality of the teacher (cf. 2 [7], 3 [13]).

2. mercy is added, as in 2 Tim 1 [2], to grace and peace. The addition is natural; it is the old man who feels the need of mercy most.

3-20. False teachers waste time on myths and genealogies.

3. As I exhorted: better *requested*. The Apostle's oral instructions are now supplemented. The sentence which begins here is never finished. **charge**: the persons unnamed are evidently Christian teachers.

4. dispensation: better *stewardship*. The fables or myths are probably apocryphal Jewish legends (Tit 1 [14]); and the genealogies (Tit 3 [9]) stories centring round the pedigrees of the OT, upon which Jewish speculation was based (cf. Hort, *Jewish Christianity*, 135-138). A similar difficulty arises in India to-day; such speculations beget other speculations till all relation to life is lost. The steward is charged with the mysteries of faith; and it is in the atmosphere of faith, not of dreaming, that his work is done. He must not waste the time and attention of his hearers.

5. the end, i.e. the goal of your charge, is that love to God and man which grows out of a guileless heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned. No teaching is of value that does not help to produce love, or one of the three roots out of which it grows. The Christian teacher must have a definite aim, and that the highest.

6. ' Failure in these qualities loses sight of the true goal ' (Lock).

7. **vain talking:** here only in the NT. To ' will ' to be a teacher of law is to go back to Pharisaism. Those who so ' will ' pose as teachers, but do not understand their own assertions (Tit 3 9), or the subjects about which they dogmatize. When a subject is not understood, the statements made are devoid of intelligible meaning even to those who make them. Much confident dogmatism is of this character. St. Paul does not object to confident statement in the right place. Cf. Tit 3 8, where the same word is used.

8. We Christians know that the Mosaic Law is good when used for the conviction of sinners (cf. Rom 7 7-8 4). What the Law brings is conviction of sin, not deliverance from it. If we use it for any other purpose, we do not use it ' lawfully.' It is the Spirit which delivers and makes the burden of Christ's yoke light. The Pastorals say little about the Holy Spirit, and the fact may throw some doubt upon their authenticity.

9. The order of the Decalogue is followed, except that ' false swearers ' refers back to the third commandment.

10. slave-trading, not slavery, is condemned. **sound doctrine,** i.e. wholesome or healthy; the metaphor is drawn from physical health (6 3; 2 Tim 4 3; Tit 1 9, 2 1), and refers to the moral effect of doctrine and not to its form. The health-giving character of Christian teaching is a favourite thought of these epistles. Health and growth are the needs of the converted, as restoration of the unconverted.

11. **glory of the blessed God.** Possibly a title for Christ, who manifests the divine glory (2 Cor 4 6). God is blessed, as containing all happiness in Himself and bestowing it upon men.

12-17. A personal digression put in to encourage Timothy. I feel and show gratitude to Him who empowered me as an Apostle, seeing in me the capacity for faithful service. These verses are characteristic of St. Paul's mind, and yet new both in form and in some of the thoughts expressed. The Lord's confidence implied in the vocation given to us is a great call to faithfulness. We must not disappoint Him.

13. An ascending scale from words to acts of authorized persecution and illegal violence. **injurious,** i.e. with outrageous disregard of men's rights. St. Paul ever insists that his persecution of the Church was done in good faith, yet it remains to him an abiding ground for humility. It was terrible to have persecuted Christ, even though unwittingly.

14. Cf. the title of Bunyan's autobiography, *Grace Abounding*. Grace even greater than my sin enabled me to show faith and love acting in a soul united to Christ. There is a contrast with the unbelief and hatred described in 13. **abounded exceedingly:** such a word as this is very characteristic in St. Paul. He delights in double superlatives (cf. 2 Cor 4 17; Eph 3 8).

15. This is the first of the five sayings in these epistles which have the epithet ' faithful.' Here and in 4 9 the words ' and worthy,' etc., are added. No exact parallel is found in the NT or LXX, but similar language occurs in literary Greek of the day. Turner thinks the expression a marginal note by a later copyist. But St. Paul had learned that terse expressions of truth such as these are invaluable to simple minds, which remember and dwell upon them. The words that follow are probably quoted from some Ephesian spiritual song. The phrase **came into the world** is peculiarly Johannine, or (shall we say ?) Ephesian. Swete (*J.T.S.*, xviii, 2) notes that the meaning is ' I am,' not ' I was ' (cf. 1 Cor 15 9; Eph 3 8).

16. After the pardoning of such sin as his no one need despair. The display of the patience of Christ in St. Paul's case is an example or outline of the patience He will display in the case of others. Moreover, it greatly helps us to be hopeful about others if we bear in mind what we once were ourselves (cf. Tit 3 3). The purpose of missionary work is not exhausted in the saving of individual souls: a further purpose is that God may be fully known for what He truly is. For a man is God's glory (1 Cor 11 7), and human life in all its nations and tribes and peoples and tongues (Rev 7 9) is required to reveal the divine grace (Brown).

17. An act of praise, perhaps in a form known to Timothy (cf. 6 15, 16 and Rev 15 3).

18-20. The thought of the sentence begun in 3 is picked up. Timothy's authority is given that he may watch over the interests of Christ. The **prophecies** (cf. 4 14) are those of Christian prophets pointing to Timothy as capable of performing the task committed to him. In the Apostolic Church it was often for the Christian prophets to point out the persons to be appointed to office (cf. Ac 13 2, 20 28; and Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, 181 ff.).

19. Faith is the shield and good conscience the breastplate; some having ' thrust them away ' have come to ship-

wreck. 'Fides est ut liquor pretiosissimus; bona conscientia, ut vitrum mundum. . . . Recedit invita, semper dicit, Noli me lædere' (Bengel). The Hebrews are not afraid of mixed metaphors (see Is 28 [18], and cf. Shakespeare's 'to take up arms against a sea of troubles'). The reference is to unnamed but known persons, 'whose failure to practise put their faith out of touch with its true object' (Parry). Thus they went upon the rocks.

20. Hymenæus (2 Tim 2 [17]) denied future resurrection. Nothing is known of Alexander. **delivered to Satan,** i.e. excluded from the Church and given back to the world in which Satan is powerful. Lock thinks that the sentence involves the infliction of some bodily suffering (cf. Job 2 [6]; 1 Cor 5 [5]; Ac 5 [1-11], 13 [11]). Suffering has two aspects. The activity of the personal power of evil is seen in it (Lk 13 [16]; 2 Cor 12 [7]), but God's chastening is seen in it also (Heb 12 [7]). Even Satan has a place in the divine purpose.

II. 1-VI. 10. **Practical Measures.**

II. 1-7. **Organization of Worship.**—The Church is the high priest of the world, and the 'first' duty of the rulers of the Church is to see that the duty of intercession is rightly performed. The Church's worship was now being developed and regulated. **supplications** emphasizes the sense of need; **intercessions,** with 'its association with formal petitions to a superior authority gives prominence to the close personal dealing with God in prayer' (Parry). The word **thanksgivings** is not employed in the technical sense of 'Eucharists,' but with the widest meaning. Cf. Phil 4 [6], and the opening of the prayer for the Church militant in the English Liturgy.

2. kings, i.e. heathen rulers. Christians must not copy the Jewish tendency to revolt (cf. 6 [1, 2]; 1 P 2 [13]). Pray for good government and a quiet life (cf. Tertullian, *Ap.* 30, 31). **godliness** is 'the true reverence for God that comes from knowledge' (Lock), and **gravity** serious respect for self and others. Both words are only found in the Pastorals among St. Paul's Epistles. Piety and gravity are characteristically Roman virtues; and perhaps St. Paul learned at Rome specially to appreciate them. Perhaps, too, as he grew older, he felt more the value of the quieter virtues. Christian gravity results from grasp of the serious issues of life.

4. 'The clearest anti-Calvinistic text in the New Testament' (cf. 2 P 3 [9]). The combination of truth and knowledge is peculiar to these epistles. Knowledge is direct and intimate apprehension.

5. The unity of God calls to missionary activity. It was the great failure of Israel that, when monolatry gave place to true monotheism, no widening of heart generally followed, but rather an increase of national pride. If there is no God but one, we must lead all men to Him (cf. Is 45 [22]; Rom 10 [12]). **one mediator:** the title is used of Christ only here and in Heb 8 [6], 9 [15], 12 [24]. He is the representative Man; 'the divine side is assumed.'

6. ransom: cf. Ps 49 [7-9], which explains the meaning to be redemption from death; and Mk 8 [37], 'to buy back his life.' The word is possibly a reminiscence of the Lord's saying (Mt 20 [28]; Mk 10 [45]). **in its own times.** The reference is to the seasons of God's revelation. The witness begun in the OT was continued by the Lord, and is now perfected in the Christian Gospel.

7. An echo of past controversies. First faith, then truth. First the 'herald,' who proclaims the Gospel, is believed; then the authority of the 'apostle' is accepted and his teaching followed.

8-15. Ordering of Public Prayer.—Both Jews and pagans stood to pray. **I desire:** better *I will.* It is a regulation by apostolic authority, as in [12], which applies to every place and church. Men alone 'lead' the congregation in prayer. The 'orantes' in the Catacombs stand with uplifted and outstretched arms. **holy,** i.e. morally pure and consecrated. **wrath and disputing** are contrary to love, which is the motive of intercession. If we translate with RVm there may be a reference to our Lord's teaching in Mk 11 [22-25].

9. Women, *in seemly guise,* must show modesty and self-control. Probably St. Paul has still public worship in his mind. Public worship must not be an occasion for display of the latest modes. St. Chrysostom asks the women of his congregation: 'Are you come to a ball?'

11, 12. Contrast Tit 2 [3-5]. Women are not to teach in the assembly. 'Note the repetition of "quietness." Woman's whole nature requires it, and the strain of public teaching is usually beyond her strength. The point is that in the Church teaching is an exercise of authority, and for a woman to exercise authority over a man is to reverse the divine order of the family. Possibly "the man" is here her husband. The true subordination of women to men is in the family, not in the State or the Church. It is not that men in the mass are to command women in the mass, but that the man is to bear rule in his own house.' Cf. Goudge's Essay on 'The Teaching of St. Paul as to the Position of Women,' in *The Place of Women in*

the Church (Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice).

13, 14. St. Paul is interpreting the teaching of Gen 2-3: cf. 1 Cor 11 [1-12]. 'was first formed' is explained by 1 Cor 11 [9] (Gen 2 [18]).

14 is true to the narrative of Genesis. Eve is deceived or deceives herself: Adam sins deliberately. That the Genesis narrative is not historical does not destroy the value of St. Paul's argument, since the distinction here noted between the sins of men and women is surely true to fact. It is this which makes women less good teachers than men (which is the point here). A man sins more presumptuously, but sophisticates his conscience less. He is thus more ready than a woman to admit a principle and teach it, though he knows that he sets it aside. Cf. Goudge (*op. cit.*).

15. **childbearing** is explained by Gen 3 [15, 16]. The pain of child-bearing is, according to Gen 3, the penalty of woman's sin, as the strain of ceaseless labour is of man's. The salvation of both is worked out through their frank acceptance of what is laid upon them. But the woman is not meant to bear man's penalty as well as her own. Cf. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, 367: 'If St. Paul forbids women to teach in public, he says they shall be saved through child-bearing. He means that God has given to them in place of the Christian ministry reserved for men another office in the Church, in the faithful discharge of which they are to work out their salvation—that of peopling the Church by bearing and training children to be citizens of God's kingdom on earth.' The NT suggests that in the early Church women were at first inclined to forget that Christianity does not affect the natural constitution of society. Some commentators find a reference to the Incarnation, which may be in the background of St. Paul's mind, but is not in the foreground. **if they continue**, i.e. women in general, or possibly the husband and wife, living 'the full Christian life of faith, love, and sanctification, with its condition, self-discipline' (Parry). The faithful saying (3 [1]) is probably to be referred to the preceding words 'she shall be saved.'

III. 1-13. **The Officials of the Church.**—St. Paul tells Timothy what sort of men to choose, and so deals with characteristics that can be seen rather than with the inner life.

1. The overseer, or 'bishop.' The subject is perhaps introduced half apologetically as if the local ministry were despised. We know that this was a danger, though Clement of Rome (ad *Cor.* 44) shows how soon wrong ambition aspired to this office. The 'bishop' has to preside, teach, control finances, and represent the community to Christian strangers and to the world (cf. Tit 1 [5-9]).

Bernard compares the requirements for the Stoic wise man, who should be married, not puffed up, temperate in wine, and combine self-control with decorum (Diog. Laert. vii, 116-126). Dibelius quotes Onosander (*De Imperatorum Officio*, i) on the qualifications of a general, who should be self-controlled, temperate, discreet, not a lover of money, etc. St. Paul's description is probably independent.

2. **husband of one wife**: cf. 5 [9], 'the wife of one man.' In neither case is the meaning certain, and the view taken of the authorship of the Pastorals is here important. If this section of the epistle is St. Paul's, we should interpret 'faithful in married life.' There is no reason to suppose that a Jew like St. Paul would have had any prejudice against second marriages in men; while it is most unlikely that, as early as St. Paul's day, when Christians old enough to be chosen as presbyters were all converts from Judaism or heathenism, the fact that a man had been married twice would be a bar to his ordination. That this is the meaning is supported by the fact that otherwise the list of necessary characteristics does not definitely include purity. But Lock points out that there were tendencies in the heathen world to honour those who had been married but once, and the interpretation current in the 2nd century, 'not remarried after his wife's death,' is the more probable, if we can place this section considerably later than St. Paul's day. In 5 [9], though either of the alternative explanations is possible, 'married but once' is the more probable. But the interpretation adopted there must correspond to that adopted here.

given to hospitality. It would be for the 'bishop' to entertain Christians coming from other churches (cf. 3 Jn [5]). **apt to teach**, i.e. possessing knowledge and able to impart it (cf. 2 Tim 2 [24]; Tit 1 [9]).

5. The same faults which ruin the house ruin the parish. If a man cannot keep servants, he will not keep workers. If his study and his accounts are always in a muddle, so will be his parish and his church accounts. The home is the test.

6. **not a novice.** A warning needed in Ephesus where Christianity had been long established; it is not repeated in Tit 1 [7-9] for the new Church of Crete. **of the devil**, i.e. be condemned for the devil's own sin of pride. The belief that the

devil fell through pride probably rests upon the primitive myth which underlies the language of Is 14 [12-14] and Ezek 28 [11-17]. The long experience of the older Christian promotes humility.

7. A man's sense that he is not respected is a great snare. It leads to discouragement and idleness.

8. **Deacons . . . doubletongued.** The latter word is found here only in the NT. It means 'saying one thing to one man and another to another' (Theodoret), a great temptation to those who wish to be popular. **greedy of filthy lucre** (Tit 1 [7]). The idea is that of 'making small gains in mean ways—a special danger for clerks to an official who had to manage finance, especially in the East, where the clerk might expect to have his bit out of alms distributed' (Parry). Suspicion easily arises here (cf. 2 Cor 8 [20, 21]).

9. **mystery.** The Christian revelation can only be grasped by those whose conscience is pure.

11. **women,** i.e. deaconesses. **slanderers:** better *tale-bearers.* The office of the deaconess is necessary where the seclusion of women makes it almost impossible for men to minister to them (cf. 5 [9] ff. and Rom 16 [1]).

12. The deacon may become a 'bishop'; thus the qualification required in [2] is repeated. The regular promotion of deacons to the priesthood was however not an early custom, as far as our knowledge goes.

13. **standing,** i.e. a stepping-stone to larger influence, or promotion to higher office. **boldness of speech,** i.e. in the presence both of men (2 Cor 7 [4]) and of God (Eph 3 [12]). Confidence is best gained by work of a humble kind.

14-16. **The Secret of Christian Character.**—St. Paul hopes to return. We naturally ask why in this case he writes so elaborately. 'The difficulty has been used as an argument against the genuineness of the epistle. The argument is as so often double-edged. It is hardly natural to suppose that a pseudonymous writer would have gratuitously created this difficulty' (Parry).

15. **the house of God:** better *God's household* (Heb 10 [21]; 1 P 4 [17]). The word **church,** applied in the OT to the congregation of Israel, is used to bring out the sense of corporate responsibility felt by 'the new Israel.' In apposition to 'church,' the phrase **pillar** *and buttress* **of the truth** expresses, Lock thinks, the idea that 'each local church has it in its power to support and strengthen the truth by its witness to the faith and by the lives of its members.' But both the greatness of the language used, and the fact that these Epistles are later than the teaching of Ephesians and Colossians, make it almost certain that St. Paul speaks of the prophetic office of the Church universal. Without the Church there would be no witness to the truth, no guardianship of the Scriptures, no understanding of their meaning; and it is the place of the Church in the divine purpose which makes the good conduct of her members so all-important.

16. The inner secret of godliness is in the Person of Christ confessed by all (Ambrose). To say that the mystery is great means that the hidden truth now revealed is of great importance, not that it is very difficult to understand. The quotation is probably a fragment of an early hymn. As Lock shows, the life of the Incarnate Lord (*a*) manifested in flesh, justified in spirit, (*b*) watched from heaven, is contrasted with the life of the ascended Lord, (*a*) preached among nations, believed on in the world, (*b*) lived in heaven. But the clauses may also be taken to present three contrasts: (*a*) The Lord was manifested in His earthly life, and declared to be righteous by the Resurrection, when His humanity became quickening Spirit (cf. Rom 1 [3, 4]). (*b*) He was seen of angels, who declared the Resurrection they had witnessed to His Jewish followers, and preached by them to the Gentiles. (*c*) He was believed on in the world, and received up into abiding glory in heaven. Faith shows His acceptance with men, and glory His acceptance with God. **justified in spirit:** a difficult phrase. 'Justified' must mean 'accounted, or declared to be righteous,' and refer to the judgement of God, endorsed on Lock's view by watching angels who saw His character in its spiritual development maligned by His foes, but vindicated in His Resurrection.

IV. 1-5. **Warning against a False Idea of Asceticism.**—St. Paul probably refers to the explicit words of a contemporary Christian prophet. Some will depart from the faith in God through Christ, inspired by evil spirits. **giving heed to,** i.e. through giving heed to. The deceiving spirits are contrasted with 'the Spirit of truth.' The false teachers had a real though diabolical inspiration (cf. 1 Jn 4 [1-6]).

2. Insincere 'men that have been seared in their own heart,' and 'interpret actions which to others are innocent as necessarily sinful—a piece of keen psychological dissection' (Parry).

3. Believers who have an intimate knowledge of the truth may marry and eat meats with thanksgiving (cf. 6 [17]). Food, like all else, is God's, and serves His purpose by maintaining those who fulfil it. Those who do not do His will have no right to subsistence. The great test that anything is lawful for us is the power sincerely to give thanks for it (cf. 1 Cor 10 [29, 30]).

4. Cf. Gen 1 [31]; Ecclus 39 [33].

5. Cf. 1 Cor 10 [26], where St. Paul quotes Ps 24[1] (cf. Ps 50 [12]), probably as used in 'grace' before meals.

6-VI. 12. **Advice to Timothy,** nourished by 'the utterances of the faith and of the excellent teaching which you have attended' (Parry): cf. 2 Tim 2 [1], 3 [10]. The participle **nourished** is in the present sense. Continual meditation and assimilation are necessary.

IV. 7. Avoiding non-religious old wives' fables (cf. 1 Cor 14 [20]). 'In divine things all that is foolish is also profane.' Superstition is not akin to faith, but is one of its worst enemies. It degrades the conception of God, and distracts attention from the essentials of religion and conduct.

7, 8. Discipline of the body has but a limited use; that of the character has the promise of life. Asceticism has no virtue in itself (Col 2 [23]). *Let the object of your self-discipline be godliness.* Asceticism may be substituted for godliness, as superstition for faith. The life of which St. Paul speaks is the spiritual life which is present 'now' as well as expected in the future. He does not mean that godliness 'makes the best of both worlds' in a low utilitarian sense (cf. 6 [19]).

9. The faithful saying is that found in [8], and is probably based on our Lord's words (Mk 10 [29]; Mt 19 [21]; Lk 18 [29]).

10. **Saviour**: cf. 1 [1]. God is the Maker and Preserver of all mankind, but not the Saviour of all in the deeper spiritual sense.

11. Authoritative 'commands' must be given, but they must be justified by 'teaching.'

12. Cf. 1 Cor 16 [11]; 2 Tim 1 [7]. The word **but** is important. Be a man who cannot but be respected.

13. Attend to public reading of the Scriptures and base your instructions upon them.

14. Never forget, as you may be in danger of doing, the effect of God's enabling grace. The reference is possibly to an ordination at Lystra (Ac 16 [1-3]), but much more probably to an ordination for the work at Ephesus with the laying on of hands of the body of elders. The ordination gift was from St. Paul (2 Tim 1 [6]); the presbyters merely attested it. Cf. Nu 8 [10]. So the Ordinal: 'the Bishop with the priests present.'

The idea in the word 'prophecy' seems to be the indication of the person to whom a special commission was to be given (cf. 1 [18]). For various uses of the laying on of hands cf. Ac 8 [17], 19 [6] (Confirmation); Ac 6 [6], 13 [3] (Ordination); Ac 9 [17] (healing). The meaning of 1 Tim 5 [22] is uncertain.

15. Progress both in character and in work.

16. Stick to them. Attention to our personal life and to our teaching are equally necessary. Each affects the other. The value of our work depends upon our character, and character is trained and developed by the right performance of our work.

V. **Advice as to Dealing with Various Classes.**—Appeal to an old man as a father: show that you do not forget the difference between your age and his. Treat girls as sisters—be kind, but without a touch of sentimentality.

3-8. Widows in distress to be relieved by relations, if there are such; if there are not, by the Church. **Honour** includes material support as in [17] and Mt 15 [5, 6]. We honour, not degrade, the worthy by the help we give; it is a mark of appreciation. But we must be careful about the character of those relieved. A widow is not always a deserving person, though it may be hard to persuade her of the fact.

4. The principle that relatives must not be relieved of their obligations is important in the organization of charity. The early Church, impressed with the merit of almsgiving, seems soon to have become careless of the harm that it may do (cf. [16]).

5, 6. Cf. Lk 2 [37]: living a life of devotion, not of luxury. Those who are supported by the Church are specially bound to pray for the Church.

8. Parry suggests a displacement of the text, and as the true order [8, 7, 5, 6]. Faith accepts the Gospel message in its entirety; to set aside the moral standards of the Gospel denies the faith as really as to set aside its doctrines.

9. An official list should be kept of widows who can be entrusted with such duties as the care of orphans, widows, and the sick. Polycarp (*Phil.* 4) and Ignatius (*Smyrn.* 13) refer to such a class as distinct from the order of deaconesses. **the wife of one man**: cf. 3 [2] and note, 3 [12]; Tit 1 [6]. The meaning is either 'faithful in married life,' or 'married but once.' For a woman to have been married

but once was regarded as praiseworthy both by the Jews (Jdth 16 [22]; Lk 2 [36]) and in the heathen world (Tert. *ad Uxor.* i, 6).

11. A reason for fixing the age at sixty. When they grow physically restless, they grow restive against the limitations brought by their service to Christ.

12. first faith, i.e. the pledge given to Christ. This seems to imply some form of ordination. Did they promise not to marry again?

13. St. Paul no doubt speaks from experience. The greatest care is necessary in the choice of Church workers.

14. The hostile critic or possibly Satan.

16. The relief of women should generally be by women. If men do it, scandal may arise.

17-25. elders to be rewarded for faithful work 'in the word,' i.e. in exposition. Apparently not all elders taught.

18. For the first quotation cf. Dt 25 [4]; 1 Cor 9 [9]; for the second Lk 10 [7]. The saying of the Lord 'might be known to the writer orally or possibly in the Lucan copy of Q. In the latter case it . . . would be the earliest instance of the Lord's words being quoted as Scripture' (Lock). To teach is to thresh—to detach the food required from the context in which it is found.

19. Jewish law required an accusation to be supported by two or three witnesses (Dt 19 [15]). Timothy had judicial powers (cf. 2 Cor 13 [1]).

20. Punish publicly. The sins of the clergy are not to be hushed up.

21. elect, in contrast to fallen; for their interest in men cf. 1 Cor 4 [9], 11 [10]. The temptation to partiality is so great that we need the thought of the public opinion of the universe (cf. 2 Tim 4 [1]).

22. Haste may lead to bad appointments. By ordaining the unworthy we make their sins our own. Lock suggests that the reference is to the receiving of an offender back by the laying on of hands (cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiv, 12). This suits the context, which is one of discipline; but there is no other evidence for this practice in the NT.

23. 'The verse comes in oddly, but it brings out the personal and informal character of this part of the epistle. It is almost inconceivable that an imitator could have written it' (Parry). The connexion may be that 'purity' does not involve abstinence from wine, as the ascetic teachers may have taught.

24, 25. You cannot avoid mistakes in discerning character, but the truth will come out in the end. Unworthy elders must be dealt with by discipline. Translate [25] with Moffatt: *Good works are equally conspicuous; and even when they are not, they cannot escape notice for ever.*

VI. 1, 2. **Rules for slaves,** of whom there were many in the primitive churches. The reference is to Is 52 [5]; cf. Rom 2 [24]. Let not a heathen master think that religion has taught a Christian slave to do his duty badly (cf. Tit 2 [5]). The irreligious are ever disposed to ascribe the moral failures of Christians to their religion; and such teaching as that of Gal 3 [28] would be suspect.

2. the benefit, i.e. in improved service.

3-21. **Conclusion.**—Return to the subject of 1 [3].

3-10. **Wrong methods and aims of some teachers.** sound words (cf. 1 [10]), i.e. wholesome, dealing with the right subjects and aiming at moral and spiritual edification.

4. puffed up: cf. 3 [6]. doting: better *sickly,* suggested by 'wholesome' (3). The false teacher's sickness arises from his interest in speculations and disputes, in which words are the weapons. They lead to envy of brilliant rivals, quarrels, and suspicion of low motives. The Gospel is perverted in order to obtain popularity and make money. The Eastern Church in its early centuries suffered terribly from the evils here described.

5. wranglings: better *mutual irritations.* These teachers think chiefly of money-making.

6. 'Godliness is a great means of gain for a man if he rightly estimates the value of things' (Parry). contentment (lit. 'self-sufficiency') is shown to be reasonable in 7. What I am I take into the future life; what I have I leave (cf. Phil 4 [11]).

8. Sustenance and clothing are the primary needs of man's body recognized by the Lord (Mt 6 [25]); He bids us not be over-anxious about them.

9. The moral disasters induced by avarice through the centuries are the best commentary on this teaching. The desire for wealth may be more disastrous than wealth itself (cf. 6 [17, 18]).

10. Absorption in money-making has the same effect to-day: men do not lose faith, but it ceases to be a strong motive power. With a boom they crave for luxury, with a financial crisis they are tempted to suicide. The love of money is seen in the keeping and hoarding, as well as in the getting of it.

11-16. **The true teacher in his aims, grip on real life, loyalty to his call, and sure hope** (Parry).

11. O man of God: cf. 2 Tim 3 [17]. This is the regular OT description of a prophet

(1 S 9 [6], etc.). 'Faith enables us to receive the grace which builds up the character of the righteous and godly; it works by love, enabling us to endure and be gentle.'

12. Fight the faith's fight for the prize of the high calling; St. Paul does not speak of fighting 'for the faith' as against error (Phil 1 [27]: cf. 2 Tim 4 [7]). **Lay hold on,** and live now, the real life. Tr. *the noble confession*, i.e. Timothy's baptismal creed, 'Jesus is Lord' (Rom 10 [9]; 1 Cor 12 [3]; Phil 2 [11]). 'Correlata, vocatio divina et confessio fidelium. Utraque in Baptismo fit' (Bengel).

13. The simplest explanation of the confession which Christ witnessed before Pilate is to say that He avowed that He was a king (Jn 18 [36]). To this the creed of His followers that He is Lord corresponds. There is probably no evidence here of a developed creed including the mention of Pilate. In Heb 4 [14], 1 Jn 4 [15], 5 [5], confession is made of 'Jesus as the Son of God'; and this corresponds to the form put into the mouth of the eunuch in Ac 8 [37] (RVm). It is very precarious to reconstruct a creed of NT times from scattered references, e.g. 2 Tim 4 [1], which refers to Christ's return to judge. This would be an element in St. Paul's catechetical teaching no doubt, and we have other fragments like that quoted as taught to him in 1 Cor 15 [3-7]. But the only declaration of faith required as yet from a candidate for baptism would seem to have been the simple declaration of loyalty to Jesus as Lord or Son of God (see Burn, *Introd. to the Creeds*, 8). 'Confessio Christi animat omnes confessiones. Testari confessionem erat Domini; confiteri confessionem Timothei' (Bengel).

15. St. Paul hopes that Timothy may live to welcome the Second Coming, which God 'shall show' at His own season. The cautious language is noticeable. The Lord's return has been more delayed than had been anticipated. **King of kings**: cf. Dt 10 [17]; Ps 136 [2, 3]; Dan 2 [47]; 2 Mac 13 [4]; 3 Mac 5 [35]. The title is used also of Christ (Rev 17 [14], 19 [16]). It was a not infrequent Oriental title, adopted first by the Jews, no doubt, as a deliberate challenge to heathenism, and taken over by Christians, in face of the claims made by the Roman Emperors. The solemn cadence of this doxology shows the depth of St. Paul's emotion.

17-19. Advice to the Rich.—Rather an afterthought than an interpolation. St. Paul comes back to the besetting sin of the citizens of Ephesus, where he had been accused of endangering the wealth of the city (Ac 19 [25]). There are now Christians of wealth and position. He contrasts 'wealth's uncertainty' with the unfailing generosity of God. **all things to enjoy,** i.e. to be enjoyed by ourselves and others, not to be hoarded. This verse is perhaps the least severe to the wealthy in the whole NT.

18. To share our wealth with others is to lay up treasure in heaven and to build a firm foundation (cf. Mk 10 [21] and Mt 6 [20], the Lord's words on the true treasure and the true foundation). 'Men must compute their riches not so much from what they have as from what they give' (Beveridge). Cf. Lk 12 [15, 21].

20, 21. Conclusion.—Probably in St. Paul's own hand. 'Keep your trust' (1 [18], 5 [21]; 2 Tim 1 [14]), avoiding in your own teaching, and rebuking in others, speculations which have nothing to do with religion, and oppositions (or cavillings) of the knowledge falsely so called (cf. Introd., pp. 576, 577). This is the only place in these epistles where the word 'knowledge' (*gnosis*) occurs—'a fact almost sufficient in itself to set aside the suggestion that there is a reference here to the Gnostic schools in any form' (Parry).

21. the faith, i.e. probably 'their own faith' in God revealed in Christ. **with you**: some MSS. have 'thee.'

II. TIMOTHY

Historical Situation.—If we assume the reality of the second imprisonment (see Introd.), this letter was written about A.D. 65 from prison in expectation of death. Timothy is urged to come to St. Paul before the winter to receive counsel on the work of his office, which he will have to carry on without his spiritual father. The tone of the letter is most affectionate. As Parry says, it is natural 'that the long-drawn companionship of those years of service in the Gospel, with their strange and moving experiences, should stir the deepest depths of that sensitive and loving heart.' And again: 'There are no false notes in the sentiment, no flaws in the psychology. If this is not the genuine work of St. Paul, a natural and intimate letter to his friend, disciple, and successor, then we have a performance which it would be impossible to match in the whole record of pseudepigrapha, and difficult to parallel even in the best achievements of modern literary art.'

There are no references to ecclesiastical organization, except the personal reference (1 [6]) to Timothy's own ordination, and

few to false teaching. Very appropriately the first example of the latter is the denial of the future resurrection, for which St. Paul himself hopes through the risen Christ (2 8. 18). The emphasis lies on the self-discipline by which Timothy is to be trained to endure hardship. When 'impostors wax worse' (3 13), he will find mental discipline and spiritual refreshment in study of 'inspired scripture,' in the light of the 'faith which is in Christ Jesus.'

The letter is, in Bengel's famous phrase, 'a last will and swansong conveying a legacy.' Timothy is to continue the work which St. Paul leaves.

I. 1, 2. **Greeting: New Life in Christ Here and Hereafter.**—The new life—spiritual, intellectual, moral, and affective—which has been brought by Christ is the main thing with which apostleship is concerned.

2. **child:** used of converts (1 Cor 4 17; Gal 4 19). Timothy and Titus are the only individuals so addressed.

3-14. Thanksgiving and Appeal to Stir up the Grace of the Ministry.

3. From thanksgiving for Timothy St. Paul goes on to refer in 4 to the sadness of parting and the hope of reunion. His continued intercessions are a lesson for us. **from my forefathers:** a noble spiritual ancestry is a great source of strength. We feel ourselves the depositories of a great tradition (cf. 5). **unceasing:** St. Paul gives thanks for his continued remembrance of Timothy in prayer. It is a sign of goodwill to Timothy in the Spirit who inspires it.

5. **unfeigned faith,** i.e. without pretence, unmixed with hypocrisy. 'It is surely unnecessary to vindicate the naturalness of the pathetic appeal to the memories of the Christian home' (Parry).

6. **stir up:** here only in the NT. The meaning is 'stir into fresh flame.' Timothy was tempted to slackness. **the gift** is the qualification for the work of teaching and for his ministry as a whole. Divine gifts bestowed by ordination do not operate mechanically. They must be welcomed, relied upon, and continually brought into use. Their reality is bound up with their operation, and is only manifested as they are faithfully employed.

7. Note the delicacy of the word 'us': St. Paul associates the timid Timothy with himself. The 'spirit' is the human spirit as endowed by the Holy Spirit. The 'discipline' is that of others as well as of self, and it is the former which is in point here. Timothy was weak in the exercise of discipline. The spirit of love is also the spirit of power in relation to others, and the two cannot be separated.

8. **ashamed,** through fear of failure, or shrinking from circumstances of shame or suffering. The **testimony** is to the Lord, the witness to the crucified Messiah. **hardship:** a word coined by St. Paul; it must be borne 'to the full stretch of power, not our own, but God's.' We must not expect men to treat us better than they treat the Gospel, or even desire that they should.

9. Cf. Eph 2 8, 9. God acts for the fulfilment of His purpose. It is He who initiates our salvation, and not we. **works** are contrasted (i) as a ground of redemption, with God's will, love, grace; (ii) as means employed by man, with faith. **in Christ:** the divine purpose rested on Christ, and on us as His members. Predestination is corporate rather than individual.

10. **manifested:** the word is used in Tit 2 11, 3 4. Lk 1 79 combines the thoughts of divine intervention and the dawning of new light. **abolished:** the Lord robbed death of its power by teaching the nature of true life. It is the Lord in His Risen Life who reveals God's agelong purpose for ourselves. We are to be what He already is (cf. Col 3 4).

11. St. Paul again speaks of his own position as parallel to Timothy's (cf. 1 Tim 2 7 and note).

12. **that which I have committed unto him:** if this translation is accepted, we should explain by Lk 23 46; Ac 7 59. But perhaps better *the trust committed unto me* (cf. 14 and 1 Tim 6 20, where it means the trust committed to Timothy of devotion to his work). **against:** better *for* that day when I shall be judged as a trustee.

13. **pattern of sound words** has become almost proverbial as a description of doctrinal orthodoxy. 'But seldom has a text been more consistently mishandled' (Parry). Tr.: *Represent wholesome teaching received from me by faith and love, that which is in Christ Jesus.* **pattern,** found in the NT only here and in 1 Tim 1 16, means a rough model by the sculptor or a sketch by the painter; in literature a summary which gives a general idea of a subject. Timothy, by showing faith and love in his own character and conduct, is to illustrate the Gospel.

14. **good thing which was committed:** better *noble trust.* The reference is to Timothy's position as St. Paul's successor. **dwelleth in us:** the individual guarding is to be by the corporate gift.

15-18. Parenthesis on Onesiphorus, faithful in Asia when all to whom St. Paul

appealed abandoned him before his arrest in Troas (cf. 4 [13]).

16. Prayer for the household of Onesiphorus. Ephesus was probably his home. The words suggest that he was now dead. **refreshed**: here only in the NT (cf. Ps 66 [12], in LXX, where the corresponding substantive is used of a place of refreshment).

18. Probably a prayer for the soul of Onesiphorus to the Lord (Christ), that he may obtain mercy from the Lord (God) as Judge. The Jewish practice of prayers for the departed is established by 2 Mac 12 [44] f. The Christian practice is proved by inscriptions in the Catacombs to go back at least to the 2nd century, and is probably continuous with the Jewish.

II. **1-13. Use your powers to the full, and be ready to suffer.** This section picks up the thoughts of 1 Tim 4 [6-16].

2. hast heard. The Greek aorist describes summarily all that Timothy has learnt from St. Paul, and on the authority of witnesses who attested facts outside St. Paul's experience (cf. 1 Cor 15 [1-8]). **faithful men**, i.e. men who will respond to the trust. The faith is to be preserved by tradition, and St. Paul provides for a considerable delay of the Second Coming. There is no thought yet of a New Testament; but we may be sure that without it there would have been a rapid deterioration in the quality of the tradition.

4. affairs, i.e. businesses which provide a livelihood. Wholehearted devotion to the work of the ministry did not preclude St. Paul from following his trade, but he was not entangled by desire of gain.

5. The Christian athlete must both train and obey the rules of the arena.

6. fruits, i.e. honour and maintenance (cf. 1 Tim 5 [17] f.).

7. 'A hint not to misunderstand St. Paul as if he was preaching suffering for suffering's sake' (Parry). 'Read between the lines.' St. Paul probably hints that Timothy shrinks from claiming the Christian husbandman's right to be maintained by the Church; and, in seeking to maintain himself, is becoming involved in worldly business. That is contrary to the Lord's regulations (cf. 1 Cor 9 [14]). The time for imitating St. Paul's own refusal of maintenance was over now that the Church of Ephesus had been long established.

8. The order **Jesus Christ** lays stress on the historic life as the first thought. **of the seed of David**: perhaps a 'semi-quotation from an early form of creed' (Lock), or a familiar phrase from catechetical instruction. Ignatius uses it against the Docetists (*Eph.* 18; *Trall.* 9; *Smyrn.* 1). Cf. Rom 1 [3].

9. St. Paul's chains were the punishment of his proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles. The Jews wished to bind and restrain the word of God.

11. The phrase **faithful saying** introduces a quotation from a hymn or liturgical formula, which passes into a quotation of the Lord's words recorded in Mt 10 [33]; Lk 12 [9].

13. The fulfilment of Christ's word does not depend upon our belief, though our own blessing may do so.

14-26. Character of the Teaching and Teacher.

4. Cf. 1 Tim 6 [4]. The result of the wrong teaching is the ruin of the hearers.

15. The best witness against useless combats of words will be borne by Timothy's own example. **approved**: a metaphor from the mason's craft. God tests workman and work (cf. 1 Cor 3 [12] ff.). **ashamed**, i.e. when confronted with bad work. **handling aright**: a rare word found in LXX (Pr 3 [6]), literally 'cutting stones square to fit.'

16. profane babblings: better *the profane babblings*, i.e. of the false teachers. **they will progress**: the language is ironical. It is a case of progress backwards.

17. Hymenæus (cf. 1 Tim 1 [20]); nothing is known of him or of Philetus.

18. Probably a false conclusion from St. Paul's teaching in Rom 6 [1] ff. and similar passages.

19. foundation: the fundamental truths of Christian belief are like stones with the mason's mark (cf. 1 Cor 3 [10-12]) of teachers living good lives. The quotations are from Nu 16 [5]; Is 26 [13].

20. The great house is the Church.

21. To be a vessel unto honour, as an instrument of God's purpose, a man must clear himself from these base uses. The highest motive for holiness is the desire to be of use to the Divine Master.

22. Youthful desires include impatience and self-assertion as well as sensual passions. It is not necessarily implied that Timothy himself is young. For call cf. Rom 10 [12-14]. Sensual temptations should be avoided by flight. Righteousness, faith, etc., are ideals to be ever pursued, though we never quite come up with them. Their pursuit is a corporate task; we must pursue in union with others.

23. foolish, i.e. bringing no light for the matter in hand. **ignorant**: 'a very shrewd hit at a half-educated mind untrained to see the real points at issue' (Parry).

Many theological questions raised are 'foolish,' since we ought to see that reliable answers are unattainable; and many are 'ignorant,' since error is involved in the very statement of them.

24. **Lord** without the article lays stress on that character of Jesus as a Teacher which is described in the words following. The qualities demanded are given in the order in which they are required. First comes teaching, then patience under opposition, then meekness in dealing with the objections urged.

26. They have been out of their senses in a snare of the devil, but are captured unto life by the Lord's servant in fulfilment of God's will (cf. Lk 5 [10]). This probably gives the meaning correctly. It is, however, possible that both the pronouns refer to the Lord's servant.

III. 1-9. **Critical Times bring Special Danger.**

2. A list of sins, perhaps drawn from some apocalyptic writing. Self takes the place of God, and all sense of duty to God and man disappears For **unthankful** cf. Rom 1 [21].

3. **implacable** when offended.

5. They have the externals of religion only. These are but a shell; their only value lies in that by which they are filled. If the character itself does not correspond, the power of religion is denied.

6. They find proselytes among unstable women, caricatures of true womanhood. Note St. Paul's contempt for those teachers who shrink from dealing with men and appeal to the weaknesses of women.

7. There is endless 'interest' in religion and discussion of it, but no real decision or attainment of truth. The reason is that the heart is wrong; there is no willingness to make the moral efforts which the truth requires. This is what the next verse brings out. The faith tests us. If the heart is wrong, we either fail to gain faith, or fail to keep it.

8. For references to this incident in apocryphal books see M. R. James, *Apoc. N.T.*, 101, 178, 465. For other NT references to apocryphal books see 2 Cor 11 [14] and Jude [6, 9, 14].

9. Christian faith is rational; no intellectual victory is ever won over it. Thus the different forms of attack are transitory; they are ever passing away and giving place to others.

10-14. **Timothy Encouraged to Endure.**

10. 'My teaching of you, my training of you, my suggestion of tasks for you to perform' (Lock).

11. Is this pride? St. Paul has been called self-conscious, but this is a private letter. In the trials that Timothy will have to bear, St. Paul would encourage him to follow his own example, and so to share God's unfailing support.

12. Cf. 1 Th 3 [4]; Ac 14 [22]. A reminiscence of Mt 5 [10, 11] or some similar saying.

13. Where truth and simplicity are absent, self-deception and the deception of others go hand in hand: cf. R. Browning, *Mr. Sludge the Medium*.

14. The condition of stability and progress is faithfulness to the truths of which we have really been assured; and a great ground of assurance is the character and capacity of those who have taught them to us. Our modern neglect of Scripture not only deprives us of its teaching, but of our knowledge of the character of those upon whose witness the faith has rested.

15-17. **The Uses of Holy Scripture.**

15. A reference to the Old Testament, with a possible contrast in mind with the unwritten myths of false teachers. Note the importance of the words 'faith which is in Christ Jesus.' The Scriptures will illuminate to salvation by leading to Christ and finding their true meaning in Him (cf. Jn 5 [39, 40]; 2 Cor 3 [14]).

16. **reproof**, i.e. refutation of false teaching. **correction**, i.e. 'setting upright on their moral feet' (Lock).

17. The man trained in God's school fit for his task and fully equipped. St. Paul would no doubt have approved of the study of Scripture by all; but it is study by the 'man of God' (cf. 1 Tim 6 [11]), with a view to his duties, that is here in view. Without a knowledge of Scripture his work cannot be done.

IV. **Final Exhortation.**

1. I assert solemnly.

2. 'Five short, sharp military words of command.' **in season, out of season:** either (*a*) do not think of your own convenience, or (*b*) do not wait in dealing with others for what appears to be a convenient season. The latter suits the context best. St. Paul again says that reproof and exhortation must rest upon definite teaching.

3. Wholesome teaching as contrasted with that of a confused crowd of teachers who tickle the ears. The sooner the effort to evangelize takes place the better. Men's willingness to listen generally decreases rather than increases; and, if we fail in our duty, those who might have listened will turn to others. The vast number of strange teachers to whom people listen to-day is largely the result of the Church's neglect of evangelization.

4. **fables**: better *the myths*. The language is half-contemptuous—'those myths of which they are so proud.'

5. **sober**, as an athlete is self-controlled. **evangelist**: perhaps a special title (cf. Ac 21 [8]; Eph 4 [11]). Thou hast a Gospel to teach; carry out thy task of service to the end.

6. The great motive for earnestness in the young is that those to whom they look up will pass away, and that the young must be fitted to take their places. **offered**: the metaphor rests on the Jewish belief in the sacrificial value of a martyr's death. Note RVm. Wine was poured over a victim before it was killed (Nu 28 [7]). **my departure**: lit. 'loosing'; the soldier is ready to strike his tent.

7. 'A true pride in true achievement in the power given by Christ' (Lock): the metaphors are drawn from the arena. **the faith in Jesus** (cf. Rev 14 [12]), or 'my faith': I have been true to my promises. It is interesting to compare these verses with Tennyson's *Crossing the Bar* and Browning's *Epilogue* in *Asolando*. St. Paul's outlook on the future is as much more assured as his struggle has been more heroic, and his faith more strongly held and retained.

8. The victor's crown is either that won by righteousness, or that which consists in perfect eternal righteousness (cf. Job 33 [26]). It is parallel to the crown of life (Jas 1 [12]; 1 P 5 [4]; Rev 2 [10]). All these sayings may perhaps be based on some unwritten saying of the Lord. **appearing**: a favourite word in these epistles (cf. 2 Th 2 [8]). St. Paul, unlike Tennyson and Browning, looks beyond death and the intermediate state to the Lord's Second Coming.

9-18. **Personal matters; appeal to Timothy to join him quickly.** On his journey he was accompanied part of the way by Demas, Crescens, Titus, Tychicus, and Luke: only Luke still remains.

10. Demas was with St. Paul in his first imprisonment (Col 4 [10]; Phm [24]); in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* he is represented as a jealous and treacherous companion. Business rather than fear seems to have been the motive for his desertion. Lightfoot suggests that he was a native of Thessalonica. **Galatia** may be either the Asiatic province of that name, or Gaul, which was sometimes spoken of as Galatia. If St. Paul was thus interested in Churches west of Rome, it would support the theory of a visit to Spain.

11. St. Mark was with St. Paul in the first imprisonment (Col 4 [10]); he was needed for personal service, possibly in the place of Tychicus (Ac 20 [4]; Eph 6 [21]; Col 4 [7]).

13. **cloke**: probably for winter wear. Possibly the word translated **books** means 'bookwrap' for the papyrus letters of his correspondence and the OT rolls, of which he goes on to speak.

14. Nothing is known of Alexander, but the words seem to imply that he lived at Ephesus (cf. 1 Tim 1 [20]).

15. **our words**, i.e. preaching and teaching.

16. **first defence**: either the first stage in the present trial, or (more probably) the trial which closed the earlier imprisonment at Rome. In this case [17] will refer to the preaching after his acquittal. The words cannot refer to an audience at the first trial, since criminal trials were not public (Mommsen). **mouth of the lion**: either a proverbial phrase for extreme danger (Ps 22 [21]), or a veiled reference to Nero. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii, 6, 10, where 'the lion is dead' is a reference to Tiberius.

17. St. Paul recognizes that the divine support has a wider purpose than individual blessing. The individual is supported for the work that he is to do for the body.

18. **will deliver**: possibly a reference to the Lord's Prayer; but the many coincidences of phrase which Lock points out between this passage and Ps 22 make the theory attractive that St. Paul, like his Master, had been using the psalm in his trial hour.

19-22. **Greetings and Blessing.**

19. Prisca and Aquila (cf. Ac 18 [2, 18]; Rom 16 [3]; 1 Cor 16 [19]).

20. Erastus (cf. Rom 16 [23]; Ac 19 [22] ?); Trophimus (cf. Ac 20 [4], 21 [29]).

21. A mention of members of the Roman Church, probably not of sufficient standing to support him in court. Linus may have been the future bishop (Iren., *Hær.*, iii, 3).

22. A unique blessing, perhaps in St. Paul's own handwriting.

TITUS

Historical Situation.—Crete, 'the island of a hundred cities,' sometime a centre of civilization when the city of Cnossus now revealed to the explorer was the magnificent capital of Mycenian civilization, had sunk into a backward and barbarous condition. Its inhabitants were despised as 'liars and mischievous brutes and idle gluttons' (1 [12]), and St. Paul says that they need 'sharp rebuke' because such accusations are true. We do not know

for certain that he founded their Church, but he had laboured there; and the fact remains that the fruit of his ministry and that of Titus enabled that Church, as Brown says truly, 'to weather the storms of time, and not to succumb even to centuries of Mohammedan persecution. The Mohammedans have now left it; and the population, though illiterate, is Christian. The Cathedral Church of Candia is dedicated to the memory of St. Titus.' The personal references in this letter are few, and the tone of the opening address, written as man to man, expresses the confidence of the Apostle in Titus as his delegate.

I. 1-4. **Greeting.**

1. **servant of God**: only here in St. Paul's salutations; cf. Phil 1 [1], 'servants of Christ.' Parry notes that AV and RV ignore the absence of the article throughout the clause. He translates: 'An Apostle (i.e. commissioned agent) to secure faith and apprehension of truth about religion in God's elect.' The Jewish nation was charged with a message for the world (cf. Is 42 [1-7]). The Christian Church is chosen to carry on the task. The term 'elect,' like the term 'called,' is applied by St. Paul to all Christians, not to one class among them.

2. **who cannot lie**: contrast [12]. Hope with St. Paul rests upon God's promise; there is in it no element of uncertainty. God's eternal purpose is His eternal promise.

4. **after a common faith**: the epithet hints at Titus's Gentile origin (cf. Jude [3]). The length of the greeting, and the terms in which it is couched, express St. Paul's confidence in the character of Titus and his ability to cope with a difficult situation. The subtle difference in the tone of his writing to Titus and Timothy would not occur to the mind of an imitator. The character of Titus was stronger than that of Timothy, and the personal warnings given to the latter are absent.

5-16. **His duties in Crete**—to correct defects and to appoint elders, with attention to their character because of disorderly self-appointed teachers.

5. **For this cause.** Zahn suggests that he is answering a letter from Titus about his difficulties.

6. The character of the home life is all-important. If there are children, they must be Christians. 'Qui liberos non potuit ad fidem perducere, quomodo alios perducet?' (Bengel). Scandals in the families of the clergy do great harm.

7. **For the ruling elder (bishop) is a steward of God**: elder is his title, oversight his function (cf. Introd., pp. 577, 578). It is the relation to God which makes the moral demand. **self-willed**: better *arrogant*. The word implies indifference to the feelings of others. The priest must not be a man who always wants his own way.

8. **a lover of good**: here only. The phrase should be understood in the widest sense. He must love good wherever he finds it, and whatever form it takes. Narrow sympathies are fatal. Philo (*de vit. M.* ii, 2) ranks this characteristic among the virtues of a lawgiver. **just, holy**: not in 1 Tim. Duty to man goes with duty to God. **temperate**: here only in the NT.

9. **holding to**: perhaps 'busying himself with.' Parry quotes *Tebt. Pap.* xli, 25 (117 B.C.), 'that we may be able to attend to the collection.' But for the AV translation cf. Mt 6 [24]. The bishop carefully adheres to, and guards, the Gospel.

10. **unruly**: disloyal, self-appointed teachers. **vain talkers**, i.e. without Christian aims. **deceivers**, i.e. self-deceivers (cf. Gal 6 [3]). There were many Jews in Crete (Josephus, *Ant.* XVII, xii, 1; *B.J.* II, vii, 1). It was natural that Jewish Christians should be prominent in the new Church and take their own line. The false teaching dealt with in the Pastorals was mainly of Jewish origin; but, as this verse shows, not confined to Jews.

11. **must be stopped.** The best method is that of [9]. Men should be so convinced of the truth that they no longer desire to open their mouths against it. But St. Paul probably contemplates disciplinary action also. **filthy lucre**: better *base gain*. Stern discipline is only right when the objects of it are morally as well as intellectually at fault (cf. Ezek 13 [19]).

12. **prophet.** The verse is attributed to Epimenides, one of the seven wise men who predicted the failure of the Persian invasion of Greece. It was well known for the syllogistic puzzle which it contained; otherwise St. Paul would hardly have heard of it. But the dialect is Attic, not Cretan. Callimachus (300-240 B.C.) quotes the first half in a hymn to Zeus, and applies it to the Cretan legend about the tomb of Zeus in the island.

13. **sharply**: without parley or qualification. Moral defects have made their lives unwholesome. **the faith**: their loyalty to Christ.

14. 'It would appear that these alien teachers claimed to put their theories on a religious basis, and asserted for the instructed a superiority to what they called

a conventional morality; they employed "Jewish fable," and had a code of their own' (Parry). What the commandments were may be seen from 1 Tim 4 [3] (cf. Col 2 [16, 21, 22]). St. Paul may have known our Lord's application of Is 29 [13] (Mt 15 [9]).

15. To the pure all things are pure. This was a commonplace of popular theory both among Gentiles and Hellenistic Jews; von Soden suggests that it was perhaps a saying of the Lord Himself (cf. Lk 11 [41]). The meaning is that all things are pure for the use of the pure. It is inward character which makes external things what they are to us (cf. Mt 15 [11]; Lk 11 [41]; 1 Tim 4 [4, 5] and notes there). But on the lips of those whose mind and conscience were perverted the commonplace was misleading.

16. Their conduct does not correspond to their creed. **deny him**: renounce allegiance to Him as St. Peter did to his Master. **reprobate**: rejected after trial (cf. Rom 1 [28]; 1 Cor 9 [27]).

II. 1-III. 11. **Advice for Various Classes.**

II. **1.** Give them wholesome instruction on family life.

2. temperate (1 Tim 3 [2]). Intemperance is a special temptation to some old men, because they have so few pleasures.

3. reverent in demeanour: better *reverend*, which is perhaps what the Revisers meant to say. St. Paul shows great knowledge of the temptations of different ages and classes. The Cretans had a reputation for drunkenness.

4. The necessary teaching for Christian married women is best given by old Christian women.

5. kind, i.e. to their servants. The credit of the Gospel is still foremost in St. Paul's mind. The conduct of Christian wives would have much influence.

6. The young must practise self-control. They tend to be wanting in balance.

7. Titus is to be their example both in conduct and as a teacher, by purity of motive (cf. 1 [11]) and dignity of utterance. This verse (with [8] and 2 [12]) supplies the substance of the questions put to those to be consecrated as Bishops in the English Ordinal.

9-10. Practical instruction to servants always appears when St. Paul speaks of family life. He puts the highest motive before all. **purloining**: a reference to the petty thefts so easy to servants—the 'picking' of the Church Catechism. **adorn**: 'Quo vilior conditio servorum, eo pulchrius describitur eorum pietas.'

11-14. The reason for this appeal—the enabling grace of God.

11. appeared: cf. 3 [4]; Lk 1 [79]. Christ came to our aid. **bringing salvation**: 'ut ipsum nomen Jesu indicat' (Bengel).

12. The Lord's character and acts are an education in themselves. 'The final cause of the revelation in Christ is not creed but character' (J. H. Bernard). **denying** probably refers to the baptismal promise. **worldly**: here only in the NT with this meaning (cf. 1 Jn 2 [16] f.). **soberly**: duty to ourselves; **righteously**: duty to others; **godly**: duty to God. Cf. the General Confession, the Form for Adult Baptism, and the Consecration of Bishops.

13. 'The strength in which the Christian life is to be lived is the grace revealed in the First Advent . . . the hope to which it presses is the glory of the Second Advent' (J. H. Bernard). Do the last words of this verse refer to two Persons or one? Probably to one, and that one Jesus Christ, as the Greek Fathers suppose (cf. Rom 9 [5]). So also Lock, for (*a*) This is the natural (though not necessary) construction of two substantives after one article, and the relative clause 'who gave' seems to require a second article with 'Saviour,' if that refers to a separate person. (*b*) The purpose in [14] 'that he might redeem' is attributed to Jehovah in the OT, but here to Jesus Christ: so that it is natural that Jesus Christ should be identified with Him in the composite phrase of the previous verse. (*c*) There is possibly an intentional contrast with the Roman Emperor, or with objects of worship in the mysteries. Ptolemy I was called 'saviour and god.' So Osiris was called 'lord and saviour' in the Isis mystery. (*d*) In Jewish apocalyptic there is sometimes an anticipation of a manifestation of Jehovah, sometimes of that of a Messiah, but not of both. Parry prefers Hort's interpretation, taking 'the glory' as in apposition to 'Christ Jesus,' and rendering 'the appearing of him who is the glory of the great God and our Saviour.' In 2 Cor 4 [4] Christ is called 'the image of God' whose glory ([6]) is personified in Christ. **the great God**: the epithet is often found in the Old Testament (Ex 18 [11]; Dt 10 [17], etc.).

14. redeem 'implies release and the purchase of those released' (Hort). Ezek 37 [23] speaks of cleansing after rescue, and **for his own possession** is added from Ex 19 [5] and other places. The LXX seems to have coined the word *periousion*, 'for one's own private possession.' The two purposes of the Atonement should be noticed; we tend to forget the second.

15. speak looks back to [1]; **exhort** to [6], 1 [9]; **reprove with all authority** to 1 [9, 13].

There is great stress upon authority in the Pastorals. The Christian preacher does not just make suggestions to be taken or left; he speaks in the name of God.

III. 1-8. **Christian Citizenship.**—'The keynote of the chapter is usefulness' (Lock).

1. Christian liberty must not be abused. The Cretans were notorious for sedition. **every good work** includes civic and municipal duties.

2. Lock quotes Aristotle's definition of gentleness: 'It is the indulgent consideration of human infirmities.'

3. Christian grace is to remove barriers set up between classes, nations, and races. The thought of our own past should inspire both patience and hope for others. **divers**: cf. 2 Tim 3 [6]. 'Insigne epitheton. Varietas delectat' (Bengel).

4. **God**, i.e. the Father.

5. Cf. Dt 9 [5]; Ps 109 [26]. We did not deserve it, but **according to his characteristic mercy** ('his' is emphatic) **he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.** The two phrases probably refer to baptism and the laying on of hands, which in the early Church normally took place at the same time. Here only in the NT is the word 'regeneration' used of spiritual birth. In Mt 19 [28] it has another sense. But cf. 1 P 1 [3. 23]—'begat us again,' 'begotten again'—both perhaps suggested by the Lord's saying afterwards recorded in Jn 3 [3-5]. **renewing**: elsewhere in St. Paul of daily renewal (Rom 12 [2]); but 'newness of life' (Rom 6 [4]) begins at baptism.

6. **poured**: Ac 2 [17] (Jl 2 [28]), [33], 10 [45].

7. **justified**: 'at the start of the Christian life . . . with the hope that it (the life) will become richer and fuller' (Lock).

8. The 'saying' is contained in [5-7]. **maintain**: the technical use of the word is that of standing before a shop as a tradesman selling his goods. Here the application may be either literal, 'to profess honest occupations' (RVm), or metaphorical, 'to make a business of all that is excellent' (Lock).

9-11. **False Teaching.**

9. For **questionings** cf. 1 Tim 6 [4]; 2 Tim 2 [23]; for **genealogies** 1 Tim 1 [4].

10. **heretical**, i.e. making divisions, factions (RVm). **admonition** may be either by private appeal (cf. Ac 20 [31]), or by public censure (2 Th 3 [15]; 1 Tim 1 [20]). There may be an allusion to our Lord's command (Mt 18 [15-17]).

11. **perverted**: lit. 'turned inside out,' 'completely changed from his true Christian character' (Parry). **sinneth**: by breaking up the brotherhood. **self-condemned**: by refusing to listen to warnings. The word is coined by St. Paul (cf. 1 Tim 4 [2]). Here again severity is justified by the moral obliquity, not by the mere errors, of those condemned.

12-15. **Final Message and Greetings.**

12. **Artemas**: probably a contraction of Artemidorus, according to tradition one of the Seventy and Bishop of Lystra. He or Tychicus (2 Tim 4 [12]) is to take Titus's place as apostolic commissioner in Crete. **Nicopolis**, probably in Epirus, though there were cities of this name both in Thrace and in Cilicia. Ramsay (*H.D.B.*) thinks that St. Paul meant to make it a centre for evangelization in Epirus and Acarnania, and was arrested there. At the moment he was at liberty.

13. **Zenas**, according to tradition Bishop of Diospolis and author of an apocryphal *Acts of Titus*, probably a Jewish teacher of the Law. **Apollos** (cf. Ac 18 [24], 19 [1]; 1 Cor 1 [12] ff., which tells of him at Ephesus). Probably they brought the letter on their way through Crete.

14. Titus's helpfulness to them is to be an example to 'our friends.' A comparison of 1 Th 4 [12] and Eph 4 [28] with this place is very suggestive as to the gradual deepening of Christian motives, the desire of independence, the willingness to help individuals, the desire to be a useful member of society' (Lock).

15. **with me**: as my travelling companions. **in faith**: in loyalty to Christ (1 [4]; 1 Tim 1 [2]). The final prayer includes the disloyal.

Bibliography

Among other recent commentaries may be mentioned: E. F. Brown, *Westminster Commentaries*, London, 1917; R. St. J. Parry, Cambridge University Press, 1920; W. Lock, *International Critical Commentary*, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1924; M. Dibelius in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum N.T.*, Tübingen, 1913. Reference should also be made to P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, Oxford, 1921; and to R. A. Falconer in *D.A.C.*, article 'Timothy and Titus' Epistles.'

For Philemon see p. 565 f.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

By S. C. Gayford

(1) **The Title** in the best MSS. is simply 'To the Hebrews.' This was no part of the original letter: it was added as a heading when the letter came into general circulation. It may be derived from an early tradition, or merely by inference from the contents. In spite of recent criticism it is fairly certain that the letter was written for Hebrew Christians. Where they were living is uncertain. 2^3 suggests that it could not have been Jerusalem or Palestine where some contemporaries of Timothy (13^{23}) might have heard the Lord Himself; 13^{24}, 'They of Italy salute you,' seems to point to the letter as written either from Rome or from abroad to Christians in Rome. The latter alternative becomes the more probable when we find that Clement of Rome (*c.* A.D. 95) was familiar with the epistle, and even quotes its actual words. The 'Hebrews' form a distinct community; they are not isolated individuals scattered about in a larger group. They have had their own peculiar history and experiences (12^4), and have their own present conditions and connexions (6^{12}, $13^{19, 23}$). The writer treats them as a cultured audience, able to rise above the 'milk' of elementary Christian teaching to the 'strong meat' of more recondite doctrine (5^{12}). It is possible that they formed a 'house-church' or group of house-churches in some larger Christian Church such as that of Rome.

(2) **Authorship.**—The author regards himself as belonging to the same community as the Hebrews, though separated at the time from them (2^3, 13^{19}). His great interest in the details of the Law, and especially the regulations of sacrifice, make it almost certain that he was a Jew, and probable that he was of a priestly family or connexion. If a Jew, he was a Hellenistic Jew and highly educated. The arrangement of his argument is in the best rhetorical style of the day; his Greek in language, grammar, and syntax is the best in the New Testament, and he shows the influence of Alexandria, the headquarters of Hellenism. He uses the Greek (Alexandrian) canon and text (the LXX) of the Old Testament, and his choice of words and phrases exhibits numerous and remarkable points of affinity with Philo, the Alexandrian Jew, who wedded Jewish theology to Greek philosophy. There is no strong evidence, however, to show that he had assimilated and accepted the ideas of Philo. His treatment of the Old Testament is different. To him the persons and institutions of the Old Testament are *types*, rudimentary and imperfect anticipations, prefiguring and promising the higher fulfilments of the new covenant. This is different from the allegorical method of Philo (Westcott, *Hebrews*, 200). One of the central ideas of the epistle—the distinction between the heavenly and spiritual, which is the real and eternal world, and this material world, the copy and shadow of the heavenly realities—looks at first as if derived from Platonism, the home of which at the time was Alexandria. But there are marked differences (see on 8^5), and it is doubtful whether more can be proved than the popular influence of Alexandrian Platonism upon the cultured thought of the day. The same applies to the writer's use of the Aristotelian term 'hypostasis' (1^3, 11^1). There has been perhaps a tendency to overrate the Alexandrian influence on the epistle in the interest of locating the author in Alexandria. If he was familiar with the writings of Philo and the Alexandrian teaching, he was of too original and independent a mind to go very far in adopting them. Apart from these facts and inferences all is guesswork. The nearest approach to a 'tradition' is one quoted by Tertullian as current in North Africa at the close of the 2nd century ascribing the epistle to Barnabas. In the first three centuries the Eastern Church generally—probably in order to justify its inclusion in the canon—attributed it to St Paul, while the Westerns denied the Pauline authorship, and on that account disputed its right to a place there. It was only after the 4th century that the Latin Western Church accepted the Pauline authorship. From that time it was quoted generally as the 'Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews.' At the Reformation the Pauline authorship was at first again disputed. But after a time it came back into general acceptance, and so remained until the 19th century. To-day, however, it is almost universally regarded on the grounds of style and of subject-matter as very improbable. On the positive side there have been many conjectures. Luther's suggestion of Apollos has been widely favoured. Other suggestions are: Luke (on the ground of style),

Prisca the wife of Aquila (Harnack), and Philip the evangelist (Ramsay).

(3) **Date.**—8 [4] has been taken to imply that the Temple was still standing and its worship going on, and 10 [32-34] as a reference to the Neronian persecution. If this were the case, the epistle could be dated between 64 (the persecution) and 70 (the fall of Jerusalem). But 10 [33-34] is too mild for a reference to Nero's tortures of the Christians, and 12 [4] could not have been written to those who had gone through that persecution. The references to the worship of the old covenant as continuing still (8 [4], 9 [6, 9], 10 [1] ff., 13 [10]) provides a surer clue. It is true that other writers (e.g. Josephus) also speak of the sacrifices in the present tense after the destruction of the Temple, but our writer had a very special interest in pointing to the fact of their cessation if they had ceased. Had the Temple been destroyed, and the old worship brought to an end with no hope of revival, he would have had to hand so obvious and complete a vindication of his root principle that the old covenant was doomed to disappear and be merged in the new order, that it is inconceivable he should not have made use of it in the epistle, still less that he should have talked as if the Jewish cultus were still in operation. Other allusions to the time of writing are: (*a*) 2 [3], 12 [4], 13 [7] point to a date when the first converts had passed away and a second generation of Christians was coming on; (*b*) 13 [23] shows that Timothy was still alive. These indications all agree in placing the date of the epistle not later than 70 (earlier than 64, if written to Rome), but not earlier than about 55-60. In any case it is certainly earlier than the letter of Clement of Rome (A.D. 95).

(4) **Contents and Purpose.**—The 'Hebrews' were in danger of drifting (2 [1], 13 [9]) into apostasy. The fact of apostasy and its terrible consequences more occupy the writer's mind than the form of religion to which they were attracted. This seems to be some novel form of Judaism (13 [9-13]). Their case was different from that of the Galatians who were Gentiles and tempted to graft Judaism on to Christianity, for they were Jews tempted to relapse from Christianity altogether (3 [12], 6 [4-8], 10 [29], 12 [25]). That it was some form of Judaism that attracted them is shown by the elaborate pains the author takes to prove the superiority of the new covenant to the old. Not only is it the final fulfilment of all that the old could exhibit only in figure and promise and shadow; it embodies also the final and perfect religion. It is God's last word in revelation, and is mediated and guaranteed by One who is no less than the Son of God, Himself the very God (1 [2, 3, 10-12]), higher than the angels (1 [4-14]), who handed the Law to Moses, greater than Moses (3-4), and, chiefest of all, Priest of an order above that of Aaron with a sacrifice fulfilling the true demands of sacrifice and securing all its blessings to men. Woe then to any who having been admitted to this covenant and tasted its blessings should deliberately turn away from it. Suffering and humiliation had a necessary place in the victory of the Incarnate Son over death (2, 12 [2]), and in His preparation for the priesthood (2 [17, 18], 4 [15], 5 [7-10]). Let us therefore be ready to endure as He did whatever may come upon us, and not be tempted by any worldly advantage to desert this glorious faith in Him (11-13). God Himself can do no more for us than He has done. The issue now rests with us, and if we reject this final offer, what further can we hope for? It is this line of thought which prompts the solemn, warnings repeated in 2 [1-4], 4 [1-13], 6 [4-8], 10 [26-31], 12 [15-17]. For the teaching on priesthood and sacrifice (5-10), which is the central theme of the epistle, see next section. The epistle has no opening address, but closes in the regular epistolary form on a personal note (news and greetings) and a final blessing.

(5) **Teaching of the Epistle**—(*a*) *Covenant, Priesthood, and Sacrifice.*—For the general idea of the covenant see on Gen 9 [8-17], 15, 17, and Ex 24 [1-11]. The idea of a solemn contract between man and man in which each party made a formal promise to the other was adopted into the religion of Israel to explain how the relationship between Jehovah and His people originated. But it was adopted with a notable difference arising from the different relations between the contracting parties. In human contracts both parties might be equals: here One is the superior and Lord. So the terms of the covenant were imposed upon the people by God. His own side of the contract was the *promise*: under the old covenant it was 'the promise of entering into his rest' (4 [1]), which took up and renewed the original promise to the patriarchs that they should possess the Promised Land (11 [13-16]). The full meaning of the promise 'to enter into his rest' is reached only when it is seen to point forward to the citizenship of the heavenly land, and an endless fellowship with God unbroken by sin.

Israel's side of the contract consisted in the vow of obedience to the commands of God. He was to be their Ruler and they His people. For this they were 'separated' from the rest of mankind and 'set apart' to the service of Jehovah. The 'separation' took the form of a 'cleansing' from all defilements of previous heathenism, and the 'setting apart' was a solemn 'consecration' or 'sanctifying,' making them a peculiar people 'holy to the Lord.' The 'cleansing' and 'consecration' were both effected by the blood of the inaugural covenant sacrifice described in Ex 24 [4-8]: see 9 [18-21]. The 'mediator' between the two contracting parties was Moses (9 [19]). But under this covenant there was no provision of grace such as men needed to fulfil their promises (7 [19]: cf. Rom 8 [3]). Its sacrifices could not avail to remove past sins, still less to supply grace for help in future need. So the covenant with its law, its priesthood and sacrifices failed to rear up a people who could claim the promised rest because they had fulfilled their side of the contract. Israel was unfaithful, and their punishment culminated in the Exile. But at the hour of an apparent breakdown of hope came a message from God through the great prophets of the Exile—Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the unknown prophet of Is 40-55—that they should be restored to their land, and He would make with them a new covenant in which the past would be forgiven and a gift of grace would help them to know the Lord and obey Him with a new heart. This promise our writer, following the example of St. Paul (2 Cor 3 [6]) and of the Lord Himself (1 Cor 11 [25]), sees fulfilled in the Christian dispensation (8 [7-13]).

Fellowship with God ('to draw nigh' to Him) is the object of all covenants between God and man. On the side of man that fellowship is expressed supremely in worship. Reverent adoration is the right and natural attitude of the creature in the presence of the Creator; and in the ancient world worship took the form of offering sacrifice. In the Old Testament 'to draw near' is used of coming to offer sacrifice. So the covenant was inaugurated by a sacrifice, and under the covenant the Law ordained and provided sacrifices, a sanctuary, and a priesthood (7 [11-14], 9 [1-7]), all of them ineffectual in themselves, but typical of higher and better realities, 'a shadow of the good things to come' (8 [5], 10 [1]). Even in Jeremiah's day the old covenant was 'nigh unto vanishing away' (8 [13]). But though under sentence of abolition it was still in being when the epistle was written, and the writer contemplates its continuance until the Second Coming of the Lord. So for the time being the two covenants were working side by side. This seems to contradict our author's principles (8 [4]), but the contradiction is apparent only. In reality the two orders operate in different worlds. The old order is 'carnal,' i.e. belonging to the material world of sense. The new order belongs to heaven, the realm of spiritual realities which is neither far off nor merely future, but around us here and now, though shut off by the 'veil' (10 [19] ff.). With the Second Coming—and it is near at hand (10 [36] ff.)—the first covenant with its law and priesthood and sacrifices will be removed (12 [27]), while 'the things that cannot be shaken,' 'Mount Zion,' 'the city of the living God,' 'the city that hath the foundations, will 'remain.' In this world, then, and already now, Christians are citizens of the heavenly kingdom and worshippers in the heavenly sanctuary. But withal they are still in the world and subject to its conditions, called upon to endure persecution, affliction, and temptation, and under probation with the possibility of falling away and losing for ever the promised land. So 'the city' is at once a present reality and a city 'which is to come' (13 [14]).

The priesthood of Jesus under this new covenant is of an entirely different order from that of the old. He is not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah: a Priest not after the order of Aaron, but 'after the order of Melchizedek,' a greater than Levi, since to Him Levi's forefather Abraham did homage (7 [4-10]). His appointment in contrast with that of Aaron rests upon a divine oath (7 [20]). And lastly, while the Aaronic priesthood was transmitted in succession from generation to generation, His belongs to Him alone, yet is nevertheless an eternal priesthood because His is an 'endless life' (*ib.* [16, 24]).

(*b*) *Melchizedek and his Priesthood.*—The figure of the king of Salem and 'Priest of the Most High God' (Gen 14 [18] ff.) had been taken up in Ps 110 as a type of one who combined in His own person the two Messianic offices of priesthood and kingship. This combination became a historical fact after the Exile, and some stately figure such as Simon (Ecclus 50 [1-21]) may have suggested the idea in Ps 110. This Psalm, which stands alone in pre-Christian Jewish thought in its treatment of Melchizedek, adds to Gen 14 a new idea, 'a priest for ever.'

It is possible that this idea was not connected with Melchizedek: in the Psalmist's mind the two thoughts, a priest-king (like Melchizedek), and a priest for ever, may have been distinct and separate. If this was so, the writer of our epistle was the first to discover in Gen 14 allusions to an eternal priesthood. To him Melchizedek, the mysterious figure appearing upon the scene for a brief moment out of the darkness into which he retires again, a priest without ancestry or descendants, is marked out by Scripture as the type of a 'priest for ever,' like unto the Son of God, 'having neither beginning of days nor end of life,' at once a King sitting upon His throne (1 [3], 8 [1], 10 [12]), and a Priest ministering in the heavenly sanctuary (8 [2], 9 [11, 12, 24, 25], 10 [21]). The earthly life of Jesus was the time of His probation when He was being made 'perfect through sufferings' (2 [10]). At its close (i.e. at the Ascension) He received His reward, was 'crowned with glory and honour' (2 [9]), and took His seat upon His kingly throne (1 [3], 10 [12]). This earthly life was also the time of His training for the priesthood. In it he 'learned' obedience towards God (5 [8]) and sympathy with man (2 [17, 18], 4 [15]), the two supreme qualifications for a perfect Priest, and having been 'made perfect' in these qualities He was 'proclaimed' of God 'a High Priest' (5 [9, 10]). It is now generally agreed that according to this epistle (i) our Lord entered upon His priesthood after the order of Melchizedek at the Ascension, and that (ii) the scene of its exercise is the heavenly sanctuary. But commentators have long been divided on the relation of the death upon the Cross to the priestly work. The desire to see in our Lord's death a *priestly* act, and the recognition that the Melchizedekian priesthood belongs to the ascended life have led some writers (e.g. among moderns Westcott and Bruce) to ascribe to our Lord a quasi-Aaronic priesthood upon earth as well as a Melchizedekian priesthood in heaven. There is no evidence for this double priesthood in the epistle, and indeed 7 [11] ff., 8 [3, 4] seem directly to contradict it. The priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, which is the fulfilment, the antitype, of the Aaronic priesthood, is the only order to which our Lord is said to belong.

To understand what the epistle says of the functions of this priesthood and our Lord's exercise of them we must go back, as our writer does, to the Levitical sacrifices which were the 'copy and shadow' of the heavenly pattern. The ceremonial of the old sacrifices turned upon three main actions: (1) the slaughtering of the victim; (2) the 'offering' of the blood upon the altar; (3) the 'offering' of the body. The first of these was not normally the work of the priest but of the sacrificer (see Lev 1 [5] and note). The priest's work proper was the 'presenting' or 'offering' of the blood upon the altar (or its equivalent, the mercy-seat), and the offering of the body by burning the flesh upon the altar. So sacrifice consisted of two elements: death, the symbol of supreme self-surrender, followed by the dedication to God (which is what offering means) of that which had been surrendered, the victim's body and the life (=blood) belonging to it. Of these two, the latter only (the 'offering' of body and blood) was exclusively a priestly act in the sense that it could be performed *only* by a priest. Now our writer had the ceremonial of Jewish sacrifice constantly before his mind in writing of the sacrifice of Jesus. The continual allusions show this to be the case. Familiar as he was with the old sacrifices he would not find it necessary to see in our Lord's death a *priestly* act or to think of Him as being a Priest on Calvary. It would seem to him quite natural that our Lord should enter upon the priestly part of His work at the Ascension, and that this priestly ministry should consist in the offering of Himself (of which the offering of the blood and the bodies of goats and calves was a type: 9 [12]) in the heavenly sanctuary (9 [24, 25]). Nor would these thoughts lead him to depreciate the unique importance of the crucifixion. On the Cross our Lord as Sacrificer and Victim laid down His life for us, and endured that shedding of His Blood apart from which is no remission (9 [22]). In the heavenly sanctuary as Priest and Victim He 'offers himself' for us in His ascended life. Just as the offering of the body and of the blood in the Jewish sacrifices would have had no value, even if it had been possible, without the death of the victim, so the death of Christ was indispensable for the priestly offering in heaven. His appearing 'before the face of God for us,' His 'intercession,' and His offering of Himself there would lose all its meaning and power if He had not first laid down His life on Calvary. The heavenly offering is 'an offering of life whereof to have died is an ever-present and perpetual attribute' (Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, 246). And so, to say that the death of Jesus was not a priestly act is far from saying that it did not belong to His sacrifice, or formed no

essential part of the sacrifice. The death is the source from which all the virtue of the priestly work (cleansing, sanctifying, perfecting) is derived. Our writer's mind is fixed upon the vision of the High Priest at work in the heavenly Temple, and this fact accounts for the rare occurrence (four times only: 2^{9} ff., 9^{15}, 12^{2}, 13^{12}) of direct references to the death of Jesus. But the Cross fills the background of his thoughts throughout the whole epistle. It is never forgotten or overlooked.

It would follow from the position we have now reached that where the epistle speaks of our Lord 'offering Himself,' the writer's mind is directed to the priestly offering in the heavenly sanctuary, although to the inclusion, not to the exclusion, of the Cross. This interpretation is clearly right in 9^{25}, and it throws a new light on 7^{27}, 9^{14}, and 10^{10}.

A further divergence of opinion arises here among those who are agreed up to this point. Is the offering in heaven conceived as one single act, an offering made at the time of our High Priest's entering into heaven, and then as being complete, followed by His session upon the royal throne? Or does the epistle think of it as a perpetual offering, a perpetual fact, 'the eternal presentation of a life which eternally is the life that died' (Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, 246)? The passages in favour of the offering being regarded as a single act are (1) those which speak of our Lord as sitting upon His throne (1^{3}, 8^{1}, 10^{12}). To sit is the symbol of authority for a king: the attitude of the ministering priest is (as the Hebrew word etymologically signifies) that of standing, which is 'nowhere said of Jesus in heaven'; (2) two passages speak of the offering as followed by the session: 1^{3}, 'when he had made purification of sins, sat down'; 10^{12}, 'when he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down.' These two passages (see notes) are not so conclusive in the Greek as in our English version, but it is hardly disputable that in 10^{12} at any rate the offering is conceived as finished when the priest sat down. On the other hand, in favour of a perpetual offering, it is pointed out: (1) The epistle very strongly emphasizes the truth of the eternal priesthood: 'Thou art a priest for ever.' (2) The work for which a priest is appointed is that he may 'offer gifts and sacrifices' (5^{1}, 8^{3}). A priesthood without an offering is a priesthood without its purpose and *raison d'être*, and could hardly be said to be a priesthood at all. So in 8^{3} there follow the words 'wherefore it is necessary that this high priest also have somewhat to offer,' and the next verse shows that it is of a *present* offering the writer is thinking. (3) The 'intercession' of 7^{27} and the 'appearing' for us (9^{24}) are undoubtedly ever-present facts; they cannot however be separated from the idea of 'offering himself' for us with which the latter is actually identified (9^{26}). (4) The figure of the Lord as sitting in royal dignity cannot be pressed to signify that He is not also an offering Priest. If so pressed it would be inconsistent also with the 'intercession.' Sitting is not the attitude of prayer or mediation. So $8^{1, 2}$ places side by side the two visions of our Lord (*a*) sitting as King on His throne, and (*b*) at the same time as Priest *ministering* in the sanctuary, as being both true of Him for all time. In 10^{19} ff. also we have the picture of the Priest engaged in His ministration, i.e. standing, not sitting. The epistle seems, therefore, to vary between the two conceptions. In 10^{12} and probably 1^{3} the offering is regarded as a single act completed as soon as the Lord entered the heavenly sanctuary. At other times this self-oblation is an ever-present fact, a perpetual offering. In either case it is one offering and only one, in contrast with the repeated offerings of the old covenant. See notes on $9^{24, 26}$.

(6) **The Eucharist in the Epistle.**—The mind of our author is so concentrated upon the work of our Lord in heaven that he only glances occasionally as it were at the worship of the Church upon earth. There is no direct mention of the Holy Communion; but $13^{9, 10}$ refers to it, and it cannot have been absent from the writer's thoughts when he spoke of the 'assembling of yourselves together' (10^{25}), the prime object and purpose of which was the eating of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11^{20}). The leading thought in $13^{9, 10}$ is that of being fed from the altar, i.e. of communion, the partaking of sacramental grace. But the mention of the 'altar' links this communion with the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which includes His death on the Cross and the offering of Himself in the heavenly sanctuary. The 'altar,' like the sanctuary, is 'not made with hands': it belongs to the 'heavenly things.' It is the heavenly altar or the mercy-seat on which Jesus offers Himself as the High Priest offered the blood on the Day of Atonement (9^{25}). From this altar and its sacrifice we are fed like the priests in the ordinary sin offerings of old (Lev 6^{25} ff.). The Holy Communion is therefore an integral part of the one sacrifice. But 13^{15} ff. goes on to bid the Christian unite with Jesus in the offering

of a 'sacrifice of praise' and of 'good works.' Here we have in germ the idea of a eucharistic offering, the offering of ourselves in worship and good life 'through' Christ to God; and the *through Christ* shows the unity of our offering with His. In 10 [19-25] we have the picture of a worshipping congregation with its Priest at its head, united with Him in His priestly act, i.e. the offering of Himself. So far as the Eucharist was present to the writer's mind in 10 [25], the eucharistic offering is implied. It will be noticed in both passages (10 [19] ff., 13 [15] ff.) that the parallel in the one sacrifice to this eucharistic offering of the Church on earth is the heavenly self-oblation of the ascended Christ. The 'assembling of yourselves together' reminds us that it is an earthly worship under earthly conditions. Yet this worship is one and the same with the eternal worship of the heavenly shrine. Negatively, also, this epistle has played a great part in the history of the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice. The emphasis it lays upon the sacrifice of our Lord as being made 'once for all,' and its strong assertion that by 'one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,' make impossible any theory of the eucharistic sacrifice which presents it either as a 'repetition' of Calvary or as supplementing the one offering (as if it needed further reinforcement). These are the false teachings denounced by the Anglican Articles (Art. xxxi) under the title of 'The Sacrifices of Masses.' A true conception of the eucharistic sacrifice must put it 'in one line' (if we may so say) not with what Christ did once for all on the Cross, but with what He is continually doing in heaven' (Bright, *Ancient Collects*, 144).

(7) **The Value of the Epistle to the Church To-day.**—The teaching of the heavenly priesthood, as we saw above, has a direct bearing upon Christian worship in general and eucharistic worship in particular. It offers to us the sublime vision of a worship in which earth and heaven are united: men are bidden here and now to step through the veil that separates the two and enter into fellowship with angels and saints (12 [22, 23]), and above all with the High Priest and leader of the heavenly liturgy, 'the great Priest over the house of God.' As in the Apocalypse, a door is opened into heaven and a voice bids 'Come up hither.' 'Sursum corda' might well be taken as the motto of the epistle. It is from this uplifting vision that the 'glorious interchanges' of earth and heaven in the eucharistic liturgies have sprung. Time and space are done away, and redeemed humanity on earth and in Paradise is revealed in union with its High Priest engaged in their unceasing offering. At each Eucharist on earth we step as it were into this heavenly land, and enjoy the privileges of citizenship in the city that hath the foundations.

Another treasure-house of truth is opened to us in the teaching of the epistle upon the Atonement. By the Blood, the risen life, of Him who died, the token of His victory over sin and death, the new covenant was inaugurated. By its sprinkling Christians are purified from all uncleanness and consecrated to a priesthood with right of access to the Holy of Holies, the shrine of the presence of God (10 [19] ff.: cf. 9 [14]). It is chiefly under this aspect of the covenant-relationship that the epistle considers the effect of Christ's work and suffering for us. But beyond this there is a further and final stage for the sake of which even the covenant itself was established. It is called 'perfection,' i.e. the reaching of the goal of human destiny as purposed by God. So far as Christ's work is concerned this stage, like the earlier stages, cleansing and sanctification, is already an accomplished fact: 'by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.' But so far as we are concerned it is still to come, and will not be completed till this life of probation and trial is over (12 [23]). It was so with Jesus Himself (5 [9]), and must be so with us as well. The exhortations of the epistle (e.g. 12 [1-13]) show the author's sense of his readers' liability to fall and his fear of their coming short of the grace of God.

The epistle passes by the question how the Blood of Jesus can effect this for us. It is sufficient that '*according to the law . . . all things are cleansed with blood*' (9 [22]). The Law was of divine ordinance: it is enough therefore that this was the divinely appointed means of atonement. We are sensible here of a gap in the teaching of the epistle as compared with that of St. Paul. The Apostle of the Gentiles is steeped in the truth of the believers' union with Christ. We are 'in Christ Jesus': 'Christ liveth in me.' The writer of this epistle also holds to this truth: 'Both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one' (2 [11]). The unity of mankind with Christ is the basis of the whole argument of 2, and of the assertion that the Church shares in His priesthood (10 [19] ff.): 'We are partakers

of Christ' (3 14, if that is the correct translation, rather than RVm 'with Christ'). The holy food on which we are fed from the heavenly altar (13 10) is His Body and Blood, and so it is 'through him' that we offer our sacrifice (*ib.* 15), as also it is 'through him' that God works in us (*ib.* 21). The truth 'Christ in me and I in Him' is implicit in our author's faith. But it is not as vividly or continually present to him as to St. Paul. The general theme of the epistle—the priesthood of Christ—leads to the thought of our Lord as one along with others, a brother-man, rather than as '*the* Son of Man' in whom the human race is gathered up and represented, so that already by virtue of what He is and has done God sees us as we are found in Him. Our author comes perhaps as near in 2 as anywhere to that thought. On the whole, however, the redemption wrought for us seems a work accomplished by Him externally for us rather than something accomplished within us, Christ *in* us the hope of glory. The immanence of Christ in the Church 'which is his body' is not found in the 'Hebrews.' On our side, also, while to St. Paul faith is pre-eminently the personal self-identification of the believer with Christ, here it is the assurance of the divine promises and the realization of the unseen world (11 1). In another direction, however, the epistle compensates us for this loss. Nowhere outside the Gospels is the brotherhood of Jesus with us, His fellowship with us in human nature and human experience, so clearly realized as here. Nowhere except in the Gospels is He so frequently called by His human name Jesus. To many devout Christians probably the most familiar and precious verses of the epistle are those which speak of the share He bore of human suffering and temptations. His 'prayers and supplications,' 'with strong crying and tears,' and His 'tasting of death' reveal to us a Brother 'in all things made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest' (2 9.17, 4 15, 5 7.8, 12 2). Although He is the Son of God, eternal before heaven and earth, higher than the very angels, 'over the house of God,' 'our Lord' (1 10-12, 2 3, 3 6), yet withal He is one who has suffered and been 'tempted in all points like as we,' and can therefore be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Sin is the only human experience to which He is a stranger. So He is the Saviour, able to save to the uttermost, because He is the true Priest in heart and fellow-feeling, as well as in the greatness of His Being. This is the unique dignity of His office and the unique perfection with which He has fulfilled and still fulfils its functions.

(8) **Some Difficulties of the Epistle.**—The modern reader of the epistle encounters two special difficulties which must be frankly faced.

(i) *The Writer's Attitude towards the Old Testament.*—Nowhere in the New Testament do we find so near an approach to belief in the verbal inspiration of the Old. The words of the Old Testament writers are presented as spoken by God (1 5. 6. 13, 5 5), or Christ (2 11-13, 10 5), or the Holy Spirit (3 7, 10 15). Once only, and then where the words are addressed to God, is the speaker a man (2 6); once also the Scripture is quoted as the words of a human agent, David, through whom God speaks (4 7), and in 1 1 this idea of inspiration is applied to the whole Bible. God is the speaker even where the original context shows the words to have been addressed to Him by the human writer: in 1 8.10 such words are taken as addressed by the Father to the Son. Passages in which the writer refers to himself are quoted as words of our Lord (2 13, 10 5). The general treatment of Jewish history (e.g. the use of Ps 95 in 3, 4) and religious ceremonial as typical, i.e. foreshadowing Christian truth, is not without parallels in the Gospels and epistles. The use of the story of Melchizedek (Gen 14) in 7 goes further in supplementing the silences of the Old Testament with supposed unspoken thoughts of the original writer. Because Genesis says nothing of Melchizedek's ancestors or descendants, its writer portrays him as eternal and immortal (7 3). But unlike Philo our author (1) does not forget or desert the original meaning of the passages he quotes. It is 'type,' not 'allegory' that he employs. (2) He quotes from the Old Testament only to illustrate or at the most to confirm the point on which he is dwelling, not as the source from which it is derived. Christian truth for him is derived from the teaching of the Lord and the Apostles (2 3). They and not the Old Testament are its source and guarantee. He uses 'the prophets' to corroborate or throw further light upon the revelation made in 'the Son.' The Old Testament is secondary and supplementary (Nairne, *Epistle of Priesthood*, viii). One further point. His Bible is the Greek LXX, which he uniformly follows even where it differs from and mistranslates the original (10 5). This, however, only concerns details here and there without affecting the general soundness of his argument, or the merits and demerits of

his attitude in general towards the Old Testament.

(ii) *The Teaching about Sin and Forgiveness.*—In speaking of the old covenant and the validity of its sacrifices the epistle unconsciously suggests a feature which seems to give the 'daily' repeated sacrifices an advantage over the one sacrifice of the new covenant. They met the 'daily' recurrence of sins with a 'daily' atonement, or such atonement as they had power to provide (7^{27}, 10^{3}). But does the same apply to the one sacrifice? It covered the transgressions of the past under the old covenant (9^{15}): the Blood of Christ cleansed and sanctified both the heavenly sanctuary and its worshippers (9^{23}, $10^{14, 22}$). But how does it meet the daily fact of post-baptismal sin? There are parts of the epistle which suggest that Christians once cleansed and consecrated in baptism are then expected to live henceforward the perfect life, and need no further cleansing. Such a passage especially is 10^{26-31}. The same thought appears to lie behind 6^{4-8} and 10^{1-18}. This severe attitude prompted the 'Puritans' of the early Church to refuse penance and restoration after certain sins, but the general conscience of the Catholic Church revolted against such harsh discipline. With regard to our writer it should be noticed: (1) the particular sin before his mind is apostasy; (2) the apostasy is not one that proceeds from honest change of conviction or intellectual loss of faith (6^{4}), or even from human weakness in face of persecution. It springs from unworthy motives, like Esau's despising of his birthright (12^{16}). It is a deliberate and final outrage of conscience, the outcome of a 'hardened' 'evil heart of unbelief' ($3^{12, 13}$). Such an offence is of the same character as the sin against the Holy Ghost, which is unforgivable because the hope of repentance is cut off. The writer assumes not only that the revelation and the grace are complete and final, but also that men are able completely to assimilate them. Is not this the weak point in the argument? If indeed the enlightenment were equal to the Light, the sin of apostasy would be the sin against the Holy Ghost, irremediable and irremissible. But man's capacity to receive falls ever short of the fulness of the gift offered: and therein is our hope that divine justice may find room for divine mercy. With regard to other kinds of sin there are two points to bear in mind: (1) If the one offering is a perpetually present offering, it would be perpetually available to make atonement for fresh sins. Is not this the thought in 7^{25}: 'he is able to save to the uttermost . . . seeing he ever liveth to make intercession'? And is not the same implied when the sacrifice of our High Priest is shown to be the antitype not only of the covenant-inaugurating sacrifice (Ex 24), but also of the yearly renewal of the covenant on the Day of Atonement? (see on 9^{19-21}). (2) If the one offering is one that is finished and past, nevertheless its efficacy extends indefinitely into the future to avail at least for cleansing those who in the ages to come would turn from heathenism to Christianity. Our epistle does not limit the atonement to the sins of the world up to the time of the making of the new covenant. And if it extends beyond the 'transgressions that were under the first covenant,' is there any reason to refuse it to such sins of Christians as are forgivable, i.e. where the sinner is capable of repentance? We have a High Priest who can be 'touched with the feeling of our infirmities,' and can 'bear gently with the ignorant and erring.' Such words as these must be given their due weight in considering the interpretation of the stern words of warnings. See notes on 2^{3}, 6^{4-8}, 10^{26-31}, 12^{17}.

I.-II. **The Son Greater than the Angels.**—These chapters fall into line with the rest of the book when we remember the general Jewish belief that the Law was delivered by the hands of angels to Moses (Ac 7^{53}; Gal 3^{19}). A probable allusion to this is found in 2^{3}: 'the word spoken by angels.' The reason for its choice by the Church as the epistle for Christmas Day is obvious.

1. **1. the fathers,** i.e. the saints of the old covenant. **by divers portions**: 'in many portions': no prophet was entrusted with the whole of the truth as it was revealed in the Son. **in divers manners,** i.e. in the various ways in which the prophets' messages were received and transmitted. The Greek (lit. 'many portions, many forms') does not imply the inferiority of the old revelation, but rather its richness; it was manysided both in content (divers portions) and in the channels or means of its delivery (divers manners). Both the old and the new revelations are from God, and there is a continuity between them. There is, however, a tacit contrast between the fragmentariness of the old and the unity and finality of the new.

2. at the end of these days: the early Christians derived from the Jews the division of time into two 'æons' or 'ages':

'this age' or 'this world' and 'the age (world) to come' i.e. the Messianic age. The birth of Jesus heralded the beginning of the end of this age (9 [26]: cf. 1 P 1 [20]), which was to be terminated by the imminent second coming of the Lord (9 [28]). **his Son**: lit. 'a Son,' i.e. one who was not as the prophets 'a servant' in the house, but 'a son over the house' (3 [5, 6]: cf. Mk 12 [1-8]). The contrast implies not only the superiority of the new revelation, but also its finality. No later revelation can go further than this. This point is emphasized by the words that follow. **heir**, i.e. destined to the lordship and ownership of all things. The 'firstborn' ([6]) son is the destined heir, even if the inheritance be not attained in 'this age' (2 [8]: cf. 1 Cor 15 [25] ff.). **through whom he made the worlds**: cf. Jn 1 [3]; Col 1 [16]; so the Son is an eternal Son: He existed before the ages, i.e. before time 'in the beginning' (cf. Jn 1 [1]). He is the Eternal Creator, the Mediator of the revelation of God in time, and the Heir of all at the end of time.

3 describes what the Son is in Himself and what He has done, as [2] speaks of what the Father has done to and through Him. **being**, i.e. not as 'appointed,' but by His very nature. **the effulgence of his glory**: the glory of the Lord in the Old Testament means a manifestation of God as a bright light (e.g. Ex 24 [17]), and this idea clings to the expression in the New Testament also (e.g. Lk 2 [9]). The Son derives from the Father the nature of Divinity, as the radiancy of the sun, though derived from the sun, is what the sun is. The two figures 'brightness' and 'image' are complementary the one to the other, the former expressing the unity of the Son with the Father, the latter His perfect revelation (reproduction) of the Father to man. **the very image of his substance**: the figure now is from the imprint of the die which reproduces exactly its shape. The 'substance' of God in this connexion means His Being or Nature of Divinity. **upholding all things by the word of his power**: the Greek for 'all things' implies their unity, 'the universe.' As the agent in Creation the Son is also the sustainer of the universe (cf. [3]). The 'word of his power' is the utterance of command which shows forth His power (cf. Ps 33 [6, 9]). **when he had made purification of sins**: the word and the idea of 'purification' are derived from the Jewish sacrifices, and particularly from the sin offerings on the Day of Atonement, when the priest made a purification of sins by the sprinkling of blood upon the mercy-seat. The writer introduces his main theme—the Priest-King and His sacrificial work—at the outset of his letter. The Jewish priest made purification by the blood which had been obtained through the death of the victim. So, too, the reference here is to the priestly work of our Lord in the heavenly sanctuary after His ascension into heaven (cf. 9 [25] and Introd., § 5, pp. 599 f.). Either the purification in this verse is regarded as a completed act, or the aorist participle (having made) must be translated by a present 'making purification . . . he sat' as in 2 [10] 'in bringing . . .' **sat down**: as King (Ps 110 [1]). The three Messianic offices are represented in these opening verses: Prophet ([1, 2]), Priest, and King ([3]).

4. having become by so much better than the angels: the reference may be as in 2 [9] to the ascended Lord or, more probably, 'having become' is equivalent to 'having been shown to be.' They are created spirits: He is the Son. The insistence on the unique supremacy of the Son above the angels is emphasized for two reasons: (*a*) because of the popular belief that the angels were intermediaries in the delivery of the Law (2 [2]); (*b*) in answer to the exaggerated and almost idolatrous reverence paid to the angels (Col 2 [18]; Rev 19 [10], 22 [8]).

5-13. Quotations from the Old Testament to show the superiority of the Son above the angels. God the Father is the speaker: 'he saith.' The primary meaning of the words in their original context is of little importance to our author in comparison with the significance he sees in them as applied to our Lord.*

* To understand the writer's use of the Old Testament several points must be borne in mind: (*a*) The anticipations of the prophets arise from a God-given insight into the divine purpose; but the 'times and seasons' (Ac 1 [7]) are hidden from them, and they often attach these anticipations to contemporary champions of Israel who do not realize them. The later Jews expected the fulfilment of these anticipations in the future, and attached them to the Messiah, in whose coming they more and more believed. Thus we explain 1 [5, 8, 9, 13]. (*b*) In many of the prophets, it is God Himself rather than any human instrument who is expected to appear as the Redeemer of His people, and the Christian Church found this anticipation also fulfilled in the Lord. Thus we explain 1 [6, 10-12]. In Dt 32 [43] (LXX) the Song of Moses is extended to present a picture of God's final manifestation for judgement and salvation, and of the universal homage offered to Him. In Ps 102 we find a prophecy of God's return to His people, of the restoration of the Church, the conversion of the Gentiles, and the transformation of the world. But it is the Lord, through whom the worlds were made, who is to realize all this, and so the author of Hebrews applies the words to Him. Cf. Westcott, *Hebrews*, Additional Notes on 2 [12] and 3 [7].—H. L. G.

5. Ps. 2 [7] and 2 S 7 [14]. The latter refers to the son promised to David. In the former 'This day' originally referred to the coronation day of the king, and, if so, in the mind of our present author the reference is to the Lord's entrance into His Kingship, i.e. the ascension, when He was declared to be the Son (Rom 1 [4]).

6. **when he again bringeth in the firstborn into the world**: the reference is to the Second Advent. The quotation is from Dt 32 [43] (LXX differing from the Hebrew): cf. Ps 97 [7], 'worship him, all ye gods' (=angels).

7-12. The angels for the purposes of their service are transformed into elements lower in the scale of existence (winds, fire). The Son remains unchanged in divine majesty.

7. Ps 104 [4]: 'winds' is better than 'spirits.'

8. The angels are equipped as servants: the Son is saluted as God the King eternal and righteous. **O God**: see on Ps 45 [6]. In the Psalm the King is addressed as God (Elohim: cf. Ps 82 [6]). If this translation is retained our Lord is here proclaimed as God by the Father (='thy God' in next verse). The other translation 'thy throne is God' is equally possible, and we cannot say which of the two our writer adopts.

9. **Therefore**, i.e. the crowning of our Lord as King (the ascension) is the reward of His faithfulness during the earthly life. This is the first hint of the earthly probation by temptation and suffering through which the Lord passed to His triumph in heaven.

10 ff. Ps 102 [25-27]. The Psalmist is speaking to God: here the Father (8) is addressing the Son. The quotation takes up the thought of 2 'through whom also he made the worlds.'

13. Ps 110 [1]. This and the following verse form the climax of the contrast between the Son and the angels. They stand to minister, and are sent forth on errands of service to mankind: He sits upon His throne at the Father's right hand.

14. **ministering spirits.** The word is the same as for 'ministers' in 7, i.e. ministers of God: a Godward ministry of service and of worship (cf. Dan 7 [10]; Is 6 [2]). **sent forth**: present participle, '(always) being sent forth.' **inherit salvation**: salvation includes deliverance from death, but is seen from 2 [3] ff. to have a wider meaning, viz. the attainment of the true destiny of man to have dominion over the creation, and so to rise, in a sense, above the angels (2 [5-8]). The 'heirs of salvation' in part already taste this blessedness, but its full realization awaits them in the 'world to come.'

II. 1-4. The dogmatic teaching of 1 leads up to a practical exhortation and warning. The first indication of the dangers which threaten the readers (10 [26-31]: cf. 4 [1] ff., 6 [1-8]).

1. **Therefore**, i.e. because of the superiority of the Revealer and His revelation to the Law and its mediators, the angels.

2. **the word spoken through angels**, i.e. the Law: see introductory note to 1-2. **stedfast**: valid or effective, as was shown by the divine penalties inflicted on those who disobeyed it.

3. **was confirmed**: the Greek is the same as for 'stedfast' (2). The validity of the message was guaranteed by the witnesses themselves, and by its effect both in them and in the wonders God wrought through them (4). 3 is rightly taken as an indication that the date of the epistle is to be placed in the second generation of Christians.

4. **signs and wonders, and manifold powers**: the same combination is found in Ac 2 [22], where 'powers' is translated 'mighty works.' **gifts of the Holy Ghost**: lit. 'distributions' (see 1 Cor 12 [11]).

5-18 links directly on to 1 [14]. The angels serve man because, although in this world he is lower than they, his destiny is to be the ruler of the world to come. Jesus after His abasement has been crowned with glory and honour as Lord both of this world (14) and of the world to come. And He is our forerunner (10). As our Brother He represents us and is our Priest before God.*

5. **the world to come**: see note on 1 [2].

6. **one hath somewhere testified**: here only in the epistle is Scripture cited as the words of a man.

6-8, from Ps 8 [4-6]. The Psalmist is speaking of man's dominion over the *present* world, but our author interprets 'all things' (8) as a reference to the 'world to come.'

7. **a little lower**: from the LXX; 'a little' means 'for a little while' (RVm). The Hebrew is 'but little lower than God,' or 'than the angels.'

8. **nothing that is not subject**, i.e. not even the angels or the 'world to come.' The verse is speaking of man in general, not of Jesus in particular: the 'not yet' means in this present world. In this

* The writer probably means that the present world *is* in some sense subject to angels. Cf. Dt 32 [8] (LXX); Dan 4 [17]. 10 [13, 20]. If this was his view, his insistence upon the superiority of the Lord is the more intelligible.—ED.

present order of things we see not yet all things subjected to man. He is in bondage to the devil through the fear of death. But in heaven, i.e. the 'world to come,' we 'behold . . . Jesus . . . crowned with glory and honour.' It is not stated but left to be inferred that all things are subject unto Him.

9. behold: intentionally a different word from 'see' (8); the apprehension by faith of Jesus in His glory is a different kind of seeing from the ocular demonstration that man has not yet all things subjected unto him. **a little:** i.e. 'for a little while,' see 7. **because of the suffering of death:** these words introduce a train of thought which has not yet appeared in the epistle except perhaps by suggestion in 1 3, 4, 9. For the idea that the glory of Jesus is the reward of His suffering cf. Phil 2 8, 9. **by the grace of God,** i.e. the gracious gift of God to us. **for** (i.e. 'on behalf of,' not 'instead of') **every man.**

10. it became him, i.e. God. **the author of their salvation:** the pioneer who goes before opens up and points out the way to His followers (see further on 12 2). **perfect through sufferings:** the Son having entered into human life as Jesus must pass through the human experience, by which, according to the divine decree, 'through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God.' So he goes on (11) to affirm the brotherhood of the Son with the 'many sons' in their common humanity.

11. Note the three different expressions to describe the redemptive work of Christ: 'bring to glory,' 'salvation' (10), and 'sanctify.' 'Sanctify' is almost a technical term in this epistle in the Old Testament sense of consecrating to God by a sacrifice (cf. 10 29). It connotes the initial dedication to God (as e.g. in baptism), and is distinct from 'perfection' (10 14). We are *dedicated* to God from infancy: by a good life we gradually become sanctified inwardly also in the heart to correspond to the external dedication. Cf. the double meaning of *saint*: (1) any member of the Church; (2) those who are perfect in holiness.

13. Probably from Is 8 17 as the next quotation is from *ib.* 18.*

14-18. Cf. the *Te Deum*: 'When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.' To be 'made perfect through suffering' is the law of human life, and as our Brother, Jesus also was made perfect by passing through death. But in so being made perfect He overcame death and him who has the power of (i.e. over) death, viz. the devil. The devil is regarded as the ruler of the realm of death, holding mankind under the bondage of the fear of death until they have passed through and beyond death. Now this ruler is overthrown and his power destroyed. It is important to remember that here, as practically always in the Bible, death implies much more than the merely physical fact of dying. The Jew never really got clear of the old Semitic belief that death involved banishment from the presence and rule of God: the dead are 'out of remembrance, and cut off from thy hand.' It is in this sense that death is regarded as entering into the world along with sin (Gen 2 17: cf. Wisd 1 13, 2 23, 24). By dying Jesus proved that death does not separate the faithful soul from God. He 'abolished death (i.e. in the Jewish sense), and brought light and incorruption to light' (2 Tim 1 10). Because of the suffering of death He was crowned with glory and honour by His resurrection and ascension.

16. the seed of Abraham: the father of the whole people of God, Gentile as well as Jew (cf. Rom 4 16, 17; Gal 3 29).

17. A priest is the representative of his people: so he must know all their life from within, be truly one of them; so will he have compassion on them, bearing them in his heart ('merciful'), and they will feel that he is one whom they can trust entirely to represent them ('faithful,' i.e. trustworthy: this gives a better sense than the interpretation 'obedient towards God'). The need of complete sympathy as a qualification for the true priest is a characteristic thought of the epistle (cf. 4 15, 5 2). The 'things pertaining to God' are the 'offering of gifts and sacrifices for sins' (5 1). **make propitiation:** by this word the train of ideas associated with the 'making of atonement' by the sacrifices under the Law is introduced into the work of Jesus Christ: see article Atonement in Hastings' *D.B.*; Gayford, *Sacrifice and Priesthood*, ch. v. The word is of the same root as the words in Lk 18 13 ('be merciful'), Rom 3 25, and 1 Jn 2 2, 4 10. In the Old Testament it is the regular LXX word for 'to make atonement.' Primarily and properly it describes the effect of the sacrifice upon God: it wins His favour by

* The writer, like the Lord Himself (Mt 13 13 ff.), sees the Lord's experience foreshadowed in that of Isaiah. Both came with a message from God to Israel, to which Israel proved deaf; both broke with the nation as a whole, and committed their teaching to a band of disciples, the nucleus of the Church of the future; both with their disciples put their trust in God, and looked to Him for their vindication.—ED.

changing or removing that which He 'cannot away with,' i.e. sin. Such is His love, however, that He Himself provides this means by which His 'wrath' may be appeased (1 Jn 4 10; cf. Lev 17 11). When its object (as here only in the New Testament) is the sin, this primary meaning has been lost sight of, and some word like 'expiate' would better express the meaning of the periphrasis 'make propitiation for.'

18. being tempted: here as in 4 15, 5 7, 8 the special temptation in view is that of Gethsemane, the temptation to escape the death of the Cross. It was to just such an apostasy that the Hebrews were being tempted now.

III. 1-IV. 13. Jesus a greater than either Moses, the founder of the theocracy, or Joshua, the conqueror of the Promised Land. This section, like the previous one (1-2), concludes (4 14-16) by reverting to Jesus as the Priest.

III. 1-6*a* draws out the superiority of Jesus to Moses, leading up to a warning and an exhortation (3 6b-4) based (in the same way as in 2 1-4) upon the previous dogmatic passage, and incidentally implying the superiority to Joshua:

1. a heavenly calling: cf. Phil 3 14; 2 Tim 1 9; either a call from heaven, or a call to be citizens of the heavenly realm. **the Apostle and High Priest of our confession:** the 'confession' is the sum of the faith which we confess, i.e. witness before the world; 'our' is emphatic in implied contrast to the Jewish faith. Jesus is described as the Apostle, i.e. the One sent by God to manifest Him to us (cf. Jn 20 21), and also the High Priest appointed to represent us before God.

2. appointed: lit. 'made.' The reference is to the office (Apostle and High Priest) and not to the origin of Jesus. **his house,** i.e. the house(hold) of God, the Christian Church. This is clear from the original (Nu 12 7, 'Moses . . . who is faithful in all mine house'), of which this is virtually a quotation. The same is implied in 4.

3. he that built the house, i.e. Jesus, perhaps with reference to Mt 16 18. Moses is a part of the 'house': Jesus is outside and above it, its Founder and Builder. God made the Church as He made the universe (1 2), 'through Christ.'

5. for a testimony of those things which were afterwards to be spoken, i.e. the Law was a silent witness to the truths of the Gospel. 9 is an eloquent comment on this verse.

6. Christ as a Son: 'Christ' has no article before it in the Greek, i.e. it is used as a personal name, not as a title. But it denotes Jesus as the Messianic King, so its use in this verse is intentional. **over his house,** i.e. again, the house of God. The 'house of God' is one and the same Church under the old (3) and the new covenant (6). There is development, but also continuity and identity: our Lord came not to destroy but to fulfil the Law. **if we hold:** these words serve as introduction to the long exhortation that follows. Membership of the house of God and its privileges are not ours by a mechanical necessity, but conditional on our perseverance (cf. Mt 3 9; Jn 8 37-39; Rom 9 6-8). **boldness,** i.e. of speech in our 'confession' before men. **the glorying of our hope:** our proud witness to the hope that is in us. Both words contain a challenge to an open confession of faith.

7. as the Holy Ghost saith: see Introd., 8, p. 602*b*. Jews as well as Christians used Ps 95 in their liturgical worship. **To-day** is emphatic from its position at the beginning of the sentence. At three epochs especially was the call made and the reward promised: before the entry into the Promised Land, before the return from exile (when this Psalm was probably written), and at the first preaching of the Gospel.

8. provocation . . . day of temptation: see notes on Ps 95 8, 9.

9. forty years: these words in LXX go with the next verse ('forty years was I grieved'). Our writer intentionally (he knew the correct reading: see 17) attaches them to the preceding clause, and adds 'wherefore,' probably to emphasize the warning. (One MS. of the LXX, the Veronese Psalter, agrees with the text as in this passage; but the reading in this MS. was probably derived from the passage as quoted here.)

11. my rest: originally a reference to the peaceful settlement of the Promised Land. After the nomad life and warfare of the desert, Israel might hope in glad unbroken fellowship with God to share *His* rest, i.e., as explained in 4 1-4, the eternal Sabbath of Heaven.

12. evil heart of unbelief: the heart, the source of all good (Lk 8 15), is also the source of evil (Mk 7 21) in the life which has turned away from the truth (unbelief) and from the living God (apostasy) and fallen into moral iniquity (evil).

13. so long as it is called To-day, i.e. before the night cometh when no man can work: before the door is shut; before the 'end of the age' of which already the last days are running out (1 2). **the de-**

ceitfulness of sin: sin is personified as a deceiver (cf. Rom 7 [11]), luring men on to harden their hearts against the persuasions of truth and goodness.

14. partakers of Christ: cf. 6 [4] 'partakers of the Holy Ghost.' RVm 'with Christ' gives a more direct meaning: partners with Christ in the glory and honour with which He is crowned. **we are (have) become . . . if we hold fast**: see note on [6].

15. while it is said, i.e. while the time of probation is still with us.

IV. **1. a promise being left**, i.e. unfulfilled in regard to those to whom it was first made, and so left over for an opportunity of fulfilment in us. The promise cannot fail: if one generation loses the fulfilment, it remains valid for others. **seem**: better *be found, be judged* to have come short of it.

2. we have had good tidings preached unto us: lit. 'we have been *gospelized*.' **they were not united by faith with them that heard**, i.e. the main body of the Israelites in the wilderness split off from the faithful few who heard and believed. A better reading would make 'united' agree with 'the word': the word was not united, incorporated, assimilated, by faith in them that heard it. This is truer to the context which regards the *whole* nation as disbelievers (3 [16, 17]).

3. do enter: are on the way to enter, are sure to enter. **the works were finished**: therefore God's rest was ready waiting for men to share it with Him.

4. See Gen 2 [2].

7. saying in David: David is mentioned to show that long after the disobedience in the wilderness the rest was still being offered.

9. a sabbath rest: lit. 'a sabbatizing' (see [4]).

10. his rest, i.e. the Sabbath rest of God: the word *Sabbath* means 'desisting from labour,' and with man as with God the rest is earned by previous labour (Rev 14 [13]).

11. after the same example: better as RVm 'into the same . . .' i.e. become a warning example to future generations as the Israelites were to them.

12. For the word of God is living. The order of the Greek 'for living is the word of God' throws the emphasis upon 'living.' As God is 'the living God,' so His word (the Scripture) is alive, and proves its life by its power ('active'). The old words are not dead and past: they still live and work. **two-edged sword**: cf. Rev 1 [16], 2 [16]; also Ps 33 [6] 'by the word of the Lord were the heavens made'; Eph 6 [17] 'the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.' As the spoken word of God possessed the creative power to make the world ('And God said, Let there be . . . and there was'), so the word of Scripture has the power to search, test, judge, and condemn (cf. 2 [2] f.). **dividing of soul and spirit** as no sword can do. The 'soul' is the principle of animal life animating our bodies: the 'spirit,' of the higher life of reason and will, the life of man by virtue of which he is 'in the image of God.' As the sharp sword will divide the body even to its inmost recesses, so the word of God will tear asunder the inmost recesses (joints and marrow) of the soul and of the spirit. (The thought is *not*: divide the soul from the spirit, the joints from the marrow.) **joints and marrow**: the sharp sword not only divides limb from limb, but opens up the very bones and discloses the marrow. **quick to discern**: puts them on their trial. **discern** is used in the old sense of judging and differentiating (the good from the bad). Cf. 1 Cor 11 [29, 31]. With the whole of this verse cf. Lk 2 [34, 35], and Keble, *Christian Year*, St. Bartholomew's Day.

13. Note the ready transference from the word to the speaker. The 'word of God' is God speaking. **laid open**: the figure is again taken from the butcher's shop or the sacrificial altar. The word means literally 'to expose the throat by bending back the neck.'

14. Having then: the writer concludes his warning with a return to his main theme which he left at 3 [6]. **who hath passed through the heavens**: the meaning is seen from 9 [6, 7, 11, 24]. As the Aaronic High Priest on the Day of Atonement passed through the Holy Place into the Holy of Holies, so Jesus at His ascension passed through the heavenly Holy Place into the very Presence of God, there to 'sit on the right hand of the Majesty on high' (1 [3]), 'to appear before the face of God' and to 'offer himself' for us (9 [24, 25]). **Jesus**: the human Brother, also the divine **Son of God** (cf. 1 [2, 5], 3 [6]). **our confession**: see 3 [1].

15. For: Jesus the Brother is **touched with the feeling of our infirmities**, those human limitations which, if yielded to, become the source and cause of sinning. Such e.g. is the natural fear of pain or the shrinking from shame and unpopularity; innocent in themselves, they are nevertheless the conditions within us by which sin becomes possible. **like as we are**: lit. in accordance with (the) likeness (between Him and us). **yet without sin**: 'Only he has felt the full force of

temptation who has never yielded to it' (Holmes).

16. draw near, i.e. exercise our priestly right of entry within the veil into the Presence (6 [19], 10 [19] ff.). **with boldness**: because the way has been opened for us (10 [19]), though forbidden to the Jews under the old covenant. **throne of grace . . . receive mercy**: the King is at once the Judge who may use His mercy towards the sinner, and the Dispenser of gifts (*grace* = a gift from God).

V. 1-X. 25. The priesthood of Jesus and the Levitical High Priest (see Introd., 5).

V. 1-10. Qualifications and preparation for the priesthood. The earthly life of Jesus was a preparation or training for the priesthood: (*a*) in sympathy towards man; (*b*) in obedience towards God. Having been made perfect in these, He was glorified (at His ascension) to be made a High Priest. He was not self-appointed, but 'proclaimed' of God a High Priest.

1. taken (i.e. by God, [4]) **from among men**, i.e. he is a man with a sympathy bred of experience. **in things pertaining to God**: cf. 2 [17]. **gifts and sacrifices for sin**: gifts (= Hebrew *minḥah* 'the offering of the fruits of the field: the meal offering') and sacrifices (= *zebaḥ*, animal sacrifices) together cover the whole range of sacrifice under the old covenant. The latter class is here limited to the sin offering, 'sacrifices for sin.' It is true that in a subordinate sense the burnt offering and even the peace offering made atonement for sin (Lev 17 [11]: cf. Ezek 45 [15, 17]); but the term 'sacrifices for sin' could only refer to the sin offering. This is plain from 10 [6].

2. the ignorant and erring. For deliberate and defiant sins ('with a high hand,' Nu 15 [30]) the Law provided no atoning sacrifice, but only for 'unwitting' offences (*ib.* and Lev 4 *passim*), including, however, some at any rate which should be classed as sins of incontinence (Lev 5 [1], 19 [20] ff.). These may be included here under the term 'erring.' Even the offences for which atonement was made on the Day of Atonement are described as 'ignorances' (9 [7]).

3. as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. The reference is especially to the sacrifices on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16: see notes on Heb 9). But see also Lev 4 [3].

4. as was Aaron: Ex 28 [1].

5. Christ: the choice of the title seems deliberate (see note on 3 [6]). **glorified not himself**: the reference is both general (cf. Jn 8 [54]) and particular—to the glory of the ascended Lord. This is in accordance with the conception of the priesthood as conferred upon the Christ at the ascension (see [9]). In accordance with this the words of Ps 2 [7] ('Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee'), which in 1 [5] are connected with the ascension, are quoted again along with the words of appointment to the priesthood.

6. From Ps 110 [4]: cited here as a proof of the divine appointment. The full significance of the passage and its application to our Lord is drawn out in 7.

7, 8 are a comment on the words 'taken from among men.' In the clearness and emphasis with which they portray the completeness of our Lord's humanity these verses stand alone in the epistles.

7. in the days of his flesh: in contrast with the glory of the ascended life. He shared the universal human experience of suffering, grief, and death. **offered**: the same word as in [1] for offering 'gifts and sacrifices.' Prayer is an offering from the soul to God (cf. Ps 141 [2]). **prayers and supplications**: 'prayers' = definite requests for definite things; 'supplication' is more general, 'taking up the attitude of a suppliant.' **with strong crying and tears**: the reference is of course especially to the Agony in the Garden and to the fourth word from the Cross, that 'loud cry' (Mk 15 [34]). But other strivings of spirit (e.g. Lk 12 [50]; Jn 11 [33, 35]) must be included. **save him from death**: RVm 'out of death' gives the meaning. He was not saved from dying, but in the midst of and right through to the other side of death God kept Him safe. Rom 6 [9] and Rev 1 [18] form a comment on these words. **godly fear**: the same word is commonly used in the Acts for 'devout men,' e.g. 2 [5], 8 [2], 22 [12].

8. though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things he suffered: as a true Son He was obedient from the first in heart and will; not a thought or a desire contrary to the will of the Father was ever suffered to rest in His heart. The learning of obedience in His case consisted not in the unlearning of disobedience, but in the trial and testing of the heart's intention, in the experience of fulfilling it in actual deed and suffering. 'The full reality of obedience is only realized by the actual endurance of what it costs.' This trial of obedience was only complete when the earthly life of probation was ended. He became 'obedient even unto death.' The last hours of life (the Passion) were a climax of the testing of His obedience. With the expiring cry 'It is finished' the lesson was learnt and the learner 'made

perfect.' The period of training (the learning of obedience) over, the Son was ready for consecration to His office of priesthood (see H. Scott Holland in *Priesthood and Sacrifice*, 134).

9. made perfect, i.e. for the priesthood He was to exercise. 'To make perfect' in this epistle is always with reference to some particular end or purpose (as e.g. here, the exercise of priestly work), not to general all-round perfection. The saints like their Master are made 'perfect' by the experience of life and death, and as with Him so with them, the 'learning' is finished only with the close of life (12 [23]). Here and in 2 [10], 7 [28] there may be an allusion to the LXX use of the same word in the sense of 'consecration' to the priesthood. Here, however, the 'perfecting' refers to the completion of the preparatory training rather than to the actual consecration. **the author**: lit. one who is the cause of anything (see RVm). A different word is used in 2 [10], 12 [2].

10. named: properly 'proclaimed,' 'addressed by the title of.' As the Son entered heaven (cf. 12 [22-24]) at His ascension He was greeted by the Father with the title 'High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.' This was His 'ordination' to the priesthood.

11-VI. 20. A Warning, a Complaint, and an Encouragement.—Once more the writer prefaces the central theme of his epistle (the High Priesthood of Jesus) with a solemn warning against their backwardness in the knowledge of their faith (5 [11]-6 [3]), and the cause of it, that they have fallen away from the grasp they once had of it (6 [4-8]). There is hope for them, however, in the love they showed to the saints ([9-12]) and in the immutability of the divine promises ([13-20]).

11. whom, i.e. Jesus. **hard of interpretation**=hard to expound to you: because of your backwardness. **dull of hearing**: the word 'dull' means 'slow,' 'sluggish.'

12. the oracles of God generally means the Scriptures of the Old Testament (cf. Ac 7 [38]; Rom 3 [2]). In this passage it undoubtedly includes as the greater with the less the word of God spoken by the Son (cf. 1 [2], 2 [3]). **milk . . . solid food**: cf. 1 Cor 3 [2].

13. without experience: he learns it as a child learns a lesson which lies outside his own personal experience; it has not tried him nor has he made trial of it.

14. use: the word means 'long-continued use,' 'habit.' **discern good and evil**, i.e. discriminate between them. This is the mark of moral and spiritual maturity in a man, as its absence is characteristic of the child (Dt 1 [39]; Is 7 [16]): its presence qualifies him to be an ideal ruler and judge (1 K 3 [9]), and likens him to the angels (2 S 14 [17]), and indeed to God Himself (Gen 3 [22]). **good and evil** here includes truth and falsehood generally, as well as moral right and wrong, as 'the word of righteousness' in the previous verse covers the whole field of Christian doctrine.

VI. 1. perfection: the word is the same as that translated 'full-grown men' in 5 [14], and signifies 'full-grown teaching.' The writer has in view the intellectual apprehension of the faith rather than moral attainment. **laying again a foundation**, i.e. in his teaching. It does not necessarily cover *all* the 'fundamental' truths, but only such as would be put before a catechumen in his elementary instruction. These foundation truths are given in three pairs: (1) The two qualities of mind and heart demanded of the convert at the outset: he must *repent* of his former sinful life (**dead works**=sinful acts, as in 9 [14]; not merely barren, unfruitful works as in the Pauline phraseology), and **faith** in the true God. (2) On his expression of repentance and faith he is admitted to membership in the Church with its gifts and privileges by baptism with the laying on of hands (Confirmation). (3) The last group is concerned with the final end or goal of life: resurrection and judgement. The three groups thus present a summary of the first teaching given to a convert. For the first group cf. Mk 1 [15]; Ac 20 [21].

2. the teaching of baptisms: the plural is probably meant to cover the 'baptism of John' and perhaps, although this is uncertain, the various Jewish washings, and the difference between them and Christian baptism to which is attached as its distinctive feature the gift of the Holy Ghost through the laying on of the Apostles' hands (see Mt 3 [11]; Ac 1 [5], 8 [14-18], 19 [1-6]). The laying on of hands in Ordination (1 Tim 4 [14]) would hardly be included in the first teaching given to catechumens, and it is therefore improbable that it is included here. **eternal judgement**: the last and final judgement (Mt 25 [46]).

3. this will we do, i.e. press on unto perfection ([1]).

4-6. For . . . it is impossible to renew. He will press on to the higher teaching and not lay again the foundation, because even if he did, those who had fallen away could not be renewed: his labour would be in vain.

4. once enlightened: the 'once' contains the idea of 'once and for all,' as in 'once to die,' 'once offered' (9 [27, 28]),

'entered in once' (9[12]). 'Enlightened' is not yet as in later Christian language a technical term for baptism: it means more generally those to whom the light of the truth has been revealed. **tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost**: these words describe the fruits of baptism and the laying on of hands. 'The heavenly gift' is generally the salvation of which Jesus is the 'author' to His brethren (2[10]).

5. **the good word of God** probably means His promises. **the powers of the age to come**: the meaning of this difficult expression is perhaps to be found by comparison with 2[4. 5], where, after speaking of the 'manifold powers' (the same word that is used here, and also in the Gospels where it is translated 'mighty works') which accompanied the first preaching of the Gospel, the writer goes on, 'For not unto angels (but unto man) did he subject the world to come.' The miracles are the effect of mastery over the spiritual world. So here the 'powers' are the works of healing and casting out devils, etc., wrought by the Christians. The *world to come* means the world of heavenly unseen realities (cf. 2[5]).

6. **impossible**: for theirs is not a case of loss of conviction, but of falling away from convictions still held: of apostasy or 'wilful sin' (10[26]). The solemnity and severity of the warning reminds us of the sin against the Holy Ghost (Mk 3[29]). Theirs too is a sin against the light (see [5]). The impossible thing is therefore not God's forgiveness, but their own repentance which is the condition of forgiveness (see further Introd., p. 603). **crucify**: probably 'afresh' should be omitted. **to themselves**, i.e. as far as they are concerned. **put him to an open shame**: make Him a public spectacle of shame before the heathen world.

9-12. Grounds of encouragement to hope that this is not the case with his readers.

10. **towards his name**: love of the brethren is love of the Name which is called over them as belonging to Him (Jas 2[7]; Mt 25[40]).

11. Hope must be kept alive by the stirring up of faith. On this living hope depends their whole spiritual life. So they must devote to its nurture the same diligence as they devote to their works of charity.

12. **who through faith and patience inherit the promises**: 11[1]-12[1] gives illustrations.

13-20. To make our hope the more confident God confirmed the original promise with an oath (cf. 7[20-22]).

14. **Surely . . . multiply thee**: Gen 22[17]. In the preceding verse comes the oath 'By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord.'*

17. **counsel**: the word includes 'purpose' as well as deliberation.

18. The **two immutable things** are His purpose (declared in the promise) and His oath. **fled for refuge**: from the doom of sin or the corruption of the world to the salvation promised in Jesus Christ.

19. **which**, i.e. the hope. The predicates 'sure,' 'stedfast,' 'entering,' etc., might grammatically belong to 'anchor,' but are better (as in RV) taken as agreeing with 'hope.' **entering into that which is within the veil**, i.e. into the Holy of Holies which is on the inner side of the veil. There is the Presence of God in the heavenly shrine. The Hope of Salvation is personified as a High Priest having access into the very Presence-chamber of God. The thought is skilfully used to bring the reader back to the main theme, the High Priesthood of Jesus. He is our Hope personified, because He has entered within the veil not as the solely privileged Priest, but as the Forerunner of His brethren. His right of access to the throne is the assurance of ours. In 10[19] the access is realized by faith as a *present* fact; here it is beheld by hope as a future certainty. Both aspects are true (Introd., 5, p. 598*b*).

20. The words remind us that our hope also is based on a divine oath: cf. 7[21].

VII. **Melchizedek and his Priesthood.**—Taking the narrative of Gen 14[18-20] as his starting-point the writer draws out from it the features in Melchizedek which made him the type of a priesthood greater than the Levitical (see Introd., 5).

1-10. Melchizedek: greater than Abraham and therefore *a fortiori* than Levi, Abraham's descendant. Like St. Paul with the story of Hagar (Gal 4[21] ff.), our writer takes the story of Melchizedek as it stands and treats it as containing a hidden meaning. He has already decided upon the point of comparison he wishes to emphasize (a priest for ever), and draws it out from the silences of Gen 14 regarded as indications of the author's thoughts (**without father**, etc., i.e. one of whom it is witnessed that he liveth, i.e. for ever).

* The divine oath is only found after the faith of Abraham has endured its final testing (cf. 11[17-19]). The promise came at the beginning of Abraham's life of faith (Gen 12[1] ff.); but it was always subject to revocation, if Abraham proved unfaithful. The oath came at the end, when his probation was over. So it has been with the Lord (Ps 110[4]), and so it must be with us. The promise is ours already, but not yet the oath ([11, 12]).—H. L. G.

2. righteousness . . . peace: a favourite combination in prophetic pictures of the Messianic King (Is 9 [7], 11; Ps 72 [1-3, 7], 85 [10]).

3. like unto the Son of God. Our Lord's eternal pre-existence was implied in 1 [3]: for His 'endless life' cf. 7 [24], 1 [10-12]. **abideth a priest continually:** this is the point of comparison, and therefore, grammatically, forms the main sentence, the other comparisons being relatively incidental and inserted in a parenthesis. The eternal nature of our Lord's priesthood is the central theme of the epistle.

6. whose genealogy is not counted from them: the Levitical priest had to be able to point out his genealogy with great exactness as a qualification for his office (Neh 7 [64]). Here we have a distinct and independent priesthood.

8. men that die receive tithes, i.e. the Levitical priests. **of whom it is witnessed that he liveth,** i.e. Melchizedek, of whose birth or death nothing is said: only that he liveth.

11-28. The advent of this higher priesthood supersedes the Levitical priesthood and the entire Covenant on which it rested. The need of such a supersession is seen in the ineffectualness of the old covenant, and, in contrast with that, the effectiveness of the priesthood of Jesus (see Introd., 5).

11. under it: on the basis of the priesthood was the legislation of the Law imposed upon the people. The Levitical priesthood is regarded as the core and essence of the whole Law (see [12]).

14. our Lord: cf. 1 Tim 1 [14]; 2 Tim 1 [8]. From the standpoint of the Law Jesus would have been disqualified for being a Priest at all, because He was of the tribe of Judah and not of Levi: the very fact that He is a Priest is then a proof that the Law is superseded.

16. hath been made: i.e. at some definite time. **the law of a carnal commandment . . . the power of an endless life:** there is a double contrast between the two priests. The one is made priest by a law, i.e. a regulation external to himself; the other by a power inherent in His own Nature and Person. Further, the Law in the one case is the regulation that a priest must be qualified by physical descent from the priestly stock: it is therefore 'carnal' (i.e. a physical ordinance, not 'carnal' in the moral sense). On the other hand, the 'power' in the Son was the 'endless life,' in virtue of which His priesthood was neither inherited nor transmitted. **endless:** RVm 'indissoluble,' i.e. death which attacked it, and for the moment seemed to end it, was not able to dissolve it. It is in virtue of His risen life that our Lord is the Melchizedekian Priest. So He was appointed to that priesthood after His resurrection.

18. foregoing commandment, i.e. the regulation about the priesthood. 'Foregoing' is not simply 'preceding,' but 'leading on before': so the word implies that the purpose of the Law was to lead up to something better following it: even its failures had a purpose (cf. Gal 3 [21]). The same thought is implied in 'the bringing in thereupon' ([19]).

19. we draw nigh unto God: the whole function of a priest is to draw men into fellowship with God. The hindrance to that fellowship is sin: therefore the great object of a priest's work is the removal of sin and the obstruction caused by it, 'to offer sacrifices for sin,' to 'make atonement.' The Levitical priest could not really take away sin (10 [1-4]), and therefore access to the inner Presence-chamber, the Holy of Holies, was forbidden to the Israelite (9 [8]); but 'by the blood of Jesus' Christians enter through the veil into the Holy Place (10 [19, 20]), and offer to Him their burnt offering of a dedicated life of good works (13 [15] ff.).

22. By so much the better a covenant is that of which Jesus has become the surety. **the surety:** the guarantor on God's behalf to us. Jesus is that because He is the eternal Priest: 'he ever liveth.' **covenant:** see Introd., 5.

24. unchangeable: (1) that which cannot pass away, i.e. remains unaltered; or (2) that which cannot be trespassed upon, i.e. inviolable (RVm). In either case the meaning is that the priesthood is inalienably His, and that it never loses its efficacy.

25. save to the uttermost: in the fullest degree of all that is meant by 'saving' and 'salvation.' The verse reveals the way in which Jesus fulfils the words of the angel: 'he shall save his people from their sins' by the efficacious exercise of His priesthood in heaven. **them that draw near unto God through him:** see on [19]. The 'drawing near' is to be our own act: our will and work is the condition of His saving efficacy (cf. 4 [16], 10 [22]). **ever liveth to make intercession for them:** the words almost amount to 'ever devotes his life to the purpose of.' **make intercession:** the same word is used in Rom 8 [34], and, there as here, of the ascended Christ. The 'intercession' includes every kind of mediation—verbal prayer, appearing 'before the face of God for us' (9 [24]),

offering Himself for us (*ib.* 25); all are included in it, and it cannot be limited by any or even all of them.

26. became us, i.e. is fitted for our needs and conditions. **holy:** the word is not used here as in 2 11 in the sense of dedicated to God: it describes the interior holiness of purity and sanctity which are the mature fruits of that dedication. **undefiled,** i.e. without blemish of soul such as would disqualify Him for the office of Priest. The Aaronic priest was disqualified by a bodily blemish (Lev 21 17-23); this Priest is clean in heart as well. **separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens:** these two phrases apply only to the ascended Christ. By His ascension He has been taken out from among sinful mankind and lifted above all created things (cf. 1 10, 4 14).

27. This verse leads on from the consideration of the office (7) to that of the ministry (8-10) of this High Priest. Two points of contrast with the Aaronic priests are intermingled: (1) They needed to make atonement for their own sins before offering for the people: He needed only to offer for others. The 'this' refers to the offering for the people. (2) They made their offering 'daily': He made it 'once for all.'—As it was only on the Day of Atonement (i.e. once in the year) that the Jewish High Priest offered first for himself and then for the people, either the 'daily' is not to be taken literally, or else it is meant to cover the ordinary sin offerings provided for priest as well as people (Lev 4). In any case the need of repetition, not the exact frequency of it, is the essential point of the argument. Two further points must be made clear for a proper understandning of this verse: (1) The offering of Himself corresponds with the sprinkling of the blood upon the mercy-seat on the Day of Atonement: this is clear from 9 25. It is to the ministry of the ascended High Priest in the heavenly tabernacle that the offering refers, not to the death upon the Cross by itself, but as included in this priestly work. (2) 'Once for all' stands in opposition to 'daily,' i.e. repeatedly. It is consistent with a *perpetual* offering in the heavenly shrine (see Introd., 5, p. 600). The use of the aorist participle is inconclusive; the English version 'when he offered' shows that the action is meant to be simultaneous with that of the main verb 'did.' (See G. Milligan, *Theology of the Epistle to Hebrews*, 131.)

28. men . . . a Son: for the contrast cf. 1 1, 2. **after the law:** the oath of Ps 110 4. **perfected for evermore,** i.e. by His earthly sufferings (2 10) and His learning of obedience (5 8, 9), in both of which the earthly life is preliminary to the appointment as Priest.

VIII.-X. 25. **The Ministry of this Priest: its Scene, its Nature, its Effects.**

VIII. **The Scene of the Ministry.**

1. the chief point: the 'essential feature' of this priesthood is that the Priest is also the enthroned King, and that His priesthood is exercised not in a tabernacle on earth, but in the heavenly sanctuary.

2. a minister of the sanctuary: here and in the next verse the word for 'minister' denotes an officiating priest. The priestly ministry of our Lord, as well as the royal session, is an ever-present fact. Probably to avoid confusion the epistle does not speak of the priest as 'standing' (the characteristic attitude of priestly service). Ac 7 56, Rev 5 6 use the figure 'standing' of the ascended Lord in heaven, and that attitude is implied in the perpetual 'intercession' just above (7 25). **the sanctuary:** as the same word in 9 8, 10 19, 13 11 undoubtedly means 'sanctuary,' that translation is better here than RVm 'holy things.' **the true tabernacle,** i.e. of which the material earthly tabernacle was a copy (5), as its ministry was a 'shadow' of the heavenly offering (10 1); see note on 5.

3. appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices: cf. 5 1. **it is necessary that this high priest have somewhat to offer:** both in this verse and the next to do the work of a priest is essential in order to be a priest. A priest who ceased to do the work for which he has been appointed (to offer gifts and sacrifices) would no longer be a priest at all. Therefore if our Lord is a Priest in heaven, He must have an offering there. To translate 'it was necessary that he should have,' or 'it is necessary that he should have had' is neither necessary from the Greek nor natural from the sense of the context. The words imply the necessity for a perpetual offering if our Lord is the Eternal Priest (Introd., 5, p. 600). The offering, like the 'intercession' (7 25) and 'appearing' (9 24), is an ever-present fact.

4. if he were on earth, he would not be a priest. This verse implies the present existence of both priesthoods. It is difficult to see how it could have been written as it stands after the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. It excludes also the idea of a priesthood exercised by our Lord during His earthly life (see Introd., 5, p. 599*a*).

5. copy . . . shadow: the copy is an outline drawn from a pattern; the shadow

is the solid figure reflected from the original. The quotation is from Ex 25 [40]. The idea of a sanctuary pre-existing in heaven, and of the earthly tabernacle being a copy of it, is common in Jewish literature of this time. When our writer adds that this heavenly sanctuary is the real and eternal one, he is saying no more than St. Paul: 'the things that are not seen are eternal.' In all this there is no need to look for the influence of Greek philosophy. In two particulars indeed the epistle differs widely from Platonism. (1) Like the seer of Rev 14 [17], 15 [5] ff., our writer pictures the heavenly Temple in naive fashion as an actual visible structure which could be copied by Moses (cf. 10 [19] ff.). This is very different from Plato's 'ideas' existing in the world of thought. (2) The Platonic 'idea' is contrasted with the material world as the 'one' with the 'many,' the one universal with the many concrete particular individuals. Of this there is no trace in our epistle. There is only one 'copy'—the tabernacle of Moses—of the heavenly sanctuary.

6. ministry: the same word as in [2]. On the connexion between priest and covenant see 7 [11, 12] and references.

7. faultless: the old covenant could not offer a real forgiveness, or the higher vision and the purer heart promised under the new. There was a 'fault' in the covenant itself, but the main fault lay with the Israelites: so [8] 'finding fault with *them*.'

8-12. See notes on Jer 31 [31-34] and Introd., 5, p. 598*a*.

8. he saith, i.e. God saith (see 1 [5]).

12. This is the part of the quotation which to our writer is the most important. This is clear from the form of the quotation in 10 [16, 17]. In 9 and 10 the covenants are compared in respect to this very point, their provision for the forgiveness of sin.

13. Even in the time of Jeremiah the old covenant was aged and 'nigh unto vanishing away.' But the writer is thinking of his own time as well. The Aaronic priesthood and its covenant are on the point of vanishing away before the imminent approach of the Second Coming, when the new covenant and the heavenly priesthood will be established on earth (cf. 9 [28]).

IX. **The Ministry Itself: of what it Consists.**—8 [12] leads the writer on to this chapter. Under the covenant sacrifice was provided 'to make atonement' to procure forgiveness of sin. In this chapter we have a detailed comparison between the work of our great High Priest in heaven and the ministry of the Aaronic priest under the old covenant. Two particular moments in the latter are selected as typical: (1) the inaugural sacrifice by which the old covenant was established (Ex 24 [1-11]); (2) the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16), by which the tabernacle and its sacred objects were annually cleansed and reconsecrated. So closely are these two connected in the mind of the writer that he interweaves the references almost as if alluding to one and the same passage throughout. Thus [6-12] refer to the Day of Atonement: in [13, 14] he seems to have both that and Ex 24 in mind; [15-21] refer to Ex 24, but [22-24] return to the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement. Clearly he sees no difference in principle between the two. Lev 16 regulates the annual repetition of the inaugural sacrifice. On the Day of Atonement, as at the establishment of the covenant, the tabernacle and the people were purified from former uncleanness and consecrated to be holy to God.

The Day of Atonement.—A knowledge of the chief points in the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement (see Lev 16) is necessary for the understanding of this chapter. The High Priest killed the bullock which was the sin offering 'for himself and his house' (i.e. the priesthood), and taking its blood entered the innermost shrine (the 'Holy of Holies'), where he sprinkled the blood upon the mercy-seat. On this day alone was entrance allowed to the Holy of Holies, the shrine of the manifested Presence of God (Ex 25 [22]). Having 'cleansed,' 'consecrated,' 'made atonement' by the 'sprinkling' for the priesthood, he came back, killed the goat which was the sin offering for the people, and sprinkled its blood in the same place. The golden altar of incense in the Holy Place and the altar of burnt offering in the outer court were also 'cleansed' by the blood of both victims. Our writer does not allude to the ceremony of the scapegoat (Lev 16 [20-22]).

1. the first covenant had ordinances. had: imperfect 'used to have.' The tense might be understood as implying the destruction of the Temple and the passing away of the old covenant. But it might equally be a reference to the time before the building of Solomon's Temple. Our writer refers always to the original tabernacle and the services in the wilderness rather than to the actual Temple of his own day and its present version of those services. The ark and the mercy-seat were lost at the Exile and never recovered. In Herod's Temple the annual 'sprink-

ling' of the blood was performed on the spot where the mercy-seat would have stood. **ordinances**: arrangements ordained [by God]. **of this world**, i.e. material and 'made by hands' (cf. [11], 8[2]).

2. a tabernacle, or tent: the two divisions, the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, are called two tents. **were**: there is no verb in the Greek, and we could equally well read 'are' (RVm). So the past tense in the English is not to be pressed, or inferences drawn from it. The verbs in [6, 7] are in the present tense. **the candlestick**: the seven-branched *candlestick* (Ex 25[31-39]). **the table, and the shewbread**: *ib.* [23-30].

3. the second veil: the *Paroketh* (Ex 26[31-33]). The first veil, the 'screen' hung at the entrance of the Holy Place screening it from the outer court (*ib.* [36]). The second is '*the* veil' (6[19], 10[20]; Mk 15[38] and parallels). The first veil excluded the layman from the Holy Place; the second excluded from the Holy of Holies all but the High Priest on the Day of Atonement ([7]).

4. having a golden censer: the word is different from the 'altar of incense' (Lk 1[11]; Rev 8[3]), which stood not in the Holy of Holies but in the Holy Place (Ex 30[6]: see Lev 4[7], 16[12] and notes). The altar of incense was, however, too important a part of the tabernacle to be omitted in this list. And so in spite of the fact that the earlier sources of Leviticus speak of a movable censer instead of the altar of the later sources, it is probable that here the altar is meant, and our writer follows Ex 40[5] in attaching it to the Holy of Holies (1 K 6[22] does the same, but not in the LXX text which our writer followed). If, however, he speaks of a 'censer,' it is probably because Lev 16, describing the Day of Atonement, does the same (Lev 16[12]). The *Apocalypse of Baruch* (vi 7) also uses the term 'censer,' and speaks of it as belonging to the Holy of Holies. **the ark of the covenant**: for the expression see Jos 3[3]; for a description of the ark see Ex 25[10] ff. **pot holding the manna**: Ex 16[33, 34]. **Aaron's rod**: Nu 17[10]. **the tables of the covenant**: Ex 25[16]. The rod and the tables were the divine guarantee for the validity of the Aaronic priesthood and the Law of the old covenant.

5. cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat: Ex 25[18-22]. For the 'mercy-seat,' its meaning and use, see on Ex 25[17]. It was so named because on it, by the sprinkling of the blood, atonement was made for the sins of the people on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16[14-16]). It was chosen for the sprinkling because above it rested the Presence of God (*ib.*[2]; Ex 25[22]; Nu 7[89]).

6. Cf. Lk 1[9, 10]; Ex 30[7, 8].

7. the high priest alone, once in the year: Lev 16[2, 29]. **not without blood**: 'apart from' blood. The purpose for which he enters is the ground of his right of access. So the blood (=the life that has passed through a death) is the means by which he is able to enter ([12]). **which he offereth**: cf. 5[3]; the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy-seat, like the 'putting' of the blood in ordinary sin offerings, or the 'pouring' of it in other sacrifices, was an offering: the sprinkling was not merely for the purpose of cleansing (cf. [21] f.). **for the errors of the people**: lit. *ignorances* (RVm). The Law provided sacrificial atonement for sins committed 'unwittingly' (Lev 4[2, 13, 22, 27]). For deliberate sin committed 'with a high hand' no sacrifice could avail (Nu 15[30]; Ps 51[16, 17]). The emphatic '*all*' of Lev 16[16] ff. was probably not meant to cover deliberate moral offences, but only unconscious ceremonial transgressions: see note on Lev 4[2], 5[3].

8. the Holy Ghost this signifying, i.e. by the witness of the Scripture (Lev 16[2] ff.) recording the regulations: (*a*) that only the High Priest might enter, and even he only once in the year, (*b*) that he might not enter 'without blood.' **the holy place**, i.e. the Holy of Holies, as in [12, 25]. **not yet been made manifest**: as it is under the new covenant (10[19] f.). **the first tabernacle**: first, not in order of place as in [2], but in order of time, and contrasted with the 'more perfect tabernacle' of the 'good things to come' ([11]).

9. It is hardly conceivable that, had this been written after the destruction of the Temple, the writer should have omitted a reference to such a vindication of his contention. **which is a parable**: 'which' is not neuter ('which thing') but feminine ('which tabernacle'). The tabernacle and its arrangements (the veil and the Holy of Holies) are a parable, a sign or symbol, of the truth that under the old covenant man's fellowship with God was strictly limited: his conscience was not cleansed, and therefore he dare not approach. **as touching the conscience, make the worshipper perfect**: see 10[1-3].

10. meats and drinks and divers washings: Lev 11. **carnal ordinances**: 'ordinances (regulations) of flesh' i.e. using physical means to remove a physical uncleanness ([13]). **imposed until a time of reformation**: imposed by God, and therefore having their rightful place in

the divine economy for human discipline, but temporarily until things were set straight ('reformation') by the new covenant.

11. Christ having come a high priest: 'having come' is an emphatic word, 'becoming present,' 'having come upon the scene.' Probably the word refers to His entry into the heavenly temple. **through the greater and more perfect tabernacle,** i.e. the heavenly sanctuary. 'Through' is ambiguous; it might be understood either (1) locally, 'passing through,' or (2) instrumentally, 'by means of.' The latter is shown to be the proper meaning here by the parallel 'through his own blood.'

12. through the blood of goats and calves, as on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16). Here and in the parallel 'through his own blood' allusion is made to the blood as the means by which the priest was allowed to enter the sanctuary (see on [7]). **entered in once for all:** cf. [26] in contrast with the yearly entry under the Law ([25]). **having obtained eternal redemption:** cf. 10 [14]. The translation is misleading if it implies that the redemption was obtained *before* the entry. The entry and the offering were the means and the token of the redemption. This would be better brought out if we translated 'entered and obtained.' **redemption:** the figure is taken from the redeeming of captives. It conveys the two ideas of deliverance and the cost of obtaining it. In the Old Testament it is used of deliverance through a price paid to God (Nu 18 [15,16]). The word expresses in another way the same truth as the 'cleansing,' 'sanctifying,' 'making atonement,' 'salvation,' 'perfection' wrought for us by our Saviour.

13. the blood of goats and bulls: the reference is primarily to the Day of Atonement, and gives an authoritative interpretation of the 'uncleannesses, iniquities, transgressions and sins' of Lev 16 [16, 21], limiting them to ceremonial offences of bodily uncleanness. **the ashes of an heifer:** Nu 19 [18]. **sprinkling them that have been defiled** refers only to 'the ashes of an heifer.' This cleansing is effected by contact with the *body* of the victim in distinction from the cleansing power of the blood. It is added perhaps with a view to the fulfilment in our Lord (see 10 [10]).

14. the blood of Christ. Our writer assumes without further explanation that in both covenants 'it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life' (Lev 17 [11]). That being so, he shows that the 'blood of the Christ' (the article is important) is better than the blood of goats and bulls, for (1) it is the life of a Person, not of a beast; (2) that Person is 'the Christ,' the Lord's anointed; (3) His offering is a self-oblation: on the Cross He was both Victim and Offerer (cf. Jn 10 [18]); in the heavenly sanctuary He is both Priest and Offering; (4) He is the 'victim' 'without blemish,' not merely in body (as was required of the victims in the old sacrifices), but in spirit also; (5) He offered Himself 'through eternal spirit.' The definite article should be omitted, and the reference to the Holy Spirit then becomes highly improbable. The writer leaves it uncertain whether he is thinking of the *human* spirit of the Incarnate Christ or of His Divine Personality, in which as God He is Spirit. His offering was made in the realm of 'spirit' (heart and will), and therefore of eternal reality. Goats and bulls have the principle of animal life (*psyche*, the mortal soul): the Christ has an immortal 'spirit,' the principle of the higher life which is in the image of God who is Spirit (Jn 4 [24]). It is probably then to the human spirit of the Incarnate Son that the words refer. Possession of this 'eternal spirit' gave Him 'the power of an indissoluble life' (7 [16]), and therefore the life laid down by the Offerer upon the Cross is taken up again by the risen Christ as High Priest, and presented on the heavenly mercy-seat where He ever liveth to make intercession for us. **offered:** the offering on the Cross is probably meant; see next verse. **cleanse your conscience:** the thought passes now from the offerer to the priest. Because the offerer's work was of such higher order, therefore the blood presented in the heavenly sanctuary by the Priest has this greater power. In the parallel of the Day of Atonement it was by the sprinkling of the blood upon the mercy-seat that the atonement was made (Lev 16 [15, 16]). So too in the sacrifices generally it was 'the blood upon the altar' (i.e. presented by the priest after the victim's death) that made atonement. The 'Blood' of Christ means His *risen* life, as the 'blood' in the old sacrifices meant the 'life' that had passed through death. **from dead works:** not merely your body from contact with a dead body (as with the purification by the ashes of the heifer), but your soul from the defilement of sins (cf 10 [2]). Dead works=works that are corrupt and lifeless, i.e. sins (6 [1]). **cleanse your conscience . . . to serve the living God:** as with the blood of the old covenant, so with the Blood of the Christ; it cleanses

and then dedicates or sanctifies (see note on 2^{11}; also Introd., 5, p. 598*a*).

15. for this cause, i.e. because His blood avails so greatly. In $^{15-21}$ the comparison shifts from the yearly renewal of the old covenant (the Day of Atonement) to its first establishment by the inaugural sacrifices described in Ex 24. **the mediator of a new covenant:** see Introd., 5, p. 598*a*; 7^{22}, 8^{6}, 10^{15-18}. **a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant.** The establishment of a covenant between God and man was based upon the offering of a covenant sacrifice; the covenant was sealed by the application of the blood to the parties concerned: the blood was obtained by the death of the victim, and this death was needed to 'redeem' past transgressions. The covenant of fellowship between God and man could not be instituted until the sins which hindered that fellowship had been forgiven, and 'apart from shedding of blood there is no remission' (^{22}). This is called 'the redemption of the transgressions,' the price paid for them. **they that have been called:** to enter into the covenant fellowship. **may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance,** i.e. the end for which the covenant was established, the salvation of which the Christ is the Author to us (2^{10}).

16. where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. The same Greek word (*diathēkē*) means both a 'covenant' and a 'will' or 'testament,' and it is supposed that the writer is led off by the word 'inheritance' to play upon the two meanings of *diathēkē*. The language of $^{16, 17}$ makes the translation 'testament' necessary to give sense to the passage. The objections to this translation are (1) it finds no support from the usage of the LXX and the New Testament; (2) will-making was unfamiliar to the Jews of this period; (3) the play on the two meanings is of no help to the argument: it does not follow that what is true of a will must be true of a covenant, even if the two are expressed by the same word in the Greek. These are strong objections, but, on the other hand, no satisfactory explanation can be given to the words 'doth it ever avail while the testator liveth?' if the translation 'covenant' is retained. **be:** see RVm 'be brought,' i.e. posited, taken for proved.

17. where there hath been death: see RVm 'over the dead'; lit. 'over dead persons.'

18. even the first covenant, in spite of its relative imperfectness. We return here to the meaning 'covenant.' The point holds good (that a sacrifice is essential to the making of a covenant: see on ^{15}) even if the analogy of a testament be fallacious. The dedication of the 'first' covenant is described in Ex 24^{1-8}. Our writer clearly regards the Day of Atonement as an annual renewal of this dedication ceremony (see preliminary note to this chapter). This explains the freedom with which he alters the narrative of Exodus. Thus (1) he adds 'the blood of goats' (from Lev 16^{5}) where Exodus has 'oxen' only; (2) he changes the 'pouring' or 'throwing' of the blood in Ex $24^{6, 8}$ (where the English version 'sprinkling' is a mistranslation) to 'sprinkling.' The 'sprinkling' of the blood was (with a few minor exceptions) a peculiar feature of the ceremonial of the Day of Atonement (see notes on Lev 16^{14}). The use of 'water and scarlet wool and hyssop' for the purpose of sprinkling is another addition (from Lev 14^{5}: see note); (3) in addition to the 'altar' and the 'people' (mentioned in Ex 24) he adds 'the book' (^{19}), 'the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry' (^{21}). The tabernacle was not in existence at the time of Ex 24. But the chief feature of the Day of Atonement was the cleansing of the tabernacle and its 'vessels' by the sprinkling of the blood (Lev $16^{16, 19}$). As we see how closely our writer unites (we might almost say 'identifies') the covenant sacrifices of the inauguration (Ex 24) and those of its yearly renewal on the Day of Atonement, we realize that to him the two combined formed the means ordained by God to keep 'in being' the covenant relationship between Himself and His people. When sin destroyed the fellowship with God, the Day of Atonement, by the cleansing and sanctifying power of 'the blood,' restored and renewed it. And as the sacrifice of Jesus is the 'fulfilment' not only of the inaugurating sacrifice, but also of the renewing sacrifice, so His Blood is the means by which both the new covenant was inaugurated ('My Blood of the New Testament') and the people of God are from day to day cleansed and resanctified, restored to the covenant fellowship with God (cf. Introd., 8, p. 598*a*; also 7^{25}, 4^{16}).

22. almost: the rule is not quite absolute (see Lev 5^{11-13}). **all things are cleansed with blood:** so when the tabernacle was first dedicated (Lev 8^{15}), and annually afterwards on the Day of Atonement (Lev $16^{14, 15, 19}$). **apart from shedding of blood there is no remission:** the reference in 'shedding of blood' is primarily to the act of slaughtering: this

is in accord with the argument that a death is necessary for the forgiveness of sins and the making of a covenant: cf. Mt 26 [28], 'my blood, the blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins.' It must not be supposed, however, that the blood as shed in death is contrasted with the blood as poured upon the altar. Rather the one is included along with the other in the author's mind. **remission** probably refers to persons rather than sins: setting free from the sins to which they were tied and bound. In any case its meaning is tantamount to forgiveness. Note (1) as in Lev 16, the cleansing of things (the tabernacle) and the forgiveness of sinners are interchanged; (2) the writer is concerned only with the statement of the fact (the shedding of blood is needful for remission) which he makes on the authority of the Old Testament. He does not attempt to explain or justify.

23-25. Returning now to the Day of Atonement, our writer proceeds to draw a close parallel between the acts of the Jewish High Priest on that day and their fulfilment by our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary. The parallel may be set out as follows:

The Jewish High Priest entered each year the Holy Place	The Christ entered once for all the Holy Place not made with hands, viz., Heaven itself,
to sprinkle the blood upon the mercy-seat,	to appear before the face of God,
viz., to offer blood (7) not his own.	viz., to offer Himself.
to offer often.	to offer once.

Note (1) the death of the victim in both covenants is presupposed as the condition necessary for obtaining the blood to be offered in the Holy Place; (2) the blood is the 'life' of the victim: the offering in the Holy Place is the offering of life that has passed through death. The epistle avoids actually saying of the Christ that He 'offers his blood' in heaven, though [12] comes very near it. Jewish readers accustomed to the literal offering of physical blood in their sacrifices would be liable to misunderstand such an expression. The writer therefore substitutes for it the spiritual equivalent: Christ 'offers himself,' i.e. His risen life.

23. copies: see 8 [5]. **the heavenly things themselves:** even the heavenly sanctuary by contact with sinful worshippers needs a purifying and consecrating act of 'sprinkling.' And, as on the Day of Atonement, so now, in consecrating the Holy of Holies by the sprinkling of the blood, the priest also cleanses and consecrates the people.

24. into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us: under the old covenant the Presence of God was manifested above the mercy-seat on which the victim's blood was offered: here the Priest who is also the Victim offers Himself upon the heavenly mercy-seat, i.e. in heaven itself where is the 'face of God.' **to appear:** lit. 'to be made manifest.' The Christ meets the Father face to face; and as His appearing is 'for us,' so in and through it man and God meet face to face, i.e. the covenant fellowship is realized. And this not merely at some past moment for a brief space of time (as the Jewish priest stayed in the Holy of Holies for a few minutes each year), but continually: '*now* to appear.' The 'appearing' is a perpetual condition until the Second Coming.

25. nor yet, i.e. did He enter in ([24]) that He might offer Himself often. **offer himself often; as the high priest entereth . . . year by year:** the following points are clear: (1) The entering was for the purpose of offering, and the offering follows upon the priestly entering, i.e. the heavenly self-oblation follows the ascension. (2) This 'offering' is the same as the 'appearing' of the preceding verse: both are described as the object for which He entered the Holy Place; He is the sacrificial Lamb 'standing, as though it had been slain,' in the midst of the throne of God (Rev 5 [6]). (3) The perpetual 'self-offering' is, therefore, both an act and a condition or state: see Introd., 5.

26. else must he often have suffered, i.e. in order to enter with His Blood into heaven ([11, 12]). **at the end of the ages:** the epistle regards the Incarnation as heralding the close of the 'present world' and ushering in the 'world to come' (cf. 1 [2], 8 [13]). The actual dividing line between the two 'ages' is the Second Coming which was believed to be near at hand ([28], 10 [36, 37]). **manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself:** 'the sacrifice' of our Lord includes the whole series—death, resurrection, ascension, priestly entry, and self-offering. The 'appearing' of [24] is an appearing before God; the 'manifestation' of this verse (a different Greek word) is to men. It refers primarily to the Incarnation.

27, 28. Men die once only, and enter heaven to meet their Judge; they do not come back to earth to live and die again, as the Jewish High Priest came back to the people again after sprinkling the blood in the Holy of Holies. Similarly our Lord

has been once offered and will not return to earth again until this 'age' is over. In the parallel we should expect the passage to run 'shall he appear the second time as Judge,' but the writer turns aside to give a note of hope and comfort.

28. offered refers primarily to the *Offerer's* offering on Calvary, but includes all that followed it (cf. 7^{27}). **to bear the sins of many:** His death, unlike ours, was a sacrificial act; as sin-bearer He offered a sin offering for many. **many** = all mankind, not 'some' as opposed to 'all.' **shall appear (to us) a second time, apart from sin,** because the sins have been 'put away' by His sacrifice as sin-bearer. **unto salvation:** the judgement in His case will be His vindication in the eyes of all men by His glorious appearing when He will bring deliverance to His faithful ones.

X. 1. shadow . . . image. A shadow is a more or less distorted outline without detail: the image is the exact reproduction of a thing. **the good things to come,** i.e. the fellowship with God realized through the sacrifice of Christ (see on 9^{24}). **make perfect,** i.e. for the end which we have in view, fellowship with God. **draw nigh** is the technical term for the priest or layman coming to offer sacrifice (Lev $9^{7,8}$: cf. Heb 7^{25}, 10^{22}). At the same time the expression has a wider reach, including all approach to God for worship.

2. conscience of sins: lit. *consciousness of sin*, i.e. unforgiven (cf. 9^{14}).

5. Wherefore: because of the imperfections noted above God made known even in old times, that the Jewish form of sacrifice was to make way for something better which is its 'fulfilment.' The quotation is from Ps 40^{6-8}. **when he cometh into the world,** i.e. the Christ at His birth. Note (1) Christ is here made the Author of the Scripture, as in 1^{6} it is 'God saith' of the Son (see note on 1^{5}). (2) The words written by the Psalmist some centuries earlier are regarded as intended to refer to the moment of the Incarnation. **Sacrifice and offering:** see note on 5^{1}. The terms cover the whole range of the sacrifices. **a body didst thou prepare for me:** so LXX. The Hebrew runs 'mine ears hast thou opened,' expressing the attentive listener; in the LXX obedience is translated into act: the body acts. The 'body' of the Incarnate Son was prepared for Him by God that it might be the organ of His perfect obedience in life and particularly in death.

7. In the roll of the book: see note on Ps 40^{7}. **To do thy will,** i.e. the true sacrifice of an obedient life.

10. By (or 'in' RVm) **which will we have been sanctified:** by the divine decree that sacrifice should be accomplished in the Son's offering of obedience we are consecrated through the covenant relationship established by this covenant sacrifice (9^{15}). 'Sanctified,' as always in this epistle, refers not to holiness of character, but to outward dedication. We are dedicated to God by the offering of Christ. **the offering of the body of Jesus Christ:** the reference to the offering of the body is prompted by the quotation from the Psalm. There is no contrast intended with the blood, the life of the body, the offering of which is included in the offering of the body. It should be remembered that in the Jewish sacrifices the 'offering of the body' was made by the burning of the carcase upon the altar. This was the peculiar feature of the burnt offering, in which the whole carcase was burnt upon the altar, symbolizing the entire surrender of obedience. This offering of the body equally with the presentation of the blood was the work of the priest, and so it is regarded here (see next verse). In the work of the ascended High Priest there is a heavenly counterpart to the burning of the carcase in the burnt offering, as well as to the presenting of the blood in the sin offering ($9^{24,25}$). But the priestly offering of the body presupposes and includes the previous obedience in act and suffering. What Christ the Offerer wrought and endured in the days of His flesh, Christ the Priest presents upon the heavenly altar.

11. day by day: cf. 7^{27}. If the reference here is to the burnt offering, this is literally correct (Ex 29^{38} ff.). The burnt offering is frequently said to 'make atonement' for sins (Lev 1^{4}, 16^{24}).

12. when he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God: 'for ever' may go either with 'offered' or with 'sat' (RVm). If the translation 'had offered' is correct, the words regard the priestly offering in heaven as completed with the moment of the entry and followed by the session. As in 1^{3} it is grammatically possible to translate 'offering one sacrifice for ever,' but the context is against this interpretation (see further Introd., p. 600).

13. expecting, i.e. at the Second Coming (cf. 2^{8}; 1 Cor 15^{25-28}; Ps 110^{1}).

14. by one offering: see note on 9^{25}. **he hath perfected . . . them that are sanctified:** by the original covenant sacrifice we were consecrated (sanctified); now by the heavenly offering (corresponding to the Day of Atonement) we have been per-

fected (cf. 7 [11, 18], 10 [1]). The perfection is regarded as an accomplished fact in the purposes of God: cf. the Pauline doctrine of justification (1 Cor 6 [11]). The epistle is notably lacking in the teaching of the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, to which we should expect a reference here.

15. **the Holy Ghost . . . beareth witness . . . said**: see on 1 [5].

16, 17. The two passages are cited to show that under the new covenant there should be full and final remission of sins (cf. [2]).

19-25. **The Picture of Christian Worship.**—The scene is the heavenly sanctuary into which the people of God are admitted. Leading the worship at the head of the congregation is the 'great priest' with His perpetual offering. Behind Him the body of the faithful are bidden to 'draw near,' prepared in heart and life for their worship.

19. **boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus.** As the Jewish priest entered 'not without blood,' and as Christ entered 'through his own blood,' so Christians admitted to the privilege of the priesthood enter 'by' (or 'in') the blood of Jesus (see note on 9 [7, 12]). The union of believers with the Christ admits them to share in the privileges of His priesthood, viz. the right of entry into the Holy of Holies.

20. **that is to say, his flesh**: these words contain a reference to [5-10], and may be taken in apposition either to (*a*) the veil (as in RV): 'the flesh' of Jesus will then mean those human limitations of the earthly life which hid the Father from Him (cf. 5 [7]); or to (*b*) 'the way': the death of the Cross was the way by which it was ordained that He should enter the Holy of Holies (cf. 9 [12]).

21. **the house of God**, i.e. the heavenly sanctuary pictured locally as in 3 [3] ff. But as there, so here, the idea of the building insensibly passes into that of the society 'whose house are we.'

22. **let us draw near**: the word is used of all approach to God for worship (7 [19, 25], 10 [1]), but particularly in reference to the priest's work of offering sacrifice (Lev 21 [17, 21]), and this meaning must not be excluded here. In union with the High Priest the priestly 'house of God' enter the Holy of Holies to offer their sacrifice of 'good works' ([24]). **hearts sprinkled . . . body washed**: there is a double reference in the latter to the purifications required of the Aaronic priest before his ministrations (Lev 16 [4]; cf. Ex 40 [32]), and to Christian baptism (cf. 1 Cor 6 [11]; Tit 3 [5]). The former was physical only: the latter included both the body and the 'heart' (cf. 9 [13, 14]). **hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience** (cf. 9 [14]). The figure of the 'sprinkling' is taken from the physical purifying by blood (9 [19-22]) under the Law. Our hearts are cleansed by the Blood of Jesus (1 Jn 1 [7]).

23. The verse selects the particular point on which the Hebrews stood in urgent need of repeated warning and exhortation (cf. 2 [1] ff., 3 [12]-4 [14], 6 [1-8], and below, [26] ff.). **the confession of our hope**: a reference to the confession of faith required of the candidate for baptism. The faith he professes is here presented as the things he not only believes but hopes for. **hope** is objective: 'the things for which we hope.' **he is faithful that promised**: cf. 11 [11].

24. **consider**, i.e. regard, study the circumstances of others to see how you can help them.

25. **the assembling of ourselves together** in the earthly copy of the heavenly worship just described. It should be remembered that the chief object of the Christian assembly was the breaking of the bread (1 Cor 11 [20]). **the day drawing nigh**: the day of the Lord's return to judgement (1 Cor 3 [13]). The signs of the nearness of 'the day' were plain for the faithful to see (cf. Mt 24 [33]).

26-31. The closing words of [25] suggest this solemn warning followed (as in 5 [11]-6 [12]) by an encouragement.

26. **sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth**: the kind of sin is explained in [29]; it is the sin of apostasy in the face of full knowledge. 'Wilfully' excludes sins of infirmity and weakness of will; 'knowledge' excludes 'errors,' i.e. sins of ignorance (9 [7]: cf. Lk 23 [34]). As in 6 [4] we cannot help feeling that the weak point of the argument lies in the assumption that our knowledge is as perfect as God's revelation. **there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins**: the Law provided no sacrifice for such offences (Nu 15 [22-31]). See on 9 [7]. More true still is this of the Gospel, in which the one sacrifice for sin is God's final offer, and if rejected cannot be supplemented by another.

27. **a certain**, i.e. 'a sort of': not 'certain' in the sense of 'sure.' **fierceness of fire**: cf. 12 [29].

28. Dt 17 [2-6], where, as here, the sin is apostasy: cf. Dt 13 [6-8].

29. **trodden under foot the Son of God**: the words seem to hint at some open public act of dishonour (cf. 6 [6]). **the**

blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified: see 9 13. 14. 19-22. 'Sanctification' has made him indelibly one of God's people. To abjure his membership is to treat the Blood of Christ as if it had no sanctifying power, but were **an unholy thing:** RVm 'a common thing,' i.e. not sacred and set apart, but the opposite, ordinary and profane. **done despite unto:** the word implies high and haughty insult. **the Spirit of grace:** probably the meaning is the Spirit given to us by God's gracious favour. The reference may be to the 'manifestations' of the Spirit, such as are described in 1 Cor 12 4-11, and alluded to in our epistle (2 4, 6 4). To do dishonour to these manifestations would be like the 'sin against the Holy Ghost' (Mk 3 22-30).

30. Vengeance . . . recompense: from Dt 32 35. The only Old Testament quotation in the epistle which deviates from LXX. **The Lord:** from Dt 32 36.

31. the living God: the expression is from the Old Testament, e.g. Dt 5 26 (see note). It denotes a God of power and activity.

32. enlightened: see 6 4. The persecution seems to have followed close on their conversion.

33. a gazingstock: 'exposed' as in a theatre to the gaze of the audience. These previous persecutions extended to imprisonment (bonds) and confiscation, but not to martyrdom (12 4).

35. recompense of reward: cf. 11 26 and (in the opposite sense = punishment) 2 2.

36. need of patience: cf. 6 12. **having done the will of God,** i.e. offering the true sacrifice of obedience as Christ did (10 7). That 'will of God' may include for us, as it did for Him (Mk 14 36), the endurance of persecution and death. **receive the promise,** i.e. 'of the eternal inheritance' (9 15).

37-38. The quotation is a conflation of Hag 2 6 and Hab 2 3. 4; the two halves of 38 are transposed from their order in the LXX, to lead up to 39.

XI. The Triumphs of Faith in the past history of the Jewish race are skilfully marshalled to constitute a great argument for strengthening the faith of the readers. Their generation, they are told, is the climax of an agelong expectation (39. 40). The 'end of these days' is at hand when all that the previous generations looked for will be fulfilled. If we break down now, the sufferings and triumphs of the past will have been in vain. There is an appropriateness in the selection of heroes which is probably intentional. Abel received the reward of a better sacrifice; Noah warned the world of impending disaster (cf. 12 26); Abraham and Moses left their homes for the fellowship of God's people.

1. The author is not setting out to give a definition of faith, but only to point out some of the effects it must necessarily produce in those who possess it; it makes the unrealized future and the unseen things of the present into solid certainties on the strength of which men have been content to depart this life without attaining them with unabated conviction in their reality. **the assurance:** the word *hypostasis* meaning 'solid reality' may be applied to the conviction in the mind, i.e. 'assurance' (or 'confidence,' as in 3 14), or to the thing believed, i.e. 'substance,' as in 1 2 (see RVm). **things hoped for,** i.e. on the strength of the promises of God the future is a matter of certain conviction. **the proving of things not seen:** the unseen world as pictured, e.g. in 9 24, 10 19, 11 10, 12 22 f., is put to the test and found real; 'proving' includes both 'put to the proof' and also 'approve.'

2. **witness borne to them,** i.e. by God (cf. 4).

3. **what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear,** i.e. this material and visible universe has for its ultimate cause not any material thing, but an unseen Spirit Person.

4. **God bearing witness:** Gen 4 4. **in respect of his gifts:** RVm 'over his gifts' might be a reference to the divine acceptance of the sacrifice by fire from heaven (1 K 18 24: cf. Lev 9 24). **he being dead yet speaketh:** see on 12 24.

5. **Enoch:** Gen 5 21-24; for 'walked with God' the LXX has 'pleased God.'

7. **he condemned the world,** i.e. by believing the warning of judgement: cf. Mt 12 41.

9. **sojourner:** as an alien. **tents,** i.e. not in a permanent house, but moving from place to place, in contrast with 'the city that hath the foundations.' The unseen is the solidly real and the eternal (cf. 13 14). Isaac and Jacob, the second and third generation persevering in faith, are an example to this second generation of Christians.

10. **builder and maker:** architect and master-builder. God both plans and executes the work.

11. **Sarah herself:** even Sarah the aged (Gen 18 11 ff.). **counted him faithful who had promised:** cf. 10 23.

12. **him as good as dead:** cf. Rom 4 19.

13. Cf. 39. **from afar,** as pilgrims

might die just as they came within sight of the goal of their pilgrimage. **strangers and pilgrims on the earth**: they had renounced their own country, and now dying in faith they showed that they did not regard the country of their sojourning as the Promised Land; so they made it plain that their 'abiding city' was not upon earth.*

17. was offering up: in the very act of doing so when he was prevented.

18. In Isaac: 'through Isaac shall they come who shall be called thy seed.'

19. Abraham believed that God would raise Isaac from the dead, and Isaac's delivery was a parable (a prefiguration, a type: see 9 [9]) of the resurrection.

20. concerning things to come: Gen 27 [27-29, 39, 40].

21. Gen 48 [15] ff. **leaning upon the top of his staff**: Gen 47 [31] in the LXX; the Hebrew is 'leaning upon the bed's head.'

22. Gen 50 [24, 25].

23. Ex 2 [2].

24, 25. Ex 2 [11-15].

26. the reproach of (the) Christ: Moses looked forward to the Christ (Messiah) as the goal of the fulfilment of the promises. Or the Christ (= the anointed of God) may refer to Israel (Ps 89 [51], 105 [15]). **the recompense of reward**, i.e. the salvation brought by Christ: see 10 [35].

27. forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: the apparent contradiction with Ex 2 [14-16] has led some commentators to see here a reference to the deliverance of the people from Egypt. But the expression 'forsook' and the context point to the flight. **not fearing** would then amount to 'not being turned aside from his purpose (of throwing in his lot with the Hebrews) by fear of.'

28. kept: lit. 'made' the Passover. The verb is found in the LXX with the meaning 'to offer,' but to take it in this sense here would fit in awkwardly with 'the sprinkling of the blood.' **sprinkling** should be 'pouring' (see on 9 [19]): a reference to the throwing of the blood upon the altar in the peace offering. The Passover was a sacrifice of the class of the peace offering.

33. wrought righteousness, or 'executed justice,' referring either to the just rule of the Judges and Kings, or to the righteous judgement inflicted on other nations by them. **obtained promises**, i.e. promises subsidiary and incidental to the great promise ([39]), such as e.g. the promise to David of a son who should build the Temple. **stopped the mouths of lions**: Dan 6 [22].

* Cf. notes on Mt 22 [23] ff., pp. 184, 185*a*.

34. quenched the power of fire: Dan 3 [17]. **escaped . . . the sword**: the phrases here become more general and many of them probably not intended as references to particular incidents. The writer probably had in mind the great heroes of the Maccabæan rebellion.

35. dead raised to life, e.g. 1 K 17 [22]; 2 K 4 [34]. **tortured**: beaten to death on a wheel. **a better resurrection**: i.e. to the eternal life, not merely to this life again as in the resurrection referred to just above.

37. Cf. 2 Mac 6 [18]-7 [42]. **stoned**: 2 Ch 24 [21]. **sawn asunder**, as Isaiah, according to Jewish tradition. **tempted**: if this reading is correct (as is probable on the authority of the MSS.) it refers to the temptation under torture to apostatize from their faith. **slain with the sword**, as Urijah, Jer 26 [23].

38. The world which thought evil of them was not worthy to contain them. **caves**: cf. 2 Mac 6 [11].

39. the promise that was made to Abraham (7 [6]) and 'fulfilled' in the Christian covenant (8 [6]).

40. made perfect, i.e. they had to wait till the work of the Christ was fully accomplished and the new covenant established. They died without receiving this perfection: we receive it here and now. This is the 'better thing' referred to.

XII. Exhortation to follow these examples of faith and the example of One greater still.

1. let us also: the words connect with 'these all' in 11 [39]. **we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses**: these words have been taken to mean that the saints of old are spectators of our lives. In favour of this are (1) the struggle is pictured under the figure of a race, and it is natural to speak of spectators as well as runners; (2) 'compassed about with a cloud' suggests the crowds of the amphitheatre rising tier above tier and surrounding the arena; (3) the word 'witnesses' *may* mean spectators. On the other hand it is urged: (1) the meaning of the context is that we are to look to the victors of old, not that they are watching our struggle. The latter idea would be the sudden introduction of a new thought foreign to the context; (2) throughout 11 'witness' means 'one who bears witness,' 'testifies to a fact'; and this is the more natural meaning of the Greek word (martyr). It means not so much one who sees, but one who, having seen, testifies to what he has seen. In this sense it came to mean at a later time one who is faithful unto death in his

witness-bearing, a martyr. Our corresponding word, 'witness,' in ordinary speech has lost much of its strict meaning, and is often used to mean little if any more than 'one who looks on, who watches.' But the Greek 'martyr' always meant a witness-bearer. On the whole, it is probable that the idea of the saints as spectators of our struggle passed through the writer's mind, and is expressed by 'compassed with a cloud.' But the thought is too incidental and transitory to have any weight as evidence of his belief as to the relation of the dead to the living. **lay aside every weight**: every encumbrance, even if innocent. The figure is taken from the athlete stripping for the race. **the sin which doth so easily beset us**: the word is only found here in the whole of Greek literature. It probably means 'that which easily surrounds us.' 'The sin' does not mean any particular sin (as in the common expression 'our besetting sin'), but sin in general: 'sin that hems us all round and clogs our running.' **with patience**: with uncomplaining endurance. The same word is used in the next verse for 'endured the cross.' **set before us**: not 'ordained by God for us,' but 'lying in front of us before our eyes.'

2. looking, away from the saints of old, **unto Jesus**: the supreme example of faith. **the author and perfecter of our faith**: 'author' (as in 2 [10] where the same word is used) does not contain the idea of source or origin (as e.g. when we speak of the 'author' of a book), but means no more than 'leader.' It describes Jesus as the perfect and authoritative example of faith for all to follow: not as the creator of faith in us. The word 'our' is not in the Greek. If 'faith' be taken of faith in general and 'our' omitted, the two phrases describe Jesus as the great example of faith and as the One who brought faith to its perfection. In both the idea is of Jesus as our example, not as the grace-giver. **set before him**: the same word and meaning as in [1]. By faith He saw and was assured of the 'things hoped for' (11 [1]). **hath sat down**: the perfect denotes the continuance of the session. This is the fulfilment of the anticipated joy.

3. gainsaying of sinners against themselves. On the evidence of the MSS. the reading 'themselves' has more authority than the other 'himself.' If it is followed the sense will be 'gainsaying (=contradiction) of himself by those who were sinners against themselves.' It must be admitted that this reading gives a very unnatural turn to the expression. A somewhat similar thought is found in Jer 7 [19].

4. Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, i.e. up to the point of actual bloodshedding. The 'ye' is not so much the readers personally as the Christian community in the district to which they belonged. If this be Rome, the epistle was clearly written *before* the Neronian persecution A.D. 64. **striving against sin**, i.e. sin in yourselves. The temptation of apostasy is what is meant.

5, 6. Pr 3 [11, 12]. **reasoneth with you as with sons**: in Proverbs the speaker is the wise man addressing his disciple. Our author characteristically puts the words into the mouth of God, whom he regards as the speaker throughout all Scripture. God 'receiveth,' i.e. acknowledges as His sons.

7. for chastening: with a view to your chastening. The word for 'chastening' throughout this passage means etymologically the training of a boy. It includes a great deal more than chastisement, which our word 'chastening' suggests more strongly than its Greek equivalent. 'It is for the building of character that ye endure' would better express the meaning.

9. Father of spirits: lit. 'Father of the spirits': cf. Nu 16 [22], 27 [16]; Zech 12 [1]; Ec 12 [7]: Creator, Ruler, Provider of our souls, the spiritual side of our nature. **and live**, i.e. reap the reward of eternal life.

10. as seemed good to them: sometimes mistakenly or with arbitrary caprice. **partakers of his holiness**, i.e. His entire separation from evil. By the blood of the covenant we were 'sanctified,' i.e. made holy to the Lord.

11. All chastening: the word is still the same as in [7], and implies educative discipline rather than punishment. **peaceable fruit . . . of righteousness**: after the strain of endurance is over comes the fruit of rest (peace) and accomplished victory in goodness.

12. lift up . . . knees: from Is 35 [3]. Let the 'chastening,' instead of depressing, stimulate you.

13. make straight paths for your feet: from Pr 4 [26]; 'go forward in a straight course without fear or hesitation,' so that those who stumble (lame) may recover and follow your example. **turned out of the way**: note RVm 'put out of joint'; the lame leg dislocated by the rough path.

14. peace with all men, and the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord. The 'all men' includes and is principally meant to denote 'non-Christians' who threatened the Church. Seek peace: do not retaliate; but let it not be peace with men at the expense of

surrendering fellowship with God, which we lose by disloyalty to that divine dedication (sanctification) conferred upon us (in baptism) by the covenant. **see the Lord**, i.e. meet Him in fellowship (cf. Job 19 [26]).

15. falleth short of the grace of God: lit. 'falls behind away from'; fails in response to grace, falls behind and drifts away. **root of bitterness**, i.e. a poisonous plant corrupting others, not bitterness as contrasted with peace. This is not merely shortcoming, but active evil infecting all about it.

16. fornicator: this might be taken in its literal sense, but more probably refers to the sin of 'apostasy.' As the covenant relationship with God was often compared to the marriage tie between man and wife (e.g. Hos 2 [19, 20]), so the unfaithfulness of Israel to Jehovah is continually described as adultery, and coquetting with heathen religions is called 'whoredom' and 'fornication' (Hos 2; Jer 3, etc.). The reference to 'apostasy' is supported by the context (contempt for spiritual privileges and rights). **profane person**, i.e one who although 'sanctified' by the blood of the covenant has renounced his birthright and joined the world for worldly advantages. The reference is to apostasy. The apostate like Esau has profanely desecrated his birthright of sacred privilege by selling it for a mess of pottage.

17. The chief difficulty of this verse disappears with the proper translation restored by the RV, according to which the thing that Esau sought with tears was not 'a place of repentance,' but the blessing (Gen 27 [34, 38]). **place of repentance**, i.e. opportunity, room for a repentance which would reverse the natural consequences of the surrender of his birthright, i.e. the loss of the firstborn's blessing (cf. 2 Esd 9 [11]). Natural consequences of sins are not removed even by repentance: and there is no evidence that Esau ever sought for repentance.

18-29. A renewed and final warning of the danger of turning away from the covenant. Though it invites us to a glad and glorious fellowship in contrast with the dread warnings and threats of the old covenant, yet to refuse is on that account even the more heinous a crime. It will be seen that this last warning is linked with a final encouragement in the bright vision of the glories of the new fellowship.

18. ye are not come unto, and the corresponding 'ye are come unto' of [22] have been interpreted eschatologically: the last day is at hand (cf. 1 Jn 2 [18]). But the point of comparison is the respective natures of the two covenants, and the moment contemplated is the time of the inauguration of the covenant. Ex 19-23 is the prelude to 24, defining the covenant requirements on Israel's side. If the time of the 'coming' must be specified, it would be the moment at which by baptism the Christian entered into the covenant relationship. **a mount that might be touched**: there is no word for 'mount' in the Greek, and 'might be touched' should be properly 'is being touched.' The English is therefore a paraphrase of the Greek which runs literally; 'ye are not come unto a (thing) which is being touched and has been burnt with fire.' 'Mount' is supplied in the English version from the parallel 'Mount Zion' in [22]. 'Might be touched' apparently contradicts the prohibition in [20], but the Greek avoids this by employing two different words. **might be touched**, i.e. a material thing as contrasted with the spiritual Mount Sion ([22]).

19. intreated: Ex 20 [19].

20. Ex 19 [12, 13].

21. There is no reference in the Old Testament to these words of Moses: the nearest approach is in Dt 9 [19] referring to a different occasion.

22. mount Zion: the spiritual and heavenly 'holy hill' of the new covenant. Even in the old covenant Sion, the Temple mount, the mount of grace, stood in contrast to Sinai the mount of warning and terror. **city of the living God**: cf. Ps 48 [8]; Rev 21 [3]. **the heavenly Jerusalem**: Gal 4 [26]; Rev 21 [2].

23. The inhabitants of the heavenly city are: (*a*) The angels in their myriads (**innumerable hosts**) gathered in a joyful festal assembly (**general assembly**, Greek *panegyris*, the assembly of the nation for a national festival), who are the sacred company (church) of the 'firstborn' (created first of all creatures) of the citizens of heaven (enrolled on the register of the heavenly city: cf. Rev 3 [5]). (*b*) **God the Judge of all.** (*c*) **The spirits of just men made perfect**, i.e. the departed saints. As the 'ye' in [22] refers to the Christian Church as a whole, these 'just men' will be particularly those of the old covenant now 'made perfect' with us by the true sacrifice (cf. 10 [14], 11 [40]). (*d*) **Jesus the mediator of a new covenant**: 9 [15]. (*e*) **The blood of sprinkling**: 'sprinkling' is the correct translation here, and refers to the ceremony of making a covenant (9 [19]), and of its renewal on the Day of Atonement. **that speaketh better than that of Abel**: the Greek adopted by the RV can only mean 'better than Abel.' The

difference in the sense is considerable. The allusion is not to Abel's blood crying from the ground (Gen 4 [10]), but to Abel's 'more excellent sacrifice' through which 'he being dead yet speaketh' (11 [4]). The Blood of Jesus speaks of a sacrifice better still.

25. warned them on earth, i.e. from the mount that could be touched ([18]). **from heaven,** i.e. by the Son in whom God spake (1 [2]), with a fuller revelation and a greater authority than that of Moses.

26. shook the earth: Ex 19 [18]. The quotation is from Hag 2 [6].

27. removing: the same word as used for the 'translation' of Enoch in 11 [5]. All that is created passes away: the eternal kingdom of the saints ([28]) remains.

28. The note of confidence to which the writer rises is checked by the undertone of warning which runs throughout the passage. **have grace:** perhaps better *show thankfulness* (cf. RVm).

29. a consuming fire: not only in the old covenant ([18]; Dt 4 [24]), but also in the new (2 Th 1 [8]).

XIII. **Concluding Practical Exhortations.**—These are of various kinds dealing with daily conduct and church discipline. They are given in no particular order, as they occur to the writer out of his intimate acquaintance with the conditions and needs of his readers ([22]).

2. love unto strangers: the reference is particularly to Christian brethren from other churches. The brethren in each town made themselves responsible for hospitality towards these passing strangers (cf. Ac 21 [8]; 1 Tim 5 [10]; 3 Jn [5, 6]). **entertained angels unawares:** Gen 18 [3], 19 [2]; Jg 13 [16].

5. I . . . forsake thee: Jos 1 [5].

6. The Lord . . . unto me: Ps 118 [6].

7-14 follow a consecutive line of thought which re-echoes the burden of the whole epistle. The chief purpose of the writer was to persuade his readers to be firm in their faith and not to drift into 'strange teachings.' So he reminds them of their first teachers ([7]) and the principles in regard to which their faith stood in contrast with the old covenant ([9-10]), and then urges them once and for all to make the break with Judaism ([11-14]).

7. them that had the rule . . . which spake: a previous generation of teachers who first brought the Gospel message to them. They were the guarantee, he implies, that the Gospel they taught was true. Leave not the old Gospel for 'strange teachings.' **the issue of their life:** lit. 'the outcome of their manner of life.' The word for 'life' (*anastrophe*) denotes not only the life but its character. So too 'issue' refers not only to their death, but to the triumphant vindication of their life by the glory and confidence of its close.

8. This verse connects with [7]. The Christ who was to the saints of old the object of their faith and the source of their strength is the same to you to-day, and will be to all others in the days to come.

9. carried away: lit. *side-tracked.* **divers and strange teachings:** from the words that follow it would appear that he alludes to some form of heresy which taught men to rely upon external ('carnal') ordinances for salvation rather than on inner grace from God. This suggests some form of Judaism, and the suggestion is supported by the comparison between worshippers under the old and the new covenants ([10-11]). But the simple Judaism such as we find in the Pauline epistles would hardly be called a 'novel,' 'strange' doctrine, and the reference is probably to some early forms or precursors of Ebionism. **grace . . . meats:** cf. 9 [10]. There the contrast between the 'carnal' and the 'spiritual' was applied to the 'cleansing' ([13, 14]); here to feeding. In the old the body was nourished by meats; in the new the heart by 'grace.' The next verse shows that the writer in speaking of 'meats' has in mind the sacrificial meals of the priests in the sin offerings, and that in his references to 'grace' and the 'altar' he is thinking of the Holy Communion.

10, 11. We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle . . . burned without the camp. Note (1) [11] shows that the reference is to the sin offerings on the Day of Atonement, when in accordance with the general rule (Lev 6 [30], 4 [3-21]) that when the offering was made for the priest or for the whole nation including the priests, and therefore the blood was brought into the Holy Place to be put on the horns of the altar of incense or sprinkled on the mercy-seat, no portion of the flesh was assigned to the priest, but the whole was burnt (Lev 16 [27]). (2) The altar was not the place on which the victim was slain, but on which its blood was solemnly offered to God. The 'altar' in question, therefore, cannot be the Cross. It must be the heavenly altar of 9 [12, 14, 25]. From this 'Table of the Lord' our 'hearts' are fed by 'the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood' of the Lord. We have 'priests' portions' such as were denied even to the priestly caste in the old

covenant. **they have no right to eat:** this means more than the truism that they, being Jews, could not share the Christian privileges. The principle of their covenant offered no grace-giving sacrament. Their sin offering provided a cleansing but no 'stablishing.' There was no sacrificial meal in their sin offering even for the priest. 'Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.'

11. Even on the showing of their own Law they were debarred from feeding upon the victim (Lev 6 [30]). **burned without the camp** (Lev 4 [12], 16 [27]). This was in contrast with the eating 'within the sanctuary' (*ib.* 6 [26]) to show that there was no sacred ceremonial significance in this disposal of the carcase. It was got rid of in a secular way.

12. Quite after his usual manner the writer lays hold of a casual word or phrase to introduce a new theme (cf. 6 [20]). The only point of strict analogy between the two cases is seen in the words 'without the camp.' Pressed further the comparison breaks down, for the burning of the carcase in the one case presents no parallel with the crucifixion. **that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered,** i.e. He died in order that His (His *own*, not another's: the writer cannot help inserting this central thought although it is not to the point in this context) Blood (the risen life) might cleanse and consecrate us (cf. 9 [14], 10 [22, 29], 12 [24]). **without the gate:** Jesus was content to be excommunicated from the earthly Jerusalem in order that He might build 'the city which is to come,' 'the heavenly Jerusalem.'

13. go forth unto him without the camp, i.e. renounce once for all their membership in the Jewish community. **his reproach:** cf. 11 [26].

14. an abiding city. The Jewish Church and the covenant on which it is established had been from olden days 'nigh unto vanishing away' (8 [13]: cf. 11 [10, 16], 12 [28]). **the city which is to come:** cf. 2 [5] ('the world to come') and notes on 1 [2], 9 [26]. Although the city is yet to come, the Christian by faith is already a citizen and a worshipper within it (10 [19] ff., 12 [22-24]).

15. The Christian's own sacrifice. **then:** the connecting link with the preceding verse lies in the implied thoughts: (1) citizenship in the heavenly city consists in paying homage to its King, i.e. in worship; (2) that worship is offered by means of (in union with and through the grace supplied by) the sacrifice of Jesus —so it is 'through him.' **a sacrifice of praise:** in the LXX the Greek words are used to denote one of the peace offerings, the thank or praise offering (e.g. Lev 7 [12]). Here again the writer borrows the technical language of the old covenant sacrifices and applies it to the spiritual sacrifices of the new. Our sacrifice finds a higher and truer expression than in the offering of a lamb; it is the offering of the heart out of the abundance of which the mouth speaketh. **the fruit of lips:** an Old Testament phrase, Is 57 [19]: cf. Hos 14 [2] 'we will render as bullocks (the offering of) our lips.' This sacrifice is a continual one, not occasional as under the old covenant. It is offered through Him, i.e. Christ, possible only through Him, acceptable only through Him, as the High Priest over the house of God (cf. 1 P 2 [5]). Like 10 [19] ff. this verse presents a picture of the perpetual offering in the heavenly sanctuary. But it adds two new thoughts: (1) we have an offering of our own to make; (2) that offering is a 'praise offering': we cannot make an offering for sin as our Priest does, but we can make a praise offering. It is also a burnt offering ([16]).

16. The offering of the dedicated life ('do good') and of giving under the old covenant was the burnt offering. **to communicate**=to share with others, i.e. give alms of what we possess.

17. that have the rule over you: the successors of the rulers referred to above ([7]). The words point to an organized community, although the 'rulers' may have been non-Hebrew. The Hebrews may have formed one or more 'house-churches' in a mixed church. **do this:** i.e. watch over you; this explains the 'unprofitable.'

19. that I may be restored to you. The writer's home was with this Hebrew community, and he was for the present debarred from returning to them by some unmentioned hindrance.

20-21. A prayer embodying the main themes of the epistle: the covenant, the 'priesthood' of the shepherd, and the perfecting of the sheep. The prayer assumes the collect form and order: (1) title and address; (2) mention of divine attributes appropriate to the thing asked for; (3) the petition; (4) the ground of asking: 'through Jesus' the Mediator; (5) ascription of praise.

20. brought again from the dead the . . . shepherd . . . with the blood: the only mention of the resurrection in the epistle. It is occasioned by the thought that the Priest-Victim has dedicated the covenant with His Blood (the *risen* life) in the heavenly sanctuary. **the great shepherd:** as Moses and Aaron were to the Israelites

(Ps 77 [20]), so behind their local 'rulers' there was a chief Shepherd (1 P 5 [4]).

21. to whom may refer either to God ([20]) or to Jesus Christ. It is not certain which, but the nearness of the words suggests the latter.

23. set at liberty: nothing else is known of this imprisonment of Timothy. The words show that our writer was familiar with the friends of St. Paul and by inference, with his teaching.

24. They of Italy: lit. 'Those from Italy.' The words are more natural in a writer addressing readers in Italy and sending a greeting from their fellow-countrymen, who like himself were absent from their home. Had he been writing from Italy it would have been more natural to say 'Those *in* Italy.'

Bibliography

Commentaries: Westcott; A. B. Davidson (Handbooks for Bible Classes); Peake (*Cent. B.*); *Holmes (*Indian Church Commentaries*); Nairne (*Cambridge Greek Testament*); Moffatt (*I.C.C.*); Wickham (*Westminster Commentaries*). Cf. also (on the teaching): G. Milligan, *Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews;* Nairne, *The Epistle of Priesthood;* Du Bose, *High Priesthood and Sacrifice;* Dale, *Jewish Temple and Christian Church.*

* On the English Text for Indian Readers.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES

By C. T. DIMONT

The Author.—(*a*) He was a Jew. He speaks of God in the manner of one brought up on the Old Testament. God is one (2 [19]), the Creator (1 [17]), holy (1 [13]), the Lord of Sabaoth (5 [4]). He is described as 'jealous' in the Old Testament sense (4 [5]). Man is made in God's image (3 [9]). Sin is universal among men (3 [2]), and they are responsible for their sins (1 [13-14]). Old Testament notables are taken as examples (2 [21] ff., 5 [11, 17]). The writer's standpoint suggests a Pharisaic upbringing. Life is to be governed by law (1 [25], 4 [11]), and the whole law must be obeyed in every detail (2 [10]). But it is to be a law of liberty (2 [12]). The influence of Ecclesiasticus, a book representing the ideals of the earlier scribes, is seen in this epistle. (*b*) He was a Christian. There are two explicit references to the Lord Jesus Christ (1 [1], 2 [1]). whose name is to the author the 'honourable name' (2 [7]). The teaching of the epistle has reminiscences of the teaching of Christ, especially as given in the Sermon on the Mount. The resemblances between the epistle and the sermon are so numerous that they cannot be accidental, e.g. Mt 5 [3] = Jas 2 [5]; Mt 5 [7], 6 [14] = Jas 2 [13]; Mt 5 [11-12] = Jas 5 [10]; Mt 5 [19] = Jas 2 [10]; Mt 5 [34-37] = Jas 5 [12]; Mt 6 [19] = Jas 5 [2]; Mt 6 [34] = Jas 4 [13-14]; Mt 7 [24] = Jas 1 [22-25]. Besides these correspondences in detail there is a reflection in the epistle of the Lord's treatment of particular sins. Sensual sins are not ignored, but more soul-destroying are malice, pride, formality (2 [1-13]), and the preoccupation which makes men spiritually blind (1 [24]). These phenomena forbid us to entertain Spitta's suggestion that the epistle was written by an unconverted Jew and afterwards edited for Christian use.

The author described himself as 'James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.' This tells us little, as James, or Jacob, was a common name among the Jews. Anglican formularies in quoting this epistle affirm only that it is by an Apostle (Art. 39, *Homily on Faith*, pt. 1). From early lists of canonical books it appears that the epistle soon took its place amongst them in the East, but was regarded with suspicion for some time in the West. Article 6, in including it among those books, 'of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church,' is historically incorrect. In the Christian literature of the 2nd century there are many reminiscences of the epistle, especially in Hermas. But Origen is the first who explicitly names James as the author, and even he uses the qualifying phrase 'the epistle which passes under the name of James' (*Comm. in Joh.*, xix, 6). A like uncertainty as to the authorship is reflected in Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii, 25). The assertion that Origen called the writer an Apostle, and the Lord's brother, rests upon passages in his commentaries known only in a Latin translation. But Jerome gives both names to the writer (though admitting that many ascribed the epistle to someone else), and his opinion became the accepted view. It was therefore not until the end of the 4th century that this theory was generally

received, and it must be brought to the test of internal evidence.

The name James without qualification would naturally refer to the most conspicuous bearer of it. This was undoubtedly the head of the Church in Jerusalem. Both the Acts and the Pauline Epistles refer to him simply as 'James'—the James *par excellence* (Ac 12 [17], 15 [13], 21 [18]; 1 Cor 15 [7]; Gal 1 [19], 2 [9]).

The writer belongs to the older Jewish school in the early Church. This fits in with the portrait of James in the Acts. Further, there are certain coincidences between the epistle and the speech of St. James preserved in Ac 15 (cf. Ac 15 [17] with Jas 2 [7] RVm). The epistle does not refer to the events of our Lord's life or to the claims of His Person, but distinctly echoes His ethical teaching. This, it is argued, is what we should expect in one who during the Lord's Ministry remained unconverted, but who even then could not have been unaffected by His moral teaching. The writer, a son of the Law, now reads that Law as interpreted and fulfilled by Christ. Was it not for this that St. James stood at the Jerusalem conference? Nor is there any difficulty in thinking that a Palestinian Jew could command Greek as good as that of the epistle. In bilingual countries many speak both tongues with equal fluency. But as against the traditional view several objections are urged. It is said to be incredible that one so closely associated with Jesus as James His 'brother' could possibly have been entirely silent about the facts of His earthly life. This argument is not without force. Less weight attaches to the criticism that there is no reference to the Sacraments of the Church. The absence of this may be accidental. (Without 1 Corinthians we might have been left with the impression that St. Paul knew little about the Eucharist.) It is not so easy to meet two further questions: (1) Why is the epistle altogether aloof from the great controversy in which St. James was so conspicuous a figure? (2) Why, if so eminent a man was the author, was his connexion with the epistle a matter of speculation for three centuries? There are also positive reasons for looking for the writer among the Hellenistic Jews. While his ideas recall the Old Testament prophets and the Wisdom literature, his style resembles that of neither of them, but is akin to the manner of the Greek writings called Diatribes, tracts suited for popular reading. He also has affinities with the great Alexandrian Jew Philo (cf. *Expos.*, July, 1911). Some critics therefore argue that he was a Hellenistic Jew living in Palestine.*

The Readers.—They are living in Jewish communities. Their faults, clearly noted in the epistle, are not the scandalous moral offences which, as we see from the Pauline letters, were a peril to Christian living in heathen surroundings. Around them are well-to-do unbelievers, farmers and tradespeople, who persecute them by withholding their wages (5 [4]), suing them at law, and insulting the Name of Christ (2 [6-7]). The description of them in the address as 'the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion' is symbolical, meaning Christians who are exiles from their true home in heaven (so 1 P 1 [1], and cf. Gal 4 [26]; Heb 13 [14]; Ps 39 [12]; and St. Bernard's hymn, 'Urbs Sion').

Date.—If St. James is the writer, the epistle must have been composed before A.D. 62, the date of his death. The absence of developed doctrine in the letter, and the primitive type of Church organization implied in it are compatible with this date. Many of those who think that St. James was not the author hold that the epistle has in view conditions similar to those contemplated in the Didache and the Shepherd of Hermas, and should be assigned to the end of the 1st century A.D. In this connexion must be considered the relation of the epistle to the other New Testament writings. In three cases—Romans, Galatians, and 1 Peter—there are unmistakable parallels with this epistle. But they are of such a nature that no certain conclusion as to whether it is of earlier or of later date than the others can be based upon them. The parallels with the Sermon on the Mount prove no more, as St. Matthew and the epistle may have both been quoting from an earlier written source. It must be allowed that for dating the epistle we have no material which gives any absolutely clear indication.

James the Lord's Brother.—James is mentioned as 'the Lord's brother' alone, or with other 'brethren of the Lord,' in Mt 13 [55]; Mk 6 [3]; and Gal 1 [19]. Three different explanations have been given of the phrase. (1) The Helvidian—a son of Joseph and Mary, born after our Lord. (2) The Epiphanian—a son of Joseph by an earlier marriage. (3) The Hieronymian—a cousin of Jesus.

* The genuineness of this epistle as by James, the Lord's brother, and its very early date are the conclusions reached in G. H. Rendall's very careful study just published, *The Epistle of St. James and Judaic Christianity*, a book which may well turn the tide of criticism.—C. G.

Owing to the authority of Jerome and of the Western Fathers who followed him in adopting his view, (3) was for many centuries the opinion prevalent in the Western Church, but historical investigation has proved it to be untenable. In its complete form it involves these positions: (*a*) The assumption that only two men of the name of James are mentioned in the New Testament. As the name was common among the Jews this is in itself improbable. Jerome supported his theory by mistranslating 'mikros' (little), the epithet applied to James, as 'less.' 'Mikros' probably described the stature of James; it had no reference to any comparison with James the son of Zebedee, who is nowhere in Scripture called 'Greater.' (*b*) The identification of James 'the Lord's brother' with James the son of Alphæus, and of the 'brethren of the Lord' with the three Apostles, James, Judas, and Simon the Cananæan. (This is accepted in both the Anglican and Roman liturgies: cf. the Collects for SS. Philip and James, and for SS. Simon and Jude.) But Jn 2 [12] distinguishes the 'brethren' from the disciples, and at a later stage the 'brethren' are still unbelievers (Jn 7 [5]). Ac 1 [13-14] clearly excludes the 'brethren' from the number of the twelve Apostles. (*c*) The conjectures that 'Mary of Clopas,' who was among the women near the Cross (Jn 19 [25]), was the sister of the Virgin, and that Clopas is another form of the Aramaic name also represented by Alphæus, so that James the son of Alphæus was the Virgin's nephew. This requires us to believe that there were two sisters bearing the same name, Mary, which is unlikely; nor does the text permit us to evade this difficulty by taking sister to mean sister-in-law. (The Peshito actually reads here: 'His mother's sister *and* Mary of Clopas.') Further, the identification of Clopas with Alphæus is for linguistic reasons improbable.

There is therefore no ground for assigning to 'brethren' the unnatural meaning of 'cousins.' Jerome's theory was his own private 'critical' theory, unheard of until his time, and in later days declared even by himself to be doubtful (*Ep. ad Hedibiam*). It is astonishing that it should ever have passed for Catholic tradition.

Helvidius (about A.D. 380), desiring to controvert the exaggerated estimation of celibacy already manifesting itself, taught that by the 'brethren of the Lord' were signified sons of Joseph and Mary, born after Jesus. He relied on two texts, but neither of them is conclusive. Mt 1 [25] says no more than that Joseph and Mary did not live together as man and wife before the birth of Jesus. It does not necessarily imply that they did so afterwards (cf. Gen 8 [7], where similarly it is not implied that the raven ever returned). At most the passage is but neutral. Again, in Lk 2 [7], Jesus is said to be the 'firstborn' son of Mary. This epithet is seen by reference to 2 [23] to denote the special consecration of the Child's life. It certainly cannot be turned into a proof that there were other children born after Jesus. For in Col 1 [15] and Heb 1 [6] the same word (*prototokos*) is applied to the divine sonship of Christ, and cannot there be taken to mean that He was only one among many such sons of God.

The teaching of Helvidius seems to have had no greater support in the tradition of the Church than had that of Jerome. For when it was expounded by his followers, Jovinian and Bonosus, it was condemned as novel and false by synods in Rome, Capua, and Illyria. Helvidius had indeed appealed to Tertullian's writings for support, possibly not without justification. This is not altogether certain, and in any case Tertullian is a precarious witness to orthodox belief. Origen, however, plainly implies that the opinion was common within his circle.

It is otherwise with the theory known as Epiphanian, on which the 'brethren' are half-brothers—sons of Joseph by a former wife. This opinion was stigmatized by Jerome as being 'ravings of apocryphal writings,' because it appears in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, the Protevangelium of James, and other books of the same sort. But under the rubbish with which such books were filled was often preserved genuine tradition. That this is the case here is rendered likely by a much more reputable witness, Hegesippus, a Palestinian Christian Jew of the middle of the 1st century A.D. In fragments of his writings preserved in Eusebius (*H.E.*, ii, 23; iii, 20) he speaks of James the 'brother of the Lord,' and of Jude, 'called His brother according to the flesh.' This phrase suggests reputed brotherhood, and appears to have been so understood by Eusebius himself (cf. *H.E.*, i, 1). Its Palestinian origin is an important point, for that region was not one in which virginity was praised. This view can claim the support of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen, of Ambrose, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrosiaster, etc. It remains the doctrine of the Eastern Church.

We might add to this evidence the clause in the Apostles' Creed, 'Born of the Virgin Mary.' This Creed represents the old Roman Creed which is now traced back to the earliest years of the 2nd century A.D. The primary reference is, no doubt, to the birth of the Lord. But it may fairly be asked whether it would have been natural to attach 'Virgin' as a standing epithet to Mary if she had been the mother of a large family.

What light is thrown upon this theory by the New Testament? It has been objected to it that it requires us to put a strained sense upon 'brethren' as used in the Gospels. It may be replied that St. Luke, who refers to the 'brethren' (Lk 8 [19]), also calls Joseph the 'father' of Jesus without qualification (2 [33]). Yet his account of the birth of Jesus makes it plain that he can have meant only that Joseph was His reputed father. Why then should he not also mean by 'brethren' reputed brothers? And, after all, half-brothers are fairly often so called. But there are also in the Gospels two phenomena which tell in favour of the Epiphanian theory. (1) Our Lord when on the Cross commended His mother, not to His 'brethren,' but to St. John. Would He have done this if she had had sons of her own, especially when their conversion was so near? (2) The attitude of the 'brethren' to Jesus is that of elder brothers, who feel that they can on occasion criticize and control the younger.

A question of this nature can be settled only on historical and critical grounds, and on these the balance is in favour of the Epiphanian explanation. It is significant that two such dispassionate scholars as Lightfoot and Hort both record their agreement with this theory.

(Lightfoot, Essay in his edition of *Galatians*; Hort, *The Epistle of St. James*, Preface. For the Helvidian view: Mayor, *St. James*. For a restatement of the Hieronymian position: Chapman, *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, vol. vii, 424 ff. An excellent summary of the whole controversy by C. Harris in Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*: art. 'Brethren of the Lord.')

I. 1. a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ. The form of this greeting implies that the writer believed that Jesus was not only Messiah, but also one who can be set by the side of God.

the twelve tribes. The New Testament has no idea of 'lost tribes' (cf. Ac 26 [7]).

2-18. Perfection the goal of Christian life. Temptation an essential condition in training for this ([2-4]). Can temptation come from God ([13-18])?

Two Parentheses.—(*a*) The right way to meet temptation is with prayer which is sincere and full of faith ([5-8]). (*b*) The unimportance of outward prosperity in forming character ([9-11]).

Perfection.—In the New Testament this is definitely set before Christians as their goal (Mt 5 [48]; Eph 3 [19]; Col 1 [28]; 1 Jn 4 [12]; Heb 6 [1]). The word 'perfect' must be interpreted in the light of our Lord's use of it (Mt 5 [48]). The Christian is to be perfect as reflecting the loving justice of God. While in one sense of the word perfection can be reached only in heaven, in another that man is perfect in whom everything contrary to the love of God is excluded (Thom. Aq., *S.T.*, II-II, Q. clxxxiv, Art. 2). Every Christian is called to strive for this perfection. It is not to be the goal only of those who follow 'counsels,' for everyone is called to love the Lord God with all his heart. Nor is it only for the 'elect,' as Calvin maintained. We must all aim at either perfection or perdition (St. Jeanne de Chantal). The teaching of the Anglican Prayer Book is clear. The Collect at the beginning of the Liturgy asks that we may perfectly love God. 'Keep us this day without sin' is the aspiration of the *Te Deum*. The Baptismal Office asserts that the body of sin can be 'utterly abolished.' (Cf. also Collects for Circumcision, First Sunday after Easter, and Holy Innocents.) The same doctrine is expressed in the Homilies on Charity and for Good Friday. Though St. James gives no ordered exposition of the way of perfection, he recognizes the three stages—the purgative in the endurance of trial (1 [12] ff.) and humility in affliction (4 [9-10]); the illuminative in approaching the Father of lights (1 [17]), and receiving the wisdom which is 'from above' (3 [17]); the unitive in the Divine communion vouchsafed to those who draw near to God (2 [23]). Thus the perfect man is *entire*, full-grown spiritually, and sound in every part (1 Th 5 [23]), and *lacking in nothing*, endowed with all the gifts intended for us.

2. Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations. The readers of the epistle knew by experience how manifold are the trials which test life, persecution (2 [6]), poverty (2 [15]), and the peril of becoming subservient to the rich (2 [1]), violent in speech (3 [1-11]), irreverent even in prayer (4 [3]). This exhortation about temptation implies: (1) That it is the normal accompaniment of the

Christian course. It will constantly recur, and will attack the strong points in a character. Thus our Lord was tempted to make His trust in the Father a pretext for avoiding suffering, and this suggestion was repeated at intervals (Mk 8 33). (2) That temptation is not sin (cf. Heb 4 15); if met aright it '*worketh patience*.' Modern psychology supports this: 'Temptation is the voice of suppressed evil when good is dominant' (Hadfield).

Parenthesis 1 5-8: temptation to be met with prayer. The first condition of this is wisdom, in which is included a right view of God (cf. Job 28 28; Ps 107 43). God gives to all without reserve; He does not proportion His gift to the merit of the recipient (cf. Mt 5 45). This is in contrast to the Jewish representation of Him as a great and exacting creditor (*Pirke Aboth*, iii, 23). The second condition is in the character of the man who prays. Unsatisfactory prayers are often a sign of moral weakness. Clogged prayers are a call to self-examination (cf. Mk 11 25). Instability of character as making prayer ineffective is noticed again later in the epistle (cf. 3 16 with 4 2). **nothing doubting** (6). Cf. Ecclus 1 28, 7 10. **like the surge of the sea** (cf. Is 57 20). To the Hebrew mind the sea was almost always repulsive. It is dangerous as being easily affected by outside influences. The **doubleminded man** (8) resembles it in this.

Parenthesis 2 8-11: spiritual progress independent of outward prosperity.

9. his high estate. The poor man persecuted is worthy of the beatitude pronounced by Jesus (Lk 6 20-26). **the rich in that he is made low.** The persecution which, like a sirocco (cf. Is 40 7), destroys everything belonging to the rich man **in his goings**, i.e. suddenly, as he is going about, leaves him the stronger for no longer depending on his goods. The rich here are Christians, not as in 2 6. This passage reflects Christ's warning against trust in possessions, which differed from the Jewish view that though riches are perilous, yet a comfortable competence is the best for a man.

12-18. The cause of finding in temptation the path to evil. **each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust**, or rather 'desire.' Desire, in theological language concupiscence, in psychological instinct, when it is perverted and leads to deliberate self-identification with evil **beareth sin.** Sin is the parent of spiritual death (Rom 6 23). Temptation yielded to is at last no longer felt because the soul is dead. Thus the cause is not in God. For (*a*) **God cannot be tempted with evil.** The Divine transcendence raises God above all evil, physical and moral, which are both included in temptation. He has nothing in common with evil, and therefore cannot be the author of it. Jewish teaching was clear on this (see Ecclus 15 11, 12, 20; Enoch 98 4), but pagan theology, on the contrary, made Zeus the creator of evil (*Il.*, xix, 87), and we imply the same if we assert that it is natural to sin. God is the author of good, every giving is good, and every gift is perfect from its origin, descending as it does, etc. (Hort). (17) 'and He does not change.' With Him **is no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning.** Heavenly bodies revolve in their course, and pass in and out of shadows. God does not so alter His position. He does not appear to us as light, good, one day, and darkness, evil, the next. This doctrine of an unchanging God must not be confused with the Oriental idea of a passive God. In Him there is an eternal flow of life. But as the source of righteousness He does not vary. The modern doctrine that God is Himself undergoing some kind of development, involving a change of nature, is Pantheistic, and encourages moral instability. (*b*) God, of His own will (cf. Mt 11 25, 26), has given us a new birth so that we should be **a kind of first-fruits** (18), the best which the world has to offer to Him. The new birth is that bestowed by the Gospel. The idea of a new birth was familiar in pagan mysteries. But in them it was sought by ceremonies, such as the Taurobolium, the bath of bull's blood. Here the instrument is spiritual, **the word of truth** (cf. 1 P 1 23). 'The word of God and the Sacrament of the Eucharist are equally necessary for the sustenance of "souls"' (Dupanloup: cf. *Imitat. Christi*, IV, ii, and the definition of the Church in the Anglican Art. 19). Hort takes this verse to refer to the creation of man, If so, the 'word of truth' is the Divine resolve to create man in the image of God, and man becomes the first-fruits as having dominion over all other creatures.

19-27. How to hear the Word aright. There must be a right 'disposition' for this (cf. Ecclus 5 11), just as for receiving the Sacraments, and an 'honest and good heart' (Lk 8 15). Hindrances to this: (*a*) The angry, controversial spirit (cf. 3 14, and note there). (*b*) Neglect of practice.

20. the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God, i.e. an angry man is not likely to do that which is just in God's eyes. This is a warning against undue confidence in the principle that anger may

on occasion serve the ends of righteousness.

21. putting away filthiness: furious wrath is compared with a dirty garment (same word as in 2 [2]) which spreads over the whole character. **the implanted word**: the original is here very uncertain in meaning; probably the sense is 'so that the word received' may become deeply rooted within you. **A hearer of the word and not a doer** ([23]). Heedlessness, lack of recollection, arising from preoccupation (cf. Mt 13 [22]). We are slow to grasp the severity with which our Lord warned us against this sin. But just as a man **beholding the face of his birth** (RVm) **in a mirror, . . . forgetteth what manner of man he was**, so the preoccupied hearer of the Word preached, or of the Divine Office, or of the Holy Liturgy, goes away without learning anything about his own character.

25. The heart prepared is like one who bends long over a mirror until that which it shows is stamped on his memory. Regular meditation on the Word produces outwardly obedience to God, **a doer that worketh**, and inwardly, the harmony and peace which belongs to him who is **blessed**, that is who bears himself aright towards God (cf. Ps 84 [4, 5] and the Beatitudes). **the perfect law, the law of liberty**: the law of the Old Covenant as applied by Jewish teachers had become a burden. Now in accordance with prophecy (Jer 31 [31]) it is to be superseded by a higher law, which rests not on external enactments, but upon the inward testimony of the heart. The phrase recurs in 2 [12], where it is specially connected with the merciful aspect of the Gospel.

26-27. If any man seemeth (RVm) **to be religious**, i.e. regular in the outward observances of religion. Two tests of genuineness. (1) Negative: religion is worthless if it does not produce control of the tongue. (2) Positive: the proof of its worth is in works of mercy. **unspotted** to a pagan or legalist meant freedom from ritual defilement. To the Christian it must have a spiritual meaning. This verse does not teach that Christianity is merely a code of ethics. Organized worship, the outward cultus, is essential, but worship is to show its fruits in morality. The standard is the divine character. It is that which is **before** (or rather with) **our God and Father.**

II. A particular illustration of the relation of worship and morality. Subservience to the rich is contrary to (*a*) faith in Christ ([1]), (*b*) the facts of life ([2-7]), and (*c*) the law ([8-13]). The whole law must be kept ([10-12]). That involves mercifulness, the proof of faith ([13]). The relation of faith to works ([14-26]). The chapter begins and ends with faith. 'Hold the faith,' is a primary demand. But it is only rightly discharged where its moral implications are recognized.

1. our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory. 'The Lord of' is not in the original, where 'glory' is in apposition with 'our Lord Jesus Christ.' By 'glory' is probably meant the Shekinah, the manifestation of divine glory in the Old Testament (cf. Jn 1 [14], where note the word 'tabernacled,' and 1 P 4 [14]). It is here used appropriately as the name of Him who is the effulgence of God's glory (Heb 1 [3]: cf. Lk 2 [32]). 'The Lord Jesus Christ who is the Glory:' the use of this title shows that the writer's 'Christology' has reached a stage of considerable development. In the presence of that glory manifested in poverty, what place is there for class distinctions?

2. synagogue: rather *your assembling together*. There is no reason to suppose that Christians met in a synagogue (cf. Rev 2 [9], 3 [9]).

3. Sit thou here in a good place: rather 'Please sit here.' This is nearer the Greek idiom, which is one of polite request.

4. divided in your own mind. The double-mindedness condemned in 1 [8] here takes this form. There ought to be no stopping to consider expediency in such a case. Here again the epistle follows the teaching of Christ in condemning a practice which was customary among the Jews (cf. Mt 23 [6]; Lk 11 [43]).

4. judges with evil thoughts, i.e. who judge on evil principles.

5, 6. The facts which prove the folly of subservience to the rich: (*a*) **Did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom?** An echo of the Beatitude in Lk 6 [20]. (*b*) **Do not the rich oppress you?** Currying favour with the rich will not prevent this. It is not meant that the rich who come to worship also persecute; but they belong to the class who are persecutors (cf. 5 [4-6]). It is not necessarily religious persecution which is here mentioned, but vexatious lawsuits, by which the rich defeated the attempts of the poor to obtain redress for such swindling as is described in 5 [4]. **the judgement seats** are probably those of the local Jewish courts.

7. Do not they blaspheme the honourable name which was called upon you? (RVm: cf. Jer 14 [9]; Ac 15 [17]). This cannot mean the name 'Christian,' for the tense of the verb implies that the re-

ference is to a name uttered at some particular moment, i.e. the moment of baptism into Christ. There is good evidence that baptism in the early Church was sometimes administered simply in the Name of Christ (cf. Ac 2 38, 8 16).

At this point those whom the foregoing verses censure are thought of as offering two excuses: (*a*) We keep the law of love (8-13). (*b*) We follow the law of faith (14-26).

8. the royal law: probably the law on which all others depend (Mt 22 40). A less likely explanation is that it is a law meant for believers who are called 'kings' (cf. 1 P 2 9).

10-11. The call for Christian perfection, already heard in 1, is now repeated, but under a different aspect. **stumble** (10) is a misleading translation, as the reference is to deliberate disobedience: cf. the same word in Rom 11 11. *Fail* (Weymouth) is better. We cannot reserve the right to disobey one part of the Law on the ground that we keep the rest. The penitent who refuses to face some one sin will lose even the virtues which he has won (cf. our Lord's warning, Mt 5 29-30). Similar teaching is found in *Test. Asher*, ii. In the man who is divided between good and evil, the evil will finally swallow up the good.

11. For he that said. The claim of the whole Law to obedience is based upon the unity of the Law which comes from one Lawgiver. We cannot bargain with Him as to which part of His Law we are going to observe. All sins are not of equal gravity; but all are breaches of the rule of love. So, as Augustine shows (*Ep.*, 167), one cardinal virtue involves the others. A wise man cannot be a coward, or intemperate, or unjust.

13. judgement is without mercy to him that hath showed no mercy (cf. Mt 18 32-35, 25 14-30). **mercy glorieth against judgement:** judgement will have no terrors for the merciful (cf. Mt 25 34-40).

14-26. Profession of a creed which leads to no good works is valueless. Belief without action is as futile as good wishes without action—dead in itself, intrinsically dead.

14-17. A description and condemnation of church members in whom works of charity are absent.

18 is an attempted defence of them. **Yea, a man will say, Thou hast faith, and I have works.** The key to this obscure verse is in recognizing the Greek idiom by which 'Thou' and 'I' simply mean 'one man . . . another.' The objector says that there are different temperaments: the religion of one consists in having faith, of another in doing works. It is implied that these are two distinct types. But James replies that both must be found in the Christian. There is no minimizing of faith here, or suggestion that it does not matter what a man believes. But no one can be a good Churchman merely by holding a creed.

19. An example of 'barren' faith, i.e. belief which produces no salvation. The fear of evil spirits before God, a thought familiar to Jews, is seen in the meetings of the possessed with Christ (Mt 8 29: cf. Ac 19 15). They tremble at the thought of coming judgement. Two examples of faith producing works: (*a*) Abraham—faith expressed in fortitude. Abraham made the great adventure, and was 'justified,' i.e. accounted righteous, accepted for what his faith was going to make of his life. (*b*) Rahab—faith expressed in charity. Rahab believing in God protected the spies, even though it was perilous to herself to do so.

26. This verse, which seems to reverse our ordinary conception of the true relation of faith and works, becomes clear if we remember that to the Hebrew 'life' and 'spirit' are bound up with movement and action.

By many, notably by Luther, the argument here has been taken to be a direct contradiction of the Pauline treatment of faith and works (Rom 4; Gal 3). But the two writers are dealing with different situations. The 'works' which St. Paul rejects are those of Jewish legalism, which Pharisaic Christians wished to fasten on all believers. The 'works' for which St. James calls are those of the Gospel, which become a Christian. The faith which St. Paul teaches is manifested in 'working through love' (Gal 5 6). This is precisely the faith demanded by St. James, who condemns only the faith which is empty of such working. It is improbable that St. Paul's letters were known to the writer of this epistle. The common use of the example of Abraham proves nothing, as Abraham was a familiar topic of discussion with Jewish teachers. In both writers there is a clear expression of the demand characteristic of to-day, that religion shall be tested by its ethical results.

III. **The True Wisdom.**—The wise man is not in a hurry to be a teacher. He knows how great is the risk of misusing the teacher's instrument, the tongue (1-2). This danger illustrated at length (3-12). False and true wisdom contrasted (13-18).

1. Be not many teachers. Cf. our Lord's warning (Mt 23 8; Rom 2 17 ff.). Teachers

were held in high honour among the Jews (Jn 3 [10]; *Pirke Aboth*, iv, 12). In the Church teaching was regarded as a gift of the Spirit (Rom 12 [7]), which was bestowed upon leaders like prophets (Ac 13 [1]) and bishops (1 Tim 3 [2]; Tit 1 [9]). The theory that there was a separate order of 'teachers' is not borne out by the New Testament. The *Didache* provides a sketch of what was in later days supposed to be typical apostolic teaching, dealing with Two Ways (moral instruction), Christian life and worship (the Sacraments), and the Ministry.

The teacher's temper is to be gentle. James is a strong man, who can denounce when necessary (cf. 4 [1-4], 5 [1-6]), but his ideal is not in controversy, but in making peace.

2. If any stumbleth not in word, the same is a perfect man. The view that control of the tongue is in itself the mark of perfection may seem to be out of proportion to the modern mind, to which the tongue is only an instrument of expression. But in antiquity the tongue was regarded as something independent, able to assert itself against the rest of the man (cf. Ps 57 [4]; Pr 15 [4]; Ecclus 5 [13]). Primitive man ate the tongue of a dead king in order to gain eloquence, or of a fierce animal in order to gain strength.

3-12. So there is something unnatural and terrifying in the tongue. Man can control one of God's creatures, such as a horse ([3]), and he can control things which he makes himself, such as a ship, which is steered according to the 'desire' (not as RV 'impulse') of the steersman ([4]). But the tongue can be likened only to something uncontrollable, such as fire. **boasteth great things:** rather *can boast greatly* of claims which can be made good ([5-6]).

5. how much wood: rather *how great a forest.*

6. the world of iniquity. In this difficult expression 'world' must be interpreted in conformity with its use elsewhere in the epistle (1 [27], 2 [5], 4 [4]), as being something apart from God, or opposed to Him. The tongue is a power in itself, which may be full of wickedness. **The wheel of nature:** nature (genesis) means all human life. The tongue is like the axle of a wheel which gets red-hot, and then sends the fire along the spokes, until the whole wheel is ablaze. Furious and uncontrolled speech makes the individual man as unapproachable and useless as a burning mass, and then spreads into society around him and sets all ablaze. Contrast the fire of the Spirit, which at Pentecost consecrated tongues to the service of Christ. The unnaturalness of a tongue which both blesses and curses illustrated by two analogies ([11-12]). In the Old Testament cursing is not reprobated (cf. Jos 6 [26]; 2 K 2 [24]). Later Jewish thought had risen above this (cf. the condemnation of 'two tongues' in *Test. Benj.*, vi, 5), and our Lord called for a complete change of attitude about it (Lk 9 [54-56]: cf. 1 P 3 [9]; Rom 12 [14]). The woes uttered by Christ (Mt 23), or the curse laid by St. Paul on Elymas (Ac 13 [11]), were not maledictions, but the words of stern love seeking amendment. We can only repeat the curses in the Anglican Commination Service if we are willing to pray for those against whom they are directed.

13-18. Wisdom from below and from above. James applies his test of works to the tongue. **Who is wise and understanding?** Who claims to be an expert teacher? 'The Wise' had this technical meaning to a Jew. It is he who bears himself gently among the brethren. The evils resulting from **jealousy**—personal animosity, and **faction**—party spirit (cf. Gal 5 [20]) are (*a*) shouting down opponents, and (*b*) disregard of truth: **glory not, and lie not against the truth.** The history of controversy provides abundant illustrations of both, and Jewish leaders displayed both when attacking Christ: vainglory (Jn 5 [44]), falseness (Mt 21 [25-26]). Such a spirit is spurious wisdom, which is **earthly, animal** (RVm), **demoniacal** (RVm). The second epithet describes man's natural faculties unsanctified; it is opposed to spiritual (1 Cor 2 [14]). The third witnesses to the conviction common to Jews and Greeks, and shared by Christians (1 Cor 10 [20]; 1 Tim 4 [1]; and cf. Enoch 6-19), that evil demons were constantly near, waiting to obsess men, and capable of inspiring them with that spirit of deliberate opposition to God which is an 'energy of Satan' (2 Th 2 [9]). So controversy, divorced from love and truth, may become the sin against the Holy Spirit. The result is **confusion.** The controversialist aiming at his own glory will be shifty, unstable (1 Tim 6 [5]).

17. The true wisdom that is from above. For its heavenly origin cf. Wisd 7 [25], 9 [4]; Ecclus 1 [1-4]. This wisdom is **first pure,** i.e. near to God (4 [8]: cf. Mt 5 [8]). Originally the word meant 'ready for worship.' It is contrasted with the contact with demons of the false wisdom. Christian morality starts from a right view of God. The true wisdom is in controversy **peaceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, pre-**

ferring to win an opponent rather than a victory; **full of mercy and good fruits,** leading to works (1 [27]), not passive (2 [17]). **without variance:** colloquial Greek suggests that the word here used means 'not too critical.'

18. the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace for them that make peace. The rewards which righteousness brings belong to the peaceful (cf. Phil 1 [11]; Heb 12 [11]).

The description of the heavenly wisdom suggests these practical applications: (1) Public discussions on religious subjects, especially as conducted in the newspapers, would be more profitable if those who took part in them realized more clearly that spiritual experience, a sense of responsibility, and a sincere desire to arrive at the truth are indispensable qualifications for the task. Where these are absent only 'confusion and worthless deeds' ensue. (2) Acquaintance with facts about religion, such as even a demon may have, is not spiritual knowledge. (3) The true pattern of heavenly wisdom is to be sought, as in all else, in Christ (cf. Mt 11 [29-30]).

IV. **Conduct in Relation to Man's Attitude to God.**—The passionate and pleasure-loving cannot pray aright to God ([1-3]). The worldling is the enemy of God, to be saved only by subjection to God ([4-10]). The censorious usurp God's right to judge ([11-12]). The presumptuous ignore the will of God ([13-17]). 3 ended with peace, 4 begins with the war which arises from pleasures 'which campaign' in the members (cf. 1 P 2 [11]), that is not merely sensual pleasures, but every kind of selfish pleasure. In contrast with the first days in Jerusalem (Ac 4 [32]), this Christian community is rent by wars and fightings.

2. Correct the punctuation thus: **Ye lust, and have not: ye kill. And ye covet, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war.** Unbridled pleasure-seeking, striving to remove out of the way those who impede it, is illustrated by Ahab and Naboth in the Old Testament, and Herodias and the Baptist in the New Testament. Here some actual occurrence is evidently in view. The fanaticism of the Jew (cf. Jn 16 [2]), even when converted, made murder by him possible. This is implied by 1 P 4 [15]. A favourite disciple of St. John became a murderer (Clem. Alex., *Quis Dives*, 42). Even in a Christian congregation to-day, as the experienced missioner knows, may be those who have removed others to serve their own ends.

3. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss. Prayer is not simply a demand note, presented to God to claim anything which we want. It is a moral act in which we ask only for that which can be granted by the Giver of every perfect gift (1 [17]).

4. adulteresses: figuratively meaning apostate souls. Ancient Semites spoke of a god as married to his tribe. The gross forms taken by this conception were refined and spiritualized by Hebrew prophets (Is 62 [4]). Hence apostasy from God is called adultery (Ps 106 [39]). **friendship of the world** (cf. 1 Jn 2 [15-17]; Phil 3 [18-19]). Pursuit of pleasure leads not merely to indifference to religion but to downright hostility to God, destroying the capacity for worship and service.

5. the scripture saith (RVm): introducing the next words as a quotation. No known Scripture contains anything like them, but cf. Ex 20 [5]; Wisd 6 [23]. Hort suggests that there were in circulation Greek paraphrases of the Old Testament which may have contained these words. **Doth the spirit, etc.:** translate as Hort: *Jealously doth He yearn after the spirit which He caused to dwell in us.* God longs for men's friendship. The Fall interrupted it. Holy men, Abraham and Moses, were described as God's friends. Divine wisdom 'entering into holy souls, maketh them friends of God' (Wisd 7 [27]). God's 'jealousy' is His refusal to allow man to give to the world the loyalty due to Himself alone. As the previous verse suggests, the writer is thinking of the allegiance of the believer to God as comparable to faithfulness in marriage. This thought is frequently found in Scripture, applied both to the people of God as a whole and to individuals (Is 54 [5]; Hos 2 [16-20]; Rev 21 [2]).

6. But he giveth a greater grace (RVm). The soul which uses grace receives ever-increasing supplies of it (cf. Mt 25 [29]; Jn 1 [16]). As in biology a function used grows stronger, so in grace.

7. Be subject therefore unto God; but resist the devil, and he will flee from you. The same connexion of humility with resistance to the devil is found in 1 P 5 [6-9]. The devil is compared in the Ignatian Exercises to a forward woman, who will trample on a weak man, but yields to a bold man.

8. Draw nigh to God: a phrase used of priests approaching the altar in the Old Testament. So the Christian draws near to Him, pure not only in outward act (hands), but also in motive (heart) (cf. Ps 24 [4]).

9. let your laughter be turned to mourning. This is not the Puritan attitude, by which all joy is made to appear

sinful, because humanity is held to be totally depraved, but the sorrow which springs from penitence, when the soul, looking upon its sins, 'sickens at the sight' (Pusey, *Penitence*, 9). The affliction here demanded is understood by Mayor, following Erasmus, to refer to fasting and self-discipline. As with faith (2 [14-17]), so with repentance: its reality is proved not by the mere feelings which we have about it, but by its practical results.

11-12. An instance of the strife mentioned in 4 [1]. The law here in mind is the 'royal law' of love (2 [8]). To refuse to obey this law is to criticize it as though the call of brotherhood were unreasonable (cf. Mt 7 [1]).

13-16. If pleasure-loving chokes the word, so also does the pursuit of gain (Lk 8 [14]). This paragraph is apparently addressed to unbelievers. They are not called 'brethren.' For godless traders among the Jews cf. Am 8 [4] ff. Trade is as noble a thing as any profession if its ethics conform to the will of God. But these traders look far ahead with plans guided only by love of gain (cf. Lk 12 [15-21]). They represent those who to-day see no connexion between the Gospel and business.

15. ye ought to say, If the Lord will. This was a Greek or Roman, not a Jewish, formula, so that James is saying that even pagans have more piety than these who **glory in their vauntings,** brag about their independence of God.

17. To him therefore that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin. The 'therefore' does not confine this conclusion to the paragraph immediately preceding. It is a general reference back to such passages as 1 [22-23] and 2 [14] ff. Christian morality is positive: it is not satisfied by saying, 'I have never done anybody any harm.' The cardinal virtue of justice requires us to render to everyone his due. Omission to perform the commands of God to do this, when they are known to us, is consequently sinful as being a failure in justice (cf. Jn 13 [17]; Thom. Aquin., *S.T.*, II-II, Q. lxxix, Art. 3). For the basis of this in the teaching of our Lord cf. Mt 5 [43-48].

V. **1-6.** The persons here denounced are, as in the last paragraph, unbelievers. But they stand for wrong-doing of an even worse type, that of the men who pile up riches by merciless sweating, the capitalists without any sense of responsibility. The writer calls upon them not to repent—the day for that is past—but to prepare for a fearful retribution. The possibility that iniquity may reach a point where there is no remedy is recognized by our Lord (Mt 23 [23]; Lk 12 [10]: cf. Rom 1 [28] ff.; Heb 12 [17]). Here we might be listening to one of the prophets of the Old Testament (cf. e.g. Is 5 [8-10]; Jer 22 [13-14]; Am 5 [11]; Mic 2 [8]). They proclaim, as James here, the certain doom awaiting those who gain wealth unjustly. Our Lord went beyond this, and pointed to the immense spiritual risk which in any case accompanies the possession of riches (Lk 6 [24], 18 [24]). His words were not to be explained away then, nor can they be now.

1-3. The doom of the rich. **your miseries that are coming upon you** (1), i.e. the torments of the damned. The judgement descends on them because they have made no attempt to serve others with the riches they possess. In the East this sin took the form of hoarding (cf. Lk 12 [18]; 19 [20]; Mt 13 [44]). To-day it appears in all the kinds of greedy avarice whereby the poor are defrauded, and in that luxurious use of riches which is without any sense of responsibility. Both are aptly symbolized by the figures used here, and by our Lord (Mt 6 [19]): **moth-eaten** (2) and **rusted.**

3. Placing the full-stop after **flesh** and connecting **as fire** with the following words: *Your riches eat into your skin like rusty fetters. You are storing up for yourselves in the day of judgement the fire of gehenna.* **in the last days:** the prophetic expectation of a final appearance of God in judgement (Jer 23 [20]) coloured also the early Christian idea of the Second Advent (cf. 2 Th 1 [7-8]).

4-6. Specific offences of the rich.

4. Withholding wages due to servants. The law ordered that wages should be paid at the end of each day's work (Deut 24 [14-15]). The prophetic denunciation of breach of this law is recalled by the title **Lord of Sabaoth** (Is 5 [7], and cf. Ecclus 34 [22]). God is almighty, and therefore not to be mocked.

5. Wanton luxury, only making them into victims fattened **for a day of slaughter.**

6. Slaying the righteous, either by privations brought upon him, or by actual violence (cf. Wisd 2). **he doth not resist you:** the reference is probably to righteous victims in general. In favour of referring it to our Lord is the fact that He is called the Righteous in Lk 23 [47]; Ac 7 [52], 22 [14]; but, on the other hand, He did not endure the particular acts of oppression named (cf. Is 53 [7]). An allusion to Him here seems to be irrelevant, and in Wisd 2 [12] the 'righteous man' is used generically.

If the clause be referred to the Lord, it may be interrogative. 'Doth not he' (the Lord, by His judgements) 'resist you?' Or, Has He not become your adversary?*

7-11. Endure, for the Lord is at hand. **Be patient:** the virtue here called for is not gentle patience, but brave endurance. The word is not that used in 1 3. The writer turns from those who oppress to those who are being oppressed. They are to endure because **the coming of the Lord is at hand** (8). '*Parousia*' meant in common speech the visit of a king or emperor. Jews used the word of the expected appearance of God to vindicate them (*Test. Judah*, xxii, 2). Christ taught His disciples to look for His own coming (Mt 24), and it became to them a practical inspiration of endurance (as here and in 1 Th 3 13), constancy in the faith (1 Jn 2 28), belief in the vindication of righteousness (2 Th 2 8), certainty of immortality (1 Th 4 13-18). It is thought of as being very near. **the judge standeth before the doors** (cf. Mk 13 29). This expectation died away in a later generation (2 P 3 4). But it represents an abiding call to think of the spiritual values of life as they appear in eternity. The endurance which is to follow from it is compared here to the stout heart with which the farmer waits for the coming of the rains, which in Palestine are more uncertain than in any of the other countries of the Near East (7).

The looking for the Lord is to cure the tendency, natural in times of tension, to find relief in grumbling at those about us (9).

10. **the prophets who spake in the name of the Lord** (cf. Mt 5 12; Ac 7 52).

11. **the patience of Job:** Job is cited as an example of righteousness in Ezek 14 14 and Ecclus 49 9 (Hebrew text). Though, probably from this verse, the patience of Job has become proverbial, his distinguishing quality was rather passionate resentment against undeserved suffering. But he endured until he saw **the end of the Lord** i.e. the vindication which at last he received from God. (Augustine's suggestion that the phrase means the death of Christ is untenable.) It is remarkable that among these examples of patience the supreme instance of Christ is not mentioned (ctr. 1 P 2 23).

12. **But above all things,** i.e. above all other signs of impatience. **swear not:** although the direction, **Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay,** may have been current among the Jews, yet the rest of this verse shows unmistakably the influence of the Lord's words in Mt 5 34. To swear by God is commanded in Dt 6 13, and is a sign of His worshippers (Ps 63 11; Is 48 1). But later teachers discouraged it (Ecclus 23 9-13). In a truly Christian society there would be no need of oaths. Where they are necessary, as in a court of law, it is because of the hardness of men's hearts, and they are to be used as sparingly as strong medicine (*Cat. Conc. Trid.*, III, iii, 7), and with justice, judgement, and truth (Jer 4 2). Cf. Anglican Art. 39, and Thom. Aquin., *S.T.*, II-II, Q. lxxxix. There is always the risk that the resort to oaths will produce a double standard of truthfulness, as it may be held that in an unsworn statement a lie is lawful.

13. **Is any among you suffering? let him pray,** instead of swearing. **Is any cheerful? let him sing praise.** Psalms and hymns were a prominent feature in Jewish worship at this time. The Church used these, especially such as were drawn from the Psalter, and added hymns which were distinctively Christian (examples in Eph 4 8; 1 Tim 3 16; and in Rev., e.g. 4 11). The 'Odes of Solomon' were probably a hymnary originally Jewish, so adapted and amplified. St. Paul similarly regards hymn-singing as the natural expression of a Christian's joy (Eph 5 19; Col 3 16).

14-16. The healing of the sick. Two distinct cases are here contemplated. In general cases of sickness the Christian will call in **the elders** (presbyters) **of the church,** who will use oil, a recognized remedy for physical ills, accompanied by the spiritual aid of **the prayer of faith.** In some cases, where the patient is conscious of sin, he will take the opportunity to make confession of it, and so secure ghostly as well as bodily healing. There is no suggestion here of any connexion between the use of oil and forgiveness (*v.* appended note on Unction). The ministers of this anointing are to be the

* In favour of referring the clause to the Lord it should be noticed that: (*a*) The section 5 1-6 is strongly minatory, and addressed not to Christians but to their oppressors. Thus the question 'Is he not your adversary?' is in place, while a reference to Christian meekness is less suitable. (*b*) 'The Righteous' was in the early Church of Jerusalem a recognized title for the Lord, and the charge that the Jews had condemned and crucified Him habitually pressed home. To the references given above add Ac 3 14; 1 Jn 2 1; and perhaps 1 P 3 18. Cf. specially with St. James's words Ac 3 14, 15. Wisd 2 would almost certainly have been applied to the Lord by the early Christians. (*c*) The word here translated 'resist' is repeated from 4 6, and St. James immediately proceeds in 7 to speak of the coming of the Lord. It is difficult to give a satisfactory meaning to 'therefore' in 7, if the AV translation of 6 is accepted. Cf. Hort, *Epistle of James*, 100.—H. L. G.

elders of the Church. From Ac 14 [23] and 1 P 5 [1] it is clear that presbyters were a normal part of the constitution of every church. This passage implies that they discharged spiritual functions. If they were no more than elderly believers, with no particular office, it is difficult to see why the sick man should send for them to anoint him and pray over him. But this act was natural if they were the ordinary leaders in worship. **Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed:** the confession here intended is not merely the acknowledgement of a fault to one who has been wronged by the sinner, but confession to another Christian, in order to obtain his intercession, and through it healing, i.e. of the soul (cf. Heb 12 [13]). The primary reference here may be to confession to Christians of any order, but, as Calvin remarks on this verse (*Inst.* iv, 2), the most natural hearers of such confessions are the pastors of the Church. Among the Jews sick persons were urged to make confession to Rabbis, to whom the presbyters of the Church here answer. The public confession of sin, which was the normal method in use until the 5th century (*Didache*, iv, xiv; Tert., *De Poenit.*, ix), ultimately passed into private confession to a priest. But the principles here laid down are still kept in view. The penitent, after naming his sins, asks the priest to intercede for him, and receives the healing of absolution.

17. An illustration of the power of prayer. **Elijah was a man of like passions with us,** not a superhuman being, as Jewish tradition regarded him (Mal 4 [5]; Ecclus 48 [1-12]; Mt 27 [49]). **and he prayed fervently:** the Old Testament mentions only his prayer at the end of the drought. The story as here quoted suggests the subjects for the intercession mentioned in the preceding verses. First, there will be prayer that the sinner may learn his sinfulness, even at the cost of punishment. Then there will be prayer for his deliverance and healing.

19-20. The blessedness of restoring an erring brother. The reward is that he who does so **shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins:** either (1) the sins of the man converted, or (2) the sins of the converter: (2) is more in keeping with Jewish modes of thought. There is a close parallel in 1 P 4 [8] and 1 *Clem.* xlix, all evidently resting on some proverbial saying. There is a sense in which he who labours to bring others to God also works out his own salvation (1 Tim 4 [16]).

Note on Unction

14. Anointing is here recommended as a means of physical healing then in common use. The Jews accounted oil to possess strong remedial properties (Joseph., *Bell. Jud.*, xxxiii, 5). While our Lord Himself is not recorded to have employed it for this purpose, His disciples did so (Mk 6 [13]), and the text here implies that the practice was continued in the Church. This interpretation rejects two inferences which have been drawn from this verse. (1) That a magical use of oil is here intended. Such a use was known among the Jews (*Tract. Sabb.*, xiv, 3). But here restoration to health, described as **saving** and **raising,** follows the **prayer of faith. in the name of the Lord** is no more an incantation here than it is in baptism. Christian commentators on this verse expressly contrast this Unction with pagan magic (Cyril Alex., *De Adorat. in spir. et ver.*, vi, 211; Ven. Bede, *Expositio super div. Jac. Epist.*). (2) That the allusion here is to Unction as a sacrament normally applicable only to those about to die, and conferring grace with remission of sins. This view finds no support among early interpreters, who explain the text as referring to a physical remedy, and know nothing of any sacramental significance (Orig., *Hom. in Lev.*, ii; Chrysost., *De Sacerd.*, iii, 6; Bede *ad loc.*). To the same effect is the testimony of the early Roman Church in the so-called Egyptian Church Order (Rome, 3rd century), and the Letter of Innocent I to Decentius (A.D. 416). In the Gregorian and Gelasian Sacramentaries the forms for the hallowing of oils make no reference to remission of sins. Irenæus declares that anointing as a spiritual protection for the dying was in vogue only among heretics (*Hær.*, I, xxi, 4). But by the 9th century (Council of Chalons, A.D. 813) the theory was emerging that Unction was a sacrament to be employed only for those *in extremis.*

In the First Prayer Book of Edward VI an office for Anointing was inserted in which restoration to health was emphasized, as it is now in the Office of the Greek Church (*Euchelaion*).

Healing is one of the normal functions of the Church (1 Cor 12 [9]) to be reckoned amongst its regular ministries (cf. the charge at the giving of the Bible in the Consecration of Bishops). It must be exercised under the sanction of lawful authority. It rests upon the belief that health means that complete harmony of

body and soul which the Incarnation shows to be according to God's will, and it therefore requires in the recipient repentance for all sin which may disturb that harmony, and faith in the power of God to restore it. This conviction in no way ignores the need of full co-operation with the medical profession, nor does it overlook the educational use of suffering, by which God often brings us into nearer fellowship with Christ.

(*Vide* Report of Lambeth Conference of 1920, 125. Puller, *The Anointing of the Sick*: Ch. Hist. Soc. Tract., LXXVII [an exhaustive survey]. Bishop Maclean's article, 'Unction,' in Hastings' *E.R.E.*; Dearmer, *Body and Soul.*)

Bibliography

Commentaries: J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*; J. H. Ropes, *St. James* (*I.C.C.*); Hort, *Epistle of St. James*: Macmillan (unfinished); R. J. Knowling, *St. James* (*W.C.*) (best for English readers).

Expositions: J. Adderley, *St. James*, with notes for general readers; H. Maynard Smith, *The Epistle of St. James*; A. Plummer, *Expositor's Bible.*

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

By A. J. Mason

According to the testimony of Eusebius, this epistle was 'undisputed' in the early Church, which was not so uncritical as is sometimes thought. Among the early writers who quote the epistle by name are Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian in Africa, Irenæus in Gaul. Earlier writers still, who show a familiar acquaintance with it, but without naming it, are Clement of Rome, Polycarp of Smyrna, and 'Barnabas.'

Authorship.—A great many modern critics reject this epistle. Their grounds for doing so are mainly threefold: (1) its language; (2) its relation to other New Testament writings; (3) the political situation supposed in it.

(1) If we were obliged to consider St. Peter to be the immediate author of every word and phrase of the epistle, or else to abandon his authorship altogether, no doubt most scholars would choose the latter alternative. Though probably St. Peter could speak Greek, it was unlikely to be this delicate and idiomatic Greek, as good as any in the New Testament. Nor is there the least sign that the epistle was written by him in Aramaic, and translated by another. It is the free composition of someone to whom the language presented no difficulties. St. Peter must have told the writer in some detail what he wished to express, and left him to put it into words. If he then read it through, and approved of it, and perhaps added with his own hand the final words, it would be his epistle. Silvanus is named (5 ^{12}) as the bearer of the epistle; it is easy to imagine him to have been also the scribe, but there were doubtless many others near St. Peter qualified to be so.

(2) The epistle contains many traces of the writer's familiarity with other documents which form part of our present New Testament. Of these the most noticeable are the Epistle of St. James (cf. 1 $^{6, 7}$ with Jas 1 $^{2, 3}$, 1 ^{24} with Jas 1 $^{10, 11}$, 4 ^{8} with Jas 5 ^{20}, 5 $^{5-9}$ with Jas 4 $^{6-10}$), and the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans (cf. 1 ^{14} with Rom 12 ^{2}, 1 ^{17} with Rom 2 ^{11}, 1 ^{20} with Rom 16 ^{25} f., 2 $^{6, 8}$ with Rom 9 ^{33}, 2 ^{10} with Rom 9 ^{25}, and many other passages) and Ephesians (cf. 1 ^{2} with Eph 1 ^{4}, 1 $^{4, 5}$ with Eph 1 $^{11, 18}$, 1 ^{14} with Eph 2 ^{3}, 2 ^{18} with Eph 6 ^{5}, and others). It is not possible to think that these documents are the later and have been influenced by our epistle. St. Peter's is the later. There is no reason why he should not have used them. The Epistle of St. James was early known at Rome (Clement, Hermas), from which, as we shall see, St. Peter was writing. He could not have stayed long in Rome before becoming acquainted with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, if indeed he had not read it earlier. The Epistle to the 'Ephesians' was, like his own, a circular letter to some at least of the same churches, and could not have been absent from the mind of the messenger whom St. Peter was about to employ to carry it. So far as dates are concerned, there is no difficulty.

Nor is there more difficulty in imagining how St. Peter could receive from St. Paul, unless, like an obsolete type of scholars, we conceive of the two men as belonging to hostile and irreconcilable groups of Christians. For that view there is no historical ground. The Epistle to the Galatians is enough to disprove it. All

evidence goes to show in St. Peter an impressionable character, quite capable of learning from others. And the 'Paulinism' of 1 Peter is capable of being much exaggerated. The epistle contains nothing about the conflict between the Law and the Gospel, about justification by faith, or other specially Pauline topics. A comparison between 4 1, 2 and Rom 6 7, between 3 22 and Rom 8 34, between 3 18 and Rom 5 2, and similar passages, does not show St. Peter as a humble disciple of St. Paul. Though his language is no doubt, influenced by St. Paul's—it must, however, be remembered that the influence may have been more felt by the scribe than by the Apostle himself—the underlying beliefs belong to the common stock of primitive Christianity, as represented in 1 Cor 15 3, 11. Differences still exist. St. Peter, for example, is inclined to speak of Christ's death as our example (2 21), which is not Pauline. The doctrines are not incompatible, but they are independent. It will be noticed how often the resemblances between the two Apostles show themselves in connexion with Old Testament quotations, some of which are traced back to our Lord Himself, and which (as 1 Cor 15 3 shows) were studied by the original believers before St. Paul came on the scene.

(3) There is perhaps more difficulty in reconciling the Petrine authorship with the date (A.D. 64) traditionally assigned to St. Peter's martyrdom. The Christians are liable to be put to death, though apparently none have yet died, not for crimes supposed to be associated with the Christian name, but for the name itself, i.e. for being Christians (4 14, 16). It used to be argued that this only became the case in the time of Trajan, in consequence of his famous letter to Pliny (A.D. 112). But Ramsay and others have shown that Trajan made no alteration in the state of the law. What was illegal after him was illegal before him—to be a Christian.

The state of things described in the epistle is precisely such as we might expect in a document dated from Rome at the beginning of the Persecution of Nero. Up to that time the Roman authorities had in the main been protectors of Christianity, especially against the Jews. They are still considered in this epistle as friends. Christians are warned, however, not to give room for any suspicion of disloyalty. 'Foolish men' are on the watch, and ready to report any antisocial conduct. Nero, according to Tacitus, had taken advantage of the popular belief that Christians were guilty of such conduct to screen himself from the odium of burning Rome by transferring it to the Christians. It would have been unnatural at any later period to repeat so complacently St. Paul's language about the government (2 13 f.; cf. Rom 13 1 f.). Yet nothing like a universal persecution has broken out. It is imminent (1 6, 3 14 f., 4 12 f., 5 10), but it is possible that it may yet be avoided. The whole epistle is coloured by the danger, and the means of averting it, and the way to regard it, if it comes.

Destination.—The readers to whom St. Peter writes are the Christian churches of 'Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia'—probably named in that order, because that was the order in which Silvanus was about to visit them. They are addressed in terms which would at first sight imply that they were Jews living in Gentile countries—the 'Dispersion' (cf. Jn 7 35). St. Peter was eminently the Apostle of the Jews (Gal 2 7 f.). But his apostolate was not confined to them. The description given in the epistle of the past life of its recipients implies that the majority were of Gentile origin (see especially 4 3). It is a strained interpretation which makes it otherwise. But whether Jews or Gentiles by birth, they had succeeded as Christians to the position of Israel (2 9 f.). St. James had used the same metaphor before (Jas 1 1).

They were in fact mostly Pauline churches, founded partly by St. Paul himself, partly by his coadjutors. Why then does not St. Peter mention him? Either he was out of reach on his long projected visit to Spain (Rom 15 28), or more probably he had already fallen by the sword. It was in any case safer not to go into unnecessary details, but to leave Silvanus to report by word of mouth (cf. Eph 6 21), when affairs were so critical. The reticence was of a piece with the allegoric dating.

The epistle is dated from 'Babylon.' There is no tradition or probability of St. Peter's ever visiting the Babylon on the Euphrates or that on the Nile. Interpreters unbiassed by Protestant views all understand it to mean Rome, beginning to be to the new Israel what Babylon was to the old (cf. Rev 14 8, etc.).

Character.—It is a letter of practical advice in the circumstances of the time, not a doctrinal treatise. It is, however, based on Catholic belief with regard to the Trinity (1 2), the Divine nature of Christ (2 3, 4, 3 14, 15), His redemptive sufferings and transcendent glory (*passim*), the work

of the Spirit (e.g. 4 [14]), the continuity of revelation in the Old Testament and the New (1 [10], etc.), and other topics. The one thing in which it is peculiar is the development of the 'Descent into Hell' (3 [18] f.), which goes far beyond anything else in the New Testament.

The writer professes to be a 'witness' of the sufferings of Christ (5 [1]). He speaks with sympathy of those who love our Lord without having seen Him (1 [8]) as he himself had done. But he does not labour the point. He calls himself 'an Apostle of Jesus Christ' (1 [1]); he claims to be a 'fellow-elder' (5 [1]), because he is enduring whatever hardships elders were called to endure.

Analysis.—The following is a rough analysis of the epistle: (1) Address (1 [1, 2]). (2) Exultation in the Gospel (1 [3-9]), as foretold by the prophets (1 [10-12]). (3) Exhortation to live in accordance with it (1 [13]–2 [10]), specially in view of threatening dangers (2 [11, 12]). (4) Submission to authority, political (2 [13-17]), social (2 [18-25]), domestic (3 [1-7]). (5) General advice (3 [8]–4 [11]). (6) Encouragement to endurance (4 [12-19]), especially to church officers (5 [1-4]). (7) Final exhortations (5 [5-11]). (8) Salutations (5 [12-14]).

I. 1. **Salutation: lit. to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, etc.** 'Sojourners of Pontus' would naturally mean Jews inhabiting Pontus (cf. Jn 7 [35]), as opposed to Jews in their central home of Palestine. But the Christians had succeeded to their position, and this was part of the metaphor. Christians are settled in the world, without making it their home. The 'election' is both that of the Church, the new Chosen People, and of the individuals who compose it.

2. Note the Trinitarian character of this verse (cf. Mt 28 [19]; 2 Cor 13 [13])—not, indeed, worked out into a system, but clearly outlined. The **foreknowledge** is that of God, even the Father. It is not only a knowledge of facts, but of persons, and implies the carrying out of a divine plan. The word was thought by ancient commentators to be attached to the word 'Apostle' (cf. Rom 1 [1]); most moderns connect it with 'elect'; Hort would connect it with both. The **sanctification** is the work of the Spirit (cf. 2 Th 2 [13]). It includes the passage from a profane state to a hallowed one, and the progressive consecration generally associated with the word. The foreknowledge and the hallowing had their purposed result in **obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.** This phrase carries us back to Ex 24 [7, 8], the inauguration of the Mosaic covenant. 'Obedience' to the revealed will of God was the condition of the benefit; the 'sprinkling' God's acceptance of the people. The blood (for these Christians) was that of Jesus the Messiah. His sacrifice on the Cross is presupposed; its mysterious efficacy is not enlarged upon. How or when it was 'sprinkled' upon them is not stated; but it was evidently at every time that in self-surrender they received the tokens of the renewal of the New Covenant (cf. our Lord's words at the institution of the Eucharist). St. Paul does not use the metaphor; but cf. Heb 9 [18-21], 10 [22], 12 [24]. There may be here an allusion also to the self-sacrifice which Christian 'obedience' may demand.

3. **Thanksgiving for the blessings of the Gospel** (cf. Eph 1 [3]). God is still the God of Jesus Christ, as well as His Father; see Jn 20 [17]; Eph 1 [17]. Jew and Gentile—St. Peter says 'us'—had failed alike, and it was a proof of 'abundant mercy' that they had been admitted to the New Covenant.

begat us again: better *anew*. The word used by St. Peter does not occur elsewhere in the Bible, or indeed in any earlier literature. For the idea cf. Jn 3 [5]; 2 Cor 5 [17]; Gal 6 [15]; Tit 3 [5]. 'St. Peter's language includes [the] conception . . . of entrance into a new order of existence, but combines with it that of Divine parentage; men enter the new life as children of its Author' (Hort). That new life is described as **a living hope.** Even to the Jews 'hope' had mostly become lifeless and conventional; the Gentiles had never known of anything to look forward to (Eph 2 [12]). The means whereby the great change was effected was the historical fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. It changed the whole aspect of things, and infused into men new force to apprehend their meaning.

4. What in one sense is a 'hope,' in another is an **inheritance.** St. Peter thinks of the Christian as enjoying a new and better Canaan. The old Canaan had been ravaged by hostile armies, desecrated by misuse, and withered by scorching suns; the new was not subject to such calamities. It 'had been kept' from eternal ages—such is the force of the participle—'in heaven, with a view to' those whom St. Peter is addressing. Servants of God in earlier days had not enjoyed it (cf. Mt 13 [16, 17]). 'Heaven' had been God's storehouse.

5. As the inheritance had been kept for Christian times, so are the Christians themselves under guard now, until the suitable moment. It is God's power which guards them, but not without their co-operation; it works **through faith.** The object towards which it works is **a salvation,** or preservation, which was already there, but was not yet fully disclosed. Disclosed it would be at the proper time; St. Peter calls that moment **the last time.** It is doubtful what he means by that. Some suppose him to mean 'in a season of extremity'—when, for instance, persecution broke out, and all human hopes failed. Or it may mean, as often, in the perils of the end of the world, which the Apostles felt to be not far off.

6. Joy in the foregoing thoughts. If the antecedent to **wherein** is not personal (God, Christ), it is probably the whole content of [3-5] (cf. Mt 5 [11, 12] for exultation under persecution). The tense of the participle forbids the translation 'are in heaviness'; it should be *after being grieved.* The 'grief' is regarded as over, at the point on which the writer fixes. The *various trials* include the small annoyances, as well as the serious dangers, to which his readers were subject (cf. Jas 1 [2, 3]).

7. *That the genuineness of your faith, being more valuable than gold which perisheth but is tested with fire, may be found unto,* etc. Hort conjectured that the word translated (AV) 'trial' was really an adjective 'genuine,' 'approved.' Several instances of this word have now been discovered giving the required sense, as above. However perishable a thing gold is (cf. [18]), men take much pains with it; how much more is it natural and worth while to take pains over an imperishable thing like faith, to secure that it is real. The order of the original is in favour of joining **may be found** with **unto praise.** The thought of 'finding' a particular result in the last day is frequent in the New Testament (e.g. Phil 3 [9]). The 'praise,' etc., appears to be both that of the faithful (cf. Mt 25 [21]) and that of their Saviour (cf. 2 Th 1 [10]). **at the revelation of Jesus Christ.** However and whenever the veils which hide Him are removed—at the final appearance, or in the partial disclosures of the present age.

8. St. Peter recognises the difficulty, which for himself did not exist, of loving One whom they had never seen. **on whom** belongs to **believing.** Not only do they love without seeing, but faith is strong enough to bring an inexpressible joy. **full of glory** is lit. *glorified,* i.e. irradiated by the glory of God. This joy is seen frequently in the Acts of the Martyrs (cf. Ac 7 [55, 56]).

9. **receiving** already, in such a joy, **the end of your faith.** The word implies that what is so received was *due.* The true text has no 'your' before 'faith'; but St. Peter seems to mean such a faith as he has been speaking of, as contrasted with sight (cf. 2 Cor 5 [7]). Such moments of 'glorified joy' are an end of 'faith' in this sense. They are, indeed, that 'salvation of souls' towards which faith looks. 'Salvation is deliverance from dangers and enemies, and above all from death and destruction. The soul is not a particular element or faculty of our nature, but its very life' (Hort).

10. The Christian salvation a mystery to the prophets who foretold it. **the prophets** (omit the article: cf. Mt 13 [17]). **grace,** i.e. 'favour'; the whole of Christianity is included in the word. There is no need to think specially of *Gentile* believers.

11. First, what is meant by **the Spirit of Christ that was in them?** A well-instructed Christian cannot doubt that it is the same Holy Spirit that afterwards dwelt in Jesus Christ and was given to the Church by Him. But at the time of the prophets' 'searching,' the title bears a somewhat different shade of meaning. We might almost translate 'the Christ-Spirit,' 'the Messianic Spirit,' i.e. the Spirit whose function in the prophets was to prepare beforehand for the Christ that was to come (cf. 1 Cor 10 [4]; Heb 11 [26]). Secondly, what did the Spirit then teach? 'The sufferings destined for Messiah, and the glories that should come after' (cf. Lk 24 [25, 26]). The plural 'glories' seems to denote the different aspects under which the glory appeared to different prophets. Thirdly, what does St. Peter say about the intimation of this message by the Spirit to the prophets? Two words are used. The AV translates the first 'did signify,' the second 'testified beforehand.' Perhaps the simplest thing will be to translate the first *meant,* the second *appealing beforehand to.* Lastly, the point of the prophets' search was 'with a view to what season or to what manner of season,' i.e. to what kind of circumstances 'the Spirit meant' when it impelled them to prophesy so solemnly of salvation.

12. In answer to their 'search' it was **revealed** to them that their prophecies concerned the future. It seems to be a generalization from passages like Dan 12 [8, 9]. **did they minister these things,**

viz. the sufferings and triumphs of the Messiah. The word 'sets forth the prophets as servants of God conveying to others certain things received from Him' (Hort). *Not for themselves, but for you.* There is something of appeal in the 'you.' The 'evangelists' referred to were mainly St. Paul and his associates. The prophets had spoken by a mysterious power within; these evangelists through (God being regarded as the speaker) the Spirit who was now publicly and authoritatively sent, as at Pentecost, from heaven for the purpose.

The short concluding sentence asserts that even angels desire to 'look down,' as from their heavenly windows, at the things contained in the Gospel, and their development (cf. Eph 3 [10]).

13. Exhortation founded on the foregoing. **girding . . . mind** means energetic thought. *Fixing your hope upon the grace which is being brought to you.* **grace,** as in [10]; **at the revelation,** as in [7].

14. **children of obedience:** a Hebraic form of expression. It carries us back to [2]. **not fashioning,** etc. (cf. Rom 12 [2]). **in (the time of) your ignorance** naturally points to converts from heathenism, while not inapplicable to Jewish Christians.

15, 16. Lit. *in conformity to the holy One that called you.* 'Conversation' (AV) = intercourse with others. It is characteristic of this epistle to feel the influence of a quotation before it is actually made. See Lev 11 [44], etc., and cf. Anglican Article VII, 'Of the Old Testament.' Usually 'holy' denotes persons or things set apart for God's service; but as applied to God Himself, it suggests the moral perfection which is wholly aloof from all evil. The thought is not Pauline.

17. **if ye call on him as Father, who judgeth,** etc: probably a reference to the Lord's Prayer, but cf. [2, 14]. **respect of persons:** a Hebraic expression for favouritism. Judgement is being passed at each moment on Christian, Jew, or Gentile. **sojourning:** cf. 'strangers' above. The word rendered **pass** is 'hold intercourse,' as in [15]. **fear:** no doubt of God, but expressed generally, including the impression made upon others.

18 f. The exhortation to 'fear' is based on recognition of the cost of their privilege. **silver,** etc. (cf. [7]). Their former manner of social life, whether Jewish or Gentile, had been both burdensome and 'vain' (Ac 15 [10]; Eph 4 [17]).

19. Probably said with reference to the Paschal Lamb. They had been 'redeemed,' like Israel of old, with blood; but the blood was infinitely more 'precious,' as being that of Messiah Himself. He is likened to a lamb without blemish, etc. (Ex 12 [5]); but St. Peter does not mean that the blood of *any* such lamb was precious. How the redemption was effected he does not explain (cf. [2]); he rests upon the fact.

20. **foreknown** (cf. [2]). **manifested:** His previous, though hidden, existence seems to be implied, but is not definitely stated. **at the end of the times** (cf. Gal 4 [4]). **for your sake:** not necessarily 'for you Gentiles', it enforces the appeal.

21. It was 'through' Christ that they were 'faithful unto God'; they could not have been so without His resurrection and ascension. As usual in the New Testament the resurrection is the work of God the Father. There is little to be said for the modern rendering 'that your faith may be also hope in God.' St. Peter means that Christianity substitutes no new object of faith and hope for the ancient and eternal object—God.

22. Continuation of the practical exhortation of [17] f. **ye have purified your souls in your obedience** partly repeats the 'sanctification' of [2], as 'obedience' repeats the following clause and [14]. St. Peter argues from the position that this purification has been gained. Its first effect was to produce **love of the brethren,** i.e. of their fellow-Christians. But this was not to be the end. 'Love' was a greater thing yet (cf. 2 P 1 [7]). **fervently:** rather *persistently.*

23. No exhortation to be begotten anew, but grounded on the fact that they have been so begotten (cf. [3]). It is this which makes Christians brothers. The **word** of God, i.e. the Christian revelation, is often likened to a seed. But this seed is not 'perishable'; it is the implanting of something of God's own being.

24. Is 40 [6-8]: the old life, with its many attractions, was a perishing thing, not lasting, persistent, like the new.

25. The word for **word** here is not the same as in [23]. This is a definite and concrete utterance of that. **was preached unto you:** 'was brought as a gospel within your reach.' Whether the preachers were St. Paul, Silvanus, or others, St. Peter has no doubt that it came from God, with all His regenerating power.

II. 1. The exhortation continues, enforced by the grandeur of the Christian position. These warnings are resumed from 1 [22].

2. **newborn babes:** with reference to the 'regeneration' of 1 [23]. An un-Pauline comparison. **spiritual** is certainly wrong; it should be *of the mind.* **without guile:**

the reference is probably to 'guile' in 1. The epithet is common in the sense of unadulterated. This milk is the same thing that had brought them into life—*inde pascimur unde nascimur*. Beyond it the Christian never gets; all else is distasteful. **salvation** as in 1 5, 9 f.

3 explains what 'milk' is meant (Ps 34 8). Observe that **the Lord** in the psalm is 'the incommunicable Name,' which we represent by Jehovah. St. Peter does not say that whenever in the Old Testament Jehovah is spoken of the person of Jesus Christ is meant; but the next verse shows that he has no hesitation in applying to Jesus Christ the Old Testament language about Jehovah (cf. 3 15).

4. The word 'proselyte' is derived from that rendered **unto whom coming. a living stone: as living stones:** the epithet makes it plain that the relations between Christ and the faithful are not fixed and unchanging, as in an ordinary building. **rejected** (Ps 118 22); **of men:** both Jew and Gentile. **elect,** etc. (Is 28 16).

5. **spiritual,** negatively, as not being literal or material; but also positively, the Spirit of God being the bond of union. **to be** (i.e. for the purposes of) **an holy priesthood.** Some would translate 'an . . . act of priesthood.' This is possible, but it would involve a change of meaning in the same word between this and 9. The purpose which house and priesthood serve is **to offer up spiritual sacrifices.** Priesthood and sacrifice are correlative terms:—no sacrifice, no priest. But the sacrifices (note the plural) offered by the Christian priesthood are 'spiritual,' like the 'house' in which they are offered—not literal, nor material. The essential part of any sacrifice, even under the Old Testament, lay in the disposition of the offerers. Such was the value of the sacrifice of Christ, and the Christian sacrifices can only be 'acceptable to God' so far as they are united with His and bear the same character. This does not exclude the offering of the body or blood of Christ, which gave full expression to His will (cf. Heb 10 7 f.); nor does it exclude any holy action by which Christians identify themselves with His action—only St. Peter does not discuss this question.

6. Is 28 16; cf. Rom 9 33. **in Zion,** of which in the fulfilment all Christians were citizens. Isaiah seems to have meant the sure promises to David and his kingdom; the Apostles 'had come to know the true Son of David, and to see the beginning of a larger Zion' (Hort). **put to shame:** 'no word could better express the collapse and frustration of a life not built up on faith in a Divine Cornerstone sustaining and unifying human existence and human society' (*ibid.*).

7. **For you therefore . . . is the preciousness** resumes from 4. Christians recognize the value of the Stone, and share in it. To 'unbelieving men,' Jews and Gentiles, the prophecy holds true, 'the Stone,' etc.

8. **A stone of stumbling** (Is 8 14; cf. Rom 9 33). Both Apostles follow the Hebrew original, as against the LXX. **the word,** i.e. the Christian Gospel; its twofold effects are constantly spoken of (cf. Lk 2 34). **were appointed** in God's providential ordering of events (cf. Rom 9 17, 22, of which St. Peter was probably thinking). 'Appointed' is the same word in the original as 'Behold I lay,' and perhaps refers to it. We cannot understand the mystery of God's predestination, but it is something to know that His hand is in everything, even when men are most rebellious.

9. These glowing titles catch up Is 43 20; Ex 19 5, 6, 23 22 (LXX); Mal 3 17. Christians were **an elect race** (cf. 1 1)—chosen of God, for purposes of His own, and bonded together as if by a common origin. In Exodus Israel is, as in Rev 1 6, 'a kingdom of priests'—God being their King, and each Israelite being a priest. In 5 1 St. Peter bears witness to differences of rank within the body, but that is not directly intended here; he dwells rather on the joint function of the whole organism. **royal** seems to denote dignity and spiritual independence—perhaps in spite of secular attempts from outside. They formed a **nation** of their own, distinguished from those among whom they sojourned by a special sanctity. They belonged to God in a sense which no other nation could claim ('peculiar'). The purpose of these attributes is defined in words chiefly taken from Is 43 21. Christians are chosen, not that they may enjoy their exalted privileges, but that they may 'tell out the excellences' of God to others (cf. Mt 5 15, 16). For God's 'calling,' cf. 1 15. **called:** to all alike, the former state was 'darkness' compared with the light of Christian faith.

10. From Hos 1 and 2; cf. Rom 9 25 f. In Christ they had gained a unity which they had never had (Gentiles) or had lost (Jews). **For mercy,** cf. 1 3.

11. An appeal for conduct befitting citizens of a better country, resident among jealous observers. Cf. 1 1, 17. **fleshly:** a Pauline word. It does not

occur in LXX. Such lusts are pre-eminently of this world, not of the eternal one, to which Christians belong. The metaphor of 'warring,' occurring both in St. Paul (Rom 7 [23]) and in St. James (4 [1]), was perhaps by this time part of the common stock of Christian language. The effect of such lusts is to disintegrate the true personality, 'the soul.'

12. behaviour (1 [15, 17, 18]). **seemly** = honourable, marked by moral beauty (cf. Jas 3 [13]). **wherein**: cf. 3 [16]. **evildoers**: an uncommon but quite general word, which St. Peter uses three times. Suetonius (*Nero*, 16), speaking of this very period, says that 'the Christians, a kind of men of a new and maleficent superstition, were punished.' **the Gentiles**, because, Jews by birth or not, the Christians were now of a higher race. **by** (i.e. in consequence of) **good** (honourable) **works** aforesaid. A distinct reference to the Lord's words in Mt 5 [16]. **which they behold**, lit. *beholding*, in a course of personal observation. **glorify God** denotes the recognition of His moral character, as seen in the behaviour of His people. **day of visitation.** There is no article; St. Peter does not contemplate any particular moment. The expression, frequent in the Old Testament, looks forward to a time when God will 'visit' His people with deliverance and the heathen with judgement.

13. Submission to lawful authority (cf. Rom 13 [1] f.). 'In ancient society subjection was taken for granted as a necessary condition for the well-being of society; but as a universal principle of personal life, subjection is characteristically Christian. It consists not in the sacrifice of the individual to the community (the weakness of the ancient social life), but in the recognition that the individual attains his own true growth and freedom only through devotion to the community' (Hort). It does not make much difference whether we understand the institutions spoken of to be 'of man,' or divine institutions 'among men.' In any case submission to them is urged **for the Lord's** (i.e. Christ's) **sake**; i.e. not (probably) because of Christ's teaching on the subject, but because of practical consequences to Him and His Church. **the king** = the emperor. Though the title was hateful to the Romans, it was used without hesitation by Greek-speaking people. He was **supreme**, i.e. held the highest position. It is not implied that he *ought* to hold it.

14. governors: all who were entrusted with provincial administration. **by** (lit. through) **him**, i.e. 'through' the emperor. St. Peter does not, like St. Paul, explicitly trace all such authority to its divine source; but he implies it. **evildoers** (see [12], and cf. Rom 13 [3, 4]). Both Apostles dwell upon this double end of the magistrate's function; **praise** is, of course, less prominent than punishment, but it would find place when men falsely accused left the court without a stain upon their character. See Pliny's testimony in his famous Letter (x. 96).*

15. so, viz. by respect for authority; further explained by the following clause. **ignorance** = inability to discern the facts. **foolish** implies a reprobation for want of thought.

16. Such submission as St. Peter enjoins is a voluntary thing, which implies no bondage. It has its limits, as St. Peter proceeds to point out—**bond-servants of God.** His own martyrdom was an instance. *not as using liberty for a pretext of ill-will* towards the institutions in question.

17. Honour (cf. Rom 13 [7]). St. Paul had spoken of special persons to whom honour was due; St. Peter extends it to all, inclusive of authorities. **the brotherhood** (cf. 5 [9], and see 1 [22] f.). The two next clauses are taken from Pr 24 [21]; but these injunctions of duties which all Christians will recognise only serve to enforce the duty expressed in the last.

18. Submission of slaves to masters. St. Peter turns to the extreme opposite in the social scale. Slaves were a most important element in the early Church, and perhaps the words 'as free' suggested this address. The word for 'servants' is not the usual one, but the more respectful term which denotes the household relation. The **fear** prescribed is probably not that of the master only, but of giving occasion for charges of disaffection; but cf. Eph 6 [5]. **good**, i.e. kindly; **gentle**, i.e. reasonable, considerate; **froward** (lit. 'crooked'), i.e. perverse, one who puts a bad construction on everything.

19. this, viz. what goes before, explained by what follows. **acceptable**, lit. 'grace,' or 'thanks'; St. Peter does not as yet say from whom. **conscience towards God**: rather *consciousness of God*. The man knows that God is present and sees, and it helps him to endure.

* Bigg *ad loc.* notes that, owing to the wide paternal jurisdiction of the Roman magistrate, praise was much more directly and frequently his function than it is in the case of his modern counterpart. It is an evil that rule should be too much associated with punishment.—ED.

20. glory: rather *renown*; a high-sounding word, not elsewhere found in the New Testament—here slightly humorous. **when ye sin**: the word is often used for faults, less grave than 'sins.' There is no need to insert 'for it' in either sentence. **acceptable**: the same word as in [19]. God, says Archbishop Leighton, 'will thank a man for it.' A Christian may not care for 'renown'; but he will not be indifferent to God's thanks (cf. Lk 6 [32] f., and 17 [9], which were probably in the writer's mind).

21. The noble passage which follows was called forth by the grievances of slaves. **hereunto**, viz. ill-treatment with well-doing. **called** (cf. 1 [15], 2 [9]). **because**: it is assumed that His experience and ours will be alike. **suffered**: the word acquires a darker shade than it had in [20]. **for you**, not 'instead of you,' but 'on your behalf.' **leaving you an example**: both the Greek words are unique in the New Testament.

22. no sin (Is 53 [9]). St. Peter substitutes for the LXX word the simpler one which would cover such 'faults' as slaves might easily commit. **guile** (cf. [1]).

23. reviled: the same word recurs in 3 [9]. Probably St. Peter has in mind Is 53 [7]. He refers not only to the time of the Passion, but to the habitual conduct of our Lord. He speaks from personal recollection. Revilings and threatenings were very frequent among slaves. **committed**, not Himself, but rather a general word, like 'the matter'; no object is expressed. **righteously**, with reference to [19], 'wrongfully.'

24. Is 53 [11. 12]. A very difficult verse. Christ did far more than leave an example. **his own self**—so far from committing sins—**bare** ours. 'Bare' means lit. 'took them up,' 'shouldered'; 'in his body' seems to emphasize the thought of 'his own self.' It was a voluntary act. St. Peter feels for the slaves undergoing corporal punishments. **upon the tree**: there is no need to press the thought of motion, as in RVm 'up to.' **our sins**, not 'your'; St. Peter cannot leave himself out here. 'The tree,' as thrice in Acts=the cross, always with reference to the passage in Dt 21 [23], quoted by St. Paul (Gal 3 [13]). **having died**: a word not found elsewhere in the New Testament; lit. 'being lost to sins.' **live** (cf. Rom 6 [11]). **by whose stripes** (Is 53 [5]): St. Peter reverts to the second person. Much that St. Peter here says is not Pauline.

25. like sheep (Is 53 [6]). **are now returned**: better *turned*; it does not imply that they had once been in the fold and had left it. The word is common, but here there is probably a reference to Ps 23 [3]. **Shepherd**=Christ, suggested by 'as sheep.' The title denotes ruling more than feeding. **Bishop**, though already an ecclesiastical word, had not the special modern meaning. The office was one of inspecting or visiting. St. Peter has already used a cognate word in [12]. **your souls**: the inmost part of you (see [11]).

III. **Submission of wives to husbands.** It is to be observed that this is not a manual of ethics. There is no section on the duties of masters, as in Ephesians and Colossians. St. Peter is giving pastoral advice in special circumstances.

1. your own, *because* they are your own. **the word**=the Gospel; cf. 2 [8], where also 'disobedience' to it is spoken of, as here. In the next clause there is no article, **without . . . word**; the wife's best way of preaching the Gospel is to *live* it. **behaviour**, as in 1 [15], 2 [12]. **be gained** (lit. 'shall be gained') seems to imply the success of the plan; cf. Mt 18 [15]; 1 Cor 9 [19] f.

2. beholding: the same word as in 2 [12], though in a different tense ('after beholding'). **chaste**: the word—or the verb from it—comes in 1 [22], and the order of the original denotes that **fear** has helped to form this character. For 'fear' see 1 [17], 2 [18].

3. Note that not all to whom the epistle was written belonged to the poorer classes. St. Peter does not condemn these things, though it has been pointed out that such processes may involve waste of time, but he speaks of them as ineffectual for the main purpose, i.e. for 'gaining' the husband.

4. hidden: contrasted with 'outward,' and explained by the addition 'of the heart.' In Eph 3 [16] St. Paul speaks of 'the inner man'; and St. Peter may have taken it from him (cf. Rom 7 [22]; 2 Cor 4 [16]). There is no need to add (with RV) 'apparel' after **incorruptible**; it is good Greek for the abstract quality of 'incorruptibility.' Twice before the writer has spoken of gold or the like as corruptible (1 [7. 18]). **meek and quiet** bear out the main injunction, to submit. **spirit** =temper; not often used thus in the New Testament (but cf. 1 Cor 4 [21]; Gal 6 [1]), though frequently in the Old Testament (e.g. Ps 34 [18]; Is 29 [10]). **which**=the hidden man in such a spirit.

5. Old Testament examples of this adornment. **holy** as consecrated in Scripture. **hoped in God**, RV rightly; the hope had been realized in the Gospel (cf. Eph 1 [12]).

6. See Gen 18 [12]. They 'became' her children by the new birth which makes Christians the heirs of all the promises. **if ye do well** (cf. 2 [14] f.) expresses not the means by which they became Sarah's children, but the condition on which they would remain so; as in Heb 3 [14]. **terror**: a reference to Pr 3 [25]. The quotation perhaps is intended to enforce the 'quiet' spirit. The 'sudden fear' would perhaps come from the husband.

7. Added as a partial corrective to the foregoing. The husband has a corresponding duty to the wife's 'submission.' **according to knowledge**: it requires care, thought, study. The following words are ambiguous in their construction. Perhaps the simplest way is to take the words 'the wifely (or womanly) vessel' with 'dwelling with' —'dwelling with the wifely vessel as being the weaker.' Herein lies the need of 'knowledge.' **vessel**=body (cf. 1 Th 4 [4]). **giving** occurs in the New Testament only here; rather *assigning*. **honour . . . as being also joint-heirs** with yourselves. Some, thinking that the injunction is to husbands of unbelieving wives, say that they are heirs by right, but not in fact. This is unnecessary. The 'honour' (probably there is no reference to 2 [17]) is of the same kind as in 1 Th 4 [4]. **the grace of life**: rather *a grace*, a gift of eternal life, bestowed by the favour of God (cf. 4 [10]). This injunction is given *with a view to your prayers not being hindered*—the husband's prayers are probably meant. They would be hindered by remembering that he had treated his wife with disrespect or discourtesy.

8. General application of the injunctions given in 2 [11]-3 [7]. **Finally** sums them up. The impression to be made upon society at large is still in view, though the relations mentioned are mainly within the Church. **likeminded** (the word only occurs here in the New Testament): cf. Rom 12 [16]. **compassionate** includes sympathy with joy, as well as with grief (cf. Rom 12 [15], and see Bp. Butler, *Serm.*, v). **loving as brethren** (cf. Rom 12 [10]; and see 1 [22]). **tenderhearted** (for 'pitiful'): cf. Eph 4 [32]. **humbleminded** (for 'courteous'): cf. Eph 4 [2].

9. We now pass back into the outer world. **evil** in act; **reviling** in word (cf. Rom 12 [17] and 2 [1]; see 2 [23]). **blessing** (cf. Rom 12 [14], and see Lk 6 [28])—a saying which St. Peter probably refers to. **hereunto**, i.e. to bless, especially perhaps under provocation to do otherwise. **were called** (cf. 2 [21]). **that** = 'in order that ye may.' The connexion, as von Soden says, was so self-evident to the early Christians that it needed no exposition: 'He who keeps in memory that he himself is called to an inheritance of blessing, cannot but bless, especially when he knows that the one is a condition of the other.' The inheritance is not future only (cf. 1 [4]).

10. for: such is the implication of Scripture (Ps 34 [12]). **that would love life . . . refrain**: the word of 'cursing' is on the tip of the tongue. **guile** (cf. 2 [1, 22]).

11. evil (cf. 2 [1, 15, 20], 3 [9]). This is to 'bless' in act. **and pursue it**: if peace seems likely to depart, active steps are to be taken to retain it.

12. St. Peter adds the reason *because*. Does he mean Christ by **the Lord**, as in 2 [3]? (cf. Lk 22 [61]). **upon**: the preposition is the same as 'over,' above. The Lord marks both the one and the other (cf. 2 [19]).

13. Encouragement in thus acting. **And who?** The answer is, 'No one: such conduct will disarm all opposition.' **zealous**: St. Paul uses the word several times. **if** here looks on to the future.

14. But if, contrary to the expectation just expressed, *ye were even to suffer*—a somewhat remote contingency. 'Suffering' and 'sufferings' come much more frequently in this epistle than elsewhere. No one, apparently, had yet 'suffered' in these provinces. The word does not actually mean to suffer death, but, especially when Christ's sufferings are mentioned in the neighbourhood, it is apt to take the gravest connotation (cf. 2 [19, 20, 21, 23]). **for righteousness' sake** deepens the thought of 'well-doing.' 'Happy' or **blessed**: a clear reference to the Beatitude (Mt 5 [10]). **fear not their fear**, i.e. the thing that they fear (Is 8 [12]). The same passage has been referred to before in 2 [8]. The heathen are themselves afraid of suffering, and think that you will be also.

15. Translate *but sanctify the Lord, even the Christ, in your hearts*. 'The Lord,' as before, is Jehovah. There is, as usual, no article in the LXX. The RV is wrong therefore in translating 'Christ as Lord.' St. Peter is distinctly and explicitly identifying the Christ with the 'Jehovah Sabaoth' of this passage of Isaiah. To 'sanctify' Him in the heart is to make the heart a consecrated dwelling for Him, where His worship is carried on undisturbed. Possibly the Hebrew text is not satisfactory, but St. Peter uses the LXX. **ready to give**: the hindrance, if there be any, is not to be in the Christian ('always,' 'to every man'). **answer** =apologia, as e.g. in Ac 22 [1]. **asketh a**

reason or 'account': St. Peter is probably thinking not of private enquirers, but of officials. **hope**, because the Christian amidst his troubles was evidently looking forward to something. Two qualifications for such an answer are laid down: **meekness** towards man, and **fear** towards God, a sense of the solemn responsibility of speaking.

16. a good conscience: we shall have the words again in [21]. **wherein** (cf. 2 [12]). **put to shame** (cf. 2 [6]), whenever the facts come out. **revile**: not the same word as 'revile' above. **manner of life**, as before (1 [15], etc.). **in Christ**, a Pauline expression, occurs again in 5 [10, 14]. Its position in the Greek seems to give a kind of reason for the goodness of the life.

17. if the will of God should so will: the same distant contingency as in [14] (cf. 1 [6]). The smart of suffering is lessened, if the will of God is discerned in it, not only the injustice of men. Not **for well-doing**, but *in*, or as we say colloquially, 'while well-doing.' There is a little pleasant irony in the statement. St. Peter keeps repeating his words (see 2 [15, 20], 4 [19]). His sentence is quite generally put (there is no 'ye' in it).

18. Because Christ also: cf. 2 [21], where the argument is precisely the same. We should probably read 'died' instead of 'suffered,' which comes from 2 [21]; His suffering amounted to death, suggesting that theirs ('also') might do the same. **once**, which plays so prominent a part in Hebrews, serves here to bring out the effectual character of Christ's death. It may also point to its transitory duration (cf. 5 [10]). **for sins**, i.e. as a sin offering, as in Rom 8 [3]; 1 Cor 15 [3]; Gal 1 [4], etc. **righteous** (cf. 2 [19, 22]): He suffered in well-doing. **for the unrighteous**: here, as in 'for sins,' St. Peter touches upon the beneficent purpose of Christ's death, which is developed in what follows. **that he**, etc. (cf. 2 [21]): such sufferings as St. Peter has in view are not undesigned and useless annoyances. RV, perhaps by an oversight, keeps the *us* of AV. It should be *you*; they were themselves among the fruits of the Passion. The word **bring** may have reference to priestly action on the part of Christ, but it is uncertain (cf. Rom 5 [2]; Eph 2 [18], 3 [12]).

St. Peter proceeds to draw out the significance of Christ's death. It had two directions. One was bodily: He was **put to death in the flesh**. The other was in the higher region: He was **quickened in the spirit**. The latter might mean 'kept alive'; death was not its extinction, but another word would probably have been used for this. More naturally it expresses some enhancing of the faculties of the 'spirit' on escaping from the trammels of the 'flesh' (cf. 2 Cor 5 [4]).

19. in which, i.e. without the fleshly integument. **he went . . . unto the spirits**: it was a journey (so to speak) with an object. The object was to 'preach,' or 'proclaim' to them; 4 [6] describes the preaching as a Gospel. The spirits were **in prison**, i.e. in a state of punitive confinement. Did the Apostle speak of *all* the dead, at that time, as being 'in prison' (*limbus patrum*), or only a class of them?

20. The definite article, which occurred in the last clause, is now dropped; it is lit. *to men (or spirits) who once disobeyed*. This clause carries out the meaning of 'for the unjust,' and the victorious power of the Passion. The date of the disobedience (cf. 2 [6], 3 [1]) is defined, and its heinousness marked, by what follows. **waited** for them to obey. **long-suffering**, a period of 120 years according to Gen 6 [3]. Probably St. Peter thinks of Noah as preaching righteousness all the time (2 P 2 [5]), both by word and by making the ark. Naturally he treats the narrative in Genesis as literally true.

Probably some words spoken to the disciples by our Lord after His resurrection were the source of these and similar reflections upon what came to be called the 'Harrowing of Hell.' But we must be careful how we commit His authority to the details of the story of Noah and his contemporaries. The main inference which the Apostle intends us to draw seems to be that none are finally condemned without having the fullest evidence presented to them, here or hereafter; and that we who believe the resurrection of Christ are indeed blessed.* St. Peter turns from the many who disobeyed to the few who were saved. The author of 2 Peter was clearly thinking of this passage when he wrote 2 [5]. **saved through water**: they escaped the Flood, taking refuge in the ark. The power of righteous suffering is shown to be very far-reaching.

21. The true reading and translation is, *which also in antitype doth now save you*. Not that 'type' and 'antitype' were as yet fixed to their modern connotation; 'antitype' only expresses a corresponding resemblance. The antecedent to 'which' is perhaps hardly 'water,' as Archbishop Bernard implies, but the

* See Additional Note at the end of the Epistle.

water through which Noah was saved. 'Now,' as then, there is saving efficacy in it. 'You' is emphatic (cf. [18]). 'Doth save'—not exactly the word in [20]—may mean as each successively comes to it, or it may imply the abiding safety of those who are in the ark (cf. 1 [9]). St. Peter leaves the likeness without interpretation. St. Peter is not here using **flesh** in the ethical sense (as in 2 [11]), but the literal. Baptism is no mere outward washing. Endless discussions have been raised by his word translated **answer** (AV), **interrogation** (RV). The verb means either to ask a question, or to ask for a thing; the substantive might be the question asked, or the thing asked for. In Dan 4 [17], the only place in the Greek Old Testament where it occurs, it stands for what is translated 'demand.' The demand might be either 'of' or 'for' a thing. Here it suits best to understand the latter. Baptism is the *demand for a good conscience towards God*, i.e. for the cleansing of the sins which have disquieted the conscience. This would agree with the whole tenor of the epistle. **conscience** (cf. [16]). Nothing in the context points to a technical meaning of 'interrogation' here.

The Apostle has not lost his thread amidst his digressions. It is the triumph in Christ of sinless suffering for others. To this he returns in the resurrection and ascension. The former gives Christian baptism its force (cf. 1 [3]). St. Peter does not explain how it works: the doctrine of baptism was too well known to need it.

22. who is: an emphatic statement of His present existence **on the right hand of God** (taken from Ps 110 [1]). The Latin authorities here add, 'swallowing up death, that we might be made heirs of eternal life.' **having gone into heaven** precedes in thought 'who is.' Perhaps it is accidental that this 'going' takes the same form as the 'went' in [19]. **angels,** etc. (cf. Eph 1 [21]; Col 1 [16]). **being made subject:** the grammar indicates that it synchronized with the 'going into heaven.' Possibly there is an allusion to the often-repeated 'submit' of 2 [13], etc.; there will be an end to this condition of things.

IV. **1.** Application of the story of redemption. **arm yourselves,** a poetical word. **mind** = view, conception. **the same,** viz. as Christ Himself had. **for,** rather *that*: this was the encouraging view. See Rom 6 [7, 10], which was, no doubt, in the writer's mind. **suffered** here=died. **hath ceased**—a part of the word which is unique in the New Testament—means 'hath been made to rest'; it does not imply any previous sin. 'Sin' is here, as in Romans, a power. That this was our Lord's view, see Mk 7 [20-23]; Jn 8 [34].

2. that, i.e. 'with the result that': it must be taken with 'arm yourselves.' To live 'to' anything means to be occupied with it, to be sensitive to it.

3. suffice, said with irony. The perfect tenses of the Greek treat these things as wholly past and done with. The **desire**—a quite different word from 'will'—**of the Gentiles** means what the Gentiles would like them to do, though it does not exclude what the Gentiles themselves like to do (cf. 2 [12]). **and to have walked** correctly brings out the meaning of the tense, though 'walking' would mean the same. There is no 'we' nor 'you' in the Greek. Certainly St. Peter does not accuse himself of such conduct, as AV implies. **abominable:** in Ac 10 [28] the word is rendered 'unlawful.'

4. wherein, as in 2 [12], 3 [16]: 'in the point wherein they think it strange, they speak evil of you.' **strange** (cf. [12]). **speaking evil:** not the same word as before at 2 [12], 3 [16].

5. Perhaps there is a reference to 3 [15]. Those who call you to give account, shall give account themselves. St. Peter returns to the order of the faith: after the session at the right hand, the judgement. He regards it as 'ready' (cf. 1 [17]). Christ is the Judge.

6. unto this end, as in 2 [21], 3 [9], looks backwards, viz. that the dead might be ready for the judgement. **even to the dead,** or 'also to the dead.' The reference is to 3 [19]. **that they might be judged . . . but,** might be translated 'that though judged indeed . . . they might.' In their case the judgement in certain respects had already taken place, viz. death, so far as human beings could discern, and in flesh; but there was a brighter side to the judgement still to come. This does not mean that the grammatical form used itself signifies a *past* judgement. The verse is admittedly one of the hardest in the New Testament.*

7. Resumption of the directions in 3 [8]. The apostolic age believed itself to be the last (cf. 1 [5] and elsewhere). The practical consequence was to be **sober and watch.** Strictly, the second of these words represents sobriety (cf. 1 [13], 5 [8]); the first means rather soundness of mind (e.g. Tit 2 [6]). Read *prayers*, i.e. acts of prayer.

8. *Persistent* rather than **fervent** (cf. 1 [22]); and translate *having persistent your love*

* See Additional Note at the end of the Epistle.

towards one another (lit. 'towards yourselves'), i.e. within the Church. The quotation that follows originates with Pr 10 12, but differs both from the Hebrew and from the LXX, agreeing with Jas 5 20. Perhaps the saying was current in this form; but this is not the only place where St. Peter is influenced by St. James. It seems to mean that the charitable are themselves forgiven much (cf. Lk 7 47).

9. Entertainment of Christian travellers formed an important element in the social life of the early Church (see 3 Jn 5 f.). It was apt to become burdensome.

10. 'The gift' (AV), **a gift** (RV): unfortunately, English has nothing between the two. It is implied that all Christians **received** something from God for the good of the community. Both the word and the thought are Pauline (cf. Rom 12 6). Here the gift of wealth seems especially intended to serve such purposes as hospitality. **ministering,** i.e. administering, dispensing; the same word as in 1 12, with the same meaning. **stewards,** i.e. not possessors. **manifold,** because of the varied forms of God's gracious gifts. St. Peter mentions two.

11. **speaketh:** St. Paul in Rom 12 6 enumerates many ways of speaking. **oracles of God:** not (as in Ac 7 38; Rom 3 2; Heb 5 12) the Bible, but as men truly inspired. **ministereth:** as in 10; this is here the point. Everyone will recognize the duty of 'speaking' as God prompts; in the same way they should recognize that wealth too is from Him. The same mode of argument occurred in 2 17. **strength**=force. **supplieth,** a Pauline word. Mark the repetition of the name **God.** **glorified** (cf. 2 12). **whose,** probably of Christ.

12. Encouragement in view of coming troubles. This section, like the last (2 11), begins with the appealing word **beloved.** **strange:** the word in 4. **fiery trial** (cf. 1 7); it is a single word in the original, 'burning.' Lit. 'which taketh place unto you for trial'; St. Peter now speaks as if the trial were in active progress.

13. **partakers** = sharers (cf. 1 11, 5 1). **rejoice** (cf. 1 6). They are to be congratulated upon it. **that,** i.e. in order that, expresses the purpose both of the sharing His sufferings and of the rejoicing in it. **his glory also,** the correlative to His sufferings (cf. 1 11, 21, 5 1), is already there, but as yet concealed (1 7, 13, 5 1). **with exceeding joy:** a single word in the Greek, used in 1 6, 8. There is, no doubt, a reference to the words of Christ in Mt 5 11, 12.

14. **for the name of Christ,** viz. because they bear His name (cf. Ps 89 51). It leads on to the mention of 'Christian,' in 16. **reproached:** notwithstanding the alarming tone of the epistle, the persecution seems to have got no further, as yet, in these provinces. **blessed,** as in 3 14. **because,** without waiting for the future manifestation (13), even now, at the moment of being reproached, **the Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you.** The magnificent phrase is based on Is 11 2. Perhaps it is influenced by the promise recorded in Mk 13 11. The Spirit is called the Spirit of glory in much the same way as in Isaiah, the 'Spirit of wisdom,' etc., i.e. the Spirit which issues from glory and confers it. 'Glory,' in contrast to 'reproach,' takes us back to 13. And 'with great emphasis' (Bigg) St. Peter repeats the article, to make quite clear that this Spirit is no other than 'the Spirit of God' Himself, which 'rests' upon the suffering Christian as upon Christ (Is 11 2), with satisfaction and blessing. Hort is inclined (in his note on Jas 2 1) to take 'the glory' as a title of Christ; this seems unnecessary. St. Peter's doctrine of the Spirit may be gathered from this passage compared with 1 1, 11, 12.

The last words of the verse in AV are an interpolation, though an ancient one.

15. **suffer:** the writer does not say what, or whether by law. He deals with imaginary cases. **evil-doer,** quite general, as in 2 12; after **murderer or thief** it indicates 'or any other form of evil-doer.' **or meddler in other men's matters,** a word, perhaps humorously, coined by St. Peter; lit. 'an inspector of what does not belong to him.' By prying, meddlesome conduct the Christians might easily bring discredit and unpopularity upon other believers. The argument is something like what we have seen in 2 17, 4 11.

16. **but if as a Christian:** to 'suffer' in this case would perhaps mean something different from the cases mentioned. The name, so sacred to us, began as a nickname at Antioch (Ac 11 26). Believers did not willingly use it of themselves, and here St. Peter, or his scribe, seems to have purposely misspelt it. **in this name** (RV), viz. 'even in this name of ridicule and obloquy.' **glorify God:** see 2 12, 4 11.

17. St. Peter treats the coming troubles of the Church as the beginning of the universal judgement. **the house of God:** a reference to Ezek 9 6; but it admits of the Christian interpretation of the house = the church (see 2 5). Hence it is

explained by **at us.** **that obey not** (cf. 2 [8], 3 [1. 20]).

18. Pr 11 [31] (LXX). **scarcely,** i.e. with not much to spare.

19. In this verse the leading thoughts of the epistle are gathered up. 'Suffer,' whatever it may amount to ([16]); 'will' (2 [15], 3 [17]), 'souls' (1 [9], 2 [11. 25], 3 [20]), 'well doing' (2 [14. 15. 20], 3 [6. 17]). The word for **Creator** does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament (but see 2 [13]). To call Him **faithful** implies that He has, as such, a duty to His creatures, which He will not neglect. This epithet, employed not unfrequently by St. Paul, is specially appropriate to the word **commit,** which means to confide, or entrust, a deposit for safe keeping.

V. 1. Further advice suggested by the crisis. **elders:** the official title, 'presbyters,' in which the thought of seniority is not yet extinct. Their office may be gathered from the verses following. It is not merely from humility that the Apostle calls himself a fellow-elder. As officers of the Church they were specially exposed to persecution, and St. Peter claims to be at least as much exposed as they. **witness** does not mean exactly 'eye-witness,' but one who bears testimony. **The sufferings of Christ** (cf. 1 [11], 4 [13]). **partaker,** etc. (cf. 4 [13]). The splendid assurance that he was a partaker already of the glory was based on the fact that he was already suffering; and it was intended to encourage the other elders; but there may also be an allusion to special promises, such as those of Jn 21. In 1 [5] he uses similar language of our unrevealed possession.

2. **Tend** (see 2 [25]). It denotes 'cure of souls,' rather than providing sustenance. No doubt the Apostle was thinking of the charge laid upon him in Jn 21 [16]. The **flock of God:** it was not the flock of the pastors themselves (see Ac 20 [28]), and (as in Acts) was one and the same everywhere.

not of constraint, because of the dangers attending it. **according unto God,** viz. according to His ordering. Already high offices in the Church were well paid; hence the warning that follows.

3. The domineering, self-assertive temper is forbidden, e.g. in Mk 10 [42] f. 'Over God's heritage' (AV), **over the charge allotted to you** (RV), lit. 'over the lots.' It probably means the churches or spheres of work assigned to the different pastors. **the flock:** the singular is repeated, in spite of demarcation into 'lots.'

4. Christ is the Chief Shepherd (see 2 [25]). **shall be manifested:** the word was used in 1 [20] of His first coming; here it is used as='be revealed' in 1 [7. 13]. **receive,** the same word as 1 [9]. **that fadeth not away** would strictly be a translation of the epithet in 1 [9]; *this* is a wreath *made* of those unfading flowers employed metaphorically. **of glory** (cf. 4 [18. 19]).

5. It seems impossible to take the 'elders' here in a different sense from [1], or it might be simpler to understand it in the natural sense, as compared with 'younger.' To avoid the difficulty, some would make 'younger' also a term of office, like 'deacons.' There is, however, no indication of such a title (though see Ac 5 [6. 10]). As a matter of fact, the presbyters were taken from among the elder Christians, and those entrusted to their care are called 'younger' in the natural sense in distinction to them. Note that the same kind of thing is found in 1 Tim 5 [1. 2]. 'Submission' is urged again, as in 2 [13. 18], 3 [1. 5]. **gird yourselves with humility:** lit. 'tie on humility for (i.e. towards) one another.' It is an uncommon word, not elsewhere found in biblical Greek. The substantive derived from it is said to have been a sort of apron or 'overall,' worn by slaves—perhaps for the protection of their clothing while at work. Some doubt attaches to the meaning, but this interpretation would suit our passage, for it would indicate something (1) external and conspicuous, and (2) a mark of servitude. Commentators, perhaps with good reason, point to Jn 13 [4] f. (cf. 3 [8]). The quotation comes from Pr 3 [34], apparently by way of Jas 4 [6] (see note on 4 [8] above). **grace,** i.e. favour. Such humility shown towards men will also be acceptable to God.

6. **the mighty hand,** which allows them to suffer, is ready also to deliver and exalt. **in due time** (cf. 2 [11]).

7. From Ps 55 [22] (cf. Mt 6 [25] f.).

8. **sober, watchful** (cf. 1 [13], 4 [7]). **your adversary:** the word is a technical term for the opponent in a lawsuit, but nothing in the context suggests that it is so used here. **the devil** occurs in Jas 4 [7], the passage referred to in [5]. The 'Satan' of Job 1 and 2 is so translated in LXX, where he is spoken of as 'walking about' in the earth. **a roaring lion,** perhaps from Ps 22 [13] (LXX). **whom,** lit. 'which to devour'; a time of persecution seemed to offer a good chance.

9. **resist** (cf. Jas 4 [7]). St. Peter addresses his readers not as individuals, but as a body. Therefore he bids them resist

as a solid wall or phalanx might. This is what **stedfast** here suggests; and it affects the meaning of **faith**. The word usually in the New Testament means the quality that makes a believer (as in 1 [5]); but it sometimes denotes the religion or body of convictions (as Eph 4 [5]). Here there would be special reason for thinking the latter to be intended, when the Church is bidden to present a firm front to the adversary.

the same sufferings, etc. A very strange and difficult expression. The first part may mean 'the same things by way of sufferings,' and it would be some encouragement and consolation to know that others were undergoing them too. But **are accomplished** is not a very natural translation. Then the order of the words *by your brotherhood in the world* is very curious, if St. Peter means by them what he is generally taken to mean—and the use of 'the brotherhood' in 2 [17] seems to point that way. Hard as it may be, no better translation seems to be offered than those in our versions, unless (possibly) for 'are accomplished' we substitute 'are being paid.' **in the world** is a reminder that the present order will not last for ever.

10. St. Peter has spoken of the 'manifold grace of God' (4 [10]); now conversely he speaks of the **God of all grace**, as the bestower of all forms of favour (1 [2, 10, 13], 3 [7], 5 [5]). **called you**: cf. 1 [15], 2 [9, 21], 3 [9]. **unto his eternal glory**, after suffering, contrasted as often before: this 'glory' is **in Christ** (cf. 1 [21]). The suffering is of no long duration, or perhaps light in quality (1 [6]). **shall perfect** or 'restore' what is impaired. These things He will do as 'Himself' the 'God of all grace.'

11. Conclusion; greetings. **Silvanus**, etc. (see Introduction). No doubt the well-known companion of St. Paul, called in Acts 'Silas.' The I is not emphatic, as if St. Peter opposed his estimate to that of others. He proceeds to describe his own epistle and its purpose. It was brief (cf. Heb 13 [22]) in comparison with all that he might have said. It was a letter of 'exhortation,' including (as in [1]) encouragement and consolation, and of 'testimony.' The object of the testimony was to assure the recipients that the Gospel which they had received (1 [13]) was the true Gospel. Persecution was likely to try their allegiance to it; therefore he adds, **stand**, i.e. stand fast 'in it.'

13. She that is in Babylon, elect together with you no doubt describes the church, in terms that recall 1 [1]. It seems a not unnatural way of describing a church: see 2 Jn. **Marcus, my son**, i.e. the evangelist St. Mark, the cousin of Barnabas. His relation to St. Peter was spiritual.

14. The **kiss of charity** is mentioned in 1 Th 5 [26]. **peace** takes us back to 1 [2]

NOTE ON 1 P 3 [18]-4 [6]

The whole passage is continuous, and should be taken as it stands. It has been suggested (cf. Moffatt's trans.) that Enoch (cf. En 1 [12-16]) was originally the subject of [19], but that his name has dropped out. But (i) a reference to him would be inappropriate where St. Peter is referring to the Lord's example as an encouragement to Christians; (ii) Enoch had no gospel to preach; (iii) the 'spirits' of [19] are human spirits, as is clear from the use of 'spirit' in [18] and the explanation given in [20].

St. Peter's point seems to be this. To the Christian death comes as a friend; though for awhile he may be unclothed (2 Cor 5 [4]), the Lord's example shows that he has nothing to fear. When the Lord died, the straitening from which He had suffered was at once removed (Lk 12 [50]); His human spirit was filled with more abundant life, and went to proclaim His Gospel in the realms of the dead (3 [19], 4 [6]). It is possible that the risen Lord may have told St. Peter this (Lk 24 [34]; 1 Cor 15 [5]); it would have been like St. Peter to ask the Lord where He had been. But probably his statement rests upon current Jewish belief. When belief in the resurrection was established, belief in the 'Church Expectant' came with it; and old words, such as those of Zech 9 [11, 12], probably acquired a new meaning (cf. Ac 2 [25] ff.). Both Justin (*Tryph.*, 72) and Irenæus (*c. Hær.*, iii, 20; iv, 22) quote as from the Old Testament: 'The Lord remembered his dead from Israel that slept in the earth of the sepulchre, and he came down to them to preach his salvation'; and similar language is found in the Bereschit Rabba (cf. Bigg on 1 P 3 [19]) of the Shechinah, which the New Testament identifies with our Lord. Thus among Christians the belief in the 'Harrowing of Hell' naturally arose (cf. Mt 27 [51-53] and note), and is probably presupposed in Heb 12 [23]. Nor is the special reference to the antediluvians difficult to understand. The journey of the Lord to the realms of the dead would itself suggest the journey of Enoch, and with it the whole story (Gen 6) of the fall of the angels, the corruption of humankind which followed it, and the deluge by which

the corruption was punished. Moreover, the thought of the deluge was useful for St. Peter's immediate purpose. Christians in their position in the world resemble Noah and his family. They have accepted a divine warning which the world ignores; they are preachers of righteousness (2 P 2 [5]) who by entering the ark of the Church 'condemn the world' (Heb 11 [7]); they have to face cruelty from those in whose wickedness they will no longer take part (4 [4]); their very suffering has separated them from sin to a deeper consecration (4 [1]); and, above all, they are saved by passing through the water (cf. 1 Cor 10 [1, 2]) to the new life of a regenerated world ([21]; but cf. the interpretation given in the commentary). The very point of St. Peter's exhortation is that they too, whatever judgement may come upon them, must live 'according to God,' and be ready for the final consummation.

The teaching here given is of abiding interest in two ways: (i) It suggests, like 1 Cor 5 [5] and 11 [30-32], a 'larger hope' than the Church has generally recognized. Even a penal death may have a purpose of mercy beyond; and, as far as we can see, there can be no full probation without the hearing of the Gospel (cf. Jn 15 [24]). (ii) It suggests that for saints departed, as for the Lord after Good Friday, an evangelistic activity may be possible. There are more souls in the world unseen than here.—H. L. G.

Bibliography

Commentaries: A. Leighton (of great devotional value); F. J. A. Hort (1 [1-2 17] only); C. Bigg (*I.C.C.*); J. H. B. Masterman. **Articles:** F. H. Chase, in *H.D.B.* on 'Simon,' 'Peter and Petrine Epistles.'

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

By T. W. Little

Introduction

(1) **Its Place in the Canon.**—See *The Bible in the Church*, OT, 14.

(2) **Authorship.**—The writer styles himself 'Simon Peter' (if 'Symeon' be the true reading, it is only another form of the same name: see Ac 15 [14]), 'servant and apostle of Jesus Christ.' The epistle therefore is written in the name of St. Peter the Apostle, and his authority is claimed for its contents. There is no question about this claim.

There are, however, serious difficulties in the way of accepting its genuineness, and they come from many sides. Briefly they are these: no certain evidence of its use before the end of the 2nd century; its very late reception into the Canon of Scripture; definite doubts expressed about its genuineness (e.g. by Origen and Jerome); its great dissimilarity to 1 Peter; its borrowing from, and deliberate modifications of, St. Jude (see Jude, Appendix); an allusion to St. Paul's epistles, which is without precedent in the New Testament, and which seems inconsistent with the Apostolic Age (3 [15, 16]); and, finally, a resemblance to *other* books attributed to St. Peter, which are known to be pseudonymous, and to be not much earlier than the middle of the 2nd century.

This is a formidable array of difficulties; and, as a consequence, there is a growing consensus among scholars to class it, so far as its authorship is concerned, among the many books written under an assumed name, of which the Wisdom of Solomon, the books of Esdras, and the Apocalypse of Peter are instances. The present commentator, however, is bound to confess that he is not convinced of the soundness of this conclusion stated in this way. It seems to him that, apart from a few passages, the resemblance between 2 Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter has been greatly exaggerated, e.g. by Dr. Chase (in tone, and in real interest, they are poles apart); that some arguments are based on a misunderstanding of the epistle itself, e.g. the motive of the reference to the Transfiguration (see note *in loc.*); and that the evidence for the genuineness of 1 Peter, though its canonicity is unimpeachable, is not so overwhelming as to be, with any fairness, placed in the scale too heavily against 2 Peter (but see below 'Date' and 'The Relation between 1 and 2 Peter').

(3) **Date and Character.**—If the epistle is Petrine, its date can hardly be later than A.D. 64, and that it can be as early as this is very unlikely. If it is more nearly allied in time to the Apocalypse of Peter and similar pseudepigraphs, it should be placed between 125 and 150. If it is neither strictly Petrine, nor very

closely connected with the apocryphal group referred to above, its date is probably early in the 2nd century; and the facts and difficulties will be fairly met, if we may conjecture that the epistle, though not St. Peter's own, was written by a man who in his earlier years had heard St. Peter preach, and remembering his message on the subject of Christ's coming to judge, wrote this epistle for an age in need of such teaching, and issued it under St. Peter's name. Thus some of it would be practically St. Peter's, some of it would be St. Jude, 'the very thing' found ready to hand, but worked up and modified or elaborated as the writer thought best. The attitude expressed towards St. Paul would be what had been St. Peter's; though a man writing thirty or forty years later would naturally speak of apostolic writings in the language of his own time, and reflect the mind of the Church in his own day in regard thereto.

Further, if we accept the authenticity of 1 Peter, with its large assimilation both of the thought and of the language of St. Paul, we shall have no difficulty in accepting as *Petrine at least in spirit* the desire to commend, and to protect from misconstruction, St. Paul's writings. Thus the passage (3 [15, 16]), though not St. Peter's words, reflects St. Peter's mind. If this account be anywhere near the truth, the Second Epistle of St. Peter becomes much more than an ordinary pseudepigraph. For we shall be claiming for it, as its merits demand, a kernel of Petrine matter, which we could not claim, or indeed wish to claim, for much of the apocryphal writings to which the Apostle's name has been attached. In any case the judgement of the Church in receiving 2 Peter into the Canon, and excluding the Apocalypse of Peter (which was, at one time, more than its rival), is justified a hundred times.

The eventual 'consensus' of the Church is more trustworthy as to value than the verdict of any age, or any group of Christian scholars. The Canon is a sacred enclosure, which does not secularize what is outside it, but which hallows all that it contains. The Second Epistle of St. Peter, whosoever its author may have been, is within this enclosure, and therefore is, for us, 'Scripture,'* in a sense in which other writings outside the Canon are not; and its message is, to-day, independent of the man who wrote it.

Whenever, and by whomsoever written, the epistle is a message of serious warning, and an exhortation to Christian steadfastness in faith and conduct, in an environment of scepticism and general licence. For the destination of the epistle see note on 3 [15].

(4) **Relation between 1 Peter and 2 Peter.**—Bigg maintains the Petrine authorship of both epistles; but, in order to do this, or at least in process of doing it, he maintains the priority of 2 Peter to Jude, which seems an untenable position (see Jude, Appendix). Mayor, on the other hand, after a most exhaustive comparison of 1 and 2 Peter from all possible angles, both of language and contents, sums up as follows: 'On the whole I should say that the difference of style is less marked than the difference in vocabulary, and that again less marked than the difference in matter, while above all stands the great difference in thought, feeling, and character—in one word, of personality' (Introd., cv).

The most important points of contrast between the two epistles (other than those of idiom, style, and vocabulary) are the much larger proportion of quotations from the Old Testament, and the more intimate place occupied by the Person of Jesus, in 1 Peter than in 2 Peter. In spite of this, the resemblances also are considerable; these include a certain number of unusual words which occur in both, reference to the Flood in both (though introduced to enforce different lessons), and the fact that both epistles have important things to say about prophecy (1 P 1 [10-12]; 2 P 1 [19-21]). The most penetrating difference is, perhaps, that in 2 Peter the dread of the Gospel has taken the place of what was in 1 Peter its gladness (cf. 1 P 1 [3, 8], 2 [8, 10], 4 [13] with 2 P 1 [10], 2 [20, 21]). But this contrast may be easily exaggerated. There is not a little of judgement, and a good deal of serious warning, in 1 Peter (see 1 [13, 17], 2 [1, 11], 4 [7, 17], 5 [8, 9]).

(5) **Summary of the Contents.**

1 [1-11]. Salutation: followed by emphasis on (*a*) God's great gifts, and their effects; (*b*) the diligence required from man in response to them.

[12-15]. Need of remembering what has been taught. The writer will devote his 'swan-song' to this end.

[16-21]. The Coming of the Lord with power. It is witnessed to by (*a*) the Transfiguration; (*b*) prophecy, rightly understood. A short description of the nature of 'prophecy' is given.

2. Warning against the false teachers, who have their prototypes in the Old Testament. (This is a long digression, founded on St. Jude.)

3 [1-13]. The need for remembrance

* See, however, *The Bible in the Church*, OT, 14*b*.

Warning against mockers. If the Lord delay His Coming, it is through mercy, not through slackness. The day *will* come suddenly and with fire.

14-18. Our brother Paul wrote in the same strain, about God's longsuffering; though his teaching on this and other things has been wickedly perverted.

Let steadfastness be your motto. So, grow in grace.

(For the relation between Jude and 2 Peter, see Jude, Appendix. The bibliography relating to both epistles is also given at the end of Jude.)

I. 1. a like precious faith with us. Bengel's note here is: *Æque pretiosa . . fides eorum, qui Jesum Christum viderunt, ut Petrus et reliqui apostoli, et eorum qui citra visum credunt.* This is the simplest explanation. But the Greek word *isotimos*, which occurs here only in the New Testament, is used outside the New Testament to express equal political privileges. There may therefore be a reference here to the equality of rights in the Gospel enjoyed both by Jews and Gentiles.

of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ (RV text), or **of our God and the Saviour Jesus Christ** (RVm). The question between these two renderings is whether Christ is here called God or not. The question is one that is often difficult to answer. Cf. Tit 2 [13], and see the first part of the note on *despotês* in Jude [4].

in the righteousness. The equality of Christian right in the preciousness of the faith is inherent in the righteousness and justice of God. Mayor gives a most convincing quotation from Clement of Alexandria in support of this being the true meaning here.

3. by his own glory and virtue. Either 'by his own glory and *excellence*,' two terms of kindred meaning, or 'by his own glory and *goodness*' (Mayor), two manifestations of the Caller, one of which claims our worship, the other our imitation. *Aretê* is a common word in Greek for excellence of any kind, as well as in a more restricted sense for moral excellence (see *Vocab.* s.v.). But it is only used outside 1 and 2 Peter in Phil 4 [8], and there, it would seem, with a distinct recognition that the thought for which it stands is Greek rather than Hebrew or Christian. So Lightfoot *ad loc.*: 'Whatever value may reside in your old heathen conception of virtue.' In 1 P 2 [9] there is a reminiscence of the LXX of Is 43 [21] or 42 [12], where the sense is 'glory' or 'praise' rather than virtue. Thus the use of the word here and in 1 [5], in the latter case certainly in the Greek sense, is like 'his divine power' (3) and 'the divine nature' (4) a trace of Greek thought.

3, 4. his divine power, the divine nature. These terms have been pointed to as more akin to Greek, or Alexandrine, philosophy than to Jewish thought.

4. that ye may become partakers of the divine nature. There is emphasis on the word 'become.' Human nature, at any rate as we know it, does not partake of the divine, in its own right. This only becomes possible through the promises of the Gospel fulfilled, i.e. through the Gospel of the Incarnate Christ and its appropriation by the believer. But thus the participation is attainable. The passage most akin to this, in thought if not in language, is Jn 1 [12. 13]: 'to them gave he the right to become children of God' (RV). We have here, then, one of the great texts of the New Testament. Led by it, some of the greatest of the early Fathers did not shrink from statements like the well-known expression of Athanasius: 'He was made man, that we might be made God.' The love of antithesis led here to an obvious exaggeration. But this is harmless in comparison with much popular thought which, though claiming to be religious, makes no real distinction between the human and the divine. The verses that follow (5-10) emphasize the earnestness and diligence required in responding to God's gifts. For though it is true that God's 'gifts and calling are without repentance,' this does not imply that, so far as individuals are concerned, their effect and blessings are independent of man's response. With [10] cf. Phil 2 [12].

5-8. These verses treat of the growth of Christian character and of its ingredients. A comparison of this list of virtues with the fruit of the Spirit in Gal 5 [22], or with 1 Tim 6 [11], will show how far the elements of Christian character were from being stereotyped in primitive times. Mayor analyzes or interprets the passage thus: 'The relation between the seven virtues may be thus stated. Faith is the gift of God already received. To this must be added: (1) moral strength, which enables a man to do what he knows to be right; (2) spiritual discernment; (3) self-control, by which a man resists temptation; (4) endurance, by which he bears up under persecution or adversity; (5) right feeling and behaviour towards God; (6) towards the brethren; (7) towards all.'

7. Mayor rightly deplores the RV's unfortunate rendering 'in your love of the brethren, love,' which obliterates the

radical difference between the two words used for 'love' in the original. The AV 'and to brotherly kindness, charity' was preferable as a translation, as well as in rhythm. On the different words used here for 'love,' Trench says: 'It should never be forgotten that *agapé* is a word born within the bosom of revealed religion; it occurs in the Septuagint; but there is no example of its use in any heathen writer whatever; the utmost they attained to here was *philanthropia* and *philadelphia*, and the last indeed never in any sense but as the love between brethren in blood' (*Synonyms of the N.T.*, 50; but the whole note, 46-51, should be read).

9. is blind, seeing only what is near. The Greek word used here is one of several words in this epistle that occur nowhere else in the New Testament. It means literally 'screwing up his eyes.' It qualifies the description of the man's blindness. It implies that the man is not totally blind, but that lack of the qualities above named will leave him spiritually very short-sighted, with reference to the past as well as to the future.

11. the entrance: see under [13-15].

12. in the truth which is with you. Bigg conjectures that the word translated 'delivered (to the saints)' in Jude [3] may be the true reading here.

13-15. tabernacle . . . decease. Both of these words, occurring where they do, read like a subconscious anticipation of the account of the Transfiguration which immediately follows. The word rendered 'decease' is only found once elsewhere in the New Testament, viz. in the Lucan narrative of the Transfiguration (Lk 9 [31]), while St. Peter's suggestion 'Let us make three tabernacles' is recorded by all three evangelists in their account of that event. But further the word 'decease' (Greek *exodos*) may look backwards as well as forwards. It is difficult not to trace some connexion between *exodos* here and *eisodos* rendered 'entrance' in [11]. Both words are rare in the New Testament, and the occurrence of both within a few lines is at least remarkable. The contrast they suggest is that of the *exit* from the tabernacle of this life in which we are sojourners, and the *entrance* into the eternal kingdom, which is our true home.

14. even as our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto me. M. R. James thinks it possible that the allusion may be not to Jn 21 [18, 19], as is commonly supposed, but to the *Domine, quo vadis?* legend, which, in its earliest form, is known to have been current in the 2nd century.

16-21. This is a singularly difficult passage. It will probably always be open to question where the emphasis really lies. Which is regarded as of the surer evidential value—the Transfiguration, or 'the prophetic word'? The RV rendering stresses the firsthand evidence of the Transfiguration, and makes the writer then speak of prophecy as corroborated by this: 'We have the word of prophecy *made* more sure,' i.e. by the witness of the Transfiguration. The AV, however, seems to us nearer the mark, and we prefer to render: 'We have also a still surer ground in the prophetic word, to which ye do well that ye take heed,' etc. Our reasons for preferring this are: (1) It gives the more natural meaning to the Greek *bebaióteron*, instead of forcing it to be almost equivalent to *bebaiômenon*. (2) It makes the subsequent exhortation, and description of prophecy, much more relevant. (3) The exaltation of prophecy is characteristically Petrine (see 1 P 1 [10-12]; Ac 1 [20], 2 [16-21, 25-28], 10 [43]). This is important, whether we believe the epistle to have been written by St. Peter himself, or by another impersonating him. (4) The end of [21] in the original (especially the text WH) reads like the climax of the *main* subject. (5) The way in which the Transfiguration is introduced suggests that the writer is on his defence concerning it; and, though he justifies a former appeal to it, he passes on to another kind of evidence, which is of more general trustworthiness than anything which is of the nature of a vision or the privilege of a few can ever be. The value of this last point depends on the view we take of the alternatives given in the next note. But the other four points are independent of this.

16. we did not follow cunningly devised fables. *Either*, as the writer had been wrongfully accused of doing by disparagers of the Transfiguration as a credible fact, *or* as the subverters of the Gospel themselves were in the habit of doing, *or* (possibly, but not probably) as St. Jude had done, when he quoted from the Book of Enoch in support of the Lord's coming to judge. (The author of 2 Peter, though using the subject-matter of St. Jude wholesale, himself carefully refrained from quoting by name an apocryphal book.)

the power and coming = the coming with power. There can be no doubt that the Second Coming is intended here, as in 3 [4]. The glory exhibited at the Transfiguration is adduced as an assurance of that future glory.

20. of private interpretation: Greek

idias epiluseōs. Readers who know Greek will be repaid if they trace the use of *idios* in 2 Peter. It is a favourite word with him (1 [20], 2 [16, 22], 3 [3, 16, 17]). Should they make this attempt, they are advised to come to this passage (1 [20]) last instead of first. The contrast here is between what is 'a man's own' and what is God's. *Epilusis,* according to its general usage, means 'interpretation' as here rendered; its derivation suggests the further meaning 'solution.' It may be treated in this passage as containing both these ideas. (1) The point is not that 'prophecy' is a dark thing, and of little use until it has been interpreted; rather that it is itself an interpretation, 'a light shining in a dark place'; but it is *God's* interpretation of life's facts or problems which the prophet has to bring, *not his own.* Otherwise it is no 'prophecy.' 'No prophecy of Scripture' had its origin in man's own mind. (2) Again, no prophecy of Scripture is limited to man's own solution of it; the way, or the full extent of the way, in which it will be fulfilled, is beyond his ken. The Gospel was the great solution of prophecy that it was because it both interpreted and fulfilled it at once. But it was God's solution.

II. 1-III. 3. This is the section the contents of which are common to 2 Peter and Jude.

II. 7, 8, 15. The exemplary conduct of Lot is set forth here in a much stronger light than the Old Testament narrative by itself warrants. The passage reads as if the character of Lot had been developed and expanded in some apocryphal book known to the writer. Balaam, on the contrary, in the New Testament (e.g. here, Jude [11], and Rev 2 [14]) appears without any of the softening of the outline which we find in Numbers. He is simply the type of the lucre-loving prophet and the moral seducer. The Balaam of the New Testament could never have inspired Butler's famous sermon.

20-22. For the gravity of moral apostasy here insisted on cf. Heb 6 [4] ff.; also the warning in our Lord's teaching (Mt 12 [45]); consciously or unconsciously a saying of Jesus in that passage is quoted here, but this may easily have been a current proverb when He used it.

(For other notes on this section, see under *The Epistle of St. Jude,* and specially the analysis of that epistle, and *The Relation between Jude and 2 Peter.*)

III. 4-9. The answer to the scoffers is threefold: (1) Their statement is not true that things have always continued the same. They forget the Deluge. (2) We have no means of measuring God's time, still less His longsuffering. (3) But the catastrophe and judgement will come, and this time the manner of the catastrophe will be by fire (see below on [10-13]). It would, however, be more accurate to say that (1) only is the reply, or retort, to the scoffers, and that (2) and (3) are addressed to the 'beloved,' the scoffers having been left behind.

The delay of the Parousia was a great difficulty to the first preachers of the Gospel who expected it and preached it as imminent. But we can trace in the New Testament how the emphasis was shifted, and with the faithful it soon ceased to be a difficulty. To the objectors described here, and to their like, it *never was* a difficulty, but only a convenient peg upon which to hang their scepticism, which was 'as old as the hills,' and as new as to-day. Ps 10 (PBV), with its 'Tush, thou God carest not for it,' is a good example, and expresses what is at the root of it all. The form of the attack may vary with the point exposed, but the temper and root remain the same.

10-13. These verses reflect current speculations about Creation, and about the catastrophic end of the present cosmos, combined with traditions of the Deluge. In his belief in the completeness of the destruction by the Flood, the writer goes much further than the implications of the Old Testament. In his opinion, a new heaven and earth were needed after the Flood in the same way that a new heaven and earth will be provided after the destruction by fire to which he looks forward. Destruction of the present cosmos by fire was the expectation of the Stoics as well as of Christians; but the speculation of the Stoics, or of the Greeks generally, seems to have been that destruction by fire and water would come alternately, and that after each destruction a cosmos similar to the present one would emerge; in these respects being very different from the Christian expectation of one catastrophe only, and of a heaven and earth greatly superior in character to those at present existing. 'The passage 3 [5-13] is the only one in the New Testament which speaks of the destruction of the world by fire. This is a noteworthy fact; so widely spread is the notion of a final fire, that it comes as a surprise to most people when they realize how very slender is the Biblical foundation for that belief. It is not practicable to trace (its) gradual growth; but it did grow, and in later times the

passage in 2 Peter became the authoritative one on the subject' (M. R. James, *C.G.T.*, 34-35).

5. out of water and amidst (margin **through**) **water.** The exact force of these prepositions is not very clear. But the basis of the description is probably Gen 1 [2, 6, 7]. Mayor translates 'built up out of water and through water, by the word of God,' and his note is: 'This appears to refer (1) to the general evolution out of chaos: (2) to the stages by which the heaven and earth were built up.'

10. the elements shall be dissolved: RVm 'heavenly bodies' (in place of 'elements'). This is probably correct. The belief that the stars were involved in the destruction of the last day is found both in the Old Testament and New Testament (see Is 34 [4]; Mt 24 [29]). Moffatt renders here: 'the stars will be set ablaze and melt.' If the true reading (RVm) is 'discovered' or 'found,' the most plausible suggestion is that a 'not' has been left out. In this case, for a parallel we may cf. Rev 16 [20], but James thinks that the word 'discovered' may be equivalent to 'manifested,' and so be a suitable judgement term.

13. new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. *Idcirco non veterascent* (Bengel).

15. even as our beloved brother Paul also wrote to you. Who are these to whom St. Paul is said to have written? The allusion to God's longsuffering is a special feature of the Epistle to the Romans (Rom 2 [4], 3 [25, 26], 9 [22-23]). This favours the idea that 2 Peter was written to the Church in Rome, which is, Mayor thinks, its most likely destination. The theory that it was written to the same Asiatics as 1 Peter is based entirely on the assumption that 'this second epistle' (2 P 3 [1]) implies that our '1 Peter' was the 'first' there referred to. But the description of the contents of the epistles which follows makes this very doubtful.

16. It is strongly held that the language here used about St. Paul's epistles, and the apparent placing of them upon a level with the recognized Old Testament Scriptures, imply a much later development of the Canon of Scripture than existed in the lifetime of the Apostles: and to many minds this furnishes the strongest of all arguments against the Petrine authorship of this epistle.

THE JOHANNINE EPISTLES

By Sir Edwyn Hoskyns

General Introduction

The 4th Gospel and the Johannine Epistles, consisting of a Catholic epistle, an epistle written to a particular church, and another to a particular individual, form a distinct and well-defined group within the New Testament. This literary unity is due partly to an almost certain identity of authorship, partly to a common historical situation which needed delicate handling. The communities of Christians were disturbed by extravagant and undisciplined teaching, under the influence of which men had separated themselves from their fellow-Christians, declaring that Jesus had not come 'in flesh,' and that in discarding so materialistic a belief they had been enabled to attain a more spiritual and progressive knowledge of God.

The author of the Johannine writings regards such men as antichrists and false prophets, and holds their assumed and unsympathetic superiority to be destructive of the truth of the Christian religion. And yet he does them the honour of treating them seriously and of explaining with great care why he is putting forth his whole literary and pastoral energy in an attempt to expose them. In the first epistle he lays down the axiom that any claim to a peculiar knowledge of God must be carefully examined, and proceeds to conduct the examination on the assumption that genuine religious experience must issue in moral transformation and be productive of charity. Thus tested the new teachers fail lamentably, and he draws the deduction that their knowledge of God is false knowledge, and that they are inspired by the devil. He then deals with their assertion that the true knowledge of God can dispense with the belief that the Son of God has come in the flesh, and shows both that it is a well-founded belief and that it is the ground of the righteousness and love characteristic of genuine Christian knowledge of God. The denial of the Incarnation and of the Passion of the Son of God is therefore ultimately the source of pseudo-Christian

esoteric religious experience devoid of righteousness and lacking in charity. This conclusion, which is only referred to in the first epistle, is worked out with great care in the Gospel, the purpose of which is to show that Christian salvation was from the beginning dependent upon the manifestation of the Son of God in flesh, and upon His death. If therefore Christianity be divorced from belief in the reality of the Incarnation and of the Passion of the Lord, it must inevitably lose its power to convert men, and the unity of the Christian community in its opposition to the world cannot be maintained. The situation which underlies the Johannine writings is thus closely parallel to that to which St. Ignatius refers in his *Epistle to the Smyrnæans* (v, vii, translated by Dr. Kirsopp Lake in *The Apostolic Fathers*, The Loeb Classical Library, 1912):

'There are some who ignorantly deny him, but rather were denied by him, being advocates of death rather than of the truth. . . . For what does anyone profit me if he praise me but blaspheme my Lord, and do not confess that he was clothed in flesh? But he who says this has denied him absolutely and is clothed with a corpse. Now I have not thought right to put into writing their unbelieving names, but would that I might not even remember them, until they repent concerning the Passion which is our Resurrection. . . . They abstain from Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ who suffered for our sins, which the Father raised up by his goodness.'

It was not until the 4th century that all three epistles found a secure place in the canon of the New Testament, apparently under the influence of St. Augustine and St. Jerome. In earlier times, that is from the beginning of the 3rd century, three Catholic epistles, James, 1 Peter, 1 John, were generally accepted; but with regard to the remaining four, 2 Peter, Jude, 2 and 3 John, there was considerable hesitation in appealing to them as possessing especial authority. No doubt it was the recognition of their apostolic authorship which finally secured their position in the canon of Scripture.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN

[References to the 4th Gospel are prefaced by G.]

THE close similarity between the epistle and the 4th Gospel in grammar, style, vocabulary, phraseology, and thought to which attention will be drawn in the commentary (cf. Brooke in *I.C.C.* Com., i-xix) makes it almost certain that the author of the epistle was also the author of the Gospel. For a discussion of the problem of the authorship of the Johannine writings the reader is referred to the Introduction to the Gospel, pp. 241-244, and Appended Note, pp. 272-276. It should, however, be noted that the author of the First Epistle claims to be one of the original disciples who saw and handled the Word of Life (1 $^{1-4}$: cf. G 1 ^{14}), and that the note of authority which underlies the epistle rests upon this claim.

It is impossible to decide whether the epistle was written before or after the Gospel, or whether it may not perhaps have been written at the same time with the intention that both should be read together. Neither the epistle nor the Gospel gives any clear indication of date, and the external evidence is extremely puzzling. There is no direct quotation from the epistle until the last quarter of the second century. Irenæus cites the epistle and attributes it to John the 'disciple of the Lord.' The Apostolic Fathers, it is true, use phrases which seem to be reminiscent of the epistle, and Polycarp in his letter to the Philippians (7) writes: 'Everyone who does not confess Jesus Christ to have come in the flesh is antichrist, and whosoever does not confess the witness of the Cross is of the devil.' This appears to be an echo of 1 Jn 4 ^{2}: cf. 2 Jn ^{7} (Brooke, lii-lviii). If Polycarp knew the epistle, it must have been written before A.D. 120 (?). But it is possible that both the author of the epistle and the Apostolic Fathers are using popular Christian language, the origin of which is obscure. Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.*, iii, 39) says that Papias made use of the epistle.

Nor is there any clear internal or external evidence as to its destination. Those scholars who hold that it was written to a definite group of Christians are thrown back on Ephesus and the surrounding district both for its provenance and for its destination. It seems, however, more probable to suppose both the Gospel and the epistle to have been written for all Christians. If this be correct, it must be assumed that they reflect a situation in Asia Minor which the author believed to be not entirely unique. The false teachers to whom reference has been made above are mentioned in 2 $^{18, 23}$, 4 ^{1}, and their conduct and beliefs condition the language of the epistle as a whole. But it must not be deduced from this that

the epistle is merely controversial. It affords an admirable illustration of the possibility of conducting controversy in such a way that there emerges from the controversy a simple and direct statement of Christian truth and experience as realized by one whose interests are primarily pastoral and paternal.

Commentary

I. 1-4. The Writer's Authority.—The neuter relative, **that which we have heard**, merges into a person who has been seen and touched by the author in company with others. The life-giving Word is therefore both a Gospel which can be proclaimed in word and the manifestation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in flesh (cf. G 1 [1-14], 2 [11]). The manifestation of eternal life was given to the original disciples in order that by their witness others might share in the brotherhood of the believers. Christian fellowship is, however, much more than a human fellowship. It is union with the Father and with His Son, and for that reason carries with it life and joy. The authority of the epistle is based on the author's claim to have been an eyewitness of the manifestation of the Word.

1. the beginning. Cf. 2 [7, 13, 24], 3 [8, 11]; 2 Jn [5, 6]. (*a*) Before the creation of the world the Word existed (G 1 [1]: cf. Gen 1 [1]); (*b*) before the first manifestation of the Gospel (cf. Mk 1 [1]); (*c*) before the moment of conversion to Christianity. Perhaps all these meanings are suggested here. **handled.** Cf. Lk 24 [39]; Ac 17 [27]; Heb 12 [18]. Literally to *feel after* and so to handle or touch. G 20 [17], though a different Greek word is used, suggests that the union of the believers with the Lord after the ascension will be so intimate that it can be described as touching Him (cf. G 6 [53, 54]). Here, however, the reference is to physical contact with the Lord before His ascension (cf. G 20 [25-28]).

2. eternal life. Literally, the life which belongs to the age to come; it does not mean 'everlasting further life after the death of the body.' The manifestation of the Son of God was the manifestation of a totally new kind of life. A new order was revealed on earth, the chief characteristic of which is supernatural and immortal life. In the Gospel the Lord both proclaims and gives life (G 6 [35], 10 [10, 28]).

4. we write. The original disciples are thought of not only as preachers and teachers, but also as joyfully recording in writing what they had seen and heard. If, however, **these things** refer to the letter which follows, and if *your joy*, though not so well attested as **our joy**, be the correct reading, then **we** is equivalent to *I*, and the whole sentence merely expresses the author's intention of writing a letter which he is confident will give his readers great pleasure. But the possibility must not be entirely disregarded that the writer is addressing the whole Christian community in the name of the original disciples, thought of as a compact body (cf. G 21 [24]). **these things we write.** The tradition that John wrote the Gospel in the name of the Apostles may be based upon a correct exegesis of these two passages (Muratorian Fragment, 9-15).

5-10. Christian truth. The Christian message which has been revealed by God through Jesus Christ to the original disciples, and which is delivered by them to men, is that God is Light, and that, since He is Light as opposed to Darkness, those who have fellowship with Him must no longer continue to walk in darkness (sin). And moreover there can be no Christian brotherhood apart from that moral transformation which is the necessary result of any true contact with God. Christianity is therefore not so much truth to be believed as truth to be done because it is believed. Religious experience which leaves human action untouched is thus shown to be false. The sinlessness which has been attained by those who do the truth does not spring solely, or even primarily, from the declared message that God is Light, it is rather the result of the death of Jesus, the Son of God. Christians are purified by the blood of Jesus, and therefore a denial of the reality of the Passion cuts at the roots of Christian moral purification. The sense of sinlessness in a Christian is open to serious misunderstanding. Conversion does not totally abolish sin; the man who says that it does deceives himself and makes God a liar. He makes God a liar, because God has Himself provided the means by which sin after conversion can be forgiven. Sin must be at once confessed. This done, complete purification is re-established by the action of God Himself, since He **is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.** The blood of Jesus is thus declared to be effective in destroying both the sins which men committed before their conversion and those which they commit afterwards. There is, however, a sin which is unforgivable (see 5 [16, 17]).

5. The order of words in [1-5], **beginning, Word, life, light, darkness,** reappears in

the prologue to the Gospel, and suggests the first chapter of the Book of Genesis. In the Gospel Jesus is the Light of the world (3 19, 8 12, 9 5, 12 35 ff., 46: cf. Mt 4 16; Lk 2 32; 2 Cor 6 14; Eph 5 8), and rescues men from the power of darkness (sin) (9 1-41).

6. The contrast between Light and Darkness (G 1 5, 3 19-21, 8 12: cf. 6 17) is further defined as a contrast between Truth and Falsehood (2 21, 27: cf. G 8 44; Jas 3 14). **do not the truth**: G 3 21: cf. Rev 21 27, 22 15.

7. **the blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us** (cf. 2 2, 4 10). This is sacrificial language (cf. Lev 17 11; Mt 26 28; Heb 9 14, 22; Tit 2 14, and throughout the New Testament). The death of Jesus was the sacrifice, effectual not merely for the forgiveness of sin, but for the actual purification of the heart. The author of the epistle needs only to refer to the efficacy of the death of the Lord, since he knows that his readers will understand his meaning. In the Gospel the crucifixion is narrated as the completion of the work of the Incarnate Word (19 30), and as the fulfilment of the Jewish sacrificial system (1 29, 36, 2 19-22), and of the Passover in particular (19 36), fulfilling Ex 12 46; Nu 9 12: cf. 1 Cor 5 7. The account of the Passion concludes with the carefully recorded incident of the piercing of the Lord's side and of the outpouring of blood in the sight of, if not actually upon, the beloved disciple (19 34, 35). The importance of this incident lies in its symbolism. The Christians too have been cleansed by the blood which flows from the crucified Lord. The present tense in this verse in the epistle shows that the reference is not only to the cleansing at conversion (baptism), but also to the cleansing from sin after conversion (cf. G 13 10, where it is pointed out that the complete bath—baptism—does not render further washing unnecessary).

8. Those who deny that sin remains in them as an active power, deny a plain fact of experience.

9. For those who recognize it and confess their sins God provides a complete remedy, since He both forgives the sin and cleanses the sinner. And in so doing He fulfils His promises (Jer 31 34: cf. Heb 11 11; Rom 3 25, 26; 1 Th 5 24), and thereby shows Himself to be faithful and just.

10. The denial of the fact of sin makes God a liar (Ps 14, 51), and proves those who make such statements to be devoid of truth and ignorant of His declared word.

II. 1-6. **The Imitation of Christ.**—The reality of the forgiveness of sin and of radical moral purification makes possible the sinlessness not only of those who are now Christians, but of all men. The death of Jesus Christ is an adequate propitiation for all sin, and His righteousness enables Him to act as the effectual friend and helper of men in the Father's presence. This universal salvation can, however, only be appropriated by those who obey the commands and imitate the life of Him who made the sacrifice. Those who are thus obedient possess the true knowledge of God, and His love is perfectly realized in them. The ability to keep God's commandments is therefore the test of the knowledge of God and of life in Him. The knowledge of the disobedient is false knowledge.

1. **Advocate**: RVm *Comforter, Helper, Paraclete* (G 14 26, 15 26, 16 7) of the Spirit (cf. 14 16, 17, where the word is applied both to the Spirit and to Jesus). The Greek word *Paracletos* means literally, *one called to the side of another* to help or comfort him. The Greek Fathers usually understand the word in this general sense. The limitation of the meaning of the word to that of an advocate in a lawsuit was chiefly the result of translating the Greek word by the Latin *advocatus*, in which the legal meaning was predominant. The best translation here is therefore probably *friend* or *helper*, which does not suggest only a pleader before a judge. Since, however, God is the Judge, this meaning must not be wholly eliminated. Dr. Brooke prefers to retain the translation *advocate* because it preserves the passive form of the Greek word. Dr. Gore, at the suggestion of G. H. Whitaker, accepts the meaning *agent* or *representative* (*Can We Then Believe?* 204 ff.). **with the Father.** The awkward Greek preposition (cf. 1 2) reappears in G 1 1: cf. Mk 6 3, 9 19. **righteous.** Only one who is perfect in virtue can remain in active communion and intercourse with God, and assist men to attain the righteousness which is His. For the title given to the Lord in the Apostolic Church cf. Ac 3 14, 7 52; Jas 5 6; 1 P 3 18. It is, however, not thus used in the Pauline Epistles.

2. **propitiation.** Cf. 4 10; Rom 3 25. The Greek word denotes the effective result of an act of propitiation. The enormity of human sin rightly provokes the anger of God, and demands an adequate expiation. This has been effected by the life and death of the incarnate and sinless Son of God, as a result of which human righteousness is attain-

able, and God can manifest Himself as Love. In Christianity the popular sacrificial idea of propitiating an angry God is entirely transformed, since God in His love has Himself provided the effectual sacrifice by sending His Son (G 3 16, 17). The love of God is therefore manifested not only in the effects of the innocent death of His Son, but in the sacrifice itself. The objectionable ideas suggested by the word 'propitiation' perhaps account for its rare use in the New Testament.

4. Calvin comments: 'The knowledge of God is an efficacious reality. For God is not known by a naked imagination, but when He reveals Himself in our hearts through the Spirit.' This is exactly what is meant by 'Truth' in the Johannine writings.

5. **the love of God has been perfected.** The choice does not lie between the interpretation of the genitive as either subjective or objective; both are implied. Since Christian righteousness is a supernatural experience, obedience to the commands of God is the sign that God has manifested His love towards men, and human love for God is also perfected by the victory over sin.

6. **abideth in him.** A characteristic phrase in the Johannine writings (2 24, 27, 28, 3 6, 24, 4 12, 13, 15, 16: cf. G 6 56, 14 10, 15 4-10). **as he walked.** The insistence on the *Imitatio Christi* is not unconnected with the sacrificial language in 2. In primitive sacrificial rites the imitation of the god to whom the sacrifice had been offered, or of the animal which formed the material of the sacrifice, formed an integral part of the ritual action. The idea of sacrifice therefore carries with it the idea of imitation (cf. Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, 351 ff.). Much of the early Christian attack on heathen sacrifices was conditioned by the connexion between sacrifice and imitation. The myths of the gods were largely stories of immorality, and those who offered sacrifice to such gods were incited thereby to imitate them. The superiority of Christianity consisted not in excluding the idea of sacrifice and preserving that of imitation, but in proclaiming a sacrifice made by one worthy of imitation.

7-17. The Christians and the World.—The Word of God which the Christians heard and received is no new commandment, for God has always demanded that men should love one another. Yet it is a new commandment, because now at last the Word of God has been fully obeyed first by Christ Himself, and, as a result of His victory over sin, subsequently by the Christians. For this reason the darkness of unfulfilled divine commands is passing away and the true light is appearing. The darkness remains where men hate their brothers, and the light is manifested where true philanthropy abounds. Those who are filled with hatred stumble in their journey and are ignorant of its end, whereas those enlightened by brotherly love pass securely on their way towards the eternal mansions of God. The converted Christians form one victorious community of old men, young men, and children, whose sins have been forgiven by the power of Christ, who know God, have conquered the evil one, and are strong in the abiding strength of the Word. They stand in complete opposition to the world, which strives to entice them with its charm. The charm of the world is lust and empty presumption, and is, moreover, passing away. The opposition between God and the world is therefore absolute, and this opposition must be reflected in the Christians, for the love of God and the love of the world are incompatible. But the power of the world is temporary, whereas those who do the will of God will survive the destruction of the world, and 'abide in' the life of the age which is to be.

7. The especial commandment referred to here is that men should love one another (G 13 34). This was an old commandment (Lev 19 18)—old, that is, when they received it at their conversion. For the various suggestions underlying the word **beginning** cf. 1 1 note.

8. The old commandment has become new, because it is **true in him and in you. true,** because genuinely obeyed by Christ and by His disciples. The distinction between the old and the new is illustrated in the Gospel by the distinction between the hirelings and the Good Shepherd. The former know that their duty is to care for the sheep, but fail in their service; the latter shows His love by dying for them (G 10 1-18). St. Peter is entrusted with His work, and must likewise surrender his life (G 21 15-18). **the darkness is passing away.** For the underlying eschatology see 2 18 note.

10, 11. The metaphor of a journey undertaken in the darkness or in the light is presupposed but not fully developed here (cf. G 11 9, 12 35, 36). In the dark (hatred) men stumble (sin) and know not whither they go (to destruction). In the light (love) the end is in view (eternal life and the mansions of God: G 14 2), and the dangers (sin) are avoided. The metaphor

is controlled by its meaning. The author does not write, *He trips over no stumbling-block*, but *There is no stumbling-block . . . in him*, because 'the occasions of falling are within.' **the darkness hath blinded his eyes.** Cf. G 9 39-41.

12-14. The author exercises his pastoral office as it had been defined in the command to St. Peter (G 21 15-17). The characteristic features of Christian experience, the forgiveness of sins through Christ (cf. Lk 7 47-50), the knowledge of Him who is from the beginning, that is the Christ (1 1: cf. G 1 1), and of the Father, and the victory over evil (G 16 33), are not to be attained by his readers but maintained. They are the children of God (3 1, 2) and also of the writer of the epistle (2 1. 18, 3 7), fathers of those who will believe through their preaching and example (G 17 20), and young men in the strength of their victory over sin through the power of the Word which abides in them.

15-17. Outside the Christian community is the world, and the righteous and beloved children of God are contrasted with the children of the world, possessed by no love of God and controlled by fleshly desire. The Christians must renounce the world (Mt 6 24), and this is all the more necessary because its destruction is imminent (2 18), and because only those who do the will of God (G 6 38. 39; Mk 3 35; Mt 7 21) will survive the catastrophe and share in the new age. For the distinction between **the lust of the flesh** and **the lust of the eyes** cf. Gen 3 6. **the vainglory of life.** Cf. Jas 4 16; Rom 1 30; 2 Tim 3 2. The presumptuous display of the externals of life, especially of wealth.

18-29. The Apostates.—The warning against the enticement of the world is necessary because some have apostatized from Christianity and returned to the world. The familiar prophecy of the coming of the antichrist immediately before the end is now being fulfilled. The apostates are the antichrists. Like Judas they were among us but not of us, else they would have remained with us. Now therefore we know that the end is at hand, and that not every Christian can be trusted. The test of the true Christian —and you can apply the test, since you were anointed (christened) by the Holy One and know the Truth—is whether men believe that Jesus is the Christ or not. You received this belief at your conversion, and it is the ground of your union with God and with His Son; this also is the message which we, the original disciples, received from Jesus Himself, and it is eternal life. The apostates are liars, and they are trying to deceive you. For this reason I write unto you; and yet my letter is unnecessary because the Christ who christened you taught you and still teaches you Himself. Abide in Him. Our knowledge that the end is at hand makes constancy imperative, if we are to be bold and unashamed of Him at His return. He is just and will certainly punish unrighteousness; but those who do righteousness are the children of God, and such men need have no fear.

18. Cf. 4 1-3; 2 Jn 2 7. The readers are supposed to be well aware of the tradition of the coming of the antichrist immediately before the end, referred to in 2 Th 2 3-8 as the 'man of sin,' in Mk 13 14 as the 'abomination of desolation standing where *he* ought not,' and throughout the Book of Revelation as the 'Great Beast' (Brooke, additional note, 69 ff.). This mysterious incarnation of evil is interpreted here as having actually taken place not in a single person, but in those who have apostatized from Christianity; they are the antichrists. The writer therefore draws the deduction that the end is at hand, and that, since the world is passing away (8. 17), the Christians must be prepared for the advent of the Lord (28). This passage clearly disproves the theory that in the Johannine writings primitive Christian eschatology has been entirely displaced by the mystical union with God and with His Son. In the Gospel, it is true, small reference is made to the belief in the second coming of the Christ and in the imminence of the judgement, but cf. G 5 28. 29, 6 39. 40, 21 23.

19. The apostates have left the community of the sons of Light and returned to the world (4 1; 2 Jn 7). If it may be assumed that reference is made to these men throughout the three epistles, they are fairly clearly characterized as men who claim to know God, without exhibiting the true signs of such knowledge. They neither love the brethren nor have they been morally transformed (1 6, 2 4. 9, 3 9. 10, 5 1; 3 Jn 11). The underlying cause of their apostasy is, however, their denial that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God (22. 23, 5 1), and their disbelief in the incarnation (4 2; 2 Jn 7). This precision of false belief has led many commentators to find in these men a clearly defined semi-Christian sect, followers of Cerinthus or of the gnostic Basilides, Docetists, or Judaists (see Brooke, xxxviii-lii). But the precision may be due to the author of the epistles. Men apostatized because they

found the moral demands made upon them too severe and belief in the incarnation too difficult, and also because they were subject to persecution. It is more natural to suppose the epistles to have been directed against such careless apostasy rather than against any organized or carefully thought out attack on Christian faith and practice. **they all are not of us.** Not one of such men is of us. The apostasy is valuable because it shows that not all who share externally in the Christian fellowship are controlled internally by its truth.

20-24. ye have an anointing—lit. *a chrism*. His readers are contrasted with the false brethren who deny that Jesus is the Christ. There is a play upon the words *Chrism, Christ*. Christened they know the Christ, and abide in the Son and in the Father. Union with God is dependent upon the supernatural knowledge of Jesus as the Christ and the Son of God (G 17 [3]).

25. the promise which he (Christ) promised us (variant reading *you*). The manuscript evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the reading *us*. The message which his readers have received is the same message which the Christ gave to His original disciples (cf. 1 [4] note).

26-28. The union of the Christians with Christ is so genuine a union that He teaches them as truly as He had taught His first disciples. In the Gospel this teaching is the work of the Spirit (14 [26], 16 [13, 14]). He *taught* and He *teaches*. Their first baptismal anointing is maintained by a continuous anointing, and the whole is thought of as a continuous instruction which renders the Christians independent of the apostolic witness, or at least should do so, and also will enable them to stand boldly before the Christ when He returns in judgement (cf. [18] note).

29. The thought of the judgement, however, involves the justice of God. He must punish sinners; and therefore the only security lies in 'doing righteousness' which is the test of the true sonship of God.

III. 1-12. **The Rebirth of the Children of God.**—The double test of the reality of the knowledge of God—moral transformation and love of the brethren—is also the proof that Christians have been born of God and are His children. The mysterious rebirth of the Christians is as unintelligible to the world as was the incarnation of the Son of God; and just as it perceived in Jesus no more than a man, so it sees nothing peculiar in His followers. But we are the sons of God, and our glory will be manifested. When the Christ appears we shall be like Him and shall see Him as He is; but of that glory even we are now ignorant. For the present our duty is to follow Him who came to take away sins and to destroy the power of the devil, and was Himself sinless. We must therefore purify ourselves as He is pure, for sin is lawlessness against God, and the sinner has neither seen nor known the Christ. It is the absence or presence of sin which distinguishes the children of God from the children of the devil, who is the original sinner. Our conquest over sin is, however, no mere achievement of human will; it is consequent upon our supernatural rebirth and upon the presence within us of the divine seed which itself is available only on account of the incarnation. Similarly, brotherly love is the outward and visible sign of spiritual regeneration, and is sharply contrasted with that murderous and devil-born hatred of which the ancient story of the death of Abel provides so poignant and pertinent an illustration.

1. The choice of the title **children of God** to denote the Christians carries with it the rich metaphorical language of generation to describe Christian faith and experience (cf. G 1 [12, 13]). Paternal creative love, conception and birth, the kinship of father and sons, and the innate common characteristics which distinguish the children of one father from those born of different parentage, suggest a connected series of experiences closely parallel to the varied but connected facts of peculiarly Christian experience. The love of God, the incarnation, the outpouring of the blood of Jesus (G 3 [16]; Rom 5 [8]), the mysterious appearance in the world of the Christians as one compact community, their individual conversion, their intimate union with God and with one another, their separation from the world, are all summed up in the title 'children of God.' **and such we are.** The Christians are what they are called. The title 'children of God' is no empty title; it adequately expresses their nature. **because it knew not him.** The ignorance of God, revealed in the failure of the world to recognize Jesus as His Son (G 7 [28, 29]), entirely explains its failure to recognize the Christians as His children (G 16 [2, 3]).

2. if he (i.e. the Christ) **shall be manifested.** The result of the second coming of the Christ will not be to make His disciples sons of God. They are that already. Rather it will mean the end of their humiliation. The contrast is between the humiliated and the glorified

children of God. As Jesus was once humiliated, but is now glorified, so the time is not far distant when His unrecognized and persecuted disciples will both see and share His glory (G 17 [24], 14 [2, 3]; Col 3 [4]; Rev 22 [4]). Sight is the climax of knowledge and of faith. The nature of that glorification, however, has not yet been made manifest.

3-6. The second advent of the Christ then will have as its main purpose the glorification of the disciples, and must be contrasted with the first manifestation which took place in order that sin might be removed (G 1 [29]). The hope of glorification can therefore only be fulfilled if His disciples purify themselves and share in His sinlessness. What He was they can now see and know and imitate, if they abide in Him, whereas the vision of what He is in His glory remains the supreme object of their hope. The Christian hope is thus more precisely defined as **hope set on him. purify himself.** Cf. G 17 [17, 19]; Ac 21 [24, 26], 24 [18]; Nu 8 [21, 22]. The Greek word for *purify* belongs to the terminology of sacrificial worship. Moral purification is the necessary prelude to the vision of God (Mt 5 [8]: cf. Ex 19 [10] ff.). **sin is lawlessness.** Sin is not indifferent. It is rebellion against God. Sin and lawlessness are therefore identical terms (cf. Rom 4 [7]; Heb 10 [17]).

7-10. So far from being a matter of indifference, sin reveals a deep-seated perversion of human nature due to diabolical paternity, whereas righteousness declares the righteous man to have been *born of God*, and reveals the work of the Christ. For the devil as the father of sinners cf. G 8 [41-44], 13 [2, 27]; Gen 3; for the victory of Christ over the devil cf. G 12 [31], 14 [30], 16 [11, 33]; Mk 3 [20-27]; Lk 10 [18]; for the Christians as new-born children cf. G 1 [13], 3 [4, 9]; 2 Cor 5 [17]; Tit 3 [5]; Jas 1 [18]; 1 P 1 [3, 23], 2 [1-3]. For the distinction between sons of the evil one and sons of the Kingdom cf. Mt 13 [38].

11, 12. Christian righteousness is particularly apparent in the brotherly love of the Christians for one another, hatred being the most ancient sign of diabolical activity (Gen 4 [1-12]).

13-24. Love and Sacrifice.—The opposition between Cain and Abel illustrates the permanent incompatibility of love and hatred. Between those who have been born of God and the children of the devil, between death and life, between God and the world, there can be no peace. The opposition of the world, therefore, is not surprising. Our love of the brethren proves that we have passed from death to life, and reflects the love manifested in the Passion of the Christ. Contrariwise, the hatred which our enemies manifest towards us, and which leads to murder, reveals a life which is in fact death. Christian love must be prepared for sacrifice. Such sacrifice may be the sacrifice of life itself in literal imitation of Jesus; it must be the sacrifice of worldly possessions, if our poorer brethren be in want. This is the test of Christian love, whether it be in mere word or tongue, or in deed and truth. The desire to avoid sacrifice of life or goods is deep-set in our hearts. This innate impulse must, however, be persuasively overcome in the presence of God, who is greater than our hearts, and knows what is for our advantage. Only if we master our natural desires and obey the commands of God and do His pleasure can we enter boldly into His presence and expect Him to answer our prayers. And the command of God is that we should imitate the self-sacrificing love of Jesus Christ, and show thereby that He dwells in us and we in Him. The sign of this mutual indwelling is the gift of the Spirit which makes possible Christian sacrifice.

13-15. Love is the sign of life as hatred is of death. Hatred, death, and the world stand in absolute opposition to love, life, and the Christians. Love is life-giving, hatred deals death to hater and hated alike. The contrast between Abel and Cain reappears therefore inevitably in the opposition of the world to the Christians.

13. For the active persecution of the Christians cf. G 15 [18, 19], 16 [1-4], 17 [14].

14. Cf. G 5 [24]. **15.** Cf. Mt 5 [21-24].

16-18. The precise nature of Christian love was manifested by the Christ Himself who died for the brethren (G 10 [11, 15], 17, 18], 13 [37, 38], 15 [13]: cf. the significant action recorded in 13 [4]). The *imitatio Christi* is the essence of Christian piety. Even if death be not demanded, Christian love at least must issue in active charity. It is incredible that those who have this world's goods should profess love and leave the poorer brethren in want. **this world's goods:** cf. Lk 16 [11, 12].

19-22. An exceedingly difficult passage, which some commentators regard as corrupt (cf. Windisch *ad loc.*). But this is unnecessary. The interpretation depends on the meaning given to the Greek word translated in the RV **assure** and RVm **persuade**, and also on the significance given to the repeated phrase **our heart**, which may refer to a good or bad impulse. If it be held that the heart of

a Christian must be good, and if the difficult Greek word be translated **assure**, the passage yields no clear meaning. But if **our heart** be equivalent to the *base thought* of the exactly parallel passage in Dt 15 [9], and if *persuade* be chosen rather than **assure**, an appropriate meaning is given to the whole passage. The demand for sacrifice has been made as in Dt 15 [7, 8], but a *base thought* arises in the heart of a Christian which condemns the sacrifice demanded as unnecessary, and suggests that it can be avoided and that love can be maintained apart from a definite surrender of life or goods. The writer of the letter insists that this impulse, however natural, must be eradicated. The heart must be reasoned with and persuaded in the presence of God to make the sacrifice willingly. The demand of God is greater than the base and ignorant impulse of the human heart (cf. 4 [4]). Moreover, His knowledge is infinite, and no motion of the heart escapes His notice. So long as the evil thought is cherished there can be no answer to prayer, and no boldness nor freedom in approaching God now or at the day of judgement.

22. For prayer to the Father in the name of Jesus (cf. G 16 [23, 24]) by those who do the will of God cf. G 9 [31], 14 [12, 13].

23, 24. True belief in Jesus Christ involves willing sacrifice for the brethren. This was His expressed command (G 13 [34], 15 [12]). The gift of the Spirit is the assurance of the reality of the union which binds the Christ to those who believe in Him (Rom 8 [9, 10]; 2 Cor 1 [22]).

IV. **1-6. The Spirit of Deceit and His Prophets.**—The Spirit of God must be clearly distinguished from the spirit of the antichrist. The return to the world of those who had once been Christians makes it necessary to test the spirits even within the Christian community. The denial of Jesus, the incarnate Christ, betrays the work of the spirit of the antichrist; the confession of His coming in flesh reveals the presence of the Spirit of God. Ye are aware that the inspired men of the antichrist must come. They are here. Ye have overcome them because ye are of God and they are of the world. This is the secret of your victory. God is stronger than the antichrist, who is now in the world deceitfully alluring the men of the world who know not God. To all this activity of evil we stand opposed, we and those who are converted by our preaching. In this opposition is detected the work of the Spirit of Truth and the work of the spirit of deceit.

1, 2. Cf. notes on 2 [18, 19]. **gone out into the world**: the phrase is left more vague than in 2 [19], because the emissaries of the antichrist are not confined to apostates from the Christian community. Men whose actions are controlled by the passions of the world and by false beliefs are called false prophets, without thereby necessarily implying that they form an organized body of men with a definite teaching. If, however, such men had been formerly Christians, the act of *going out into the world*, that is of separating themselves from the Christian community, involves the denial of the incarnate Christ, since true imitation of His life and death makes a return to the world impossible (cf. 2 P 2 [1, 2]; 1 Cor 12 [3]). The possibility of apostasy places a necessary responsibility on all Christians of testing the spirits by which men are controlled (cf. 1 Th 5 [21]).

3. The variant reading *divideth Jesus* for **confesseth not Jesus** indicates a more precise false teaching in which Jesus the man who lived and died was distinguished from the supernatural Christ, the Son of God. Such teaching is illustrated in the description given by Irenæus of the views held by Cerinthus: 'He held Jesus not to have been virgin-born, but to have been born as all other men, the son of Joseph and Mary. He grew increasingly righteous and wise; and after the baptism the Christ descended upon Him from the Father of all in the form of a dove. He was thus enabled to do miracles and proclaim the unknown Father. At the end the Christ departed from Jesus and He died and was raised, whereas the Christ, being spiritual, remained throughout passionless' (Irenæus, *c. Hær.*, I, xxvi, 1). The variant reading is best explained as a gloss introduced in order to make the passage condemn more definitely a particular heresy. For the spirits of the antichrist cf. Rev 16 [13, 14].

4. have overcome them. It is impossible to decide whether this refers to their perseverance in the truth or to some disciplinary action directed against the false prophets. **he that is in the world.** That is, the ruler of this world (G 12 [31], 14 [30], 16 [11]).

5. Cf. G 15 [19], 17 [14-17]. **6.** Cf. G 3 [11].

7-21. Love and Fear, and Faith in the Only Begotten Son of God.—The application of the test of belief in Jesus as the Son of God is but another mode of applying the test of love. God is love; and only those who love the brethren know God and have been born of Him. Such love can, however, only blossom on the

soil of Christian faith. The love of God was not attained by human endeavour; rather it was manifested in the life and death of the only begotten Son of God, who gave us life and made propitiation for our sins. Love of the brethren ought therefore to follow inevitably upon the recognition of the love of God manifested in the mission of His Son. The gift of the Spirit is the gift of love, and, though no one has ever seen God, He abides in us if we love one another. This mutually expressed love is the perfecting of the love of God first manifested in the incarnation and death of His Son. If Jesus be denied or unconfessed, love is banished or unattained, but he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God abides in God and God in him, and love is the fruit of this indwelling.

We, the original disciples, have seen the Saviour of the world whom the Father sent, and, because we have seen Him, we now bear witness, and know and believe that our love is the love of God. This is the perfect love by which all fear of the final judgement is excluded. We are the *imitatores Christi*. Fear of judgement implies fear of punishment for sin; but the perfect love, which is grounded upon the remission of sins, casteth out fear. The fearful man has not been perfected by the love of God and by love of the brethren. And so, when all is said, love of the brethren is the supreme test. It was His express command that we should love one another, and how can one who does not love his visible brother love the invisible God?

7, 8. Cf. Rom 13; 1 Cor 8 [1-3].

9, 10. The divine mission involved both the incarnation and the crucifixion of the Son of God. This double purpose is suggested by the word *gave* in G 3 [16].

9. only begotten. Cf. G 1 [14, 18], 3 [16, 18]. The same Hebrew word is translated in the LXX by the Greek words for *only begotten* (cf. Lk 7 [12], 8 [42], 9 [38]) and *beloved* (Mk 1 [11], 9 [7], 12 [6]). The Hebrew word which underlies *only begotten* and *beloved* in the New Testament means *only one*, there is no other.* When the word *beloved* is applied to the Christians in the New Testament it implies that they stand in a peculiar relation to God through their relationship with His unique Son. The Christian belief in Jesus as God's only Son was a chief ground for the refusal of the Christians to consider Christianity as forming but one element in the widespread religious syncretism of the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. Jesus was not one of many sons of the unknown God: there is no other Lord and Christ. No compromise was therefore possible with other religions.

11. if God so loved us. Cf. G 3 [16].

12. Christianity does not seek to attain a mystical vision of God in this world (cf. G 1 [18], 6 [45, 46]); it finds His presence assured in the exercise of Christian charity, and in the sight of (G 14 [9]) and belief in (G 20 [29]) His Son. **his love has been perfected in us.** (*a*) The love which we have for God is perfected in our love of the brethren; (*b*) the love of God manifested in the life and death of Jesus is perfected in the love of the Christians for one another (cf. G 13 [34, 35], 15 [12]). **13.** Cf. 3 [24].

14. we. Here the original disciples (cf. 1 [1-5]; G 1 [14]). It is, however, possible that belief in Jesus is equivalent to seeing Him; if so, the verse may refer also to the readers of the epistle, and consequently to all true Christians, but see G 20 [29]. **the Saviour of the world.** Cf. G. 3 [17], 4 [42].

15, 16. For the confession of the twelve Apostles cf. G 6 [69]. The active love of God operative in the Christians is recognized and appropriated by faith in Jesus. The example of Judas (G 6 [70]), however, shows that a merely external confession is ineffectual.

17, 18. The perfection of Christian love is manifested in the removal of fear of punishment on the day of judgement (2 [28], 3 [21]; G 5 [24]), and this boldness is grounded on the consciousnes of the believers that they abide in God as Jesus abides in God (G 14 [11, 12], 17 [20-23]), even though they remain *in the world* from which Jesus has been removed (G 17 [11]).

18. has punishment. Cf. Mt 25 [46]. The existence of fear is in itself a punishment for imperfect love; but it is also the sign of the expectation of punishment to come. Such fear is completely removed where love is perfected.

19-21. Cf. Mt 25 [39]. The obvious falsity of claiming to love the invisible God whilst at the same time hating the visible children of God is established by the direct and authoritative command of the Lord (G 13 [34, 35]; Mk 12 [29-31]: cf. Dt 6 [4, 5]; Lev 19 [18]).

V. 1-21. Faith and Love and the Victory over Sin.—Faith and love are inextricably interwoven. The one has no true existence apart from the other. The faith which makes us the children of God generates also the love of God and the love of all who have been reborn by belief that Jesus is the Christ. Yet, even though the love of God be produced in us by faith in Jesus, and tested by the love of the brethren, it is spurious and ineffective if it be not

* Cf. note on Mk 1 [11].

exhibited in complete obedience to the commands of God. Obedience to God is no grievous and monotonous submission; it is the victorious conquest over sin and the world, and, like the love of the brethren, it is the fruit of that conversion through faith in Jesus by which we have been created children of God. The Christian experience of victory over the enticements of the world depends upon belief that the Son of God did in fact Himself achieve the perfect victory over sin by sanctifying Himself and offering His sinless life as a sacrifice. He passed through the cleansing water and offered His life-giving blood. Thus the victory was won. This victory, which is also our victory, was not achieved merely by the revelation of the sinless Christ, it was achieved by the action of the sinless Victim who offered His blood for our salvation. By the blood of Christ we have been cleansed, and by the water which flows from His side we are sanctified. The last incident in the story of the Passion sums up the meaning of His life, and bears witness to the significance of His death. Water and blood flowed from His side, and bending His head He handed over the Spirit. The water, the blood, and the Spirit of the evangelical narrative are the sanctification, new life, and inspiration which God has poured out upon us through His Son. Therefore both our experience and the clear teaching of the Spirit witness to the truth of our faith by which we have conquered the world. The life and death of Jesus, the new birth of His disciples, and the nature of their abiding mysterious experience form one witness of God to the power of His Son, and this witness must be accepted by all who can estimate at all the value of evidence. The faithful Christian proclaims through his own mouth the witness of God, for he possesses God's witness in him. The unbeliever neither has this witness in him, nor does he believe God's witness once manifested in the Christ and now in the lives of the Christians. This unbelief, in the face of such overwhelming evidence, is simply to make God a liar. But more is involved in Christian experience. Ultimately the effective witness which the believer has within him is the possession of eternal life, since the life of Jesus which God gave to us is eternal life. He who has the Son has life, and he who has not the Son has not life. The purpose with which the epistle is written is to ensure that those who believe on the name of the Son of God may recognize clearly that this belief carries with it eternal life. The free and confident approach of the Christians to God is evident from the answers He gives to their petitions. The prayers of the true believers are effective prayers, efficacious especially in releasing the brethren from those sins which are not mortal. A deliberate rejection of Christ is, however, apostasy, and an apostate is in mortal sin: no prayer can save him. The recognition of the power of prayer must not be understood in such a way as to obscure the fact that a Christian should not sin at all. The children of God are removed from the power of the devil. The devil controls the world, but we are controlled by God. Keep yourselves from idols. Gentile worship stimulated by immoral stories of the incarnate lives of the voluptuous sons of the gods is a direct incentive to sin. Christians must therefore separate themselves completely from all such worship, and be on their guard against its degrading influence. We know the true Son of God who became flesh for our salvation; and our worship, since it is centred in Him, is the true worship which issues in the knowledge of God, and moves us to love and righteousness and life everlasting.

1-4. Belief that Jesus is the Christ is not merely the acceptance of a dogma; it is a creative action by which men have been transformed so radically that the experience is in fact rebirth from God. The effect of this rebirth is apparent in the love of God and the consequent love of all who have been likewise reborn which is characteristic of the true believer; its reality is proved by the ability of the reborn to obey the commandments of God which have been found hitherto so severe and impracticable. Conversion carries with it a victorious mastery over sin and the world. But the power by which this victory has been achieved is our faith (cf. Mt 11 [28-30]).

5-8. The faith which generates in men the love of God and enables them to fulfil His commands is again more closely defined as belief that Jesus is the Son of God. Then follows the *crux interpretum*. The obscurity is caused by the allusive character of the phrases used. Suggestions which were no doubt caught at once by the readers of the epistle can only be recovered by the modern reader who is familiar with the Johannine writings as a whole, and with the varied elements out of which popular primitive Christianity was constructed. The author is here alluding to the actions of the Son of God by which He had conquered sin and empowered His disciples to share in the fruits of His victory (2 [13, 14]; G 16 [33]).

The baptism by John and the Crucifixion are referred to in the phrase **This is he that came by water and blood**, but in such a manner as to concentrate the attention of the reader upon the significance of water and blood rather than upon particular historical incidents. Water symbolizes purification, and blood both purification and life. In the life and death of Jesus the perfect conquest over sin was attained and exhibited to the world. But for those who believe in Jesus far more is indicated. They have shared in this victory through the inspiration of the Spirit of Jesus, who is the Holy Spirit of God; and the symbolism of water and blood is freely used to give precision to the effects of this inspiration as involving an intimate union of the believer with the Son of God and in order to point to the life and death of the Lord as its source.

In the Gospel (19 [25-37]) the beloved disciple, as the forerunner of those who shall believe, stands at the foot of the Cross and sees the water and the blood pour forth from the side of Jesus, and watches Him bend His head and hand over the Spirit. The Spirit, the water, and the blood bear witness to the completion of the perfect sacrifice and to the benefits which are secured by it. The beloved disciple is thus depicted as the first Christian believer.

The death of the Son of God (blood), and not merely the perfection of His life (water), is emphasized as the source of the victory of the Christians over sin and the cause of their rebirth: **not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood.** To this the Spirit bears perpetual witness in the experience of the converted. Thus the Spirit who is given by Jesus (G 20 [22]), the water of purification (G 7 [37-39]), and the blood of the new transformed life (G 6 [53-58]), form a threefold witness to the truth (cf. Dt 17 [6], 19 [15]; G 8 [17]). They are the means by which the life of the Son of God is communicated to men, and of this communication Baptism and the Eucharist are effectual symbols (G 3 [5-8], 4 [1, 2], 7 [37-39], 6 [52-59]).

The 'Comma Johanneum.'—The biblical texts of certain Spanish and African Fathers of the 5th and 6th centuries contained the following addition as a preface or conclusion to [8]: **For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost,** and the consequent insertion of the words **in earth** into the original text. During the Middle Ages the passage thus expanded became established in the authoritative Latin version, and was therefore accepted as authentic in the English Authorized Version of 1611. On January 13, 1897 it was pronounced by the authorities at the Vatican to be an integral part of the epistle. The decree is, however, now regarded merely as a disciplinary measure which the progress of study joined to the tacit consent of authorities has allowed to fall into desuetude (see Batiffol, *Credibility of the Gospels*, 190, note 2). The manuscript evidence is overwhelming against the authenticity of this passage. It is found in no Greek or Oriental manuscript before the 15th century; it was unknown both to the Greek Fathers and to the African Fathers, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and St. Augustine; nor did St. Jerome, when he revised the Old Latin texts, seem to have any knowledge of its existence. The gloss, for gloss it must be, is known to us as included in the text of the epistle first from a citation by the Spanish Bishop Priscillian, who died in A.D. 385. For various reasons it is improbable that he himself composed the insertion. The gloss is capable of a simple explanation. Already in the 2nd and 3rd centuries the Trinity was supposed to be concealed behind the number three wherever it occurred in the sacred text. 1 Jn 5 [8] almost demanded a trinitarian interpretation, not only because of the number 'three,' but also because of the significant phrase 'and the three are one.' The comments of the Fathers suggest that the application of the verse to the Trinity formed part of the traditional exegesis of the passage (Tertullian, *Against Praxeas*, xxv; Cyprian, *On the Unity of the Church*, vi; Augustine, *Against Marcion*, ii, 22). It must therefore be supposed that during the 4th century in Spain (? Africa) the interpretative gloss was incorporated into the text of certain biblical manuscripts, and was afterwards gradually accepted in the West. In the Revised Version the whole has been removed, no reference being made to it even in the margin. For a discussion of the history of the insertion see Brooke, separate note, 154-165.

9-13. If a threefold human witness be sufficient to establish the truth of a matter (Dt 19 [15]), a threefold divine witness renders the unbeliever guilty of proclaiming God Himself to be a liar. Not only did God authenticate His Son, as is clear from the narrative of His life and death (Mk 1 [11], 9 [7]; G 1 [33, 34], 5 [37], 8 [18], 12 [28]), but everyone who believes has an additional and corroborative witness in his own experience. The believer has passed from death to life, and the new life which he has received through union

with the Son of God is eternal life. The generalization is therefore true. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life (G 3 [36]). The purpose of this epistle is to declare plainly the implications of belief in the power of the Son of God, lest Christians be induced thoughtlessly to surrender the faith by which they have been saved (cf. G 20 [31]).

14-17. To the orderly Western mind the epistle would seem to have ended appropriately with [13]; but neither the Gospel nor the epistle concludes with the formal statement of the purpose for which it was written.

The author returns to the theme of 3 [21, 22] and 1 [7-10]. The free and sure access to God which results from the gift of eternal life by faith in His Son involves the knowledge that petitions addressed to God according to His will are most assuredly answered. Though conversion both should, and in fact does, render sinlessness possible for the believer, yet Christians do sin, and this involves the responsibility of offering intercessory prayer on behalf of those who are guilty of sin **not unto death.** Such prayer is effective and lifegiving. At the same time a clear distinction must be drawn between **sin unto death** and **sin not unto death.** From the epi e as a whole it may be reasonably deduced that by **sin unto death** the author means apostasy. If a man leaves the Christian community and returns to the world, his sin is unto death, and there is no certainty that intercessory prayer in such a case will be answered; indeed it would seem to be actually discouraged: 'Pray not for this people for their good' (Jer 14 [11]). The apostate must hear that condemnation and rejection at the last day which is the penalty of apostasy. This is the real death. Sins, however, committed within the Christian community which do not spring from the denial that the Son of God has come in the flesh form a proper subject for prayer and confession (cf. 1 [8-10]). The distinction between mortal and venial sin, that is between sin which must be confessed and sin which need not, cannot be supported from this passage. On the other hand, the underlying distinction between sin which wounds the soul and sin by which it is killed gives a satisfactory interpretation of St. John's language.

18-21. The main purpose of the epistle is restated in a short summary. The converted Christians know God through faith in His Son Jesus Christ, who is the true incarnate image of the Father. Christian faith thus stimulated by the picture of God depicted in the life and death of His Son stands in striking contrast to the faith of the Gentiles stimulated by images and idols which call to mind the actions of the sons of the gods. Both Christian and pagan worship are effective. The worship of idols begets ignorance, encourages sin, and leads to destruction; the true worship of God is productive of sinlessness and insight into truth, and generates eternal life. The distinction between Christianity and the world is therefore simply the distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil. The author shudders as he contemplates the fact that men once purified and reborn can again surrender themselves to the influence of pagan worship: 'For the worship of those idols that may not be named is the beginning and cause and end of every evil' (Wisd 14 [27]), and he therefore appropriately concludes his epistle with the poignant exhortation, **Little children, keep yourselves from idols.**

18. he who is born of God keepeth him. The variant reading *keepeth himself* is supported by Origen, codex Sinaiticus, and other manuscripts. It presents, however, considerable difficulty, since *keepeth himself* (i.e. from the evil one) is hardly a Johannine conception (see G 17 [11-15]). The more usual reading gives admirable sense: *He who was born* (aorist) *of God*—Jesus, the only begotten Son, who Himself overcame the world (G 1 [18], 16 [33])—*keepeth him*—keepeth from the evil one the Christian who has been born of God. Harnack (*Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes*, 1915) holds that both readings are corrupt, and suggests, with support from the Vulgate, two Greek minuscules, St. Jerome (*c. Pelag.*), and Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, *the generation from God keepeth him* to have been the correct reading.

19. the whole world. Here not the physical structure of the universe, but the secular society of unconverted men and women: 'Non creatura, sed sæculares homines et secundum concupiscentias viventes' (Clement of Alexandria).

20. this is the true God: cf. G 20 [28-31]. The Christ is to the divine sons of the heathen gods as the true to the false. He is the revelation of God; they make manifest the works of the devil.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN

General Introduction

THE phraseology of the epistle is identical with the former epistle, and the situation is similar though more precise. Men

who have previously been Christians have 'gone out into the world' (7). But they have not severed all connexion with the Church; they are travelling about claiming Christian hospitality (10). The writer of the epistle is convinced that, since they do not confess that Jesus Christ came 'in flesh,' they are deceivers and antichrists; and he therefore urges the 'elect lady' to have no intercourse with them and to show them no hospitality, because the most casual act of friendship involves fellowship with their evil works (10, 11).

The 'elect lady' to whom the letter is addressed is capable of various interpretations, the most probable being that the 'lady' is a particular Church, and that her 'sister' is the Church in which the author is resident when writing the letter (see note on 1). The writer describes himself as 'the Presbyter' (see note on 1), a designation not used in the First Epistle, but which reappears in the Third (1). The letter is written with the authority of one of those who received a commandment from the Father from the beginning (4, 5), and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the author is here repeating the claim of the prologue to the Gospel and of the opening verses of the First Epistle that he was one of the original disciples. But he writes shortly, because he hopes to visit the Church and exercise his authority by word of mouth.

Commentary

(*References to the 4th Gospel are prefaced by G.*)

1. The Presbyter: cf. 3 Jn 1. A claim to authority underlies the author's designation of himself as **the Presbyter** without the addition of his name. The phrase may be either descriptive of one who is old in years, or it may be a title with a clearly defined meaning. Papias is held by many to have used the title 'Presbyters' to describe those who, having been closely associated with the Apostles, were able to hand on their teaching (Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, iii, 39). Irenæus certainly at times uses it precisely in this sense (Irenæus, *Against the Heresies*, V, xxxiii, 3). The theory is attractive which gives this very restricted meaning to the title here, and therefore identifies the author of the Johannine writings not with the Apostle John, but with the Presbyter, from whom Papias had received directly or indirectly important information (Irenæus, *op. cit.*, V, xxxiii, 4, and the passage from Eusebius quoted above). But the meaning of the title in Papias is exceedingly obscure. It may be argued with very great probability that he means by 'the Presbyters' the Apostles themselves (see Nolloth, *The Fourth Evangelist*, 60 note, quoting Brooke and others). Irenæus is aware of no inconsistency in quoting this epistle, in spite of, perhaps because of, the heading 'the Presbyter,' as the work of John 'the disciple of the Lord,' that is of one of the original disciples of Jesus, and in attributing to him the whole *Corpus* of the Johannine writings. He must mean John the Apostle (Irenæus, *op. cit.*, III, xvi, 8). It must, however, not be forgotten that 'the Presbyter' may denote no more than the leading man in some church. The exact significance of the title is therefore obscure. The problem of authorship cannot be solved by giving to the title a precise meaning, and starting with it, as though a fixed point of departure were thereby secured.

unto the elect lady. Various explanations have been given of these words. (*a*) *Unto the Lady Electa* (Clement of Alexandria), taking 'Electa' as a proper name, and 'Lady' as a term of affection, as in the Papyri. Dr. Rendel Harris has given his support to this interpretation (*Expositor*, 1901). But 11 is exceedingly difficult to explain if 'Electa' be taken as a proper name. (*b*) *The Elect Kyria.* It is true that the Greek word *Kyria* occurs as a proper name, but, as Brooke points out, we should expect *unto Kyria, the elect one.* (*c*) If the epistle be read as a whole, the address to an individual seems inappropriate. Both the 'Lady' and her sister have many children (13); she is addressed in the plural (6, 8, 10, 12), and in such a manner that she disappears as a distinct individual in her children, who are known throughout the Christian world (1), but need to be reminded of the command that they should love one another. The author regards himself as standing within the sphere of their mutual love (6). If the 'Lady' and her children be a venerable Christian Church, the language is intelligible; if they be a Christian family, the language is strained throughout. The interpretation accepted by most modern commentators, that the letter was written to a Church (the elect Lady) by a resident in another Church (the Lady's sister) is by far the most probable (cf. 1 P 5 13; Rev 1-3; Is 54, 55).

2, 3. The truth which the Christians possess, and which is eternal, is the ground of mutual charity; and if it be held in love, grace and mercy and peace will abound from God the Father and from His Son Jesus Christ.

4-6. The elder rejoices that so many of the children of the elect Lady walk in truth, but urges that the truth should find adequate expression in that mutual love concerning which the Lord had given definite command (cf. 1 Jn 3 [23] note, 4 [21]).

7. Both truth and love are threatened by the itinerant apostate Christians who deny that Jesus Christ comes in flesh (cf. 1 Jn 2 [18] ff., 4 [1] ff. notes). The use of the present **comes** rather than the perfect *has come* (1 Jn 4 [2]) is difficult to explain. It may be that the deceivers denied the continuance of the incarnation in the experience and worship of the Church (G 14 [18]), or that they denied the future advent of the Lord to be a *coming in flesh* (cf. *The Epistle of Barnabas*, vi, 9), or that they discarded the idea of an incarnation altogether, whether past, present, or future, since the conjunction of the Son of God with the material world was felt to be derogatory to His divine dignity.

8. The Church is warned to be careful lest by attending to the false teachers the work of the writer and his companions be destroyed, and the children of the elect Lady lose their final reward—eternal life (cf. G 4 [36-38], 6 [27, 28, 39], 17 [12]). The text in certain MSS. has been simplified by the substitution of the first person plural for the second person plural throughout. The reading adopted in the Authorized and Revised Versions is almost certainly correct. The author of the epistle does not contemplate the possibility that he could destroy his own work or lose the final reward.

9. Everyone who progresses beyond the teaching of Christ forfeits his union with God (cf. 1 Jn 2 [23]). The writer betrays a delicate sarcasm in describing the antichrists as progressivist atheists.

10, 11. In order that the children of the elect Lady might be protected from these dangers, the elder commands that itinerant preachers, who have progressed beyond the teaching of Christ, be not admitted to the fellowship of the Church, and that no greeting be given them. A greeting is no mere formality, for it expresses approval of the guest.

12, 13. The letter is short, not because there is little to say, but because the writer hopes to visit the Church soon. The final greeting expresses the unity between the Church in which he is residing at the time of writing and the Church he is shortly to visit; it is not a greeting sent by the nephews and nieces of the elect Lady to their aunt.

THE THIRD EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN

General Introduction

THE Third Epistle is addressed by the Elder to Gaius the beloved, presumably an important person in one of the Churches over which the elder exercised peculiar authority. The main purpose of the epistle is to communicate with the Church through Gaius. The masterful Diotrephes has refused to receive the itinerant evangelists who are associated with the Elder, and is engaged in preventing others from receiving them, and in expelling them from the Church. The elder hopes to come himself to withstand Diotrephes and explain by word of mouth how dangerous his teaching is. Meanwhile he wishes very especially to introduce and recommend a certain Demetrius, of whom all speak well, and who has been particularly approved by the Holy Spirit. The elder is sure that Gaius will undertake to protect Demetrius from Diotrephes because he has heard from other itinerant evangelists how much Gaius has done for them, both in showing them hospitality and in making arrangements for their departure to other Churches.

The question arises as to the ground of the opposition of Diotrephes to the elder and his associates. Harnack (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. xv, 3, 1897) suggested that the reference is to a phase in the early history of the establishment of the local episcopate. The elder thus represents the older patriarchal supervision of an extended area by means of apostolic emissaries; Diotrephes stands for the independence of the local Church. Harnack holds that men like Diotrephes eventually won the freedom they desired and became themselves the local bishops. It would, of course, be attractive to some to imagine that the episcopate was the outcome of a movement for the self-determination of local Churches at the expense of what remained of an older and wider apostolic authority. But questions of administrative authority find no place elsewhere in the Johannine writings, nor is it at all clear that Gaius is not of equal, if not of greater, importance than Diotrephes. It is much easier to suppose Diotrephes to have been one of the 'deceivers and antichrists' referred to in the other epistles, and that he was opposed to the elder not in the interests of the independence of his Church, but in the interests of a 'progressive' Christology, which denied that the Lord could be associated with flesh. This gives a far more natural meaning to [11], in which Diotrephes

is described as an evildoer who has not 'seen God,' and whose actions must not be imitated because he is 'the evil.'

Commentary

(*References to the 4th Gospel are prefaced by G.*)

1. The elder. Cf. note on 2 Jn 1.

the wellbeloved Gaius: cf. Eph 6 [21]; 2 Tim 1 [2]; Phm [1]. Gaius was a very common name. There is no reason to identify him with one of the others of the same name to whom reference is made elsewhere in the New Testament (Rom 16 [23]; 1 Cor 1 [14]; Ac 19 [29], 20 [4]). Origen records a tradition that the Gaius of the Pauline Epistles was later the first Bishop of Thessalonica; according to the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii, 46) the Johannine Gaius was the first Bishop of Pergamos.

2. A prayer for physical health formed a more or less conventional epistolary introduction in the ancient as in the modern world. The hope that the health of Gaius's body may correspond with that of his soul is a natural expression of Christian piety.

3-8. The brethren who have been sent out by the elder to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles have, on their return, publicly borne witness to the kindness of Gaius and to his hospitality to them even when they were presumably unknown to him. Such hospitality was of the utmost importance, because the evangelists made a practice of not accepting hospitality from those who were not Christians (cf. Rom 12 [13]; Heb 13 [1, 2]; 1 P 4 [9]). The elder expresses his gratitude, and writes that nothing gives him such genuine joy as the news that his children walk in the truth, as Gaius obviously does.

6. before the church. The reference is to the report which the returning missionaries gave to the Church which had sent them forth on their journey (cf. Ac 14 [27], 15 [4]). **thou wilt do well.** The future suggests that the missionaries are starting on another journey, and that this letter is a letter of recommendation to Gaius on their behalf.

7. for the sake of the name, i.e. Christ: cf. Rom 1 [5]; Ac 5 [41]. **taking nothing of the Gentiles.** The missionaries refuse to be indebted to the Gentiles for hospitality (cf. 1 Cor 9 [18]; 2 Cor 12 [14]; 1 Th 2 [9]).

9. I wrote. If this be an epistolary aorist, equivalent to *I am writing*, the author intends his letter to be a communication to the Church as a whole, privately addressed to Gaius because of the enmity of Diotrephes. This interpretation underlies the variant reading *I would have written something to the church, but* . . . If, however, the aorist is a genuine aorist, the reference is to a previous letter, and the elder complains that Diotrephes has tampered with his correspondence and acted tyrannically and inhospitably towards his messengers (cf. 1 P 5 [2, 3]; Mk 10 [42-45]). Nothing is known of Diotrephes except what can be gathered from this passage.

10. If Diotrephes be one of the 'deceivers' referred to in 1 Jn 2 [18] ff., 4 [1] ff.; 2 Jn [7], who has established himself in the Church, he has adopted the same attitude towards the elder's itinerant missionaries as the elder had urged the elect Lady to adopt towards the itinerant 'antichrists' (2 Jn [10, 11]). And, moreover, in addition he claimed the right to excommunicate men from the Church (cf. G 9 [34, 35]).

11. The antithesis between the true and the false Christians is absolute (cf. 1 Jn 4 [6]). It is the antithesis between the evil and the good.

12. Demetrius is a common name. It is pure conjecture which identifies him with the Demas of the Pauline Epistles (Col 4 [14]; Phm [24]; 2 Tim 4 [10]), or with the Ephesian silversmith (Ac 19 [24] ff.). He is solemnly recommended to Gaius as approved by God (the Truth itself), by all Christians, and also by the elder. For the importance of the elder's witness cf. G 19 [35], 21 [24].

13, 14. Cf. 2 Jn [12, 13].

Bibliography

The following books have been consulted in the preparation of this commentary:

Patristic writers: St. Clement of Alexandria, *Adumbrationes in epistola Johannis prima et secunda*; St. Augustine, *Tractatus X in Epistolam Johannis ad Parthos.* **Modern Commentaries and Articles:** F. D. Maurice, *The Epistles of St. John*, 1857; Rothe, *Der Erste Johannis Brief praktisch erklärt*, 1878; Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, 1883; Plummer, in the *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges*, 1884; Lias, in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*, 1887; Holtzmann-Bauer in the *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, 1908; Baumgarten in the *Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 1908; Windisch in the *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by Lietzmann, 1911; Brooke, *The Johannine Epistles* (*International Critical Commentary*), 1912; Gore, *The Epistles of St. John*, 1920; Harnack, *Über den III Johannes Brief* (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xv, 3), 1897; *Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes* (*Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1915, xxxvii).

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JUDE

By T. W. Little

Introduction

(*a*) **The Author of this Epistle.**—There appear to have been three Judases of apostolic or sub-apostolic rank. These are (exclusive of 'Judas called Barsabbas' of Ac 15 [22]): (1) Judas (the son) of James, also called 'Thaddeus,' one of the Twelve. (This is the Jude who is presumably commemorated on St. Simon and St. Jude's Day.) (2) Judas Iscariot, the traitor. (3) Judas, one of the 'brethren of the Lord' (Mk 6 [3]). It is this third Judas who was in all probability the author of this epistle. He calls himself in the title 'the brother of James,' and there is little doubt that the James here referred to is the Lord's brother, who became 'bishop' of Jerusalem, and presided at the Jerusalem Council. No other James of whom we know was sufficiently prominent to identify a man who called himself the 'brother of James.'

(1) and (3) have often been confused, just as James the Less (the Apostle) and James 'the brother of the Lord' have been. In both cases the epistles for the festivals of St. Philip and St. James and St. Simon and St. Jude have encouraged the error. These passages were doubtless chosen in the belief that they were written in each case by the person commemorated. But we cannot set aside the testimony of the Gospels—'neither did his brethren believe on him' (Jn 7 [5]); and even if it were possible to discount this statement, as found only in the 4th Gospel, Ac 1 [13-14] is conclusive against any of the Lord's brethren ever having been among the Twelve.

Thus the identification of James the Less, one of the Twelve, with James the Lord's brother, and of Judas the Apostle (not Iscariot) with Jude the brother of James becomes practically impossible; and the only alternatives left to us, as regards the authorship of the writings, are either that the two epistles were written by the two Apostles James and Jude, concerning whom nothing else is known except the question asked by the latter at the Last Supper (Jn 14 [22]), or that they were written by James and Jude the 'brethren of the Lord.' Of these the former attained great eminence in the Church; and his recognized position was well calculated to earn a hearing for his less eminent, but zealous, brother. To the latter, the title 'brother of James,' by which he describes himself, would be both natural and serviceable. This is the opinion maintained in this commentary.

There is nothing in the description of the false teachers and their works which requires a late date for the epistle. The trouble is similar to that found in the Pastorals and in the Apocalypse (cf. especially 2 Tim 3 [1-9]; Rev 2 [2, 14]; and the implications of 3 [4]): the germ of it is found even as early as Phil 3 [18-19], if not earlier.

Neither the salutation nor the contents of the letter give any clue to its destination. 'We may place the community to which (St. Jude) writes very much where we please. Dr. Chase's conjecture that it was at or near the Syrian Antioch is as good as any' (M. R. James).

(*b*) **The Purpose and Character of the Epistle.**—The writer is full of one subject, viz. the need of a stern warning against men who have come in as underminers of the morality of the true Gospel. The epistle, short as it is, might from a literary or logical point of view have been arranged better. But practically it is more effective as it is; read as if it were spoken, not written, it becomes a righteous invective against these mischievous seducers of the faithful. St. Jude piles up the evil examples of the Old Testament which they resemble, and adds all the illustrations from nature which he can command. He returns again and again to 'these men,' as their doings strike him in a new way (see [8, 10, 12, 16, 19]). Almost every time he does this the argument is interrupted; but if we imagine him speaking, not writing, the warnings gain thereby a personal force. And this is not lost, even if—as Chase and M. R. James think—the repetition of 'these men' is an echo from apocalyptic visions; see note on Jude [12] in James (*C.G.T.*). The orator reduced to writing generally suffers. Jude is an orator bursting with conviction; as Elihu says in the Book of Job: 'I am full of matter; the spirit within me constraineth me.' Jude is like this; but he has almost spent himself before he comes to his one touch of mercy. Is it only an accident that there is such uncertainty about the reading in [23]? May it not reflect St. Jude's own difficulty in expressing himself on the extent and limits of merciful treatment?

We wish we might also have had the

epistle on 'our common salvation' which he had been anxious to write. Then we should be able to judge both sides of him, instead of one only. As far as we know, however, it was not his vocation, perhaps not within his powers, to give us the Gospel on its more gracious side. But, at least, he may be allowed to teach us that it is no part of Christianity to call by soft names either things or persons when they deserve hard ones; and that, where influences are perceived to be poisonous, the true charity is to expose them fearlessly and without delay.

(*c*) **Analysis.**—(1) **1-2.** Salutation.

(2) **3-4.** Purpose of the letter. The need, in view of immoral teaching, to contend earnestly for the faith.

(3) **5-7.** The warnings of the past.

(4) **8-13.** Immorality and presumption of the false teachers. Illustrations of their conduct and character in Bible history and nature.

(5) **14-16.** The prophecy of Enoch. Further characterization of the false teachers.

(6) **17-23.** The warnings of the Apostles. Final exhortations.

(7) **24-25.** Doxology.

---

3. to contend earnestly for. The Greek word here is *epagônizesthai*. A verb with the same prepositional prefix in [20] suggests that 'to contend *upon*' rather than 'to contend *for*' is the meaning here. If this meaning be adopted, the result will be that the faith is not something that needs our struggles for its support, but something that we need to support us in our struggles.

The word occurs here only in the New Testament; but a full investigation of its use elsewhere yields this result. The *metaphor* contained in it is derived from wrestling or boxing or other athletic contests. The chief *idea* expressed in it is that of those who return again and again to the fray, hammering away at their antagonist or at their task, never giving in, and regarding victory, when it comes, not as something to rest upon, but as the starting-point or foundation for further activities. It is used of generals in their campaigns, of philosophers in their arguments, of rulers persisting in well-tried policies. Based upon this investigation, the following paraphrase of Jude [3. 20] has been supplied to us: 'The faith, or faith, has come with Jesus Christ, and has once for all been delivered to the consecrated people. It is the victory that overcame the world. It has to be followed up, built upon. All its potentialities have to be developed, unfolded. It has to go forward to its glory. The consecrated people have to build themselves—i.e. the whole Church, the several communities, and their own characters—upon it. They have to regard it as the one foundation, the starting-point for all effort (*agôn*); to "hammer away" at self and Satan in the power of it; to treat it as a "policy" given them by God, a victory won by Christ, enabling them to win and challenging them to win further victories, which are but unfoldings of His.'

This enquiry into the use of the word goes to show that the common rendering of it in Jude [3] is at best a partial, and perhaps an incorrect, translation. Plutarch (*passim*) is the principal authority for it.

the faith. The word 'faith' in the New Testament almost always expresses an active faculty of the soul. Here, however, and in [20], 'the faith' stands objectively for the substance of the Christian creed, or the 'deposit' of Christian truth. For this deposit and its transmission, and the duty of rejecting irrelevant matter, cf. 1 Tim 6 [20. 21]; 2 Tim 2 [2. 14-18].

4-18. This section is duplicated, though with considerable variations, in 2 P 2 [1-3].

4. set forth unto this condemnation, i.e. predicted for it by Enoch ([14]) and others. **denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ** (RV text), or **denying the only Master, and our Lord Jesus Christ** (RVm). The word for 'master' is *despotês*. Does it refer to God? or to Christ? It may be doubted whether this antithesis was so clear to the New Testament writers as it is to us (see Ac 20 [28]; Eph 5 [5]; Tit 2 [13]); and, had the question been put to them directly, they might have hesitated about their answer; for, on the redemptive side of the Gospel, the dominant thought was that 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.' Apart, however, from this passage and the parallel in 2 Peter, the usage of the New Testament points to the word *despotês* referring to Almighty God, and therefore favours the marginal rendering here. Further, St. Clement of Rome, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, uses the word at least twelve times, and always of God the Creator. This is important evidence.

6. The warning of the angels who fell (cf. 2 P 2 [4]). Jude speaks of them as being confined with chains, 2 Peter as confined in pits. But the word in 2 Peter for 'pits' is very similar to another that means 'chains.' Both ideas are found

in the apocryphal literature, in which the fallen angels of Gen 6 [2] are a favourite topic.

7. gone after strange flesh—meaning unnatural vice. The similar expression, however, in 2 P 2 [10] omits the word 'strange.' In both epistles, impurity and contempt for authority or 'dignities' go together.

8. in their dreamings. Not, as in AV, 'filthy dreamers,' but dreamers of vain dreams and, so, full of foolish infatuations.

9. But Michael the archangel, etc. We have the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Didymus that the reference here is to a passage in the *Assumption of Moses*. But only about one-third of this book is now extant (in a Latin translation), and this fragment does not contain the passage in question, which came further on in the story. Dr. M. R. James, with the help of scattered references in Christian writers, has endeavoured to reconstruct the missing part. Slightly abbreviated, we reproduce his conjecture: The soul of Moses left the body when Moses died of the kiss of God. Immediately Michael and his angels came to receive the soul, and to bury the body. This was the moment for the contest between Michael and Samael (or Satan). Samael, as being the lord of matter, claimed the body as his; this claim being denied by the Archangel on the ground that all creation is God's, Samael brought up another charge against Moses, viz. that Moses being a murderer, having killed the Egyptian, was not worthy of burial at all. This blasphemy kindled the wrath of Michael, but he restrained himself, saying only: 'The Lord rebuke thee, O slanderer' (*diabole*). This is the extreme case where, if ever, contemptuous language might have been permitted. Some of the phrases in Jude [16] are also probably borrowed from this book.

12-13. hidden rocks in your love-feasts. The parallel passage in 2 P 2 [13] has 'spots' instead of 'hidden rocks,' and (according to the better-attested reading) 'deceivings' instead of 'love-feasts.' But in both instances the words substituted are very similar in sound to those in Jude. The RV text has retained 'love-feasts' in 2 Peter, rejecting the better-attested word; while Dr. James, following Bigg, shows there is reason for thinking the word *spilades* in Jude, though it more often means 'rocks,' should be understood here as the equivalent of *spiloi* (spots) in 2 Peter (*C.G.T.*, 40). The passages after all, therefore, may be real parallels. If they are not, a possible explanation of the differences is suggested in Appendix.

autumn trees without fruit. Mayor (55-59) has an elaborate note on *phthinoporina*, the Greek adjective here rendered 'autumn.' The gist of the note is that 'autumn' trees does not mean 'winter' trees, and that the comparison intended is that of trees at the proper time of fruit, yet fruitless. The rather picturesque word used here for 'autumn' may, according to its derivation, be reproduced by 'summer-on-the-wane.' Mayor does not himself suggest this translation, but his note helps us towards it.

wandering stars. The Greek word for 'wandering' is *planetai*. It does not, however, here mean the planets, but stars which have deserted their appointed orbits, and therefore would be treacherous guides. This refers to the same people who have already been described as 'feeding themselves' (instead of the flock) 'without fear.'

14, 15. to these also Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying, Behold, the Lord came, etc. The quotation made here is from Enoch 1 [9]. The description of Enoch himself as 'the seventh from Adam' is also a direct quotation from that book. In the Vision or Apocalypse of the Weeks Enoch describes his place in the world's history thus: 'I was born the seventh from Adam, in the first week, while judgement and righteousness still endured' (93 [3]). Dr. James shows that there are many more allusions to, and borrowings from, the Book of Enoch in Jude than the passage actually quoted here. The 'wandering stars' of [13] is an instance of them.

Dr. Charles goes so far as to say: 'The influence of Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books taken together'; and he claims (though other scholars consider this to be an exaggeration) that almost all the writers of the New Testament show signs of having been acquainted with, or reproduce something from, the book. According to him, its different portions date from Maccabæan times to 64 B.C.

16. The word rendered 'complainers' here is a composite one. It means literally those who are dissatisfied with and find fault with their lot. This verse contains a very searching description of character with a subtle combination of qualities, which is evidently taken from life. 'They are murmurers and men discontented with life, following where their passions lead them, talking big the

while, flatterers of persons for what they can get.'

19. who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit. The Greek word *psychikos* here and in Jas 3 [15] is translated 'sensual,' with the marginal note 'or, *natural* or, *animal*.' In 1 Cor 2 [14] and 15 [44] it is translated 'natural,' without any alternative rendering. Where *psychikos* and *pneumatikos* are contrasted in the New Testament, as they are in 1 Cor 2 [14], 15 [44], the *psyche* must be regarded as the seat of the natural, and the *pneuma* of the supernatural, life. This is a more subtle distinction than that between 'carnal' and 'spiritual,' though the actual contrast may sometimes be the same. Hence the varying translations of *psychikos*. 'Sensual,' however, suggests a grossness which *psychikos* never does. In the New Testament language, a man may be proficient in the world's wisdom and learning, and still be *psychikos*, i.e. on the lower, the 'natural plane' of life. The present context (Jude [19]) implies that the Spirit of God brings men together and harmonizes, where the 'natural' man, left to himself and his own pride, is all for distinguishing and dividing. For the word translated 'who make separations' see James (*C.G.T.*) *in loc.*, and Introduction.

22-23. The text here is very corrupt. It is questionable whether there are three clauses in the exhortation, or only two. Following Chase (*H.D.B.*) and Mayor, we have preferred three. For the verb in the first clause, we adopt the reading which gives 'convince' or 'reprove.' 'The conviction wrought by the Spirit is a conviction unto salvation, rather than unto condemnation' (Mayor, reproducing Julius Hare). The RVm *while they dispute with you* is more likely to be correct than the RV text 'who are in doubt.' Those in view in this passage are not the false teachers, but their unhappy victims, who have been taught much more how to argue and dispute than to have doubts. This is also the meaning of the same word in [9]. A further suggestion to account for the corruption in the text is made in the Introduction (*b*).

hating even the garment spotted by the flesh. The expression is doubtless derived from the pollution caused by bodily issue; but, as applied further, the exhortation is to loathe, and give a wide berth to, even the outside border of moral filth.

24. *free from stumbling*: the adjective here used occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. But in other literature it is used (*a*) literally, of a horse that is sure-footed; (*b*) metaphorically, of a man who is morally straight.

24-25. This is a noble doxology, expressive of a faith which is undaunted by all that is opposing it. The last few words are probably a form already familiar in the worship of the Church. Cf. Rom 16 [27]; 1 Tim 1 [17].

APPENDIX

The Relation between Jude and 2 Peter

That there is a close relation between Jude and 2 Peter is obvious even to a casual reader. Jude [4-18] and 2 P 2 [1-3] [3] practically cover the same ground. The parallel passages are as follows:

Jude.	*2 Peter.*
4	II. 1
6	4
7	6, 10
8, 9	11 (generalized and shortened)
10	12
12, 13	13, 17-19
11	15, 16 (lengthened)
16	18
17	III. 2
18	3

From Jude [6-18] there is hardly anything which has not a parallel in 2 Peter except the reference by name to the Book of Enoch.

The only questions are which borrowed from the other, or whether both borrowed from a common source. For the latter explanation there is no external evidence at all, and it now finds little support. A comparison of the two epistles and other considerations make it highly probable that Jude is the earlier, and that 2 Peter borrowed from it. Among the reasons for coming to this conclusion are the following:

(1) That the early testimonies to Jude are stronger than they are to 2 Peter.

(2) That in the parts in which they coincide it is much easier to imagine Jude softened or paraphrased into 2 Peter than to imagine 2 Peter hardened or altered into Jude.

(3) That, allowing 2 Peter to be the earlier, so little remains to Jude, when the part common to both has been eliminated, that it is difficult to account for so short (and, in that case, so unimportant) an epistle as Jude being preserved.

Granted this connexion, however, the

resemblances, great as they are, are not to be compared with the 'word for word' parallels to be found constantly in the Synoptic Gospels. The author of 2 Peter is saturated with Jude, but, even though he may have Jude before him as he writes, he is reproducing him from memory rather than from manuscript, repeating his words and his illustrations, but arranging the sentences in his own way. There are a few cases in which 2 Peter seems to have in his mind the sound of Jude's words rather than their meaning. This is, perhaps, the best way of accounting for *spiloi* and *apatais* in 2 P 2 [13] instead of *spilades* and *agapais* in Jude [12]. In the same way, 'Noah, an eighth person' (Noah with seven others) may be a reminiscence of 'Enoch, the seventh from Adam' in Jude [14], although the purport of the numerals in the two cases is quite different. But Mayor suggests a much more elaborate motive for the appearance of 'eighth' in 2 Peter (192).

There are two allusions in Jude, one of which is abbreviated and generalized and the other amplified in 2 Peter (see above 'parallel passages'), 2 Peter is certainly more guarded in his use of the apocryphal books than Jude is. The motive behind these changes may be: 'Balaam's ass is scriptural, and therefore welcome; Michael and the body of Moses is apocryphal, and therefore better omitted.'

Bibliography for Jude and 2 Peter

The most serviceable books on the subject in English are the following: Bigg, *St. Peter and St. Jude* (*I.C.C.*, 1901). Chase, Articles in *H.D.B.* on *Peter, First Epistle of*, and *Peter, Second Epistle of*. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (Macmillan and Co., 1907). M. R. James, *The Second Epistle of Peter* and the *Epistle of Jude* (*C.G.T.*) **For the Book of Enoch:** Charles, *The Book of Enoch*. Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 99-109 (Macmillan and Co.). **For the Assumption of Moses:** M. R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, 42-51 (S.P.C.K.). **For the Petrine Apocryphal Books:** M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, especially 505-521 (Oxford University Press).

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE

By T. W. CRAFER

General Introduction

THE last book of the New Testament forms a fitting conclusion of the whole. The facts of the Gospel give the historic side of our Redemption; the record of Acts shows how the Incarnation is continued in the life of the Church; and the epistles apply the Christian faith to the practical needs of the community and the individual. But the New Testament takes us a stage further. The final note is from the trumpets of heaven. The drama of Redemption does not end with the Church militant: there is an 'other-worldliness' which might be forgotten in the Church's daily round were it not for the 'Revelation,' the 'Apocalypse,' the unveiling of the mysteries of God and 'the things that must be hereafter,' closely linked indeed with the trials of the present, and yet full of assurance that the earth is the Lord's, and that He will vindicate His people. We still behold 'the Lamb of God'; but, though He is still 'the Lamb as it had been slain' in the Gospel story, He is set in the midst of the throne for all to adore. We still behold the Church at worship, but here its worship is not only in the breaking of bread and the prayers of an upper room, as in the Acts. The noble army of the redeemed, whom no man can number, are now seen perpetually in the Presence, in the joy of an ordered and unending worship. And the Holy Catholic Church herself, revealed in a 'mystery' by St. Paul as the bride of the heavenly Bridegroom, is now shown in a deeper mystery still as the wife of the Lamb. She joins with the Spirit who has inspired her in an invitation to her Lord to bring about the consummation of all, for 'the Spirit and the bride say, Come.' The Saviour's fulfilment of His long promise is the reply: 'Yea, I come quickly.' And the final utterance is our own response: 'Amen, come, Lord Jesus.'

There is a further reason why this mysterious book fitly finds a place in the New Testament. It represents at its best a type of literature characteristic of Judaism in the period after prophecy had ceased.* 'Apocalyptic' is indeed the

* Cf. *N.T. Prophecy and Apocalyptic*, pp. 709*b*, 710.

successor of prophecy, the main difference being that the prophets feel that God can fulfil Himself by means of men's co-operation in the world as it is, whereas the apocalyptists have now despaired of things as they are, and yet are so sure that God will vindicate Himself, that they look for salvation through the catastrophic intervention of His own right hand. Daniel is the only canonical book of this type, but in the two centuries before Christ came a series of writings (the most important being perhaps the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch) often prompted by the present trials and persecutions of the faithful, which claimed to reveal through the mouth of one of the ancient patriarchs the final working of God, bringing judgement on their enemies and salvation to themselves. These Jewish apocalypses were seized on by the early Christians and applied to themselves, and had for a while such a vogue among them that the Jews themselves ceased to hold them in repute. The world had never known such persecutions as befell the Christian Church, first from the Jews and then from the Roman Empire. It was therefore natural that these apocalypses should be used to inspire with comfort and hope while persecutions lasted, but that afterwards the Christian Church should follow the Jewish in laying them on the shelf. And there they have remained until recent years, when the critical study of them has revealed that they form one clue to the understanding of our own Apocalypse.

It would have been a misfortune if the Christian Church had merely used such Jewish books, without claiming apocalyptic as a vehicle for distinctively Christian teaching. From such a misfortune she has been saved by the author of Revelation. If indeed we go to this book expecting much positive light on its mysterious figures from existing apocalypses (other than Daniel), we shall be disappointed: but the spirit and method of our book is that of the apocalypses, and it is no longer possible to study it without taking them into account. A word of caution, however, is necessary, which has not always been heeded. The dissection of our Apocalypse can be made to lead to the conclusion that very little of it is original. In its 404 verses we are told that there are 518 quotations from the Old Testament, most of them from the prophets, and 88 of these from Daniel. Its language often consists of a catena of earlier phrases. Other figures—such as the 'seven stars' and the 'hidden manna'—are to be traced to apocryphal sources, and it has been suggested that heathen mythology and even astrology are responsible for some of its imagery. But the author did not merely take over his material from others. We may look in his work for the same power of appropriation as we find in Genesis in the utilizing of Babylonian myths for the expression of the deep truths of Creation. The language and figures which he adopts he interprets by the faith of the Church, whose faithful member he claims to be (cf. 1^{9}). Now this we must continually remember. Three questions must be distinguished: (*a*) What is the source of the language and imagery which the author employs? (*b*) What is its history and original meaning, as far as they can be traced? (*c*) In what sense does the author adopt them? Modern critical Commentaries—above all the great Commentary of Dr. Charles—rightly deal with all three questions, while the necessary limitations of this book will lead us to give our chief attention to the third. Our Lord Himself uses the language of apocalypse, but He puts His own meaning upon it (cf. e.g. Mt 16^{14}; Lk 10^{18}; Jn 12^{31}); and the author, we shall hope to show, does the same. But now a further point. The author was a 'seer,' belonging to that order of Christian prophets of which we are given so brief a glimpse because its usefulness in the Church so soon came to an end (see E. C. Selwyn, *The Christian Prophets and the Prophetic Apocalypse*). His book is a prophecy, a series of visions seen 'in the spirit.' His mind was steeped in the apocalyptic imagery of the past; and if much of it is subconsciously reproduced in his visions, that is exactly what psychology would suggest. Once St. Peter fell asleep in view of the quay of a Mediterranean seaport, whence ships were sailing to Gentile lands with live-stock for food, which perhaps he may have seen hoisted on board in a sail. It was perfectly natural that the subsequent vision, which led to a mission to Gentiles, should reproduce the mental images which had come thus to the hungry Apostle. And similarly the seer, hungering after the things of heaven to explain the things of earth, instinctively receives his vision in accordance with his previous mental imagery. But the result is something on a high plane of originality, forming a book which rightly claims to be inspired.

The scholarship of to-day has thus shown us that the book is not so *unique* as the Church had imagined, for it is only one of a series of apocalypses, Christian as well as Jewish, the former class being further represented by the so-called

Apocalypse of Peter. But ours remains *the* Apocalypse still, because no other existing specimen, Jewish or Christian, is worthy to be compared to it. Again, even in the New Testament it is not wholly unique, and the study of it may well begin with the reading of the apocalyptic discourse of our Lord Himself in Mk 13 and Mt 24 and 25. To this may be added the disclosures about the 'man of sin' in 2 Th 2, compared or contrasted with the warnings in 1 Jn 2 and 4, and the anticipations of 2 P 3. The first impression given by our book is a very mixed one—of glory and beauty and the inspiration of hope on the one hand, and of horror on the other: and when we come to the study of its details there are many which are perplexing and some which seem unprofitable and repulsive. We are moreover beset by complicated problems of authorship and of its relation to other literature. But when we gain a right perspective we come back to a sense of its value.

Now if this is true of its reception by the individual, it is true also of its reception by the Church. In the first age, amid the persecutions which it encouraged men to face with joy, it was probably warmly received by all. A little later hesitation about it was caused by the exaggerated and often quasi-heretical teaching concerning the Millennium which claimed support from its language. Also a more critical study of it caused many to become doubtful of its value. The problem of its authorship, and its unlikeness to the other writings bearing the name of St. John, added to the difficult sayings of the book, made the Eastern part of the Church for some time hesitate to admit it into the Canon of Scripture, and it is significant that the number of early MSS. which contain it is small. But the West remained true to it; and finally the East also, under the guidance of Athanasius, accepted it again in spite of its difficulties. At the Reformation there was a somewhat similar process; for it became a matter of dispute and doubt, though it was nowhere excluded from the Canon of the New Testament.

When we turn to its interpreters we find them divided into three main schools. The first, which has been named the *Futurist*, would regard the book as describing only the events, still in the future, connected with the Second Advent. The second is the *Historical*, which would see in the book the history of the Church and of the world's opposition to it, from the 1st century to the end of time. Thus the Reformers were able to see the Papacy prefigured in the scarlet-clad harlot seated upon the Beast, and their opponents discovered that 'Luther' was the word underlying the mystic number of the Beast. Again, in the career of Napoleon, there seemed a counterpart to the return of the Beast 'that was, and is not, and yet is.' This is the form of interpretation which may be described as popular, particularly when predictions of the immediate future are found, and indications that the end of the world is about to come. There are still some who approach the Apocalypse in the hope of finding references to events of their own day. But there are fatal objections to this method, even apart from the arbitrary and often trifling selection of events found among its advocates. It would contradict all that we are led to infer as to the occasion and purpose of the book, and would make it quite useless to those to whom it was first addressed (see W. Milligan, *Lectures on the Apocalypse*, 127 ff.). The third line of interpretation, which may be said to have ousted the other two, is the *Preterist*, which would look for clues primarily in the circumstances of the period when the seer saw his visions, and in the apocalyptic anticipations and imagery of earlier prophets and of our Lord Himself.

There is one other method of interpretation worthy of mention; it is that especially associated with Milligan himself. He divorces the book almost completely from history, and finds in it little more than a noble expression of those great principles of the divine government whose operation we can trace in every age of the world. It is no doubt those principles which it is the great purpose of the book to make clear to us, but it is quite evident that the author is mainly concerned with his own day.

We shall now consider the following questions: (*a*) the authorship of the book, and its relation to the Johannine writings; (*b*) its occasion, purpose, and date; (*c*) its symbolism; (*d*) its significance; (*e*) its theology and leading ideas; (*f*) its plan.

(*a*) **Authorship and Relation to the Johannine Writings**—(i) *External Evidence*.—The 2nd century is unanimous in ascribing it to the son of Zebedee. So Justin Martyr (*Dial.*, lxxxi, 15), Irenæus (*Hær.*, LV, xx, 11, etc.), Tertullian (*c. Marcion.*, III, xiv, 25): while at Rome Hermas and Papias both seem to depend upon its imagery, and it stands in the Muratorian Canon. But the Montanistic movement, which appreciated it as a Christian prophecy, roused a distaste for it in the

East. The Alogi, an anti-Montanist and anti-Gnostic sect, rejected it, and actually ascribed it to the heretic Cerinthus (Epiphanius, *Hær.*, ii, 33). The first reasoned criticism, however, was by Dionysius of Alexandria (*c.* A.D. 250), a pupil of Origen, who himself had ascribed it to the Apostle 'who lay on Jesus' breast.' Dionysius rejects earlier views, and proves that, though it may be by a John, it is not by the author of the Gospel and First Epistle. He seems to have been influenced not only by its unlikeness to these writings, but by the encouragement it had given to extravagant ideas about the Millennium (Euseb., *H.E.*, vii, 25). Eusebius is doubtful about its canonicity, but inclines to ascribe it to the Presbyter John of whom Papias wrote (*H.E.*, iii, 39). In the 4th century it is largely rejected or ignored in the East, and does not seem to have been read by the Syrian Church, being wanting in the Peshitto. But Athanasius recognized it, and in the West only Jerome sympathized with Eastern doubts. It was the instinct of the Church (which we may identify with something higher) which kept it in the Canon in spite of doubts, and failures to understand its mysterious form and language. Luther's objection to it as neither apostolic nor prophetic began a new era of criticism, which has continued ever since. Modern criticism has set aside altogether the authorship of the son of Zebedee, and has largely inclined to the view (e.g. Bousset), suggested by Eusebius, that there was a second John who may have been the author. At one time the fact that Jewish apocalypses are pseudonymous suggested the conclusion that its author lived at a later date, and simply put a great name to his book as a literary device. But the work is so different from other apocalypses that the force of this argument is no longer felt.

(ii) *Internal Evidence.*—A comparison with the other Johannine writings reveals many affinities. We find in the Apocalypse the titles of 'the Word' (19 [13]: cf. Jn 1 [1]), a fact which Zahn considers to outweigh all the divergences. We find there also 'the Lamb of God,' though a different Greek word is employed. Moreover, the seer and the evangelist write in the same spirit. There are the same violent contrasts between absolute good and absolute evil, the same combination of tenderness and severity, the same emphasis upon witness-bearing and the keeping of the commandments of God. The seer has far more in common with the Fourth Evangelist than with any other New Testament writer. If we cannot identify them, it is the style rather than the teaching which forbids it. Of course, a writer who knows little of Greek may in time learn to write it correctly. But Charles's invaluable study of the style and grammar of the Apocalypse shows its language to be not so much full of crudities and solecisms as of Hebraic idioms unknown in the other Johannine writings. The whole style is strongly individual; and it is almost inconceivable that one who writes in it could also have written in the style found in the Gospels and Epistles. That the books are not by the same author may now be taken for granted (see Charles, *I.C.C.*, i, 29 ff.). The views of Dionysius are further supported by the simple fashion in which the author of the Apocalypse inserts his own name (1 [9], 22 [8]) and by his writing merely as a prophet (1 [3], 6 [1], 22 [18]). The less known he was, the more likely was the next age to ascribe his book (with its claim to inspiration and a place in Scripture, 1 [10], 22 [18]) to the greatest John they knew.

But the question of authorship has been greatly complicated by the various theories of the 19th century as to the composite character of the book: e.g. Vischer's theory (first put forward in 1886 and approved by Harnack), that 4 [1]-22 [5] is a Jewish apocalypse set in a Christian framework; Weizsäcker's, that the author inserts many older materials, so that it is a compilation which in its origin is already a compilation (*Theol. Lit. Zeit.*, 1882); and Spitta's, which divides it into two Jewish and one Christian source, put together by a reviser. But a return has now been made to the recognition that the book is a unity. However much of earlier material has been woven into the texture of his thought and language (and our knowledge of such material has grown greatly of late), the author works on a plan which is to be recognized throughout. We need not look for a perfect plan, nor ought we to expect it in such a book. But the whole is worthy of the grand subject with which it deals, and the mighty drama of here and hereafter is unfolded by one who cannot possibly have been a mere 'paste-and-scissors' editor. The minutiæ of criticism have often made scholars blind to that form of internal evidence which appeals to the devout as well as to the learned, and reveals an inspired message such as no 'editor' could have given. There is no doubt that the use of sources by John the unknown seer helps to explain the problems of the book; and if we could postulate a disciple who afterwards acted

as his editor, it would enable us to explain difficulties by finding insertions and dislocations which are due to him. This is the view of Charles, who faces in this way the difficulties of the last two chapters. Some of his points will be noticed in the commentary which follows, though it may be too large an assumption to say that the seer 'died after writing 20^3' (see Charles, *Lectures on the Apocalypse*).

(*b*) **Occasion, Purpose, and Date.**—The book reveals that (like Hebrews and 1 Peter) it was written for the strengthening and assurance of the faithful in time of crisis and trial. In St. Paul's time the infant Church had nearly been 'strangled in its cradle by the iron hand of the older Jewish law.' In the years that followed, its growing life seemed doomed at the heathen hand of the irresistible empire of Rome. It was soon obvious that a religion which could tolerate no other would itself cease to be tolerated, and the act of Nero in A.D. 64, which meant the outbreak of persecution, seemed the beginning of the end. Most deadly of all forms of antagonism was the deification of the living emperor, and the growth of the worship of his image as a regular imperial cult in the provinces. The Christians of the province of Asia (whose commercial cities were so important to the empire) were in the forefront of the danger. The first step was for those who were faithful to Christ to refuse to join in such a worship, and then (with the charge of treason as the excuse for persecution) nothing seemed in store but the stamping out of the Church by a universal martyrdom. The death of Nero brought little relief. Not only was it followed by civil war, with three claimants to the purple in the year A.D. 69, but men's minds were not at rest even about the monster from whom they had been delivered. The rumour spread that Nero was not dead, but in hiding among the Parthians, the deadly foes whose invasion from the East was like a 'yellow peril' to the Roman world. Some day Nero *redivivus* would return at their head and break the power of Rome. The fear passed away from the world, but not from the Church, for it took a new shape when the Emperor Domitian, a new monster who seemed to be the reincarnation of Nero himself, began in A.D. 95 another persecution.

The external evidence for the date is in favour of that year 95, though parts may have been written earlier.* Irenæus, himself from Asia Minor, says that it was 'almost in our own generation, at the end of the reign of Domitian' (V, xxx), and Victorinus (*c.* 300), that John was condemned by Domitian to the mines in Patmos. It was only later that a Neronian date was suggested. Modern criticism inclined at one time to this latter view, but it is now considered that the time of Domitian is far the more likely. The internal evidence accords with this. It is true that some of the passages of the book (as in 17, *q.v.*) suggest the reign of Vespasian or Titus, and in $11^{1,2}$ the Temple seems still standing. Of this, two explanations have been suggested: (1) That these passages come from earlier sources which the seer has not always brought up to date. (2) That he himself records in them his own earlier prophecies. The seer, whose activities have already caused his exile to Patmos, looks out from his rocky isle across the stormy sea, and passes a lonely 'Lord's day' in dreaming of the churches on the mainland which he has known, recalling their weaknesses, and trembling for the new onslaught which is in store for them. As he dreams, and lifts them up to God and to the Lamb, who has been the Victim sacrificed for them, his dreams pass into visions. He is of the order of 'prophets,' and has already known the ecstasy and the trance. But the Holy Spirit so guides, as St. Paul has declared, that 'the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets' ($1\ Cor\ 14^{32}$). The seer is able to set down afterwards the messages that sounded in his ears and the visions that rose before his eyes. After that first Lord's day he is able to recall an orderly series of visions which have reference to his own day, and yet are unfolded in a sequence which leads at length to the last judgement and the final joys of heaven. The visions all point on to God's answer to the pangs of the world and the throes of the Church, and show an assurance that the Lord will vindicate Himself and those who are His. The visions begin with messages to the seven churches which specially need present succour. The words are a revelation from God Himself, but they are revealed by the Son, who is manifested in the glory of the Father and yet under His human name of Jesus. Nor is it only through the medium of the seer that the revelation comes. The Lord 'signified it by his angel unto his servant John' (1^1). From first to last he sees in the opened heaven angels ascending and descending, as the instruments of God's purpose in the judgement of the world and in the salvation of the Church. As a pious Jew, his mind is already open

* Cf. the Additional Note at the end of the commentary.

to receive visions of angels and archangels. And indeed all the visions find their material in what is already in his Hebrew mind. His very diction takes Hebraic forms. From the storehouse of his mind comes forth the imagery which this Christian prophet has learned from the prophets of the old dispensation, from Jewish apocalypses, and from fragments of mysterious writings expressing strange hopes and forecasts. If afterwards he sets them down in orderly fashion at his leisure, he would think it no harm to elaborate them and make them perhaps more like the earthly sources from which they came. Nor was it only in language and imagery that his work would follow older examples. The prophets had spoken of judgement, and the apocalyptists, in days of bitter trial, had added that it must come by God's miraculous intervention. The seer could only see one solution for the Church. The deliverance could not come *from* death, for there seemed nothing before the faithful but martyrdom. It must be deliverance *through* death; and the reign of Christ, whether in earth or heaven, must find its full embodiment among those whose witness has brought them through 'the great tribulation,' and presented them before the throne as the firstfruits of the redeemed. For the Second Coming, which the first age had expected at once, had been mysteriously delayed. No wonder that the souls of the redeemed (the men of that generation who had passed on) could be heard from heaven's altar crying 'How long?' And it is in answer to their perplexity that the later visions follow concerning the judgement of the world. For the struggle between good and evil was before men's eyes, and evil seemed to be prevailing. The visions anticipate throughout the triumph of good; but the forces of evil only fall one by one, and the final victory is only realized when the great assize is over, and the former things are passed away. Thus the last scene of the drama of redemption leads at length to a new heaven and a new earth, the city of God, in which there is no temple because the Lord God, the Almighty, and the Lamb are the temple thereof.

(*c*) **Its Symbolism.**—The seer's visions will be but half understood if they are thought of only as appealing to the eye. What he sees, and still more what he hears and describes, is *symbolical*, and on this mental side the symbolism of numbers plays a large part. The sacred number '3' represents heaven, and '4' suggests the earth. The mysterious blending of heaven and earth throughout produces one series of 'sevens' after another, from the seven churches of Asia to the seven eyes of God. The *seven Beatitudes* of the book (1^{3}, 14^{13}, 16^{15}, 19^{9}, 20^{6}, 22^{7}, 22^{14}) should especially be noticed; they constitute a sort of summary of its spiritual teaching. Half of the '7' of perfection naturally reveals the short but evil days of earthly trial; and the number '666,' whose digits each fall short of it by one, represents the power of antichrist. The number '12,' whether of the tribes or of the Apostles of the Lamb, lends itself to multiples large and small, whether it be of the number of the redeemed or of the measurements of the city of God.

(*d*) **Its Significance.**—There arises a further question. The main thought in the seer's mind with regard to the prospects of the Church on earth seems to have been that of martyrdom. But his worst anticipations were not realized. Domitian's reign of terror ended with his death in A.D. 96. Through the providence of God and the faithful witness of Christians the Church held its own, and in time gave its religion to the empire. But the struggle between good and evil, between the Church and the world, between Christ and antichrist, is an agelong struggle. Has the Apocalypse still any force, or did its message die out with the 1st century, when its prophecies had failed of literal fulfilment? The earlier prophets may supply an answer. Their words had often lacked literal fulfilment; but their message dealt with eternal principles which cannot be falsified, and therefore has its force for our own age and every other. It did not literally come true that the Christians, marked with the name of the Saviour, would all pass forthwith through death for Him to share His reign in glory; but the words of the seer contain a wider message. For the baptized have all received His mark on their foreheads; and the Christian era, in spite of the survival of evil, has meant a binding of Satan and a growing power of the Kingdom of God among men. In later days men have generally recognized that the Church is an institution which nothing on earth can destroy, and yet they have sometimes, in a spirit of despondency or of hostility, used language implying its approaching extinction. But the amazing thing is that, though the seer seems to despair of its survival in its earthly form, yet, above the voices of judgement upon the wicked world, we hear in his book the perpetual refrain which welcomes the final suprem-

acy of the city of God and joins heaven to earth in the triumphant Hallelujah.

(*e*) **Its Theology and Leading Ideas**—(i) *God.*—The scene of the book is laid in heaven, and the kingly throne of God is its centre. There is no doubt about the Jewish monotheism of the whole. Jehovah cannot be seen or described, except under such symbols as precious stones which flash with dazzling glory, surrounded by gems of softer hue which temper majesty with mercy (4 [2, 3]). The first function and purpose of created being is to join in worshipping Him as the omnipotent Creator. The record is of an agelong struggle between good and evil; and the latter is personified in a Satan who wars against God and man, and inspires the wicked to act as his agents in overthrowing the Church on earth. But there is no dualism of thought. It is God who lets him loose upon the earth; the evil power marks a phase in the working out of God's purpose. Satan's instrument can be described as one who 'was and is not; and is about to come up out of the abyss, and to go into perdition' (17 [8]). But the Creator is one 'who was, and is, and is to come' (1 [4, 8], 4 [8]). *Majesty* is His first attribute, and entails universal worship; but it is the absolute *justice* of God which enables men to put their sure trust in the future. He will punish the wicked and vindicate the righteous. The 'great divide' will be before His throne (6 [10, 16, 17], 19 [1-5], etc.). But the note of *tenderness* is not absent, and the book borrows from prophecy the picture of the most personal care a human father could show for his little child in 'God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes' (7 [17], 21 [4]).

(ii) *Christ.*—Interwoven with his monotheism the seer gives us 'the Son,' who is described in the language which the Old Testament uses of Jehovah (e.g. 1 [14], 2 [18]). He is the 'Word of God' (19 [13]), 'the first and the last' (22 [13]), and is in the midst of the throne. He receives a universal worship with the Almighty, and the new song which He has inspired heaven and earth to sing is 'Salvation unto our God and unto the Lamb' (5 [13], 7 [10]). It is indeed in His glory that He is seen, but He reveals Himself still by His human name of Jesus (22 [16]). And more than that. He is the 'living one' indeed, even as God is (1 [18], 4 [9]), and as such He stands on heaven's altar. But it is as the Lamb 'as though slain' (5 [6]). It is as the Victim offered in sacrifice that He inspires the worship of countless hosts. His atoning death on Calvary has won a redemption for men which even the hosts of heaven acclaim (5 [9, 12]). Yet Christ's is no merely vicarious sacrifice. His followers must follow Him therein; it is through death that they too attain to glory. But it is not in the guise of the meek sufferer that we see Him; He rides victorious in front of His hosts to conquer the powers of evil; a two-edged sword proceeds from His mouth (1 [16]), and He comes for judgement. He opens the seals of the book of destiny, and things terrible come forth upon the earth. Yet in all this, alike in mercy and judgement, He works through angels. He Himself is classed with God, and they are classed with men. The book is full of angels' ministry, and yet, while they command men's trust and obedience, they themselves forbid men's worship. 'See thou do it not; worship God' (22 [8, 9]). But in spite of the use of angelic mediators, the Lord's own personal care for His bride the Church never ceases. He knows the needs of each part of it (as the letters to the churches reveal), and at the door of each man's heart He stands and knocks, and promises him a share of His throne (3 [20, 21]). He supplies the need of each one. 'He that is athirst, let him come' (22 [17]).

(iii) *The Holy Spirit.*—The Spirit represents the divine activity, and therefore is symbolized by the number of perfection. There are seven lamps before the throne 'which are the seven spirits of God' (4 [5]). The 'seven eyes' of the Lamb are also to be thus interpreted, as is suggested in Zech 4 [10]. The manifold activities of the Spirit thus proceed from both the Father and the Son (cf. 22 [1]). But He appears also as the one personal Spirit. It is '*the* Spirit' who speaks Christ's message to each of the churches. He sets His seal upon the beatitude of those who die in the Lord (14 [13]). He is associated with the Church in the last invitation to her Lord, 'the Spirit and the bride say, Come' (22 [17]). He is the means whereby the visions are seen, for they come to the seer when 'in the Spirit.' We hear of the manifold 'spirits of the prophets' (22 [6]), but also of the one 'spirit of prophecy' (19 [10]).

(iv) *The Church.*—The Holy Catholic Church has a worthy place in the Apocalypse. She is made up of men; but she is mentioned in the same breath with the divine Spirit ('the Spirit and the bride') and as having 'the glory of God' (21 [11], 22 [5, 17]); and as such she will reign for ever and ever. The book is written in her hour of trial, to show that neither the forces of the world nor the gates of Hades can prevail against her. Her voice is heard again and again in the worship of

heaven, and heaven itself sets its seal of 'Amen' upon her praises (5 14). She is gathered in from every race; and, because she is purchased unto God with the blood of the Lamb, she is a 'kingdom,' and her members are priests, who reign upon the earth (5 9, 10). The defeat of the powers of evil means for her a Millennium shared with her Lord (20 6). From her is purged all that is evil (21 27), and in her is seen the new Jerusalem, the city of God, lying foursquare, and lighted by the abiding presence of God and of the Lamb. But she is seen on earth in the communities of Christians in the various cities. Some of them need to repent, and one of them is well-nigh dead; but they are still within the Saviour's love (3 19).

(v) *The Christian Life.*—With all the grandeur of the visions, they reveal also God's care for each individual in the Church's fold. Those baptized into Christ are marked with His sign upon their foreheads. To the sharer in His life is promised, with a probable reference to the Eucharist, 'I will sup with him, and he with me' (3 20). Each contributes to the life of the whole, and the spirit of each church depends upon the faithfulness of its members. The white robes of Christ's bride are made of 'the righteous acts of the saints' (19 8). It is 'according to their works' that men are judged (20 12). There is no substitute for personal purification. It is only the blood of the Lamb that can purify, but the saints themselves must do their part and wash their robes therein (7 14). In each of the letters to the churches, the promise attached is addressed to individuals. It is '*he* that overcometh' who will know the gift of the hidden manna (2 17), share in his Lord's conquering activity (2 27), and become 'a pillar in the temple of God' (3 12). But it is only through sharing the spirit of sacrifice and claiming the divine grace, and not through any sufficiency in himself, that he who will may 'take the water of life freely' (21 6, 22 17). And if the work of winning the world for Christ figures but little in a book which was to help Christians to face the world as a deadly and implacable foe, yet it has been found possible to frame its lessons into missionary instructions (B. K. Cunningham, *Bible Studies in the Book of Revelation*).

(*f*) **Its Plan.**—An analysis will be found in the course of the notes on the text. The following is the summary given by Zahn (*Intr. to N.T.*, ii, 392 ff.).

Introd., 1 1-9; *1st vision*, 1 10-3 22 (seven letters); *2nd vision*, 4 1-8 1 (seven seals, with two episodes before the seventh: [*a*] 7 1-8, [*b*] 7 9-17); *3rd vision*, 8 2-11 18 (seven trumpets, with two episodes before the seventh: [*a*] 10 1-11, [*b*] 11 1-14); *4th vision*, 11 19-14 20; *5th vision*, 15 1-16 17 (seven bowls); *6th vision*, 17 1-18 29 (judgement on Babylon): 16 18-21 introduces it, and 19 1-8, 9-10 concludes it and introduces *7th vision*, 19 11-21 8 (judgements and awards); *8th vision*, 21 9-22 5; conclusion, 22 6-21.

The Title.—This comes from the first verse, which is the only place in which the word *Apocalypsis* appears. It is 'a revelation given by Jesus Christ'; but as it came through a human medium, it bears a man's name. St. John is here called 'the divine' in the sense of being the theologian among the Apostles.

I. 1-3. The Superscription.

1. The supreme position of the Lord is shown from first to last. In the first sentence (as in the 4th Gospel) He is brought into relation with the Father. **shortly come to pass**: the expectation of the early Church was that the beginning of the end was to come *shortly*. But the book makes no attempt to fix the hour that no man knoweth; our Lord's own words are echoed in the message to the Church in Sardis: 'Thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee' (3 3).

2. **the testimony of Jesus**, i.e. the revelation which He attests.

3. **Blessed**: the first of the book's seven beatitudes (see note on 16 15). **he that readeth**: the authorized reader in the congregation. There soon came to be an order of readers. The author expects that his book will be used for Church reading. **the prophecy** shows at once that he is a Christian prophet, claiming for his work a place with the prophetic books of the Old Testament.

4-8. **Salutation of the Churches Addressed.**—They are called '*the* seven,' although there were many others in the Roman province. They were linked by being on the circular route which ran north from Ephesus to Pergamum, and then south-east to Laodicea, joining there a return route west to Ephesus. Possibly they were the churches to which Tychicus took the Ephesian Epistle. In any case they give for the first time the number *seven*, which abounds in the book as denoting completeness.

4. **which is to come.** God is revealed by His activity for His people. His name is 'I will be that I will be' (Ex 3 14). **the seven Spirits**: earlier apocalyptic recognized seven 'angels of the presence' (Tob 12 15; En 20 7), but here the 'seven

Spirits' represent the activities of God in the world. The seer's thought goes back to Zech 4 [10], as is plain in 5 [6], where the seven Spirits are the seven eyes of the Lamb (cf. also 3 [1], 4 [5]).

5. the firstborn of the dead: see Col 1 [18-20] and note, for similar language and Christology.

6. Cf. note on 5 [10].

7. Dan 7 [13] and Zech 12 [10] are here combined. A version other than the LXX was used both here and in Jn 19 [37] ('they shall look on him whom they pierced').

8. The first and last letters of the Greek alphabet express 'the boundless life which embraces all while it transcends all' (Swete *ad loc.*). Here the Father is meant, but in 21 [6] and 22 [13] the Son.

9-20. Vision of the Risen and Glorified Christ.—Though the writer comes back to earth, it is in order to describe the Divine Source of his seven messages.

9. Though his imprisonment is not stated directly, it has been the constant view of the Church that it is implied, and the expression **for the word** has this sense in 6 [9] and 20 [4]. Patmos (Patino) is a small island about forty miles out from Miletus. It is mountainous and volcanic, with a rocky shore, and the fact may affect the imagery of the book.

10. in the Spirit, i.e. during a prophetic ecstasy. **the Lord's day** occurs here for the first time, but is frequent from the *Didache* onwards. In Ac 20 [7] the Church had already made the first day of the week a day of worship.

11. The writing of the book has always been associated with Ephesus. The churches are given in the order in which a traveller from Ephesus would reach them.

12. The seven-branched lampstand of Ex 25 [31] had already figured in Zechariah's vision (4 [2]). Here the 'lampstands' are separate, as in Solomon's Temple (1 K 7 [49]). There are seven churches, but they form but one Church (cf. Mt 5 [14-16]). The Church should witness by what it is and does even more than by what it says.

13. a son of man, i.e. a human being (cf. Dan 7 [13]). He is vested in a royal robe.

14. It is most significant that the description of our Lord is in terms of the traditional Jewish picture of the Almighty (cf. 2 [8], 22). Here it comes from the vision of the 'ancient of days' in Dan 7 [9].

16. seven stars suggest the jewels with which the heavens are adorned. They are placed in the hand of God like 'the waters' in Is 40 [12]. **from his mouth:** for the word of God is sharper than any two-edged sword (Heb 4 [12]: cf. Is 11 [4]). In the *Psalms of Solomon* (17) is a prayer that Messiah may 'destroy the heathen with the word of his mouth.'

18. the Living one is reminiscent of 'the living God' for whose presence the Psalmist longed (Ps 42 [2]). The Son lives 'by the Father' (Jn 5 [26]). In Mt 16 [18] 'the gates of Hades' are closely connected with 'the son of the living God.' (For the close connexion of the whole book with Matthew see Milligan, *Lectures on the Apocalypse*, 42 ff.).

19. resumes the charge of [11]; it is grounded now on His authority manifested by His Resurrection and present glory. Added to the present revelation to the churches (**the things that are**) are those crises of judgement which the rest of the book reveals as **hereafter.**

20. the mystery: in the sense of 'the inner meaning of a symbolical vision' (Swete *ad loc.*), as in Dan 2 [47] (cf. 17 [7]). **the angels** have been variously interpreted. (1) The 'messengers' or delegates of the churches sent to Patmos (like those sent to Ignatius at Smyrna); or (2) their bishops or presbyteral colleges. But (3) the writer's use of the word *angelos* (some sixty times) is always for angelic beings. Thus these angels of the churches seem to be not exactly their guardian angels, but their heavenly representatives or counterparts (cf. Dan 10; also Mt 18 [11]; Ac 12 [15]). We ourselves often speak of 'the spirit' of a church.

II. **2** and **3. The Letters to the Seven Churches.**—These letters are an integral part of the book, and give valuable help for the interpretation of other parts of it. We note (*a*) that their eschatology is the normal eschatology of the New Testament. (*b*) That they include references to Roman as well as to Jewish persecution, and therefore were not written before the Roman persecution had arisen. This is confirmed by references to later parts of the book (cf. 2 [11, 17, 28]). (*c*) That the writer makes use of symbolism drawn from many sources, but puts upon it a meaning of his own (cf. 2 [7, 17, 20]). (*d*) That the writer refused the name of 'Jews' to Jews who have rejected their Messiah (2 [9], 3 [9]). Like other New Testament writers, he regards the Church as the true Israel.

1-7. Letter to the Church at Ephesus.

1. Ephesus could be reached by a messenger from Patmos by only sixty miles' sail. The titles here given to our Lord apply to His relation to all the churches. His messages are pronouncements suited to the case of each.

2. The churches are known by their fruits. The stress on *works* rather than faith throughout the book agrees with St. James rather than St. Paul, but (as with the former) this is largely because of the purpose in view. Those who claimed to be apostles (and still more those who claimed to be prophets) needed a careful investigation of their claims. St. Paul, the founder of the Ephesian Church, had warned its elders (Ac 20 [29]) that 'grievous wolves' would enter, and Ignatius in his letter to them (9) speaks of 'certain persons . . . bringing evil doctrine, whom ye suffered not to sow seed in you' (cf. *Didache*, 11; and 1 Jn 4 [1]).

4. Their endurance was their best feature, but their love was not what it was when St. Paul had evangelized them.

6. the Nicolaitans are not otherwise known. Irenæus (I, xxvi, etc.) says they were founded by Nicolas of Antioch (Ac 6 [5]), and Tertullian tells of a sect of that name a century afterwards. At Pergamum they were connected with those who taught Christians 'to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication' ([14. 15]). So they evidently favoured a return to pagan laxity of morals, in opposition to the Jerusalem decree of Ac 15 [29]. The attempt has been made to identify them with the followers of St. Paul, but they were rather such as he himself protested against for perverting the liberty of the Gospel.

7. He that hath an ear, let him hear. These words, addressed to each of the churches, echo those of our Lord in the Synoptic Gospels (Mk 4 [9. 23]). In each case they are linked with a promise made to the individual and not to the community. This is enough to refute the suggestion that the Apocalypse is not concerned with the salvation of the individual. **the Spirit saith:** the Holy Spirit is no longer symbolically described as in 1 [4], but is the speaker of the message. **the tree of life:** he who follows the victorious Christ wins again that from which man's sin has debarred him. Earlier apocalyptic (e.g. En 24) pictures the tree in the garden of heaven (see 22 [2]). **Paradise**, the Persian word for 'park,' is here (cf. Lk 23 [43]) the place of rest for the redeemed.

8-12. Letter to the Church at Smyrna.

8. Smyrna: a fair city and a rival of Ephesus as capital. The seven churches have had a sad history. A pre-war commentator says that Smyrna 'alone of the seven cities flourishes to-day.' Where is its Christian population now?

9. At Ephesus the characteristic was endurance; here it is suffering. Their poverty may have been due to plunder incited by Jews. Polycarp's martyrdom there was due to Jews as well as heathen. They are not the Israel of God but of Satan, whose work they are doing ([10]), while Christians are the true Jews (Rom 2 [29]; Phil 3 [3]).

10. ten days: symbolizing a definite period and not a lengthy one (cf. Dan 1 [12]). **crown of life:** not a royal diadem, but the garland awarded to the winner in the struggle of the games. Smyrna had its games and stadium. **the second death:** a martyr need not fear a further death, i.e. that of the final judgement (cf. 20 [6]) It is implied that the 'first death' is the death of the body only, but the expression does not occur. Contrariwise 'the first resurrection' is mentioned, but not the second (20 [5]).

12-17. Letter to the Church at Pergamum.

13. where Satan's throne is. As early as A.D. 29 Pergamum had a temple dedicated to Augustus and Rome, and it was the centre of the imperial cult in the province. Satan was at work among the Jews of Smyrna, but he sat enthroned at Pergamum, with Cæsar-worship as his special cult (cf. 13 [11] ff.). The danger to Christians was a far greater one, for refusal to join in such worship brought at once the charge of disloyalty. Already they had held the faith against persecution, and **Antipas** (not otherwise known) had been martyred.

14. Nu 31 [16] (P) makes Balaam the author of Balak's policy of corrupting Israelite morality (Nu 25 [1]: cf. Jude [11]). For **Nicolaitans** see note on 2 [6].

17. the hidden manna. The phrase, as applied to the food with which Israel was fed in the wilderness, comes from Apocryphal sources. The lost ark, which had contained Aaron's pot of manna in it, was believed to have been hidden by Jeremiah, to be discovered again when Messiah came and Israel was restored (*Apoc. of Baruch*, vi, 7 ff.). But here it seems to betoken 'the life-sustaining power of the Sacred Humanity now hid with Christ in God, of which the faithful find a foretaste in the Eucharist, but which can be fully known only to the conqueror' (Swete *ad loc.*: cf. Jn 6). This reward is for those who have chosen the table of the Lord instead of the table of devils (1 Cor 10 [21]). In the **white stone** the seer refers to a common superstition—the belief in stones inscribed with a magical name. Here it is the name inscribed on a man's life and character by the 'divine magic.'

18-29. Letter to the Church at Thyatira.

18. **Thyatira** was a city of much less importance, famous only for the industry of dyeing, with which trade Lydia was connected (Ac 16 [14]). **the Son of God**: here only in the Apocalypse, but it is implied throughout from 1 [6] onwards.

20. **the woman Jezebel.** The occurrence of this Old Testament reference close to that of Balaam ([14]) suggests a party rather than a person. Ahab's wife brought into Israel the immoralities of Baal and Astarte worship. Licentious Nicolaitan tendencies were invading the Church under the guise of prophecy. Those who think Jezebel refers to a person have suggested (1) that she was the priestess of the Sibyl, who had a temple in the Chaldæan quarter of the city (Schürer). But could she have claimed to count as a 'prophetess'? (2) That she was the wife of the bishop. But this depends on the insertion of the variant 'thy' before 'woman,' and also upon a wrong interpretation of *angelos*.

22. The punishment fits the sin. The bed is that of pain and sickness, which, if not used for repentance, leads to death.

24. The Gnostics claimed to be in advance of ordinary Christians as knowing the deep things of God. Such a claim may already have been made at Thyatira, but it was really **the deep things of Satan** that they were learning. The **burden** may be that of [10] (Swete), or it may refer to the decree of Ac 15 [28] (Anderson Scott, *Cent. B. ad loc.*).

28. **the morning star.** In 22 [16] this is the name assumed by Christ Himself; so here it seems a promise that they will soon possess Him, arising as such on the night of their trial (cf. 'till I come' in [25]).

III. 1-6. **Letter to the Church at Sardis.**

1. **Sardis** had been the capital of the ancient kingdom of Lydia, but only retained a shadow of its greatness. Its atmosphere was laden with the immoral traditions of many centuries of pagan cults; and Herodotus (i, 59) gave its inhabitants a bad name for luxury and loose living. Such influences were harder for the Church to resist than open opposition, and already its life had stagnated. In this verse we hear for the first time of 'nominal Christians.'

2. In spite of this, the Master still sees a possibility of revival.

3. Repentance must begin with the cry 'Oh that I were as in times past.'

4. The hope for the whole Church is in the constancy of the few.

5. **the book of life** figures largely in apocalyptic, but goes back to Ex 32 [32] and Ps 69 [28].

7-13. **Letter to the Church at Philadelphia.**—This city was too subject to earthquakes to grow to any size. The only opposition to the church seems to have come from the Jews.

7. **the key of David**: a Messianic phrase from Is 22 [22]. Christ has the key, as the Major-domo of the house of God (cf. Mt 16 [19] and note).

8. The **door opened** seems to refer to unusual possibilities for spreading the Gospel further. From the circular route on which Philadelphia lay was a branch road which led east through Asia Minor. A door was thus opened, of which the Church had made use. It is significant that, except for the suffering Smyrna, it is only for this *missionary* church that the Master has nothing but praise.

10. **the whole world.** The seer foresees that local persecutions are leading to a crisis of universal trial.

12. **the new Jerusalem** is described in 21 [2] ff. It is new in kind (*kainé*) rather than in time. It is being built in the unseen world, and will at last come down. Its name written on the victor's brow marks finally upon him that citizenship which is the privilege of the baptized (Phil 3 [20]). For the **new name** see 19 [12].

14-22. **Letter to the Church at Laodicea.**

14. **Laodicea** completed the circle of cities. From it one road led back to Ephesus; a second up the valley of the Lycus past Colossæ into the interior; and a third south-east to Attalia (Ac 14 [25]). Its position made it famous as a trading and banking community. In A.D. 60 it refused imperial help in rebuilding after an earthquake. Its spirit of self-sufficiency and commercial success was reflected in the Christian community, and made it the worst of the seven churches. **the beginning of the creation of God**: cf. 'the firstborn of all creation' (Col 1 [15] and note). The Colossian letter must have been well known to the Laodiceans, who were told to read it in their church (Col 4 [16]: for the 'epistle from Laodicea' see note on that verse).

15. **neither hot nor cold**: the words suggest tepid water. At the neighbouring city of Hierapolis are hot springs, which become lukewarm by the time they reach Laodicea and form a waterfall.

16. 'A tepid Christianity is nauseous to Christ' (Swete).

17. Like the Pharisees in the Gospel they vex Him with their self-satisfaction.

18. **buy of me gold**: in contrast with the gold of the bankers. **white garments**: in contrast with the black wool from which 'a kind of cheap cloak . . . was

manufactured at Laodicea' (Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics*, 40). **eyesalve**: perhaps in contrast with that which the local physicians produced (*op. cit.*, 52). Swete (*ad loc.*) compares it with the reproof of the Spirit which stings while it heals, and 'destroys self-deception and restores spiritual vision.'

20, 21. The picture may be derived from earlier apocalyptic, but so precious a promise fitly ends the last of the seven messages, and leads to the vision of the throne of heaven, with which the book continues.

IV. **1-11. The Vision of the Throne in Heaven, and the Worship of the Creator.**—The scene changes from earth to heaven. The trials and imperfections of those who are God's upon earth disappear, and the scene is full of assurance and peace, the joy of creation in worshipping its Creator having the first place. But 1 has already begun to reveal both the Creator and the Redeemer. 'The things which are' (1 [19]) are followed by those of 'hereafter' (4 [1]), so there is a sequence in the visions which 2 and 3 have not destroyed. We shall expect to find the vision expressed in terms of earlier visions of God, with which the seer's mind was already saturated (see Ex 24 [10]; Is 6 [1-4]; Ezek 1 [24-28]; Dan 7 [9-10]).

1. After these things I saw: this is the formula by which the successive visions of the book are introduced. The **door opened** is not that of opportunity (as 3 [8]), or of the heart (as 3 [20]), but of revelation.

2. one sitting: the Person of God is reverently veiled in mystery and symbol. It is the Father who is on the throne, for He is distinguished from the Spirit in 5 [6], and from the Son in 5 [13].

3. The jasper may be the diamond, for it was a clear and flashing stone, while the **sardius** was of opaque red. Perhaps they suggest the glory and the awfulness of God tempered by the surrounding mercy of the emerald. Cf. Gen 9 [13] for the rainbow as suggesting covenant mercy.

4. four and twenty elders: if these are human beings, they may represent the Church in its perfection, as suggested by the doubling of twelve (so Swete). But the other denizens of heaven in this vision are not human, and it is more likely that these are the angelic 'ancients' of Is 24 [23] (cf. Col 1 [16] and perhaps Gen 1 [26]). The number is more likely to come from Jewish tradition than from the twenty-four stars of Babylonian astrology (as Gunkel). Elsewhere in the book, when they are mentioned with the four living creatures, the elders come second, as being further from the throne.

6. a glassy sea: the azure vault of the sky, which the blue sea reflects under the prophet's eye (cf. Ex 24 [10]). Solomon's Temple also had contained 'a molten sea,' and the apocalyptists pictured a mighty sea in heaven (e.g. *Test. of the Twelve Patr., Levi* ii, 7). **four living creatures**: these are the cherubim of Ezek 1 [5] ff. and 10 [2] ff., but here they are described in simpler language.

7. The four likenesses suggest in Ezekiel the ceaseless activities of creation in its attendance upon the Creator. Possibly the four represent the division of animate nature into men, cattle, wild beasts, and birds, or rather their counterparts in the spiritual world. Their unfortunate identification with the four evangelists began as early as Irenæus (III, ii, 8).

8. The language is now derived from Isaiah's description of the worship of the seraphim (6 [3] ff.). The Te Deum thus rightly speaks of 'cherubim and seraphim,' as the Tersanctus does of 'angels and archangels.' **they have no rest**: and therefore earned the apocalyptic title of 'watchers.' The threefold cry marks the perfection of their worship and of Him whom they adore (cf. note on 1 [8]).

9. shall give glory, i.e. whenever they do, as giving the signal for worship.

11. In contrast with the worship of the Lamb in the vision which follows, the praise of God is here not for Redemption but for Creation. It asserts the true Source of all things, as against Gnostic and other cosmological theories. The translation of AV is unfortunate. It was because God willed it that they *were* (in the eternity of the divine mind), and then came into being at their creation. But this thought is almost certainly too subtle for the Hebrew seer. He thinks rather of the story of Gen 1, and the prompt appearance of each part of the creation as God 'calls' it into being (cf. Wisd 11 [25]). 'God said, Let there be light: and there was light.'

V. **The Vision of the Sealed Book and the Lamb.**

1-7. The Sealed Book.—Cf. Is 29 [11]. The worship of 4 is given to the Father as Creator for His past working; that of 5 to the Son also as Redeemer for His accomplished redemption and its fruit. The seer is a monotheistic Jew, but he sees no contradiction in the two visions. Together they express the Christian faith, indicating the supreme place of worship in the Christian life and the direction that worship should take.

1. a book written, i.e. God's book of destiny, containing the divine purpose,

which none but the Lamb could reveal or contemplate. We must imagine a papyrus roll, completely filled with writing, but secured against opening.

4. **I wept much**: for it seemed as if the promise of his seeing things to come was frustrated.

5. The Victor is described by Messianic titles (see Gen 49 [9]; Is 11 [1]).

6. **a lamb standing**, etc. He was told to look for a lion, but what he saw was a lamb. In Christ meekness is combined with majesty. The sacrificial victim takes the place of the king of beasts, for it was through *sacrifice* that the divine victory was won. Yet the slain victim is not dead, but is **standing** in the new life of the Resurrection (cf. 1 [18]). His **seven horns** show the fulness of His power. His **seven eyes** show the completeness of His knowledge, as endowed with the Spirit, who 'searcheth all things' (1 Cor 2 [10]: cf. Zech 4 [10]). The Lord (1 Cor 1 [24]) is 'the power of God and the wisdom of God.'

8-14. The Adoration of the Lamb.

8. Harps are the traditional instruments of psalmody. The symbolism of incense was long familiar, e.g. Ps 141 [2]: 'Let my prayer be set forth in thy sight as the incense.' See 8 [3], where **the prayers of the saints** are assisted by the angel with the censer.

9. Note that the worthiness of the Lamb is not ascribed to His divinity or His perfection, but to His atoning sacrifice.

10. **a kingdom and priests**: cf. 1 [6]; and for the source of the thought Ex 19 [6]. The redeemed community comes first; it is as its members that those who compose it are priests to God (cf. 1 P 2 [5, 9]). The AV translation 'we shall reign on the earth' involves a multitude of errors.*

13. **every created thing**. The circle of worshippers is far wider than in 4. If the 'elders' of that vision are angels, then this is the first we hear of the joint worship of human and sub-human creation along with that of heaven. Here it is heaven that echoes the praises of earth with the response of **Amen** ([14]).

VI. 1-17. **The Opening of the First Six Seals.**—With this vision the seer's prophecy may be said to begin, the earlier chapters forming an introduction. The seven letters have shown the present trials and future rewards of the Church militant here in earth. The subsequent visions have revealed the creative power and redemptive purpose of God, 'the background of eternal facts against which all human history is transacted' (Anderson Scott). Now (6–18) is brought before us the struggle of the Church, the judgement of God upon her enemies, and her final victory. The seer almost certainly builds upon the Lord's eschatological discourse (Mk 13 and parallels), which was doubtless well known to him, and it is the judgement to fall upon apostate Israel which is chiefly in his mind (cf. Mt 24 [6-8]).

1. **Come** seems to be an invitation to the horsemen, and not to the Saviour as in the rest of the book.

2. The vision comes from the four horses of Zechariah's vision (6 [1] ff. and 1 [8] ff.), where they represent the instruments of God's worldwide judgements. Here they represent calamities which have appeared again and again in history, often following in each other's train.

The **white horse** has not as its rider the 'Word of God' as in 19 [11] ff., but the triumphant militarism of the Cæsars; or possibly (as the **bow** suggests) the Parthian conquests which threatened it. But probably Ps 7 [12] is in view.

4. The second horseman may represent the civil war which was to rage at Jerusalem in its last days. The words 'that they should slay one another' a little suggest this. Red is the colour of blood, as white is of victory.

* The understanding of this verse is of great importance. The origin of Millenarianism was probably this. The early prophets of Israel had looked for the fulfilment of their hopes through a restored Davidic kingdom, while the hopes of the later took a wider sweep and were of a more 'other-worldly' character. The Jews reached in some cases a Millenarian outlook in the effort to combine both forms of earlier belief. Now this thought of two kingdoms was adopted by the Lord in His own sense, and after Him by the Apostles. There was, the Lord taught, a present kingdom of God constituted by Himself and His followers (e.g. Mt 12 [28]; Lk 16 [16]), and prepared for by the binding of Satan (Mt 12 [29]), as well as a glorious kingdom still to come; and, according to the 4th Gospel, He spoke of two resurrections in connexion with these two kingdoms (Jn 5 [24-29]). St. Paul's doctrine is the same (cf. *The Theology of St. Paul*, 430, 435), and so is that of the seer of the Apocalypse. Probably in the first part of the verse before us, he means that Christians by the Lord's work are made to exercise royalty as well as priesthood (cf. Lk 22 [29]); and undoubtedly in the final clause he claims that they already reign upon the earth in union with the Lord as He does in union with the Father (cf. Dan 7 [14, 27]; Mt 26 [64]). This is the only Millennial reign of which the seer ever thinks; the martyrs (20 [4]), as we shall see, are not contrasted with other Christians, but with the non-Christian dead. If we ask in what this reign over the world consists, the answer is that it is the will of God, the will of Christ, the will of His people, and no other will, that is being carried out, in spite of all apppearances to the contrary. The rule of Christ, says St. Thomas Aquinas, appears 'ex comparatione rerum humanarum ad finem humanæ salutis' (cf. *S.T.*, III, Q. lix, Art. 4). His people in Him by their work and prayer and witness 'reign upon the earth' as He does.—H. L. G.

5. Dearth raises the necessaries of life to famine prices (cf. Lev 26 [26]), the *denarius* is reduced to a twelfth of its purchasing power. The oil and wine are perhaps symbols of the blessings of God's people (Gen 27 [28]; Ps 23 [5]; Lk 10 [34]). As in the case of the plagues of Egypt, their blessings are to be spared (cf. Ps 37 [19]).

8. **a pale horse**: lit. 'green,' a symbol of the terror of death. **the fourth part** implies a special visitation, and indicates pestilence and not ordinary death. But it is only a partial destruction, in contrast with later visions (cf. 9 [15]). **the wild beasts** are added, as being among the 'four sore judgements' of Ezek 14 [21]. To the ancient world they were a real menace. Charles explains the awkward references to **Hades** and to the wild beasts as glosses.

9. **underneath the altar**: for it was at the foot of the altar of burnt offering that the victim's blood was poured (Lev 4 [7]). The *soul* or life was identified with the blood in the Semitic mind (Gen 9 [4]). The desire for the vindication of righteousness against conscious and persistent wickedness is quite Christian, and not at all inconsistent with Lk 23 [34]. (Cf. Mt 23 [33-36]; Lk 18 [7]; Rom 12 [19].) The article indicates a counterpart in heaven to our earthly altars. This verse perhaps suggested the Eucharists celebrated upon the 'birthdays' of the martyrs on the altar-tombs containing their relics.

11. **to each one a white robe.** Already in the waiting state they wear as *individuals* the robe of victory, though the day of general judgement has not yet come.

12. The earlier seals describe 'the beginning of travail' (Mk 13 [8]). But the sixth seal leads to the time 'after that tribulation' when 'the stars of heaven shall fall,' etc. (Mk 13 [24] ff.), as the end grows nearer. The language is largely that of the Old Testament.

16. The cry of despair comes from Hos 10 [8], but echoes our Lord's own words on the way to Calvary (Lk 23 [30]). **the wrath of the Lamb**: a splendid paradox; it seems a contradiction in terms, but He shares this and every other characteristic of the Most High. This is implied by the addition of **their** wrath.

VII. **An Interlude for the Comforting of the Faithful.**—Before the unfolding of the drama proceeds, comes this parenthesis, combining two visions of the redeemed, before the opening of the final seal. This is fully in accord with the plan and purpose of the book. Two similar interludes occur later: in 10-11 [14], before the sounding of the final trumpet, and in 14, before the final conflicts begin. In all three cases the interlude has two scenes. Whereas the world is 'all unprepared to meet Him,' the Church is being made ready for the coming end.

1-8. (i) **The Sealing of God's Israel.**—This vision is Jewish in character; that of [9-17] is universalistic. But both are required. The Jews of the apostolic age knew nothing of 'lost tribes' (Ac 26 [7]): they thought of all as represented in the Israel of their day. Before judgement falls on apostate Israel, the faithful remnant must be sealed for preservation (cf. Am 9 [9]; Mt 3 [12], 24 [15-18]). But 'the great tribulation' (Mt 24 [21]) did not fall upon Jewish Christians only; St. Paul's Gentile Christians had their share also (cf. 1 Th 2 [14-16]). The seer thinks of these as a great number—for his enthusiastic estimate cf. Col 1 [6]—and, when he comes to speak of the triumph of the saints, he does not forget them. It is possible that in [1-8] he adapts a Jewish apocalyptic picture.

1. The destructive forces are thus held back from the whole world till the appointed time.

2. The seal is the official signet-ring of an Eastern king, and marks that which is his possession or under his protection. In Ezek 9 [4] the faithful are marked on their forehead to except them from a coming massacre of the wicked (cf. 2 Tim 2 [19]). The object of the sealing here seems to be protection, not only against physical evils (which come in 8), but against the demonic evils of 9.

4. The numbers are a squared multiple of the twelve tribes, but may be compared with the 100,000,000 of 5 [11] as denoting myriads.

5 ff. **Judah** is placed first, as being the Messianic tribe. **Joseph** takes the place of Ephraim, though **Manasseh** finds a place. Dan is omitted, perhaps only because **Levi** is included, but possibly, as Irenæus suggests (V, xxx, 2), because traditionally antichrist was to be born of Dan (cf. *Test. of the Twelve Patr., Dan* v, 6, 7).

9-17. (ii) **The Multitude of the Redeemed in Bliss.**—Here the redeemed are not only protected by sealing, but are victorious and before the throne. The psalms are probably those of the Feast of Tabernacles ([15]; Lev 23 [39-43]; 2 Mac 7 [6, 7]). There was a special promise that the Gentiles should join in it (Zech 14 [16]). It commemorated the deliverance from Egypt (cf. 11 [8]), and was the Feast of Ingathering when the labours of the year were over (14 [13]). So Milligan, 'Like the

Transfiguration before the Passion, the vision prepares the seer to face the evil which is yet to come' (Swete).

10. Salvation, etc.: this is the keynote of their worship, paid to the Source of their deliverance (cf. 19[1]). God and His Christ are both hailed as Saviour, the very title wrongly ascribed to the emperor (cf. Tit 1[3, 4]).

14. which come out of the great tribulation. They come one by one. The article refers to the Lord's words in Mt 24[21] and the particular trial which was then coming upon the Church. The crisis of trial, though still future, is seen as past. **they washed their robes,** etc.: the redeemed are unscathed through claiming their share in the sacrifice of the Cross. They 'co-operate with the divine grace by repentance and faith and the use of the sacraments, and by vigilance and victory over sin' (Swete).

16. The words come from Is 49[10], where they are used of the returning exiles.

17 is suggested by Is 25[8]. Much of the language of this anticipatory vision recurs in 21 and 22, when the final crisis has come.

VIII. **1-13. The Seventh Seal and the First Four Trumpets.**—The seven seals are followed by seven trumpets and later by seven bowls, all bringing woes upon the earth in judgement for the sins of men. The opening of the last seal produces the next series. The question is raised, Do the visions represent a sequence of events, or do they tell the same thing over again? The 'recapitulation' theory has been a favourite one since the 3rd century, but has now been called 'the most stultifying of all methods of interpretation' (Charles, *Studies*, 25). Fresh stages in the drama may be recognized as the three series proceed, though they are not easy to distinguish exactly.*

1. silence in heaven: not merely as an expectant pause before the crisis, but as showing God's readiness to listen to men's prayers (8[3]). **half an hour** means a brief and broken period.

2. the seven angels: the seven archangels of the Presence, familiar in Jewish thought (Tob 12[15]).

3, 4. The golden altar in the tabernacle was the altar of incense (Ex 30[1-3]). Thus either (*a*) heaven, like earth, has two altars, or (*b*) the heavenly altar serves the purposes of the two earthly altars. The meaning is that, while in 6[11] an immediate answer to the prayers of the martyrs was refused, it will now be given. The heavenly incense is added that they may find full acceptance.

5. cast it upon the earth: as the angel in Ezek 10[2] was bidden to take coals of fire from between the cherubim and scatter them over the city. The fire of God comes down in vengeance in answer to the prayers of His suffering people.

7 ff. The first four trumpets are unlike the last three, and do not touch men, but only nature in four of its parts: vegetation, the sea, the rivers, and the heavenly bodies (cf. Gen 3[16-19]). '4' (cf. 7[1]) is the 'number' of the world (cf. Introduction, p. 683). **the third part** in each case denotes that the judgement is not yet more than partial (cf. Zech 13[8, 9]). The first plague recalls the hail and fire of the seventh Egyptian plague; the second and third are like the first Egyptian plague; and the fourth is akin to the ninth plague of Egyptian darkness. The great Old Testament example of God's judgement on the enemies of His people is found in the plagues of Egypt, and the Lord had said that the coming tribulation would exceed all that had gone before it. Thus the seer, who of course did not know the exact form that it would take, draws his symbolism from the Book of Exodus, but makes the picture darker by the addition of features drawn from other Old Testament judgements (cf. Is 14[19]; Jer 9[15]; 51[25]; Ezek 38[22]). Many have thought the imagery to be suggested by storms and eclipses, such as would deeply impress the lonely seer at Patmos.

8. a great mountain: even as the Bay of Naples was destroyed by Vesuvius in its great eruption of A.D. 79. In the Ægean was the volcanic island of Thera.

11. Wormwood: the miracle is the reverse of that of Marah (Ex 15[23]). This word *absinthos* gives its name to absinthe, which suggests Alford's note: 'There is no effect which could be so aptly described as the falling of fire into water, as this, which results in ardent spirit, in that which the simple islanders of the South Sea call fire-water.'

13. The sounding of a trumpet and the coming of an eagle for judgement are combined in Hos 8[1]. **Woe** is thrice repeated because the following judgements are three. '3' is the 'number' of heaven. Thus the three final woes are connected with heaven (9[1, 13], 11[15]). To suggest that the trumpets were originally but three spoils the symbolism.

IX. **1-12. The Fifth Trumpet brings the First Woe.**

1. The fifth and sixth woes are demonic (9[2, 11, 17, 18]). The world is delivered unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may be saved in the day of the

* Cf. Additional Note on pp. 705, 706.

Lord Jesus (1 Cor 5[5]). If the last appeal fails, it is no fault of God's (20, 21). The teaching of the passage is quite normal teaching. The personal malignity which we seem to see behind our troubles is that of Satan, not of God. But God's purpose of testing and chastening lies behind, and Satan serves the divine purpose in spite of himself. Meanwhile all remains under the divine control, the trial being strictly regulated both in direction and in intensity (9 3-5, 15, 16). **a star from heaven**: an angel acts as God's minister. **the key of the pit**: the abode of the powers of evil is pictured, according to apocalyptic thought, as below the ground, connected with its surface by a shaft like that of a well.

3. A swarm of **locusts** is itself like a cloud of smoke. Here their natural function of harming vegetation is changed into the power of scorpions to harm mankind.

4. As Israel was exempt from the Egyptian plagues, so would be the new Israel from this new plague.

5. **tormented five months.** A scorpion's sting causes intense pain, but not death. The period is short, possibly that of a literal visitation of locusts.

7 ff. The imagery is suggested by Joel's vision of the locusts (Jl 2 4), though Ex 10 12-15 is not forgotten. The composite forms, like those of Assyrian sculpture, suggest the combination of human and bestial characteristics. There is hideous strength and power to dominate, malicious though intelligent purpose, the cruelty of a Circe. Such are 'Life's Little Ironies,' which do not kill, but torture. If the imagery of this chapter seems grotesque, it is because we try to picture what is described instead of looking at the thought behind it.

11. **Abaddon**, i.e. 'destruction,' in the Wisdom literature came to mean the place of perdition; but in Job 28 22 it is personified and connected with 'death,' as Hades is in Rev 6 8. **Apollyon**, i.e. destroyer, seems to be a Græcized form of Abaddon, but the word may contain a reference to the god Apollo, of whose cult the locust was a symbol.

13-21. The Sixth Trumpet brings the Second Woe.

13. The answer to the prayers of the saints in 8 3 comes from the altar of incense. The speaker is not defined, but the voice may be that of God Himself, letting loose new catastrophic forces in response to their cry.

14. **bound at the great river Euphrates.** Cf. Gen 15 18; Is 8 5-8. These are not the angels of 7 1, but are themselves held in check at the river beyond which lay the great heathen kingdoms of the East. (Bousset quotes a close parallel to 13 14 from the *Apocalypse of Ezra*.)

16. The angels bring armies of double the numbers given in Dan 7 10 (and Rev 5 11). They recall the Chaldeans of Hab 1 5-10, or suggest the dreaded Parthian cavalry, whose raids were a constant menace.

19. Cf. the locusts with scorpions' tails in 9 10.

20. **the rest** cannot bring themselves to abjure the 'unclean spirits,' which are the symbols of pagan immoralities.

X.-XI. 13. A Second Interlude for the Comforting of the Faithful.—Before the last trumpet comes a parenthesis staying the action of the drama, similar to that of 7 before the last seal. This interlude is likewise divided into two visions of comfort (cf. the third interlude of 14). It extends to 11 13, the epilogue of the sixth trumpet being found in 11 14.

X. 1-11. (i) The Vision of the Strong Angel with the Little Book.

1. **his feet as pillars of fire**: an indication of the seer's Hebrew origin, for in that language the word for 'foot' can also mean 'leg.'

2. **a little book open**: lit. 'a tiny little book,' not the sealed book of 5 1.

4. **the seven thunders**: the article implies that they form another well-known 'seven.' Weizsäcker and others suppose that the reference is to a set of visions of this name current in Christian circles, of which the seer did not approve, as contrasted with the 'little book.' But it is simpler to suppose that he felt himself unequal to recording the visions, and regarded this as a divine prohibition.

6. **time no longer**, i.e. no more delay in bringing about the end for which the saints have prayed. Milton's noble sonnet recurs to our memory; but no more than in 4 11 must we ascribe metaphysical ideas to the seer.

7. God's whole purpose will soon be unveiled.

9. The appropriation of **the little book** means that the seer is to make this new revelation his own and to proclaim it. 11 completes (with the seventh trumpet) the revelation of the earlier 'book' of 5 1; 12 begins a new set of visions, which may be contained in the 'little' book. But they are lengthy for such a description, and the reference may be to 11 1-13 only. The seer is receiving proof of the principle that the divine message seems sweet, but proves to be bitter in the

prophet's experience. The vision is suggested by Ezekiel's eating of the roll (Ezek 2 [7]-3 [3]; Jer 15 [16]).

11. Here the words recall the commission of Jeremiah (1 [10]). A similar divine necessity is laid on the Christian prophet, and specially fulfilled in 13, 17, 18 (cf. St. Paul's commission in Ac 9 [15]).

XI. 1-13. (ii) **The Measuring of the Temple and the Two Witnesses.**—This is the second episode of the interlude. Its difficulties have long been felt, both with regard to the 'temple,' which seems to be still standing in Jerusalem, and the identification of the two witnesses. The most recent interpretation is that of Charles (ii, 269 ff.). He suggests that we have two separate fragments, written before the Temple was destroyed in A.D. 70. In [1, 2] we find an earlier oracle by a Zealot prophet, predicting the capture of the city and the safety of the Zealots themselves in the inner court. In [3-13] Moses and Elijah witness in Jerusalem at the coming of antichrist, and call the Jews to repent. Antichrist comes (from Rome) and stays them, but they rise again and convert the Jews. The meaning which the seer himself ascribes to the oracle is fairly clear. The Temple itself, with the altar of sacrifice attached to it, is the faithful remnant of Israel, which had grown into the Catholic Church. The Church, which is the home of worship, is identical with the worshippers themselves (with [1] cf. 1 Cor 3 [16]). The outer court is 'Israel after the flesh,' the nation which has crucified its Messiah, and which will be given over to judgement (cf. Lk 21 [24]) till its time of restoration comes (cf. Rom 11 [25] ff.). Till then the Church must bear its witness. The witnesses are two because of Dt 19 [15] (cf. Mk 6 [7]), and they are identified with Moses and Elijah, since they teach the commandments of God and are filled with the spirit of prophecy. This symbolic use of Moses and Elijah exactly resembles the use of Jezebel in 2 [20]. The Church in her witness may claim the powers exercised by Moses and Elijah of old (cf. Ac 13 [9] ff.; 2 Cor 13 [2-4]). But the seer shares the anticipation of St. Paul in 2 Th 2. Antichrist will appear at Jerusalem—it is Sodom and Egypt, because the people of God have gone out from it to escape its judgements and its cruelty—and the Church's witnesses will be martyred. There will be a short-lived triumph for the world (cf. Jn 16 [20]). But soon the Church's witnesses, like the Lord, will have their resurrection and ascension (cf. 1 Th 4 [16, 17]); Jerusalem will fall, and Israel acknowledge the hand of God.

1. **measure the temple of God,** i.e. for preservation, as in Zech 2 [1-5]: cf. Rev 7 [1-8].

2. **the court which is without:** known later as the Court of the Gentiles. **forty and two months,** i.e. three and a half years, the broken seven, which already symbolized the reign of antichrist (Dan 7 [25], 12 [7]). It was the actual duration of the persecution and profanation under Antiochus Epiphanes, which lasted from the spring of 168 B.C. to the autumn of 165 B.C. It therefore formed a fitting symbol of a time of persecution. It occurs frequently in this book, either as forty-two months, three and a half years, or 1,260 days, and once (12 [14]) in Daniel's own phrase as 'a time, and times, and half a time.'

3. The same period is described as in [2], but under a different form. If this verse introduces a different oracle, the variation of the phrase is explained. **my two witnesses:** the first points plainly to *Elijah*, as the references in [5] and [6] show (cf. 2 K 1 [10] and 1 K 17 [1] ff.). Earlier apocalyptic would point to Enoch for the second, but *Moses* seems clearly indicated by the reference to the plagues in [6]. Others would see in the witnesses St. Peter and St. Paul (C. H. Turner), or, as suggested above, a symbol for 'the Church in her function of witness-bearing' (Swete). One source of the vision is found in Zech 4, where the 'sons of oil' are Zerubbabel and Joshua, the civil and the spiritual powers, continually sustained by the oil of the Spirit. **clothed in sackcloth:** this indicates that their preaching was of repentance.

7. **the beast:** this is the first mention of a symbol which becomes frequent after 13 [1]. The thought of this 'wild beast' may be derived from Dan 7 [3], where the four great beasts that come up from the sea are earthly kingdoms, in contrast with the kingdom of the saints. Thus it had long been an apocalyptic term for a mighty world-power. Here, however, 2 Th 2 (cf. Mk 13 [14]) suggests that it is antichrist.

8. The city is obviously not Rome but Jerusalem. In [13] a population of 70,000 is implied.

9. **three days and a half:** the days correspond to the years of their previous activity.

12. **in the cloud:** as not only Moses and Elijah went, but their Lord Himself.

13. **gave glory to God:** a repentance of the Jews before the end was looked for by St. Paul (Rom 11 [25, 26]).

14-19. **The Seventh Trumpet brings the Third Woe.**—The parenthesis of 10 [1]-11 [13] is now over, and the narrative returns to 9 [21].

15. The seventh trumpet brings the end—the final establishment of the rule of God (15), the completion of divine revelation, so that God is no longer He 'which is to come' (contrast 17 with 1 4), and the vindication of God's faithfulness to His covenant (19). But the seer remembers the mystery which the Lord had shown to surround it (Mk 13 42), and imitates His reticence.

18. **the prophets**: this is the order to which the writer himself belonged. In what follows he describes the rest of the Church.

19. **the ark of his covenant.** The Jews believed that Jeremiah had hidden the lost ark (see 2 17), and that in the day of restoration it would appear again (*Apocalypse of Baruch*, vi, 7-10).

XII. **The Woman and the Dragon, and the War in Heaven.**—Many explanations have been offered. (1) It is a piece of Jewish apocalyptic, which the seer has introduced without adaptation. Part of it may be based on a Babylonian myth of the birth of a god of light. (2) It begins a new series of visions, as contained in the 'little book' of 10 8, and is addressed to a wider circle of readers than the earlier half of the book (10 11). It thus forms an introduction to the struggles with antichrist. (3) It is retrospective, preparing the reader for Satan's final assault by telling of his failures in the past, and using Jewish apocalyptic for the purpose. This view has the advantage of explaining the curious insertion of the 'war in heaven' in 7-12.

In any case it will be seen that many strands are interwoven. Gunkel's view may be right that the main idea comes originally from the Babylonian myth of the birth of Marduk the sun-god. The language (1-5) may have originally applied to a sun-goddess, crowned with the twelve signs of the zodiac, and giving birth to a sun-god, who is saved by the gods above from the dragon of chaos and darkness. But for the seer the woman is the Church of God, at first seen in travail with the Messiah (Is 66 6, 7; Mic 4 9, 10), and later as suffering persecution after the ascension. In all the great types of New Testament teaching the Church is regarded as possessing a continuous life from Abraham to the final consummation. So far from the Church of Christ having separated itself from the old Church of God, Jews who have rejected the Messiah have separated themselves from the one Church of all the ages, and indeed are Jews no longer (2 9, 3 9). Cf. Rom 11 17-24; 1 P 2 9, 10, etc. Thus there is no direct reference to the Blessed Virgin, though the thought of her as the new Eve, through whom the mission of the Church to bear the Saviour of the world is fulfilled (Gen 3 15; cf. Lk 1 43), may well have been in the seer's mind.

1-6. **The Woman and the Dragon.**

1. **in heaven.** We have to do with the Jerusalem that is above (Gal 4 26; Heb 12 22; Rev 3 12, 21 2, 10). **was seen**: there is perhaps a contrast with the seer's personal visions. **arrayed with the sun**: cf. 12 23, and for the other imagery Gen 37 9; Ca 6 10; Rev 3 9. The glory of the Church, as set forth in Is 49 22 ff., 52 1 ff., 54, 60, etc., is also in the mind of the seer. Since she reigns with Christ, she is crowned as a queen.

3. **a great red dragon.** He is identified in 9 with Satan, 'the old serpent.' Here too we must remember the old mythology of Babylon and other nations (cf. Ps 74 14; Is 27 1, 51 9; Am 9 3). The language is reminiscent of Dan 7 7, and anticipates the description of the 'beast' in 13 1.

4. **the stars of heaven**: cf. Dan 8 10, where (as here) the myth of the storming of heaven (Is 14 12-15; cf. Ezek 28 13-15) is in the writer's mind.

6. The Church after the ascension escapes from the spiritual Egypt (11 8) into the wilderness, where she is fed with heavenly food. The story is continued at 13, and 14 takes up the 1,260 days of 6, the period being the familiar 'short time' of apocalyptic.

7-12. The seer, like the Lord (see note on 9), again makes noble use of the old mythology. Probably the whole section describes the Lord's victory as claimed and appropriated by His people. The victory seen on earth is but the phenomenal expression of a victory won in the supernal world. The witness and the suffering of the saints have in the power of the outpoured life of the Lord overcome the world of apostate Israel, though a greater conflict is now before them. The thought is thoroughly Johannine: cf. Jn 16 33; 1 Jn 4 4, 5 4, 5.

7. **Michael**: one of the four archangels of apocalyptic. In Dan 10 21, 12 1 he fights for Israel as their champion.

9. **he was cast down to the earth.** When the Seventy were successful in their mission, our Lord 'saw' a similar vision (Lk 10 18). And in the Church's witness since that time the prince of this world was being 'cast out' (Jn 12 31). But the final victory was not yet, for Satan was showing his power in the world afresh through increasing persecutions. The war-

fare of the Church militant is part of a larger warfare.*

10. 'This is the alchemy of faith, that it transmutes "the tribulation, and kingdom, and patience" (1 9) of the believer into "the salvation, and kingdom, and power" of the saint' (Anderson Scott *ad loc.*).

11. **they overcame him**: for the victory is due to human as well as angelic help. **they loved not their life**; an echo of our Lord's teaching (Jn 12 25, etc.).

12. The point is that the conquest of Satan by the Lord for His people—his defeat 'in the heavenlies' (Eph 6 12) or spiritual sphere—inflames his desire to arouse persecution. The more fully the Church gains the victory over sin, the more she must expect to be persecuted. It is not worth while to persecute a dead Church.

13-17. The Sequel of the Woman and the Dragon.

13. The narrative of 9 is here resumed. Satan now tries to hurt the Son through the mother and 'the rest of her seed' (17).

14. See note on 9; and for the two wings cf. Ex 19 4; Dt 32 11, 12; Is 63 9.

* Two points should be here observed: (1) The Hebrews feel such problems as the relation of time to eternity, of the phenomenal to the real, of the universal to the particular; but they make little attempt to grapple with them. Thus they tend to confuse what exists in the divine purpose with concrete existence in some supernal world. Enoch, e.g., regards the Messiah as a heavenly man pre-existing with God: cf. also Heb 8 5 (quoted from Ex 25 40) and 1 Ch 28 11, 19. Similarly, where we might speak of the divine ideal for the Church as alive in the Church and moulding it to fulfil the divine purpose, the Hebrews speak of 'the Jerusalem that is above,' and of its descent to earth. (2) The Hebrews regard the earthly conflict between good and evil against the background of a heavenly or cosmic conflict to which it corresponds. In primitive thought the gods are regarded as the champions of their peoples; the victory, e.g., of Israel over Moab implies the victory of Jehovah over Chemosh. At a later stage the thought seems to be adapted to monotheistic belief by the substitution of angelic patrons for gods: cf. Dan 10 13, 20 and note on Rev 12 7. But the survival of such primitive conceptions rests upon their expression for us of profound truths which we cannot express as effectively in any other way. If the universe forms one great whole, the Incarnation and the Atonement must have cosmic relations (cf. Col 1 16-20), and the victory which the Lord bestows upon us in our own conflict with evil must be the extension, as He said that it was (Jn 16 33), of a victory won over evil in some more universal form (cf. Col 2 15). To believe in the existence of Satan is to believe that cosmic, like human, evil must consist in perverted will; we lose much ethically, and gain nothing intellectually, by denying his existence. But though we may rightly speak of him as the enemy of Christ Incarnate, and our accuser before God—for it is our personal embodiment of the evil will which alone accuses us—we should never speak of him as the enemy of God. Such language suggests dualism, not Christianity, and magnifies Satan's place in the scheme of things. His proper antagonist is Michael, not God. If we have dark forces arrayed against us in the world unseen (Eph 6 12), we have the armies of light upon our side, and they that be with us are more than they that be with them (2 K 6 16).—H. L. G.

15-16. The imagery is perhaps from a mythological source, and describes the conflict between the kindly earth and the cruel waters. The Jewish persecution raised against the Church came to little. It was lost in the sands of 'the wilderness.'

XIII. 1*a*. **and he stood.** This is the better reading, so that the words must be taken with the preceding paragraph. Satan, foiled in his efforts, makes fresh ones by calling to his aid imperial Rome. **the sea** is the natural symbol of the troubled waters of heathenism. Cf. Is 57 20; Rev 21 1, and perhaps 17 15.

XIII. **Satan uses anti-Christian Rome and the Worship of its Emperors for his Warfare.**—Here a fresh series of visions begins, of which the 'beast' is the centre. The pictures in Daniel interpreted of the coming of antichrist had long been in the minds of apocalyptists, and such Jewish sources are probably to be traced in this passage. But in the seer's mind the present activity of Satan was to be seen in the decision of the empire not to tolerate the Christian Church, and in the enforcing of a universal worship of the reigning emperor. A personal element had been introduced by the brutalities of Nero. So the world-wide expectation that he was not dead, but would return at the head of their Parthian enemies, turned the seer's visions (in the course of the chapter) from the vague picture of antichrist and the empire to a personal 'beast'—if not *Nero redivivus*, then Domitian persecuting in the spirit of Nero.

1-10. The Vision of the Monster from the Sea.

1. A **beast** has already been mentioned in 11 7, but without any suggestion that it is to be identified with Rome. This one combines the first three beasts of Dan 7, while the **ten horns** belong to the fourth beast of Dan 7 24, where they signify ten kings. See note on 17 *init.* for the interpretation. In the 'little Apocalypse' (cf. Lk 21 20) the work of Daniel's fourth beast or kingdom is ascribed to Rome, for the words about the 'abomination of desolation' are changed to 'Jerusalem compassed about with armies.' Such an identification was therefore already known to the Church. That the beast is **coming up out of the sea** may both point to the connecting of the sea by the ancients with the powers of evil, and indicate that

the new agent of Satan comes from the Mediterranean. The seer, as we see in 17 9. 10, does not shrink from a twofold interpretation. **The names of blasphemy** are the divine titles which the emperors claimed. Domitian, e.g., claimed to be called Lord and God. We note that the beast (cf. 12 3) is the 'express image' of the dragon, and his manifestation to the world as the Lord is of the Father.

2. the dragon gave him. The terms which the Lord refused the beast has accepted: cf. Mt 4 9.

3. See note on 17 8 for the connexion with Nero and his expected return from death. But a contrast with the Lamb of 5 6 may be also intended. The beast is not only an antichrist, but a mock-Christ imitating Christ's resurrection and claiming the worship which is due to Him.

4. The worship of the beast and the worship of the dragon are identical (cf. Jn 5 19. 23), and this worship is the worship of brute force divorced from righteousness and love.

5. Cf. the Lord's words in Jn 19 11. All remains under the divine control. For the time cf. note on 11 2.

6. even them that dwell. For this identification cf. 11 1. The Church is already living a heavenly life.

8. from the foundation of the world: to be taken with **written in the book,** as in 17 8.

11-18. The Vision of the Monster from the Land.—Jewish apocalyptic, following Babylonian myths, spoke of a second monster (En 60 7 ff.). Here he works through some kind of religious cultus. He comes (not as AV and RV **out of the earth**) 'from the land,' in contrast with the first beast, who came 'from the sea.' He therefore probably signifies the *local priesthood* in Asia which organized the worship of the emperor. The letters to the seven churches and the later history of persecution testify alike to the strength of this anti-Christian influence.

10. The words are to be explained by Jer 15 2, and applied to the inevitable punishment of the enemies of God's people. Those who take the sword perish by the sword (Mt 26 52). It is on this that the patience and faith of the saints rest: cf. 14 12.

11. This 'false prophet,' as he is called in 19 20, is 'in sheep's clothing,' but he speaks in the devil's name. He is the witness to the beast, as the Holy Ghost is the witness to the Lord. Thus in the dragon, the first beast, and the second beast we have 'the anti-Trinity of hell.' Here, again, the connexion is close between the Apocalypse and the 4th Gospel.

12. whose death-stroke was healed: cf. 14 and see on 13 3 and 17 8. The spirit of Nero lived on in Domitian.

13. great signs: our Lord had predicted this of the false prophets (Mt 24 24), and so had St. Paul concerning antichrist (2 Th 2 9).

14. that they should make an image of the beast. The letters to the churches (e.g. 2 13) show how successful had been the spread of the imperial cultus in Asia.

15. Oriental jugglery was often encouraged by the imperial authorities. Cf. Bar-Jesus in Ac 13 6.

16. The **mark** of the beast seals his followers, just as those of the Lamb were sealed in 7 3. If it is a literal mark, it may be the seal of the emperor.

17. to buy or to sell: such an economic boycott led to the singling out of Christians for persecution.

18. As in both Greek and Hebrew letters were used to express numbers, it was possible to express a name by them, its separate letters being added together to form the number. Countless explanations have been offered, for the cryptogram lends itself to many solutions. Among ancient ones, the earliest is that of *Lateinos*, as denoting the race of the emperor (Irenæus). But this seems far too vague and impersonal. The best modern interpretation is *Neron Kesar*, which has the additional advantage of explaining the variant 616, which represents *Nero* without the final *n*. The appropriateness of 666 is seen in the fact that each digit falls one short of the number which represents perfection: we have thus the number of 'sin.'

XIV. **1-20. A Third Interlude for the Comforting of the Faithful.**—For the third time there is a parenthesis, staying the action of the drama, and looking forward to that triumph of good over evil and of saints over their persecutors, which is described in later chapters. As in 7 and 10 1-11 13, the interlude is for the reassurance of the Church. This time it consists of three visions.

1-5. (i) Vision of the Lamb in the Midst of His Church in Glory.—The theme is the same as in 7; it is the triumph of the redeemed.

1. the Lamb: recalling the vision of 5, but in contrast with the beast of 13. **the mount Zion:** cf. 2 Esd 2 42, 13 35, and for the Christian application Heb 12 22. The multitudes are those of 7. They bear the sacred name instead of that of the beast (cf. Jn 17 10). The divine name, as the name of the beast in 14 17, expresses ownership.

3. The saints learn the song from those seen in heaven in 4, but it is not stated that they themselves sing it. The popular picture (so distasteful to many) of spending eternity in playing the harp is not true even if the vision be taken literally instead of symbolically.

4. There is much to be said for Charles's rejection of the first two clauses as a gloss due to the later exaltation of celibacy. The Christian exaltation of the unwedded life rests upon the special opportunities which it gives for the life of devotion and undistracted service, and not upon the false idea that the marriage relation brings defilement: cf. Mt 19[12] and 1 Cor 7[32] ff. Thus, if the two clauses be retained, they must be interpreted symbolically (cf. 2 Cor 11[2]; 1 Jn 3[3]), these virgin souls being shown in contrast with the immoralities of the heathen world, wherein even the cult of religion encouraged sexuality: cf. Mt 25[1] ff. **follow the Lamb**: in witness, suffering, death, and victory over death (cf. 2 S 15[21]; 1 Jn 2[6]). **the firstfruits**: of humanity, to be offered to God (cf. Jas 1[18]).

5. This vision adds to earlier ones by laying stress on the *character* of the saints as well as their blessedness.

6-13. (ii) Vision of the Three Angels and their Proclamations.—All three angels announce the coming judgement, but in relation (1) to the call of God, (2) to the fall of the Roman power, and (3) to the individuals who have been dominated by it.

6. an eternal gospel: cf. Mt 24[14]; and for the connexion between [6] and [7], Ac 14[15-17], 17[30, 31].

8. fallen is Babylon: this anticipates the judgement upon Rome described in 18.

10. in the presence: cf. En 48[9], 'They will burn before the face of the holy.' 'Those who desert Christ for Cæsar will be the victims of a remorse that never dies or sleeps' (Swete). Cf. footnote on 19[20].

13. from henceforth, i.e. those who die in the final persecutions which seemed imminent, and therefore enter straight into blessedness. 'A new beatitude which needed a voice from heaven to proclaim it' (Swete). The later Church has rightly widened the reference of the words, and applied them in her Burial Service to all who 'die in the Lord.' **that they may rest**, i.e. 'in that they rest,' not in idleness, but with all the toil of their work gone (cf. note on 7[9-17]). **their works follow with them**: not laid up in heaven beforehand and weighed, as Jewish apocalyptic taught (En 41[1], 38[2]); nor are they works in the Jewish legal sense. They are the fruits of Christian character, manifesting what their redemption has wrought (see 12[11]). It is these that the Christian 'carries out' with him.

14-20. (iii) Vision of the Harvest and Vintage of the Earth.

14. a son of man: if this reading be accepted, it only describes him as different from the angels who have been mentioned. But undoubtedly *the* Son of Man is intended. It is true that He receives commands from angels, but they are messengers from God the Father, from whom judgement is given to the Son..

16. cast his sickle. The actual harvesting is not part of the image. He only throws the sickle on the earth, and the harvest is the result. Almost certainly the harvest refers to the saints, and the vintage to the sinners. Cf. Jn 11[52]; 1 Th 4[16, 17]; Mt 13[39, 40].

18. from the altar. The angel comes not only from God, but from the place where the saints have been praying for their vindication (6[10]).

19. The figure originally comes from Is 63[1-6], but Jl 3[13] is immediately in view.

20. without the city. Jewish tradition connected the judgement of the Gentiles with Jerusalem (e.g. Jl 3[2, 12]). Here it is the new Jerusalem of 19 and 20. **the bridles of the horses**: the reference seems to be to the angelic horsemen of 19[14]. But this strange language is best explained by reference to En 1[3]: 'The horses shall walk up to the breast in the blood of sinners, and the chariot shall be submerged to its height.' The number may represent the earth complete in all its four quarters.

XV. The Song of the Martyrs and the Commission of the Seven Angels with their Plagues.—The proleptic visions of 14 have pointed to the end, as described in later chapters. 15 chronologically follows 13. There the whole world was made to worship the beast, the refusal of Christians leading to their persecution. The vision of the martyrs, now translated to heaven, naturally follows in 15[2-4].

1 awkwardly anticipates [5, 6], and is probably an interpolation.

2. The sea (cf. 4[6] and note) seems here to recall the Red Sea. Israel of old crossed without suffering; to the new Israel it has been mingled with the fire of persecution.

3. the song of Moses, etc. The two dispensations are thus brought together, the triumph over Pharaoh typifying the Saviour's triumph over death.

5. the tabernacle of the testimony. Only here (but cf. Hebrews *passim*) does the 'tent of witness' of Nu 9 [15], etc. find a heavenly counterpart; it is conceived as incorporated in the later temple.

6. arrayed with precious stone: lit. 'with stone.' This only differs by a single letter from the variant 'in linen,' which would be easier to understand.

7. golden bowls: shallow vessels, known in the Temple furniture as basons. The imagery is derived from Ezek 10 and Is 6.

8. none was able, etc. 'The divine judgements are impenetrable until they are past' (Swete).

XVI. **1-21. The Pouring Out of the Plagues from the Seven Bowls.**—These plagues show an advance on those of the seals and trumpets, though they much resemble the latter. The seer, as before, bases his anticipations upon the plagues of Egypt. But the new plagues are no longer limited as were the old. The world is impenitent ([9, 11, 21]), and its wickedness finds its climax in the worship of the beast.

6. This verse reveals why the seer lays so much stress on the three plagues of blood which are derived from the first Egyptian plague.

7. I heard the altar: for the martyrs' prayers were upon it, and their souls beneath it.

12. the river Euphrates. In 9 [13] ff. the sixth trumpet had called forth armed forces from beyond the boundary river. Now the Parthians from the East, perhaps with Nero *redivivus* at their head, can cross it and advance on Rome.

13. as it were frogs: perhaps suggested by the Egyptian plagues (cf. 1 K 22 [19-22]).

15. If this verse be rightly placed, it is a warning to Christians not to grow careless and be 'condemned with the world' (cf. 18 [4]). But there may be some dislocation, and such a context as 3 [3] appears more suitable. As one of the seven beatitudes of the book, it fits in better with the others if placed there. The other six are 1 [3], 14 [13], 19 [9], 20 [6], and 22 [7, 14].

16. Har-Magedon, 'the hill of Megiddo,' recalls the plain of Esdraelon, the immemorial battleground of Palestine, and the scene of Israel's victory over the hordes of Sisera. The 'hill' is perhaps suggested by the 'mountains of Israel' in Ezek 38 [8].

19. the great city: here certainly not Jerusalem but Rome, as in what follows and in 14 [8].

XVII. **Oracles of the Harlot and of the Beast.**—This vision is linked with the preceding, as being revealed by one of the angels with the bowls. It gives a lurid description of the cruelty and wickedness of Rome the harlot, and of the beast-emperors, who again merge into the personality of a Nero *redivivus*. As the drama of the fall of Rome unfolds, a new power appears, 'ten kings' ([12]), who will range themselves on the side of evil against good ([14]). They will support the beast, but they will attack the harlot and destroy her ([16]). The general tenor of the chapter is therefore plain, but there are many difficulties in its details. As before, the beast is the Roman Empire; its seven heads are its emperors, five being in the past (i.e. Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero), one present (Vespasian); and the seventh, Titus, the destroyer of Jerusalem, still to come and to have but a short reign (see [10]). Then Nero will reappear as the 'eighth,' although he is also to be reckoned among the first seven (see [11]). Domitian was 'Nero redivivus.'

1. sitteth upon many waters: this is interpreted in [15], and it is the phrase Jeremiah (51 [13]) had used of Babylon. If its origin is earlier still, it may refer to the mythical monster of the waters of chaos.

2. Cf. the judgement upon Tyre, Nineveh, and Babylon, as given in the prophets (e.g. Is 23 [17]; Nah 3 [4]).

4. Of course the connexion of the 'scarlet woman' with papal Rome is a ludicrous anachronism. The colours suggest pomp and luxury.

5. Mystery: thus is proclaimed the symbolical nature of the woman and Babylon.

8. Nero, the wounded 'head' of 13 [3], here reappears as the beast himself, as probably in 13 [18].

9. This new interpretation of the **seven heads** may be a reference to the familiar seven hills on which Rome was built.

10. five are fallen. The three usurpers who followed Nero in the year A.D. 69, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, are not counted. It must be remembered that in the East, which knew little about them, they would not be reckoned as emperors.

11. is himself also an eighth, and is of the seven. The eighth follows Titus, who is the seventh (see note on 17 *init.*). The **eighth** is therefore Domitian, who can be called also **of the seven,** because he comes in the spirit of Nero, the fifth.

12. ten kings: they are described as

the horns of the beast, who constitute his power. They are thus best understood as the governors of the imperial provinces in command of the legions. Any one of them might hope to become emperor, and Galba, Otho, and Vitellius had each 'for one hour' actually done so.

16. these shall hate the harlot, etc.: twice in A.D. 69 Rome had been sacked. Domitian had no obvious heir, and the future was full of such possibilities as the verse suggests.

18. In this and many other interpretations of the visions it may be said that Rome does not *exhaust* their fulfilment. History shows us other 'mistresses of the world' whose rise and fall are governed by the same eternal principles.

XVIII. 1-8. Proclamation of the Fall and Punishment of Rome.

2. a hold of every unclean . . . and hateful bird: this accords with Old Testament prophecy (e.g. Is 13 [21]), but not literally with the seer's own expectation that the fires of Rome would continue to burn for ever (19 [3]).

4. Cf. Mt 24 [15] ff. and Rev 16 [15] with the note there.

6. This command is addressed, not to the faithful, but to the ministers of God's wrath.

9-19. The Threefold Dirge of Kings, Merchants, and Seamen.

13. slaves; and souls of men. The word for slaves is lit. 'bodies.' souls or 'lives' (RVm) is akin to it as meaning 'human livestock' (cf. Ezek 27 [13]).

23. thy sorcery: cf. the charges against Babylon in Is 47 [12].

XIX. The Triumph Song of Heaven, and the Victory of the Word of God over the Forces of the World.—First is heard heaven's rejoicing at the judgement on Rome, in contrast with the lamentations of earth (18 [9-19]). Then the final stage of the struggle is reached, and the beast and his allies are destroyed by the armies of the Lamb.

1-10. Triumph in Heaven at the Fall of the City and the Avenging of the Martyrs.—There are three sets of speakers (as in the dirge of 18), the angels ([1-3]), the elders and cherubim ([4-5]), and the martyrs ([6-8]).

1. **Hallelujah,** i.e. 'Praise the Lord,' a word familiar in the synagogue from the LXX of the Psalms, and taken over by the Christian Church. In the New Testament it only occurs in this passage. Its liturgical use partly depends upon its being a link between the worship of the Church militant and that of the Church triumphant. It has always been specially connected with the joy of Easter.

5. **all ye his servants,** i.e. those who, as martyrs, were already glorified in heaven (cf. 19 [2]).

7. **his wife.** The metaphor introduced here is elaborated later (21 [1] ff.). The Church was already familiar with it from Eph 5 [25]. It implies an intimate and indissoluble union between Christ and the community.

8. The corporate holiness of the Church, fitting her to be the bride, is attained by the individual acts of her members. **fine linen** has naturally found a large place in the vesture of the Church's worship. Here it is in contrast with the vesture of the harlot in 17 [4], 18 [16].

9. One of the seven beatitudes of the book. See note on 16 [15].

9b-10. This incident occurs again in 22 [8-9] in a more suitable context. It may therefore be an interpolation here.

11-21. The Victory of the Divine Word and His Angels over the Beast and the Kings of the Earth.—This vision comes fitly between the destruction of Rome and the beginning of the final glory.

11. The rider on the **white horse** is of course our Lord, and the vision has no relation to that of 6 [2].

12. **which no one knoweth.** Not the name of [13]. 'Only the Son of God can understand the mystery of His own being' (Swete *ad loc.*).

13. **sprinkled with blood.** In Is 63 [1, 3] it is the blood of enemies, and that seems to be the meaning here. **the Word of God:** it is only in the writings of St. John that this title is used in the New Testament (Jn 1 [1] ff.). It is therefore a remarkable link between them and the Apocalypse.

14. **the armies** were at first only angelic, but since the martyrs have now fallen, they too seem to be included. Cf. Ps 110 throughout.

16. **on his thigh:** as names and inscriptions sometimes appear on the thighs of statues.

17-18. The angel from his central position calls to the birds of prey to do their work, in a passage suggested by Ezek 39 [17] ff. Cf. Mt 24 [28].

19. Though Rome has fallen, the Nero-antichrist is not destroyed till now. **the kings of the earth** are those of 18 [3], etc., and are more than the Parthians of 16 [12].

20. **the false prophet:** the 'second beast' of 13 [11] ff., the organized priesthood of Cæsar-worship. **the lake of fire:** the abyss of waters of the Old Testament is

combined with the 'chasm of fire' (En 10[13]) of apocalyptic.*

XX. **Three Visions of the End: the Binding of Satan, the Reign of Christ and Final Overthrow of Satan, and the Last Judgement.**—The many difficulties of this chapter demand some preliminary comment. There have been many lines of interpretation, which may be summarized as follows: (1) The future is being unfolded, and in the sequence of events the fall of Rome and the power of paganism is to be followed by a 'Millennium,' during which the saints reign on earth while Satan's power is stayed. The saints thus anticipate the rest in a preliminary resurrection. Then follows a brief space in which Satan is loosed and gathers the nations for a final attack on the saints. Fire from heaven ends the onslaught, and Satan is punished for ever. The day of general resurrection and judgement follows, and the final death, 'even the lake of fire,' for those not in the book of life. This leads to the final vision of the saints in the 'new Jerusalem' prepared for them in 21[1] ff.

This interpretation led to a belief in the early Church that before the final consummation the Lord would reign visibly upon the earth for a thousand years. Under stress of persecution 'chiliasm' flourished in the 2nd century, and Irenæus (V, xxxiii) quotes with approval the exaggerated statements of Papias about this earth's wonderful fruitfulness during the Millennium. Such chiliastic views were reprobated by the better sense of the Church. But as they claimed to be based on the Apocalypse, there were many who felt obliged to reject the book. Others, such as the Alexandrian school, answered by showing that the seer's language was not literal but allegorical.

It need scarcely be pointed out that the literal interpretation of this chapter is entirely at variance with the method which the rest of the book demands. The number 1,000 must be regarded symbolically and not numerically, and so with the other details. A bodily resurrection of believers before 'the last day' contradicts the rest of the New Testament (e.g. Jn 6[40]); the return of Christ before the general judgement is against the belief expressed in the Apocalypse itself (e.g. 11[18]); and Mt 24, which is at the back of the seer's mind, shows the Church as suffering until the end comes, and not as enjoying a pleasant freedom from trial. If the literalist view survives to-day, it is always in a modified form. Those who, like Dr. Charles, insist on the visions being regarded as a sequence, naturally incline to a 'millennial' view of the seer's words. But the seer is quite clear that it was the 'souls' of the martyrs and not their bodies that he saw (20[4]).

(2) It was St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xx, 7 ff.) who gave the final blow to chiliasm by suggesting the true explanation of the 'Millennium,' and he was almost universally followed (see Swete, 262). The binding of Satan is the fulfilment of our Lord's words (Mk 3[27]) about the binding of the strong man by the stronger than he. It was begun by the First Advent and the work of Redemption. The Millennium is the whole interval from that time till the last conflict. The reign of the saints represents the Church's entire course as the Kingdom of God on earth.* The first resurrection is the spiritual share in Christ's Resurrection which is given to each believer who in baptism rises with Christ (Col 3[1]; cf. Eph 2[6]). The seer, as will be shown below, does not distinguish between the martyrs and other Christians.

(3) A third view yet further spiritualizes the vision, and does not recognize any period of time or course of events, present or future, in the Millennium. It is set forth by Milligan in his *Lectures on the Apocalypse* (211 ff). The 'thousand' simply embodies the idea of *completeness*, in the case both of the binding of Satan and

* How does the seer understand 'the lake of fire'? We should compare 14[9-11], 19[20], and 20[14], and bear in mind throughout Is 66[23, 24] with the interpretation given to it in Judith 16[17]; Ecclus 7[17]; Mk 9[48]. Three ideas seem to be interwoven—destruction, penal suffering, and the permanent vindication of righteousness. In 19[20] and 20[14] the thought seems to be mainly that of destruction. The empire and the organized Cæsar-worship are institutions, while death and Hades are not capable of suffering. In 14[11] (first half)—cf. Is 34[10], 66[23, 24]—vindication of righteousness is prominent: the overthrow of the enemies of God and man is never to be forgotten. But the later Jews plainly understood Is 66[24] to speak of penal suffering, and we cannot eliminate that thought from Rev 14[10, 11], however 'spiritual' the meaning we may attach to it. But there are several considerations to be remembered: (*a*) The seer of the Apocalypse, except in 2 and 3, does not concern himself with the infinite variety of human character. He sees but the broad contrasts of light and darkness, righteousness and sin, truth and falsehood, and thinks of all as at last reaching their zenith before the great division is made (cf. 22[11]). (*b*) The language of apocalyptic is bold imaginative language, not the language of formulated Christian doctrine. (*c*) The teaching of the New Testament seems, in speaking of the lost, to hesitate between the thought of destruction and the thought of abiding penal suffering. Two great sermons may especially be recommended: Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. i, Sermon 1—'Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness'; and Church, 'Human Life and its Conditions,' Sermon on 'Sin and Judgement.'—H. L. G.

* Cf. the footnote on 5[10].

the reign of the saints. The vision describes what Christ did for us, and the reign of the thousand years 'is the portion of every believer who in any age of the Church is a sharer in the life of his risen and exalted Lord' (221). Such a view may suggest that the following vision of the new Jerusalem may also be brought closer to ourselves and described as 'an ideal picture of the true Church now' (229).

The second and third interpretations are not far asunder, and possess an equal devotional value. Even if we believed that the original meaning of the seer was rightly given in the first interpretation, it would be true to say that the Church has only accepted the Apocalypse as a part of canonical Scripture, on condition of its rejection.

1-10. These verses are retrospective and correspond to 12^{1-12} in the first half of the book. Thus the binding of Satan here corresponds to his expulsion from heaven there. The Lord had used both these symbols, and the seer, following Him, uses both also. Now, however, Satan has received a second defeat. The Roman attack has failed as well as the Jewish; and as first he but fell to earth, so now he falls into the abyss below it, and is there confined. In $^{1-10}$ we find a close parallel to $16^{13, 14}$ and 19^{11-21}. The same final attack upon the Church is described from the new point of view adopted in $^{1-3}$.

1-3. Augustine sees here the binding of the strong man by the stronger than he which the Lord had foretold. The abyss is sealed, as the tomb of the Lord had been (Mt 27^{66}). The work of the Lord, continued by the witness of His people, is the manifestation of the truth, and it brings to an end the 'times of ignorance' (Ac 17^{30}). The world may follow Satan and the beast, but in doing so it is now without excuse.

2. The **thousand years** does not represent a fixed period, but is symbolic of the idea of completeness. But the length of Messiah's reign had been a subject of Jewish speculation (e.g. in 2 Esd 7^{28-32} it is given as 400 years), and the seer therefore expresses his vision in terms of earlier thought (cf. the three and a half years in ^{11}, the brief period of witness and tribulation).

4-10. (ii) The Millennial Reign, and the Final Overthrow of Satan and his Allies.—Charles accepts the Millenarian view of this passage. But, in order to justify it, and to get rid of the difficulties presented by 21 and 22, he finds it necessary to make an elaborate rearrangement of the text of the book. He holds that the disciple who edited what the seer left unfinished at 20^{3} places the subsequent visions in a wrong sequence. If 21^{9}-$22^{2, 14, 15, 17}$ are inserted after 20^{3}, the sequence is clear. For first we have the picture of the millennial Jerusalem on earth (in traditional language borrowed from Is 50, 52, 54 and Tob 13^{16-18}); and then the final vision which is the dramatic climax, consisting of 20^{4}-21^{8} and $22^{1, 3-13, 16}$, and giving the final judgement, the new creation, and the eternal blessedness of the redeemed. Of all his reconstructions this is perhaps the most brilliant, but the need for it forms a strong argument against the view which he adopts.

4. The verse falls into two parts, the first relating to the redeemed as a whole, the second to the souls of the martyrs. That the redeemed reign with Christ is not only the doctrine of the Lord (Lk 22^{29}) and of St. Paul (Eph 1^{20}, 2^{6}), but of the seer himself (1^{6}, 5^{9}: cf. footnote there). Cf. the great phrase *Cui servire est regnare*. The reign of the martyrs, with which the seer is here chiefly concerned, is a special, and peculiarly glorious, example of what is true of the whole Church. The fuller the sacrifice (14^{4}), the fuller the glory attained. Here below, the glowing language of the New Testament, as it describes our royal position, sounds like paradox. When it is applied to those souls who have 'outsoared the shadow of our night,' it is not so.

5. The rest of the dead: the non-Christian dead. The contrast is not between the martyrs and ordinary Christians. **This is the first resurrection:** the spiritual resurrection of Christians, of which the present position of the martyrs is the most striking example. Thus the teaching of the seer is not to be contrasted with that of Jn 5^{24-29}, but identical with it. It is the Johannine tradition of our Lord's teaching that he reproduces.

6. the first resurrection must not be pressed as a bodily resurrection to precede that of **the rest of the dead.** It was their souls and not their bodies that were seen (^{4}), suggesting a spiritual line of interpretation. Swete (*ad loc.*) notes the tendency of the book to see facts in pairs, one in the present order, the other, its greater counterpart, in the future

7 ff. Cf. Mt $24^{12, 13}$; 2 Th 2^{3} ff. The binding of Satan, like his fall in $12^{10, 11}$, depends upon the witness and sacrifice of the Church. It is the work of the Lord, but the work of the Lord as welcomed and trusted and used by His people. If there is a great corporate 'falling away'

(2 Th 2 [3]), the great sealed stone is rolled from the mouth of the abyss, and Satan comes forth to deceive the nations once more.

8. Gog and Magog come from Ezek 38 and 39, but through the medium of later apocalyptists who saw in them, not an invading prince and his land, but the world ranged against Israel under Satan's banner.

9. the camp is the city of God.

10. The opposing powers are annihilated; the anti-Trinity will never trouble the Church again. The general question of eternal punishment does not enter here.

11-15. The Final Judgement.

11. Of all the *thrones* in the book, this is the **great** one, and it is **white** in the purity of its judgement. With devout reserve, God the Father is now described on His throne, seen in His own Person, not as in 4 [3]. If difficulty is found in the Father being the Judge instead of the Son, note (1) their inherent oneness, for though the Father 'hath committed all judgement to the Son,' yet 'the Son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the Father do' (Jn 5 [22, 19]). (2) St. Paul could speak indifferently of our appearing before the judgement-seat of Christ (2 Cor 5 [10]) and of God (Rom 14 [10]).

12. the books record the deeds of men, and are suggested by Dan 7 [10], 2 Esd 6 [20], and En 90 [22]. But the **book of life** contains the roll of the citizens of the new Jerusalem (see Lk 10 [20] and Phil 4 [3]). The passage leaves a place for 'faith' as well as for 'works,' though the messages to the seven churches have already revealed a tendency to lay stress upon the latter. **the dead** are here those who had no share in the first resurrection, i.e. the non-Christian dead. The point of view of the seer is again Johannine (cf. Jn 3 [18], 5 [24]), not Pauline (2 Cor 5 [10]). The two points of view are quite compatible. St. John takes little account of the gradations of human character, while St. Paul has them ever in view. We can only escape judgement as we free ourselves from all that needs to be judged.

13. the sea gave up the dead. The language of [11] expresses the creation's sense of its nothingness in the presence of its Creator. There is no real contradiction in this verse. But 'souls' do not come from the sea, but from Hades, and the text may be corrupt.

14. the second death, i.e. the 'eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels' (cf. Mt 25 [41]).

XXI. and XXII. Final Visions of the New Jerusalem.—These visions rank with those of 4, 5, 7, and 14 as among the most beautiful and precious in the Apocalypse. They have suffered much from the literalism of popular interpretation. The precious stones of the City of God can only be rightly interpreted in the light of the vision of God Himself, appearing in the likeness of 'a jasper stone and a sardius' (4 [3]). The heavenly city is described in the language of earthly beauty and preciousness and perfection. The God who is 'light' (1 Jn 1 [5]), and the Saviour who revealed Himself as 'the light of the world' (Jn 8 [12]), have now fully removed all the 'darkness' of earth. But, as St. Augustine foresaw in his *De Civitate Dei*, the city of the future is but the final outcome of the spiritual city which is now being built among men. Already those of the Church, 'as living stones, are built up a spiritual house' (1 P 2 [5]). There are three characteristics of these final visions which must not be forgotten in studying them.

(1) The consummation of human life is revealed as a *social* thing. The Bible begins with a garden, but it ends with a city. All efforts to purge and uplift human society are leading towards God's purpose for the world. The casting out of social evils, by those who 'wash their robes' in the doing of it, prepares for the ideal State, from which is removed 'everyone that loveth and maketh a lie' (22 [15]).

(2) The coming of 'a new heaven and a new earth' involves the disappearance of the old landmarks and institutions and distinctions. But one institution remains, and indeed has become all-embracing. It is the Holy Catholic Church. The little society which began life in a house in Jerusalem has arrived at maturity. She appears as the 'new Jerusalem,' who has absorbed the holy city, and come into her own (21 [2]). It is she who, still inspired by the Spirit who has been her life, gives the final invitation to the heavenly Bridegroom (22 [17]). But the individual is not lost in the community. For there is added the final invitation of the book, which is also its closing promise: 'He that will, let him take of the water of life freely.'

(3) Though the barriers which divide men are all broken down in the heavenly city, they are not reduced to a dead level of similarity. There are *national* characteristics as well as individual among us, and these still survive. The mention of the nations and those who control them (21 [24, 26], 22 [2]) suggests two things. (*a*) Men will still be what they have been, even in

the matter of race. And therefore each race has its own contribution to make. The city cannot be perfect until men 'shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it.' The missionary import of this is obvious. (*b*) Though national distinctions may be ordained of God, it is not so with race animosities. The building of the city of God includes the healing of differences and antipathies with the help of Christ and the bride who is now 'the Lamb's wife,' for 'the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations' (22 [2]).

XXI. 1-8. **The Vision of a New Heaven and a New Earth.**—The final judgement is over, and it remains to picture the union in glory of the Lamb and His Church.

1. new: not merely in time, but in quality (cf. Rom 8 [18-23]). The redemption of man leads on to the redemption of the world. 'They may be the old heavens and the old earth; but they have a new aspect, a new character, adapted to a new end' (Milligan). Cf. note on 13 [1].

2. There was a Rabbinic tradition of an ideal Jerusalem of the future. St. Paul applies this to the Church (Gal 4 [26]), and here the seer does the same. Cf. the footnote on 12 [9].

8. sorcerers. Magic played a large part in the popular religion of Western Asia (cf. Ac 19 [19]).

9-XXII. 2. **The Vision of the Heavenly City.**—See notes on 20 *init.* and 20 [8] for Charles's insertion of this section after that verse, as representing an earthly Jerusalem—an earlier phase, when 'the nations' still existed, as in 21 [24] and 22 [2].

10. a mountain: suggested by Ezek 40 [2] ff., where the vision of the measuring is 'from a very high mountain.'

11. her light: lit. 'her luminary.' The Church herself shines with her Lord's glory. There is a reference to the Old Testament Shechinah (1 K 8 [10, 11]).

12. twelve gates: or 'gate-houses.' The idea comes from Ezek 48 [31] ff.

13. The gates are open upon every side; it does not matter from what quarter men may come. The four great notes of the Church—Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, Apostolicity—all appear in the vision.

14. the twelve apostles: cf. Eph 2 [20]. The Catholic Church is essentially 'Apostolic.' The Church is not just the house of the saints. Its stones are the saints themselves.

16. The measurements represent perfection. Their symbolical character is plain from the height being equal to the length and breadth. The city is a perfect cube, like the Holy of Holies.

17. The verse probably refers to the breadth of the wall.

19. precious stones. Brilliance, transparency, beauty, and variety are the thoughts suggested. Nothing hinders the full shining of the divine light. For the twelve cf. the stones in the High Priest's breastplate (Ex 28 [17-20]). **jasper:** probably the diamond (cf. 4 [3]). **sapphire** seems to be our *lapis lazuli*, and **jacinth** our sapphire.

22. no temple. 'The Eternal Presence renders the new Jerusalem one vast temple' (Swete).

23-26. The language is borrowed from Is 60. The Lord is the 'lamp.' The glory of God shines out through Him: cf. 2 Cor 4 [6].

24. the nations shall walk, etc. If the thought of the present era enters, we may picture the nations which are outside the Christian faith and yet influenced thereby. Every such nation has its contribution to bring ([26]).

XXII. **1. a river of water.** No capital was ever worse off for water than Jerusalem. Every ideal picture of the city rectified this (cf. Ezek 47 [1-12]; Ps 46 [4]; Zech 14 [8]). The description of the river of Eden in Gen 2 [10] may also be in view. The language suggests that the seer identifies the river with the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son. The tree of life bears fruit through its nourishment by Him.

2. the tree of life: cf. 2 [7]. In the new Paradise the tree of Gen 2 [9] is not a single one, but planted in avenues. Apocalyptic had already told of its healing properties (cf. Ezek 47 [12]).

3-5. **The Eternal Presence.**

3. no curse. See Zech 14 [11] and cf. Gen 3 [17]. But here it may mean 'no ban' to separate them from God, thus leading to the blessings which follow.

5. for ever and ever: in contrast with the 'thousand years' of the earlier visions.

6-21. **The Epilogue: Last Words of the Angel, the Seer, and the Lord.**—The visions are complete. The time for parting utterances has come. They are strangely abrupt, and the speaker is often uncertain. Charles suggests that they are only 'the *disjecta membra* of the poet-seer.'

6. he said unto me: probably the angel of the prologue (1 [1]). It is uncertain where his message ends; probably it is at [9], the Lord Himself speaking [10-16]. **the spirits of the prophets:** at the close of this book of a Christian prophet, references to prophecy abound (cf. 18 [20-24], 19 [10]).

7. I come quickly. The Lord speaks

through His angel, but in [20] in His own Person.

8. I John: cf. [19] and also Daniel's closing vision (Dan 12 [5]). **I fell down, etc.:** see note on 19 [10].

9. worship God: these words sum up the messages of the book from our 'fellow-servants the angels,' teaching how God's will may be done 'in earth, as it is in heaven.'

10. Here the closing message from the Lord Himself begins. **Seal not up, etc.:** this implies that the study of its words is to be of immediate use to the Church.

11. Cf. Dan 12 [10]. Good and evil must reach their climax before the end can come. The seer has spoken as if both had already done so, ignoring the mixed character of ordinary human action.

14. The last of the seven beatitudes. **that wash their robes:** an echo of 7 [14]. The change of a few letters gives the AV reading 'that do his commandments.'

15. the dogs: a familiar expression for the unclean and unholy (cf. Mt 7 [6]; Phil 3 [2]).

16. the morning star: a fulfilment of Balaam's prophecy in Nu 24 [17].

17. the Spirit and the bride: i.e. the Church and the Divine Source of her life, who make their response to the message of [12]. The Church's invitation is reciprocated by her Lord (cf. Is 55 [1] and Jn 7 [37]).

18. If any man shall add unto them, etc.: cf. Dt 4 [2] and the order in En 104 [11] not to 'change or minish ought from my words.'

21. The closing benediction reminds us of the epistolary form of the book, and of the intention that it should be read by the faithful.

Bibliography

R. H. Charles, *I.C.C.* (1920), and *Studies in the Apocalypse*; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John* (1906); F. J. A. Hort, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, I-III (1908); W. Milligan, *Expos. Bib.* and *Lectures on the Apocalypse* (1892); C. A. Scott, *Cent. B.* (1902); J. J. Scott, *Lectures on the Apocalypse* (1909); E. C. Selwyn, *The Christian Prophets and the Prophetic Apocalypse* (1900); F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses.*

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE APOCALYPSE

The scope of this Commentary excludes any full discussion of the present arrangement of the book. But many difficulties are eased if we adopt the view that prophecies of different dates are to be found there, and that they have been rearranged in the interest of literary unity. The first series will include those which deal with the persecution of the Church by the Jews (6-11, and probably parts of 17-19); the second will include those which deal with the Roman persecution (12-16, 20, and parts, if not all, of 17-19). 12 forms an introduction to the second series; it looks back over the former persecution, and forward to the latter. The rest of the book is less easy to assign. But persecutions both by Jews and Gentiles appear in 2-3; the former in 2 [9, 10], 3 [9], and the latter in 2 [13]. These chapters, therefore, forming as they do an indivisible whole, must belong to the second series. But the first series, published no doubt at the time at which it was most needed, requires both an introduction and an epilogue; and 1, 4-5, and parts of 21-22 probably belong to it. There is little in 1 to lead us to expect 2-3; it seems to lead most naturally to the vision of heaven in 4-5 and the revelation of the future which follows it.

The reasons for this analysis are as follows: (*a*) In 6-11 the Jewish persecution is everywhere in view. There is not a word against Rome; for 11 [7], rightly interpreted, affords no exception. The outlook is that of St. Paul and of the Church generally in the early years of Nero's reign. Rome is but the expected means of Jerusalem's punishment. Thus the seer follows closely the apocalyptic teaching of the Lord Himself. In 6 [1-8] we recognize 'the beginning of travail' (Mk 13 [7, 8]); in 6 [9-11] we find the echo of Lk 18 [7]; 6 [12-16] describes the portents heralding the final judgement, and the terror of the ungodly at its approach (Mk 13 [24-26]; Lk 23 [30]); 5 provides for the salvation of the faithful remnant of Israel (Mk 13 [14-16, 27]), reminds us that the Gospel must be preached to the whole world before the end (Mk 13 [10]), and refers distinctly to 'the great tribulation' of Mk 13 [19]; 11 speaks of the fall of Jerusalem (Mk 13 [2]), and at once, like the Lord Himself, passes on to the end. There is not the slightest suggestion that a Roman persecution will ever arise. But can we believe that the first series of prophecies originally ended with 11 [19]? Is it conceivable that, after all the preparation for Jerusalem's fall, no more was said about it than we find in 11 [13], or that the seer had nothing to reveal as to the last judgement and the perfected city of God?

(*b*) In 12-16 all is changed. Jerusalem has fallen, but the Lord has not returned; and from Nero the Church has suffered, and from Domitian is about to suffer, worse horrors than ever she had known

before. The change of feeling about Rome is startling to those familiar with St. Paul and St. Luke; and the seer writes of Rome, her empire, her cruelty, and her inevitable fall, with extraordinary power. But the progress of the writer's thought is less clear than in the first series of prophecies; and when he speaks of the approach of judgement and gives visions of consolation, he seems to have little new to say. But God's ways, he knows, with the Church and her enemies are ever the same in principle; and if Rome follows Jerusalem in her persecution, it must follow her in her fall. In the second series, which deals with a persecution far more severe than that formerly in view, there is a deeper tenderness, and a greater sternness; but the thought and imagery are much the same.

(*c*) There is, however, one striking exception—the great harlot who sits upon the scarlet-coloured beast. That she stands for Rome in the book as we read it to-day there can be little doubt (17 [18]). But did she stand for Rome originally, or is she an importation from the earlier series of prophecies, where she stood for Jerusalem? We have seen how extremely abrupt the present conclusion of the earlier series is. But there are considerations of much greater importance. (i) 'The great city' of 11 [8], identified with Sodom and Egypt, is certainly Jerusalem; and it is by no means clear that the Babylon of 14 [8] is not, for the Jews had been in many ways an evil influence. (ii) When we come to the song of triumph over Babylon we find the Lord's teaching reproduced as in the earlier series; 18 [4] recalls Mt 24 [16], and 18 [24] reminds us of Mt 23 [35. 36]. Neither verse is appropriate to Rome. (iii) The image of the harlot is very strange as applied to Rome. It is used of a heathen city in Is 23 [16-18] and Nah 3 [4]. But this use is rare, while its use as applied to apostate Israel is characteristic of the whole teaching of the Old Testament (cf. especially Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea). In the Apocalypse, the harlot stands in contrast with the bride of the Lamb, and the contrast we expect is between apostate Israel and the Church as the Israel of God. Cruel as Rome was, she was no harlot; she had never been called of God to marriage with Him. But (iv) there is an even greater difficulty. As we read the later chapters to-day, the harlot is practically identified with the beast who destroys her. We cannot here distinguish between the city and the imperial power; for the city had no responsibility for the persecutions. 17 [3] admirably depicts the real character of apostate Jerusalem. It ought to have rested upon Jehovah, but it had come to rest upon Rome, to 'have no king but Cæsar,' and had sacrificed the Messiah to retain its chosen support. The beast of its choice ultimately did destroy it. But the imperial power never destroyed Rome, nor is it likely that the seer would have anticipated its doing so. To many the language of the song of triumph will throughout seem to describe a greatness and magnificence far too striking to be attributed to Jerusalem. But a Jew would think otherwise; and it is doubtful whether before Nero's restorations began Rome was really as fine a city as the one she was so soon to destroy.

(*d*) There remain the final chapters. It is always possible to explain the text as we have it before us; but, though we cannot accept Charles's reconstruction for reasons already given, the apparent confusion cries out for explanation. Why, e.g., does the vision of the holy city have two beginnings (21 [2. 9])? We would suggest that the ending of the first series of prophecies has been combined with the ending of the second; 21 [1-8] was the beginning of the vision of the final glory in the first series, and 21 [9] ff. the beginning in the second. It is of course impossible to distinguish with exactness the different sources, but 22 [1-5] probably belongs to the second. The outlook of the seer has been so widened that the thought of the new Jerusalem is not enough, and he supplements it by that of the new Paradise. Not Israel only, but all nations, had been born of Adam, and all had been in him expelled from Paradise; now all are restored.

H. L. G.

NEW TESTAMENT PROPHECY AND APOCALYPTIC

By G. C. Joyce

'We see not our tokens, there is not one prophet more: no, not one is there among us that understandeth any more' (Ps 74 [9]). In these words a late psalmist, belonging probably to the Maccabæan period, expressed his sense of the inferiority of his own age. With longing and admiration he looked back to the days

when God's prophets had spoken out, boldly prefixing to their messages the words, 'Thus saith the Lord.' In the post-exilic period Judaism had become more and more the religion of a book and of a tradition. Scribes and Pharisees studied the law with elaborate care. They built up round it a hedge of ordinances. But the spontaneous flow of inspiration was dried up. Religious leaders drew their material from what had been said and written in the past. No one taught with authority, or ventured to claim that he spoke directly in God's own name.

Sudenly the voice of John the Baptist rang out, and set men wondering. Was the long silence to be broken at last? Was there once again a prophet in the land? No doubt the conception of prophecy, floating in the minds of those who thus hoped and pondered, was loose and vague. Popular thought is not controlled by exact definitions. Yet they knew more or less clearly what they meant by a prophet. Men counted John as a prophet, though he did no miracle (Jn 10 [41]). It was admitted that the essence of prophecy lay not in the power to work miracles, but in the immediate derivation of the prophet's message from God Himself. At the same time it seemed only natural to the men of that age that a prophet's mission should be confirmed by supernatural signs. The woman of Samaria hailed Jesus as a prophet because of the supernatural knowledge of the events of her life which He displayed. Conversely the absence of this power might be regarded as negative evidence disproving the claim to be a prophet. 'This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who, and what manner of woman this is' (Lk 7 [39]). To describe Jesus as the prophet of Nazareth is the answer of the multitude to the question, Who is this? To His own disciples Jesus was the prophet mighty in deed and word. Thus the movement which culminated in the formation of the Christian Church began with the recognition by Galilean peasants of the reappearance of prophecy.

After the Resurrection the recognition of prophecy passed on to a new stage. The conviction that their risen Lord had been a prophet and more than a prophet lay at the root of the new faith. And further, in virtue of its possession of the gift of the Spirit which He had promised, the primitive community became intensely self-conscious of its own prophetic inspiration. Joel's prediction had come true (Ac 2 [17]). Outward manifestations, such as the ecstatic utterance of 'tongues,' were unhesitatingly accepted as proof of this new and widespread inspiration.

Presently a process of differentiation set in. The endowment of the Spirit bestowed on all believers assumed different forms in different individuals. How varied were the spritual gifts is clearly brought out in St. Paul's discussion of their use (1 Cor 12-14). Wisdom, knowledge, faith, gifts of healing, the working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, the interpretation of tongues, were all manifestations of the selfsame Spirit. And from the tenor of the discussion we may learn that amongst these gifts St. Paul assigned great importance to that of prophecy. He estimated it as of much higher value than 'tongues.' The speaker in a 'tongue' uttered sounds that were no doubt expressive of his own uplifted feelings. But the sounds conveyed no meaning to others, and therefore were in no sense edifying, unless indeed there were also present someone endowed with the correlative gift of interpretation, who could put into intelligible language the speaker's ecstatic outpourings. In contrast with 'tongues,' St. Paul emphasized the superiority of prophecy. The 'prophet' spoke intelligibly to all. Yet presumably he too spoke ecstatically. Certainly he was endowed with the power to read the secrets of the hearts of some who listened to him. It was precisely this circumstance which produced so overwhelming an effect on the mind of any stranger who might be attending the meeting of the Christian community (1 Cor 14 [25]). Presumably a modern observer would have said that the Christian prophet possessed the faculty of telepathy in a remarkable degree. But, however the faculty be described, it was stimulated and controlled by the Holy Spirit so as to minister to the edification of the Church.

It is also most interesting to notice how St. Paul's words imply that the prophet was in communication with spiritual influences or beings. Who or what these spirits were is not indicated. There is no hint or suggestion that they were the souls of the departed. The dominant partner in the relation was the prophet. 'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets' (14 [32]). Trouble would certainly follow if these spiritual influences were allowed to get the upper hand. They were to be kept in subordination. Moreover, utterances delivered under

these conditions were not to be regarded as above criticism. On the contrary, the ability to criticize spirits was just as definite a spiritual gift as tongues or prophecy ('to another discerning of spirits,' 12 10). The character of the spiritual influence under which a prophet was speaking could be inferred from the nature of the terms in which he referred to Jesus. If blasphemies were uttered, obviously the influence was evil. Did the utterance recognize the lordship of Jesus, it might be assumed that the influence came from God (12 3). It is remarkable that precisely the same problem with regard to the criticism of spirits is discussed in 1 John; and precisely the same criterion is suggested. Denial of the Incarnation was a proof that the spirit under whose control the prophet spoke was evil. Men who submitted themselves to influences of this kind were false prophets (1 Jn 4 1-3).

The practical difficulty of distinguishing between the true and the false prophet was no new problem. It had seriously exercised the minds of devout worshippers of Jehovah under the old dispensation. Recognizing that God spoke to His people through the mouth of selected messengers, they were called upon to decide in particular cases whether the person who made this claim on his own behalf was, or was not, a true prophet. If both Hananiah and Jeremiah prefaced their words with the declaration, 'Thus saith the Lord,' and at the same time flatly contradicted one another, how should the Israelite decide whom to believe and whom to obey (Jer 28 11)? The author of the Book of Deuteronomy states the issue in plain terms, and lays down a fundamental rule (Dt 13 1-3). If any person alleging himself to be a prophet were to recommend the worship of other gods, he was forthwith to be rejected, even though he might work miracles, and even though he might foretell events that afterwards came to pass. In other cases let them wait and see if the prophet's predictions came true (Dt 18 21 f.). Thus in Israel the preliminary test to be applied might be expressed in the words, Is this supposed prophecy consistent with faithfulness to Jehovah as the only God of our nation? In the Christian Church the question became, Is this prophecy consistent with the recognition of Jesus Christ as Lord Incarnate? The relation between the two tests and the transition from one to the other throw light on the essential character of prophecy, and on the organic connexion between Old Testament and New Testament prophecy. The prophet taken in isolation from his predecessors and successors remains a baffling and perplexing figure. His function becomes intelligible only when it is seen that he serves as a link in a connected chain of revelation, through which the self-manifestation of God is conveyed to man. Each Old Testament prophet contributed his quota in the way of preparation for the final revelation through the Son. Each New Testament prophet might contribute his quota in the way of explanation and interpretation of the supreme Truth that had come into the world.

The study of New Testament prophecy illustrates a point in the theory of revelation which perhaps has not always obtained sufficient recognition. The inspiration of the prophet is indeed an indispensable factor in revelation. It is not the only one. In order that men may rest assured of the truth of revelation there must be introduced the complementary factor of inspired discrimination. 'Let the prophets speak by two or three, and let the others discern' (1 Cor 14 29). The procedure which St. Paul recommended to the congregation at Corinth is precisely that which the Church has adopted under divine guidance in dealing with the Bible. In the various books of the Bible there lie before us the utterances of the prophets, by two or three, i.e. relatively speaking few in number. Biblical writers speak to the world, as the prophets at Corinth spoke to their fellow-Christians. But at Corinth a revelation was not confirmed until the others had judged it. So the multitudes of the faithful in successive generations are called upon to exercise their proper function of discerning the truth within the prophets' messages, and in so doing administer a spiritual gift no less indispensable than was the original inspiration of the prophets. Divine revelation involves both factors, communication to the individual and judgment by the community. The acknowledgement of the necessity of this subsequent discrimination introduces no measure of uncertainty as to first principles. For recognition of the Divine Unity and of the supreme truth of the Incarnation furnish the impregnable foundation on which the whole subsequent process of reverent and devout discrimination or criticism is built up. In the Bible the prophets have spoken. Their words belong to the past. Upon the present is laid the obligation to

carry forward the continuous task of discrimination. It is a process that must continue while time lasts. For thus building upon the foundation laid of old time by the prophets each generation in turn may make its contribution to man's advancing knowledge of God.

The Christian prophet resembled his Old Testament prototype in being the vehicle through which the divine will was communicated to men. His inspiration occasionally assumed the form of prediction of the future. Thus a time of general scarcity was foretold by Agabus (Ac 11 [28]). The same prophet predicted St. Paul's arrest at Jerusalem (Ac 21 [11]).

Hitherto we have been considering the prophet from the point of view of the personal endowment, which distinguished him from his fellows. The same term, however, was also used to designate a rank in the Christian ministry. Next in order to the Apostles came the prophets. Apostles and prophets are associated together as the foundation on which the fellowship of the Church is built up (Eph 2 [20]). They form part of the gift of an ordered ministry which the ascended Christ has bestowed upon His Church (Eph 4 [11]). About these official prophets the New Testament tells us little, and there are many questions concerning them which must be left unanswered. We do not know, for example, whether they were promoted into the ranks of the ministry by means of a ceremony of laying on of hands, or owed their position to a recognition by the Church of their possession of special spiritual endowments. We do not know whether they were empowered to discharge such ministerial functions as the celebration of the Eucharist and ordination. The suggestion has been put forward by certain writers that the primitive Christian ministry was organized in two sharply contrasted divisions, on the one hand a so-called 'charismatic' ministry of Apostles, Prophets, Teachers; on the other hand, a local ministry of Bishops and Deacons; and that the powers which originally belonged to the first division were subsequently transferred to the second. In this essay it would be out of place to discuss the theory, but it may be pointed out in passing that there is no warrant in the New Testament for restricting the possession of a charisma to the Apostles and Prophets. On the contrary, the Pastoral Epistles indicate that the charisma was an endowment for general ministerial work conveyed through the laying on of hands (1 Tim 4 [14]; 2 Tim 1 [6]). This is entirely consistent with St. Paul's language in 1 Cor 12, where it is implied that every rank and grade of the ministry has its appropriate spiritual gift.

An early Christian document, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, contains a considerable amount of information with reference to the Christian prophets. We learn that they were authorized to celebrate the Eucharist in their own words: 'Permit the prophets to offer thanksgiving as much as they desire' (Did., 10). It further appears that they were not attached to any local church, but went from place to place, never stopping more than three days with any one Christian community. Evidently when the book was written certain abuses in connexion with these itinerant prophets had already come into existence. There were false prophets going about, who abused their position by requiring food or money to be given them. Against such the community needed to be on its guard. The facts thus described are curious and interesting. It is, however, unfortunately impossible to be sure when and where the situation which gave occasion for the writer's warnings can have existed. Opinions as to the date and origin of *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* are much divided. At any rate it is certain, from the general evidence of Church history, that the itinerant ministry of the prophet soon disappeared. Authority was concentrated in the hands of the local ministry.

Closely connected with Christian prophecy is the kindred subject of Christian apocalyptic. In the Book of the Revelation of St. John we possess the work of a prophet. Both at the beginning and at the end of the book the author describes his work as 'this prophecy' (Rev 1 [3], 22 [18]). It would be too much to assert, that the secret of the Apocalypse has at last been solved by recent commentators; but it is at any rate true that much new light has been thrown upon its complicated problems. This result has followed from the recognition of the fact that the Apocalypse must be studied not in isolation, but as a single specimen of a large class of literature. Beginning with the Book of Daniel, composed in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-163 B.C.), Jewish apocalypses had appeared in considerable numbers. These books, which for so long lay neglected and practically forgotten, are now highly prized for the information which they furnish. What is

illustrated is the temper of mind and emotional bent of those who wrote and those who read these books. It is now widely held that the way for Christianity was to a great extent prepared by this apocalyptic literature and by the prevalence of the eschatological outlook which it fostered. A recent school of criticism has indeed maintained that our Lord's own mind was saturated with eschatological ideas, and that the whole of His teaching presupposed the imminent end of the world. It is a grossly exaggerated view, which can only be maintained in defiance of much that the Gospels record. But it is true that our Lord did make use of apocalyptic language and images, and appealed to the apocalyptic expectations of His contemporaries. The discourse recorded in Mk 13 exhibits the characteristic features of apocalyptic. So much is this the case that some commentators hold the chapter to be the work of a Christian prophet who believed himself to be charged by the Spirit to convey to the Christian Church an apocalyptic message in the name of the risen Jesus (cf. A. E. J. Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, 181). Certainly the first generation of Christians looked for a speedy Second Coming, and evidence of the expectation is apparent in certain apocalyptic passages of the epistles, of which the most remarkable is to be found in 2 Th 2. It is highly probable that many utterances of Christian prophets were apocalyptic in character, and that some of these utterances were reduced to writing, and that thus a Christian apocalyptic literature came into being. Among the apocryphal books circulating in the early Church appeared several apocalypses, the most popular of which was known as the Apocalypse of Peter. But it is, of course, in the Apocalypse of St. John that we find Christian apocalyptic at its highest and best. The Christian prophet who wrote the book drops the usual veil of anonymity, and lays claim to direct inspiration. The discrimination of the Christian Church, after several centuries of deliberation, decided in favour of the validity of his claim. And a comparison of his work with that of other contemporary apocalyptists will explain and justify the verdict. He has a remarkable independence of standpoint and outlook. Though he uses the language and imagery of apocalyptic, he does not wander away, as do so many others, into fields of vague and unprofitable speculation on natural and supernatural mysteries. The truths which he sets forth in symbolic figures and visions are fundamental. Whether he is employing a literary convention, or whether he actually fell into trances, and in that condition saw the mysterious visions which baffle all description, cannot be certainly determined. But in view of what we know about Christian prophecy the latter alternative seems to be the more probable. If this be the correct account of the matter, the author was a peculiarly gifted seer to whom the Holy Spirit conveyed in this way a vivid apprehension of certain great and eternally valid principles. However strange and unfamiliar and even antipathetic to the modern mind may be the form of apocalyptic writing, yet the lessons which this great apocalyptist has to teach are of profound moment to the modern world. With a passion of conviction he proclaimed the coming of Christ's Kingdom in spite of the most desperate opposition which all the banded powers of evil could offer. He had an unconquerable faith in the final victory of the good cause. He knew that only through the faithfulness of disciples, even unto death, could this triumph be brought to accomplishment. He was a true prophet.

THE SACRED SITES OF THE GOSPELS*

By P. Usher

A description of the sites in Palestine traditionally connected with the Gospel narratives is best grouped under three headings—Galilee, the Jordan, and the district of Jerusalem.

(1) **Galilee**—(*a*) *Nazareth.*—The site of Nazareth is not doubtful. It is En-nâsira, a town of over 7,000 inhabitants, 1,155 feet above sea-level, in the hills of Lower Galilee. It has been a place of decaying trade since the building of the Haifa-Deraa branch of the Hejaz railway, and depends for its prosperity on the visitors and pilgrims who come in large numbers every year. Considering the great wealth

* This article presupposes acquaintance with the earlier article on *The Geography of Palestine*. See OT, 634 ff.

and population of Galilee in the New Testament times, we may reasonably assume that, though a provincial town of no great importance, the population of Nazareth was then considerably larger than it is to-day.

There is a large number of particular sites identified by traditions of very varying value with incidents in the Gospel narrative. Of these only two need detain us. The Latin Church of the Annunciation, a typical Italian building of the 18th century, is the successor of a Basilica built by the order of Constantine on the site of what Christians of the 4th century venerated as the House of Mary. A certain site is the Orthodox Cathedral of the Annunciation, built over the one spring of Nazareth. Here after the manner of Eastern women must Mary have come accompanied by her Son to draw water.

But it is the situation of the whole town of Nazareth which is so remarkable and impressive. It lies in a cup of the hills in a sheltered position. But from the hill, Nebi-Sain, immediately behind the town and climbed in ten minutes, there is a view unrivalled in Galilee. To the north are the sites of Sepphoris and Ptolemais in a beautiful broken and fertile country of hills and valleys. To the south the whole great plain of Esdraelon lies at one's feet, from Carmel on the right jutting out into the Mediterranean to Beisan (Scythopolis) on the left in the Jordan Valley. It is an extraordinarily rich land, and was in New Testament days thickly cultivated and densely inhabited. It is a serious mistake to picture the place of our Lord's upbringing as obscure and remote from the great world. It lies just off the great main roads, certainly; but at that period it was in the middle, and commanded a complete view, of an extremely rich and prosperous province—one, moreover, covered with wealthy Greek cities, the unmistakable evidence of the greatness of the Imperial civilization and power. To anyone acquainted with the topography and archæological remains of Galilee, a most remarkable feature of the Gospels is their complete indifference to the flourishing Hellenist civilization which surrounded the Galilean ministry.

(*b*) *Cana of Galilee.*—This is traditionally identified with Kefr Kenna on the road from Nazareth to Tiberias, and the ruins of a Byzantine church with an Aramaic inscription have been found there. An alternative site has been suggested at Khirbet Qana, six and a quarter miles to the north of Kefr Kenna. It is argued that Qana is a closer reproduction of the Hebrew name than Kenna; that it accords better with Josephus's references to Cana; and that it was on an important Jewish road. On the other hand, while there is a spring preserving the name el-Qana between Nazareth and Kefr Kenna, no tradition exists in connexion with Khirbet Qana (el-Djelîl), nor have any traces of a church been found there. On the whole the balance of probability rests with the traditional site.

(*c*) *Capernaum.*—Two identifications have been proposed for this town, the headquarters of our Lord's Galilean ministry. The generally accepted spot is Tell Hûm, which is probably a corruption of Kefar Tanhum, an alternative name to Kefar Nahum (hence Capharnaum), both names being derived from two Jewish worthies, Tanhum and Nahum, whose tombs were venerated here. An alternative site has been suggested at Khân Minyeh behind the German hospice at el-Tâbigha. It is argued that this is nearer to the plain of Gennesaret, with which Capernaum seems to be connected in the Gospels; that it is on the present route of traffic to Damascus, which would explain its fiscal importance; that it is nearer than Tell Hûm to the spring el-Tabigha (Heptapegon), to which Josephus applies the name Capharnaum; and that it possesses a better beach. It is difficult not to feel that those who support this view have been influenced by the more dramatic situation of Khan Minyeh. Against it must be set the extensive and imposing remains which have been found at Tell Hûm. There are traces of ruins for the best part of a mile along the shore, the remains of a very magnificent synagogue, and near to this an hexagonal mosaic which is believed to have been connected with the baptistery of a Christian church. The deciding argument in favour of Tell Hûm is the inability of supporters of the Khan Minyeh site to suggest any known place to which the ruins at Tell Hûm can correspond, an argument which becomes more impressive as the size and grandeur of these remains is being revealed by excavation. The predominant opinion is that the present synagogue ruins cannot be earlier than the 2nd century, when Capernaum was a centre of Jewish piety; but there are those who argue that the style of its decoration implies an earlier and less rigid standard of Judaism, and that it is in fact the synagogue built by the centurion and visited by Christ.

(*d*) *Chorazin.*—This is to be identified with the ruins known as Kherazeh, lying inland two and a half miles from Tell Hûm.

(*e*) *Bethsaida Julias.*—The opinion that Bethsaida and Bethsaida Julias were two separate places is now generally discredited. The site is east of Tell Hûm at the north-east of the plain beyond the mouth of the Jordan on a hill called Et-Tell. It was in the open country near Bethsaida (that is, somewhere in this plain) that the feeding of the multitude took place.

(*f*) *The Country of the Gadarenes.*—The identification of the locality of the story of the Gadarene swine is complicated by textual corruptions in the Gospels. It is here assumed with Lagrange that the true reading in Mark and Luke is 'Gerasenes' and in Matthew 'Gadarenes.' These would be general names descriptive of the territory across Jordan in the regions of the Decapolis. Gerasa (Gerash) in Transjordania was certainly one of the principal cities of this league. Gadara was nearer to hand between Tiberias and Scythopolis (Beisan). None of the evangelists say that the town in the story was called Gerasa or Gadara. We cannot go further than to say that it was a town in the district of the Gerasenes or Gadarenes. The only place on the eastern shore of the Lake which fulfils the conditions of the narrative is Qala'at el-Husn, the ancient Gamala. This is the only site of a town of any size on the eastern shore. There are numerous tombs between the town and the Lake. The town itself was at the summit of a lofty and precipitous hill. It is true that the precipice does not descend directly into the Lake; but it would have been possible for the 'possessed' swine, gathering panic-stricken momentum down the precipice, to have continued their headlong course over the intervening plain. Nor can we be certain that the boundaries of the Lake have not changed to a minor extent since New Testament times.

An alternative site, strongly supported by Sanday among others, is that known to-day as Kursi. Their view is that 'Gerasa' and 'Gadara' are attempts to give a Greek rendering of a local name which has survived as Kursi. But Kursi fulfils none of the conditions of the narrative. There are no indications that it was ever a town. The tombs (such few as there are) are behind the ruin towards the hills. Moreover, Kursi is probably an Arabic name meaning 'seat.'

In conclusion, something should be said about the general characteristics of the northern shore of the Lake, the scene of the major part of our Lord's recorded ministry. It possesses a very mild winter climate owing to its depth (680 feet) below sea-level. The plains of Gennesaret, at the north-west corner from Mejdel (Magdala) to el-Tâbigha and round the Jordan mouth, are of immense fertility and can produce tropical crops of all kinds. Besides this capacity for supporting a thriving settled population, the district was enriched by the great trade route from Syria to Egypt, which passed along the northern shore. Capernaum was the easternmost town of Herod Antipas's tetrarchy, Bethsaida the westernmost of that of Philip. Hence these towns had a political significance also. The region should be pictured as one inhabited in New Testament times by a prosperous, active population, in constant communication with the outside world, and keenly interested in the perilous problems it was necessary for the Jewish people to solve. Less narrow and less official in its attitude than Jerusalem, no better spot could be imagined for the first teaching of the Gospel to the people of God.

(2) **Samaria and the Jordan Valley**—(*a*) *Jacob's Well.*—The site outside Nablus, known to-day as Jacob's Well—Bir-Yakoub—and the village Askar (Sychar) are both marked on the Madeba Mosaic, a mosaic floor discovered by the present Metropolitan of Nazareth, representing Palestine and the Holy City in the 5th and 6th centuries. The two sites have, therefore, a long history behind them. They are less than a mile apart. The Well, as the narrative (Jn 4^{3}) indicates, is of great depth (about 100 feet). It is probably not fed by a spring, but is a great cistern for collecting rain-water.

(*b*) *The Sites of John's Baptisms.*—There are three such places mentioned in the New Testament: (1) The Jordan (Mt 3^{6}; Mk $1^{5\text{-}9}$); (2) Bethany beyond Jordan (Jn 1^{28}); (3) Ænon near Salim (Jn 3^{23}).

(1) Tradition from the 4th century places the scene of our Lord's baptism on the Jordan some six miles north of its mouth into the Dead Sea, near the Orthodox monastery of the Prodromos. It is clear that this identification must be at least approximately correct. John was preaching and baptizing in a place where crowds from Jerusalem and all Judæa assembled. This would clearly be somewhere reasonably near the place where the Jerusalem-Jericho road emerged into the Jordan Valley.

(2) The correct text of Jn 1 [28] appears to be 'Bethany beyond Jordan.' The memory of the place had been lost by Origen's time, and 'Bethabara' was therefore substituted. Père Féderlin suggests a site called Khirbet et-Tawil, about 300 yards from the Jordan in the Wadi-Nimrin. There is here a 'tell' with plenty of water below it in winter. The Jordan is by no means always a safe place for bathing, as many tragedies among modern pilgrims have shown. It is entirely probable that John's baptisms took place sometimes in the Jordan, sometimes in safer waters near by.

(3) Lagrange believes that Ænon is the transcription of an Aramaic word signifying 'springs,' and that the meaning of Jn 3 [23] is 'John was baptizing at the springs near to Salim.' Fourth-century tradition fixes this spot in a district eight miles south of Beisan (Scythopolis), where there is a large number of springs. One of these—ed-Deir—is surrounded by Byzantine remains. There is little doubt that this tradition is correct. Nothing can be said for the theory that Ænon was at Ain-Farah near Jerusalem.

(*c*) *Jericho.*—The Herodian Jericho lay further west than the modern town of that name close under the Judæan mountains at the mouth of the Wadi-Kelt. It was situated in an astonishingly fertile oasis, watered from 'Elisha's Fountain' (Ain Soultan) by the site of the Canaanite Jericho and the aqueducts coming down Wadi-Kelt from Ain-Farah and Ain-Douk. Possessing a perfect winter climate, it was almost a fashionable suburb of Jerusalem away in the hills. Between the two towns stretches for twenty miles the completely barren mass of mountains descending 4,000 feet from the Mount of Olives and known as the Wilderness of Judæa, the scene of our Lord's temptation.

(3) Judæa—(*a*) *Bethlehem.*—Five and a half miles south of Jerusalem in the Judæan highlands lies Beit-Lahm (Bethlehem), a town of over 6,000 people, nearly all Christians. It is an attractive place, a market for the surrounding country districts, beautifully situated, with magnificent views. The great Basilica of the Nativity is a magnificent building, the work of Constantine and Justinian. It is said that it escaped destruction in the disastrous invasion of Chosroes II because the Persians recognized their fellow-countrymen in the mosaics of the Magi. The actual Cave of the Nativity (cave-stables are still common in Palestine) is identified by evidence of a very high order. Justin Martyr, who had lived in Palestine, refers to it in the 2nd century. Origen appeals in support of the Faith to the universal consent of Christians and pagans as to the site. St. Jerome tells us it was deliberately profaned by the Emperor Hadrian and turned into a shrine of Adonis. Only an extravagant scepticism would doubt the evidence.

(*b*) *Emmaus.*—The identification of Emmaus is very doubtful. Lk 24 [13] is a disputed reading. Was Emmaus 60 or 160 stadia from Jerusalem? At the latter distance is the village Amwâs. This is undoubtedly the Emmaus of the Maccabees, which was renamed Nicopolis in honour of Julius Africanus. Tradition early identified it with the Emmaus of the Gospels, and there are remains of a fine Byzantine church. But 160 stadia is surely too great a distance to accord with the story of the disciples' hurried return to Jerusalem after supper. (The place is in fact 176 stadia—twenty miles—from Jerusalem.) It is probably a corruption which crept into certain texts under the influence of the Palestinian tradition. Where, then, was Emmaus, distant 60 stadia from Jerusalem? At approximately this distance is el-Kubeibeh, which has been venerated as Emmaus since Crusading times. There are remains of a Byzantine church in the Crusaders' building; but this cannot well have been in connexion with the Emmaus tradition, as we have clear evidence that in Byzantine times Amwâs was the accepted site. A third view is maintained, among others by Lagrange and Sanday. Qolonieh (Colonia) on the Jerusalem-Jaffa road is identified with the 'colonia' of 800 veterans settled by Vespasian after the Jewish Wars at Ammaoûs, called in the Talmud 'Mosa.' The actual site may well be at Khân Beit-Mizzeh, near to Qolonieh and about 40 stadia from Jerusalem. It would, therefore, be necessary to assume that Luke overestimated the distance.

(*c*) *The Birthplace of the Baptist.*—The home of Zachariah (Lk 1 [39-40]) has been located by the Palestinian tradition adopted by the Crusaders at the beautiful village of Ain Karim, at the head of the fertile valley of Sorek, four and a half miles west of Jerusalem. Luke says that the house of Zacharias was in a city in the *oreine* of Judah, which, according to Pliny, was the toparchy of which Jerusalem was the capital. It may be said that Ain Karim fulfils the somewhat meagre Gospel data and possesses a very long tradition in its favour. In Byzantine times a place near Beth Sour called Beit-

Zakaria (the house of Zachariah) was venerated as the place of St. John's birth. It is so identified in the Madeba Mosaic, and the remains of a small church have been found there.

(*d*) *Bethany, Bethphage, and the Mount of Olives.*—These form a closely connected group in the Gospel narrative. The identification of the Mount of Olives is undoubted. It is the Jebel et-Tour, the central of the three summits of the range of hills overshadowing Jerusalem on the east. From the other side extends a magnificent view over the wilderness of Judæa, which falls sharply in twenty miles to the Jordan plain and the Dead Sea 4,000 feet below, with the great Moabite mountains in the background. At the spectator's feet to the west lies the City of Jerusalem, with the Haram esh Sherif, the Temple area, in the foreground. The sudden splendour of this view as it opens out to the traveller from the east brings home the full meaning of the 'Dominus flevit' (Lk 19 [41]). The great Basilica of the Eleona was built by St. Helena on the Mount of Olives in commemoration of the sacred events in the Gospel narratives which took place there. To-day the village of El-Azariyeh is known to Europeans as Bethany. It is probable that the village of New Testament times lay on the shoulder of the mountain slightly higher up, where there are some ancient tombs. It is described by St. Jerome as 'in latere montis Oliveti.' The site of Bethphage is more doubtful. It was nearer Jerusalem, 'in monte Oliveti,' possibly where the village of et-Tour stands to-day.

(4) **Jerusalem.**—Before dealing in detail with the various sacred sites in the Holy City, it will be well to discuss the general topographical problems on which the particular identifications depend.

Jerusalem is bounded on the east, south, and west by the precipitous slopes of the Hinnom and Kedron Valleys. Its vulnerable point has always been its north wall. There is a third valley bisecting the city from the Damascus Gate in the north to the Pool of Siloam in the south, which is called by Josephus the Tyropœon Valley, the Valley of the Cheese-mongers. Still perceptible to-day, it has been greatly filled up with débris as a result of the repeated destructions of the city. The original level was 30 feet below the present surface at the Damascus Gate, and more than 70 feet below further down the valley.

It is now generally agreed by archæologists that the original City of David lay, not on the western hill known to Christian tradition as Sion, but on the southernmost part of the eastern hill, which is called to-day Ophel, and is outside the present walls. The converging evidence which establishes this conclusion is overwhelming. In the first place, the only spring in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem is the Ain Sitti Miriam (the Virgin's Fountain), which is in the Kedron Valley, in the side of the eastern hill. From the western hill it would have been entirely inaccessible in time of war. Moreover, the elaborate series of successive artificial workings which have been discovered in connexion with the Virgin's Fountain proves its vital importance in early days. Secondly, excavation has revealed traces of the continuous occupation of Ophel by man since 2000 B.C. Conversely, while certain remains which appear to have been the homes of cave-dwellers have been disclosed on 'Sion,' nothing has ever been found there which could reasonably be connected with the Jebusite city captured by David. The third and convincing piece of evidence is the shaft discovered by Warren, descending from the surface of Ophel and connected by an elaborate system of workings with the Virgin's Fountain, thus providing the inhabitants with access to their water supply from within the walls. The correspondence of this discovery with the narrative of Joab's exploit in the capture of Jerusalem (2 S 5 [6-9]; 1 Ch 11 [4-9]) is complete. It may, therefore, be concluded as certain that the original Sion or Jerusalem was situated on Mount Ophel, the southern spur of the eastern hill, and now outside the city walls.

Under Solomon came a great expansion. He built the Temple of Jehovah on Mount Moriah, whose summit, the sacred rock still venerated to-day, had doubtless been a 'high place' for centuries before its dedication to the worship of the God of Israel. At his time, too, in all probability the city was extended to the western hill, its north wall (the 'first wall' of the archæologists) running along the rock scarp just behind the modern street called Suweikat Allun. The city would then have assumed roughly the shape of the Greek letter π.

We come now to the all-important question of the 'second wall' of the later kings of Judah as restored by Nehemiah. This was the wall which stood in the time of our Lord. Its southern line need not detain us. It diverged from Solomon's wall by enclosing the lower Valley of the Tyropœon between the two hills, and the Pool of Siloam to which the great

tunnel of Hezekiah had diverted the waters from the Virgin's Fountains. On its line to the north depends the authenticity of the site of the Holy Sepulchre. The other evidence for the site will be discussed in due course. Here we are merely concerned with the question of whether it lies outside the 'second wall.' If it does not, it cannot possibly be right.

Our documentary evidence for the line of the three northern walls is the testimony of Josephus. He informs us that the *first wall* began at the Tower Hippicus and ran eastwards towards the Temple; that the *second wall* began at the Gate Gennath in the first wall and encircled the northern suburb as far as the Antonia; that the *third wall* began at the Tower Hippicus and enclosed a much larger district, joining the Temple wall at the edge of the Kedron Valley. It is not disputed that the Tower Hippicus stood where now is the tower of the Turkish Citadel, popularly known as David's Tower. But where was the Gate Gennath? Those archæologists who find difficulty in believing that the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre was outside the second wall assume that this gate was at or near the position of the present Hebron (Jaffa) Gate. They then point out that a line thence to the Damascus Gate (where there are remains of much earlier building) must have taken a very unnatural course to exclude the Holy Sepulchre. Quite so. But the assumption that the Gate Gennath was at or near the Hebron Gate is purely arbitrary. Josephus says that the first and third walls started from the Tower Hippicus, but that the second wall began from somewhere else. Now the Hebron Gate and the Tower Hippicus are *in the same place*, within a stone's-throw of each other. And the Gate Gennath, from which the second wall began, cannot have been on the western wall of the Upper City, for no one could build a wall down a precipice into the Valley of Hinnom. It must, therefore, have been in the (first) northern wall to the east of Hippicus. And it must have been some distance further east. In the north-east corner within the first wall was the huge Palace of Herod. It is impossible to suppose a city gate in a position which would entail all its traffic passing right through the courts and gardens of the Royal Palace. And the Palace was defended on the north by three huge towers, which themselves were built on a rocky scarp thirty cubits high—an incredible position for a city gate. Moreover, we know from Josephus that the 'Monument of John, the High Priest,' lay outside the first wall here. It is difficult to imagine a sepulchral monument in the thickly populated district within the second wall; while the Christian tradition, the archæological evidence of the tombs of 'Joseph' and 'Nicodemus' in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the express statement of Josephus, make the existence of tombs in this district certain. Add to this the traces of ancient walls found in the region of the Muristan and further north, and we shall be safe in assuming that the second wall followed approximately a line from the Damascus Gate to the west of the street at the present time leading to the sukhs (the Tarik Bab el-Amud) until it joined the first north wall running east and west, to the south of the Suweikat Allon. When, therefore, we come to discuss the claim to authenticity of the accepted site of the Holy Sepulchre, we need not be disturbed by the theory that it was inside the second wall.

The Third Wall.—The main line of the third wall, begun by Herod Agrippa but not completed owing to his fear of the Emperor Claudius, has been settled by recent excavation (1924-1926). It ran from the Tower Hippicus in a north-westerly direction, the direction of the present wall; but proceeding further, it turned east along a line from the present Italian Hospital to the present American Archæological School, a line along which great lengths of magnificent foundations have been unearthed, and then turned southwards to join the north-east angle of the Temple area.

Sites within Jerusalem—*The Pool of Siloam.*—We may now proceed to the consideration of the particular sites within the city of Jerusalem mentioned in the Gospels. Of these the greater number are best dealt with chronologically, as they occur in the narratives of the Passion and the events immediately preceding it. But first there is the question of two sites of miraculous healings mentioned in the 4th Gospel. The Pool of Siloam (Jn 9^{1-7}) may be certainly identified with the pool still existing at the exit of the tunnel, made by Hezekiah to bring the waters of the Virgin's Fountain within the city walls, at the southern end of the Tyropœon Valley.

The Pool of Bethesda.—The question of the site of the 'Pool of Bethesda' (Jn 5^{1-9}) is more complicated. The reading of Jn 5^{2} is disputed. 'Now there is at Jerusalem near the "Sheep . . ." a pool which is called in Hebrew Bethesda (or Bezatha or Bethzatha).' We follow La-

grange in supplying 'Gate' after 'Sheep' and preferring the reading 'Bezatha.' In this case the district is certain. The Sheep Gate lay to the north of the Temple, east of the Tower of Antonia. Bezetha or Bezatha is precisely the name given by Josephus to the suburb which had grown up outside the walls in this region. In this district near the Church of St. Anne two great pools have been discovered, of which one was certainly revered as 'Bethesda' from early Byzantine times. Moreover, votive offerings have been discovered, which make it clear that the pool was then regarded as possessing curative powers. But there is a difficulty. The pools at St. Anne must always have been fed by rain-water; yet the phenomenon of the 'troubling of the water' strongly suggests an intermittent spring like the Virgin's Fountain. Dr. Macalister therefore proposes to identify 'Bethesda' with Siloam. But this must be rejected, as it involves the extreme improbability that John would narrate two different miracles of healing at the same pool and call that pool by two different names. Dr. Masterman therefore suggests the Virgin's Fountain itself. This possessed a pool in New Testament times which would be disturbed at regular intervals by the intermittent uprush of the spring. He also adduces evidence that the Virgin's Fountain has been regarded as possessing curative properties by the Jerusalem Jews in recent times. It is a theory which would suit well the details of the story, but which cannot be reconciled with the topographical indications of Jn 5[2]. In the meantime St. Anne's holds the field.

The Temple.—We may now turn to the events of our Lord's last visit to Jerusalem. Between His triumphant entry and the night of His betrayal He spent His days teaching in the Temple precincts, and withdrew each night to Bethany over the Mount of Olives. This course of action was doubtless partly dictated by motives of prudence, though there is no doubt that it was customary for a large proportion of the vast concourse of pilgrims in Jerusalem for the Passover to camp out on the Mount of Olives or elsewhere. The site of the Temple is undoubted. It is the area covered to-day by the Haram esh-Sherif, which has the same boundaries as the Third Temple of Herod the Great, except that it extends further to the north. The Temple of Herod, while of an opulent magnificence which aroused the simple wonder of the Galilean peasants, must, to judge from the surviving monuments of Herodian architecture, have been built in a debased and florid imitation of classical art vastly inferior to the graceful Byzantine and Saracen buildings which cover the sacred area to-day.

The Cœnaculum.—The first of the sites connected with the Passion is the Cœnaculum, the House of the Last Supper. The traditional Cœnaculum has been seized by the Moslems on the strength of a late and worthless tradition that it covers the tomb of David. It is, in point of fact, on the western hill, while David's city, as we have seen, was on the eastern. The present building was constructed by the Franciscans in 1333, but the site was venerated for long before that period, and there is evidence for it right back to the time of Hadrian. Epiphanius definitely states that Hadrian found all Jerusalem destroyed, except a few buildings and the little church which marked the site of the 'upper room'; and the exegetists seem agreed that by the name 'upper room' the same place is designated throughout the Gospels and the Acts.

Gethsemane.—From the upper room our Lord and His disciples went to the place called Gethsemane. From the Gospels we learn that this was a garden, over the brook Kedron, towards the Mount of Olives. The traditional garden agrees with these data. When in 1920 the foundations were being dug for a new Latin basilica of surpassing ugliness, under the foundation of the Crusaders' church which it was known had stood there were found on a slightly different orientation the traces of a much larger and earlier Byzantine building, which carries back the tradition of the present site of Gethsemane to the 4th century. In any case it must be approximately correct.

The Appearances before Annas, Caiaphas, and the Sanhedrin.—Our Lord was taken bound in the small hours of the morning, first to the Palace of Annas, then to that of Caiaphas. The traditional sites of these palaces on the western hill are covered by two very lovely Armenian churches, dating originally from the 12th century, but themselves replacing much earlier buildings. The alleged site of the house of Caiaphas had been adorned under the Christian emperors by the great basilica traditionally called St. Peter in Gallicantu, built in memory of St. Peter's repentance. Of late years the claim has been made that this basilica was not where the present Armenian Church stands, but to the south-east at the place where a number of most interesting but perplexing ruins

have been uncovered by the Assumptionist Fathers. It is not disputed that the two palaces stood on the western hill, and where certainty is not obtainable, their traditional sites adequately commemorate the events therein enacted.

From the Gospel narratives it appears that our Lord was brought before the High Priest and Sanhedrin twice, once in the Palace of Caiaphas before daybreak, and again more formally in another place later on. This would presumably be the Council Chamber of the Sanhedrin, which stood to the west of the Temple, near or on the site of the Turkish Mehkemeh.

The Prætorium.—From the Sanhedrin our Lord was sent bound to Pilate at the Prætorium. It is disputed whether the Prætorium was at the Palace of Herod on the western hill or at the Antonia to the north of the Temple. It must have been at one of these two places. The evidence apart from tradition is slightly in favour of the Palace of Herod. Josephus says that it was the residence of the Procurator Florus, and as Pilate caused golden shields to be hung there, it may be presumed that it was his residence also. On the other hand, the Procurator normally lived at Cæsarea, and as Pilate had come specially to Jerusalem to supervise the preservation of order during the Passover, it is quite possible that he may have taken up his quarters at the Antonia, where the cohort was stationed whose function it was to keep watch over the Temple. Ecclesiastical tradition has gradually hardened into a definite acceptance of the Antonia as the Prætorium, but the belief is not sufficiently ancient or unvarying to be of historical value.

Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre.—From the Prætorium Jesus was led outside the city to be crucified. Before we estimate the value of the evidence for the traditional Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, there are certain things which must be said. We have already suggested that the most serious cause of doubt to modern scholars, the assumed line of the second wall, does not give rise to difficulty on a careful comparison of the statements of Josephus with the available archæological evidence.

Secondly, we have not sufficient information in the Gospels to enable us to determine *de novo* these sites. If the men of the 4th century made a mistaken identification, then all knowledge of the exact location of Calvary and the Sepulchre is irretrievably lost. From the New Testament we learn that these two places were close together (Jn 19[41]) outside the gate (Heb 13[12]); that Calvary was on a roadside is certain from the jeers of the passers-by. This agrees with Quintillian's statement that it was the Roman custom to perform executions by a high-road. Even during the war in 1915-1917 the Turks hanged those condemned to death by the road just outside the Hebron Gate.

This information is insufficient to identify any particular site, but it does rule out absolutely the hill known as 'Gordon's Calvary' and the curious cultus-shrine of the Garden Tomb. As was said above, it is clear from the Gospels that Calvary was beside a road, and it is quite certain that no road ever did or could pass over 'Gordon's Calvary,' which is really the northerly spur of Bezetha.

There is nothing to be said for the theory that Golgotha was the name of the Jewish place of execution, if such a thing ever existed. And we are dealing with a Roman, not a Jewish execution. It is nowhere said in the New Testament that Golgotha was a hill. Golgotha, 'the place of a skull,' seems to have been a local place-name, and one knows in how many hundreds of ways names of that sort are given to particular spots. And the origin of this name is hopelessly lost in the mists of the past.

What, then, is the evidence for the traditional sites? In the first place, it is quite certain that the present Calvary and Holy Sepulchre are those uncovered and identified on the instructions of Constantine. The discovery of the Madeba Mosaic and the excavation in the Russian Alexander Hospice in Jerusalem have put this beyond all possible doubt.

We have to ask on what lines the identification proceeded, and what evidence there is of a tradition of the Holy Places in the first three centuries. We are fortunate in possessing the testimony of Eusebius, a contemporary of the events he describes, the close personal friend of the Emperor Constantine on whose instructions the work was carried out, and himself, as Bishop of Cæsarea, resident in Palestine at the time. Eusebius states that moved by Divine inspiration Constantine determined to search for the sacred sites, and gave orders for the necessary work at Jerusalem. For this purpose the Temple of Venus and the elevated platform on which it stood were demolished. Eusebius says the terrace had been raised and the Temple built at the instigation of demons. Jerome and later writers assert that it was built by Hadrian with the express purpose of

desecrating the Christian site. Jerome says that the same thing happened at Bethlehem, where he had every means of knowing the truth; and Hadrian certainly desecrated the site of the Jewish Temple by converting it into a temple of Jupiter. When the work of excavation was completed the sacred tomb was found to be intact; and this is rhetorically described as a miracle by a use of language still common to-day. The chances of its destruction during Hadrian's building must have been enormous.

The story as it stands is sober, consistent, and bears the hall-mark of truthfulness. The fact that legend later collected round the original story is only an instance of what happens in all history.

It remains to be asked what grounds the discoverers of the Holy Sepulchre had for believing they were excavating in the right place. The fact that they set to work at a locality then, since Hadrian's remodelling of the city, well within the walls, in itself suggests they had strong reasons for so doing. If they had not known, they would have searched outside the city, like our confident modern supplanters of tradition.

The statement is often made that the early Christians took no interest in these questions, and that Jerusalem had been abandoned for so long by the Christians that no memory of them could have survived. But the evidence of Hegesippus is that the exile of the Christian community at Pella was of very short duration; and the records of pilgrim visits to Jerusalem take us back to Melito in the middle of the 2nd century. Constantine's work gave the seal of official approval to an already established habit of pilgrimage. He removed many obstacles from the pilgrims' path. But he did not create an interest in any cult of the Holy Places which had been non-existent.

To sum up, the authenticity of the traditional sites of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre is not susceptible of demonstrative proof (which is in such matters normally unavailable); but it is supported by evidence which would be considered sufficient for an identification connected with an event in secular history.

Bibliography

It is impossible to give a remotely exhaustive list, but the following are among the more important books to be consulted: Flavius Josephus, *De Bello Judaico*, Book V; Eusebius, *Life of the Blessed Emperor Constantine*; Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 1841 (the starting-point of modern critical enquiry); George Williams, *The Holy City* (J. W. Parker, 1845) (a piece of fine conservative scholarship); W. Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (Oxford, 1903); L. H. Vincent et F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem* (2 vols.) (the standard work, not yet complete); L. H. Vincent, *Jérusalem sous Terre*; J. M. Lagrange, *S. Marc* (Gabalda, 1920), *S. Luc* (Gabalda, 1921), *S. Matthieu* (Gabalda, 1923), *S. Jean* (Gabalda, 1925); all volumes of the *P.E.F. Quarterly Statement*, and the *Révue Biblique* of the Dominicans at Jerusalem. The best introduction to the subject is: R. A. S. Macalister, *A Century of Excavation in Palestine* (R.T.S., 1926); and the best detailed guide: B. Meistermann, *Guide to the Holy Land* (Burns and Oates, 1923).

THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

By C. H. Turner

When Erasmus published in 1516 the first printed edition of the Greek Testament, what was in his mind was simply to set the Greek text against the Latin Vulgate version, not to compare different Greek MSS. with one another. So little careful was he to collect MS. evidence from different sources, that in one case, the concluding verses of the Revelation, when his MS. failed him, he retranslated the Latin into Greek out of his own head. The question in debate was in effect between the Vulgate Latin and the Vulgate Greek: and Erasmus got into greater trouble for making a new Latin translation and placing that, instead of the Vulgate, in the parallel column to the Greek, than he did for publishing the Greek itself. But the beginnings of the textual criticism of the Greek New Testament may perhaps be traced back to the reproach levelled at Erasmus by his opponents over his omission of the *comma Iohanneum*, that is, the text about the Three Heavenly Witnesses in 1 Jn 5 ^{7}. Neither he nor his opponents knew that

it was absent from all the earlier MSS. of the Vulgate: but it had no place in Erasmus's Greek MS., it was not to be found (so a correspondent from Rome assured him) in a Vatican MS. 'written in very ancient characters'—probably the great Vatican codex B is meant—and Erasmus was so confident of his case that he promised to insert the verse in his next edition if any single Greek MS. could be found to contain it. One such Greek MS. was produced in England which did have the words, and Erasmus duly incorporated them in his third edition in 1522. He did not know how recent the MS. was, for it had in fact been written about 1520, perhaps with the direct intention of providing the evidence for which Erasmus had asked.

The episode had at least raised the problem of the examination and comparison of Greek MSS. But the time had not yet come for the fruitful investigation of so vast a field. One other early edition of the Greek Testament was indeed wholly independent of the text of Erasmus, for it was in type before Erasmus's first edition appeared—the great Complutensian Bible, produced at Alcala or Complutum in Spain under the auspices of Cardinal Ximenes, of which the text was based on 'very ancient MSS.' sent from Rome. And a beautiful little New Testament published by Simon Colinæus at Paris in 1534, though it employed both the Erasmian and Complutensian editions, made use also of the MS. material in Paris libraries. With these exceptions the text of all editions published down to the middle of the 18th century repeated for practical purposes the edition of Erasmus.

What became technically known as the *Textus Receptus*, or Received Text, is not indeed any one of the five editions of Erasmus, but the third (and only folio) edition of those published by the Stephanus (Estienne) family in Paris. Two small Greek editions had appeared at this press in 1546 and 1549: the edition with which we are concerned followed in 1550, and was succeeded in 1551 by another small edition, in which the text, divided for the first time into verses, had Latin versions, the Vulgate and the Erasmian, one on either side of it. But the folio edition of 1550 had another distinguishing mark about it, which gives it on this ground too an important place in history. It was the first edition, and for more than a century the only edition, with an *apparatus criticus*. On the inner margin of each page are given variant readings with a Greek numeral attached to each, *α'* being the Complutensian printed text. *β'–ις'* fifteen Greek MSS., mostly Parisian (including the uncial codex L, now Paris *Bibl. Nat.* Gr. 62); but *β'* is the codex Bezæ, D of the Gospels and Acts, which had been brought to the Council of Trent from Lyons by the Bishop of Clermont, and was collated in Italy by friends of Stephanus for the purpose of his edition.

There the matter long remained. Mention should be made of the *Notæ ad Varias Lectiones Editionis Græcæ Evangeliorum* of the distinguished scholar Lucas of Bruges (1606), if only because he was probably the first to adduce the combined testimony of Greek MSS., Versions, and Fathers. But the interest of writers on both sides in the period of the counter-Reformation lay rather in the history and texts of the early Christian centuries after A.D. 100; the New Testament was common ground to all, accepted as it stood without question, and the issue of the moment was whether the witness of the centuries that next followed bore out the interpretation of the New Testament given by the one side or that given by the other.

When the development of New Testament textual criticism first began in earnest, our English Universities played a leading part: landmarks in the history are the Polyglot Bible of Brian Walton, Bp. of Chester (1657); the small critical edition of the New Testament by Bp. Fell of Oxford, to which 'accesserunt variantes lectiones ex plus 100 MSS. codicibus et antiquis versionibus collectæ' (1675); the stately folio of Mill, still indispensable to students for its full and masterly introduction (1707); Hearne's edition of the Laudian Codex E of Acts (1715); Wilkins's edition of the Coptic version (1716); and Bentley's *Proposals for Printing* on critical lines parallel texts of the Greek and Vulgate Latin NT (1720)—a scheme that, alas! never came to completion. Meanwhile two great contributions to criticism and knowledge were made in France: Richard Simon, the Oratorian, published between 1689 and 1695 a series of four books on the text, the versions, and the principal commentators of the New Testament, which may be said to have laid the foundations of modern critical enquiry: Pierre Sabatier, the Benedictine, collected the whole of the pre-Vulgate Latin evidence for the text of the Bible in three folio volumes, of which the last (the New Testament) appeared in 1751. If Germany was later in the field, the works of the two precursors of a long and illustrious line of textual critics of the New Testament,

Bengel (1734) and Wetstein (1751), are still read, though doubtless more for the exegesis of Bengel and the illustrative quotations of Wetstein than for textual criticism. The great scholar who broke through the pernicious tradition of printing the *Receptus* as the text (and confining proof of its inadequacy to the apparatus or notes), and thereby inaugurated the series of modern critical editions, was J. J. Griesbach (Halle, ed. 1, 1774-1777; ed. 2, 1797-1806). He, too, led the way in the classification of the various authorities for the New Testament text by dividing them into three families—two earlier families, named 'Western' and 'Alexandrian,' a third and later 'Constantinopolitan.'

That classification has in essentials held its ground down to the present day. We may call Griesbach's 'Constantinopolitan' group by the alternative names Asiatic with Hug, or Syrian with Hort, or with still greater definiteness Antiochene or Lucianic—for the origin of this recension is with great probability to be sought in the work of Lucian the presbyter of Antioch, martyred about 311—but we are nearly all now agreed that this text, which throughout the Middle Ages was the official text of the Orthodox Church, and thence passed into the edition of Erasmus and so became current in the West also, has no real support in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, and can have no claim to represent the genuine text of apostles and evangelists. The real issue lay and still lies between Griesbach's two other groups, the Western and the Alexandrian. Both groups have indeed been subdivided. Hort distinguished, within Griesbach's Alexandrian group, texts which had undergone at Alexandria characteristic minor modifications—these he still called Alexandrian—and texts which on his view had escaped them, which he preferred to call 'Neutral.' The Western group has been swollen by the accession since Griesbach's time of more or less closely related evidence from the East; for the Old Latin MSS., the Græco-Latin codex Bezæ (D), and the Western Fathers, Greek and Latin, have now been reinforced by texts in greater or less measure agreeing with the Western texts against the Alexandrians, namely the Old Syriac version, Greek MSS. in Eastern Asia Minor, and even in Egypt, Greek Fathers in Palestine and in Egypt itself, so that the name Western as used to include all these authorities is a complete misnomer. So far as these new witnesses represent the texts of Palestine, Antioch, or Asia Minor, earlier than the 4th century, they may ultimately be found to constitute a third early group side by side with the properly Western and the Alexandrian. Griesbach himself at the end of his life (1811) had shown that Origen in later works used not an Alexandrian, but a 'Western' text. Hug realized how much the most widely spread of all texts in early times was the Western text, and gave it the name of the 'common edition.' Hort himself admitted (p. 126), 'that during that part of the ante-Nicene period of which we have any direct knowledge, "Western" texts were at least dominant in most churches of both East and West.' That is a conclusion which is obviously of the highest importance. The truth which it embodies has been far too lightly estimated in the succession of the great critical editions which commenced with Griesbach, was continued through the 19th century by Lachmann (Berlin, ed. 1, 1831: editio maior, Greek and Latin, 1842-1850), Tregelles (London, 1857-1872), Tischendorf (editio octava critica maior, Leipzig, 1864-1872), and culminated in Westcott and Hort (Cambridge and London, 1881).

These editions may be roughly said to show an increasing dependence on the text of the earliest Greek uncial MSS. The *Textus Receptus* was in possession: it had in its favour a prescription of two and a half centuries of printed texts; and the first of the great Greek Bibles to be made accessible to Western scholars, the 5th-century codex Alexandrinus, A (*Brit. Mus. Reg.*, I, D), presented to Charles I in 1628 by Cyril Lucar (patriarch first of Alexandria and then of Constantinople), bore out on the whole the same type of text. It required time, and the presentation of the decisive evidence of antiquity in favour of other types of text, and lastly the cogent and conclusive argumentation of Hort, before the Received text, at least in England, could be effectively dethroned. But to-day there is probably no scholar among us who would venture to raise a voice in its favour. Whether with the great critical editors we lean almost exclusively on the evidence of the earliest Greek MSS., or whether we urge the claim of the Western text for further consideration, we are all agreed that, by comparison with these two groups, the Constantinopolitan (= Byzantine or Syrian or Received) text is a later development, which against the earlier texts weighs little or nothing in the balance.

The issue being thus for the moment

narrowed down to two types of text, we proceed to consider why it was that during the 19th century preference was given more and more exclusively to one of the two, that represented by the earliest Greek MSS.

(1) There was first the natural preference for evidence in the language in which the New Testament books were written. Obviously there are many minute points where no version can guarantee for us absolutely the exact run of the original. Latin, being a language nearly related to Greek, is indeed for this purpose vastly more helpful than Syriac or Coptic; but all languages have their own idioms, and, moreover, the earliest translations were more careful to render the thought than the words, and may in one sentence translate with meticulous faithfulness, and in the next give the effect of the Greek in a mere paraphrase. Editors down to Westcott and Hort knew only one Greek MS. of the Gospels of a purely Western type, the Græco-Latin D (codex Bezæ), a MS. combining an element of remote antiquity with idiosyncrasies of its own beyond most other MSS.: and they were inclined to identify the Western text with the text of D, and because of the obvious weaknesses of D to hold it cheap accordingly.

(2) Next there was the romance attaching to the discovery—literal discovery in the one case, practical discovery in the sense of open access to it in the other—attaching for the scholars of the later 19th century to the two oldest MSS. of the Greek Bible. The codex Vaticanus, B (*Vat.* Gr. 1209), had long been known as the greatest treasure of the Vatican library, and its Old Testament text lay at the base of the Sixtine edition of the LXX (1587): but it was only very gradually that full use of it was accorded to editors of the New Testament, and no continuous text of it was published till after 1850. Of the codex Sinaiticus, ℵ, parts of the Old Testament were found at Mount Sinai by Tischendorf in 1844 (43 leaves, now at Dresden), but the rest, including the whole New Testament, did not come to light till 1859, and was not transferred to St. Petersburg till 1862, when Tischendorf had completed his edition of the MS. Small wonder that the recovery of these primitive texts exercised disproportionate influence on the first editors who had the privilege of using them in full: Tischendorf's edition, it is universally admitted, paid undue deference to ℵ, his own discovery; Hort, with more reason no doubt, pinned his faith almost entirely on B.

(3) But, besides their age and their novelty, these two MSS. shared with the other oldest MSS. then known, C and A, an otherwise unequalled magnificence both of form and of contents. They stand alone among our primary witnesses as having contained the whole Greek Bible. No one of them indeed is complete in its present state. C is a mere collection of palimpsest fragments—brought from the East after the fall of Constantinople to Florence, and by Catherine de Medici to Paris (now *Bibl. Nat.* Gr. 9), and published in full by Tischendorf in 1843—fortunately much less fragmentary for the New Testament than for the Old Testament; though, as the MS. was twice systematically corrected to other forms of text and finally had Greek writings of Ephrem Syrus written on the top of it, its evidence is singularly hard to disentangle. A is the most complete of all the four, though even A has three lacunæ in the New Testament, of which the most serious is Mt 1^{1}-25^{6}; but A, as has already been said, gives a text of the New Testament in substantial accord with the then recent Syrian recension, and so does not really come into competition with the rest. ℵ is very defective for the earlier books of the Old Testament, but complete for the New Testament: B, on the other hand, is fairly complete for the Old Testament, but comes to an end in the New Testament after Heb 9^{14}—the Pastoral Epistles, Philemon, and Apocalypse being wanting.

As regards the relative antiquity of these four Bibles, A and C are of the 5th century, B and ℵ of the 4th. B was probably written before A.D. 350, ℵ somewhat later than B. Both were products of the movement which followed the Peace of the Church under Constantine, when all the treasures of calligraphic skill and sumptuous material (the more durable vellum, i.e. the skins of sheep or deer, had by then begun to supersede the more friable papyrus) were devoted to the reproduction of the Holy Scriptures. But both, even in that age, can only have been meant, such is their size and splendour, to serve the use of some important Church or some very distinguished individual. It is possible, especially in view of the fact that the contents of the Bible of B show very close contact with those of the Bible of St. Athanasius, that we have in B the Bible known to have been prepared at the orders of Athanasius about 340 for the use of the Western Emperor Constans: we may therefore conjecture that when complete it contained, after the Apocalypse, the *Didache*

and the Shepherd of Hermas. It is possible again that ℵ, if it belonged from the first to Palestinian Cæsarea, was written between 340 and 379, during the tenure of that see by the Bps. Acacius and Euzoius, who, as St. Jerome tells us, undertook the task of having the papyrus MSS. of the library of their church recopied upon vellum. Anyhow, it is reasonable to suppose that MSS. of this unusual size and beauty were based upon the best available texts of their church or neighbourhood. They have in that sense a valid claim to rank as witnesses of the 3rd century.

Yet, admitting to the full the presumptive force of these considerations, there are serious and indeed insuperable difficulties in accepting Hort's conclusions, at least in the wide range which he gave to them, as the last word on the subject.

(1) In the first place, the evidence for Hort's so-called Neutral text comes, it is hardly too much to say, exclusively from one corner of the Christian world. The only version which gives thoroughgoing support to it is the Memphitic of Lower (Northern) Egypt: the earlier Egyptian version, the Sahidic of Upper Egypt, is not so definitely 'Neutral.' The only fathers ranked on the same side are the Alexandrians Clement and Cyril with Origen, and again it is the two later of the three, Cyril and, in those of his books that were written at Alexandria, Origen, who are most consistently 'Neutral'; for Burkitt showed in 1899 (*Texts and Studies*, v, 5) that there is an unexpectedly large 'Western' element in Clement's text. The only MSS. giving a Neutral or approximately Neutral text were, as far as we can tell, all written in Alexandria or copied from MSS. written there. Hort indeed was so acutely conscious of the presumption on this ground alone against the validity of his whole theory of textual history, that he was 'inclined to surmise that B and ℵ were both written in the West, probably at Rome' (p. 267), though he added that the ancestors at least of ℵ were 'in great part Alexandrian.' But the earlier these MSS. are, the more profoundly improbable is it that they can be Roman, for it was only the influence of St. Jerome that secured the admission of the Epistle to the Hebrews into the New Testament Canon of the Roman Church—not to say that both MSS. give Hebrews in the Eastern order before the Pastoral Epistles, not in the Western order after them: and Hort's positive arguments come to so little that even scholars who accept his textual theories in general have sacrificed this element in them. It is now hardly doubted by anyone that B was written in Alexandria: and though ℵ was probably written at Cæsarea, it does not give a Cæsarean text, for the writings of Origen, after he left Alexandria in 231, indicate that he used at Cæsarea a New Testament text more 'Western' than Alexandrian in type. It would seem that the phenomena of ℵ could be satisfactorily accounted for on the supposition that it represents the rewriting on vellum of papyrus texts brought by Origen from Alexandria, preserved in the library of Cæsarea, and perpetuated as part of the Origenian tradition by the devoted care of his admirers a century after his death.

(2) The conclusion is inevitable that in the so-called Neutral text we have a text representative of the Church of Alexandria alone. But it is still possible to hold that a text propagated at Alexandria was likely to be purer than any text propagated elsewhere: and this is in effect the form in which Hort's theory is now represented and defended. It is beyond doubt that Alexandria, above any other place in the Roman Empire, was the home of the scientific study and reproduction of Greek literary texts; and the history of Origen's early training, and of the catechetical school of the Alexandrian Church in general, amply illustrates the close dependence of the Christian scholarship of Alexandria on the tradition of classical scholarship there and on the teaching of the classical grammarians. We may be certain, therefore, that much labour was devoted by the Christian scribes and scholars of the Alexandrian Church to the propagation of exact texts of the Holy Scriptures. But it is quite another question, and one which does not seem to have been fully faced, whether the natural result would have been in all respects the faithful reproduction of the apostolic autographs. For there are two great dangers to which texts such as those of the New Testament are specially exposed when they pass through the hands of professional scholars and theologians. Unlearned scribes in copying texts will make mistakes of all sorts: the letter of the texts will progressively deteriorate, marginal notes and illustrative comments may creep into the text, and the ultimate result may well be at first sight deplorable. But the texts, all the same, will be reasonably free from anything like systematic rehandling or the conscious removal of difficulties; and the sort of corruptions that will arise will be

more or less the same all the world over. The mentality of the average scribe is what any modern editor of any text gets accustomed to deal with as an essential preliminary to his work. From errors of this sort Alexandrian MSS. will be relatively free, and the texts they present will be superficially attractive. But, all the same, they will be suspect from two points of view, and the more suspect in proportion to the linguistic and other attainments of those responsible for them. Grammatical solecisms will be assumed to have come in through transmission of the texts at the hands of ignorant scribes, and will be silently corrected. More serious and more difficult to detect are the changes that bear on subject-matter: and it is even in proportion to the reverence in which the subject was held that a special danger arises. We are not left solely to *a priori* presumptions here. The one Greek classical author who was regarded in something of the same light as Christians regarded apostles or evangelists was Homer; and we know a good deal about the treatment of the text of Homer by the scholars of Alexandria. Most of us would be surprised when first brought to realize how drastic was the treatment meted out to the Homeric texts under the subjective canons that ruled the Alexandrine school. Different grammarians no doubt varied a good deal in the extent to which they allowed themselves licence in correcting the text; but even the greatest of them did not hesitate to remove whole lines or emend words and phrases, where the contents of the transmitted text ascribed to gods and kings sentiments or behaviour that appeared 'unfitting,' 'unseemly,' 'undignified,' or even 'inappropriate.'

Now by the 2nd and 3rd centuries after Christ this attitude was a tradition already of long standing at Alexandria. Have we any reason at all to suppose that Christians educated in this school would have been insensible to the influence of its critical principles, when dealing with the texts which possessed for them all and more than all the sanctity which the text of Homer had for their heathen contemporaries and predecessors? Of course they would not have thought of intentionally tampering with the sacred texts; but neither would heathen critics have intentionally tampered with any text that was in their view really Homer's. In both cases the presupposition would be that the things which caused offence were not genuine at all, but must be corruptions that had arisen in the course of transmission, so that the critic's work was held to be simply a restoration of the original text. Of course also there was an undeniable difference in the extent to which the New Testament writings gave occasion for some of the criticisms that were brought against the transmitted texts of the writings of Homer. But the underlying principle was there, even if the opportunities for its application were in one important respect more limited.

Therefore it is legitimate and even necessary to approach the texts of the New Testament produced in Alexandria with a certain reserve. If we want to put into a single phrase the contrast between non-Alexandrian and typically Alexandrian texts, we shall probably not be far wrong if provisionally we label the former 'unrevised' texts and the latter 'revised' texts. In both there will be corruptions, and in the former the corruptions are likely to be more extensive and more progressive, but in the latter they will be of a sort more difficult to detect, because less obvious on the surface.

The theory here outlined is of course provisional only, and we must proceed to subject it to such tests as are at our disposal, of which the principal must always be the examination of individual readings or groups of readings. But before doing that, a word must still be said about such actual knowledge as we have of the work done in Egypt on the New Testament text in the course of the 3rd century.

Origen, the most illustrious name in the annals of the Christian scholarship of Alexandria, may for this particular purpose be eliminated. His great collection of Old Testament Texts, the Hexapla, does indeed serve to reveal the *a priori* methods of the school; for, starting from the assumption that the Hebrew text must be right against any version, he brought the LXX into compulsory agreement with the Hebrew by obelizing all that was not in the Hebrew, and by adding under asterisks from another version whatever was in the Hebrew but not in the LXX. But as regards the Gospels he tells us expressly, in a passage preserved in the Old Latin version of his *Comm. in Matt.* (Delarue, III, 671), that he did not venture to do anything of the sort, 'in exemplaribus autem Novi Testamenti hoc ipsum me posse facere sine periculo non putavi.' He is discussing Mt 19 [19], and finds on grounds of the context much difficulty in the words 'and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' words which are absent from the parallels in Mark and Luke: he is inclined,

therefore, to conjecture that they are not genuine in Matthew, basing his right to do so on the admitted existence of discrepancies between different MSS. of the New Testament: 'sive per neglegentiam scribentium sive ex temeritate quorundam . . . vel propter eos qui quod ipsis videtur in emendationibus vel adiciunt vel subducunt.' It is important to note that Origen is well aware of the existence of both classes of corruptions of the New Testament texts to which attention was called above: those that were unconscious and unintentional, and those due to conscious addition or omission. At the same time, if there had been an attempt in his time to revise the text of the New Testament, he had neither shared in it nor approved of it: and if we are right in connecting the text of ℵ with the text used by Origen, the immediate ancestors of that MS. at any rate did not to his knowledge represent any such recension.

Nevertheless, there is good reason to believe that before the end of the 3rd century some such definite edition, of the Old Testament and of the Gospels at least, was carried through at Alexandria: for Jerome on more than one occasion brings into connexion the names of Lucian and Hesychius as authors of the recensions of the Old Testament respectively in use, the one in Antioch and Constantinople, the other in Alexandria and Egypt, while in his preface to the Vulgate Gospels he speaks of the New Testament MSS. 'that took their name from Lucian and Hesychius.' The judgement of Jerome on the character and the merits (or, as he thought, the demerits) of these recensions may well be open to question—he may even have applied to both of them the characteristics that he knew to be true of one of them—but his witness to the fact of their existence and of their relation to Antioch and to Alexandria respectively must be accepted as final. Hesychius then did edit the Gospels, and did edit them at Alexandria: at what date we do not know, but probably somewhere about the year 300. And one recent critic of the New Testament, Hermann von Soden, attributes great importance to his work, and goes so far as to label with his name the whole group of 'Neutral' and Alexandrian MSS. Hesychius's date, if rightly fixed, seems to preclude this: even the two leading MSS., B and ℵ, differ too much to have a common origin anything like as late as 300. Probably enough what we might call unofficial revision of the text of the New Testament had been going on at Alexandria from the end of the 2nd century, and ℵ may represent an early stage of this process. But the hypothesis may be worth considering that the Hesychian edition became the official text of the Alexandrian Church, and that it is directly represented for us in the 4th century in codex B.

Applying, then, the tentative results of this investigation to a text like Hort's, resting mainly on B, we shall expect to find that the text attains a high degree of excellence, but we shall not be surprised if it also betrays some traces of revision. At best, we need to test it by the standard of some other text or texts whose corruptions are likely to be of a different kind: and among these other texts the most obvious group for the purpose, whether because of its antiquity or because of its defined geographical range, is that which belongs to the Western or Latin half of the Empire. Of this group the principal constituent members are the Græco-Latin MSS. D (Gospels and Acts), E_2 (Acts), and D_2 (St. Paul's Epistles); the Old Latin MSS. of the Gospels *a b e ff*, with *h* (Matthew only) *i* (parts of Luke and Mark) *k* (parts of Mark and Matthew). In date these range from the 4th (*a* and perhaps *k*) and 5th centuries (D *e ff h i*) to the 6th (D_2 and *b*) and 7th centuries (E_2): in place, *k*, now at Turin, and *e*, now at Trent, represent Africa; *a* (Vercelli) and *b* (Verona) North Italy; *i* (Naples) South Italy; *ff* (now at Paris), *h* (now in Rome), with D (now at Cambridge) and D_2 (Paris) Gaul; E_2 (now in Oxford) perhaps Sardinia. Besides these MSS., we have, of Greek-speaking fathers and writers, Irenæus of Lyons; Marcion, Tatian (author of a *Diatessaron* or Harmony of the Four Gospels), and Hippolytus, all of Rome, all between 140 and 225; and of Latin writers, Tertullian and Cyprian of Carthage, Novatian of Rome, all between 195 and 260. The close agreement between Cyprian's Bible text and that of *k* is a factor of primary importance. The texts represented in these authorities are to a large degree homogeneous, though it is also true that, like other unrevised texts of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, they suffered from progressive degeneration; from which it naturally follows that in the earliest Western texts we shall find some exceptional agreements with the Alexandrian texts which disappear from the later Westerns. But whatever corruptions happened to Western texts before A.D. 300, they were not, speaking generally, due to mixture or conflation with texts from the East. From the particular difficulty which affects the criticism of

Greek texts in the East, namely the interaction and intermingling of the different lines of tradition, the comparison of Alexandrian and geographically Western texts is relatively free.

Now it must be clearly understood that the attempt here being made is not to assert any general superiority of the text or texts of the West over the text of Alexandria, but only to show that these Western texts contain an element so good and primitive that they cannot be neglected in the reconstruction, so far as that can be attained, of the original autographs of the New Testament. In quite a considerable number of cases readings supported by all, or by some of the oldest, Western authorities seem to deserve the preference over their Alexandrian rivals. And the caution must be given *in limine* that these better readings are not necessarily, though they are generally, readings found in D: they may be found in Latin authorities only.

But before we proceed to the illustration within the limits here possible, of this conclusion by a few concrete examples, it is necessary to say something of the reinforcement of the Latin and Græco-Latin witnesses from the West by a group of witnesses to a non-Alexandrian type of Gospel texts in the East, mainly from Syria and Asia Minor, but exceptionally even from Egypt itself. Perhaps no phenomenon in the sphere of the textual criticism of the New Testament has been more remarkable, during the interval which has elapsed since the appearance of Westcott and Hort's edition in 1881, than both the discovery of early Eastern witnesses showing greater or less sympathy with the Western texts, and the further investigation of already known texts tending in something of the same direction.

In Egypt the first evidence on record is that of Clement of Alexandria, and this has been re-examined by Burkitt with the result that he is shown to have far clearer Western affinities than had been supposed. And a new MS. of the Gospels, arranged in the Western order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, has come to light—it is known as the Freer Gospels or W, and is now at Washington—hardly much later than B and ℵ in date, and in parts strongly Western in type. In all externals it is the very opposite of the two great MSS., for it is neither well nor carefully written, and, though the work of a single hand, far from homogeneous in text. But it shows that even in Egypt about A.D. 400 particular churches or monasteries might be reading the Gospels in a text that had more 'Western' than 'Neutral' elements; and it adds a little to the proof that the B text represents an official revision accepted at Alexandria, which had not entirely succeeded in ousting earlier, more mixed, and doubtless on the whole more corrupt, types of text in other parts of Egypt.

Of Antioch, the great rival centre of Christian culture to Alexandria, our new knowledge is indirect, for it comes to us by means of the Syriac versions. The history of the Syriac Vulgate or *Peshitto* has been cleared up and simplified by Burkitt's demonstration that the Syriac writers of the 4th century, especially Ephrem Syrus, make no use of it; and the way became therefore open for its identification with the new translation from the Greek known to have been made by Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, A.D. 411-435 (*Texts and Studies*, vii, 2, 1901). Its close adherence to the Antiochene recension of Lucian is, at that date, only what we should expect.

But Rabbula instituted his new version exactly because of the diversity of existing Syriac texts. Oldest and still most popular was Tatian's Gospel Harmony or *Diatessaron*, probably brought from Rome and translated into Syriac by Tatian himself; but no Syriac MS. of it has survived. We are more fortunate in regard to another Syriac version—a first attempt, perhaps about A.D. 200, to supersede the *Diatessaron* by a rendering of the four separate Gospels from the Greek. An imperfect MS., from which, e.g., the whole of Mark was absent, was published by Cureton in 1848, and was therefore known to Hort. But since Hort's time a much more complete MS., containing, too, on the whole a much purer text, has been discovered at Mount Sinai (hence cited as Syr-Sin), and the evidence of both MSS. is combined in Burkitt's *Evangelion da Mepharreshe*, 1904. Since Syriac Christianity had its point of contact with Greek Christianity at Antioch, the metropolis of Syria, this Old Syriac version gives us in the readings underlying it our earliest evidence for the text of the Gospels as read in the Antiochene Church.

More difficult to classify, but all showing distinct affinities in the first place with one another, and in a lesser degree with the properly Western authorities, are a series of MSS. or groups of MSS. of the Gospels, none of them very early as they stand, all of them derived (it would seem) from early archetypes: the first of them a new discovery, others of them much better known than they were half

a century ago. (i) Θ: an uncial MS., copied in north-eastern Asia Minor about the 9th century, by a scribe barely capable of writing Greek, from a much older exemplar; edited by Beermann and Gregory in 1913. (ii) 565 (2^{pe} in Tischendorf, 81 in W-H): a cursive MS. of the 9th century, sent from a monastery in Pontus to St. Petersburg in 1829; Hort (p. 154) emphasizes the special value of its ancient, largely Western, element in Mark. (iii) 700 (British Museum: bought in 1882, and therefore unknown to Hort): 11th century. (iv) 28 (Paris: known from Mill onwards): 11th century; according to Hort (p. 242) on Mk 6 [43] it 'has many relics of a very ancient text hereabouts.' And not less important are two families of several MSS. apiece, which are each now generally cited by the number of one of them as *fam.* 1 and *fam* 13. (v) *Fam.* 1 consists of 1 (Basle: 10th century), 118, 131, 209, and was edited by Lake in *Texts and Studies*, vii, 3 (1902). (vi) *Fam.* 13 was investigated by Ferrar (hence often called the Ferrar group) at Dublin in 1868 from the four MSS. 13, 69, 124, 346, and his collations were published by Abbott in 1877; eight more MSS. have since been found to belong to the same family, the ancestor of the family having been probably in South Italy or Sicily in the early Middle Ages. No member of the family appears to be older than A.D. 1000, but the character and affinities of the text suggest that the archetype was an uncial MS. brought by Greek settlers from the East. 69, 124, 983 are said to be its best representatives.

Lake first suggested that all these MSS. and groups of MSS. derive ultimately from a single and very ancient type of text; Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, 1924) has developed the argument to the conclusion that this text was the Palestinian text of the 3rd century, and was used by Origen after he settled at Cæsarea. If this conclusion is finally established, we shall have a third type of text to be compared with those of Egypt and the West. But, important as it is, it has still to be shown that its importance, judged by the internal evidence of readings peculiar to it, is quite as great as that of either of the other two. The investigation is of course rendered more precarious by the relatively late date of all the Greek MSS. representing this type, and their consequent exposure to contamination from the Lucianic or Syrian text which became the official Byzantine text in the 5th century A.D.; so that the crucial points for establishing the antiquity of the text are its relations to the early 3rd century texts of Syr-Sin and of Origen. For the present the work of Lake and Streeter holds the field, and must be accepted pending further and fuller enquiry. It is at any rate certain that Syr-Sin, Θ, and 565 are all witnesses of first-rate importance.

Our main and ultimate criterion, as in all cases of the restoration of ancient texts, classical or Christian, must be the internal excellence of readings. But where objective tests can be applied, there is an obvious advantage in the use of them, for they supply us with presumptions that will serve as guides in our further work of investigation, while they escape the danger, from which no critic can quite hope to shake himself free, of *a priori* or subjective bias. Of such tests, in the case of the Gospels, there are three at least that seem open to no suspicion.

(*a*) *The Nomina Sacra.*—Our earliest MSS., Greek and Latin alike, employ practically no abbreviations at all except for the sacred Names. But there are none which write out in full the words God, Lord, Jesus, and Christ. If written in full these words always refer to other gods, to earthly lords, to Joshua, and so on. Whether or no the original ground for this usage lay in the Jewish reverence for the Name of God—so that the custom would have been passed on from Hebrew MSS. to Greek Jewish MSS., and so to Greek Christian MSS.—we need not here decide; certain it is that, as the centuries went on, the number of words so abbreviated gradually but steadily multiplied. We cannot lay it down that a MS. with more abbreviations is necessarily later than a MS. with fewer; but we can say pretty confidently that the MSS. with fewest abbreviations are likely to preserve ancient types of text more faithfully than the rest. Now the word which came to be soonest and most universally abbreviated, after the original four, was *pneuma*, *spiritus*, as used of the Holy Spirit; and the only documents where this abbreviation is not yet found are one hand of codex B and the Latin codex *k*. Among Greek MSS. the one which stands next to B in its sparing employment of all other abbreviations is unquestionably (the Greek column of) D. Thus among Greek MSS. B and D, among Latin MSS. *k*, have a sort of prerogative vote: there is some presumption that MSS. of an antique type in this respect will be antique in their text as well.

(*b*) *Supposed Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark.*—Among the most

certain results of the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels in our generation has been the proof that the two later Synoptists were independent of one another in their use of Mark. Where, then, we find Matthew and Luke agreeing against Mark, one of three things has happened: *either* they are not drawing at this point on Mark alone, but on another document at the same time, such as Q; *or* the agreement is fortuitous, and both have independently made the same change; *or* where neither of these explanations really meets the case, the printed text of one or other of the three Gospels is incorrect. Long ago St. Jerome pointed out how fruitful a cause of corruption was the tendency of the scribes of one Gospel to borrow from the matter of another. The progress of criticism, as evidenced in the labours of recent editors, has removed one after another of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, which were shown in older editions: thus Westcott and Hort, following the witness of B, removed some which still held a place in Tischendorf. But there remained a few even in their text, and here the appeal to our Western MSS. produces some decisive results. Four instances may be cited, in one of which the attestation is only Latin, in a second only Western, in a third only Latin with one important Greek cursive, while the fourth, the only one of the four where D supports the original Western reading, has very full Latin attestation together with that of the newly discovered MS. Θ. (i) Mk 6 [43], 'they took up fragments [*or* of fragments] twelve basketfuls': here the parallels in Matthew, Luke, and John all include some form or other of the verb 'to remain over,' and this can hardly be a fortuitous supplement in all three, so that the source of it ought to have stood in Mark; neither *k* nor *e* is extant here, but *a ff i* have reliquias fragmentorum, with the Greek cursive 33 [*perisseumata*]. A line (11 or 12 letters) had dropped out from the Greek ancestor of all our other texts. (ii) Mk 9 [19], 'O faithless generation'; Matthew and Luke, 'O faithless and perverse generation.' It is not at all likely that both Matthew and Luke would have independently added 'and perverse' from Dt 32 [5], so that the addition ought not to be genuine in both; and, in fact, in Lu 9 [41] three Westerns, *a* and *e* and Marcion, give only 'O faithless generation' with Mark. This is therefore the true text of Luke: all other authorities in Luke have borrowed 'and perverse' from Matthew. (iii) Mk 12 [8], 'they slew him and cast him out of the vineyard.' Our editions of both Matthew and Luke invert the order, and make the murder to take place after the heir had been cast outside: and once more it is difficult to think that both should have made the change independently. But the true text of Matthew, as given in D Θ *a b e ff h*, with Irenæus and Lucifer of Cagliari, agrees with Mark, and the agreement of Matthew and Luke disappears, the text of Matthew in all other authorities having been contaminated from Luke. (iv) Lastly, in Mk 14 [72], Peter 'wept'; Matthew and Luke are both printed with the addition 'went out and wept bitterly.' But in Lk 22 [62] the addition is absent from the Old Latins *a b e ff i*, and it should be noted that Westcott and Hort so far defer to the shorter reading as to bracket the words in the text. They should certainly be omitted as an intrusion from the text of Matthew. Here then are four readings, one in Mark, one in Matthew, two in Luke, where a small group of which the most constant members are the Latins *a e i*—*k* is not extant for any one of the four cases—solve for us problems otherwise (on external evidence) insoluble.

(*c*) *Evidence of 'Marcan Usage.'*—The instances to be set down here are all in fact from Mark, because Mark is a very individual writer, and his usage has, as it happens, been made a special subject of recent study; but the same argument from the usage of the writer would in principle hold true of all other books. And of course the validity of the argument is by no means confined to the cases cited here, where the Western reading approves itself as peculiarly 'Marcan'; it extends to very many other cases where the external evidence is divided in other ways than that of a few Westerns against the rest. The cases cited are not meant to prove more than that on occasions the true text only survives in Western authorities. (i) Mark uses the Greek preposition *eis* habitually for 'in' as well as 'into': it was tempting to scholars to adapt his phrases to grammatical rule by inserting or substituting some part of the verb 'come' or 'enter' (B for instance has done this in Mk 1 [21, 39], 8 [26]), or else by boldly changing 'into' *c. acc.* to 'in' *c. dat.* (so B in 2 [1]). As between the two prepositions Latin evidence counts for nothing; early translators of the New Testament, it must always be borne in mind, rendered such details of the Greek into the idiom of their own language. But in 8 [26] the only texts to give one verb only, and that the right one—'tell it to

no one (into the village)'—are *k* and one other Old Latin MS. (ii) Mark uses the plural in relating the movements of our Lord much more constantly than Matthew or Luke, because they write biography and use the singular to concentrate attention on the central figure; he reproduces so to say the autobiography of Peter, to whom the Master and the disciples who accompany Him form a single group. In nearly all such cases the influence of the texts of Matthew and Luke has worked havoc with many or most authorities in Mark, and B has, in this particular series of variations, the best record for accuracy of any individual MS. But in 11 [11] the plural 'they came into Jerusalem into the Temple' is safeguarded by only two Old Latin MSS., *i k*, and one Greek MS. of Western type, Θ; and the same reading is indirectly represented in 565. (iii) Mark's style throughout his Gospel follows the tradition of the Semitic languages, by contrast with Greek, in his sparing use of connecting particles, while Matthew and Luke habitually modify his language by inserting them; and scribes of Mark were once more tempted to assimilate him in this respect to Greek usage as presented in one or both of the other Synoptists. Instances where the Westerns alone preserve the original absence of particles in Mark would be 1 [22], 'as having authority, not as the scribes,' D Θ *b e*, where all others write '*and* not as the scribes' with Matthew (no parallel in Luke); 7 [28], 'Sir, even the dogs eat the crumbs,' D *b ff i*, with a few other Greek authorities of 'Western' type (Θ 565 and the Ferrar group) and the Old Syriac, the rest prefixing '*Yea*' with Matthew (no Lucan parallel); 10 [9], 'what God hath joined, let not man separate,' D *k* only, the rest having 'What *therefore* God hath joined . . .' with Matthew (again no Lucan parallel). In this department B is still our best authority; and nothing is further from the line of thought here developed than to assert any *general* superiority of the Western text to B. It is only urged that there are not infrequent occasions scattered up and down the text of Mark where the Westerns, sometimes only a small fraction of the Westerns, are right even against B.

The presumption derived from the employment of these 'objective' tests may now fitly be extended to secure a hearing for the Westerns when they stand alone in some much more important variations; and this is the culmination of the present argument. In some marked instances the Westerns stand alone in giving an original 'unrevised' reading, where the others—generally following the lead of either Matthew or Luke or both—found reason for stumbling in the original Marcan text. (i) Mk 1 [41], 'being angered,' D *a ff* (*e* and *k* are defective); but 'anger' was felt to be inappropriate in the working of our Lord's miracles, and so the rest substitute 'having compassion.' (ii) Mk 14 [65], 'and some began to spit on his face and to buffet him and to say to him, Prophesy,' D *a* and the Old Syriac. But this seemed unintelligible to those who did not realize that the demand of these Jewish menials was for 'more prophecies' like that of the destruction and raising again of the Temple (14 [58], 15 [29]), and so they added the covering of the face from Lk 22 [64], that the point might be 'Prophesy, who is it that smote thee?' (iii) 15 [34], 'My God, my God, why hast thou reproached me?' D *i k* and one other Old Latin MS.; the rest soften down the words, and with Mt 27 [46] and the LXX of Ps 22 [2], substitute 'Why hast thou forsaken me?'

The main line of the argument developed in this article has brought us face to face with two very ancient types of text: a Greek text at Alexandria preserved most faithfully, though with enough well-defined and, as it seems, consciously made modifications to qualify it by the name of revision, in one superb MS., B; and a Greek and Latin type of text in the West, best preserved in *k*, fragmentary and corrupt as the MS. is, but guaranteed as to time and place by its close agreement with the Bible text of St. Cyprian. Where B and *k* agree, we have perhaps the greatest security that any two witnesses can give us of external evidence for the recovery of the apostolic text. Four cases in one short passage (Mk 9 [22-29]) will illustrate *k*'s independence of the element of unauthorized additions which is (naturally) Hort's chief *gravamen* against the 'Western' texts as a whole, for *k* stands alone (*e* being defective) against D and other Old Latins in omitting all of them: (i) 9 [22], after 'help us' add *Kyrie*, 'Lord'; (ii) 9 [23], after 'if thou canst,' add 'believe'; (iii) 9 [24], after 'said,' add 'with tears'; (iv) 9 [29], after 'prayer,' add 'and fasting.' None of these additions (except perhaps the third) has any claim to be genuine, and none of them can be explained from parallels in the other Synoptists. All of them, except the first, made their way into the main body of textual transmission; all are omitted by ℵ B *k*. But there agreement ends: our other chief witnesses vary

in different permutations and combinations. W omits all but the last. Syr-Sin has (i) and (iv), not (ii) or (iii). *Fam.* 1 omits (i) and (ii), but has (iii) and (iv). Θ has all four. 28 omits (iii). ℵ B *k* are entirely alone in omitting (iv). From the same passage may be cited one further case, where *k* is reinforced by D and *i* among Westerns in rejecting a second addition of *Kyrie*, 'Lord,' after 'I believe' in [24]: Syr-Sin has the addition, W Θ and one of the Ferrar group go with D *i k* and the Alexandrian witnesses in omitting it.

But the critic must be in bondage to no absolute rules. Nearly always the agreement of ℵ B *k* will be right: yet not quite always, for the agreement of European Westerns with non-Alexandrian Easterns appears to give the true text (against ℵ B *k*) in the omission of the covering of the face in Mk 14 [65] (D *a* Syr-Sin, see above) and in the addition of 'wilt thou' before 'that we should make' in Peter's question at the Transfiguration in Mk 9 [5] (D Θ *fam.*, 13, 28, 565, *b ff i*). Perhaps nearly always the shorter reading will be better than the longer. An omission, therefore, supported by ℵ B *k*, the Old Syriac and Old Egyptian (Sahidic) versions, ought to have every chance of giving us the right text. Yet we have only to turn to Mt 12 [47] to find that all these, our best authorities in different groups, are convicted of the common blunder of the omission of a whole verse. [47] ends with almost the same words as [46], and scribes' eyes have chanced to wander on from the end of the one to the end of the other. Against this sort of danger no MS., no combination of MSS., is quite infallible. All the ancient evidence must be taken into account: and even when that has been done, internal evidence must say the last word. It is certain that there are some cases where inferior authorities are right against the best authorities; it is probable that there are a few, very few, cases where all extant authorities are in error, and resort must be had to conjectural emendation. But so numerous, so ancient, so varied in place of origin, are the witnesses, especially for the Gospels, to the sacred text, that we may rest confident that the labours of critics are by degrees approaching an almost complete reproduction of the true autographs of evangelists and apostles. And we may be sure that in this process little or nothing will disappear of what long familiarity has taught us most to prize in our Authorized English version. No great gain is ever purchased save at the cost of some loss; but the loss will be small indeed, if the future shall have in store for us an English version that will combine the splendid stateliness of our old version and its regard for the idiom of our language with greater faithfulness to the original text.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

By W. K. Lowther Clarke

The subject naturally falls into two parts: (A) The Birth, Ministry, and Death of our Lord; and (B) The Apostolic Age. Far the best treatment in English is C. H. Turner's art. 'Chronology of the N.T.' in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, on which this art. is largely founded. Subsequent discussion has brought out certain points more clearly, but nothing of essential importance has been added.

The present reckoning of the Christian era is derived from Dionysius Exiguus (6th cent.). Earlier writers for the most part took 3 or 2 B.C. as the date of the Nativity. The problems are complicated, and the evidence does not warrant dogmatic statements.

(A)

I. **The Crucifixion.**—It is best to start with this and then work backwards.

(i) *The Year.*—A pagan annalist, Phlegon, gives A.D. 32-33. He is not corroborated by early Christian tradition, which fixes the Crucifixion in the consulship of the two Gemini (L. Rubellius Geminus and C. Fufius Geminus), 29, or in the 15th or 16th year of Tiberius. Tiberius succeeded Augustus in Aug. of A.D. 14, and either year of his reign would suit 29, according as we reckon the 2nd year to begin in Aug. A.D. 15, or, as was often done, on Jan. 1. See II (iii) 1 for the evidence of Lk 3 [1], which is consistent with this.

(ii) *The Month.*—The Jewish months began with the first appearance of the New Moon and were lunar. The opening month of the ecclesiastical year, in which Passover fell, was called Nisan, and corresponded to our March-April.

(iii) *The Day.*—This, of course, was Friday. But was it 14 or 15 Nisan?

That is to say, the Paschal Lamb being killed on the afternoon of the 14th, and the Passover feast beginning with full moon on the 15th (the Jewish day being from 6 p.m. to 6 p.m.), did the Crucifixion precede or follow the feast? The Synoptists (cf. Mk 14 [12-16]) seem to point to the 15th, the Last Supper being the Passover feast. But Mk 15 [21, 42] suggests that the Passover was still in the future. Jn 13 [1, 29], 18 [28] makes this quite plain. 1 Cor 5 [7, 8], 15 [20] suggests that Paul's Churches kept the Crucifixion and Resurrection on Nisan 14 and 16. And the earliest tradition of the Fathers is decisive for the 14th. The Last Supper is best regarded as a solemn meal, such as was held in preparation for the Sabbath or the Passover. The Passover fell on a Sabbath in that year, and, the day before the Passover having itself a solemn character, the meal was antedated and held on the Thursday.*

Now the possible years for the Crucifixion under the officials Pilate and Caiaphas are A.D. 28-33. The years 28, 31, 32 are excluded because Friday could not have fallen on Nisan 14 (or 15) in any of them. Of the remaining years—29, 30 and 33—29 is to be preferred as agreeing best with the evidence given elsewhere.

The full moon fell on March 18 in A.D. 29, and this date has perhaps the best claim to acceptance.

II. The Ministry.—Four main theories have been held as to the duration of the ministry: (*a*) that it lasted *one* year. This was widely held in the early Church; (*b*) *two* years, or between one and two years; also an early view; (*c*) *three* years or rather more—Eusebius and later Fathers; (*d*) a considerable period, 10-15 years; so Irenæus, on the strength of Jn 8 [57], 'Thou art not yet 50 years old.' To these we may add (*e*), the modern sceptical view that no accurate result is possible. In favour of (*e*) it must be granted that the apostolic writers did not take the interest of a modern historian in chronology. But such evidence as we have points to either (*a*) or (*b*) as a solution. The certainty decreases as we move backwards. We can be reasonably sure of the date of the Crucifixion. That of the Nativity is doubtful to the extent of two or three years. The ministry cannot have lasted less than one or more, so it seems, than two years. Of the views given above the writer inclines to (*a*), but would leave the door open for (*b*). He may be thought to press the evidence for (*a*) unduly; if he does, it is because this view, very common on the Continent, is perhaps unduly discounted by English writers. We now take the Gospels separately and examine their witness.

(i) *Mark.*—Recent criticism agrees with Papias that Mark arranged his reminiscences 'not however in order.' We are not justified in adhering rigidly to Mk's chronological order. But, broadly speaking, the sequence of events seems to be historical. *Prima facie*, as Mk mentions one passover only, he imagines a 1-year ministry. These are the relevant facts; of the two sets of dates in brackets, the former supposes a 2-year, the latter a 1-year, ministry:

(1) The Baptist begins to preach (autumn of 26/27), 1 [4].

(2) After a while Jesus comes to him (Feb. 27/28), 1 [9].

(3) An interval follows, spent in Judæa (March, April 27/28), 1 [12, 13].

(4) John having been arrested—the events are described retrospectively in 6 [17]—Jesus goes to Galilee and begins His Ministry (after Passover of 27/28), 1 [14].

(5) Jesus and His disciples pass through the ripe cornfields. This may be any time between the middle of April and the middle of June (27/28), according to the height (or otherwise) above sea-level, 2 [23].

(6) The 5,000 sit down on the green grass, 6 [39]. This is generally taken to imply the spring-time, not earlier than 6 weeks before the Passover (28/29). Only for a short time in Palestine is there any green grass. It is just possible, however, that the verdure was due to the presence of a perennial fountain; the need of water for the multitude would be as pressing as that of food.

(7) In 7 and 8 we have a record of journeys which has puzzled scholars. In 7 [24] Jesus goes N.W. to a spot outside Herod's sway, 'the borders of Tyre and Sidon'; thence in 7 [31] back to the Lake *via* Sidon and Decapolis. In 8 [1-8] follows the Feeding of the 4,000. In 8 [27] Jesus leaves Herod's territory once more for the journey to Cæsarea Philippi, followed by the return to Capernaum and the last journey to Jerusalem. If the 'green grass' of 6 [39] implies the early spring, then a whole year will be required for the subsequent movements, and Mk gives a two-years' ministry. Indeed the Gospel as we have it seems to compel this conclusion. If, however, the Feeding of the 4,000 is another version of the Feeding of the 5,000, as some scholars think, then

* See also notes on pp. 106, 197.

this part of the Gospel cannot be used so confidently for the chronology, and it becomes just possible, though difficult, to crowd these events into a few weeks and the ministry into a year. The concluding chapters show that Jesus had friends in Jerusalem, presumably made on former visits. Perhaps Peter, whose reminiscences are given in Mk, did not go to the earlier feasts with Jesus, and therefore they are not mentioned in Mk.

(ii) *Matthew.*—This Gospel contributes nothing to our inquiry. 11 [21] (=Lk 10 [13]) with its reference to Chorazin and Bethsaida presupposes a more extended Galilæan ministry than that described in Mk.

(iii) *Luke.*—(1) In 3 [1] we have an elaborate dating of the Baptist's ministry, which began in the 15th year of Tiberius, other rulers being Pontius Pilate, Herod, Philip, Lysanias, Annas and Caiaphas. The 15th year of Tiberius is most naturally dated from the death of Augustus in August of A.D. 14, and will then run from August 28 to August 29, a view which presents many difficulties. But we may suppose that Luke computed his years according to the Eastern reckoning, which began in Seleucid times and was abolished by Trajan (? Nerva), and thought of Oct. 1 as the New Year. The 15th year of Tiberius will then be Oct. 1, 27 to Sept. 30, 28. John's ministry in this case will have begun in the autumn of 27.

Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene, has been dismissed as a gross blunder, the historical Lysanias, King in Cœle-Syria, having been executed in 36 B.C. But there is good evidence for a younger Lysanias, and Lk's accuracy need not be impugned.

(2) Lk may well have thought that the Baptism of Jesus followed 6 months after 3 [1], as He was 6 months younger than John. After the Temptation the Ministry begins at Nazareth, where Jesus proclaims 'the acceptable year of the Lord,' 4 [19]. Clement and Origen took this to mean that the ministry lasted one calendar year.

(3) The Transfiguration comes in 9 [28-36], and in [51] the last journey to Jerusalem begins. From here to the end a few weeks or at most months are supposed. We may assume that 5-9 comprise a short space of time in Lk's reckoning.

(iv) *John.*—The 4th Gospel must be used with caution to establish chronology, for it is later than the others, and in places seems to reflect conditions at the end of the 1st cent. A.D. rather than the circumstances of the ministry. So this is a convenient place to combine the evidence of Mk and Lk, if possible. Mk seems to imply a 2-years' ministry; the dating of Lk 3 [1] a 1-year, unless the Crucifixion is put later than 29. This being so, we are tempted to use slight indications elsewhere in Lk as favouring 1-year. But if Lk really implies a 1-year ministry, then he may have taken Mk as meaning it, in which case our verdict on Mk's chronology would have to be reconsidered.

The evidence of *John* is difficult to interpret with certainty. The best course will be to state the facts first and then the rival interpretations.

(1) In 2 [13] Jesus goes to Jerusalem for the Passover. The Cleansing of the Temple is attached to this visit, which is dated by [20], '46 years has this temple been building.' The building began apparently in the 18th year (dating from 37 B.C.) of Herod, i.e. in 20 or 19. Adding 45 complete years we reach A.D. 26 or 27; 46 may mean 45 and some months, or 46 complete years. That is, the spring of 28 is the latest possible date

(2) The Baptist has not yet been arrested in 4 [1], but 3 [30] hints at the arrest. The journey to Galilee in 4 [3] seems to correspond to that of Mk 1 [14].

(3) The words of 4 [35] ('yet 4 months and then cometh the harvest . . . the fields are white unto the harvest') have been variously explained. Jn can hardly refer to sowing time, 9 months after the Passover of 2 [13]. So the alternative explanation is better, that the fields were literally white, and that '4 months, etc.' is a proverbial expression—sowing is followed in due course by reaping, Jesus is sowing spiritual seed, and the spiritual harvest, suggested by the ripe corn, may be expected. This incident is in the same relative position as the plucking of the ears of corn in Mk 2 [23].

(4) In 5 [1] '*a* feast' or '*the* feast' is mentioned, at which Jesus went to Jerusalem. Both readings were current at an early date; on textual grounds '*a* feast' is preferable. '*A* feast' means any of the lesser feasts, probably Pentecost. '*The* feast' is Passover, or possibly Tabernacles. Some scholars think that 6 originally preceded 5. If so, '*the* feast' would be the Passover of 6 [4].

(5) The Passover feast of 6 [4] was near when the 5,000 were fed. This agrees with the received view that the Feeding of the 5,000 in Mk was in February or a little later.

(6) Tabernacles is mentioned in 7 [2].

(7) The Dedication (December) in 10 [22].

(8) The final Passover in 11 [55].

Let us now see how these data support or tell against the theories of (*a*) a 1-year, (*b*) a 2-years', (*c*) a 3-years' ministry. The 46 years of 2 [20] need not be discussed further, for they are compatible with all three.

(*a*) *One Year.*—To get this we must read '*a* feast' in 5 [1]. The following harmonization with Mk can be made out:

Year.	*Mark.*	*Ch.*	*John.*	*Ch.*
27 Autumn ..	John begins to preach	1		
28 February ..	Jesus is baptized	1		
March-April ..			Passover in Jerusalem	2
	Return to Galilee	1		4
April-June ..	Passing through cornfields	2	Fields white unto harvest	4
May-June ..			*Pentecost* in Jerusalem	5
September ..			Tabernacles in Jerusalem	7
December ..			Dedication in Jerusalem	10
29 February ..	Feeding of 5,000	6	Feeding of 5,000	6
March-April ..	Crucifixion		Crucifixion	

It will be noted that the harmony fails in two places. Mk 7 to end has to be compressed into a few weeks, and the Feeding of the 5,000 in Jn is supposed to be out of place. Otherwise the combination of the two Gospels is attractive, especially as it is reinforced by Lk. Whether a 1-year ministry is probable on other grounds is a question which is differently answered. Everything recorded in the Gospels can be put into a few months; the events of Holy Week show that the disciples had learned their lessons most imperfectly; if Jesus was what Christians believe Him to be, a year's ministry was sufficient to produce tremendous results; and, finally, the political background being that described by Josephus, would the authorities have been likely to tolerate apparently subversive teaching for more than a few months? On the other hand, on psychological grounds the training of the Twelve seems to demand a longer period than a year.

(*b*) *Two Years.*—We can get this from Jn by reading '*a* feast' in 5 [1] and taking 6 to be in its proper chronological order. There is then a considerable time between the events of 5 and those of 6, and Jn 7-10, like Mk 7-9, will cover the second year of the ministry. On this theory Jesus went to Jerusalem for Passover and Pentecost of A.D. 27, and for Tabernacles and Dedication of 28; a gap of a year with no recorded visit is left.

(*c*) *Three Years.*—For this we must read '*the* feast' in 5 [1] and suppose it to be Passover. We then get this scheme: 2, Passover of 26; 5, Passover of 27; 6, Passover of 28; 11-end, Passover of 29.

We have already seen that the 15th year of Tiberius, mentioned in Lk 3, dates John's ministry as beginning in 27, 28 or 29. If the earliest of these dates is accepted, and a 1-year ministry, then the year 29 for the Crucifixion becomes possible. Because the writer thinks this on the whole the best solution, 29 was given as the date earlier in the article. If we hold a 2-years' theory, then in the light of Lk 3 [1] the Crucifixion must be put in 30. Here again there are difficulties, which incline some scholars to choose the remaining possible year, 33, and suppose that John's ministry began in 29, our Lord's in 30. But 33 does not seem to give enough time for the events of Acts, and is quite inconsistent with the strong early Christian tradition that 29 was the date. An error of one year is far more probable than an error of four years.

Since the above was written, D. R. Fotheringham's *The Date of Easter* (1928) has appeared. Relying on astronomical tables prepared by Dr. J. K. Fotheringham, which have been corroborated by German study of Babylonian Calendars, he is able to fix the precise date of the new moon which inaugurated Nisan in the crucial years. (The ancient new moon dated from the evening when it was first visible, not as now from the conjunction of sun and moon.) According to these tables there are three possible years for the Crucifixion—27, 30, 33; among these the case for 30 is overwhelmingly strong. The Crucifixion fell on April 7 of that year. If the argument holds—there must always be an element of uncertainty in our estimate of ancient chronologies—then, granted that the summing up just given is fair, the case for a 2-years' ministry is strengthened.

The discussion has unfortunately ended in no clear result. St. Mark and St. Luke, who in Rome were in touch with St. Peter, must have known the facts, and

could easily have made them clear to their readers had they thought it worth while. As it is, we must be content to remain ignorant of an interesting matter which is not of vital importance.

III. The Birth.—We have fixed the early months of A.D. 28 (possibly 27) for the Baptism of Jesus. Lk 3 [23] says He was 'about 30' then. The number is typical of the age at which a man took up a public position; see Gen 41 [46] (Joseph before Pharaoh), 2 S 5 [4] (David began to reign), Nu 4 [3, 35] (Levites began to minister). Gen 11 [12-24] gives a list of ancestors of Abraham who became fathers at 35, 30, 34, 30, 32, 30 and 29. A Biblical writer wanting to summarize these would doubtless have said 'about 30.' Probably Luke intends nothing more accurate than this. After his careful dating in 3 [1], the word 'about' betrays that he had no date for the Nativity.

(i) *Matthew's Nativity Story.*—(1) Jesus was born in the days of Herod the King, who died in the spring of 4 B.C., 2 [1].

(2) 'Two years and under,' 2 [16], implies that the Birth had taken place at least one year and not more than two years before the Massacre.

(3) 2 [19] implies an interval before Herod died.

These data point to 7-6 B.C. In May, October and December of 7 there was a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, which may be connected with the Star. If there is any connexion, since the Magi's visit was some time after the Birth, the latter would have to be not later than the early months of 7.

(ii) *Luke's Story.*—This can be studied under 4 heads: (1) The Narrative; (2) Critical Objections; (3) New Light; (4) Conclusions.

(1) The events took place in the reign of Herod the Great, *King* of Judæa, i.e. Palestine, 1 [5]. Contrast 3 [1], where the *tetrarchs* who succeeded Herod are described. A decree went out from the Emperor that all the world should be enrolled. In Palestine this took place as the first census (others followed), when Quirinius was governor of Syria. Joseph and Mary, and others, went up to their ancestral home for the numbering, 2 [1-4]. The census described by Luke in Ac 5 [37] as '*the* census,' i.e. the famous one under Quirinius in A.D. 7, must be considered in this connexion.

(2) The objections are well known. (*a*) No such general census took place. (*b*) The story of the return to one's ancestral city is improbable. (*c*) Quirinius was not governor in the time of Herod the Great, but later.

In any case Lk's description of a world-wide census is open to objection. It was Augustus' policy to institute such censuses in the Empire and to encourage them in dependent kingdoms—that is as much as can be said. The greatest difficulty concerns Quirinius, who conducted a census in Judæa in A.D. 6-7 when it became a Roman province on the deposition of Archelaus. Josephus says: 'Quirinius also visited Judæa, now an appanage of the province of Syria, to take a valuation of the Jews' property.' This caused a revolt. 'Quirinius had now disposed of Archelaus' estate and the census registrations were ended. This census took place in the 37th year after Cæsar's victory over Antony at Actium' (*Ant.*, XVIII, i, 1; ii, 1). The governors of Syria between 10 and 4 B.C. were M. Titius, C. Sentius Saturninus (under whom Tertullian, *adv. Marc.*, iv, 19, says a census was conducted), and P. Quintilius Varus. Luke must therefore have made a mistake.

(3) Recent writers have replied as follows:

(*a*) Luke is a trustworthy authority elsewhere and is to be accepted when he tells us of a census otherwise unknown. Nothing is more probable than that Herod under Roman influence fell into line with contemporary ideas of statecraft and instituted a census, taking care to respect Jewish susceptibilities.

(*b*) Egyptian papyri prove that, in place of a Ptolemaic system of yearly declarations, the Romans introduced a census every 14 years. An edict of A.D. 104 shows that persons were required to return home. Papers for the census of A.D. 19-20 exist. Reckoning backwards we reach A.D. 5-6 and 10-9 B.C. If a census may be supposed for 10-9, Herod may have conducted one in a neighbouring country at the same time.

(*c*) Quirinius conducted a campaign against the Homonadenses, a Cilician tribe, about 10-7 B.C. Possibly the fame he won by this caused his name to be substituted for the real governor who took the census at this time; or his military command was styled a 'governorship.' Further, a mutilated inscription refers to an official who was governor of Syria twice. This may be Quirinius, who may have held office for the first time after P. Quintilius Varius in 3-1 B.C.

(4) The above arguments go some part but not all of the way to rehabilitate Lk's

account. There are too many suppositions. Perhaps we may tentatively say that Lk knew of the famous census under Quirinius and had heard of Herod's census, also (through his connexion with Antioch) of Quirinius' earlier sojourn, but, as was natural in a writer without books of reference, did not see his way clearly through the difficulties presented by his data. The census had better be disregarded entirely in fixing the date of the Nativity. The double testimony of Mt and Lk in favour of the closing years of Herod the Great remains, and 7-5 B.C. is the most likely date.

(B)

Starting from 29 as the most probable date for the Crucifixion, we proceed to the Apostolic Age, which may be taken as extending to 70, the Fall of Jerusalem. The evidence is found in the Acts, to a less extent in the Pauline Epistles, and in the events of secular history referred to these books. St Luke is our main authority, to be trusted in the same sense as Josephus or Tacitus. In the 2nd half of Ac his authority is unimpeachable. In the 1st half his evidence is not first hand, and the analogy of the Gospel suggests that his order may not always be intended to be strictly chronological. St. Paul's Epistles can be trusted implicitly when they give chronological data, except the Pastorals, which present difficulties, since their authorship is disputed.

I. **Secular History.**—The table on p. 736 shows the rulers of Palestine and the Emperors.

Judæa: 29-41 under Procurators; 41-44 Agrippa I; 44-70 under Procurators.

Galilee: 29-39 Antipas tetrarch; 39-44 Agrippa I; 44-52 (?) under Procurators; then until 70 with Judæa.

Trachonitis: 29–34 Philip tetrarch; 37–44 Agrippa I; 44–52 (?) under Roman officials; then till 70 Agrippa II.

Roman Emperors: 29-37 Tiberius (accession in 14); 37-41 Caligula; 41-54 Claudius; 54-18 Nero.

Following Turner, in the main, we establish these dates for NT events in the light of external history:

(1) Paul's escape from the ethnarch of the Nabatæan King Aretas, who was in control of Damascus (2 Cor 11 [32]), occurred between the summer of 37, when Caligula, who succeeded to the throne in March, will have had time to reverse Tiberius' policy of hostility and hand over the city, and 40, about which time Aretas died. (It is just possible that the ethnarch was merely in charge of an Arabian quarter, and that Paul, by his sojourn in Arabia, Gal 1 [17], had exposed himself to his hostility and authority.)

(2) Agrippa I died after the month Nisan in 44, see Ac 12.

(3) The reign of Claudius was marked by famines, which afflicted different parts at different times. Judæa is thought to have suffered in 46 or 47; see Ac 11 [28-30].

(4) Sergius Paulus (Ac 13 [7]) was not proconsul of Cyprus in 51-52.

(5) Orosius, a 5th cent. authority, but to be followed in the absence of other evidence, gives 49 as the date of the Jews' expulsion from Rome (Ac 18 [2]).

(6) Gallio's entry upon office at Corinth as proconsul of Achaia (Ac 18 [12]) seems to be fixed for the summer of 51 by an inscription at Delphi, so Paul will have left Corinth presumably in the autumn of that year (18 [18]). This agrees with (5) above, as Paul began his ministry shortly after the arrival of Aquila and Priscilla in 49—probably early in 50.

(7) The most important date for the chronology of Acts, if it could be ascertained, is the supersession of the procurator Felix by Festus (Ac 24 [27]). Unfortunately the problem is at present insoluble. Turner concludes that 57-59 was the date of Felix's recall, but some recent writers put it as late as 60 or even 61. See end of article for the important consequences which follow from acceptance of the late date.

(8) The reckoning of days in Ac 20 [6, 7] is thought to point to one or other of the years 54, 56, and 57.

(9) Early Christian tradition makes it probable that Peter and Paul were martyred in the persecution of 64 which followed the great fire at Rome—described by Tacitus, *Ann.*, xv, 44. The death of Paul is not mentioned in Ac, but Luke is almost certainly writing after the event for readers familiar with the story.

II. **St. Paul's Life.**—This can best be discussed by arguing backwards from the late summer of 51, when Paul probably left Corinth (Ac 18 [18]). He came there 18 months *plus* many days previously ([11, 18]), shortly after the arrival of Aquila and Priscilla who had been expelled from Rome in 49 ([2]). Gallio's entry upon office in the summer of 51 was clearly at the end of the 18 months ([12]). If Paul came to Corinth at the end of 49 or beginning of 50, the spring of 49 is the obvious date for his starting from Antioch for his Second Missionary Journey (15 [40]). Journeys over high mountains

are as improbable as sea voyages during the winter. We thus get the early months of 49 for the Apostolic Council of Ac 15. The First Missionary Journey (13 [4]-14 [26]) will probably have occupied the time between the beginning of navigation in 47, and its ending in 48. We have seen that 46-47 are the most likely years for the famine in Judæa (11 [28]). If Paul and Barnabas took the alms to Jerusalem during those years, Barnabas must have fetched Paul from Tarsus during 45-46 (11 [25, 26]).

Ac 12, describing the death of Herod, which occurred in 44, fits awkwardly into this scheme. Luke's order here cannot be chronological. Indeed, the section 12 [1-24] is inserted in a framework of Paul's doings—12 [25] continues 11 [30]—and the introductory phrase 'now about that time' allows us to suppose that the historian is digressing to narrate something that had happened earlier.

This is as far as we can get so long as we rely on Acts alone, though the impression is left that the death of Stephen and the conversion of Paul come in the middle of the first period which ends with the accession of Agrippa I (41). The apostle, however, gives definite, but unfortunately ambiguous, information in Gal. After his conversion he first went into Arabia and then returned to Damascus, this occupying 3 years (i.e. 2 years and part or all of a third year). Then he went to Jerusalem for 15 days, seeing only Peter and James, after which he went to Syria and Cilicia, i.e. Tarsus. Then, 14 years later, he went to Jerusalem again with Barnabas and Titus (Gal 1 [18]-2 [1]). Two difficulties arise. Does 14 years reckon from his conversion, or from the first visit, i.e. 16 or 17 years from his conversion? And is the visit of Gal 2 [1] to be identified with that of Ac 11 [30], with Barnabas to take the alms; or with that of Ac 15, with Barnabas to discuss the question of circumcision at the Apostolic Council? Scholars are still divided in their opinions. All that can be done here is to show the effect of the different views on the chronology.

(*a*) *Gal* 2 [1] = *Ac* 15, *and the* 14 *years do not include the* 3 *years*. Then the visit of Ac 11 [30] is not mentioned in Gal, the visit of Gal 1 [18] took place 14 years before the Council of 49, i.e. in 35, and the Conversion in 33 (or 32).

(*b*) *Gal* 2 [1] = *Ac* 15, *and the* 14 *years includes the* 3 *years*. Then the visit of Gal 1 [18] took place 11 years before the Council, i.e. in 38, and the Conversion in 36 (35).

(*c*) *Gal* 2 [1] = *Ac* 11 [30], *and* 14 *does not include* 3. Then the visit of Gal 1 [18] was 14 years before the famine of 46, i.e. in 32, and the Conversion in 30 (29).

(*d*) *Gal* 2 [1] = *Ac* 11 [30], *and* 14 *includes* 3. Gal 1 [18] then falls 11 years before the famine of 46, i.e. in 35, and the Conversion in 33 (32).

Of the above (*c*) is ruled out as involving impossibly early dates. The present writer inclines to (*a*), which, it will be noticed, yields the same date for Paul's Conversion as (*d*). The figures given for the Conversion are based on the supposition that one year in all should be added to compensate for the amount by which the 14 and the 3 years fell short of full years. If in every case they were full years, then the figures in brackets should be substituted. Only (*b*) is consistent with 33 as the date of the Crucifixion.

We now return to Ac 18 [18], Paul's departure from Corinth in (probably) the late summer of 51, and work forward. The journey to Antioch *via* Jerusalem ([18-22]) will have occupied the autumn, and a sojourn at Antioch, Paul's original 'home base,' the winter. In the spring of 52 he started on the Third Journey, reaching Ephesus in the latter part of the year. Two years and three months, perhaps three full years (19 [8, 10], 20 [31]), were spent in that city, followed by an indefinite period in Macedonia and three months in Greece (20 [1-3]). Returning to Philippi, Paul and his companions spent the Passover of 56 there (20 [6]). We now follow his movements day by day as he hastens to Jerusalem for Pentecost. Shortly after his arrival he was arrested. Felix left him in prison till the coming of Festus two years later in the summer of 58 (24 [27]). When it was decided to send Paul to Rome, he proceeded by stages. A great storm ushered in the winter season and he was shipwrecked on the coast of Malta. After 3 months (28 [11]) the journey was resumed, and Rome will have been reached early in 59. 'Two whole years' in custody follow, and Acts closes about April 61.

The scheme just sketched, from 51 onwards, presents few difficulties. The concluding period of Paul's life is obscure, because his death is not expressly recorded in the NT. Three theories are possible.

(*a*) Paul was put to death in 61 at the end of his 2 years' imprisonment; early Church tradition was mistaken in supposing him to have been martyred like Peter in the Neronian persecution of 64.

(*b*) He was released in 61 at the ex-

piration of the 2 years; the movements referred to in the Pastoral Epistles occupied the next 2 or 3 years; he was re-arrested and martyred in 64. This is the generally accepted view in English-speaking countries.

(*c*) Ac 18^{21}-19^{1} describes an indefinite period between two visits to Ephesus. In any case it is practically a blank space in the narrative. If we may suppose that it lasted 3 or more years instead of 1, Paul's arrival in Rome could be brought forward to 62 and the end of Ac to 64, the date of the Neronian persecution. Some such theory is necessitated if the late date for Festus is accepted.

The chief dates resulting from the foregoing discussion are added, the more doubtful ones being placed in the right-hand column:

The Nativity	B.C. 7-5.	
Baptism of our Lord	A.D. 27-28	
The Crucifixion	A.D. 29	
Conversion of St. Paul		33
First Missionary Journey	47-48	
Apostolic Council	49	
Second Missionary Journey	49-51	
Third Missionary Journey	52-56	
Imprisonment at Cæsarea	56-58	
Arrival at Rome	59	
Martyrdom of St. Paul	64	

A TABLE OF DATES

Palestine.	*Christianity.*	*The Roman Empire.*
B.C. 37 Herod the Great becomes King		30 Augustus first Emperor.
	6 (?) Birth of Christ	
4 Death of Herod. Accession of Archelaus, Antipas and Philip		
A.D. 6 Deposition of Archelaus. Judæa under Procurators		
6-7 Census of Quirinius Revolt of Judas		
		14 Accession of Tiberius.
26 Pontius Pilate Procurator	26-27 Mission of Baptist	
	29 The Crucifixion	
	33 Conversion of Paul	
36 Pilate deposed		37 Accession of Caligula.
41 Agrippa I, King of Trachonitis, Galilee and Judæa		41 Accession of Claudius.
44 Death of Agrippa Appointment of Procurators		
	49 Council at Jerusalem	50 Jews banished from Rome.
		51 Gallio proconsul of Achaia.
52 ? Agrippa II, King of Trachonitis		
		54 Accession of Nero.
58 ? Festus succeeds Felix		
	59 Paul reaches Rome	
	64 Martyrdom of Peter and Paul	64 Fire at Rome.
67 Revolt of Palestine	67 Christians flee to Pella	
		68 Civil Wars. Accession of Vespasian.
70 Destruction of Jerusalem		79 Accession of Titus.
		81 Accession of Domitian.
		96 Accession of Nerva.
		98 Accession of Trajan.
132 Revolt of Bar-Cochbâ		117 Accession of Hadrian.
135 Jerusalem refounded as Gentile city, Ælia Capitolina		

SELECT SUBJECT INDEX

NOTE.—No attempt has been made to provide a full index, or anything that would take the place of a Concordance. Rather the idea has been to show the reader at a glance where to find information on subjects which might be treated under many different heads.

	Old Testament.	*Apocrypha.*	*New Testament.*
Adam	—	33, 37, 72	11, 464, 512 f. 584
Adonis. *See* Tammuz			
Agape	—	—	52, 262
Aggadah	—	22	—
Ahikar	395	42 f.	—
Alexander	—	—	22
Alexandria	186, 692	—	722 f.
Altar of sacrifice	93, 257	—	—
of incense	95, 104, 114, 123	—	—
Altars	34, 89, 197	—	—
Ambrose, St.	692	—	—
Amen-em-ope	310, 382, 394	—	—
Amenhotep IV	670	17	—
Angel of the Lord	51	—	383
Angels	277, 317, 320, 342, 666 f.	—	10, 172, 212, 248, 437, 558, 563, 604
Anointing	250	—	—
Antichrist	—	—	663, 694
Apocalyptic	309, 427, 430	7, 37	12, 19, 193, 297, 299, 439, 709
Apocrypha	6	59	9
Apocryphal Gospels	—	—	303
Aramaic	—	4 f., 21	—
Ark	91, 114, 220, 239, 243, 256	—	—
Asherah	160, 261, 663	—	—
Assyria	264	—	—
Astrology	—	—	29
Atonement	100, 112, 114, 116, 431, 657	—	91, 158, 159, 178, 265, 292 f., 380, 418, 457, 523 f., 599, 601, 613, 614 f.
Augustine, St.	693	—	—
Babel	681 f.	—	—
Babylonian creation epic	40, 46, 677	36, 121 f.	—
Job	315	—	—
religion	670	—	—
Bagoas	283, 287	—	—
Balaam	420	—	—
Ban (*herem*)	194	—	—
Baptism	—	—	51, 90, 295, 335, 344, 378, 395 f., 401, 420, 430, 465 f., 535
Bezan text	—	—	327, 358
Bishops. *See* Ministry			
Blood	90, 102, 104, 114, 116, 473, 662	—	256, 359, 617
of Christ	100, 102	—	616 f., 660 f., 668
Boghaz Keui	175	—	—
Calvary	—	—	717
Canaanite religion	192, 202	—	—
Canon, OT	6	—	—
NT	11	—	—
Capernaum	—	—	711
Cappadocian tablets	175	—	—

	Old Testament.	*Apocrypha.*	*New Testament.*
Census	96, 247	—	213, 733
Chaldean deluge	680	—	—
Cherubim	91, 255	—	—
Christ:			
birth	—	14	733
brethren of	—	—	69, 628 f.
cross of	—	—	428, 599, 661
crucifixion	—	—	729 f.
doctrine of	—	—	278, 290 f., 299, 334, 337, 344, 379 f., 413 f. 450, 473 f., 498 f., 539, 558, 559 f., 604, 658, 684
kenosis	—	—	100, 104, 553
ministry	—	—	730 f.
OT, and	617 f., 629	—	137
priesthood, His	—	—	612 f.
Psalms, in the	341, 345, 350 f., 353, 355, 362, 368, 370	—	—
resurrection body	—	—	302, 312, 381
St. Paul's knowledge of	—	—	411
spirits in prison, and	—	—	652
Chronology	65, 171, 176 f., 253	31	128, 213, 215, 729 f.
Chrysostom, St.	692	—	—
Church	—	—	126, 128, 162, 168, 183, 270, 289, 294, 324, 335, 340, 351 f., 385 f., 402, 408, 415 f., 419 f., 433, 443, 473, 479, 501, 596, 539, 558, 684
Circumcision	52, 193	—	—
Cities of refuge	145, 193	—	—
Cleansings	—	—	15, 73, 164, 262
Clement of Alexandria	690	—	—
Collegia	—	—	24
Confirmation	—	—	51, 398
Conquest of Palestine	178, 191	—	—
Cosmogony (Babylonian and Jewish)	677	—	—
Covenant	192, 426, 505, 537	—	184, 409, 597 f.
Creeds	—	—	378 f., 396
Cyrus	184	—	—
Dead Sea, the	645	—	—
Death	—	—	606
Decalogue	33, 84	—	—
Decapolis	—	—	67
Demonology	665 f.	80	10, 502, 505
Deuteronomists	256	—	—
Deuteronomy	250, 273, 629 f., 657 f.	—	—
Devil. *See* Satan			
Dispersion, the Jewish	—	24-30	5
Education	—	—	25
Elephantine	185	20	—
Emperor-worship	—	—	1, 8, 28 f., 191
Ephod	93, 207, 218 f., 231, 664	—	—
Erasmus	—	—	718 f.
Eschatology	427, 686	7, 36 f.	12, 20, 81, 102 f., 128, 161, 190, 193, 297 f., 314, 409, 434 f., 490, 511, 568 f., 657, 690 n.
Esdraelon	638 f.	—	—
Essenes	—	7	—
Exodus, the	65, 177, 190, 254	—	—

	Old Testament.	*Apocrypha.*	*New Testament.*
Eucharist	631	—	106 f., 197 f., 235, 262, 295, 336, 337 n., 368, 392, 397 f., 403, 421 f., 501 f., 600 f.
Ezekiel's temple regulations	115	—	—
Faith	—	—	428 f., 433, 453, 461, 633
Fall, the	679 f.	72	11, 463 f.
Familiar spirits	117	—	—
Fasting	—	—	15, 58, 148, 288
Feasts	426 f.	—	—
Filling the hand	94	—	—
First-born, the	53, 76, 78	—	—
Flesh, the	—	74 f.	537
Fool	380	—	—
Future life	314 f., 329, 345, 349, 380, 683 f.	66, 69, 71, 79 f.	260, 297, 435
Galilee	258, 640	6	—
Gentile morality	—	—	27
religion	—	—	27 f.
Gilead	645 f.	—	—
Gilgamesh	679, 683	—	—
Gnostics	—	—	314, 558
God, doctrine of	310, 342, 458, 459, 670 f.	66	9 f., 289 f., 405, 406 f., 412 f., 498 f., 539, 684
God-fearers	—	—	348, 357
Goel	120, 329	—	—
Grace	—	—	12
Greek cities	—	4, 12	23
philosophy	—	65, 68 f.	25
Habiru	59, 172, 176, 178	—	—
Halakah	—	22	—
Hammurabi	38, 48 f., 87, 175, 254, 660	—	—
Hasidim	343	3, 6, 131	—
Hasmonæans	—	1 f., 8 f.	—
Heart	379	—	—
Hebrew	—	4	—
script	647	—	—
Hellenism	308 f., 334	4 f., 12	22
Hellenists	—	—	314, 341, 349
Herod Antipas	—	4	4, 70
the Great	—	4 f.	—
Hexapla, the	—	—	723 f.
High places	148	—	—
Hittites	192	—	—
Holiness	117, 487, 606	—	10, 479
law of	95, 115, 117	—	—
Holy of Holies	254	—	—
Holy Spirit	42, 419	—	131, 263 f., 269, 271, 293 f., 330 f., 341, 344, 358, 361, 398 f., 415, 430 f., 470 f., 489, 505 f., 521, 661, 684
Hyksos	175, 176 f.	—	—
Idolatry	—	—	358, 498, 670
Images	260	—	—
Individual, the	345, 487, 522, 532	35	409, 417, 433
Infallibility	4	—	—
Inspiration	4 f., 8, 15, 39, 487, 512, 628	22	100, 206, 329, 708
Ituræans	—	3	—
Jerusalem	—	—	714 f.
Church	—	—	383, 389, 443 f.

	Old Testament.	*Apocrypha.*	*New Testament.*
Job	309 f.	—	—
John the Presbyter	—	—	273, 275
Josephus	—	29	324, 340, 352
Jubilee	119	—	—
Judaism	275, 282	26, 28 f.	357
Judas of Galilee	—	14 f.	—
Judgement, the	427	—	13, 81, 161, 194 f., 297, 426, 434 f.
Justice	252	—	—
Justification	—	—	355, 409, 426, 429 f., 452 f., 461
Kingdom of God, of Heaven, the	—	—	13, 53, 97, 128, 139, 161, 182, 266, 284 f., 286 f., 385 f., 388, 427, 429
mystery of the	—	—	63
Kyrios	—	—	334, 381 f.
Latin texts	650	—	—
Law, the	1, 22, 299, 311, 629 f.	39	14 f., 18 f., 138 f., 187 f., 343, 355, 431, 467, 480 f., 533
Laying on of hands	101	—	295, 342, 344, 390, 421, 426, 577
Leaven	103	—	—
Levirate marriage	142, 164	—	—
Levites	34, 36, 123, 192, 284, 630	—	15
Literary methods	172, 274	—	206
Logia	—	—	125, 128, 279
Logos	311	—	245
Magic. *See also* Witchcraft	—	—	30, 395
Marcion	5, 13	—	—
Marriage	668	—	86 f., 140, 173, 288, 401 f., 495 f.
Massebah	193, 661	—	—
Massoretic text	647 f.	—	—
Meats	—	—	348, 481, 498, 502
Mediator	—	65, 67	—
Megilloth	515	—	—
Melchizedek	50, 344, 368 f.	3	598, 611
Memra. *See* Word			
Mercy-seat	91	—	—
Messiah	368, 370, 433, 619	—	79 f., 93, 194, 199, 281, 283, 291, 335 f., 379, 382, 385
Messianic hope	344, 604 f., 617 f.	14, 35, 37, 41, 80	13, 133, 139, 357, 409 f.
Midrash	173	—	576
Millennium, the	—	—	690, 701
Ministry, the	—	—	323, 341 f., 350 f., 369, 389 f., 399 f., 424 f., 577 f., 584 f., 709
Miracles	170	—	76, 282, 327, 367
Mishna	—	23	—
Mithraism	—	—	31
Moabite Stone	265	—	—
Montanism	13	—	—
Morality, Gentile	—	—	27
Moses and law	22, 250, 275	—	—
and religion	192, 663	—	—
Mystery religions	—	—	30 f., 334, 489, 504
Nabatæans	—	4, 6	—
Name	—	—	337
Names of God	29, 51, 59, 68, 70, 253, 672	—	726

	Old Testament.	*Apocrypha.*	*New Testament.*
Nazareth	—	—	710
Nazarites	125, 192, 209	—	—
Nebuchadrezzar	183,	—	—
Necromancy	685	—	—
Negeb	129, 635	—	—
Neutral text, the	—	—	722 f.
New birth	—	—	250, 292
creation	484	—	—
Jerusalem	484, 522, 540 f.	—	—
Numbers in OT	171	—	—
Ordination	—	—	341, 351, 577
Origen	691	—	723 f.
OT in Christian Church	5	—	329, 437, 602
Papias	—	—	125, 275
Parousia	—	—	103, 263, 427, 436, 657, 664 f.
Passover	75 f., 126	—	106, 262
Penance	—	—	400
Peshitto	649	—	725
Peter, St., at Rome	—	—	445
Pharaoh-Necho	183	—	—
Pharisees	—	6 f., 8, 131	18, 59, 164, 186 f., 287, 297, 339, 431
Philistines	177, 220, 636	3	—
Philo	—	25, 29	—
Pillar	160, 255	—	—
Poetry, Hebrew	—	—	286
Pontius Pilate	—	15 f.	—
Poor, the	385	—	—
Prayer	—	—	15
Predestination	—	—	440 f., 472 f., 475, 477
Priesthood (levitical)	34, 161, 211, 291, 658	—	609
Priests	1, 123, 185, 240, 251, 273	—	15, 400, 425, 599
Code	184, 654	—	—
High	35, 94	1 f., 11, 17, 19	4, 15, 265, 339, 599 f.
Prophecy	419	—	707
Prophets	1, 171, 192, 223, 263, 653	—	206, 350, 657, 707, 709
as historians	170	—	—
false	264, 501	—	144
Proselytes	—	27	396
Psalms of Solomon	—	13	—
Ptolemy	—	1	—
Publicans	—	20	6
Punishment	343, 380	—	—
Quirinius	—	17	6, 213, 316, 733
Rabbis and Rabbinism	—	12, 18, 22	395, 399
Ransom	337	—	457
Redeemer	329	—	—
Religion of Gentiles	—	—	27
of Israel (*c.* 970)	251	—	—
Renunciation	—	—	288
Resurrection	430, 685	7, 35, 38, 72	13, 98, 184, 314, 354, 381, 429, 435, 509 f.
body	—	73	381, 436, 509, 512 f., 522
Roman Empire	—	—	1 f.
Roman rule in Palestine	—	1, 9, 14 f.	3 f., 97 f.
troops in Palestine	—	15	—
Rome and Christians	—	—	7, 640, 645, 682
Riches	—	—	70, 89, 142, 176, 287, 336

	Old Testament.	*Apocrypha.*	*New Testament.*
Righteousness	313	—	11, 14, 265, 409, 427
Ritual	253, 276	—	—
Sabbath	40, 42, 85, 96, 266, 303	—	14, 58, 157
Sacraments	—	—	31 f., 296, 323, 345, 395 f., 419, 420, 423 f., 501
Sacrifice	34, 89, 100, 116, 342, 422 f., 466, 542, 652 f., 662	—	16, 91, 180, 249, 293, 380, 418, 457, 598 f., 606 f., 644
human	53, 209, 271, 663	—	—
Sadducees	251, 402	6 f., 80	19, 98, 339
Sages	378 f., 383	—	—
Salt	104	—	—
Salvation	346	—	68, 451
Samaritan Pentateuch	648	—	—
Samaritans	182, 292, 480, 484	4 f.	—
Sanctuary (central)	33, 116, 195, 198, 239, 256	—	—
right of	145, 251	—	—
Sanhedrin	—	18	—
Sargon	183	—	—
Satan	44, 277, 317, 610, 666	72	10, 53, 142, 158, 264, 437, 606, 684
Saviour	—	—	28, 31, 68
Scapegoat	114, 115	—	—
Science	39	—	—
Scribes	293	21	19, 100
Selucids	—	1	—
Semites	661	—	—
Sennacherib	183	—	—
Septuagint	649	25	—
Shephelah, the	636	—	—
Shewbread	91	—	—
Sheol	323, 684	—	—
Sin	110, 114, 358, 487, 532	33, 37, 81, 86	11, 148, 158, 269, 290, 396, 401, 438, 464, 469 f., 603, 650 f., 670
Sinai	82, 127	—	—
Slavery	33, 35, 87, 669	—	23, 496, 645
Son of Man	—	—	13, 57, 111, 147, 161, 167, 254, 281, 290 f., 343, 347
Spiritual body	—	—	284
gifts	—	—	505
Suffering	309, 339, 343, 351, 473	66	301, 561
Servant	459 f., 468, 469 f.	—	291, 293, 338, 418
Sunday	—	—	302, 368
Synagogue	—	10, 21	16 f.
Synoptic problem	—	—	33 f., 45, 124, 208, 210, 243, 727 f.
Tammuz	416	113 f.	—
Targums	649	—	—
Tell-el-Amarna	175 f.	—	—
Temple	252 f., 269, 280, 484, 604	12, 19	15, 180, 716
Ezekiel's	540 f.	—	—
Teraphim	57, 210, 663 f.	—	—
Textus Receptus	—	—	719 f.
Theophanies	52, 205	—	—
Tithes	185, 301, 630	20, 44	—
Tongues, gift of	—	—	330 f., 389, 472, 507 f.
Torah	606	—	—
Totemism	667 f.	—	—
Tradition of Church	16	—	277

	Old Testament.	*Apocrypha.*	*New Testament.*
Tradition of Elders	185	23	14, 73 f., 156, 164
Trent, Council of	7, 17	—	—
Uncleanness	134, 606	—	396, 481
Unction	—	—	401, 638
Universalism	344, 431, 483, 485	—	324, 348, 357
Unleavened Bread, Feast of ...	78, 89, 160	—	—
Urim and Thummim	225	—	—
Virgin Birth, the	439	—	315 f., 384
Visions	205, 438, 525	—	346, 348
Wells	664 f.	—	—
Wisdom	307 f., 334 f., 379 f., 387	69 f., 79, 82	414, 488 f., 633
Witchcraft and magic ...	161, 529	—	30
Women	669	—	502, 583 f.
Word, the	—	35, 67	10, 245 f.
World, the	—	—	662
Worship	429, 628	81	509, 583
Yetser. *See* Sin			
Zealots	—	15	20

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

NO 15 60
JUN 3 1960
NOV 11 1965

220.7
G666

Gore, Charles
AUTHOR

A new commentary on Holy Scripture.
TITLE

N12886
Borrower's Name

220.7
G666 Gore, Charles
A new commentary on Holy
Scripture.

N12886